UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Introduction: Claiming citizenship rights through the body multiple

Netz, S.; Lempp, S.; Krause, K.; Schramm, K.

Link to publication

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

INTRODUCTION

OPEN ACCESS   Check for updates

Claiming citizenship rights through the body multiple

Sabine Netz, Sarah Lempp, Kristine Krause and Katharina Schramm

Department of Anthropology, University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany

ABSTRACT

What have affirmative action policies, categorization of care needs, plastic surgery, forensic identification of dead bodies and age assessments of refugees in common? They all determine recognition and access to resources and rights via the body. In the introduction to this special issue, the editors emphasize that the body only becomes distinct and significant when it is put in relation to historically and geographically differing norms and standards. This relational approach opens up the 'black boxes' of science, medicine, bureaucracy and eventually the body. Drawing on practice theory, critical citizenship studies and Science and Technology Studies, the authors discuss notions of social citizenship and the conceptualization of biological citizenship in medical anthropology. They think with the contributions of the special issue that analyse how medical practitioners, state and private institutions, as well as individuals enact certain bodies in specific material and discursive constellations. By taking neither citizenship nor the body for granted, the special issue shows how situationally-bound elements in relations, space and time, matter for a person's access to rights and resources – and hence can draw attention to blind spots in particular categorization practices.

The body is a crucial site for different kinds of identification and claim-making with respect to citizenship rights. Be it affirmative action policies, the categorization of care needs, urban and national beauty standards, forensic infrastructures or age assessments of migrants: in these negotiations over eligibility and rights, state agents, activists and other parties mobilize references to bodily markers and differentiations. Who belongs, who is excluded, and who has access to social rights and material goods is presented as 'truth from the body', as Fassin and d'Halluin (2005) have so evocatively claimed. Their analytical focus on the body as a site for claiming citizenship rights has been taken up by many scholars, especially at the interface of medical anthropology and migration studies (cf. Malkki 1996; Ticktin 2011a; Heinemann and Lemke 2014) . In this literature, however, it is not always clear what this 'truth from the body' precisely constitutes.

In this special issue, we start from the assumption that there is no innate quality to the body as a site for citizenship claims. Bodies are enacted. They only become distinct and significant when they are put in relation to certain norms and standards. Yet standards are themselves historically and politically situated; they are the outcome of multiple relations and contestations (Lampland and Star 2009; Bowker and Star 2000; Bauer and

CONTACT Kristine Krause   ✉ k.krause@uva.nl

Wahlberg 2009). By extension, the body does not constitute a stable object that would exist outside these relations. We therefore need to pay attention to the very ways in which the body is brought into being and enacted in and through specific practices.

Inspired by Annemarie Mol's idea of the 'body multiple' (2002), we suggest focusing on the question of what bodies and – in relation to them – citizenship *become* in concrete practices and multifarious constellations. In her seminal book *The body multiple*, Mol analyses how a particular disease (atherosclerosis) is enacted differently in different medical practices, thus arguing that 'objects come into being – and disappear – with the practices in which they are manipulated' (2002, 5). Such a relational approach, which is shared by a number of scholars in the field of Science and Technology Studies, acknowledges multiplicities and interdependencies as a starting point of inquiry (Star 1990; Pols 2014). It departs from discussions that trace the histories of categories of difference mainly via Foucauldian inspired genealogical methods. John Law, for example, argues that Foucault's idea of a dispositive oftentimes proves too static to account for the messiness of empirical situations (Law 2004, 5f). He and Ingunn Moser (Moser 2005; Law 2009) suggest thinking instead in terms of 'modes of ordering', of which there can be many, according to the specific constellation of actors at hand. This radical relationality also goes beyond an established view on performing (or experiencing) the body. To capture the contingency on which the multiple articulation of the body rests, Mol (2002, 41f) prefers the term 'enacting' over 'performing': each constellation enacts the body *anew*, generating multiple versions of it. This focus on becoming has methodological consequences for our research on citizenship claims. Inasmuch as we cannot know the body in advance, we also cannot anticipate what citizenship or a category of difference will be outside its enactment in a concrete constellation (M'charek 2013). Therefore, we not only need to pay close attention to the multiple ways in which human bodies are called upon or become relevant in the realm of citizenship, but also to the question of how citizenship and bodies are co-produced in practice.

In the social sciences, the wider turn to practices decentres minds, texts and institutionalized social forms. It shifts our attention to routines and tacit ways of doing (Reckwitz 2002, 259) on the one hand, as well as to concrete, and sometimes spectacular, acts (Isin 2009) on the other. Moreover, the focus on practice helps us to conceptualize how contingent and fluid configurations become stabilized and 'gain in reality' (Latour 1999), but also how they can potentially be undone (Hirschauer 2001). In the field of institutionalized complexes such as state bureaucracies, the focus on practices has led scholars to question the idea of taken-for-granted entities and to analyse instead how they need to be continuously maintained and done anew in daily routines and procedures (Trouillot 2001; Scott 1998). Similarly, we regard discourses of evidence and truth on which bodily norms and standards are built as situated. Following Kleeberg and Suter, they can be analysed as processes that are happening in 'truth scenes': constellations of observation that are bound to certain practices and actors and which empirically can be found 'following disruptions or accentuations of the self-evident, in situations of learning or of conflict, or as part of demonstrations of power' (2014, 217; our translation). We therefore ask how categories of difference (like disability, age, gender, race), on which norms and standards operate, are brought into being and are made evident,

how they are used to determine eligibility for citizenship in concrete and shifting situations, and how they change accordingly.

