

PANTEION UNIVERSITY Centre for Gender Studies

134 Sygrou Avenue, 1st floor, GR 17671 ATHENS, Tel: +30- 210 9210177-8, fax: +30- 210 9210178

<http://www.genderpanteion.gr>, e-mail: gender@panteion.gr

LECTURE

FLOYA ANTHIAS

«Gendered belongings in a globalising, unequal world:
understanding translocations»

JUNE 7th 2004

the text is the transcription of the lecture

NOTE: text has not been edited by the speaker. Please do not quote

Ευχαριστώ Μαρία. Πρώτα θέλω να μιλήσω λίγο ελληνικά. Θα δείτε πως τα ελληνικά μου είναι λίγο σπασμένα επειδή ζω τόσα χρόνια στην Αγγλία, πήγα στην Αγγλία όταν ήμουν τριών χρονών. Θέλω να ευχαριστήσω τη Μαρία θέλω να σας ευχαριστήσω όλους που έχετε έρθει εδώ και θα δείτε ότι θα πω και εγώ κάτι και για την εμπειρία μου επειδή η εμπειρία μας ως άνθρωποι έχει πολύ σχέση με το πώς εκδηλώνουμε τον εαυτό μας ακαδημαϊκά και πολιτικά. Τώρα θα μιλήσω στα αγγλικά και θα υπάρχει μετάφραση αλλά αν έχετε ερωτήσεις θα προσπαθήσω αν είναι πιο εύκολο για το ακροατήριο να τις απαντήσω στα ελληνικά, αν μπορώ. Τουλάχιστον μισά αγγλικά, μισά ελληνικά.

Displacement, being out of place, has become the most powerful imagery for the modern world. Displacement, presupposes already its opposite, which can be thought of as being in place. But being in place is never simple, neither are the related notions of identity and belonging. Issues of borders and boundaries and issues of hierarchies in society are important for helping us to think about the related ideas of place and position and identity and belonging. Moreover, there is much evidence that belonging is a gendered process. And that gender itself, is central to the boundary formation, which characterises ethnic, national and state formation and transformation.

As early as 1983 along with my colleague Nira Yuval-Davis we were concerned with the intersections of gender, ethnicity and class. And presented a developed argument in our book in 1989 'Woman Nation State'. This is the title of the book about women and gender processes in nation making. That is nation-making which is very much related to gender processes. We argued that women carried the burden of the reproduction of national discourse and imagery and practice, with men taking a different role in national processes. Women were important in the reproduction of the ideology and culture of the nation and in producing nationalised subjects through the transmission of national ideologies and practices as well as ethnic ones. They were symbolic of the nation. Often the nation was represented as a woman, particularly in appealing for rights. For example in Cyprus, after the 1974 war and invasion of Cyprus, there were a lot of posters on the island of Cyprus with a picture of a black clothed woman – μαυροφορεμένη γυναίκα- with the words underneath είμαι η δική μας Κύπρος. Κύπρος was this woman in black, mourning. Women play specific roles in institutional and other arrangements of the nation-state such as labour markets and the military. And of course in the process of migration women are very important. Not only is migration increasingly feminised, as we know. Women are often the cornerstone of ethnic transmission, cultural transmission and reproduction, as well as in the reproduction of patriarchy.

In terms of their role in the reproduction of patriarchy, I'll say a little more about that later. We need to go beyond the nation-state therefore, because globalisation

processes indicate a greater trans-national and international movement of culture, capital, modes of communication and of course labour. These processes of globalisation involve the growing imperialism of western cultural forms that have become I believe consumables, these western cultural forms, in an ever-growing avid market for their commodities of plenty, often in nations where poverty and exploitation by the major western countries continues and grows. We also live at a time when the distinctions between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots have become greater in a world torn apart, not so much anymore by conflicts explicitly at least of class, as underpinned by conflicts of ethnicity, nationalism and racism. Of course these conflicts of ethnicity, nationalism and racism are themselves I believe underpinned by economic and other interests.

