

REPRODUCTION AND CITIZENSHIP/ REPRODUCING CITIZENS: EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Sasha Roseneil, Isabel Crowhurst,
Ana Cristina Santos and Mariya Stoilova

Citizenship Studies (2013) 17(8), 901-11.

Contact details:

Professor Sasha Roseneil
Department of Psychosocial Studies/ Birkbeck Institute for Social Research
Birkbeck, University of London
Malet Street
London WC1E 7HX
s.roseneil@bbk.ac.uk

Reproduction and Citizenship/ Reproducing Citizens:

Editorial Introduction

Sasha Roseneil, Isabel Crowhurst,

Ana Cristina Santos and Mariya Stoilova

Whilst the politics of reproduction have been at the heart of feminist struggles for over a century and a half, their analysis has not yet come to occupy a central place in the interdisciplinary study of citizenship. This special issue on *Citizenship and Reproduction/ Reproducing Citizens* takes up the challenge posed by Bryan Turner in the pages of this journal, when he noted “the absence of any systematic thinking about familial relations, reproduction and citizenship” (Turner, 2008, 45). However, we take issue with this claim, and argue that there is now a substantial body of scholarship that explores this nexus of practices and political contestations. Nonetheless, Turner is rare amongst “mainstream” citizenship scholars working outside feminist or queer frameworks in paying explicit attention to reproduction. Despite the powerful challenges posed by theorists such as Carole Pateman (1988, 1989, 1992), Ruth Lister (1997) and Nira Yuval-Davis (1997) to traditional civic republican and liberal understandings of citizenship that rest on an un-interrogated public/private dichotomy, the complex entanglements, and gendered valencies, of “public” and “private”, “political” and “personal”, “rational” and “emotional”, “mind” and “body” in constructions and practices of citizenship have been almost exclusively the critical terrain of feminist and queer scholars. And so, the biological, sexual and technological realities of natality, and the social realities of the intimate intergenerational material and affective labour

that is generative of citizens, and that serve to reproduce membership of, and belonging to, states, nations, societies and, thus of “citizenship” itself, have largely remained marginal to “citizenship studies”.

Yet over the past two decades, across the social sciences, there there has been a flourishing of empirical and theoretical “citizenship research” that builds on the second wave feminist argument that gendered practices of reproduction are central to the reproduction of inequalities in social and political life (Mitchell 1966; Firestone 1970; Chodorow 1978; O’Brien 1981). This work has been framed through a variety of conceptualisations of citizenship, each of which offers a rather different emphasis: *feminist citizenship* (Jones 1990; Lister 1997), *inclusive citizenship* (Knijn and Kremer 1997; Lister 2007), *gendered citizenship* (Siim 2000; Lister et al. 2007; Caldwell et al. 2009; Halsaa, Roseneil, and Sümer 2011, 2012), *sexual citizenship* (Cossman 2007; Ryan-Flood 2009), *intimate citizenship* (Plummer 2003, 2005; Smyth 2008; Roseneil 2010; Roseneil et al. 2012), as well as *embodied* (Bacchi and Beasley 2002), *bodily* (Outshoorn et al. 2012) and *biopolitical* (Tyler 2010) *citizenship*.

Across these expositions and discussions, attention to the politics of reproduction has resulted in a number of radically new ways of thinking about citizenship that underline the many and varied ways in which states regulate and shape the reproduction of their citizens.

Substantively, it has drawn attention to the centrality of reproductive rights to women’s citizenship (O’Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; Mazur 2002), highlighting how full and equal citizenship remains a distant goal, given that the project of securing full reproductive

self-determination for women is far from achieved across much of the world.¹ It has demanded that the quotidian, gendered, and increasingly globalized and racialized², work of caring for children, and elderly and disabled people, that is central to the reproduction of the social, be understood as practices of citizenship (Sevenhuijsen 1998; Williams 2004; Tronto 2005). This has led to arguments about how the analysis of the ways in which welfare regimes of the global north support, provide or neglect care-work is crucial to understanding citizenship (Knijn and Kremer 1997; Tronto 2001; Lister et al. 2007; Bergman et al. 2012; Le Feuvre et al. 2012). Relatedly, the care-work of citizen-mothers has come to be understood as vital to “the reproduction of the nation” (Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989; Yuval-Davis 1996; Luibheid 2004; Tyler 2013), so that demographic concerns about the health, strength and/ or ethnic/ racial composition of the nation have historically often shaped reproductive law and policy, and hence who is and is not able to have children (Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989; Mottier and Gerodetti 2007).³ The dependence of nations, states and ethnicities on natality and ancestry (*jus sanguini*) to determine membership (Stevens 1999) has also become the critical object of scrutiny, as has the state’s “primary demographic objective of securing and enforcing the historic connection between reproduction and citizenship” (Turner 2008, 53).⁴

