



Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the European Union: Traversing national boundaries of inequality?

Vieten, U. M. (2008). Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the European Union: Traversing national boundaries of inequality? In D. Schiek, & V. Chege (Eds.), *European Union Non-Discrimination Law: Comparative perspectives on multidimensional equality law*. (pp. 93-113). Abingdon: Routledge-Cavendish Taylor & Francis Group.

Published in:

European Union Non-Discrimination Law: Comparative perspectives on multidimensional equality law

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2008 the author.

This is an accepted manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in *European Union Non-Discrimination Law: Comparative Perspectives on Multidimensional Equality Law* in 2008, available online: <http://www.routledge.com/9780415457224>.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.



European Union Non-Discrimination Law

Comparative perspectives on
multidimensional equality law

**Edited by Dagmar Schiek and
Victoria Chege**

 **Routledge·Cavendish**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK



viii *Contents*

4 Positive rights and positive duties: Addressing intersectionality	73
SANDRA FREDMAN	
4.1 Introduction	73
4.2 Intersectionality in a context of positive duties	74
4.3 Intersectionality and the law: a blunt instrument	77
4.4 Positive duties in anti-discrimination law	79
4.5 Intersectionality and positive action	81
4.6 Role of European Union law	85
4.7 Conclusion	87
PART II	
Theorising intersectionality from different disciplinary angles	91
5 Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the European Union: Traversing national boundaries of inequality?	93
ULRIKE M VIETEN	
5.1 Introduction	93
5.2 Recognising differences: doing feminist research on intersectionality and social complexity	95
5.3 The meaning of social categories and subjective dimensions: looking for research strategies that improve emancipation	98
5.4 The disappearance and re-emergence of social class: the intersecting dimensions of gender, ethnicity, class and faith	101
5.5 European socialisation and intersecting social categories	104
5.6 Conclusion	107
6 Stigma: A limiting principle allowing multiple-consciousness in anti-discrimination law?	115
IYIOLA SOLANKE	
6.1 Introduction	115
6.2 Grounds and immutability in anti-discrimination law	116
6.3 Intersectionality	118
6.4 Stigma	121
6.5 A stigma-led approach as the basis for multiple consciousness: Appiah and Wabwire: Race, gender, age discrimination	123
6.5.1 Stigmas attached to young black men in British society	124





List of contributors

Dr Oddný Mjöll Arnardóttir is Professor of Law at Reykjavík University, Iceland. She is also a board member of the Icelandic Human Rights Centre.

Dr Susanne Burri is Senior Lecturer at the School of Law (Gender and Law), University of Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Victoria Chege (LLM, LLM (Eur)) is research assistant at the University Carl von Ossietzky of Oldenburg, Germany.

Sandra Fredman is Professor of Law and a Fellow of Exeter College at the University of Oxford, UK. She was elected Fellow of the British Academy in 2005.

Dr Morag Goodwin is Lecturer in Law at the University of Maastricht, The Netherlands, and a CLPE Visiting Fellow at Osgoode Hall Law School, Toronto, Canada.

Dr Kristina Koldinská is Lecturer in Law at the Charles University of Prague, Czech Republic.

Dr Sylvaine Laulom is Lecturer in Law at the University of St Etienne, France.

Dr Titia Loenen is Professor of Gender and Law at the University of Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Dr Ruth Nielsen is Professor of Law at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark.

Dr Kevät Nousiainen is Academy Professor for women's studies at the University of Helsinki, Finland, and Professor of Comparative Law and Legal Theory at the University of Turku, Finland. She is also a board member of the Christina Institute of Women's Studies.

Dr Michael Orton is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for Employment Research, University of Warwick, UK.



*Contributors* xix

Dr Sacha Prechal is Professor of European Law at the University of Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Dr Peter Ratcliffe is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Centre for Rights, Equality and Diversity at the University of Warwick, UK.

Dr Lynn Roseberry is Associate Professor of Law at Copenhagen Business School, Denmark.

Dr Ute Sacksofsky, MPA (Harvard) is Professor of Public Law and Comparative Law at University of Frankfurt aM, Germany, a director of the Cornelia Goethe Centrum für Frauenstudien und die Erforschung der Geschlechterverhältnisse (Centre for Women's and Gender Studies), and Public Advocate to the Hessian State Constitutional Court.

Dr Dagmar Schiek is Jean Monnet Professor of European Law and Director of the Centre of European Law and Legal Studies at the University of Leeds, UK.

Dr Hege Skjeie is Professor in Political Science at the University of Oslo, Norway, adjunct professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Aalborg University, Denmark, and a Member of the Norwegian Equality Tribunal.

Dr Iyiola Solanke is Lecturer in Law at the Law School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK. In 2007, she was awarded a Jean Monnet Fellowship at the University of Michigan Law School.

Dr Ulrike M Vieten is visiting Lecturer in Media and Cultural Studies at the University of East London and at the London Metropolitan University, UK.





Part II

Theorising intersectionality from different disciplinary angles







5 Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the European Union

Traversing national boundaries of inequality?

Ulrike M Vieten

5.1 Introduction

Directives 2000/43/EC,¹ 2000/78/EC,² 2002/73/EC and 2004/113/EC³ signify a policy strategy willing to create more cohesive and integrating working conditions and to combat discriminations of citizens within the EU.⁴ While initiating a broader implementation process of multidimensional equality law the EU framework aims to deepen national regulations and anti-discrimination practices in all EU Member States. This ambitious goal confronts solicitors and law scholars,⁵ but even more so feminist sociologists⁶ with theoretical and pragmatic concerns on how to evaluate, balance and generally relate different discriminatory grounds, individual claims and social systems of oppression to each other. It is proclaimed that 'EC non-discrimination law needs to maintain an adequate balance between group-related and individualistic aims'.⁷ Hence, as we seek to enrich our understanding of multidimensional discrimination effects unfolding between and among different dimensions of social divisions it is necessary to go back to methodological questions: indeed, we are confronted with epistemological problems as the notion of individual differences as a matter of intersecting identities does not capture adequately the systematic impact of historically constructed group hierarchies. Besides, intersectional identities could be linked to 'hybridity'⁸ and, therefore, new configurations of discriminatory grounds might occur that diffuse even more the meaning of group clusters of, for example, class, 'race' and gender, as the most prominent categories of social inequality. As the phenomenon of intersecting identities will lead our interest in how to grasp research approaches to intersectionality, we have to ask: what does intersectionality mean and why did feminists start to focus on it? And further, in what ways can we make the most of an analytical understanding of overlapping social categories that keeps a political eye on the balance between individual subjectivity and social groupings?

In the following, I am going to sketch some characteristic conceptual aspects of the term 'intersectionality' confronting theoretical considerations⁹ with the distinctive logic of empirical demands that take into account the





94 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

overall scope of the EU Directives. Generally, there is a tension between an analytical approach to intersectionality which argues for anti-essentialism on the one hand, and a more pragmatic purpose defining discriminatory grounds according to certain group characteristics, on the other. In order to advance an interdisciplinary discussion on methodology, that is, to discuss the need to answer the question how to study intersectionality, I turn to the arguments of the US American sociologist, Leslie McCall, who put this question at the core of her concerns.¹⁰ McCall's systematic overview of different research approaches to intersectionality underlines that we have to understand the purpose of specific (academic) knowledge before deciding what kind of intersectionality approach might be appropriate to use. Not by chance, we come across a more principled dilemma between research that challenges any fixity of classifications and more strategic approaches relying on defined categories. The latter, as McCall argues, does focus on existing hierarchical relationships, that is, the salient importance of social class, in order to map the impact of group subordination and individual discrimination.

