FINAL REPORT

"Comparing Scales of Citizenship Between Legal and Social Representations"

**IPAS Project, Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme and
Columbia University Institute for Scholars in Paris (Reid Hall)
April-June, 2007.**

Members of the group:

Catherine Neveu (LAIOS, Cnrs-Ehess, France)
Evelina Dagnino (University of Campinas, Brazil)
Kathleen Coll (Stanford University, USA)
John Clarke (Open University, UK)

I. Points of departure:

Members of the project "Comparing scales of citizenship between legal and social representations" shared a conception of citizenship as a complex and polysemic notion, which can be used to refer to an individual legal status, to describe a form of membership in a political community, or an active engagement in the public sphere. While there is theoretically no necessary conceptual link between the two notions, citizenship and nationality are often confused, in their academic as well as ordinary uses, and even legal definitions of citizenship are sometimes unclear as to the differences that exist between the two.

But whether one considers the links built in each society between nationality and citizenship, the range of rights available for citizens, or the procedures giving access to citizenship, it remains the case that such issues are largely considered as legal and juridical issues to be dealt with by States. Thus citizenship has mainly been studied

and defined from a legal standpoint, and research has been mainly developed by law specialists, who analyzed how legislations changed through time and space. Obviously, such specialists are not unaware of the extent to which legal definitions of citizenship reflect a given state of societies, and incorporate evolutions as to representations of legitimate membership.

It is however somehow surprising to realize how little attention has been paid to the role played by "civil society" in defining citizenship and its extension. Meanwhile on the one hand, citizenship is also formed, debated, contested in more mundane circumstances than revolutionary changes; and on the other hand, citizens' (and non-citizens') answers to State policies and mobilizations within "civil society" itself are as important to consider if one wishes to understand how citizenship is "manufactured" (Bénéï, 2005).

In other words, we clearly took into account, in line with J. Leca (1991), the fact that citizenship (and nationality) is a social and political construction, and an arbitrary one, the borders of which are not only defined in periods of historical upheavals, but in the day-to-day interactions between States' policies and social movements. Our starting point has thus been that the notion that citizenship is more a process than just a status, and that it is being constantly redefined and reshaped in the multiple interactions between State and society, and within society itself.

It has precisely been such connections and disjunctions between legal and social conceptions of citizenship that the group has explored, relying on research already developed by its members in Brazil, France, Great-Britain and the USA. We all had, through our own research, highlighted the extent to which such legal and/or dominant representations of citizenship could be at odds with actual social practices and representations, especially in local mobilizations and movements by economically or socially disadvantaged groups.

Among the dimensions of citizenship that need to be (re)considered is the complex issue of its relationship with nationality, especially since contemporary evolutions, among which the post-colonial dimension of European societies and the development of international migrations, are today strongly questioning such a confusion. If the literature concerning the emergence of post-national form of citizenship can here be useful (Soysal, 1994) it often largely underestimates two central dimensions: that of political rights, and that of the spheres of citizenship within the national society itself.

In other words, if a change in the references on which to rely to claim citizenship, from incorporation in the "national culture" to universal human rights, can rightly be observed, it cannot be so disconnected from the central issue of the extent to which such changes are socially interpreted and incorporated. As Poche argued, citizenship is also about recognition within society itself, between citizens, about the recognized legitimacy of sharing and using a "topos" (Poche, 1992).

The group has had as one of its main topic of research an in-depth analysis of an often understudied field of citizenship studies, i.e. how socially produced and/or local conceptions of what citizenship is about can be different from what the law actually says, and the extent to which such socially/locally produced practices and representations on the one hand, and legal categorizations on the other, interact in complex ways. The group analyzed two central series of issues.

1. Scales of citizenship.
The group engaged itself in a more precise exploration of "scales of citizenship". By relying on research led in four very different societies, its members first analyzed how citizenship is related to different scales (mainly national and local), the extent to which the "local" was considered, by agents and the State, as a proper scale for exercising, but also defining citizenship. It also considered how nationally defined criteria and references were contested, re-appropriated and re-interpreted locally, and how such localized practices could rightly be analyzed under the category of citizenship.