Through the lens of queer cultural theory, a critique has been developed of how the fetus,

¹ See, for example, Petchesky and Judd (1998), Rajan (2003), Gouws (2005), Einhorn (2006), Rousseau (2007), Outshoorn et al. (2012). In her discussion of citizenship in Central and Eastern Europe post 1989, Einhorn argues that reproductive politics “provide a strong indicator of women’s citizenship status” (108), noting that after the reintroduction of private property, the first piece of state social legislation to be overturned in many newly democratic countries was abortion legislation. See also Gal and Kligman (2000) and Alsop and Hockey (2001) on the different trajectories of reproductive politics in CEE countries after 1989.

² On the globalization of care, and the establishment of an international division of reproductive labour, see Parreñas (2000, 2001), Lutz (2002), Williams and Gavanas (2008), Williams (2010) and Mahon and Robinson (2011).

³ These demographic concerns have historically been expressed in a wide range of ways, from the racist, anti-disabled eugencist policies of nation-states such as German, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland, to pronatalist propaganda encouraging reproduction for the sake of the nation, and more welfare-orientated interventions about child and maternal health and “good parenting”.

⁴ See also Somerville (2005) on the “queer history of naturalization”.

disconnected from the pregnant woman, has, at in certain times and places, come to make claims as a citizen (Berlant 1997), and how in a culture of “reproductive futurism”, the figure of the Child has come to embody the citizen as an ideal, “the telos of the social order [...] the one for whom that order is held in perpetual trust” (Edelman 2004, 11). In parallel, social policy scholars have identified the emergence, potency and increasing global ubiquity of a “social investment” citizenship regime, in which the child, as the future citizen-worker, and the “hard-working” family that produces human capital, have become the primary, or only, worthy welfare subjects (Jenson and Saint-Martin 2003; Williams and Roseneil 2004; Dobrowolskly and Jenson 2004). And ontologically, taking seriously the “fleshy” (Beasley and Bacchi 2012), biological realities of reproduction has been regarded as overturning conventional constructions of the citizen as an autonomous, rational actor, giving rise instead to an appreciation of the citizen as embodied, relational and gendered, as fundamentally interdependent and always potentially vulnerable (Beasley and Bacchi 2012; Roseneil et al. 2012).

Our interest in the questions and challenges posed by this literature on citizenship and reproduction has developed in parallel with our involvement in a large cross-national, multidisciplinary research project, FEMCIT (see Halsaa, Roseneil, and Sümer 2011, 2012).⁵ The aim of FEMCIT was to understand the legacies, impacts and resonances of women’s movements across Europe in relationship to the gendering of citizenship (see Halsaa, Roseneil, and Sümer, 2011; 2012). The project was organised through separate empirical studies of six “dimensions of citizenship” – political, social, economic, multicultural, bodily

⁵ The FEMCIT project – Gendered Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: the impact of contemporary women’s movements – was an EU funded Framework 6 Integrated Project (Project No: 028746), directed by Beatrice Halsaa, Solveig Bergman, Sasha Roseneil and Sevil Sümer. The Intimate Citizenship work package was led by Sasha Roseneil, with researchers Isabel Crowhurst, Tone Hellesund, Ana Cristina Santos and Mariya Stoilova.

and intimate – each of which addressed a set of claims and demands arising from post-1960s women’s movements.⁶ One of the most striking aspects of FEMCIT, in terms of our focus in this Special Issue, is that the relationship between citizenship and reproduction emerged as a matter of central concern in each of the sub-projects, and thus as part and parcel of the study of each dimension of citizenship. So, for example, FEMCIT research by Monica Threlfall and colleagues⁷ (see Halsaa, Roseneil and Sümer, 2011:10-20; Threlfall et al, 2012) suggests that women’s traditional relegation to the private sphere and their reproductive roles – actual and potential – continue to impact upon their realisation of full *political citizenship* as elected representatives. The work of Solveig Bergman and colleagues⁸ (see Halsaa, Roseneil and Sümer, 2011: 20-28; Bergman et al, 2012) found that childcare politics and policies remain one of the most important and unresolved issues of *social citizenship* addressed by European women’s movements, albeit that movements frame their claims and visions of “good childcare”, “good mothering” and “good fathering” in different ways across different national contexts, and sometimes within countries. Nicky Le Feuvre and colleagues⁹ (see Halsaa, Roseneil, and Sümer, 2011: 29-38; Le Feuvre et al, 2012) identified gender inequalities and the differential level and nature of state regulation of, and involvement in, the social reproductive work carried out in the rapidly expanding elder care sector as increasingly important in understanding women’s differentiated experiences of *economic citizenship*