The debates around borders, around security, around social cohesion are becoming important particularly in what the Americans and the British call the 'post September 11th world'. This has reinforced the importance of engaging critically with the notions of belonging. By this I mean critically not accepting the received wisdoms about what notions of belonging mean but engaging critically with them. And critically with the centrality they have in peoples lives as well as in political practice. We need to go beyond I believe a politics of identity or a politics of belonging and relate to the continuing importance in the modern world of unequal social resources. We need to think in what I have termed or what have been termed 'intersectional ways' and I'll develop this concept of intersectionality a little bit further on in my paper because I think it is very important that we develop an intersectional way of analysing social processes. And this, once we do that, once we focus on the intersectionality of notions of belonging, we can move away from essentialised notions of belonging on the one hand but also avoid the rapid deconstructionism of post-modern approaches to belonging and identity which leave us with nothing. So my starting point in a way is the thorny issue of how we think of belonging and identity in transnational and what I have called a translocational way, which recognises the different, and multiple locations, positions and belongings that people have.

Recognising the multiplicity of these, in a situated and contextual way which doesn't end up as I said with the thoroughgoing deconstruction of difference. But permit me if I may to give you a personal narrative about belonging because as I said in the beginning our own position influences the way we think about our ideas in the world and as I said I am myself the child of migrants. And my first moment of realising about borders and boundaries came as a tiny child. My father, leaving first for a foreign country, England, a few months before the rest of us. Then came the boats and trains. A seven-day journey, taking me from sunny Cyprus by Venice and Paris into grimy, foggy London. And in the eager eyes of my papa, journeys, loss, longing, fear. And yet another border, as a migrant;

the border between home and school. A vivid memory of deepest exclusion and denigration. Going to my first class in the local primary school in north London and all the other children were given a small pot of flowers, which I didn't get. And I could not understand why I didn't have one also. Why I couldn't belong to the club of flowerpots. And I think it probably was because I had joined the class late and they had ordered these pots of flowers, probably paid some money. But I couldn't, nobody explained to me why I was the only person in the class who didn't get this pot of flowers. And I was crying when my mother came to pick me up. But no explanation came. Being called a 'greasy Greek' when I could understand the words, hating the food, hating boiled carrots, different from what I was used to. 'Go on, eat your food you greasy Greek' came the chants from the children. And then I felt the smack on the hand by the teacher. Let me take you to another border. Some years on I returned back to Cyprus, now back in Nicosia, when I was about 8 my family returned to Nicosia briefly. And I went to another school, a Greek-Cypriot school in Nicosia this time. And there I was the little 'English girl' as I spoke better English than Greek this time round. And this was the time of EOKA the national struggle, and the bodies of young men soaked in blood were in the streets. Whose were they, theirs or ours? Did it matter theirs or ours? Of course this was the question the people always asked. Who has been killed are they theirs or ours? This was the time of the struggle for independence against the colonial power Britain but fought by right-wing nationalists at the helm. Running home one day I was told by a small child that my father had been killed by EOKA.

My father was a communist and EOKA and communists didn't get on very well. The right wing, EOKA is the right wing national liberation group in Cyprus. Of course it was not true, my father luckily was not killed but the little girl who told me this was just been malicious because my father as I said was an active communist. Going to stay in my mother's village for a few days and the little friends of my cousin saying your dad is a bad communist, communist yes, and finding out for the first time, I didn't realise before, that communists don't believe in God. It surprised when I was told by this little girl actually communists don't believe in God. And then the other border, the one this is strongly imprinted on all societies of ethnic conflict. The border with and against your other, which is around the corner but cannot be in your homes, of course Turkish-Cypriots in our case. We lived in the old quarter of Nicosia and in a side street, rarely visited by Greek-Cypriots were a cluster of little houses where some Turkish-Cypriot families lived or Turks as we called them. Been told by neighbours not to go there, but why? Why shouldn't I go there? It was fun, they were good at playing ball and skipping. But no, they are not like us, they have different habits. Best to stick to your own. I never told my mother that I used to go and play with them. I was too fearful of what she would say. And stopped going around the

corner. Passed that imaginary but all too real border. No need for a flag, for barbed wire, for soldiers. The mere existence of that prohibition was enough. Hence here the border of the rejection of the other. Where I was not in this case an "other", I was the self, coexisting with the communist other and the little 'englesoula' other, that I actually was in this society. So a home, as is typical, of a migrant child, in two places at once but a home also in neither.