In contrast to the rather marginalised attention that is given to social class, sometimes 'invisibly' encapsulated¹¹ in other social categories, I argue in a further section that classed economic hierarchies underscore current political debates on cultural integration, equity and civic participation of individuals and minority communities in the EU and beyond. My neo-socialist-feminist insistence on the meaning of social class opposes those public and academic views that approach clusters such as ethnicity, religion and sexuality while neglecting the central impact of class on individual chances to secure those differences. Also, I argue that we have to take into account specific scopes of (European) policy that interfere in the regulating role of national societies while not handling fully the emergence of new social complexities. This contention brings me to a discussion of Sylvia Walby's timely proposal¹² in my final section who urges us to re-conceptualise social categories with reference to more flexible and less nested social systems. The notion of system has a central role to play in the way we interpret social categories and, finally, how we might understand the complex overlap (intersectionality) of social divisions. Hence, her intervention is particularly relevant as the transformation of national societies in and beyond single nation states pushes ahead new transgressive formations of what sociologists regard as *social systems*. My chapter will conclude while arguing that EU multidimensional equality law should privilege the intersections of particular discriminatory grounds due to its intentional policy character and its prospective wish to come to terms with historical totalitarianism and National Socialism: all in all, multidimensional anti-discrimination policy aims to strengthen the institutionalisation of the EU as a transnational (trans-nation state) community in its own right, but while constructing transnational equality parameters (*de jure*) more complex social layers and demands for social justice are generated that are stretching beyond the borders and boundaries of the EU.





5.2 Recognising differences: doing feminist research on intersectionality and social complexity

The term intersectionality indicates a commitment to analyse whether and to what extent certain socio-cultural hierarchies such as class, gender, ethnicity, nationality, ‘race’ and sexuality might intersect. Also, it includes in-depth studies of how social categories are constructed and in what ways these categories support one another while producing inclusion or exclusion. Therefore, the overall analytical scope reaches out for an understanding of multiple dimensions of oppressions in terms of socio-economic structures, but also its impact on the social positioning of individuals.¹³ But what kind of social consequences occur when ‘particular identities are lived in the modalities of other categories’?¹⁴ Do multiple identities erase social clusters nesting within nationally framed social systems of power or might they create new social groupings?

The phenomenon of intermingling systems of social oppression was recognised before the term ‘*intersectionality*’ appeared: back in 1990, the historian Gerda Lerner argued that sex, class and ‘race’ dominance are interrelated and inseparable from the very beginning. According to Lerner ‘[t]he form which class first took historically was generic and racist. The form that racism first took was generic and classist. The form the state first took was patriarchal’.¹⁵ Without even using the term ‘intersectionality’, Lerner relates to ‘race’, gender and class, but also to patriarchy as reinforcing and backing each other. More recently, Irene Browne and Joya Misra¹⁶ argue:

Feminist sociologists call for an alternative theorizing that captures the combination of gender and race. Race is ‘gendered’ and gender is ‘racialized’, so that race and gender fuse to create unique experiences and opportunities for all groups – not just [for] women of color.

These different statements address the theme of overlapping gendered and racialised oppression, that is, gender and ‘race’ and therefore give us insights on how US feminists have approached intersecting social categories. Baukje Prins¹⁷ claims that the ‘US approach foregrounds the impact of system or structure upon the formation of identities, whereas British scholars focus on the dynamics and relational aspect of social identity’.¹⁸ In this regard a more *systemic* and a more *constructionist* interpretation¹⁹ of intersectionality could be identified, both of which are, nonetheless, as will be discussed later, significant to an Anglo-American research and broader public discourse context. What is of major interest here, is to find out which epistemic directions encompassing intersectionality might be more suitable to an EU framework as the impact of social divisions (systemic elements) and subjective and performative acts (constructivist elements) have developed in EU Member States unevenly and quite differently. In addition, these dissimilar legal and





96 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

cultural contexts are now undergoing mutual transformations that eventually might lead to a *novel social space* in Europe and beyond.

In principle, research agendas and for that reason, applied sociological empirical studies regarding individual discriminations and their linkages to group structures are embedded in ‘national’²⁰ (nation state) academic institutions. Methodological frameworks and socio-political conditions on how to explore and explain social hierarchies regarding gender, ‘race’ and ethnicity are for example connected to broader configurations of notions of citizenship, patterns of trans-border migration and racialised boundaries.²¹

Diverse national histories indicate that the national community (‘the people’) addressed in a definition of the democratic body is a fluid rather than a fixed sovereign. Therefore, discourses on citizenship rights and participation in democracy relate directly to nationally framed membership which gives selective and exclusive entry to a community. As John Rundell argues:

[c]itizenship is the formal and trans-communal mechanism that draws an anonymous and even polymorphous population who inhabit the territory of a nation-state into its regulatory system. Or to put it another way, territorial-national citizenship . . . is a mechanism for the administrative control of the movement of a nation’s inhabitants within and across its borders.²²

Apart from the multiplicity of individual biographical experiences and subjective positions within state borders, ‘national borders become a specific form, spatially bounded, of collectivity boundaries’.²³ Currently, perceptions of legal citizenship, community boundaries and territorial borders are modified to more complex layers of national, nation-state and EU ‘imagined communities’²⁴ transforming the meaning of collective belonging, citizen rights and its reach in terms of territorial borders and socio-cultural boundaries. Thus, these social and ideological transformations are affecting notions of social divisions and, accordingly, academic approaches to intersectionality and multidimensional equality.

In the following, I am going to sketch some aspects of the tension between shifting academic research agendas and (feminist) political movements in their call for acknowledging different stages in understanding social complexity.

As far as the German feminist discourse on diversity is concerned Gudrun Axeli-Knapp,²⁵ for instance, admits that either researchers with minority background²⁶ or researchers working in the field of migration studies²⁷ pushed forward a more critical perspective on gender studies in Germany. While rightly reflecting the importance of academic status regarding the public recognition of intellectual arguments her observation disregards feminist dialogues that took place in radical feminist journals back in the early 1990s.²⁸ A controversial debate about naming differences among women developed after the critical interventions of Jessica Jacoby and Gotlinde Magiriba Lwanga in 1990.²⁹ Jacoby and Magiriba Lwanga confronted the





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 97

dominant Christian and ‘white’ outlook of German feminists as a taken for granted hegemonic cultural lens; their publication was a reflection of controversial debates that shook the ‘feminist consensus’ at ‘women weeks’ (*Frauenwochen*) at the end of the 1980s. Knapp’s perception makes clear that the academic recognition of marginalised voices, that is, their relevance for the public discourse often unfolds in a delayed (academic) institutional frame and further, that the public articulation of social movements (that is, feminist movements) does not automatically match with the academic findings of its contemporaneous (feminist) research. In contrast to a rather late academic adaptation of ideological contestations about *difference* among feminists in Germany, British feminist and post-colonial scholars of transnational, bi-national and/or ethnic minority backgrounds challenged mainstream academia in Britain much earlier. Since the early 1980s, British feminist social theory analysed intersecting complexity³⁰ and in the 1990s, translocational³¹ social positioning of women – though as Nira Yuval-Davis remarks, ‘[a]pparently, without noticeable effect on policy makers’.³²