⁶ This research design was both a theoretically informed and practical decision, expressing both our commitment to a feminist, multi-dimensional and multi-disciplinary understanding of citizenship that does not prioritize the traditional domain of institutionalized politics, and also enabling us to carry out discrete sub-projects. However, we always emphasised that these six “dimensions” of citizenship are not ever really empirically separable, and indeed we engaged in passionate debate about the boundaries between the sub-projects on “bodily” and “intimate” citizenship for instance, and about their relationship to the notion of sexual citizenship (Bell and Binnie, 2000; Richardson, 1998; 2000; Weeks, 1998).

⁷ The political citizenship team led by Threlfall comprised Drude Dahlerup, Malgorzata Fuszara and Lenita Freidenvall.

⁸ The social citizenship team led by Solveig Bergman, with Hana Hašková, Celia Valiente, Kateřina Pulkrábková, Zuzana Uhde, Minna Rantalaiho and Trine Rogg Korsvik.

⁹ The economic citizenship team led by LeFeuvre, with Anne-Jorunn Berg, Malgorzata Fuszara, Milka Metso, Anna Krajewska, Saloua Chaker, Rune Ervik, Beata Laciak, Elisabet Ljunggren, Berit Gullikstad, and Dorota Orłowska.

across Europe. The study of *bodily citizenship* carried out by Joyce Outshoorn and colleagues¹⁰ (see Halsaa, Roseneil and Sümer, 2011: 47-55; Outshoorn et al, 2012) found that European (majority) women's movements have, since the late 1960s/ early 1970s, placed the struggle for bodily integrity, autonomy and self-determination, and particularly for control over reproduction and access to abortion, at the centre of their agendas, and that their interventions have made a significant difference to the development of abortion law and policy: in times and places where there was no significant autonomous feminist mobilization of women, reform was limited, and control over abortion remained in the hands of the medical profession.

But it was our own research on *intimate citizenship*¹¹ (see Halsaa, Roseneil and Sümer, 2011: 55-67; also, Roseneil et al, 2011, 2012) that particularly spiked our interest in citizenship and reproduction. Our analysis of the intimate citizenship regimes of four contrasting European countries – Bulgaria, Norway, Portugal and the UK – draws attention to the ongoing potency of the procreative norm: the assumption, expectation and cultural demand that biological procreation should occupy the centre-ground of the social formation, that intimate relationships, sexuality and the wider organisation of the social should be driven by, and structured around a naturalized notion of a primary, fundamental procreative imperative. More specifically, we suggest that the analysis of the procreative norm should be central to understandings of the historical and contemporary configuration of European citizenship, and that the dynamics of inclusion/ exclusion/ marginalization that are integral to the promulgation of the procreative norm are central aspects of regimes of intimate citizenship.

¹⁰ The bodily citizenship team led by Joyce Outshoorn, with Teresa Kulawik, Karin Lindelöf, Radka Dudova, Susanne Dodillet and Ana Prata.

¹¹ The intimate citizenship team was led by Sasha Roseneil, with Isabel Crowhurst, Tone Hellesund, Ana Cristina Santos and Mariya Stoilova.

Our research points to the importance attached by governments of all political hues across the four countries to encouraging *good citizens* to have children, and to the construction of the good citizen as properly procreative – which has overwhelmingly meant, procreative within the context of the co-residential heterosexual, gender normative couple. However, it also found that pro-procreative policies and other laws and policies that promulgate the procreative norm are far from just the top-down product of governments; policies aimed at protecting and supporting mothers and families are also the outcome of historical struggles by maternalist sectors of women’s movements and, in some cases, labour movements, and have sometimes been fought for by conservative and religious pro-family pressure groups. Moreover, there have been significant differences between nation states in both emphasis and technique in the pursuit of this fundamental aspect of intimate citizenship policy, and there have been important changes over time in the ways in which intimate citizenship regimes operationalize the procreative norm. Broadly speaking, “strong-armed” technologies employing legal sanctions, punitive measures and explicit propaganda, such as the Bachelor Tax in Bulgaria which imposed additional taxes upon the non-reproductive (see Roseneil and Stoilova, 2011), have given way to more subtle, “caring”, welfare state modes of regulation which seek to support and encourage desired procreative behaviours, such as “good parenting” within “strong families”, but which continue to socially and culturally marginalise the non-procreative.