All these borders of migration, of feeling alien, because I stood out; of the borders with the English colonialists, of the borders between communists and others, of the borders of belonging to do of course with gender exploitations which I haven't spoken about. Of course the borders of class as well which again I could talk about but I don't have the time. The borders with Turkish-Cypriots and of course my belief now in a Cyprus in a world that is inclusive and the rejection of all ethnic borders. So just through my own short description about my own borders and boundaries that I've experienced, you can see that borders and boundaries are of many kinds, and the difficulty is trying to think through the complex interweaving and contradictions involved. And this I believe poses challenges for feminists and for anti-racists whose political projects often channel them into prioritising the boundaries and identities, which are the focus of their own struggles. In the case of feminism, the feminist project involves prioritising the gendered struggle and very often in this process feminists forget about other boundaries and other struggles that need to be forged. And therefore it is important to be aware of other boundaries of difference and identity and exclusion as well, when we're struggling on the feminist front. Otherwise we fall into the trap of a kind of feminist fundamentalism I believe.

Now I started off with belonging and I gave you a kind of personal narrative about my own kind of experiences in relation to movement, you know, my movement across national boundaries as a migrant. But identity and belonging have become very important in modern day discussions. It probably sticks out, a discussion particularly I think after the September the 11th event, as one of the most fundamental issues of modern life. How do we identify collectively? Where we are positioned where we are placed collectively. And I believe it is precisely when we feel destabilised, when we seek for answers to the questions raised by uncertainty, disconnection, alienation, invisibility, threat that we become more obsessed with finding, even fixing a social place that we feel at home in, or at least more at home in. Where we seek for our imagined roots, for the secure haven, at least we think of it as a secure heaven, of our group, our family, our nation writ large. Issues of identity and belonging particularly are becoming important therefore in situations of conflict and lack of stability. Where do I belong is a recurrent thought for most of us in the modern world. And this question is usually prompted by feeling that there are range of places, spaces,

identities that we do not and cannot belong to. Belonging therefore involves an important affective or emotional dimension relating to social bonds and ties. And of course, it is relational.

Belonging involves saying I belong to this group but not to that group. We can only think we belong to one group when we say we do not belong to another group. It is a relational concept. But when we say we belong to one group we actually say belong to the Greek ethnic collectivity, what we are doing with this statement of belonging is we are ignoring or pushing to one side and underestimating the losses, the absences, the fissures, the contradictions within. In this we are assuming that all Greeks and the Greek ethnic collectivity exists as an unproblematic entity that we can belong to, that there are no contradictions, that there are no differences. So in constructing our sense of belonging to a particular group we often disguise the contradictions, we override them. And in the process of making these assumptions of belonging we naturalise, we take for granted the similarities within. We forget that belonging is not something natural, that you might feel as a Greek say but that this is something that is produced and that it has ideological resonances and the idea of say belonging to the Greek ethnos, just as an example, has political aspects involved in it. This depends on when you would say I belong to the Greek ethnos. If in Cyprus, for example, I make a very strong statement as a Greek Cypriot that I belong to the Greek ethnos that is a very political statement that I am making because what I am saying is actually that my main kind of sense of identity and therefore loyalty is to the Greek group on Cyprus, not to the whole of Cyprus.

So that belonging often involves quite political notions. Sometimes we don't even realise how political and how ideological our notions of belonging are. And of course therefore we need to avoid the idea of a natural community of people that we belong to. And recognise that belonging is socially produced, is contextual, situational and it has to be seen as a political act as well as an affective and emotional placing of who we are. So belonging therefore is not just about who we feel we are, belonging has a number of dimensions. There is the dimension of how we feel about our location in the social world, which as I suggested is partly produced, although it is actually very difficult for us to be aware of this. For example, I will reinforce that I am a Greek Cypriot when there is conflict, when I feel there is exclusion. So belonging is partly generated through experiences of exclusion rather than experiences of inclusion. So the notion of belonging becomes activated I believe through a sense of exclusion. And belonging is not just about how we feel, it is also about formal and informal experiences of belonging. It has an experiential dimension as well as an affective dimension. It's about experiences and of course it's about practices. We express our belonging through our practices. So belonging is also not just