2. Categorizations
Citizenship can usefully be considered as an "institutional semantics" (Abélès, 1999), or a "key-word" in the sense given to the term by R. Williams (1988), i.e. a word that encompasses certain definitions and conceptions, and that, through complex processes of evolution and circulation, accumulates meanings, delimitates fields of possible, and patterns for understanding society and eventually (re)-organizing it. But one can observe other categories are also used, in parallel or in contrast with that of "citizens", such as "users", "inhabitants", or even "consumers", as well as "foreigners", "(im)migrants" or "the poor". The group started from the hypothesis that far from being purely descriptive categorizations, the use of such terms reflects different "political projects" (Dagnino, 2005), carrying different or even contradictory visions of the role and place of individuals and groups in society, of their relationships with the State and of their political space.

Such an approach in terms of categorizations has then allowed both for questioning issues of citizenship's scales from another angle, and for unraveling the diversity of "political projects" thus proposed and circulated; by including potential alternative categorizations (Coll, 2004), for instance when social and political movements in different societies refer themselves to the notion of citizenship when they mobilize for recognition, fight for equal rights, or try to gain access to the public sphere more generally, it is the very "manufacturing" of citizenship (Bénéï, 2005) and of citizens that has been more precisely explored.

II. Method of Working:

The group has organized itself with a pattern of work that combined individual study and reflection with, on average, two days a week of intensive collaborative work. These days have been driven by a combination of inputs: the analysis of key texts selected and introduced by members of the group; the presentation of selected key themes and issues by members of the group; and presentations made by invited researchers (see appendix 1). This has provided a distinctive rhythm of work to structure the group's activities.

The work of the group around these themes was brought into public encounter with the work of other researchers in a two days workshop (les journées d'études). This event was held on the 6-7 June, 2007 and took place in the Maison Suger and Reid Hall. A programme and list of participants is attached as Appendix 2. As we note later, the workshop also forms the basis for a proposed edited volume of papers.

Finally we should note two other sites of exchange that have informed and helped to develop the group's work. Through Catherine Neveu, we were offered access to the deliberations of the GRDR (Groupe de Recherches et de Réalisations pour le Développement Rural www.grdr.org). This association, working in what it defines as the 'double espace de la migration', is directed towards bringing into alignment development and citizenship ('la mise en coéerence du développement et de la citoyenneté'). We were invited by the group to participate in its day long deliberations on the meanings and politics of citizenship (27 May). This engagement has been developed through written responses by members of the group to the GRDR around how its deliberations intersect with the ideas and approaches we have been developing.

We have also been very much aided in our work by the environment provided by the Columbia University Institute at Reid Hall. The scholars and staff there have been a supportive and stimulating community in which to work and we wish to thanks for their thoughtful and generous engagement with us and our project.

III. Progress of the group and temporary findings

The work has focused on exploring a number of distinctive issues at the core of working collaboratively and comparatively on questions of citizenship. We have had to address and examine some important questions of **difference**.

First, there is the question of **disciplinary differences**. Members of the group come from very different academic formations (anthropology, cultural studies, political sciences and social policy). These disciplinary formations have shaped our engagements with citizenship in significant ways, both in term of how such disciplines conceive of citizenship and how our own positions have been developed in relation to established disciplinary knowledge. Each of us occupies a critical position with relation to established disciplinary understandings, enabling us to seek and value dialogues across disciplinary borders. A careful attention to the specificity of disciplinary formations has been an important foundation for the productive working of the group.

Secondly, we have examined carefully the questions of **different national contexts** for our own work and the study of citizenship more generally. We are united in an understanding that 'context matters' as a principle of social investigation generally and especially for the study of citizenship which has been the object of many generalizing abstractions. In the process of working together we have explored not just the specificity of our own empirical work, but also how the national political-cultural context has shaped and made possible particular understandings and mobilizations of citizenship (from French republicanism through to Brazilian popular democratization). Each member of the group has taken on responsibility for explicating the particular national context in which their work is located. As will be said in more detail later, this involves critical reflections on the relationships between formations of nation and conceptions of citizenship.