The Special Issue

This Special Issue carries forward many of the concerns expressed in this varied body of feminist citizenship research, whilst offering a new and distinctive focus on the mutual entanglement of practices of citizenship and practices of reproduction, and on some of the

processes by which citizens and citizenship are reproduced. Foregrounding issues of gender, sexuality, and familial and intergenerational relations, papers address the relationship between citizenship and reproductive rights, law and policy, between citizenship and contemporary mainstream and trans/gender experiences of and discourses around reproduction, between citizenship, ethnic identity and practices of mothering, and between citizenship and intergenerational solidarity within the families of lesbians and gay men. In so doing, their authors attend to new social contexts of reproduction and citizenship, in particular to the globalization of reproduction (Riggs and Due), to mothering after migration (Erel), and to reproductive and familial relations outside the normative heterosexual couple (Gunnarsson Payne; Bertone), as well as to new legal contexts, particularly regarding abortion (Amuchástegui and Flores) and assisted reproductive technologies (Hanafin). Whilst by no means offering a global perspective, the papers engage with diverse national contexts – Mexico, Sweden, Italy, Australia, India and the UK – and are thereby suggestive of the widespread salience of this Special Issue's concerns.

In the first contribution Ana Amuchástegui and Edith Flores focus on the (gendered) citizen as an autonomous actor and discuss the sphere of reproductive citizenship in making their claim that the acquisition of reproductive rights does not automatically produce active, decision-making, and right-exercising actors. They explore women's experiences of abortion in Mexico City shortly after abortion was legalised for the first time and became freely accessible to women within the first 12 weeks of pregnancy (2007). The aim is to assess the extent to which this unprecedented development in women's rights in Mexico has contributed to an increased sense of reproductive freedom. Investigating the reconfigured relationship between women as subjects of rights and the state, the authors discuss the complex terrain of reproductive rights in Mexico inhibited by co-existing multiple actors

and contradictory positions, including pro-choice feminist groups, family planning organisations, conservative pro-life activists, religious organisations, and medical practitioners. Against the backdrop of a strong procreative culture and a more recent wave of conservative legal changes aimed at protecting the life of the unborn in other state congresses, abortion remains a highly stigmatised practice, limiting the extent to which women can perceive it as a right and reproductive freedom. Exploring the narratives of women who had recently undergone legal termination of their pregnancy, Amuchástegui and Flores found that only young, childfree and well-educated women saw abortion as a way of exercising individual freedom and having ownership over their own bodies. Most women did not narrate their experiences as those of subjects carrying reproductive rights; on the contrary, the most prominent discourse focused on gratitude towards the state and represented abortion more as a gift that intends to alleviate women's difficult living conditions rather than as a right they are entitled to. The third type of narrative identified by the authors represented legal access to abortion as opening possibilities for an excessive tolerance on the part of the state and possibly creating an irresponsible reproductive subject, thus denying women's ability to make reproductive decisions without the intervention of the state. In their explanation of the ways women negotiate and make sense of their entitlement to reproductive autonomy, Amuchástegui and Flores refer to the history of the reproductive regime in Mexico and to how it has been subject to change, including the recent hard-won achievement of legal abortion in Mexico City, which they regard, the discourses of the women they interviewed notwithstanding, as constituting an unprecedented gain in women's reproductive freedom.

The second article in this issue is authored by Jenny Gunnarsson Payne. It explores the importance of new media as spaces for claiming and practicing citizenship rights, with a

particular focus on recent Swedish transgender politics. The author's point of departure is the celebration of Mother's Day in 2010 as a catalytic event that (perhaps surprisingly) triggered collective action through blogging. Gunnarsson Payne reminds us that the criterion of sterility as a forced medical procedure imposed on transgendered people in Sweden¹² prevents access to reproduction and, concomitantly, the prospects of an inclusive celebration of Mother's Day. In making this connection between forced sterilization and Mother's Day, transgender activists sought to promote broader solidarity from cultural and political sectors. This was achieved by the strategic use of a cultural event – Mother's Day – in a way that fostered intelligibility between differently oppressed groups that might not necessarily have been sensitive to transgender claims previously. Therefore, instead of claiming individual rights anchored in minority politics – which historically generates inflamed debates about timing, political agenda and social priorities – this strategy shifted the language of transgender citizenship claims into one of universal human rights, to which people could relate to on a more immediate and transversal basis. The medium chosen to advance the critique of forced sterilization was a particular form of citizen's media – blogging. Through blogging, transgender activists developed a new political grammar to address issues of reproduction, embodiment, and recognition, thereby contributing to changing the mainstream mediascape in Sweden.

