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Abstract

This study explores feminist uses of ‘gender’ as a social category in relation to the phenomenon of cross-border migration and its regulation. Specifically, it examines feminist narratives produced from lived experiences of struggle that contest and contrast with the current governing of migration into Italy during the period 2007-2013. It focuses on ‘gender’ as (1) a structure of power affecting both migrants and citizens in destination societies and (2) a source of identification shaping the construction of feminist subjectivities. It argues that this category may be both distinguished from and interlocked with ‘race’ in ways that normalise or deconstruct the production of ‘irregular’ migration as an object of governmental power.

Epistemologically, this work draws on feminist theories of knowledge in the social sciences to illuminate the making of ‘gender’ from the situated perspectives of predominantly white feminists. A number of tools from Critical Discourse Analysis are employed to analyse the feminist narratives collected during one year of fieldwork. The combination of feminist epistemological theories and Critical Discourse Analysis enables the study to bring to the fore the central role of resilient processes of racialization of the Italian national community in the feminist signification of ‘gender’. In particular, it shows an underlying tension that drives and shapes contemporary feminist politics, one which combines the aspiration to fight racism with the sub-conscious reproduction of dominant racialising processes.

Theoretically, this study promotes the collaboration among, and dialogue between, three bodies of literature: the Autonomy of Migration approach, which helps us to unravel tensions between the phenomenon of migration and governmental processes; Intersectionality, which serves to bring into view the role of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in these social phenomena; and Transnational Feminism, which assists us in revealing methodological nationalism in applications of intersectionality. Fine-tuning these theoretical ap-
proaches, this work aspires to open up new possibilities to critically re-
think the meanings of ‘gender’ so as to participate in the moulding of an
intersectional feminist approach to migration.
Samenvatting

Dit onderzoek gaat over hoe feministen ‘gender’ gebruiken als sociale categorie met betrekking tot het verschijnsel grensoverschrijdende migratie en de regulering ervan. In het bijzonder worden feministische narratieve onderzocht die voortkomen uit de gevoerde strijd en die in schril contrast staan met het beleid rond de migratie naar Italië in de periode 2007-2013. Gender wordt in het onderzoek opgevat als (1) een machtsstructuur die zowel migranten als burgers in de landen van bestemming treft en (2) een bron van identificatie die de ontwikkeling van feministische subjectiviteiten vormgeeft. Deze sociale categorie kan zowel worden onderscheiden van ‘ras’ als eraan worden verbonden, waarbij ‘onregelmatige’ migratie als object van overheidsmacht wordt genormaliseerd of gedeconstrueerd.

Dit onderzoek is epistemologisch gezien gebaseerd op feministische theorieën in de sociale wetenschappen en belicht het begrip ‘gender’ vanuit het perspectief van overwegend blanke feministen. Met behulp van Critical Discourse Analysis worden de feministische narratieve geanalyseerd die in een jaar veldwerk zijn verzameld. Door feministische epistemologische theorieën te combineren met Critical Discourse Analysis, komt in dit onderzoek naar voren dat terugkerende racialiserings processen in de Italiaanse nationale gemeenschap een centrale rol spelen in de feministische betekenis van gender. Uit dit onderzoek blijkt in het bijzonder dat er een onderliggend spanningsveld bestaat dat de hedendaagse feministische politiek stimuleert en vormgeeft. Daarin gaat het streven naar racismebestrijding samen met de onbewuste reproductie van dominante racialiserende processen.

In theoretisch opzicht bevordert dit onderzoek de samenwerking en de dialoog tussen drie onderzoeksgebieden. Het eerste is de Autonomy of Migration-benadering, waarin spanningen tussen het verschijnsel migratie en bestuurlijke processen worden onderzocht. Het tweede is Intersectionaliteit, dat de rol van ‘gender’ en ‘ras’ in deze maatschappelijke processen in beeld
brengt, en het derde gebied is Transnationaal Feminisme, dat methodologisch nationalisme in toepassingen van intersectionaliteit zichtbaar maakt. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om deze theoretische benaderingen op elkaar af te stemmen en zo nieuwe mogelijkheden te creëren om de betekenissen van ‘gender’ kritisch te heroverwegen en daarmee een intersectionele feministische benadering van migratie mede vorm te geven.
“I do not believe that there is any thought process possible without personal experience. Every thought is an afterthought, that is, a reflection on some matter or event” (Arendt, 1994: 20).

I was a 21 year-old white Italian student at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México for a one-year scholarship. During the winter break, I travelled to Guatemala with other international students to visit the country. After a party night, a European white doctoral student entered my bed and raped me. While it happened, I felt my body was paralysed. Afterwards, I discovered that my inability to move and speak had been caused by the so-called ‘date rape drug’. I never came to know how I took it.

In several occasions, I publicly spoke about the rape both in Mexico and Italy. In Mexico, the great majority of acquaintances and friends reacted with denial. I think that believing that someone known and close, such a ‘good guy’, had become author of violence was difficult to accept. Instead, it was easier to trust that the one accusing could be misunderstanding, exaggerating, or having ulterior motives.

Once back in Italy, where nobody knew the perpetrator, I was often taken seriously when speaking about the violence I survived. Yet, I soon realised that most people assumed that the rapist was Mexican. Certainly, the fact that the rape occurred in Mexico well justified this assumption. However, it did not explain the resistance I encountered when making explicit the identity of the attacker. In few words, I had the impression that my target audience believed that the person committing the rape could only be a racialised man.

The repetition of similar dialogues, the proliferation of criminalising discourses against racial Others in the media and politics, and my own approaching of feminist politics were all factors that made me realise how
much the myth of the dark rapist was internalised by the white majority of
Italian society. Experiencing the effects of this myth on white women, who
pay for the fact that male violence perpetrated by whites is systematically
concealed, I began reasoning on feminist anti-racism.

During the years, I became involved in feminist struggles against migra-
tion policies. Puzzled by the implications and stakes of the role of white
Italians in these struggles, I pursued a self-financed PhD position at the In-
ternational Institute of Social Studies to reflect on how white feminists may
work to dismantle racism from their own position of privilege and domina-
tion.