In fact, a broader European recognition of the theme of social complexity emerged only recently while acknowledging the research on intersectionality undertaken by US black feminists, most prominently Patricia Hill Collins³³ and Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw.³⁴ Black feminist scholars had challenged white middle-class feminism and male-centred anti-racism for ignoring the specific and different situation of black women. Crenshaw introduced the term ‘intersectionality’ stressing that single-axis discrimination (that is, gender) left black women outside the focus group ‘woman’. The ‘no responsibility’ in concrete situations of *claims* made it necessary to think about the combination of discriminatory grounds potentially overlapping in different social categories. Having said ‘claims’, this term signals an individual rights/interests nexus looking at, for example, the actual living conditions of women regarding employment, wage, violence or access to housing, social services and so forth. Susanne V Knudson argues that ‘approaches to intersectionality have mostly been used in qualitative field studies. The theoretical inspiration has developed the complexity of analysis from observations, interviews and questionnaires’.³⁵ For example, Crenshaw based her critical argument on research focusing on violence against women of colour; that is, the non-reasonable accommodation they got in shelters for battered women.³⁶ Accordingly, we have to bear in mind two decisive angles of the concept of intersectionality: first, its more prominent rooting in an US American context focusing on skin colour and its intersections with gender and class as the most important signifier of its racialising and discriminating systems.³⁷ Second, and this is important to an overall inclusive political discourse, we have to understand the philosophical element of the concept of intersectionality. Naomi Zack³⁸ proposes that intersectionality means that we cannot impose:

[I]imits on the numbers or kinds of possible intersected identities . . . there is no reason to stop at one dimension of oppression. To race can be





98 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

added class, age, physical ability, sexual preference, for starters. The only way to limit possible intersected identities is by counting only those whose proponents have managed to give recognized voice to what they are.³⁹

The last remark about the ‘recognized voice’ brings in the explicit political dimension of public dispute and collective struggle, mentioned above. It stresses that legal, social and cultural spaces in which group representations can be articulated are contingent and open to contestation. Hence, the flux of categories as introduced above and connected to this, the historical embedding of group struggles, are at the core of feminist debates on how the concept of intersectionality engenders meaning. What I am proposing here is an ethically sensitive and reflexive understanding of the term ‘intersectionality’ that, in principle, offers various ways to generate emancipatory knowledge. Conceptualising and theorising social divisions evolves in a different academic sub-field than does the remedy of concrete cases of injustice or discriminations. Accordingly, there is no right or wrong in doing intersectional analysis; it rather matters to understand the range of methodological concerns on the one hand, and differing needs to find adequate research methods to solve the tension between structural (group) exclusions and concrete (individual) emanations of discriminations. Without any doubt the preference for specific approaches to intersectionality goes hand in hand with *particular* political or strategic objectives.

5.3 The meaning of social categories and subjective dimensions: looking for research strategies that improve emancipation

Leslie McCall’s⁴⁰ approach to intersectionality research brings back socio-economic aspects to the theory field of researching equality and justice while differentiating *discriminatory dimensions* of individual positioning within a constellation of group hierarchies. The central question to be answered when thinking of complex social reality and multiple discriminations might be: how can complexity be managed in concrete cases of discrimination? According to McCall:

Individuals usually share the characteristics of only one group or dimension of each category defining their social position. The intersection of identities in individuals takes place through the articulation with a single dimension of each category. Thus the ‘multiple’ in these intersectional analysis refers not to dimensions within categories but to dimensions across categories.⁴¹

Hence, McCall’s differentiation between ‘dimensions’ and ‘categories’ could help to clarify the limits of subjective identity aspects of individuals (*dimension* as the personal interpretation of an overlapping belonging to certain





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 99

groups) and social categories echoing systematic power relationships of historically constructed group hierarchies.

To make more explicit the difference between: (a) dimension; and (b) category we might construct a person at the intersections of various social axes,⁴² for example a Protestant, middle class, gay British woman living in Yorkshire is placed at the intersections of multiple categories, that is, religion, class, sexuality, nationality, and gender. Only one single dimension of different categories is relevant in her unique social location as the multiplying of discriminatory grounds also requires that we have to clarify in what ways the relationship, that is, the tension between majority and minority categories might unfold. In this case, we could assume that in particular her (homo-)sexuality might be an objective of structural vulnerability (asymmetry) as far as dominant patterns of heterosexuality are concerned. Does it make a difference when the concrete person we are talking about would be working class instead of middle class, or Jewish instead of Protestant, or Mexican instead of British? We might agree that her individual experience of homophobic discrimination in a hetero-normative environment probably might be the same independent of other layers of minoritised status, but intersecting dimensions of specific categories will increase her vulnerability to being targeted, perhaps, by anti-Semitism and homophobia; racism, classism and homophobia or xenophobia, homophobia and sexism. According to Gill Valentine, a spatial understanding of intersecting social identities refers to 'varying levels of emotional investment in different subject positions at different temporal and spatial moments, as well as continuities and discontinuities'.⁴³ Thus, from the individual's perspective the 'undoing of one identity by another',⁴⁴ is part and parcel of dealing with different power situations where 'dominant spatial orderings'⁴⁵ exist. Therefore, intersecting subjective identities are embedded in a web of intersecting or overlapping social hierarchies. To come back to McCall's approach, its purpose is to differentiate 'dimensions' and 'categories' following a research logic that is interested to measure *relationships* between discriminating factors. As McCall emphasises, 'The concern is with the nature of the relationships among social groups and, importantly, how they are changing, rather than with the definition or representation of such groups per se'.⁴⁶

In Scheme 5.1, I have clustered the three main intersectionality approaches unearthed by McCall to make clear in what ways research methods and methodology are embedded in specific intellectual projects. The classified investigating strategies to intersectionality have to be regarded as *models*⁴⁷ catching specifically designed scopes of (feminist) knowledge. Whereas the *anti-categorical (I)* and the *inter-categorical complexity (III)* approach express opposing views on the notion and accordingly, use of social categories, the *intra-categorical complexity approach (II)* attempts to mediate the deconstruction of classic holistic groups such as class, gender and 'race' while insisting on political strategies. The latter is based on the assertion that group identities could be mobilised against oppression. Nonetheless, this middle way



100 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

Table 5.1

<i>Scope/ intersectionality</i>	<i>I Anti-categorical complexity</i>	<i>II Intra-categorical complexity</i>	<i>III Inter-categorical complexity</i>
Characteristics	Deconstruction of 'master categories'; argues against fixed ascriptions; this approach is often linked to (white) postmodern feminism.	Analysis of 'narratives' or 'single case studies'; focuses on particularly neglected intersections, i.e. 'race, gender and class; supported by (black) feminism; feminists of colour.	Focus on 'relationality'; McCall favours this approach looking at the relationships and tensions of existing social categories.
Problematic aspects	This approach creates and multiplies categories: for example 'trans-gender', 'bisexual', 'multiracial' identities though rejecting 'stable' categories.	This approach works on and accepts 'relatively stable relationships of social categories' while interrogating boundary marking and condemning explicit definitions.	This approach requires provisional definitions of analytical categories in order to denounce group relationships; it contains the danger of re-essentialising group belonging.
Scope of knowledge	Its anti-essentialism fosters a permanent re-drafting of group categories and boundaries.	Its middle way approach announces a political challenge to specific hegemonic group hierarchies.	Its insistence on the hierarchical meaning of social categories asks for an evaluation of concrete dimensions across categories; this approach could be applied to comparative, multi-group studies.

approach accentuates conflicting social dimensions that unfold as identity elements across group categories. What becomes very clear from the different approaches is that McCall's own research, namely that of inter-categorical complexity, does focus on structural relationships that reflect social positions as an outcome of group hierarchies across different categories.