In his article, Patrick Hanafin continues the focus on the restriction of access to reproduction, with an exploration of introduction in Italy of new highly restrictive legislation concerning assisted reproduction in Italy in 2004. He discusses the influence of the Roman Catholic Church and Italian conservative political elites in framing this law, and their unwillingness to engage in an open, deliberative consensus politics where issues of bioethical controversy are

¹² This is not required in the UK (see McCandless and Sheldon, 2010), although it is in many other countries.

at stake. Based on a normative, ideological and exclusionary model of reproductive practices, the 2004 law severely constrains individuals' rights to exercise reproductive choice in the context of assisted reproductive technologies by reinforcing a "traditionalist conception of Italian national identity based on a heteropatriarchal model of family relations". More specifically, the law accords symbolic legal recognition to the embryo, it prohibits embryo research, embryo freezing, and donor insemination, and prevents gay couples, single women and couples with genetically inherited conditions from gaining access to assisted reproductive technologies. In this respect, with its restriction of individual freedom, Hanafin argues, the law represents a case of 'politics *over* life' (Esposito 2012). Nevertheless, despite the social, cultural and political support that the law has continued to receive since its passing, a counter-politics of resistance has also emerged, in the form of citizens' contestations that reclaim, via court challenges, pre-existing constitutional rights to privacy, health, and freedom from discrimination. This opposition has allowed interested citizens to resist their exclusion from full reproductive citizenship, resulting in a gradual judicial reworking of the 2004 law. This recent development, the author points out, is a powerful example of citizens practicing bioconstitutionalism (Jasanoff 2011); that is, they have made claims about their bodies by productively using existing legal resources offered by constitutions and bills of rights. In this way, a contestatory form of citizenship has been performed, allowing affected citizens to win back autonomous decision-making in relation to reproductive matters, by asserting and reclaiming a 'politics *of* life' (Esposito 2012). Citizens have thus been able to access and re-claim the possibilities offered by their legal rights, and to contest the ideologically-driven control over life, and curtailment of full reproductive citizenship, exercised by the Italian state.

In the following paper, Damien Riggs and Clemence Due point to the need to interrogate the norm that operates by valuing reproductive heterosex as the best and most successful form of reproduction, thus exposing those who are unable to reproduce via heterosex to ‘reproductive vulnerabilities’. The authors argue that in a context where heterosexual reproductive capacity has become a key marker of citizenship, being outside the heterosexual reproductive norm inevitably entails “being vulnerable to the diminishment of one’s cultural capital as reproductive citizen”. Reproductive vulnerability is not about not being able to reproduce *per se*, rather, it arises because one cannot reproduce in the expected, normative, and most valued way. The authors point out a general lack of critical focus on reproductive vulnerabilities in academic literature on reproduction, and particularly on new forms of “reproductive travel”. Here, they explain, the prominence ascribed to the experiences of surrogate mothers and the ethics of reproductive travel in relation to these experiences, has contributed to representing reproductive travellers as successful, agentic neo-liberal citizens, without fully exploring how “‘success’ is the product of a reproductive vulnerability in the face of the norm of reproductive heterosex”. The discussion of these issues proceeds by problematizing Australian media reports that portray Australian people who undertake offshore surrogacy agreements in India as agentic citizenship who overcome reproductive vulnerabilities to fulfil their human right to reproduce. The authors argue that this representation contributes to reinforcing the norm of reproductive heterosex, whilst constructing reproductive vulnerabilities as problems that can and should be solved. The prominence ascribed to the agency of reproductive travellers, who take in their hands their reproductive vulnerabilities and do all they can to overcome them, obscures the underlying assumption that those who experience reproductive vulnerabilities are failed citizens. In this way, the norm by which full reproductive citizenship is measured is unquestioningly perpetuated, preventing public consideration of other options for starting a family, e.g. adoption, and of the ethical

ramifications of engaging in reproductive travel. Riggs' and Due's article concludes by calling for a more critical acknowledgement of citizens' reproductive vulnerabilities, with a view to recognising and thinking more critically about the norms that construct these vulnerabilities in the first place, and the reproductive desires that reinforce them. A focus on the reproductive vulnerability of those who undertake reproductive travel, the authors suggest, might offer ways of re-thinking about more sustainable and ethical offshore surrogacy arrangements.

The next contribution, by Umut Erel, focuses on the cultural production and reproduction of citizenship that is performed through practices of mothering. Concentrating particularly on migrant women's mothering practices, the author focuses on how their complex positionality, related to simultaneous belonging to ethnic minority communities, locality, nation, as well as transnational communities, challenges understandings of the reproduction of citizenship that focus exclusively on the nation state. It is precisely this multiple positionality that produces a reflective form of cultural and identity work that enables the reworking of nationally-bounded notions of citizenship in both countries of origin and residence. Thus, Erel conceptualises migrant mothers' ethnic identifications and their contributions to the cultural reproduction of their children as citizenship practices.