Finally, it is worth remarking briefly on the intersection of these two dimensions of difference: disciplinary and national. We have also had to take into account the specific national formations of academic disciplines, since these have implications for

the debates and discussions in which each of us has been engaged. There are specific engagements that have taken shape and carry significance in these specific settings (e.g., about questions of level and scale in French political thought; of contestations around 'cultural citizenship' in US anthropology; of radical distinctions between different politically-charged conceptions of citizenship in contemporary Brazil). It is not that such debates and concerns do not travel in academic terms, but it has been important for us to grasp the particular conditions in which they arose and which have consequences for how they are formulated.

Here the question of **translation** has been of particular importance. The group's working language has been English, but significant discussion allowed us to debate the "cultural translation" of terms used in discussion on citizenship issues in our different contexts. For instance, "local", or "community", have been among the terms that required in-depth discussions so as to collectively grasp how they were culturally and politically connected to the conceptions and representations about citizenship in the different contexts under discussion.

The work of the group has then been focused on a set of thematic concerns that emerged in our collective reading and discussions as key 'points of entry' to engaging comparatively with citizenship. There are four such themes:

- Scales and levels;
- States;
- Culture; and
- Political Projects.

The group has addressed itself to the key questions identified in the original proposal: the relationships between different scales or levels of citizenship; and the relationships between legal and social representations. Each of these has required bringing our own work into critical encounters with other scholarship. We have focused considerable effort on the questions and problems of 'scalar thought' (Isin, 2007) which has been preoccupying anthropologists, geographers and political scientists – although not always in the same way. We have also been concerned to problematise the view of citizenship as a legal status, inscribed in juridical and/or political representations. A critical issue here is that such representations intersect with and reinforce particular aspects of scalar thinking (citizenship understood as a status that occurs at the level of the nation and the 'central' state).

In our work, we have built critically on innovations elsewhere to develop these lines of analysis, not least in working out important distinctions between concepts of level and scale (and their articulation with processes of hierarchization and territorialization). We have also directed much attention to how the relationship between social and legal may be thought about. Here our work has examined the question of culture – and its intimate entangling with relations of power and practices of politics. This set of connections informs our understanding of formations of citizenship, and illuminates debates about 'cultural citizenship' emerging in US anthropology particularly. In particular, it has drawn us into critical reflections on the troubled articulation of culture, citizenship and nation in periods of migration.

This work led us to the following statement, written as the presentation of the 2 days workshop in June, "Questions de Citoyennetés/Questioning Citizenships":

"We address the questioning of citizenship in two related ways. First, the practical or political questioning of citizenship by different political projects in different social contexts illuminates the polysemic character of citizenship. Second, such substantive challenges to citizenship require a questioning form of analysis. The two types of questioning (political and analytical) are thus implicated in each other.

We will concentrate on drawing out a series of key issues made visible by these processes of questioning. Although the meanings of citizenship are fluid and mobile, the political projects that contest citizenship always seek to concretise or crystallise specific meanings in institutions, laws, processes, practices and forms of social relationship. As a result, questioning citizenship implies attention to the 'unfinished' processes of making citizenship. Further, citizenship acquires its meanings through its articulation with other keywords, for example, nationality, identity, rights, difference and equality. In consequence, questioning citizenship implies exploring how specific projects to make or remake citizenship articulate its relation to such keywords. Citizenship is enacted in processes and practices across diverse sites (rather the being the sole property of the nation-state and the national level). Questioning citizenship implies attention to the diverse locations in which vocabularies and practices of citizenship come into being, and how citizenship may connect different sites and scales of social and political life.

Finally, we ask what it is about citizenship that makes it such a persistent object of desire for divergent, opposed or contradictory political projects."

In our introduction to the two days, we presented thematised statements about the four key 'points of entry' noted above: Scales/levels; States; Culture; and Political Projects [1].

1. Scales and sites of citizenships

Exploring "scales of citizenship" was one of the main of the departure points of our work. By "scales" we understood then an exploration and analysis of how socially and/or locally produced conceptions of citizenship interacted with legal conceptions and definitions. Our aim was thus to compare different levels and types of production of citizenship (social and legal, localised and state formulated…) and to understand the processes by which these different spheres were mutually constituted, through more or less continuous and fluid circulations that could temporarily crystallized before changing anew. Citizenships were thus conceived of as constantly being redefined and reformulated through a variety of interactions between states, institutions, societies, and among societies themselves. Ours was an "imperfect" citizenship (Balibar, 2001), an unstable set of practices and processes rather than a stable form or a purely legal status.