Throughout the time of the doctorate, I opted for the status of non-res-
dent PhD student. Staying in Italy has allowed me to remain connected to
the same struggles that were at the centre of my analysis, while also raising
my two children with the needed support. Although this choice has
lengthened the activity of researching, my attempt has been to put scientific
knowledge production at the service of life and politics.
1.1 Introduction

In recent years, considerable attention has been given to the establishment and expansion in many parts of the world of detention apparatuses and the adoption of emergency measures of territorial and extra-territorial control targeting ‘irregular migrants’. Since the end of the 1990s, Italy – as a member country of the European Union (EU) entering the Schengen Area\(^1\) – has followed this policy trend through numerous initiatives: the introduction of mandatory detention for ‘irregular migrants’, the declarations of a state of emergency in connection with movements of

---

1. According to the IOM (2011: 34), “irregular migration” is defined as “the movement that takes place outside the regulatory norms of the sending, transit and receiving countries”, though there is “no universally accepted definition”. Indeed, the fluidity of migration status on the ground and the different perspectives held by origin and destination countries on what constitutes ‘regular migration’ point to the difficulty in clearly defining the term ‘irregular migration’ (De Tapia 2003, Moffette 2015). In this study, I will employ the term ‘irregular migration’ to refer to migrants in a legal situation of administrative irregularity.

2. The Schengen Agreement was signed in 1985 by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany and was joined later by several other European countries. In 1990, it was complemented with the Schengen Convention, which came into force in 1995 and created the Schengen Area abolishing border controls between member states, and establishing common rules on visas, and police and judicial cooperation. Italy became part of the Schengen Area in 1997. See: [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs?what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs?what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen\_en)
non-EU citizens into the national territory, the adoption of bilateral agreements with states – both of origin and transit – to deport ‘irregular migrants’ and curtail ‘irregular movements’, and the organization of joint operations with the European Border and Coast Guard Agency (FRONTEX) to conduct maritime surveillance and screening procedures of recently arriving migrants (Global Detention Project 2012). Under these conditions, irregular movements across Italy’s national borders have been turned into “a problem for governmental intervention” by plural authorities and agencies, which have over time illegalised the presence of ‘irregular migrants’ in the country (Moffette 2015: 6, Bauder 2013, De Genova 2016). Importantly, this process of illegalization has been racially marked in so far as ‘irregular migrants’ have not only been constructed in public discourses as a security threat, but also as a ‘racial Other’ with supposed fixed characteristics linked to ancestry (Calavita 2005, De Genova 2010, Moffette 2015).

This treatment of cross-border migrants categorized as ‘irregular’ has triggered a wide range of political reactions in Italy – including advocacy, service delivery and protests organised, often, on behalf of the migrants by leftist and Catholic constituencies3 (Ruzza 2008, Fella 2013). This study chooses to explore the responses of a rather different group: ‘radical feminisms’4. This is a minoritarian, yet heterogeneous, orientation in

3 Most visible actors at the national level include charitable organizations connected to the Church (e.g. Caritas), trade unions (e.g. ANOLF), the left (e.g. ARCI), and social centres; at the local level, migrant-led groups are another important actor to consider (Mezzadra 2004, Ruzza 2008).

4 Here, the adjective ‘radical’ indicates political radicalism and it should not be confused with the feminist stream associated to the work of Shula Smith Firestone and biological-sex reductionism. The label ‘radical’ was explicitly employed for self-definitions by some of the research participants. In the literature on feminisms in Italy I encountered some alternative labels: ”other feminisms” (Bertilotti et al. 2006), ‘feminist third-wave’ (Figlie Femmine 2011) or ‘neo-feminisms’ (Peroni 2012). Besides, the plural term ‘feminisms’ stresses the heterogeneous political background of the subjects active in this field as well as the multiplicity of the issues treated and practices employed. This usage of the plural form is a common practice both among activists and researchers (Bertilotti et al. 2006, Andall and
feminist politics that seeks to bring about radical changes in dominant social structures and values systems. It particularly stands out for its emerging consideration of the intertwining of gender and race power relations in the governing of irregular migration, which constitutes a novelty in the feminist field. Specifically, this work focuses on three radical feminist struggles: (1) mobilizations against legal and media representations of migrant masculinities as a sexual threat (2007-2011); (2) solidarity with the struggles led by migrant women held in administrative detention against diverse forms of institutional gender-based violence (2009-2011); and finally (3) solidarity with the struggles led by the families of missing Tunisian migrants to know about the fate of their beloved (2011-2013). Then, inspired by my own personal experience of participation in these struggles, the study reflects on their prevailing, and often unmentioned, whiteness.


It deserves to be stressed that this study focuses on the marginalization of racial issues in feminist politics, and not on the marginalization of gender issues in anti-racist movements.

The term ‘whiteness’ is employed to indicate a social position of domination and privilege that is internal to power relations of race. In particular, ‘whiteness’ refers to the racialization of subjects in dominant positions that impose themselves as neutral in relation to other, non-white subjects. As discussed in Chapter 2, the concept of ‘race’ refers to a socially constructed category – connecting ancestry, bodily features, and culture – that originated in the context of European colonialism and slavery, during the rise of the European capitalist system, to justify hierarchies among people (Haslanger and Haslanger 2012, Tabet 1997, Quijano 2000, Lentin 2015).
with the theories of Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism, this work aims at providing careful reflections on radical feminist discourses on the governing of irregular migration, and their comprehension of the intertwining of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ within the transnational dimension (Erel et al., 2010, Patil 2011 and 2013, Ahmed 2012, Puar 2012, Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall 2013, Carbado et al. 2013, Tomlinson 2013a and 2013b, Falcon and Nash 2015, Bilge 2013 and 2014, Millan 2015, Lentin 2015, Wekker 2016, Collins and Bilge 2016). In a nutshell, the study seeks to illustrate the need of fine tuning collaboration between the three bodies of knowledge mentioned above to understand the intersectional character of the radical feminist discourse, and its ruptures and complexities with the illegalization and racialization of irregular migration.