Here, we can build on previous work in critical citizenship studies which has foregrounded the question of *what makes the citizen* over the 'mere' question of status (Isin 2009, 383). Conceptualizing citizenship in terms of subject positions that allow people to 'act' in the first place (Isin 2019, 4), these studies interrogate how a rights-bearing subject comes into being and how individuals or groups gain positions which make them recognizable as such (Krause and Schramm 2011, 127). As Engin Isin (2019, 45f) has pointed out, these studies are grounded in diverse theoretical traditions that employ notions of dramaturgical language such as enactment, staging and performing. What they all share is that they look at citizenship as a relational process and as a space of action, negotiation and change. To do justice to the different concerns represented in these writings, Isin (ibid., 51) has suggested differentiating citizenship (in) law from citizenship (in) practice, citizenship (in) acts and citizenship (in) theory. The articles in this special issue aim at studying the relationships between these different elements, while their focus lies on citizenship (in) practices because, first, in our definition, practices encompass and interrelate laws, theories, actors and acts, as well as world-views, things, words, technologies, among others. Second, we are more concerned with doings and routines in conventions than with disruptive acts. As Isin and Ruppert detail, 'performing citizenship both evokes and breaks conventions' (2015, 16). They define conventions as 'sociotechnical arrangements' (ibid.), and it is these arrangements which are at the centre of the special issue.

Substantiated by close ethnographic analysis, we explore how medical practitioners, state and private institutions, as well as individuals enact certain bodies in specific material and discursive constellations to claim citizenship rights. Our relational approach allows us to open up the 'black boxes' of science, medicine, bureaucracy and eventually the body. This enables us to grasp the fluidity of citizenship practices and bodily articulations, as well as to understand how and why they become credible and convincing. Bringing the relationality of the body in practices to the forefront of analysis, our question then becomes how the physical and bodily qualities on which people base their citizenship claims come into being; or, in other words, how a body becomes recognizable and thereby articulate. What constitutes a body as deserving, capable or in need, and how do these markers shift over time? We therefore ask: how do these multiple enactments lead to different forms of inclusion, exclusion, belonging and claims to, as well as the distribution of, rights, resources and restraints? How does the articulation of categories of difference take place in practices? How are these categories naturalized or destabilized?

By paying particular attention to the kinds of positions to speak and act from that are made possible via the body, the contributions to this special issue analyse how bodies are shaped, modified and narrated in order to claim certain rights. Drawing on ethnographic examples from a wide variety of cases, they discuss which truths, which bodies and which subjectivities are being articulated and done or undone in practices of categorization and infrastructures of recognition.

While all of the papers highlight the multiplicity of the body in various practices, they each do so with a different focus. Lempp, M'charek/Casartelli and Netz follow a material-semiotic understanding of practices that draws strongly on work in Science and

640 S. NETZ ET AL.

Technology Studies (Haraway 1991; Mol 2002). These authors assume that the enactment of a body is bound to a particular practice, of which the body of a person is just one among many decisive elements. The analyses by Lempp and Netz decentre the body by showing that a particular enactment of the body is only one among many factors in a citizenship-determining practice. In M'charek and Casartelli's paper, the body is literally put together in a dense network of forensic care work that calls into question the boundaries of citizenship. Treating cases in which people make claims for care and belonging through (dis-)abilities, Hiddinga/de Langen and Rickli point to the changing articulations of a body in time, space and specific claim-making settings. While Hiddinga and de Langen show that by foregrounding practices multiple ways of doing deafness become visible, Rickli also takes Mol's multiplicity as a starting point, but in order to analyse how post-polio bodies are enacted over the course of time. Liebelt uses insights from this material-semiotic approach with regards to the normative and affective (un-) doing of racialized and gendered bodies. In doing so, her paper points to the ways in which a body can be intentionally modified as an act of claim-making.

Bringing together citizenship and the body

Our discussion of citizenship and the body multiple is in conversation with three strands of literature that have made significant interventions in recent citizenship studies: a) feminist studies; b) notions of social citizenship; and c) the conceptualization of biological citizenship in medical anthropology. All of these strands have contributed significantly to a more nuanced understanding of citizenship in practice.

In fact, according to Bryan Turner, citizenship can be defined as 'that set of practices (…) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups' (1993, 2). What forms this 'competence' is certainly not given a priori, but is a matter of negotiation, if not contestation and struggle. As Linda Bosniak (2006) reminds us, these negotiations can simultaneously control and liberate subjects. She draws our attention to the porousness of the insider-outsider distinction in citizenship practices and to how citizenship's aspirational potential is always coupled with violent exclusions.