about membership in a community, rights in a community and duties we have in a community, as in the case of citizenship, belonging in that sense as a citizen. Nor is it just about forms of identification with groups, like I said I belong to the Greek Cypriot collectivity; it is not just about identification. But is also about a range of experiential, practical processes and ideological and political processes. So belonging is actually quite complicated and I think that the problem with many discussions of identity particularly in sociological literature is that identity has often been discussed in terms of cultural membership of a community. This involves feeling we identify with a group whose culture we share. Which is the old anthropological way of thinking about identity, from this point of view. Belonging and identity have a number of features to do with politics, with ideology, with practical and experiential aspects as well. And because of this it is very important to locate the notion of belonging in terms of difference, the different locations we inhabit, often at the same time.

The title of my paper is about 'gender, ethnicity and migration' but if we think about belonging in terms of gender, as men and women, and our belonging in terms of our ethnic or national position, we can also add to this our belonging in terms of our class position. And we often carry the belonging of these three things together and it is actually quite difficult to separate out belonging as a woman from belonging as a member of a particular class or belonging as a member of a particular ethnic group, because in our lived experience all these things are intertwined together.

Now, having said that, as a kind of frame if you like, I want to now turn to belonging in a migrant context. And minority research in a way shows some of the problems and contradictions one faces as a migrant. But in sociology particularly there have been some attempt to theorise and understand belonging in a migrant context.

Is there something unique about the belonging of migrants? Of people who move from one place to the other? Are they special? Is a Greek who's gone to America and lived most of their life in America or Australia, do they have a different notion of belonging? Not just a different relationship say to Greece, or a different relationship to America or Australia than Greeks who stayed in Greece. But is there something more there? Have they developed a different way of thinking about the world? For example, are they more likely to be cosmopolitan in the way they think, are they less likely to be nationalist or to be ethnocentric? And these are some of the questions that researchers have tried to answer when they've looked at migrant populations. And they've been two different positions that have emerged in some of the literature. One is the idea that migrants actually have very distinctive ways of thinking about the world. Migrants and their descendants have very complex relationships; they have migrant and Diasporic networks that they are involved in,

for example in my case in Britain you might belong to a village association, for example my mother's village in Cyprus, the migrants over there belonged to it. So they are connected there, they have symbolic, social and material ties with the homeland, they might invest in property back home, but day-to-day life may be in America in Britain or the UK. And the other complication is that the Diaspora populations are often subjected to a lot of pressure from the homeland. In the case of Israel or in the case of Greece or the case of Cyprus for example, the homeland wants to retain the identity of the Diaspora. They want the Diaspora to help them, to help them in terms of their national project. So all this creates a multiplex reality. And the concept of Diaspora has been used in sociology in a theoretical or conceptual way to suggest that if you are a member of the Diaspora you develop a new and different form of consciousness linked to this complex reality.

The other aspect that has emerged is a notion of hybridity. And here the emphasis has been on the idea that within migrant populations there is a kind of synthesis of different cultural elements, different experiences, divergent knowledges emerge. Which can be brought together to create a new space of belonging. So that you become more hybrid in the way you think about the world you can pick and choose more such as which features of your parents culture or ideology you believe in, which features you wish to reject, how much of the new culture, the new form of way of life, you want to adopt. But here I think too much emphasis in discussions of hybridity have been placed on choice, on the idea that the younger generation can actually choose, so for example I can choose to say well I am not going to believe in, not going to be so *θρήσκα* as my parents were, I am going to reject that, I am not going to get married in church for example, but I will accept the importance that they give to family relationships. And I can mix with that something that I get from England.

But I think choice, you know, the construction of choice as the most important element is very problematic. Because what we have to explain certainly as sociologists is why some young people choose to adopt more of their parents values and culture whereas others choose to adopt less. And I think the relationship between gender, ethnicity and class is important here. And for example one needs to see whether young women actually have a different relationship in terms of hybridity to both homeland and the place they've gone to live, than men. So there are all kinds of questions about class and about gender when we think about discussions of Diaspora and hybridities. Is not possible to think of Diaspora and hybridity as processes that happen in an ungendered or unclassed way. Because we lost a little bit of time maybe I suggest also make a critique very briefly of the idea of culture. Because what much of the literature on migration has emphasised in recent years is this question: What happens to the culture of migrants. What is their sense of

cultural belonging? And I want to make a critique of this, because I think culture is important, we can't overemphasise the importance of culture. Because culture does not exist in a social vacuum, culture exists in terms of structures, of processes, social processes, class processes, gender processes and we need therefore not to overemphasise the cultural problems of the cultural differences or the cultural crisscrossings that happen in the migrant situation but locate them within an understanding of structural processes also.