The author's starting point is a critical engagement with the paradoxical positioning of migrant women in relation to questions of reproduction, which sees them on the one hand as capable of contributing to social reproduction through paid work (often in caring occupations), but on the other hand perceives them as endangering the social cohesion of a future citizenry as they are assumed to be transmitting traditional, ethnically specific values and cultural resources to their children. Erel draws on interviews with Kurdish mothers and their children living in London, arguing that as cultural and caring subjects, these mothers

enact citizenship in ways that challenge both the notion of the cultural homogeneity of citizens, and racialized hierarchies of migrant and ethnic minority cultures. Tracing elements of continuity and change in cultural identification with Kurdishness, the author looks both at women who actively engage in critical reworking of their cultural and ethnic heritage, contesting notions of homogeneous Kurdish identity, as well as those who embrace and transmit intergenerational continuity. Both groups, however, are seen as enacting flexible citizenship and experiencing multiple belongings - to the nation of origin, the state of residence, the local, and Diasporic non-state Kurdish identifications. Thus, their cultural work becomes a resource for constructing counter-hegemonic narratives of citizenship and belonging across various locations, and across generations.

In the final paper in this Special Issue, by Chiara Bertone, we are reminded that the demand of lesbian and gay movements for full and equal citizenship is far from being met in Italy, where, despite significant cultural changes, the legal sphere remains heteronormative, with no recognition of LGBT rights. The lack of formal protection and recognition is particularly serious in a country in which (similar to its Southern European counter-parts) the support of biological family remains crucial for young people both on emotional and economic grounds, in the context of an ongoing familialisation of social rights. Despite the well-established body of literature focusing on the importance of biological kinship and the issue of familialisation in Southern Europe, research on LGBT issues has tended to focus on ‘families of choice’. Bertone suggests that this almost exclusive focus on families of choice has disregarded the study of intergenerational relations within the biological family, which is, she argues, a key factor in the citizenship of young lesbians and gay men. Based on in-depth interviews with parents of young lesbians and gay men in Italy, Bertone’s article explores the ways in which

the citizenship rights of young lesbians and gay men are perceived, constrained and achieved within intergenerational familial contexts. She examines a tendency towards parental narratives of unconditional love and solidarity, underneath which there are other more differentiated narratives, linked to differences in gender, class and family cultures, and she focuses particularly on the demand to comply with normative ideals of the “good child”, which weighs heavily on young people who are challenging the conventions of heteronormative citizenship and familial reproduction.

Together, these articles make an important intervention in the field of citizenship studies, pushing forward feminist and queer agendas that insist on the salience of political and ethical demands to rethink both reproduction and citizenship, and the relationship between these complex power-laden practices. Raising issues of state power and citizen-action, of the embodiment and gendered and sexual difference of citizens, of reproductive vulnerability and dependence, of practices of care and social reproduction, and of the political and emotional dimensions of intergenerational relations, this Special Issue opens up numerous questions for future researchers within the field.

References

Alsop, R., and J. Hockey. 2001. “Women’s Reproductive Lives as a Symbolic Resource in Central and Eastern Europe.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 8 (4): 454-471.

doi:10.1177/135050680100800404.

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.

Beasley, C., and C. Bacchi. 2012. "Making Politics Fleshly: The Ethic of Social Flesh." In *Engaging with Carol Bacchi: Strategic Interventions and Exchanges*, edited by A. Bletsas, and C. Beasley, 99-120. Adelaide: Adelaide University Press.

Bell, D., and J. Binnie. 2000. *The Sexual Citizen: Queer Politics and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bergman, S., H. Hašková, K. Pulkrábková, M. Rantalaiho, C. Valiente, and Z. Uhde. 2012. "Remaking Social Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements' Agency in Child-Care Politics and Policies." In *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*, edited by B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer, 94-117. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berlant, L. 1997. *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Caldwell, K. L., K. Coll, T. Fisher, R. K. Ramirez, and L. Sui, eds. 2009. *Gendered Citizenships*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chodorow, N. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: Regents of the University of California.

Cossman, B. 2007. *Sexual Citizens: The Legal and Cultural Regulation of Sex and Belonging*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Dobrowolskly, A., and J. Jenson. 2004. "Shifting Representations of Citizenship: Canadian Politics of 'Women' and 'Children'." *Social Politics* 11 (2): 154-180. doi:10.1093/sp/jxh031.