How exclusions are intrinsically part of citizenship projects becomes particularly clear when looking at the interrelation between citizenship and bodies. 'Bodies give substance to citizenship and citizenship matters for bodies', write Beasley and Bacchi (2000, 337), deconstructing along with other feminist scholars the classical idea of the citizen as the rational and disembodied individual (Bacchi and Beasley 2002; Benhabib 1992; Lister 2002; Young 1989; Yuval-Davis 2006; Werbner and Yuval-Davis 1999). Teasing out how bodies are at the same time the *interface*, *material* and *object* of citizenship practices, rights and claims, these authors have widened our understanding of the citizen and pointed to the exclusionary nature of the notion of the liberal, articulate, political subject – which by default was imagined as the productive and able-bodied worker, father or soldier. In joining forces with disability activists, feminist scholars of citizenship studies have embraced more diverse and differently-abled bodies (Lister 1997a, 1997b; Young 1989), as well as different articulations of citizenship, including forms of embodiment that transcend the notion of voice (cf. Schramm, Krause, and Valley 2018). Moreover, if we think

beyond 'inclusive citizenship' (Lister 2007), we may also draw attention to what becomes invisibilized, silenced and excluded, also within the realm of citizenship (not only as an externalized other, cf. Bosniak 2006).

In this special issue, we build on this significant feminist work, as it allows us to conceptualize those moments of mismatch between citizenship (in) theory and citizenship (in) practice that bring the power effects of citizenship to the fore, while at the same time opening up alternative strategies of belonging, as well as space for the negotiation of rights and claims (see also Star 1990). Our starting point, however, is not the body that is already classified as disabled or able-bodied, private or public, silent or articulate within the realm of the political, but the multiple ways in which bodies are brought into being in relation to classificatory practices on the one hand, and forms of claim-making on the other. Clearly, there are many different ways of being a worker, a person, beautiful or able-bodied – and these differences shape what citizenship becomes in concrete situations in significant ways.

Here, we are in conversation with a second body of scholarship, which has profoundly influenced the debate around citizenship in recent years. Moving away from a narrow definition of citizenship as legally defined and bound to nation state belonging, the citizenship debate has shifted to the discussion of social rights and the struggles connected to them. What is most significant in these discussions is a 'recasting of the social in citizenship' (Isin et al. 2008; Yalçin-Heckmann 2011). In his classical essay 'Citizenship and social class', T. H. Marshall (1950[1938])[1938]) regarded the provision of and access to healthcare, education and housing as social citizenship, which enabled members of a political community (for Marshall, it was the national welfare state) to become healthy, educated citizens who could enact their political and civic citizenship in a meaningful way. As Isin et al. (2008) argue, Marshall saw social citizenship as subordinated to civic and political citizenship. However, we share Isin's view that citizenship 'is social before it is civic or political' (ibid., 283) because incorporation and governing via education, health care or other resources happens via many interfaces, not just the nation state (Trouillot 2001). Even if somebody does not (yet) hold citizenship as a legal status, they can be interpellated and articulated in many possible political subjectivities (Krause and Schramm 2011; Schramm, Krause, and Valley 2018; Krause 2018).

While the classical view on citizens as metaphorical workers, soldiers, fathers and mothers has long been criticized for its underlying ableist and patriarchal assumptions (Yuval-Davis 2006), the term social citizenship has proven to be productive in writings that focus on two different yet related aspects of citizenship. The first one looks at the processes by which a person is bestowed with resources and rights, not on the grounds of being an autonomous citizen-subject, but in terms of being cared for as a patient or through belonging to a minority group. This view combines logics of recognition (to be recognized in a certain category of difference) with logics of distributive justice (to have a share in resources) and has transformed into a kind of 'social governance' (Brodie 2008, 27ff) in most (post-)welfare states. The second aspect of citizenship prioritizes the very act of claim-making on the part of those who are not regarded as full members of the nation state – either because they lack legal citizenship status or because they fall outside the dominant group(s) that determine the standard of liberal citizenship.[1] By focussing on social citizenship, it becomes possible to discuss the profound ambiguities of classification, claim-making and belonging that manifest in citizenship practices.

Moreover, social citizenship in the classic Marshallian understanding was always about bodies: bodies that needed to be shaped in education and sports, the military or work, or cared for in health care and pension provision. In the expanded understanding of social citizenship, the body comes once again prominently into play. Thus, activist forms of claim-making very often work via the body: squatters claim the right to housing by putting their bodies in place, political prisoners starve their bodies through hunger strikes, Femen activists paint slogans on their naked bodies. These forms of activist protest are 'acts' in the sense of Isin (2008), which create the 'scene' in which they are represented while they are being done (2009, 25). Yet they are not isolated but form part of a wider network of political practices (Butler 2015, Chapter 2) that include routine forms of organization as well as multiple encounters with powerful categorizations.

When Isin maintains that the moment of becoming political is 'that moment when the naturalness of the dominant virtues is called into question and their arbitrariness revealed' (2002, 275), this also applies to the 'naturalness' of classifications and bodies. Thus, our opening up of the category of the body in relation to citizenship is itself political. The 'breaking of a script' is thereby inherent in *doing the script*: every enactment is new because the constellation in which it is brought forth is different.[2] This is where multiplicity comes in: it not only allows us to show how categories of difference are made, but also how they are made relevant (or not). We therefore preeminently follow praxeological approaches whose conceptualization of practices implies the possibility of ruptures and transformative changes, as well as routines, adaptations and subversions.