Scales progressively appears as one of these many often unquestioned uses of spatial references, such as "public space", bottom-up or top-down processes… We then proceeded to consider Isin's criticism of what he calls "the scalar thought", that on the one hand implies vertical and hierarchical representations of power and the State, thus underplaying horizontal dimensions as well as the consequences of such a "vertical topography" (Ferguson, 2002) for understanding and conceptualising relationships between the State, social movements, localities and politics. On the other hand, such a scalar thought implies there is only one level of belonging and loyalty, i.e. the State level. Because of its exclusive and encompassing logic, scalar thought supports an also exclusive conception of citizenship as essentially linked to the State as sole producer of identification, belonging and involvement. Questioning such conceptions is thus a pre-condition to consider the very complexity of citizenship, and the variety of its sites, levels and places of production and enactment.

---

[1]. The group's introduction and its synthesis at the end of the two days were videoed for the MSH archive. They can be viewed online at http://semioweb.msh-paris.fr/AAR/.

A series of topics open for investigations flows from this approach:

- Where does "the State" reside? Does it rely to the sole central (or national, which is different) level? How are constituted and linked the "actual", "imagined"… country?

- What are the sites and places where the production of law and its uses, both by the State and by other agents, meet and feed each other?

- Working on the sites of citizenship also implies considering the connections and tensions between national and/or state model of citizenship, and its localised accommodations, re-interpretations and negotiations, that provide for diversified and interconnected registers of citizenship to emerge.

- It also implies a critical reappraisal of such sites usually conceived as alien to citizenship: the domestic, the personal, the local, and to underline the variety of levels through which it is built and transformed (public policies, education, police…).

- Lastly, such an approach to the sites and scales of citizenship requires us to pay attention to issues of actual spatialization, to the concrete dimensions of representations in terms of occupying spaces, building up places, sharing the topos; indeed processes of citizenship are also played out in co-presence in actual places.

2. Citizenships and states

Citizenship and the state appear to be always intertwined. The state appears as the agent that inscribes, guarantees, polices and realises citizenship as a social status (and as a political, juridical and administrative category). Our own work (and that of others) suggests a more complex, variable and changeable set of connections between citizenship and the state. We begin from the concern to *radically pluralize* the connection – such that we are talking about examining the relationships between citizenships and states. The 's' of pluralizing this field of relationships is attentive to historical and geo-political variation, rather than assuming a normative model from which deviations or divergence might be assessed.

For us this radical pluralization of the relationship between citizenships and states implies three key issues for thinking about states as they are implicated in 'making up' citizenships:

1. they are diverse.

2. they are heterogeneous.
3. that they are contestable and changeable.

We have also had to confront the troubled and troubling relationship between states, nations and citizenships. States work at many (and shifting) levels or scales. States work transnationally and multi-nationally; they also work at the most local levels – the house, the street, the neighbourhood. These are sites of what Painter calls the 'prosaic geographies of stateness' (2006), or Ferguson and Gupta's everyday practices of spatializing states (2002). States organise homes (and the homeless); administer streets (policing, lighting, cleaning etc); create neighbourhoods or communities as administrative, governmental and political sites. In all of these, forms of citizenship may be implicated, produced and practised.

Nevertheless, states also serve as privileged sites for organising the nation and the national. For example, states (as ensembles of policies, practices and people) involve themselves in:

- The management of the relationship between citizenship and nationality (in small and large ways), and the new Ministry of Immigration, National Identity, Integration and Co-development in France brings such questions together.
- The invention and institutionalisation (and reinvention) of national culture and its relationship to other cultures.
- In the everyday interactions between people and state apparatuses that centre on 'recognition' in various ways – as a citizen, as a member of the public, as 'worthy', as 'national, as suspicious, as stranger/foreigner and so on. These range from delivering rights and services, through enabling and empowering people, to regulating, policing and disciplining.