Edelman, L. 2004. *No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Einhorn, B. 2006. *Citizenship in Enlarging Europe: From Dream to Awakening*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Esposito, R. 2012. *Dall'Impolitico All'Impersonale: Conversazioni Filosofiche*. Milano: Mimesis.

Firestone, S. 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. New York: Morrow.

Gal, S., and G. Kligman. 2000. *Reproducing Gender. Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gouws, A., ed. 2005. *(Un)thinking Citizenship: Feminist Debates in Contemporary South Africa*. Aldershot and Burlington: Ashgate.

Halsaa, B., S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer. 2011. *Gendered Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: The Impact of Contemporary Women's Movements*. FEMCIT Final Report.

Halsaa, B., S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer. 2012. "Remaking Intimate Citizenship in Multicultural Europe." In *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*, edited by B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer, 1-20. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jasanoff, S., ed. 2011. *Reframing Rights: Bioconstitutionalism in the Genetic Age*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Jenson, J., and D. Saint-Martin. 2003. "New Routes to Social Change? Citizenship and the Social Investment State." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 28 (1): 77-99. doi:null.

Jones, K. B. 1990. "Citizenship in a Woman-Friendly Polity." *Signs* 15 (4): 781-812. doi:null.

Knijn, T., and M. Kremer. 1997. "Gender and the Caring Dimension of Welfare States: Towards Inclusive Citizenship." *Social Politics* 4 (3): 328-361. doi:10.1093/sp/4.3.328.

Le Feuvre, N., R. Ervik, A. Krajewska, and M. Metso. 2012. "Remaking Economic Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movement, Claims and the 'Commodification of Elderly Care'." In *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*, edited by B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer, 70-93. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

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

Lister, R., F. Williams, A. Anttonen, J. Bussemaker, U. Gerhard, J. Heinen, S. Johansson, et al., eds. 2007. *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe: New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Luibheid, E. 2004. "Childbearing against the State? Asylum Seeker Women in the Irish Republic." *Women's Studies International Forum* 27 (4): 335–350.
doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2004.10.001.

Lutz, H. 2002. "At Your Service Madam! The Globalization of Domestic Service." *Feminist Review* 70: 89-104. doi:10.2307/1395972.

Mahon, R. and F. Robinson, eds. 2011. *Feminist Ethics and Social Policy: Towards a New Global Political Economy of Care*. Vancouver: UBC.

Mazur, A. G. 2002. *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCandless, J. and S. Sheldon. 2010. "The Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act (2008) and the Tenacity of the Sexual Family Form." *Modern Law Review* 73 (2): 175-207.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-2230.2010.00790.x.

Mitchell, J. 1966. "Women: The Longest Revolution." *New Left Review* I (40): 11-37.
doi:null.

Mottier, N., and V. Gerodetti. 2007. "Eugenics and Social Democracy: Or, How the European Left Tried to Eliminate the 'Weeds' From Its National Gardens." *New Formations*, no. 60: 35-49. doi:null.

O'Brien, M. 1981. *The Politics of Reproduction*. New York: Harper Collins.

O'Connor, J. S., A. S. Orloff, and S. Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families. Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Outshoorn, J., T. Kulawik, R. Dudovà, and A. Prata. 2012. "Remaking Bodily Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: The Struggle for Autonomy and Self-Determination". In *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*, edited by B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer, 118-140. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Parreñas, R. 2000. "Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers and the International Division of Reproductive Labor." *Gender & Society* 14 (4): 560-80. doi:10.1177/089124300014004005.

Parreñas, R. S. 2001. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration and Domestic Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pateman, C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pateman, C. 1989. *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Pateman, C. 1992. "The Patriarchal Welfare State." In *Defining Women: Social Institutions and Gender Divisions*, edited by L. McDowell, and R. Pringle, 223-245. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Petchesky, R., and K. Judd. 1998. *Negotiating Reproductive Rights*. London: Zed Books.

Plummer, K. 2003. *Intimate Citizenship: Private Decisions and Public Dialogues*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Plummer, K. 2005. "Intimate Citizenship in an Unjust World." In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Inequalities*, edited by M. Romero, and E. Margolis, 75-99. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Rajan, R. S. 2003. *The Scandal of the State. Women, Law and Citizenship in Postcolonial India*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Richardson, D. 1998. "Sexuality and Citizenship." *Sociology* 32 (1): 83-100.
doi:10.1177/0038038598032001006.

Richardson, D. 2000. "Claiming Citizenship? Sexuality, Citizenship and Lesbian/ Feminist Theory." *Sexualities* 3(2): 255-272. doi:10.1177/136346000003002009.