Section 1.2 frames the research problem and presents its contextual justification under two main aspects: the societal significance of the contemporary governing of irregular migration, and the political novelty that radical feminist struggles engaging the intersection of gender and race bring in public discourses in Italy. Section 1.3 elaborates on the theoretical relevance of this dissertation for a number of research areas: the Autonomy of Migration approach, Intersectionality, and Transnational Feminism. It argues that this study can contribute to promote an original dialogue between the Autonomy of Migration approach and Intersectionality, and to expand specific debates within Intersectionality, including its dialogue with Transnational Feminism. Section 1.4 presents the dissertation research objectives, and the novel aspects of the chosen epistemological approach and methodology. Section 1.5 closes the chapter with the outline of the study.

1.2 An intersectional perspective on the governing of irregular migration

Since the creation of nation states in Europe, the movements of people across borders have been subject to historically specific governmental rationalities and practices, extensively constructed on the basis of the distinction between citizens and non-citizens (Torpey 2001, Balibar and Wallerstein 1991, Balibar 2011). The modes and extent to which this distinction has been articulated along racial and gendered lines is an important issue at stake to reflect on the potentialities and limitations of ‘gender’ as a political instrument to respond to the inequalities and viol-
ence produced by the governing of irregular migration. Conceptually, this study conceives ‘gender’ as a social category indicating (1) a structure of power differently affecting citizens and migrants in destination societies, and (2) a source of identification shaping the construction of radical feminist subjectivities. Hence, it argues that this category may be both distinguished from and interlocked with ‘race’ in ways that normalise or deconstruct the production of irregular migration as an object of governmental power. Specifically, it focuses on how the intersection of ‘gender’ with ‘race’ is conceived from the specific position of white women in radical feminisms who experience a disjunction between a social position of racial privilege and domination, and a resistor positionality against racist structures. Briefly, this study aspires to reflect on whether, how, and why white subjects can use ‘gender’ analysis and awareness as one political instrument to challenge and dismantle the illegalization and racialization of irregular migrants – a crucial dimension of social life at the present historical conjuncture in Italy specifically, and in the EU more broadly.

The significance of examining radical feminist struggles that confront the governing of irregular migration into Italy and their signification of ‘gender’ rests on two main considerations. First, the high human costs of the current political and administrative governing of irregular migration establish the societal relevance of this research topic. Second, radical feminisms’ attention to the gender-race intersection introduces a much-needed political novelty in the panorama of feminist politics in Italy that is noteworthy to explore. To clearly support these arguments, this section (1.2) discusses both the violent and lethal effects of the governing of irregular migration, resulting in the illegalization and racialization of migrants across European societies, and the thematization of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in radical feminist struggles about the governing of irregular migration into Italy. Furthermore, the section presents specific features characterising Italy as the contextual background of these struggle. It refers to the country’s geopolitical location at the Southern frontiers of the EU, which makes irregular migration a highly politicised issue within Italian public debates, and to the common “presumption of innocence” about racial issues across Italian society, which conceals the everyday reproduction of racism in this national context (Faso 2012: 8).
1.2.1. Political and human stakes

Cross-border human mobility and the modalities of its governing constitute a central field of power relations in the contemporary period. Since the end of the Cold War, states around the world have increasingly posed limitations to cross-border movements of people, while assuring free circulation of capital and goods (Kunz, Lavanex and Panizzzon 2011, Truong 2011, De Genova 2011). In Europe, since the 1985 Schengen Agreement, multi-lateral policy mechanisms attempting to regulate cross-border human mobility have emerged. Formal and informal decision-making processes – including various levels of government, civil society organizations and inter-state bilateral partnerships connecting origin, transit, and destination countries – have been primarily oriented to manage and selectively restrict people’s movements into the EU.

For example, regional, trans-regional and international frameworks of cooperation have generated processes of externalization of border control to EU neighbour countries. Entanglement of migration with the policy areas of development, trade and finance has produced selective restrictions on migratory movements in an era of economic liberalization. Shifts of responsibilities from labour and welfare ministries to home affairs and justice ministries – the domain of policing, border control and national security – have securitized migration, conflating external and internal security threats (Huysmans 1995, Bigo 2002, Zincone and Caponio 2006, Truong 2011, Kunz, Lavanex and Panizzzon 2011).

The emergence of multi-lateral policy mechanisms in the field of cross-border human mobility is rooted in the foundation of the European Economic Community (1957), which provided for the creation of a common market and treated people’s movements across borders as a labour matter. During the 1970s, informal coordination began approaching cross-border human mobility in relation to issues of terrorism and crime. The Schengen agreement (1985) and the Single European Act (1987) brought Western Europe to plan the regulation of extra-European human mobility along common lines. The Maastricht Treaty (1992) established migration and asylum policies as “matters of common interest”. The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) formally delegated powers over migration and asylum to the European Community, creating a legal normative framework – the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice – binding member states in regard to visa, immigration and asylum policies, police cooperation, and the fight against terrorism, organised crime, trafficking in human beings, drugs, etc. See: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen_en.
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The logic underpinning this form of governing cross-border human mobility reflects two main rationalities, each one based on a twofold distinction. First, the division between regular and irregular forms of mobility stands at the roots of securitization as a governmental rationality that prescribes to filter and channel people at the border “according to the different economic functionalities migrants hold within the global capitalist economy” (Walters 2009: 492, Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). According to this distinction, freedom of movement is granted to EU nationals within Schengen and in addition to non-nationals from outside the Schengen area belonging to the knowledge and services economy (Truong 2011). Implicit in this categorization is EU and member states’ construction of unskilled migrants from outside the Schengen area as an internal and external existential threat to European societies. As a result, legal and administrative practices enforcing borders illegalise irregular migrants, who – while being targeted for exclusion – are at the same time incorporated in the labour market of destination societies in precarious, subaltern, liminal and typically low-paid positions (Fassin 2001, De Genova 2012a and 2012b).