Given some of these questions we might want to ask as sociologists different kinds of questions; under what conditions, structural conditions or political conditions is a synthesis of cultural elements possible? Which elements of culture do people abandon? Which aspects of culture are the most likely to survive? And one of the things that we have found in much of the research that we have done as sociologists is that gender is often a continuing influence; cultures around gender and gender differences often survive where other things might disappear. And this partly is because the dominant gender, the male gender has an interest in preserving the traditional gender relations in countries of migration. So there is a lot of, you know, a kind of pressure in families for women to transmit traditional cultural ideologies to their daughters and their sons. You must not lose sight of the materialist basis of culture however, which is the message I want to put across when we talk about culture.

Now I want to turn a briefly to something, a set of issues related to the issue of belonging that I started with, in a migrant context, in the context of migration which is the debate on multiculturalism. The countries in Southern Europe since about 1990 have had new waves of migration coming to them. And they have to face the development of a multi-ethnic, a multi-cultural society. Of course countries of the western world have been debating multiculturalism for some time and have put into practice certain forms of multicultural policy, of multicultural practice. And multiculturalism itself has been critiqued. One of the main critiques of the kind of multiculturalist policies that have been put in place in countries like Canada and in countries like the UK, has been the overemphasis on culture as a static and given phenomenon and the over-celebration of culture. So that, for example in Britain, when multiculturalism is discussed one thinks of teaching the language of origin to the children, or providing funding so that they can set up special schools or where they set up groups where they can meet to devote time to their culture. And this puts culture in little boxes. It is a term that has often been used, the 'museumisation' of culture. It is assumed that people who travel, who migrate, actually want to preserve their culture and their culture is static. But as we know culture is a dynamic and moving phenomenon. A multiculturalism 'museumises', liberal multiculturalism anyway, museumises culture. One

of the other things about this emphasis on culture and the preservation of culture within multiculturalism has been the development of what we might call a form of cultural relativism.

A cultural relativism says: as long as this is the culture of the group it is their right to exercise their culture. If this is what they want, they have the right to do it and we should celebrate this. One of the difficulties of course from a feminist point of view is that many cultures, including western cultures, actually are based on the oppression of women. So if you develop a multiculturalist philosophy and practice that is based on the principle that cultures have certain rights to pursue their own traditions and their own way of life, then you are not actually addressing the issue of the oppression of women and the exploitation of women within culture. And that's another reason why you have to think in tandem not only about the rights of minorities but the rights of particular sections of minorities, which is women and members of subordinate classes. You know, you can't say we have to build a society which is multicultural and say let's allow people to exercise the rights that they have in terms of their culture when it involves the exploitation of women. But of course we have to recognise that exploitation of women isn't just something that happens by men. We can see this in Greece around us, where women, particularly Greek middle class women who will employ the Philippine maid or whatever, they will oppress women from other social groups as well. So that when we think of the oppression of women we do not think of the oppression of women purely as something that happens by men.

Although I know the classic feminist notion of the oppression of women is that women are oppressed by men. But once we take into account ethnicity and take account of class we can then recognise that women can also exploit and oppress women. And this exploitation of women, oppression of women, the use of women to do traditional tasks in the home by women who develop careers, this of course is on the one hand a positive thing because it means that indigenous women (in our case we use as an example Greek women), are entering the labour market, they're becoming less perhaps dependent, economically dependent on men, but at the same time they're dependent increasingly on the labour of other women who are paid very little and whose own citizenship rights may be very few, particularly if they're illegal. So on the one hand it is a positive thing for it shows that Greek women are becoming perhaps less oppressed and exploited, but at the same time this is based on the exploitation or oppression of other women. And the other thing that happens in this kind of situation, this use of other women, is that it stops the transformation of gender relations itself. What it means is that it is still accepted by men that it is other women who will continue working in the home, who will look after the