While some of the articles in this special issue point to instances of activist citizenship (Deaf activists in the case of Hiddinga and de Langen, disability activists in the article by Rickli, and forensic specialists who do volunteer work in the case of M'charek and Casartelli), we do not want to limit ourselves to such noticeable acts of making a difference. Oftentimes, the nexus of citizenship and the body is articulated through more subtle forms of interpellation. This is where our third point of reference comes in, where we are in discussion with medical anthropologists who have theorized these arbitrary relations through various notions of biological citizenship. In these works, categorizations of difference and their relation to political subjectivities are central when bodies become the grounds of claiming rights. The focus here is not so much the body in action as the body that gains agency through being subjugated to categories of difference. Different to citizenship acts, which break with a code and create new scenes, thereby bringing forth new political subjects, other articulations of citizenship through the body claim rights that already exist in principle, such as access to medical treatment.

Paul Rabinow's idea of biosocialities – by which he describes how individuals identify themselves and form associations based on their biological or genetic qualities (1996) – is a milestone in the research on such forms of 'biologically' founded citizenship. Since then, a whole corpus of literature has evolved around cases in which legitimate candidacy, claims for rights and political participation, as well as the distribution of resources, recognition and sometimes even 'life itself' (Rose 2001) are negotiated via the body. This move has been coined as biological, medical or therapeutic citizenship (Petryna 2002; Rose and Novas 2005; Nguyen 2005), where legitimate

candidacy and forms of belonging are negotiated via 'biological' properties and qualities.

The relevance of the body, as well as marks on the body, in terms of rights and belonging have been analysed particularly in relation to immigrants (Fassin and d'Halluin. 2005; Heinemann and Lemke 2014; Malkki 1996; Ticktin 2011a, 2011b) and in the study of biometrics (Aas 2006; Breckenridge 2014; Dijstelbloem and Meijer 2011; Rao and Greenleaf 2013; van der Ploeg 1999). Writings on therapeutic or genetic citizenship are concerned with claims that can be made on a global order beyond nation states, as in the case of HIV treatment (Nguyen 2005), or within transnational networks, as in the case of people suffering from rare genetic diseases (Rose and Novas 2005).

So far, this body of literature from medical anthropology has hardly engaged with matured debates in citizenship studies. In this special issue, we suggest doing exactly this. Our intervention is therefore twofold: we place the biosociality literature firmly within the debate on expanded notions of citizenship. At the same time, we put forward a relational approach which recognizes that the biological itself is fundamentally social, rather than being contrastable with it (see also Latour 1993). Thinking citizenship via the body multiple thus consequently destabilizes the assumption of a fixed ground for citizenship (and the inclusions and exclusions that go along with it). This opens up new spaces for analysis, critique and intervention.

Spelling out multiplicity and relationality

The different practice-oriented approaches underlying the contributions to this special issue make it possible to unpack the idea of a non-ambiguous body by showing the ambiguities and selections in the practices enacting it. These analytical perspectives shed light on often black-boxed, powerful elements and knots of relations that are crucial and decisive in determining a person's kind of citizenship.

Francesca Rickli, for example, unpacks 'truth' from the body by addressing contradictory articulations of citizenship via the (post-)polio body over the life course. Her main attention is on the post-polio body of elderly Swiss citizens, i.e. the bodies of people who suffered from a polio infection in childhood and who continue to be affected by the infection, despite the fact that polio is considered to be extinct in Switzerland. Not only does their body change over the life course, but their changing body also becomes articulated differently in ambiguous encounters with state institutions – for instance, as a pensioner's or worker's body or as the body of a disability activist. Furthermore, as laws and views on polio and disability change in Swiss society, so too do the possibilities of articulation and claim-making. Where Mol thinks of the multiplicity of a body in different therapeutic disciplines within the same time period, Rickli describes multiplicity in different historical constellations by analysing how the (post-)polio body is articulated differently in distinct citizenship projects over time. By attending to these changing articulations, Rickli's analysis can teach us a lot about the interrelationality of regulations, recognition politics and imaginaries of a 'good citizen'. Furthermore, her case shows that thinking of citizenship as a process needs to be specific: what kind of processes are we talking about, how are they interlinked and how do they influence each other? For instance, the pensioner's body is influenced by the

way in which the worker's body was handled. Rickli's paper thus demonstrates the significance of a historical perspective, since the interfaces of recognition change even within the time span of one biography.