Accordingly, McCall's own epistemic project is quite distinct from other approaches to intersectionality as she clearly stresses an 'evaluating' perspective regarding equality and difference. In her own phrasing, 'meaningful inequalities'⁴⁸ matter and should be measured quantitatively. Thus, she focuses on the question of how to gather data with respect to multidimensional layers of social locations supporting distributive justice that prioritise, for example, group compensation strategies.

Further, McCall asserts that the earning gap between poor and rich





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 101

populations in the US rose in the late 1970s⁴⁹ confronting feminist research with an urgent need to understand more closely wage differences between men and women, but also between women of various classed, ethnic and 'race' backgrounds. Her overall criticism that feminist research tended to focus on qualitative research neglecting methodological innovations of quantitative methods hits an ideological nail. Also, she complains that research using highly complex statistical material is difficult to publish in leading peer-journals.⁵⁰ These allegations and concerns are serious and thus, we should ask ourselves, what kind of complexity are we able to measure and what are the limits to digest complexity? Given that global poverty is on the rise, although post-industrial economic transformations are diminishing the gap in wealth between the classic North and South of the Globe (First and Third World economies),⁵¹ McCall's plea to focus on the meaning of *social class* is reinforced. But as the remedy of individual cases of discriminations depends on comparative data and therefore methodological parameters to measure inequalities, we also have to reflect on the normative directions of inquiries (scope of knowledge).

5.4 The disappearance and re-emergence of social class: the intersecting dimensions of gender, ethnicity, class and faith

Academic approaches on ethnicity and gender,⁵² and, as far as a general crisis in faith systems⁵³ is concerned, gendered intersections with religion (Muslim faith, in particular) have had more attention in recent years.⁵⁴ This is due to alarmed nation state governments in and beyond Europe trying to cope with 'ethnically' framed social conflicts, fundamentalist threats and organised terrorist violence in the aftermath of 11 September 2001 and 7 July 2005, as well as efforts to combat an increase of anti-Muslim racism.⁵⁵ With reference to increasing global risk and security discourses, however, we should bear in mind that beneath the surface of these regional and local debates, economically and socially excluding cultural practices⁵⁶ exist in all EU states, although perhaps varying in their scale of violent expressions and political consequences.

The Parisian Banlieu riots in 2005 and the latest of 2007, give very good examples of spontaneous eruptions of anger and frustration due to social and economic segregation. The 'criminal' face of youth violence appears in a 'cultural' or 'ethnic' make up caused by long-lasting experiences of institutionalised racism. As Alana Lentin argues, the Banlieu riots, not unlike the riots in urban black ghettos of the US in the 1960s–1970s, or the London-Brixton riots in 1981, articulate a protest against 'heavy handed policing of the poor, non-white people in neighbourhood that have become no-man's lands, severed from the centres of political, cultural and economic life'.⁵⁷

European nation states often only 'tolerate' non-Christian populations either as foreigners, as cheap labour, as temporary working cohorts or as second-class citizens, while not standing up to the social consequences of





102 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

failed integration politics and *classed* cultural exclusions. As John Rex⁵⁸ (1996) puts it:

Although it protests loudly about being against ‘Racism’ and ‘xenophobia’, the European Union has devised an institution in the Migrants Forum which classifies racial and cultural minorities who are citizens together with the *gastarbeiders* who are not. The problems of minorities are, in fact, to be marginalized and dealt with outside the normal democratic process.

When we look at national reports on racist violence for example, we are confronted with information deficits of EU Member States regarding criminal records and coherent data collections. The RAXEN NFP Reports of 2005⁵⁹ for example made clear that Greece, Italy and Portugal have no public official criminal justice data on racist crimes and violence.⁶⁰ Other countries hold good or excellent data collection mechanisms, but the focus swings between ‘general discrimination’ and ‘activities of extreme right-wing groups/hate speech’.⁶¹ Thus, the overall EU report concludes that ‘Member States have different official systems in place for collecting data on racist crimes and violence’;⁶² this appears as significant and fairly typical⁶³ for federal policy structures undermining more coherent attempts to combat racism, that is, discrimination of religious or ethnic minorities in the EU.

Consequently, looking at the incongruence of national reports on racist violence we should act with reservations against research agendas that focus on the collection of sensitive data regarding gendered religious membership. Moreover, the current policy agenda in different European countries seems to concentrate on axes of ‘gender, religion and ethnicity’ while widely neglecting the central impact of (deprived) social class status and complex notions of transnational belonging. It seems that prejudiced perceptions of collective cultural competence have become central to an ideological discourse about minority ethnic group rights against female individual right claims.⁶⁴ Symptomatically, a British mainstream public discourse, for example, shifted its attention from ‘race’ and gender intersections to signifiers of culturalised regimes of ‘female oppression’: policy discourses on minority ethnic communities, for example, connected the theme of immigration and citizenship with bogus and forced marriages.⁶⁵ Hence, national state authorities which prioritise information on the potential of minorities to engage with political extremism and violent culture rather than encouraging co-ordinated EU studies on how to change patterns of prejudices and structural social exclusions underscore they do not traverse boundaries of inequality.

Hence, we should keep a critical distance from any formalised application of social categories as they only work as *approximations of constructed relationships*; they have to be read, after all, in concordance with shifting ideological implications of intersecting social categories.

Avtar Brah and Anne Phoenix⁶⁶ argue that the social category ‘class’ nearly





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 103

passed away in sociological research over the last 20 years, but also in ‘governance policy tackling, for example, child poverty, obesity or scandalising poor achievements in education’.⁶⁷ The disappearance of class as the dominant social category of subordination addressed by critical (Marxist) research, however, has to be read in concordance with advancing research on class and its other intersecting social divisions. According to Floya Anthias⁶⁸ social stratification theory focused on class only while talking about economic inequalities without reconsidering in what ways ethnicity and gender might shape concrete class positions. It seems that this trend of neglected ‘class analysis’ is slightly reversed in British sociology more recently, as a series of publications with the journal *Sociology* makes clear.⁶⁹ Now, we could intervene and argue that ‘race’, nationality, religion, citizenship, sexuality and physical ability shape concrete class positions similar to ethnicity and gender, insisting that notions of working or working-poor class appear as multidimensional when embedded in continuously problematic and precarious living conditions. Emphasising this link means arguing that intersecting identity layers nurture notions of *class* while pinpointing individual departures in distinctive ways. All in all, social class frames individual access to economic wealth, cultural goods influencing political and public participations; and this classism is wrapped in intersected layers of different cultural, ethnic, religious and gendered economic performances.

More fracturing categories such as ‘ethnicity’ or ‘sexuality’, for example, have complicated the original scope of anti-discrimination and sex equality law. Nonetheless the contestation about income, working conditions and equal payment for women and minoritised groups underscores the policy framework of all EU Directives.