In short, we wish to displace or decentre states, but not make them disappear. Rather we are interested in the diverse ways in which states may be articulated with citizenships.

3. Citizenships and cultures

The fact that both "citizenship" and "culture" are so frequently invoked and hotly contested in contemporary political and academic debates signals the cultural capital both terms carry, as well as their apparent, some say problematic, flexibility as categories of social analysis. Rather than belonging to as separate domains, culture

and citizenship overlap, interact and mutually constitute one other in multiple, specific ways. These include, but are not limited to, material relations of economic or political struggle. Culture is dynamic, and always in process, as opposed to static or essentialized. It is a site of dispute, conflict, reproduction and change. Culture is relational in that it is constituted in and through political, economic, social and historical relations. It has formal expression in legal institutions and political statuses, but these institutions are themselves the products of cultural processes. The state itself exerts discipline on citizens, but state power is one of many forces influencing how people see themselves, each other, political institutions and social change.

Like other cultural forms, citizenship is *imparfait*, precarious, limited, incomplete and always *en travaux*. As a cultural field, citizenship includes naturalized assumptions, beliefs and practices as well as formal, institutionalized set of statuses. The received categories of citizenship -- citizen, subject, national, national identity, inhabitant, foreigner, alien, rights, duty, and so on – are hardly universal. One way we come to identify the cultural "common sense" of citizenship in a particular context is through careful attention to the words people use, the apparently mundane aspects of daily life, and the practices they engage in that relate social belonging, political rights, and issues of equality and social justice. Understanding these different definitions and the particular cultural contexts in which they are embedded also demands careful attention to the historical and subjective processes underlying political transformations.

Culture may provide resources for the articulation of new citizenship identities. People do find creative inspirations in specific ethnic or aesthetic traditions that help them highlight the very cultural specificity, as opposed to claimed universality, of dominant ideas about citizenship and politics in their particular context. Relatively subordinated groups often mobilize cultural practices and identities in their struggles for respect, dignity and recognition as citizen-subjects. At the same, culture is not a thing to be held as property or possession, something we all *have,* or that can *hold* groups of people in its grasp. Cultural politics cannot be limited to identity politics, aesthetic realms, nor to demands for resources and access to artistic work.

As productive and dynamic as the topic of culture and citizenship has been for us, it is also a site of concern as well. On the one hand, decentering citizenship from narrowly statist realms expands the possibilities for the development of innovative democratic practices and institutions. On the other hand, it may also pose a serious question about the bounds of 'citizenship'. If we truly accept that citizenship is constituted through subjective, daily acts as well as institutions, then which politicized realms are not realms of citizenship? We are not satisfied with approaches that expand the scope of the meaning of the terms "culture" or "citizenship" to the point that they become banalized empty signifiers of "everything in the world" or even "politics". At the same time, we resist policing the boundaries of citizenship as a political or analytical category.

Recognizing the cultural contingency of our own ideas about citizenship means engaging new subjects, questions, and methods, but also entails approaching the subject of "citizenship" itself with self-reflexivity and indeed, humility. Critical studies of citizenship as cultural process and product cannot *a priori* determine what is or isn't appropriate as a topic or method or approach for engaging issues of political belonging, rights and emergent citizenship struggles. To do so would be to constrain or prevent the emergence of as-yet-unforseeable analytical possibilities that may offer important resources for addressing intransigent political and social concerns about citizenship.

4. Citizenships and political projects

The idea that the polysemics of citizenship is due, in the first place, to its historical and contextual character is by now, widely recognized. That is to say that citizenship **does not have an essence** which is **immutable along time and spaces**, although we do have questions whether or not this perspective carries the risk of banalizing the idea of citizenship to a point where it may designate anything or become a synonym with politics. In the same sense, specific contexts and times account for the salience and importance given (or not) to citizenship. But historical and contextual perspectives shall be taken further in order to consider specific political projects and the specific meanings they attribute to citizenship, which will give substance to the assertion that citizenship is a contested concept. Such a consideration, it is our

contention, will help us to understand not only the "fluid and changing character of its meanings" (Menendez Carrion, 2003) but also should allow us to emphasize (specific) conflicts and antagonisms that preside over the contestation around citizenship.