The dynamics around the double face of categorizations are contradictory. On the one hand, they provide access to resources, while at the same time fixing a status (Staples 2005; Krause 2018). This ambiguity is central in **Anja Hiddinga's and Maja de Langen's** article on claiming elderly care through deaf citizenship. Here we see again how changing bodily conditions can lead to a switching in and out of categories over the life course, and can be interpellated through different discourses of (mis)recognition. The deaf elderly spending their last years in a specialized care home for deaf people in the Netherlands suffered from the medicalization of their deafness early in their biography, which forced them to lip-read in special schools for the deaf, and which denied them the opportunity to become fluent in sign language. Now, later in life, this very cultural marker of their deafness – signing – is central to their daily life in a care home specialized for deaf elderly. The institution embraces the cultural definition of Deafness with a capital 'D' via sign language, while at the same time receiving specific funds dedicated to the medically defined category of deaf elderly as a specific category of difference. Thus, as Hiddinga and de Langen argue, the claims to citizenship made through the medical model of deafness are used to care for cultural Deaf citizenship. The body is thereby sometimes the basis for claim-making, while sometimes it explicitly is not, since the cultural model of Deafness refuses a medical definition that regards deafness as a bodily deficiency and defines being deaf as belonging to a linguistic minority. Hiddinga and de Langen analyse how deafness as multiple plays out in different avenues of citizenship that are balanced strategically by the care home management and by the elderly themselves. While certain norms of bodily conditions are the basis of claims in some of these avenues, a set of cultural norms and behaviours are more relevant in others.

Claudia Liebelt's paper on manufacturing beauty and negotiating belonging through the (female) body in urban Turkey addresses the multiplicity of the body in a slightly different sense. She demonstrates how the idea of the beautiful body is contingent on categories of religion, class, race and the enactment of rural/urban distinctions. Liebelt shows how these distinctly gendered categories of difference collide and overlap in the enactment of aesthetic citizenship and thus become tokens for urban and political belonging. In the social and geographical spaces of the city of Istanbul, norms of femininity, bodily care and urban as well as national belonging are constantly negotiated. Citizenship is thus not only a matter of formal status, but is also shaped by gendered and racialized hegemonic norms. Liebelt therefore suggests the notion of aesthetic citizenship to highlight the crucial role of bodily norms for belonging in a competitive urban environment. She shows how women suffering from racist and classist discrimination actively shape and modify their bodies in order to have access to middle class, secular urban spaces. Drawing on Isin, Liebelt describes these practices of self-fashioning as affective acts of citizenship by those who otherwise face naturalization as inferior and barbarian 'villagers'. Drawing on Ahmed's idea of a visual economy of recognition (2000), she describes the city space and urban beauty practices as a battleground for citizenship and belonging, where questions of whose body counts and whose body does not are constantly debated.

The categorization encounters analysed by **Sarah Lempp** also address the 'social gaze' which classifies people into different racial categories. Her paper focuses on the work of so-called verification commissions in Brazil that have to decide whether candidates who apply for affirmative action vacancies for black candidates are 'correctly' declaring themselves as such. Drawing on ethnographic observations of such commissions, Lempp analyses how the subject that is entitled to the resource in question – the *cotista* (quota candidate) – comes into being in these classification practices. As the commissions are supposed to base their decisions only on the candidate's phenotype, they present a dense example of how bureaucratic institutions grant access to citizenship rights and resources 'through the body'. However, as Lempp shows, there is no readily racialized body 'out there' that the commissions could 'capture'. Instead, the commissions relate the body to other elements – such as verbal statements of the candidates or the comparison of a candidate's body with specific samples – in order to enact the *cotista*. Thus, race as a category of difference is no pure entity residing in the assessed individual body. Instead, it is produced via specific choreographies of interaction, technologies and standards involved in the respective practices. Through this analysis, the paper makes a strong case for the denaturalization of race as well as for a relational understanding of 'bodily' differences in general.

The analysis of age estimations of young migrants in Germany by **Sabine Netz** has certain similarities with the case study on verification commissions in Brazil, as it also addresses 'top-down' evaluations which decide upon access to specific rights. Here, forensic instead of bureaucratic practices are at the centre of the enactment of a specific subject position. While these age assessments work with the assumption of a universal body, Netz's analysis of one particular age estimation practice shows that a very classical, normal biomedical body is enacted here. Whether a person comes of age in such a practice or not – thereby becoming deportable or not – ultimately depends on the time and place of her age assessment, the body parts involved in the specific practice, the X-ray technology used, the quality of the picture, the selection of studies, samples and schemes for particular versions of normally developing body parts, and, in the particular case analysed by Netz, the roots of wisdom teeth and the grade of bone loss. That a person becomes an unaccompanied minor refugee – a very specific legal status – is therefore not only bound to the notion of her 'universal body', but very precisely to the selection of a body part, and to the scheme and sample of an expert. A different selection would maybe lead to a different result. The rights, entitlements, restrictions and (im)possibilities entailed by the status established in this practice are therefore not simply grounded in biology or in something defined as such, but are enacted in a complex relation of which the body is just one part. The kind of body that is enacted there is dependent on this very relation in a specific practice.

In a similar vein, **Amade M'charek and Sara Casartelli** show that bodies are just one important element to assess and interrelate in the forensic work of identifying dead migrants. Drawing our attention to the Mediterranean as a site of neglected migrant deaths, they discuss the identification of dead migrants as a distinct form of citizenship incorporation. To this end, they analyse the case of the *Melilli5* operation, in which a shipwreck that had sunk in the waters between Libya and Italy in April 2015 was recovered in order to retrieve the victims' bodies. Drawing on Jeannette Pols' (2006) idea of relational citizenship via care work, they show how the work of forensic

identification can be interpreted as a form of care and an obligation towards the dead, and thus constitutes a kind of citizenship work. It allows the dead migrants to become a part of the collective of humanity. By introducing the notion of forensic care work, the authors analyse practices of identification and how these produce a form of relational citizenship. They follow the movement of bodies from the bottom of the sea, through improvised sites of forensic examination, to burial. This process involves experimentation and constant tinkering. Similar to citizenship acts that create the scenes in which they are represented (Isin 2009, 25), the forensic care work described here builds improvised forensic infrastructures.