Hence, as argued here, we have to break down complex power regimes into active political perspectives in Europe: following Crenshaw, Mieke Verloo⁷⁰ underlines that the analytical model ‘intersectionality’ has to be approached from a structural and a political angle. Whereas the structural dimension refers to complex experiences of individual discriminations shaped by intersecting social divisions, the political realm hints at a broader collective frame embedded in policy and ideological strategies. This differentiation echoes to a certain degree McCall’s advocacy for an inter-categorical approach to intersectionality that focuses on the implications of *relationships* as an outcome of asymmetrically organised social categories. However, *social categories* as unfolding in particular hierarchies have to be regarded as inflected by historical configurations of the social realm. Gudrun Axeli-Knapp’s discussion of travelling theories,⁷¹ that is, the problematic meaning of the Anglo-American triad ‘gender, race, class’ in a German academic context, for example, highlights some of the theoretical shortcomings of a non-reflexive adoption of historically laden social categories. Thus, the ‘specific constellation of interdependent structures’⁷² on the background of European integration and global transformation requires tools for a complex social analysis that takes into account different historiographies of individual oppression and group





104 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

exclusions. Accordingly, we have to discuss to what extent specific social categories such as class, gender, religion and ethnicity have similar or varying grounds in discussions on intersecting social locations in European societies. Therefore, aiming to traverse national boundaries of inequality among and between 27 EU Member States requires a more fundamental revision of the ontological base of social divisions such as class, gender, ethnicity or sexuality as these social categories were analysed and understood sociologically in national (nation state) frames.⁷³ In this regard, the transformation of different European, but also non-European nation states is going to restructure the classic division of the public and private sphere that encircled the boundaries of economic, political and intimate relationships between men and women, between national citizens and non-citizens, between ethnic majorities and minorities. Only to remind us, feminists challenged the binary construction of a public and private sphere⁷⁴ in its gendered and restrictive function. As Rebecca Johnson asserts, this '[d]ivide is an important part of the background scenery against which intersectional theory has unfolded'.⁷⁵ Consequently, a critical debate on the chances of multidimensional equality and intersectionality in the EU also has to look at the *becoming* of social categories as well as at the *becoming* of social identities.⁷⁶

5.5 European socialisation and intersecting social categories

Walby suggests a new concept of 'societalization' that might be more adequate to capture the 'different temporal and spatial reach'⁷⁷ of social systems (that is, gender, class, ethnicity, UM V). According to her:

This is a process in which there is a tendency for these systems to be brought into alignment . . . For example, the societalization project of the European Union introduces new principles of organizations of class, gender, ethnicity, and nation that interrupt previous projects to societalize around would-be nation states.⁷⁸

But what would be different about the construction of social categories, that is, social systems and what does 'alignment' mean in this regard?

Nira Yuval Davis⁷⁹ argues that 'gender', ethnicity' or 'class' operate and are constructed in distinctive realms. According to Yuval-Davis:

[t]he ontological basis of each of these divisions is autonomous, and each prioritises different spheres of social relations (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1983; 1992). For example class divisions are grounded in relation to the economic processes of production and consumption; gender should be understood not as a 'real' social difference between men and women, but as a mode of discourse that relates to groups of subjects whose social roles are defined by their sexual/biological difference while sexuality is yet another related discourse, relating to constructions of the body,





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 105

sexual pleasures and sexual intercourse. Ethnic and racial divisions relate to discourses of collectivities are constructed around exclusionary/inclusionary boundaries.⁸⁰

Walby criticises this approach of specifying separate ontological bases as ‘segregationary reductionist’⁸¹ as ‘each strand is identified with and reduced to a single and separate base’.⁸² However, Yuval-Davis’s (and Anthias’s) definition of class, for example, crosses the classic notion of economy⁸³ while stressing that it refers to ‘production and consumption’ taking place in different social spheres. Nonetheless, what is interesting about Walby’s take is that she likes to advance the overall idea of intersecting social realms that are engendering new notions of social categories. Thus gender, for example, is constructed in economic interactions as well as in the process of symbolic boundary constructions of specific national or cultural groups. In this advanced complexity model⁸⁴ each system is approached as having the other as an environment thinking of a ‘more fluid conception of the mutual impact of systems’.⁸⁵ In contrast to the single base model, she proposes ‘institutionalized domains of economy, polity, violence, and civil society’⁸⁶ and ‘multiple sets of social relations such as class, gender and ethnicity’.⁸⁷ Hence, each domain and each set of social relations has to be understood as inter-related, but not saturated in terms of spatially and temporally fixed meanings. While arguing against nested constellations her approach could analyse more complex overlaps between social categories that transgress the public versus private divide.⁸⁸ As a conceptual approach of theorising multiple intersecting social inequalities, Walby’s model favours flexible combinations of institutionalised systems (that is, economy) and sets of social relations (that is, ethnicity). It pays attention to the current transformation of social, economic and political space in Europe affecting the way we have to understand social categories. While saying that ‘polity includes not only states, but also the European Union, organized religions that govern areas of life (such as personal life) and some nations (those with developed institutions, such as Scotland)’, Walby stresses the yet interwoven *institutional* layers that shape perspectives on multidimensional equality law and intersecting social divisions in all 27 EU Member States. But what tends to be lost in this proposal of complex and simultaneously operating social systems refers to the meaning of distinctive historiographies underlying any interpretation of ‘domains’ as institutionalised systems and also as sets of social systems.⁸⁹ But this contextualising is most important when reflecting various regimes and different regional histories of group oppressions or even genocides.

While analysing Canadian and South African jurisdiction, Jewel Amoah discusses in what ways the purpose of a legally framed equality analysis could *remedy* a situation where discrimination or unequal treatment is experienced.⁹⁰ The US American approach (explained above), the British colonial legacy as well as the Canadian and the South African contexts are all very different in terms of how issues of equality rights claims are conveyed.





106 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

Despite these differences, all these cultures actually share the prominence of ‘colour’ as a signifier of gendered and classed differences. ‘Colour’ signifies legacies of the white trade of black people as slaves, of organised exploitation of indigenous populations and as far as South Africa is concerned the persistence of post-Apartheid-racism. As Amoah emphasises, ‘Consideration of context is not restricted to the current state of events, but also relates to instances of historical disadvantage (versus historical privilege)’.⁹¹

Agreeing with this perspective, we could argue that taking lessons from history means to advance the contemporary debate on intersectionality and multiple equality law while re-politicising the historically specific embeddings of *group recognitions* and *group exclusions*. This could mean to privilege certain categories on the background of specific historical configurations, but also to ask for a re-contextualising of social categories according to transformed social realities. Clearly, this would require contextualised evaluations that take both group divisions, but also individual positioning within and across social categories into account.

On this background looking at Europe, or to be more precise at Continental Europe, post-Holocaust societies struggle with the legacies of the genocide directed by state racism (that is, institutionalised anti-Semitism) unfolding as legal (that is, criminalising) exclusion first, and second, as the systematic mass murder of Jews, Sinti and Roma, communists, disabled people and homosexuals, Jewish and non-Jewish, men and women, children and old people likewise. It is important to acknowledge this specific historical context as it *situates* the debate on intersecting social divisions with reference to continental Europe where minority faith and ethnic groups were outlawed before they were exterminated, collectively. In the beginning of the new millennium, the EU⁹² adopted the memory of the Holocaust as the ‘founding moment of European civilisation’.⁹³ On the background of this statement, gendered dimensions of *minoritised* ethnicity, religious, health, sexual and political belonging have to be regarded as central to legal endeavours to balance intersecting group categories and individual identities.