We should make clear that we use the notion of political project here to designate the beliefs, aspirations, desires, interests, conceptions of the world and representations of what life in society should be, that guide the political action of different subjects (Dagnino 2002, 2005).

This definition of political project is not restricted to broad and systematized formulations such as –for example– political party projects, but covers a wide spectrum of forms in which representations, beliefs and interests are translated into political actions with varying degrees of explicitness and coherence. This flexibility of the notion that we have adopted here allows us to take into account the multiplicity and diversity of the political subjects that are involved in the process of defining and re-defining citizenship, including the "non citizens" sectors excluded from dominant definitions, who struggle against them and formulate these struggles through new discourses of citizenship and their different forms of political action that, although a part of the process of building citizenship, are frequently ignored in its analysis. This diversity includes subjects that are structured to a greater or lesser degree, that act in local milieu or broader arenas, that are focused on political institutions or social and cultural transformation, etc.

Emphasis on citizenship as political projects will also help us to recognize the sites of struggles around citizenship, wherever they are, as **sites of politics**. This responds to arguments that either locate citizenship at specific sites (for instance, the national, but not the local) or, even more problematic, locate politics itself as pertaining to pre-defined specific sites.

Our hypothesis regarding the notion of political projects is that they cannot be reduced to strategies of political action in a strict sense but express, convey and produce meanings that are a part of wider cultural matrixes. In this way, distinct political projects, at the same time, are anchored on existing cultural configurations

but also elaborate and introduce new elements into them, creating tensions in and transforming society's cultural repertory. We may say then that this relationship between culture and political projects is pervaded by a constitutive ambiguity: on the one hand, the projects –especially those that are not conservative– are formulated precisely to confront and modify elements that are present within the histories and contexts to which they belong. On the other hand, these projects and the practices that they unleash are not immune to the very traits that they attempt to criticize and hold at bay, given the fact that the latter do represent characteristics of, for instance, existing Latin American cultural matrixes. This is one of the reasons why we cannot assume that these projects, either in their concrete implementation or in their discursive practices, can be exempt from contradictions or must be endowed with a high level of internal coherence.

Finally, the notion of political projects can be useful to face –analytically and politically– the situation of **perverse confluence** that characterizes, from our perspective, the situation of some countries in Latin America (and maybe others around the world). This confluence refers to the encounter between the democratizing projects that were constituted during the period of resistance to authoritarian regimes and have continued to seek further democratization and, on the other hand, the neo-liberal projects that have been installed, with different paces and chronologies, since the latter part of the 1980s. The perversity is located in the fact that although these projects move in different and even antagonistic directions, they use a common discourse and adopt the same references. And, in Brazil and several other countries, the building of citizenship (along with the notions of participation and of civil society) is one of these crucial references.

"The use of the same, common points of reference, though taking on quite different meanings, (the fact that everybody talks about citizenship) has produced what could be called a discursive crisis: the common language, with its homogeneous vocabulary, obscures differences, dilutes nuances and reduces antagonisms. This is then the fertile ground in which surreptitiously, the channels through which neo-liberal conceptions of citizenship are pushed forward, coming to occupy unsuspected terrains. In this struggle in which semantic displacement and the dislocation of meanings become

primary weapons, the terrain of political practice becomes a minefield: with any false step, we may fall right into the adversary's camp. Therein lays the perversity and the dilemma that this represents, establishing a tension that today shoots through the entire dynamics of the advance of democratic building." (Dagnino, 2004b:198). And it is here that the identification of the distinct meanings that are hidden beneath these common references, that is, the identification of conflicting projects, may contribute to elucidate the dilemma and to facing the challenges that it has posed.

We continue to see these four "points of entry" as orienting themes for our work, but wish to stress their intersection. They cannot, for us, exist as separate or separable 'approaches to citizenship'.

At this point, we believe that the approach that has emerged in our collaboration marks a distinctive contribution to the study of citizenship as a crucial social and political formation in the contemporary world. We intend to continue our work to both develop and disseminate this approach.