Second, the distinction between voluntary and forced forms of movement stands at the base of humanitarianism as a governmental rationality. This categorization identifies refugee protection that offers asylum to political migrants, whereas it delegitimises and criminalises most livelihood and economic motivated forms of movement. Indeed, when procedures for the determination of the refugee-status reject asylum seekers’ applications, they illegalise migrants by officially declaring the presence of rejected claimants as no longer authorized within the national soil. Furthermore, current rearrangements of the refugee protection system that couple humanitarian and securitarian approaches, in response to the “increasing reluctance of the global North to admit and protect refugees”, are emptying refugee protection of any meaning (De Genova et al. 2014: 18).

The configuring of these governmental rationalities – reducing South-North migration either “to a problem of law enforcement or to a prob-

---

8 For example, in the case of the Mediterranean, this externalization of border controls beyond the territorial limits of EU states has produced the coupling of pre-frontier detection and rescue missions carried on by authorities of the Southern shore, thus preventing the EU refugee protection regime from being activated (Garelli and Tazzioli 2013, De Genova, et al. 2015)
problem affording humanitarian practices” – is connected to a number of factors among which neoliberal reforms play a crucial role (Scheel and Squire 2014: 196). Neoliberal economic policies advancing liberalization of trade, deregulation of investment, and privatization of industries have transformed many economies in the Global North towards market-oriented structures focused on increasing competitiveness through labour cost reduction (Kapur 2010). Since these processes have made it more profitable to export capital rather than to import work force, many labour intensive activities have been moved to the Global South (Truong 2012). These changes, oriented to labour cost reduction, have importantly restructured local markets, in the Global South and the Global North, in terms of low wages and high unemployment rates. These consequences of neoliberal economic restructuring have not been tempered, e.g. by social provisions. As a result, people in search of better life opportunities have begun processes of mass emigration (Kapur 2010). In parallel, in the Global North, demand for cheap labour in the care, agriculture, services and construction sectors has in many cases increased. These sectors are characterised by physically immobile assets and/or clients, which cannot be relocated abroad in order to reduce labour costs (Truong, 2012). Thus, low skilled migrants and migrants whose skills are not recognised have been absorbed in these labour markets as a cheap work force. The low costs of this labour force have been intensified by

9 Geopolitical understanding of global differences along the North-South dividing line were firstly popularised through the Brandt Commission’s reports, published in the early 1980s, which asserted “the primacy of North-South economic disparities over the East-West political divide” and “saw the development of the South” in the context of capitalist globalization as crucial to impede “economic and environmental global crises” (Dirlik 2015: 13). Since then, the North/South division gained currency in political discourses with shifting usages reflecting different political agendas (Dirlik 2015). Here, the concept of the North-South divide is used to direct attention to the historical relations of domination that “emerged with the conquest of Americas in the sixteenth century”, which “have historically tended to outlive formal colonial rule” (Boatcă 2015: 16). In this frame, the adjective “global” makes it clear that “this is not a strict geographical categorization of the world but one based on economic inequalities which happen to have some cartographic coherence” (Rigg 2015: 7). It is also important to reiterate that “the line dividing the North from the South presently runs right through the north, the south, and across both” (Dirlik 2015: 14).
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its legalization, which reduces its bargaining power over labour conditions (Mezzadra and Petrillo 2000, De Genova 2011).

Furthermore, neoliberal policies put in motion processes of state se-
curitization that were then accelerated by 9/11 (Goldberg 2009: 334). In
indeed, neoliberal principles do not aim to “get rid of the state”, but to
“radically shift its priorities”, prompting “novel arrangements of demo-
graphic management” (Goldberg 2009: 333). In other words, neoliberal
policies have promoted the reduction of state revenues and the squeez-
ing of social welfare commitments, while supporting the financing and
enforcement of the “state’s institutions of violence and repressive con-
trol” as well as public-private partnerships in the security sector (Gold-
berg 2009: 334). In the field of the governing of irregular migration,
these trends have brought about the establishment of selective limita-
tions to people’s movements in the name of protection of labour mar-
kets, limitation to criminality, fighting human trafficking and terrorism,
as well as defence of local identities and values (Huysman 1995, Dal
Lago 2001, De Genova 2011). These measures have been functioning in
terms of nationalistic closures to temper the socially disrupting effects of
competition as the organizing principle of society as well as the uncer-
tainties that have emerged from the process of de-industrialization, the
reduction of the welfare state, and the redistribution of resources
triggered by the 2007-2008 financial crises (Terranova and Couze 2009,

In this process of transformation of economies and polities, the gov-
erning of cross-border human mobility has increasingly become a struc-
tural cause of lethal violence. Stiffer conditions of entry and stay in re-
gard to both voluntary and forced modes of mobility have produced the
category of the irregular migrant. This subject is forbidden to legally ac-
cept the EU and obliged to undertake dangerous journeys to move; once
inside the European territory, this same subject is integrated into precar-
ious and low paid labour markets as a highly exploitable workforce (De
Genova 2011). Large investments in external surveillance, leading to re-
direction of people’s movements to risky routes, have increased the
number of deaths at the border (Carling 2007). So far more than 27,000
people died along the frontiers of the continent10 (Del Grande 2016).

10 These numbers are updated to the 2nd of February 2016. They are based on
the incidents reported by international media. See: https://fortresseurope.blogspot.
spot.com/p/la-strage.html?m=1.
These numbers would be far greater if they included those caught in processes of migration control outsourced to EU neighbours or “the ‘disappearance’ of women and men who die without being detected but who are counted as ‘missing’ by those who know them” (Migreurop 2011, Tazzioli 2015: 5). Besides, rising internal surveillance, resulting in incarceration and deportation, has further precarised migrants’ life conditions within Europe (De Genova 2011, Truong 2017). Finally, illegalization of irregular migrants has activated latent forms of racism, openly violent discriminatory practices, and murderous racist aggressions (Curcio and Mellino 2012). As a result, restrictions and obstacles to regular migration have come to constitute a major social stratifying factor within contemporary Europe, making cross-border mobility a racial “privilege that is unevenly distributed among human beings” (Pécoud and de Guchteneire 2006: 75, De Genova 2010).