Claiming rights via the body multiple: where to go from here

As these summaries show, the papers in this special issue examine ethnographically how categories of difference – such as age, race or disability – do 'not materialize in the body, but rather in relations established between a variety of entities, including bodies' (M'charek 2013, 434). Thus, they point to the situationally bound character of truth, truth-making and truth-claiming (Kleeberg and Suter 2014).

The question that looms large then is: what do we gain in citizenship studies by thinking situationally, in always newly established relations and ever shifting constellations? What does not taking citizenship or truth from bodies for granted do in terms of creating better and more equal worlds? In an ideal world, we would not need affirmative action procedures and care homes specialized in sign language, because this world would be hospitable, fair and open to all. Border crossers would not need to die, young migrants would receive adequate care, education and safe accommodation. Bodies would not need to prove anything, but could just live and be beautiful and able in their own idiosyncratic ways.

In a world in which the ambiguity of citizenship projects reigns, however, we cannot escape the simultaneity of their aspirational and exclusionary qualities (Bosniak 2006). Recognition of difference and the fair distribution of resources require that decisions be made about who belongs to which groups and who gets access to which resources. It is in this ambiguous and painful suture (Hall 2000; Krause 2018) of continuous potential misrecognition and unfair distribution that a relational approach sets in. The intervention with such a relational approach that we propose in this special issue is that attention to detail can improve and sharpen critique: if things only exist in relations, then these relations or the knots in these webs of relations can be changed. If bodies are multiple, they can also be different, and other worlds are possible (Schramm 2017).

Ultimately, the detailed analyses of this special issue raise the question: what are the knots in the webs of relations that are decisive in the enactment of categories and therefore pivotal for the distribution of resources and the grounds for recognition? Or even: what should they be? With the analysis of Netz, for example, it becomes possible to discuss whether the right to schooling should be granted according to the stage of someone's wisdom tooth development. Liebelt's case study directs our attention to the significant role that bodily beauty norms play in claiming access to the city. Bluntly put, should the shape of a person's nose be a factor when granting her access to the city? Or, to stay with the picture of the web of relations: which knots should be unravelled, tightened, stay as they are or be

highlighted? How should practitioners and administrators relate to scientific standards and what are the criteria for selecting scientific studies, if these standards and criteria become influential knots in the relations that enact a person's age and thereby their citizenship? These details may sound trivial at first, but our contributions show that it is precisely these seemingly small elements that are crucial for a person's access to rights and resources. Or, to rephrase a common proverb: citizenship is in the details. To be sure, we do not suggest getting lost in the details. Details only matter in their interrelatedness with other elements and contingent on their articulation. The case studies presented here show that it is never one element by itself that matters, but situationally-bound elements in relations, space and time (M'charek, Schramm, and Skinner 2014). Hence, we do not forget or overlook the 'big picture'. We simply state that the big picture is contingent on actual practices and webs of relations (cf. Latour 2005). What one sees in an analysis depends, so to speak, on the zoom factor.

Moving beyond the descriptions of relational webs, we can also ask: what knots can or should be added to the web? I.e. what are the blind spots in a particular citizenship or categorization practice? The multiplicity approach opens up the possibility for a detailed comparison of differing practices of (un-)doing categories of difference. This enables us to identify implicated actors and fields that are not in the spotlight but nevertheless important sites for potential change.

Indeed, what kind of change is necessary or not is connected to the question of what a good practice is. This is a normative question that we do not answer here, but that naturally evolves from the statement that there are multiple and other ways of doing categories of difference, bodies and citizenship. Attending to the living of a good life in bad situations, Jeannette Pols argues that normativity itself is also relational and always bound to a practice and the values, ideals and goals articulated in it (2014, 187). According to Pols, 'the question [of] what is a good or best care practice [...] needs specification (what values? for whom?) that can be made by comparing values and contexts' (ibid., 189). This ultimately means that there will always be 'different settings, different people, different goals, different frictions, different materials, different concerns, different goods' (Mol et al. 2010, 86). Attending to multiplicity makes comparisons between different goods possible.

However, Pols also reminds us that policy prescriptions or proposals can be elaborate and convincing in theory, but that they only work when they can actually be put into practice (2014, 190). This is not a straightforward task. Putting values or ideas into practice means dealing with the messiness of a particular reality and locality in time. It requires taking into account how humans and non-humans, technologies, standards, theories, objects, thoughts and other elements constitute a web of relations in order to enact something, somebody, or, as we show in this special issue, a person's body and citizenship.

Notes

1. The exclusive power of liberal citizenship becomes most evident in post-slavery societies like the United States, where the citizenship ideal is closely bound to the standards of whiteness (see Hartman 1997; cf. Bosniak 2006).