According to the law scholar Elisabeth Holzleithner,⁹⁴ looking for the marginalised position within a category implies the quest for those who are most excluded. And here, we are clearly confronted with political evaluations that underly the different approaches to intersectionality as argued above. Although the different nation states in Europe are transforming rapidly into states that have joined the EU and those who, either willingly keep their distance or are held ideologically in distance, the real challenge to EU multi-dimensional equality law has to be seen in the eventual crossing of its legal borders. Hence, the logic of intersectional social categories and intersecting individual identities means actual transgressions and what Walby only takes on board with respect to the European *societalisation*, it will happen not by being ‘congruent in the same territory’.⁹⁵





5.6 Conclusion

While assessing critically various streams of intersectionality research, I intended to make clear that intersectionality, indeed, helps to identify analytically complex layers of individual subordination. However, systematic positions constructed in classed, gendered, ethnic, hetero-normative and 'racialised' terms⁹⁶ monitor individual access to privileges, cultural power and social economic inclusion in each of the, by now, 27 EU Member States differently. Despite an overarching anti-discriminatory scope of multidimensional equality law, differently situated⁹⁷ nation state legacies confront us with specific forms of prejudices, varying standards of equity and, consequently, uneven terms of (minority) *recognition* and *rights*. Although the Anglo-Dutch influence on the EU non-discrimination law packages⁹⁸ is acknowledged widely, the 'kingmaking' significance of previous political protests on the basis of political citizenship rights as a salient, but less elaborated, precondition is less acknowledged. But as underlined here, the political protest of Black Britons was essential to the legal and administrative response of what passed later as the first Race Relations Act in 1965. In this regard an ongoing complexity of social reality is inherent in the idea of intersectionality. This complexity might fabricate counter-ideological tensions in and between different EU Member States engendering new transnational political actions. Hence, the overall idea of the EU framework to harmonise different legal standards also gives way to new intersecting social and political identities that are going to boost equality efforts transcending the yet achieved EU framework. As made clear above, we should demand that our lesson from history means to advance the contemporary debate on intersectionality and multiple equality law while re-politicising the historically specific embeddings of *group recognition* and support those who are disadvantaged to air their voices, collectively.

Alain Touraine⁹⁹ argues that what is most characteristic of Europe or rather European societies at large is its *political form* of social organisation. He writes:

Europe is the part of the world where the problem of the social distribution of costs and advantages among social categories which are defined in hierarchical terms play a central role and acts as a link between mass consumption and cultural identities which, on the contrary, are separated in the USA or merged in Japan. Europe is the political continent; it is defined by the central role of social political processes.¹⁰⁰

We will see what the people of Europe make out of the ideological project of EU societalisation.



108 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law***Notes**

- 1 This Directive aims at equality irrespective of race and ethnic origin in employment and occupation, social advantages, education and provision of goods and services.
- 2 This Directive intends to establish a framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, covering discrimination on grounds of religion and belief, age, disability and sexual orientation.
- 3 These Directives deal with gender equality in employment and occupation and provision of goods and services respectively.
- 4 According to the European Commission's *Equality and Discrimination – Annual Report 2006*, 'The Directives protect everyone in the European Union, including persons who are not EU citizens', (p 7). See for further details European Commission – Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, Unit G4, Report published in September 2006; despite 2007 being the year of 'Equal Opportunities for All' there is no new Annual Report available in December 2007.
- 5 See for example J Gerrads's section on multiple discrimination (1.5): (2007) 'Chapter One: Discrimination grounds', in D Schiek, L Waddington and M Bell (eds) *Cases, Materials and Texts on National, Supranational and International Non-Discrimination Law*, Oxford: Hart Publishing, pp 170–84.
- 6 Unlike most of the other contributors to this book I concentrate on sociological and political considerations regarding multidimensional discriminations, equality and intersectional dimensions of social categories (i.e. class, gender, ethnicity, 'race', nationality, sexuality, etc).
- 7 D Schiek, L Waddington and M Bell (eds) (2007b) 'Introductory Chapter: A comparative perspective on non-discrimination law', in D Schiek, L Waddington and M Bell (eds) *Cases, Materials and Text on National, Supranational and International Non-Discrimination Law*, Oxford: Hart Publishing, p 31.
- 8 Emily Grabham uses Homi K Bhabha's (1996) term of hybridity to underscore the scope of intersecting dimensions as creating 'fluid movements between and across categories challenging definitional and temporal boundaries'. E Grabham (2006) 'Taxonomies of inequality: Lawyers, maps and the challenge of hybridity', *Social Legal Studies*, 15: 5–23, at p 17.
- 9 I am referring predominantly to an Anglo-American sociological discourse context.
- 10 L McCall (2005) 'Managing the complexity of intersectionality', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30: 1771–800.
- 11 SV Knudsen (2006) 'Intersectionality – a theoretical inspiration in the analysis of minority cultures and identities in textbooks', in E Bruillard, M Horsley, SV Knudsen and B Aamotsbakken (eds) *Caught in the Web or Lost in the Textbook?*, STEF, IARTEM, IUFM de Basse-Normandie, Paris: Jouve.
- 12 S Walby (2007) 'Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 37: 449–70.
- 13 In a background paper to a ENAR Policy Seminar in Brussels, 6–7 October 2006, intersectional discrimination is defined as implying 'a specific cumulative form of discrimination as a unique, specific synergistic situation' (p 11). Besides, multiple discrimination is regarded as covering additive and intersectional dimensions, *ibid*, available at www.enar-eu.org/en/events/directives/background-paper_EN.pdf (accessed 9 January 2008).
- 14 B Prins (2006) 'Narrative accounts of origins: A blind spot in the intersectional approach', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 277–90, at p 278.
- 15 Cited in P Rothenberg (2003) 'Learning to see the interrelation of race, class and