1.2.2. Radical feminist responses

The struggles around irregular migration into Italy examined in this study engaged a variety of governmental practices: securitization of migrant masculinities as a sexual threat; administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking; outsourcing and securitization of border-crossing control. They mainly reacted to the illegalization and racialization of irregular migrants, which began during the 1990s with the introduction of measures to fight irregular arrivals in order to allow the country’s entrance into the Schengen group. Since then, multiple regulations have constructed irregular migrants as a danger to the state’s security and public order, a threat to the socio-economic condition of citizens, and finally a risk for the national identity of the country. The Turco Napolitano Act (40/1998), the Bossi Fini Act (189/2002), and the 2008 and 2009 Security Packages constituted the background against which the radical feminist struggles treated in this study emerged. Overall, these measures were approved and enforced in a context of high politicization of inward movements determined, among other factors, by Italy’s condition as a major part of the EU southern frontier and its geographical position as a bridge in the Mediterranean between North and South as well as East and West (Corti and Sanfilippo 2009).

The feminist struggles that I will consider have predominantly involved minoritarian ‘radical feminisms’. This political field is mainly defined by its search for liberation from various patriarchal institutions –
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including capital and the state – and their material and symbolic effects on populations and the Self. This search for liberation has translated into the tendency to politically organise outside of the channels of representative politics and formal organizations, and to adopt horizontal methods in informal, small-scale, and fluid groups that support themselves through self-financing practices. The actors involved have a diversified political background, which spans from communist to anarchist politics passing through queer organising and postcolonial sensibilities, and they belong to different generations (Galetto et al. 2004, Figlie Femmine 2011). The issues treated – violence, health, ecology, work, and migration – and the practices employed – protests, direct actions, cultural productions, social activities, and consciousness-raising groups – are multiple (Andall and Puwar 2007, Peroni 2012, Bonomi Romagnoli 2014). This distinctive plurality, and lack of centralised coordination, prevents one from speaking of a unified movement, although there may be convergence of intents and efforts in regard to specific struggles. Hence, the study prefers to refer to ‘radical feminisms’ as a heterogeneous discursive space rather than as a specific political actor.

Attention to both ‘gender’ and ‘race’ as key dimensions of the governing of irregular migration represents a distinctive trait of radical feminist struggles, which particularly stands out in relation to mainstream feminist currents. Indeed, ‘institutional feminist and women’s politics’, seeking state-enhanced equal opportunities, is blind to the role of state institutions in reproducing racism; similarly, ‘feminism of difference’, considering sexual difference as the more fundamental axis of differentiation, ignores race (Galetto et al. 2009). The novel attention to ‘gender’ and ‘race’ displayed by radical feminisms has not emerged in a vacuum; rather, it has been made possible by a number of factors, including: (1) “the experiences of associations constituted by migrant and native women”; (2) “the emergence of a ‘migrant’ literature [bringing about] the intertwining of diverse gazes and perspectives”; (3) the translation and circulation of classics from African-American, Chicana, Third World and Islamic feminist traditions; and (4) “the work of young historians who, from a gendered perspective, have investigated the Italian colonial and racist past establishing connections with the present” (Perilli 2009: 70). All these elements have led, within the discursive field of radical feminisms, to problematization of the intersection of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in regard to the governing of irregular migration (Ellena and Perilli 2008).
This intersectional sensibility is especially noteworthy given the predominant exclusion of ‘race’ from public discourses across European societies, which deeply affects mainstream feminisms and most protest movements against migration policies in Italy (Lentin 2004, Curcio and Mellino 2012). As synthesised by the concept of ‘racial Europeanization’ coined by David Theo Goldberg (2006), a common trend in continental Europe is the denial of the “continuing existence of European race and racisms” (Tomlinson 2013b: 254). This denial, which has emerged after World War II (WWII), relegates racism to specific historical moments disconnected from the present, like the Holocaust – a past dramatic event that, for its brutality, is seen as exceptional within European history – and to spaces external to Europe, such as former colonies – where those defined as belonging to a different race were mostly living (Goldberg 2006, Lentin 2008, Moschel, 2011). As a result, there is a limited “availability of conceptual tools that will allow people to recognize, analyse, and debate what might count as structural racisms and how racial differences can be negotiated effectively” (Tomlinson 2013b: 254; Goldberg 2006, Al-Tayeb 2011, Lentin 2015).

Exemplary of the narrow availability of conceptual tools is the predominance of the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism in critical discourses around the governing of migration (Curcio and Mellino 2012). This is a post WWII framework for an anti-racist politics initially developed to overcome “the legacy of scientific racism” and build a “harmonious future where ‘race’ [does] not figure as a source of conflict and tension” (Gil-Riaño 2014: 9-10). This paradigm suggests to replace “racial categorizations” with “cultural distinctions as a means of explaining human differences” (Lentin 2005: 379). This substitution intends, first, to promote “the demise of racism” via “disproving the scientific validity of ‘race’”; and second, to eradicate “the hierarchical implication of ‘superiority’ and ‘inferiority’ built into the idea of race” via replacing race with culture and celebrating “cultural diversity” as a means for “enriching societies” (Lentin 2005: 385-387). This anti-racist politics mainly proposes “individually based solutions” to racism, underscoring “the need to overcome ignorance through education and a greater knowledge of the Other”, and it fails to connect racism with “the historical development of the modern European state” (Lentin 2005: 381).