children and who will perform the domestic labour. So the use of foreign women to take over the tasks of domestic labour when Greek women, or say, Spanish women, go out to work means that gender relations are not transformed, nothing happens to the men, the men can still depend on other women to do the tasks. And the role of the state is important here, particularly in the case of illegal migration and some of the difficulties that are faced by particular kind of rules, legal rules about migrating. And of course in the situation of Southern European migrants, there is the extreme degree of illegality that is faced by migrants who become very vulnerable because of this illegality. And the sex traffic in women is a particularly disturbing example, where women are brought in often under false pretences and forced into prostitution. So I think in this discussion of multiculturalism, I mean the message there for me, is that building a multicultural society, a multi ethnic society is on the agenda now for most societies given the increasing globalisation of labour trans-national movements of population. But when we develop multicultural frameworks or policies and practices we have to be careful not to fix or 'museumise' culture and not to ignore the position of women within the debate on multiculturalism. So in tandem to be concerned with multiculturalist rights we should also be concerned with gender rights, making sure that the human rights of women and of course class, economic resources is also addressed in the process.

Now I want to move to (again I think I'll be quite brief here), to two ways of thinking that I want to suggest. In order, first to begin to think about how to overcome the complexities of some of the issues that I addressed about belonging, about multiculturalism, the problem of fixing culture, the problem of how to reconcile the rights of women with the rights of migrants, when they actually might be sort of competing interests of work here. One idea that has been written about that I want to discuss is the concept of intersectionality.

Now intersectionality is a concept that has been discussed particularly by American anti-racists and feminists, which is about the importance of connecting together the divisions and identities of gender, ethnicity and class. However there are a number of ways in which we can do it. One of the ways is to say we can add these subordinations together, so for example if you are subordinated as a woman, which as women as a group anyway we feel we are, and if I am a migrant woman I can add onto my subordination experience the fact that I am a migrant so I am doubly disadvantaged, and then a third thing might be that I am poor or I am a member of an underclass an underprivileged class, and then I can add a third dimension of disadvantage; so in this way of thinking you are kind of adding on particular forms of disadvantage which leaves you in a situation where we will say, the most exploited women are poor migrant women and this is an additive process. They're

exploited and oppressed through gender, through ethnicity, through racialisation, through class. However, there is a problem and the problem is that as we don't experience the subordination as individuals in a separate way, I can't add on; you know, the fact that I am oppressed as a woman, I am oppressed as a migrant or I am oppressed as a member of a class. It doesn't work like that. It is the way they crosscut each other, it is the way they intersect that is important and there are particular forms say, of gender discrimination that are experienced by migrant women. For example it is not the same gender oppression, it has a particular form, for example it may be more sexualised, or it maybe have different stereotypes attached to it. So that Russian women might be stereotyped as women differently to Greek women. Not stereotyped as migrants but stereotyped as women. Of course the fact that they are migrant produces particular kinds of gender stereotypes, therefore it is not easy just to add on these discriminations and disadvantages. Gender subordination is transformed itself in different contexts, in a migrant context, in a class context. Working class women experience different forms of gender stereotyping, different gender practices than more middle class women. For example the forms of patriarchy experienced by working class women may be very different to those experienced by middle class women who are more educated, who have more choice, who have more power. The less power you have as a woman in class and economic terms the oppression that you experience may be greater; certainly there will be a different kind of oppression. So this is why it is important to think in intersectional ways rather than in an additive way, adding on, talking about a double burden or triple burden. And therefore, the other problem in thinking about intersectionality is that it assumes that your position is similar to being at an intersection. You think, lets say that there are three roads, say the road of gender, the road of class, and the road of ethnicity. And the intersection is the place where all these roads meet. But the problem there is that is not so easy to know where the car came from. In the case of the roads, there are three cars and all three cars meet in the section, and the cars know which road they took and they come together lets say they bump together in this intersection.