2. We acknowledge the important work that thinking citizenship from 'acts' has done to the field. However, it tends to reproduce hierarchies of spaces associated with citizenship. Acts in the sense of breaking scripts tend to be imagined as heroic public acts, even if the representation of the acts is created at the same time as they are happening. Privileging the public and heroic renders invisible the work that goes into making acting possible in the first place, to follow a classic feminist Marxist argument. But see Isin and Ruppert (2015) Chapter 2 and Isin (2019).

Acknowledgments

Disclosure statement

Notes on contributors

Sabine Netz is a research associate and PhD candidate at the Department of Anthropology of the University of Bayreuth, Germany.

Sarah Lempp is a research associate and PhD candidate at the Department of Anthropology of the University of Bayreuth, Germany.

Kristine Krause is Assistant Professor for Anthropology at the University of Amsterdam.

Katharina Schramm holds the Chair for Social and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Bayreuth, Germany.

References

Aas, K. F. 2006. "The Body Does Not Lie": Identity, Risk and Trust in Technoculture." *Crime, Media, Culture* 2 (2): 143–158. doi:10.1177/1741659006065401.

Ahmed, S. 2000. *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. London: Routledge.

Bacchi, C., and C. Beasley. 2002. "Citizen Bodies: Is Embodied Citizenship a Contradiction in Terms?" *Critical Social Policy* 22 (2): 324–352. doi:10.1177/02610183020220020801.

Bauer, S., and A. Wahlberg, eds. 2009. *Contested Categories: Life Sciences in Society*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Beasley, C., and C. Bacchi. 2000. "Citizen Bodies: Embodying Citizens – A Feminist Analysis." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 2 (3): 337–358. doi:10.1080/14616740050201931.

Benhabib, S. 1992. *Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. London: Routledge.

Bosniak, L. 2006. *The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bowker, G. C., and S. L. Star. 2000. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Breckenridge, K. 2014. *Biometric State: The Global Politics of Identification and Surveillance in South Africa, 1850 to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brodie, J. 2008. "The Social in Social Citizenship." In *Recasting the Social in Citizenship*, edited by E. F. Isin, 20–43. Toronto: University of Toronto University Press.

Butler, J. 2015. *Notes toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dijstelbloem, H., and A. Meijer, eds. 2011. *Migration and the New Technological Borders of Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fassin, D., and E. d'Halluin. 2005. "The Truth from the Body: Medical Certificates as Ultimate Evidence for Asylum Seekers." *American Anthropologist* 107 (4): 597–608. doi:10.1525/aa.2005.107.4.597.

Hall, S. 2000. "Who Needs Identity?" In *Identity: A Reader*, edited by P. Du Gay, J. Evans, and P. Redman, 15–30. London: Sage.

Haraway, D. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

Hartman, S. 1997. *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heinemann, T., and T. Lemke. 2014. "Biological Citizenship Reconsidered: The Use of DNA Analysis by Immigration Authorities in Germany." *Science, Technology & Human Values* 39 (4): 488–510. doi:10.1177/0162243913509414.

Hirschauer, S. 2001. "Das Vergessen des Geschlechts. Zur Praxeologie einer Kategorie sozialer Ordnung." In *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 41: Geschlechtersoziologie*, edited by B. Heintz, 208–235. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Isin, E., J. Brodie, D. Juteau, and D. Stasiulis. 2008. "Recasting the Social in Citizenship." In *Recasting the Social in Citizenship*, edited by E. F. Isin, 3–19. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Isin, E. F. 2002. *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Isin, E. F. 2008. "Theorizing Acts of Citizenship." In *Acts of Citizenship*, edited by E. F. Isin and G. M. Nielsen, 15–43. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Isin, E. F. 2009. "Citizenship in Flux: The Figure of the Activist Citizen." *Subjectvity* 29 (1): 367–388. doi:10.1057/sub.2009.25.

Isin, E. F. 2019. "Doing Rights with Things: The Art of Becoming Citizens." In *Performing Citizenship: Bodies, Agencies, Limitations*, edited by P. Hildebrandt, K. Evert, S. Peters, M. Schaub, K. Wildner, and G. Ziemer, 45–56. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Isin, E. F., and E. Ruppert. 2015. *Being Digital Citizens*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Kleeberg, B., and R. Suter. 2014. ""Doing Truth": Bausteine einer Praxeologie der Wahrheit." *Zeitschrift für Kulturphilosophie* 2/2014: 211–226. doi:10.28937/1000106675.

Krause, K. 2018. "Speaking from the Blind Spot: Political Subjectivity and Articulations of Disability." *Critical African Studies* 10 (3): 287–300. doi:10.1080/21681392.2019.1610012.

Krause, K., and K. Schramm. 2011. "Thinking through Political Subjectivity." *African Diaspora* 4 (2): 115–134. doi:10.1163/187254611X607741.

Lampland, M., and S. L. Star. 2009. *Standards and Their Stories: How Quantifying, Classifying, and Formalizing Practices Shape Everyday Life*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Latour, B. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. 1999. *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Law, J. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.

Law, J. 2009. "Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics." In *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, edited by B. S. Turner, 142–158. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lister, R. 1997a. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lister, R. 1997b. "Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis." *Feminist Review* 57 (1): 28–48. doi:10.1080/014177897339641.