One final factor that makes the radical feminist focus on the intersection of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ interesting to explore is the “Italian colonial
amnesia” (Mellino 2013: 91). This concept indicates the deep entrenchment in Italian society of an idealised and romanticised view of the whole national history, and the absence of any serious public discussion on Italian colonialism as well as the atrocities it committed (Tabet 1997, Labanca 2002, Mellino 2013). This colonial amnesia is connected to the specific modalities characterising the end of the Italian colonial project: a military “defeat undergone by whites at the hands of other whites”, the republican de-fascistization of Italian fascism, and finally the small numbers of ex-colonised people in Italy, at least up to the 1970s, and thus the limited visibility of critiques of the colonial past from the ex-colonies (Labanca 2002: 434, Mellino 2013, Petrovich Njegosh and Scacchi 2012). The resulting lack of a serious process of decolonization of the national memory is at the root of a common “presumption of innocence” towards racial issues that today predominates across most of Italian society (Faso 2012: 8). Against this backdrop, radical feminist struggles appear as a political novelty that deserves to be examined.

1.3. Theoretical context and contributions

Discussing radical feminist struggles around the governing of irregular migration into today’s Italy is theoretically relevant for a number of research areas: the Autonomy of Migration approach, Intersectionality, and Transnational Feminism. The section explains how the study builds on and combines each of these bodies of literature while interpreting radical feminist significations of ‘gender’, giving attention to the combination and mutual constitution of this category with ‘race’ and its composition in the transnational space. Specifically, the section presents three theoretical contributions that this work aspires to make: (1) the construction of a dialogue between the Autonomy of Migration approach and Intersectionality; (2) the expansion of one specific debate in Intersectionality, regarding the travelling of this analytic in the continental European context; and (3) the establishment of a collaboration between Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism. Overall, this section pays particular attention to the institutional histories of each approach, to appreciate the contextual relevance of the theoretical contributions here proposed.

The research stream labelled ‘Autonomy of Migration’ (AoM) is a main point of reference in this study. This approach, produced at the interface of Migration Studies and Border Studies, is influenced by the
Italian workerist or autonomous Marxist tradition and it emphasises the “vitalist” dimension of cross-bordering practices, foregrounding the “constitutive creativity of migrants” in trespassing borders, which entails “the ability to actively create a new situation, a new social reality” (Vaughan-Williams 2015: 7-8, Nyers 2015: 15). It responds to “thanatopolitical” conceptualizations of the border, such as those underlying the work of political theorist Giorgio Agamben (1998, 1998, 2005), who mainly stresses borders’ role in exposing ‘irregular’ migrants to dehumanising and lethal conditions” (Vaughan-Williams 2015: 7-8, Nayers 2015, Campesi 2012). The AoM approach conceives the relation between “politics of mobility” and “politics of control” as a site of struggle, emphasising the agency of migrants who “enact their contested presence”, overcoming governmental attempts to control mobility (De Genova et al. 2015: 26, Mezzadra 2004, Mitropoulos 2006, Bojadžijev and Karakayali 2007 and 2010, Papadopoulos et al. 2008, Squire 2010, Mezzadra and Neilson 2013, Nyers 2015). Particularly, it provides this study with a view on migration as a “creative force that enables political, social, cultural, and economic transformations”, inviting us to look at the effects produced by this phenomenon and its governing on multiple social groups (Nyers 2015: 28).

Two main points raised by the AoM perspective are of interest to this work. First, there is the conceptualization of borders beyond their “apparent role as tools of exclusion and violence” (De Genova et al. 2015: 3). In this view, borders multiply subjects’ locations as an effect of the “tensions between access and denial, mobility and immobilization, discipline and punishment, freedom and control” (De Genova et al. 2015: 3). Thus, borders are thought of not only as devices of exclusion, but also as “devices of inclusion that select and filter people and different forms of circulation in ways no less violent than those deployed in exclusionary measures” (Mezzadra and Neilson, 2013: 7). This perspective provides room to explore how ‘gender’ and ‘race’ shape the differential inclusion and exclusion of migrants as well as the privileged position of citizens for accessing cross-border mobility. Second, there is the AoM critique to the classic treatment of irregular border crossing as a malfunction or exception of borders control mechanisms. According to this approach, focusing on “the limits of [nation states’] ideal-typical representation as coherent, impartial, and effective” serves to reveal contradictions between claimed functionalities of borders and their actualization,
thus showing “the functionality of the apparent dysfunctions” (De Genova et al. 2015: 13, Fassin 2011: 217, Rudnyckyj, 2004). This perspective helps to reveal the role of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in naturalising the construction of migration as an object of governmental power and a privilege that is unequally distributed.

From this background, the study builds on the critique raised by Alana Lentin (2015: 83) to the AoM approach, which points out its lack of systematic attention to “the particular ways in which migration regimes act as techniques for the management of human life that are reproductive of race and gender on a global scale”. This criticism is here interpreted as a call to pay attention to the risks of incorporating ‘gender’ and ‘race’ within the AoM perspective without allowing these concepts to question and transform the entire conceptual framework in which they are inserted. Hence, the study brings into focus the role of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in naturalising the irregularity and illegality of migrants, while concealing the constructed characteristics of the privilege enjoyed by citizens. This contribution is especially relevant when considering the institutional history of the discipline of Migration Studies. As argued by Lentin (2015: 71), not only “mainstream sociological research into ‘migration, ethnicity, and minorities’ elides, neglects, or denies the role of race in the construction of the boundaries of Europeanness”, but also critical approaches, like the AoM perspective, often marginalise a “race critical approach”.

Intersectionality is another body of literature on which this study extensively builds. The term – first employed by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989 and 1991) in the academic field of Critical Race Studies – represented “a further elaboration” of the debates animated by black women activists in the US during the 1970s and 1980s addressing white-dominance within the feminist community as well as male-dominance in the “black liberation movement” 11 (Erel et al. 2010: 273, Falcon and Nash 2015, Bilge 2015: 17). In this frame, intersectionality has emerged as a “way of looking at the world” claiming “that it is not enough merely to take gender as the main analytical tool of a particular phenomenon, but that gender as an important social and symbolical axis of difference is simultaneously operative with others, like race” (Wekker 2016: 21). In the thirty years

since the term was coined, intersectionality theorizing has travelled across academic disciplines and geopolitical locations, raising an abundant number of discussions that have brought about the characterization of Intersectionality not only as an analytic, but also as a defined area of studies\textsuperscript{12} (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall 2013, Carbado et al. 2013).