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 109

- gender discrimination and privilege: implications for policy and practice', in *E-Quality-experts in gender en etniciteit*, Den Haag, pp 17–28, at p 20.
- 16 I Browne and J Misra (2003) 'The intersection of gender and race in the labor market', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29: 487–513, at p 488.
 - 17 B Prins (2006) 'Narrative accounts of origins: A blind spot in the intersectional approach', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 277–90
 - 18 Ibid, p 279.
 - 19 Ibid.
 - 20 The ideological fusion of nation and state has been analysed as historically constructed; see for example AM Smith (2006) 'Narrative accounts of origins: A blind spot in the intersectional approach', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 277–90; J Breuilly (2000) 'Nationalism and the history of ideas', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 105: 187–223; J Breuilly (2001) 'The state and nationalism', in M Gubernau and J Hutchinson (eds) *Understanding Nationalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp 32–52.
 - 21 See for further details F Anthias and N Yuval-Davis (1992) *Racialized Boundaries – Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*, London: Routledge; N Yuval-Davis (1997) *Gender & Nation*, London: Sage.
 - 22 J Rundell (1998) 'Tensions of citizenship in an age of diversity: Reflections on territoriality, cosmopolitanism and symmetrical reciprocity', in R Bauböck and J Rundell (eds) *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*, European Centre Vienna, Ashgate: Aldershot, pp 321–40, at p 326.
 - 23 N Yuval-Davis and M Stoetzler (2002) 'Imagined boundaries and borders – a gendered gaze', *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, 9: 329–44, at p 334.
 - 24 B Anderson (1991 [1983]) *Imagined Communities – Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd reprinted edn, New York: Verso.
 - 25 See G Axeli-Knapp (2005) 'Race, class, gender: Reclaiming baggage in fast travelling theories', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 12: 249–65.
 - 26 '[d]aughters of migrants', *ibid*, p 256.
 - 27 Ibid.
 - 28 See for example the radical feminist lesbian journal *Ihrrsim*, in particular issue 3, 1991 ('*Das Verlorene Wir*') and issue, 5 1992 ('*Die Qual der Moral*'). The journal was founded in 1989 as an initiative of intellectual political lesbians in Bochum intending to establish a forum for debate outside established circles of German universities. It was published until 2004; edited by G Büchner and U Janz (Ihrrinn eV), Bochum. For further information see also www.ihrrinn.auszeiten-frauenarchiv.de/englisch/self.html.
 - 29 J Jacoby and ML Gotlinde (1990) 'Was "sie" schon immer über Antisemitismus wissen wollte, aber nie zu denken wagte', in *Beiträge zur feministischen Theorie und Praxis*, 13: 27–95.
 - 30 See for example F Anthias, and N Yuval-Davis (1983) 'Contextualizing feminism – ethnic, gender and class divisions', *Feminist Review*, 15: 62–75; A Brah (1996) *Cartographies of the Diaspora*, London: Routledge; N Yuval-Davis and P Werbner (eds) (1999) *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, London: Zed Books.
 - 31 F Anthias (1998) 'Rethinking social divisions: Some notes towards a theoretical framework', *Sociological Review*, 46: 506–35; F Anthias (2001) 'The concept of "social divisions" and theorising social stratification: Looking at ethnicity and class', *Sociology*, 35: 835–54; also F Anthias (2006) 'Belongings in a globalising and unequal world: Rethinking translocations', in N Yuval-Davis, K Kannabiran and UM Vieten (eds) *The Situated Politics of Belonging*, London: Sage, pp 17–31.
 - 32 N Yuval-Davis (2006) 'Intersectionality and feminist politics', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 193–209, at p 194.





110 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

- 33 PH Collins (2000) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*, New York: Routledge (first: Boston, MA: Univ Hyman, 1990).
- 34 K Crenshaw (1991) 'Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color', *Stanford Law Review*, 43: 1241–99.
- 35 SV Knudsen (2006) 'Intersectionality – a theoretical inspiration in the analysis of minority cultures and identities in textbooks', in E Bruillard, M Horsley, SV Knudsen and B Aamotsbakken (eds) *Caught in the Web or Lost in the Textbook?*, STEF, IARTEM, IUFM de Basse-Normandie, Paris: Jouve.
- 36 K Crenshaw (1991) 'Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color', *Stanford Law Review*, 43: 1241–99.
- 37 As far as the debate in Europe is concerned we have to acknowledge that there are significant similarities as far as Britain is concerned in terms of the cultural, social and civic legacy of the exposed meaning of skin colour as a marker of difference. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss the complexity of differently situated nation-state histories that shape the notion of the other, racist discourses and approaches to differences.
- 38 N Zack (2007) 'Can third wave feminism be inclusive? Intersectionality, its problems, and new directions', in LM Alcoff and EF Kittay (eds) *The Blackwell Guide to Feminist Philosophy*, Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishers, pp 193–207.
- 39 *Ibid*, p 199.
- 40 L McCall (2005) 'Managing the complexity of intersectionality', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30: 1771–800.
- 41 *Ibid*, p 1781.
- 42 McCall speaks of the model of an Arab-American, middle class and heterosexual woman, *ibid*.
- 43 G Valentine (2007) 'Theorizing and researching intersectionality: A challenge for feminist geography', *The Professional Geographer*, 59: 10–21, at p 18.
- 44 *Ibid*, p 18.
- 45 *Ibid*, p 19.
- 46 L McCall (2005) 'Managing the complexity of intersectionality', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30: 1771–800, at p 1785.
- 47 This is not to say that in praxis different approaches could merge; McCall makes clear that feminist research in this field tends to be a mixture of different approaches.
- 48 *Ibid*.
- 49 L McCall (2005) 'Managing the complexity of intersectionality', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30: 1771–800, at p 1788.
- 50 *Ibid*, p 1787; in a recent publication addressing intersectionality as a theme for feminist geography Gill Valentine raises this concern, too; see for details G Valentine (2007) 'Theorizing and researching intersectionality: A challenge for feminist geography', *The Professional Geographer*, 59: 10–21, at p 14.
- 51 See for details see D Held and A Kaya (2007) 'Introduction', in D Held and A Kaya (eds) *Global Inequality – Patterns and Explanations*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp 1–25.
- 52 L Blackwell (2003) 'Gender and ethnicity at work: Occupational segregation and disadvantage in the 1991 British census', *Sociology*, 37: 713–31. Blackwell's research stresses that gender and ethnicity do not combine to create double disadvantage for minority women in the labour force' (p 713). Women of various ethnic groups, for example Indian, Sikh, white English women and Muslim Bangladeshi women obtain occupations that do not match with a general ascription of gendered and ethnic discrimination. Thus occupational performance is very distinctive.





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 111

- 53 I use the term ‘faith’ as a symbolic container for themes of national belonging, religious believe and otherwise emotional identifications with particular communities.
- 54 D Voas and A Crockett (2005) ‘Religion in Britain: Neither believing nor belonging’, *Sociology*, 39: 11–28; Y Hussain and P Bagguley (2005) ‘Citizenship, ethnicity and identity: British Pakistanis after the 2001 “riots”’, *Sociology*, 39: 407–25.
- 55 More detailed information is available at http://eumc.europa.eu/eumc/index.php?fuseaction=content.dsp_cat_content&catid=3e4fcb80ce245 (accessed 10 January 2008).
- 56 P Bourdieu’s (1993, 1999) research on the social deprivation of some of the immigrant Parisian suburbs sheds some light on the deep and long-lasting state of cultural and symbolic exclusions in the French society. See for details P Bourdieu (1999) *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 57 A Lentin (2005) ‘The intifada of the banlieus’, *OpenDemocracy*, 17 November, available at www.opendemocracy.net/node/3037 (accessed 9 January 2008).
- 58 J Rex (1996) ‘Contemporary nationalism, its causes and consequences for Europe – A reply to Delanty’, *Sociological Research Online*, available at www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/1/4/rex.html (accessed 9 January 2008).
- 59 European Monitoring Centre for Racism and Xenophobia (2005) *Racist Violence in 15 EU Member States – A Comparative Overview of Findings from the RAXEN NFP Reports 2001–2004*, April, available at <http://fra.europa.eu/fra/material/pub/comparativestudy/CS-RV-main.pdf> (accessed 9 January 2008).
- 60 Ibid, p 10.
- 61 Ibid, p 11.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 I found similar problems in gaining reliable comparative data regarding effectiveness and implementation of equality norms as far as Sex Equality-Plans and Reports in the 16 German Lands are concerned; see UM Vieten (2002) ‘Frauenförderpläne’ in D Schiek, H Dieball, I Horstkötter, L Seidel, UM Vieten and S Wankel, *Frauengleichstellungsgesetze des Bundes und der Länder – Kommentar für die Praxis*, 2nd edn, Frankfurt a M: Bund Verlag, pp 126–138.
- 64 O Reitman looks at the controversial debates on the relationship between multiculturalism and feminism. Frequently, single axes of inequality, for example ‘sex equality’ or ‘sexuality’ are defended against ‘ethnic and religious minority rights’ and thus introduced as competing layers of discrimination. Reitman differentiates minority and majority patriarchy while talking about the conflicts of cultural group rights and individual (gendered) rights. What is important to the broader theme of intersectionality is her criticism of arguments that try to *balance* dissimilar struggles against oppression. In contrast, she reminds us that a group-differentiated-rights discourse should be sensitive to a range of differences taking into account the situation of minorities within minorities, but also the asymmetric tension between hegemonic and marginal patriarchy. For details see O Reitman (2005) ‘Multiculturalism and feminism – incompatibility or synonymity?’, *Ethnicities*, 5: 216–47, at pp 230 and 236.
- 65 N Yuval-Davis, F Anthias and E Kofman (2005) ‘Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28: 513–35.
- 66 A Brah and A Phoenix (2004) ‘Ain’t I a woman? Revisiting intersectionality’, *Journal of International Women’s Studies*, 5: 75–86.
- 67 Ibid, p 81; otherwise see B Skeggs (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming Respectable*, London: Sage; B Skeggs, (2004) *Class, Self, Culture*, London: Routledge.