Lister, R. 2002. "Sexual Citizenship." In *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, edited by E. F. Isin and B. Turner, 191–207. London: Sage.

Lister, R. 2007. "Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential." *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 49–61. doi:10.1080/13621020601099856.

M'charek, A. 2013. "Beyond Fact or Fiction. On the Materiality of Race in Practice." *Cultural Anthropology* 28 (3): 420–442. doi:10.1111/cuan.12012.

M'charek, A., K. Schramm, and D. Skinner. 2014. "Topologies of Race: Doing Territory, Population, and Identity in Europe." *Science, Technology & Human Values* 39 (4): 468–487. doi:10.1177/0162243913509493.

Malkki, L. 1996. "Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism, and Dehistoricization." *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (3): 377–404. doi:10.1525/can.1996.11.3.02a00050.

Marshall, T. H. 1950[1938]. "Citizenship and Social Class." In *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*, edited by T. H. Marshall, 1–85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mol, A. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mol, A., I. Moser, E. M. Piras, M. Turrini, J. Pols, and A. Zanutto. 2010. "Care in Practice. On Normativity, Concepts, and Boundaries" *Tecnoscienza. Italian Journal of Science & Technology Studies* 2 (1): 73–86.

Moser, I. 2005. "On Becoming Disabled and Articulating Alternatives." *Cultural Studies* 19 (6): 667–700. doi:10.1080/09502380500365648

Nguyen, V.-K. 2005. "Antiretroviral Globalism, Biopolitics, and Therapeutic Citizenship." In *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*, edited by A. Ong and S. J. Collier, 124–144. Oxford: Blackwell.

Petryna, A. 2002. *Life Exposed: Biological Citizens after Chernobyl*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pols, J. 2006. "Washing the Citizen: Washing, Cleanliness and Citizenship in Mental Health Care." *Culture, Medicine & Psychiatry* 30 (1): 77–104. doi:10.1007/s11013-006-9009-z.

Pols, J. 2014. "Radical Relationality: Epistemology in Care and Care Ethics for Research." In *Moral Boundaries Redrawn: The Significance of Joan Tronto's Argument for Professional Ethics, Political Theory and Care, and Care as Practice*, edited by G. Olthuis, H. Kohlen, and J. Heier, 175–194. Leuven: Peeters.

Rabinow, P. 1996. *Essays on the Anthropology of Reason*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rao, U., and G. Greenleaf 2013. "Subverting ID from Above and Below: The Uncertain Shaping of India's New Instrument Of E-Governance." *Surveillance & Society*; UNSW Law Research Paper No. 2013–2076.

Reckwitz, A. 2002. "Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (2): 243–263. doi:10.1177/13684310222225432.

Rose, N. 2001. "The Politics of Life Itself." *Theory, Culture & Society* 18 (6): 1–30. doi:10.1177/02632760122052020.

Rose, N., and C. Novas. 2005. "Biological Citizenship." In *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*, edited by A. Ong and S. J. Collier, 439–463. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schramm, K. 2017. "Einführung: Postkoloniale STS." In *Science and Technology Studies: Ein Überblick über klassische Positionen und aktuelle Perspektiven*, edited by S. Bauer, T. Lemke, and T. Heinemann, 471–494. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Schramm, K., K. Krause, and G. Valley. 2018. "Introduction: Voice, Noise and Silence. Resonances of Political Subjectivities." *Critical African Studies* 10 (3): 245–256. doi:10.1080/21681392.2019.1610013.

Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Staples, J. 2005. "Leprosy in South India: The Paradox of Disablement as Enablement." *Review of Disability Studies* 1 (4): 3–28.

Star, S. L. 1990. "Power, Technology and the Phenomenology of Conventions: On Being Allergic to Onions." *The Sociological Review* 38 (S1): 26–56. doi:10.1111/j.1467-954X.1990.tb03347.x.

Ticktin, M. 2011a. *Casualties of Care. Immigration and the Politics of Humanitarianism in France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ticktin, M. 2011b. "How Biology Travels: A Humanitarian Trip." *Body & Society* 17 (2–3): 139–158. doi:10.1177/1357034X11400764.

Trouillot, M.-R. 2001. "The Anthropology of the State in the Age of Globalization. Close Encounters of the Deceptive Kind." *Current Anthropology* 42 (1): 125–138. doi:10.1086/318437.

Turner, B. S. 1993. *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage.

van der Ploeg, I. 1999. "The Illegal Body: 'Eurodac' and the Politics of Biometric Identity." *Ethics and Information Technology* 1 (4): 37–44. doi:10.1023/A:101006461.

Werbner, P., and N. Yuval-Davis. 1999. "Introduction. Women and the New Discourse of Citizenship." In *Women Citizenship and Difference*, edited by N. Yuval-Davis and P. Werbner, 1–38. London: Zed Books.

Yalçın-Heckmann, L. 2011. "Introduction: Claiming Social Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 15 (3–4): 433–439. doi:10.1080/13621025.2011.564806.

Young, I. 1989. "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship." *Ethics* 99 (2): 250–274. doi:10.1086/293065.

Yuval-Davis, N. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40 (3): 196–213. doi:10.1080/00313220600769331.