Two specific discussions in the field of Intersectionality interest this study. First, the debate on the travelling of intersectionality across geographical and disciplinary borders provides this work with a perspective to look at the emergence of an intersectional sensibility within radical feminisms. Indeed, a rising body of scholarship has debated on the “gains and losses” of this travelling that, in a neoliberal context of “increasing commodification of knowledge”, has made intersectionality a “mainstreamed” and “institutionalised intellectual project” (Millan 2015: 9, Puar 2012: 56, Nash 2008: 13, Ahmed 2012, Falcon and Nash 2015). Specifically, this literature has critically assessed the travelling of intersectionality to the continental European context and its Gender and Women’s Studies Departments. In this setting, interest in intersectionality has been mainly driven by a “belated recognition of the need to theorize racial difference”, hence functioning as a “method for European women’s studies to ‘catch up institutionally’ with U.S. women’s studies” (Puar 2012: 55). Many scholars have recognised that such deployment of intersectionality invites reflection on how academic feminist discourses work “as technologies of power”, pointing out diverse contradictions in the theorisation and application of this analytic that, paradoxically, reproduce the same social hierarchies that the original project of intersectionality aimed at questioning (Tomlinson 2013a: 254).

Particularly, scholars have indicated four main contradictions in the theorisation and application of intersectionality. The first ambiguity concerns the misrepresentation of the scene of argument of intersectionality, which mainly consists in the appropriation of this concept by white European researchers and lack of any recognition of the intersectional analyses developed by European women of colour as part of the history of intersectionality (Lewis 2009: 5, Petzen 2012, Tomlinson 2013a and 2013b, Bilge 2013 and 2015). The second contradiction regards the exclusion of racialised subjects from academic knowledge production about intersectionality that ends up creating a white anti-racist identity

\textsuperscript{12}When discussing Intersectionality as a field of study or theoretical tool or perspective, the capital letter is employed.
rather than producing an anti-racist practice (Petzen 2012, Stadler 2011). Third, another incongruity concerns the depoliticization of intersectionality through epistemic and methodological choices that dislodge the concept “from any political practice and socio-economic context” and fail to discriminate between the “differences that matter” — often ignoring or understating the relevance of racial hierarchies (Erel et al. 2010: 283, Ahmed 1998, Puar 2012, Tomlinson 2013, Lewis 2013, Bilge 2013 and 2015). Finally, one last contradiction concerns the non-performative articulation of the theory and political practice of intersectionality resulting in declarative positions that fail to convert into concrete commitments to disrupt racist structures (Petzen 2012: 293, Bouteldja 2013). All these contradictions, brought about by the mainstreaming of Intersectionality, hinder the objectives of feminist anti-racism.

This study draws on these critical considerations, investigating the modes in which intersectional perspectives have been developed and incorporated into the theory and practice of radical feminisms in Italy while engaging the governing of irregular migration. Importantly, this study’s choice of providing a space to reflect on the possible contradictions that might have emerged in radical feminisms responds to a specific contextual factor related to the channels through which critical knowledge production tends to travel within Italy. Within this national context, academic departments rarely represent the prime means of traveling of critical and oppositional theories; instead “militant and para-university areas of society that are contiguous with those of the new social movements” are often the main routes for such types of intellectual travels (Mellino 2006: 461-462). Thus, this study aims at carefully reflecting on the reception and adoption of an intersectional sensibility in radical feminisms in Italy, identifying possibilities and limitations in their signification of ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration.

The second debate of interest here within the field of Intersectionality regards the transnational dimension of this analytic, and offers this study a critical approach to interrogate the naturalization of spatial constructs such as the nation state. This debate has arisen from the encounter between Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism. This latter scholarship emerged during the 1980s in the context of UN-sponsored conferences and increasingly frequent contacts between feminisms from the Global South and Global North, which gave rise to “Third World feminist critiques” to “Western liberal feminism” (Conway 2008: 3). It com-

Specifically, this study builds on the critique elaborated by Vrushali Patil (2011, 2013: 853-854) to what she termed “domestic intersectionality”, that is, the uses and applications of intersectionality analysis informed by methodological nationalism. First, she sees a tendency in intersectional studies on the Global North to avoid situating their object of investigation within the geopolitical space, hence revealing an “ongoing Eurocentricity in intersectional production of knowledge” (Patil 2013: 853). Second, she notes disproportionate attention to “domestic dynamics as opposed to cross-border dynamics”, thus ending up excessively reifying the borders of nation states (Patil, 2013: 853). Third, she notes also lack of reflection on how intersectional studies make use of various scales of analysis but place a “disproportionate focus on the local and intra-national […] dimension” as against international, regional, or global levels of analysis (Patil 2013: 853). Eventually, Patil (2013: 849-850) argued that such overlooking of “the historic and cross-border dimensions” of particular gender relations may lead to “static”, “atomistic”, “colonialist” and “certainly nationalist notions of culture or tradition or religion” – undermining attempts to conduct rigorous and critical intersectional analyses.

Given the significance of the transnational dimension for researching migration, this study applies a lens that is both transnational and intersectional to the analysis of radical feminist narratives. The relevance of such an operation can be better appreciated considering the institutional histories of both Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism. Indeed, these approaches have often been “pitted against each other in the way
they have been taken up and practiced” notwithstanding the fact that “there is nothing inherent in these analytics that puts them in conflict or tension” (Falcon and Nash 2015: 4-5). For example, Falcon and Nash (2015:3) have registered that on the North American academic job market “‘transnational’ became code for ‘global’, and ‘intersectional’ became code for ‘black American’” – reflecting the fact that domestic and cross border dynamics are set against each other, while intersectionality is conflated with the domestic dimension. On the contrary, both perspectives share a similar history inasmuch they have emerged from critical intellectual contexts and theoretical debates “deployed by the discipline of women’s studies as a strategy that would complicate the field” (Falcon and Nash 2015: 5). Thus, this study explores a mutual collaboration between Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism to examine the radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration.