Roseneil, S. 2010. "Intimate Citizenship: A Pragmatic, Yet Radical, Proposal for a Politics of Personal Life." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 17 (1): 77-82.

doi:10.1177/13505068100170010603.

Roseneil, S., and M. Stoilova. 2011. "Heteronormativity, Intimate Citizenship and the Regulation of Same-Sex Sexualities in Bulgaria." In *De-centring Western Sexualities: Central and Eastern European Perspectives*, edited by R. Kulpa, and J. Mizielinska, 167-190. London: Ashgate.

Roseneil, S., T. Hellesund, A. C. Santos, and M. Stoilova. 2011. "Intimate Citizenship and Gendered Well-Being: The Claims and Interventions of Women's Movements in Europe." In *Transforming Gendered Well-Being in Europe: The Impact of Social Movements*, edited by A. Woodward, 187-212. Abingdon: Ashgate.

Roseneil, S., I. Crowhurst, T. Hellesund, A. C. Santos, and M. Stoilova. 2012. "Remaking Intimate Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Experiences outside the Conventional Family." In *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*, edited by B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer, 21-40. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rousseau, S. 2007. "The Politics of Reproductive Health in Peru: Gender and Social Policy in the Global South Social." *Social Politics* 14 (1): 93-125. doi:10.1093/sp/jxm002.

Ryan-Flood, R. 2009. *Lesbian Motherhood: Gender, Families and Sexual Citizenship*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sevenhuijsen, S. 1998. *Citizenship and the Ethics of Care: Feminist Considerations on Justice, Morality and Politics*. London: Routledge.

Siim, B. 2000. *Gender and Citizenship: Politics and Agency in France, Britain and Denmark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smyth, L. 2008. "Gendered Spaces and Intimate Citizenship: The Case of Breastfeeding." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 15 (2): 81-96. doi:10.1177/1350506808090305.

Somerville, S. B. 2005. "Notes toward a Queer History of Naturalization." *American Quarterly* 57 (3): 659-675. doi: 10.1353/aq.2005.0054.

Stevens, J. 1999. *Reproducing the State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Threlfall, M., L. Freidenvall, M. Fuszara, and D. Dahlerup. 2012. "Remaking Political Citizenship in Multicultural Europe." In *Remaking Citizenship in Multicultural Europe: Women's Movements, Gender and Diversity*, edited by B. Halsaa, S. Roseneil, and S. Sümer, 141-165. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tronto, J. 2001. "Who Cares? Public and Private Caring and the Rethinking of Citizenship." In *Women and Welfare: Theory and Practice in the United States and Europe*, edited by N. J. Hirschmann, and U. Liebert, 65-83. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Tronto, J. 2005. "Care as the Work of Citizens: A Modest Proposal." In *Women and Citizenship*, edited by M. Friedman, 130-139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, B. S. 2008. "Citizenship, Reproduction and the State: International Marriage and Human Rights." *Citizenship Studies* 12 (1): 45-54. doi:10.1080/13621020701794166.
- Tyler, I. 2010. "Designed to Fail: A Biopolitics of British Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 14 (1): 61-74. doi:10.1080/13621020903466357.
- Tyler, I. 2013. "Naked Protest: The Maternal Politics of Citizenship and Revolt." *Citizenship Studies* 17 (2): 211-226. doi:10.1080/13621025.2013.780742.
- Weeks, J. 1998. "The Sexual Citizen." *Theory, Culture and Society* 15 (3-4): 35-52. doi:10.1177/0263276498015003003.
- Williams, F. 2004. *Rethinking Families*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Williams, F. 2010. "Themes and Concepts in Migration, Gender and Care." *Social Policy and Society* 9 (3): 385-396. doi:10.1017/S1474746410000102.
- Williams, F., and A. Gavanas. 2008. "The Intersection of Child Care Regimes and Migration Regimes: A Three-Country Study." In *Migration and Domestic Work: a European Perspective on a Global Theme*, edited by H. Lutz, 13-28 London: Routledge.

Williams, F., and S. Roseneil. 2004. "Public Values of Parenting and Partnering: Voluntary Organizations and Welfare Politics in New Labour's Britain." *Social Politics* 11 (2): 181-216. doi:10.1093/sp/jxh032.

Yuval-Davis, N. 1996. "Women and the Biological Reproduction of 'the Nation'." *Women's Studies International Forum* 19 (1-2): 17-24. doi:10.1016/0277-5395(95)00075-5.

Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage Publications.

Yuval-Davis, N., and F. Anthias, eds. 1989. *Woman-Nation-State*. London: Macmillan.