Whereas, in the case of gender, in relation to the intersections of gender, ethnicity and class it is not so easy for an individual, or even for, particularly for a sociologist, to understand which road has generated the specificity of the problem faced by the individual. To what extent has gender been the influence, is that the road that has been the most important? Or is the ethnic or migrant road the most important or is the class road the most important? So it is a very complicated process of working out the kind of influences from gendered stereotypes, from migrant, or racist stereotypes, from class and economic problems and poverty. That's why we need to abandon in a way the idea of these fixed

roads; the roads themselves are always intersectional. That's the point and the message I want to make here. Each road is made up also of the other roads. It is not a question of the roads intersecting in one space only there; isn't one space of intersections but the roads themselves are produced intersectionally. So gender is produced intersectionally through class interests, through gender interests and maybe through national and ethnic interests. And we can say the same for the other roads. That's why we have to be very careful when we use this analogy of intersectionality not to have the additive model, the double or triple burden approach, nor to have this strict idea of intersections with one intersection, but rather to think of the sections, to think of gender as always ethnicised and always racialised and always classed and so on and so forth.

Now I want to come to another term that I think will help us here, which I've called 'translocational'. I've introduced this term intersectional to help us think about this complexity but now I want to talk about translocational, the notion of trans-locational belonging. We've all heard of transnational belongings or transnationalism. And transnationalism in the debates has referred to movements and processes relating to border crossings. Transnational families for example are families, which exist across national borders. Where you may have your mother and father live in one country, your sister live in another country, your brother live in another country, your children perhaps live in another country. So the family is a transnational rather than a national phenomenon. But translocational, the term translocational doesn't concern itself so much with transnational movements but it recognises that the trans process, the process of movement, of shifting around, doesn't only happen at the national level but it happens at the local level and it happens in terms of our own movement in and out of various positions. So we are translocated ourselves, in as much as our own identity and belonging will shift and change depending on our location at a particular point in time. Not only our location spatially but our location in terms of class, in terms of political interests, in terms of life cycle, in terms of whether we're in a job or outside a job. These translocational positions that we experience, the shifting and multiplicity that we all experience, produce often very contradictory interests and contradictory positions in the social world. So that we are not fixed subjects, with fixed identities. Our own notions of belonging and identity will shift around and change in a translocational way, i.e. in terms of our shifting within and between positions at different points of our life, in terms of moving in and out of work, having children, travelling to other countries, being in a relationship with a man or not been in a relationship with a man. Let's put it this way: the notion of intersectionality suggests to us that we can't think of gender without also thinking about its ethnicised,

racialised and class sense, and we can't think of ethnicity or migration without thinking of gender and class.

So intersectionality recognises that the roads of gender are always classed and raced. The concept of 'translocational', on the other hand, tells us that our belonging and our identity is not something fixed but is neither arbitrary. Because in one of the ways in which people have moved from the idea that identity is fixed (and there's been a lot of critique of the idea that identity and belonging are fixed), what they've said is that identity is shifting and changing. They've denied any kind of structure to it. But I don't think we need to go that far. To criticise the fixed notion of identity doesn't mean you reject a notion of practice and experience and the fact that identity is not arbitrary either. And the way our belonging changes, emerges as transformed, is linked to our social location in terms of gender, ethnicity and class and the way that location changes in different contexts that we find ourselves through our life course. And in terms of whether we move to another country, whether we lose our jobs, whether our children leave home and so on.

So that these twin terms I believe of intersectionality and translocation problematise the fundamentalist feminist position of course, because it means that feminists cannot ignore racism, migration, ethnicity and class, so it problematises the exclusive feminist politics. But also it problematises the idea of our belonging and identity being something given just through ethnicity. The belonging to a Greek nation, whether we feel Greek or not and how we feel Greek, and where we position ourselves in terms of the Greek nation, is not something just to do with ethnicity. It is also something to do with our gender position and our translocation, our position at particular points in time. And of course this is not just a question of agency, but a question of the politics, the structures around us. The narratives are produced by our political leaders, by economic interests, by global capital, by commodity production, by the rumbling market that tries to make us particular consumers. And so although it is important to recognise our agency, that we to some extent can choose who to vote for in the European elections or whatever, nonetheless, we are subjected to a range of practices, structures and discourses around us.

I think I want to stop on this note. I've already gone on for least an hour.

So thank you very much for listening to me.