112 *European Union Non-Discrimination Law*

- 68 F Anthias (2001) 'The concept of "social divisions" and theorising social stratification: Looking at ethnicity and class', *Sociology*, 35: 835–54.
- 69 W Bottero (2004) 'Class identities and the identity of class', *Sociology*, 38, 985–1003; TJE Walker (2002) *Illusive Identity: The Blurring of Working-Class Consciousness in Modern Western Culture*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books; M Maguire (2005) 'Textures of class in the context of schooling: The perceptions of a "class-crossing" teacher', *Sociology*, 39: 427–43; D Byrne (2005) 'Class, culture and identity. A reflection on absences against preferences', special issue of *Sociology*, 39: 807–16.
- 70 M Verloo (2006) 'Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 211–28.
- 71 G Axeli-Knapp (2005) 'Race, class, gender: Reclaiming baggage in fast travelling theories', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 12: 249–65.
- 72 Ibid, p 263.
- 73 Recently, Ulrich Beck became renown for his alternative vision of a *cosmopolitan methodology*. Although I agree with his argument concerning the limited perspectives of national methodologies, I do hold strong reservations towards his and other mainstream sociologists more recent attempts to reserve this proclaimed non-national methodology as decent research to strengthen Europeanisation. For details on Beck's proposal, see U Beck (2000) 'The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity', *British Journal of Sociology*, 51: 79–105.
- 74 C Pateman (1986) *Feminist Challenge: Social And Political Theory*, Sydney, London: Allen and Unwin; C Pateman (1989) *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 75 R Johnson (2005) 'Gender, race, class and sexual orientation: Theorizing the intersections', in G MacDonald, RL Osborne and CC Smith (eds) *Feminism, Law, Inclusion: Intersectionality in Action*, Toronto: Sumach Press, pp 21–37, at p 22.
- 76 The notion of 'becoming' has been explicated in the context of intersected subjectivities more recently by Valentine in 2007, but also explicitly in a sociological reading of feminist resistance by Kalpana Kannabiran (2006) 'A cartography of resistance: the National Federation of Dalit Women', in N Yuval-Davis, K Kannabiran and UM Vieten (eds) *The Situated Politics of Belonging*, London: Sage, pp 54–71.
- 77 S Walby (2007) 'Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 37: 449–70, at p 462.
- 78 Ibid, p 462.
- 79 F Anthias (2006) 'Belongings in a globalising and unequal world: Rethinking translocations', in N Yuval-Davis, K Kannabiran and UM Vieten (eds), *The Situated Politics of Belonging*, London: Sage
- 80 N Yuval-Davis (2006) 'Intersectionality and feminist politics', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 193–209, at pp 200–1.
- 81 S Walby (2007) 'Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 37: 449–70, at p 452.
- 82 Ibid.
- 83 Ibid, p 453.
- 84 It is beyond the scope of my chapter to review the theoretical discussion that advanced around complexity theory. See for example, P Cilliers (1998) *Complexity and Postmodernism: Understanding Complex Systems*, London: Routledge; E Cudworth (2005) *Developing Ecofeminist Theory: The Complexity of Difference*, London: Palgrave.
- 85 S Walby (2007) 'Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 37: 449–70, at p 459.





Intersectionality scope and multidimensional equality within the EU 113

- 86 Ibid.
- 87 Ibid.
- 88 This indicates that gender is not confined to the sphere of family and culture, for example, and class not determined only by economic locations and achievements.
- 89 This aspect is also emphasised by N Yuval-Davis (2006) 'Intersectionality and feminist politics', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13: 193–209, at p 203.
- 90 A Jewe (2004) *Constructing Equality: Identity and Intersectionality in Canadian and South African Jurisprudence*, MA dissertation, Cape Town.
- 91 Ibid, p 26.
- 92 In 2002, Daniel Levy and Nathan Sznajder analysed the cosmopolitanisation of the Holocaust memory and argue that '[t]ransnational memory cultures . . . have the potential to become the cultural formation for global rights politics'. D Levy and N Sznajder (2002) 'Memory unbound – The holocaust and the formation of cosmopolitan memory', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5: 87–106, citation at p 88. In this text, they also critically discuss the Stockholm Forum while stating that ' "culture" offered "politics" a template for how a unified Europe, the site of the historical Holocaust, could imagine itself as a community of shared values' (p 100). During this forum the Holocaust was officially declared as a European memory.
- 93 Levy and Sznajder, *ibid*, p 102.
- 94 E Holzleithner (2006) 'Mainstreaming equality: Dis/Entangling grounds of Discrimination', *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems*, 14: 927–57.
- 95 S Walby (2007) 'Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 37: 449–70, at p 461.
- 96 Bell Hooks used in her analysis the term 'white supremacy', B Hooks (1981) *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*, Boston, MA: South End Press (London: Pluto Press, 1982).
- 97 *Situating* means that a generalised pattern or a supposedly taken for granted discourse has to be approached more concretely while detecting complex and contradictory positioning(s) within particular historical, nationally specific and biographical locations. See for details on this methodological term U Vieten (2007) '*Situated Cosmopolitanisms: Notions of the Other in Discourses on Cosmopolitanism in Britain and Germany*', PhD thesis, University of East London (unpublished).
- 98 D Schiek, L Waddington and M Bell (eds) (2007) 'Introductory Chapter: A comparative perspective on non-discrimination law', in D Schiek, L Waddington and M Bell (eds) *Cases, Materials and Text on National, Supranational and International Non-Discrimination Law*, Oxford: Hart Publishing, pp 1–23.
- 99 A Tourain (1999) 'Conclusion – European sociologists between economic globalisation and cultural fragmentation', in TP Boje, B van Steenberghe and S Walby (eds) *European Societies – Fusion or Fission?*, London, New York: Routledge, pp 249–62.
- 100 A Tourain, *ibid*, pp 255–6.