IV. Dissemination and Future Activities:

During the current life of this programme, members of the group have been involved in activities in which they have engaged external audiences in some of the emerging themes and issues (see Appendix 3). Our plans include a variety of means of developing and disseminating the work. These include:

- Already arranged seminars and conference papers:
    - John Clarke, 'Contesting Citizenship' at the Social Policy Association International Conference, Birmingham UK in July 2007;
    - Catherine Neveu, "Questions d'échelles et citoyenneté(s), Colloque Faire territoire aujourd'hui. Colloque UMR Architecture, Urbanisme, Sociétés, Paris, in september 2007;
    - Evelina Dagnino, "Citizenship: a perverse confluence". To be published in *Buzzwords* (provisional title), edited. by Andrea Cornwall (IDS, University of Sussex), London, UK.

- Plans to produce and present future seminar and conference papers

- Kathleen Coll, "Mobilizing History: Non-citizen Immigrant Voting Rights in the United States", American Anthropological Association Conference, Washington, DC, November 2007;
- John Clarke, paper to be given at the American Anthropological Association Conference, Washington, DC, November 2007;
- J. Clarke, K. Coll, E. Dagnino et C; Neveu (PIEA), "Questioning Citizenship", panel for the Conference *Crossroads in Cultural Studies*, Kingston, Jamaica, July 2008.

- An edited collection of papers drawn from the 2 days workshop, to be published in French (editorial work already begun);

- A co-authored volume to be produced by the project team. The volume to be published in English originally, with possible translations into French, Portuguese and Spanish thereafter (schedule and initial responsibilities already established);

- Plans to produce journal articles for publication in relevant national and international journal (one paper already under consideration by *Focaal*, a European journal of social anthropology).

- Plans to meet together to mediate and develop publications, particularly the co-authored book. The group is exploring possible venues and sources of funding to enable such a meeting. Possible sites include the Rockefeller Foundation at Bellagio; and the 2008 International Crossroads in Cultural Studies Conference, in Kingston (Jamaica), where J. Clarke will be a keynote speaker in July 2008.

Appendix 1: Presentations by invited scholars.

12th of April 2007 :

Véronique Bénéï (LAIOS, Cnrs-Ehess) : « Building national citizens in India »

9th of May 2007 :

Etienne Leroy (LAJP, University Paris I) : « La post-modernité vue d'Afrique »

15th of May 2007

Danielle Lochak (University Paris X): "La citoyenneté d'un point de vue juridique"

30th of May 2007

Jean-Francois Gossiaux (LAIOS, Cnrs-Ehess) "Nation, Etat et ethnicité: le cas de la Macédoine"

Appendix 2 : Programme of the journées d'études

<p align="center">PIEA « Scales of citizenship »</p>

<p align="center">(MSH-Columbia University)</p>

<p align="center">Journées d'études, les 6 et 7 juin 2007</p>

<p align="center">Questions de citoyennetés / Questioning citizenships</p>

<p align="center"><u>Mercredi 6 juin : Maison Suger, 16-18 rue Suger 75006</u></p>

10 h – 12 h

Questions de citoyenneté : une introduction
By theIPAS members: J. Clarke (Open University), K, Coll (Stanford university), E. Dagnino (University of Campinas), C. Neveu (LAIOS, CNRS-EHESS)

« States and subalterns, information and rights: reflections on citizenship enactments in contemporary India », Aradhana Sharma (Wesleyan University)

14 h – 17 h

Une « citoyenneté » kali'na ? Constructions citoyennes et jeux de niveau en Guyane française, Gérard Collomb (LAIOS, CNRS-EHESS)

« Citoyenneté musulmane au Mali : État laïc, société civile islamique et nationalité civique », Gilles Holder (CEMAf CNRS)

« La question de la citoyenneté en Nouvelle-Calédonie », Alban Bensa (GTMS, EHESS)

<p align="center"><u>Jeudi 7 juin : Reid Hall, 4 rue de Chevreuse 75006</u></p>

10 h - 12 h

« La citoyenneté en construction ou en déconstruction dans l'Irak post-Saddam », Hosham Dawood (LAIOS, CNRS-EHESS)

« Remaking Citizenship ? Non-Citizen Immigrants and the Right to Vote in the U.S », Kathleen Coll (Stanford University and PIEA).

14 h – 17 h

« Vingt ans après : la construction démocratique au Brésil, vue depuis la banlieue de São Paulo », **Gabriel de Santis Feltran (University of Campinas, Brazil)**

« La citoyenneté locale en Afrique de l'Ouest : quelques réflexions issues de terrains en cours », Peter Hochet, EHESS (Marseille), Laboratoire Citoyennetés (Ouagadougou)

Synthèse des deux journées, by the IPAS members

Journées d'études "Questioning citizenships/Questions de citoyennetés"

List of Participants :

Mercredi 6 juin 2007
Maison Suger

Mihaela Bacou, Columbia University Institute, Reid Hall
Alban Bensa, CEMS, EHESS
Sarah Botton, GRET, Latts
Marcus Bruce, Bates College, USA
John Clarke, Open University, PIEA
Kathleen Coll, Stanford University, PIEA
Gérard Collomb, Laios
Evelina Dagnino, Université de Campinas (Brésil), PIEA
Hosham Dawod, Laios
Donna Dickenson, University of London

Peter Hochet, EHESS Marseille, Laboratoire Citoyennetés
Gilles Holder, Cemaf Aix-en-Provence
François Karé, Nouvelle-Calédonie
Birgit Müller, Laios
Catherine Neveu, Laios, PIEA
Marie-Christine Peltier-Charrier, Laios
Rock Pidjot, Nouvelle-Calédonie
Gabriel de Santis Feltran, Université de Campinas (Brésil)
Anu Sharma, The Wesleyan University
Matthieu Solier, Université Paris IV

Jeudi 7 juin 2007
Reid Hall

Naby Avcioglu, Columbia University Institute, Reid Hall
Mihaela Bacou, Columbia University Institute, Reid Hall
Marcus Bruce, Bates College, USA
Nadège Chell, Reso-Femmes, Genève
John Clarke, Open University, PIEA
Kathleen Coll, Stanford University, PIEA
Gérard Collomb, Laios
Evelina Dagnino, Université de Campinas (Brésil), PIEA
Hosham Dawod, Laios
Donna Dickenson, University of London
Peter Hochet, EHESS Marseille, Laboratoire Citoyennetés
Gilles Holder, Cemaf Aix-en-Provence
Birgit Müller, Laios
Catherine Neveu, Laios, PIEA
Marie-Christine Peltier-Charrier, Laios
Gabriel de Santis Feltran, Université de Campinas (Brésil)
Anu Sharma, The Wesleyan University

Appendix 3 : Activities of Group Members during the programme

Catherine Neveu:

Discussant, Table-ronde des collectivités locales, 3èmes Rencontres de la démocratie participative Europe-Amérique Latine, IEP-Conseil Régional Poitou Charentes, BID, 1th of June.

Evelina Dagnino:

Lecture, the 7th of May, Course "La citoyenneté hors les murs", 1er Cycle Amérique Latine à Poitiers, IEP de Paris.

Paper: "Participation y proyectos politicos in Brazil: Los dilemmas de la democracia participative", presented to the 3èmes Rencontres de la démocratie participative Europe-Amérique Latine, IEP-Conseil Régional Poitou Charentes, BID, 30 May- 1 June.

Kathleen Coll:

Lecture, the 30th of April, Course "La citoyenneté hors les murs", 1er Cycle Amérique Latine à Poitiers, IEP de Paris.

Paper : 'Remaking Citizenship ? Non-Citizen Immigrants and the Right to Vote in the U.S' presented to the Journées d'études *Questions de Citoyennetés/Questioning Citizenships,* 6th-7th of June.

John Clarke:

Lecture, the 14th of May, Course "La citoyenneté hors les murs", 1er Cycle Amérique Latine à Poitiers, IEP de Paris.

Paper: 'Living with/in and against neo-liberalism: pursuing ambivalence?' presented to Transnational Governmentality in South East Europe Workshop *"Translating neo-liberalism on the sovereign frontier: concepts, cases, contestations",* Rabac, Croatia 1-3 June 2007.

Discussant at conference on *Anthropology, Activism and the Neo-liberal State*, Central European University, Budapest, 22-23 June.