Summing up, this study hopes to make three main original contributions. First, it enters into debates in the Autonomy of Migration approach, showing the relevance of giving systematic attention to the gender-race intersection and its role in shaping and naturalising the social positions of both migrants and citizens. Second, it engages debates on the travelling and reception of intersectionality analysis in continental Europe, bringing into focus contradictions underlying the use of this analytic by radical feminisms in Italy to contest the governing of irregular migration. Third, it addresses discussions on the incorporation of a transnational perspective in intersectional studies, revealing the challenges that struggles engaging the transnational dimension confront in avoiding or overcoming methodological nationalism. On the whole, these contributions help to identify limits and possibilities of ‘gender’ as a political tool for explaining the different experiences in the distribution of privileges in regard of the movement of people across national borders.

1.4 Research objectives, epistemology, and methodology

The study’s general objective is to describe, analyse, and explain radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ in the context of the governing of irregular migration in today’s Italy. It brings into focus the radical feminist meaning making of ‘gender’ in terms of its mutual constitution with power relations of ‘race’ and its transformation in respect to transnation-
al dynamics so as to problematize the conceptualization of racial issues in the field of feminist politics. Attention to dominant discourses such as racial Europeanization, the UNESCO approach to anti-racism, and the Italian colonial amnesia is key to provide a critical perspective on ‘race’ in the making of Italy as a nation state and in the responses of women and feminist politics. Hence, the study critically assesses the relation of radical feminist structural analyses and practices of identifications with these dominant discourses to the end of discussing the potentialities and limitations of their dis-engagements with racist governmental rationalities and practices from a position of racial privilege. Overall, the study opens up new possibilities to critically rethink the meanings of ‘gender’ so as to participate in the moulding of an intersectional feminist approach to understand and respond to the production and reproduction of unequal access to mobility across borders.

In order to pursue this general objective, the study seeks to address the following research question: how do radical feminisms signify ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration in the context of contemporary Italy, and why in those ways?

Then, the main research question has been split into the following four sub-research questions and each one is addressed in one or more chapters:

How have legislative measures on human mobility and citizenship racialised the Italian national community since the foundation of the Italian nation state? This sub-question will be addressed in Chapter 4.

How did women’s institutional politics and radical feminisms distinguish between national and non-national subjects in terms of gender and race in the context of the debate associated with the 150th anniversary of Italian national unity? This sub-question will be addressed in Chapter 5.

How do radical feminisms in today’s Italy signify ‘gender’ as structure in the specific struggles they undertake against (a) the gendered securitization of in-migration, (b) administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking, and (c) the securitising and outsourcing of border-crossing control? This sub-question will be addressed in Chapters 6, 7, and 8.
How do white radical feminisms use gender as a source of identification in the specific struggles they engage against (a) the gendered securitization of in-migration, (b) administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking, and (c) the securitising and outsourcing of border-crossing control? This sub-question will be addressed in Chapter 9.

To pursue its general objective, this study takes as its main data radical feminists’ narratives grounded on lived experiences of struggle around the governing of irregular migration, which were collected during one year of fieldwork undertaken in 2012 and 2013. The study also makes extensive use of secondary sources to contextualise these narratives, and further draws on a background of several years of personal involvement in such struggles. Then, these data were examined employing a number of tools from Critical Discourse Analysis. To the end of illuminating the epistemic benefits and limitations of these narratives on the making of ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration, the study draws on the contextualist version of Standpoint Theory. Finally, it displays a strong self-reflexive character, making transparent the numerous implications of my insider status for designing, conducting, and writing this same work.

1.5. Study outline

Chapter 2. “The making of ‘gender’ in feminist theories of knowledge”, justifies the study’s epistemological and theoretical framework, showing the relevance of examining changing meanings and functions of ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration by taking radical feminist narratives, grounded on lived experiences of struggle, as main data.

Chapter 3, “Research methodology and ethics: narratives, power, and contexts”, defines the dissertation as a qualitative interpretative study, whose methodology translates the epistemological and theoretical pillars of the study into specific tools of data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Specifically, it presents Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), especially its more Foucauldian versions, as the chosen approach to examine radical feminists’ narratives and their signification of gender.

Chapter 4, “Race, citizenship, and mobility in the history of the Italian nation state”, traces the historical development of the Italian state’s normative apparatus regulating human mobility and access to citizenship, bringing into perspective multiple processes of racialization that have
produced Italian identity since the foundation of the Italian nation state. It shows that racialization of in-migrants in today’s Italy is a continuation of long-standing patterns.

Chapter 5, “Nationalism and race in women’s and feminist politics in Italy from 1861 to 2011”, discusses the reproduction, contestation, and negotiation of Italian identity and its gendered and racial boundaries, from diverse sides of the spectrum of women’s and feminist politics – in diverse moments of Italian history and in the present. In short, it shows the relevance of examining feminist approaches to the nation and nationalism to bring into focus racial conceptions of insiders and outsiders of the national community.

Chapters 6, 7 and 8 discuss how contemporary radical feminisms in Italy give meanings to ‘gender’ as a structure of power in the context of the governing of irregular migration. These chapters form the heart of the investigation.

First, Chapter 6, “Questioning the subject of security: radical feminisms and rejection of the gendered securitization of in-migration”, focuses on radical feminist critiques to the gendered securitization of in-migration, which consists in media and legal constructions of male violence against women as an issue of public order requiring the tightening of border control. Specifically, the chapter discusses the radical feminist argument that connects securitization to the production and reproduction of male violence against women.

Second, Chapter 7, “Challenging institutional gender-based violence: radical feminisms and solidarity with migrant women in struggle”, brings into view radical feminist organising around administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking, as governmental practices that bring about the production and reproduction of institutional gender-based violence against migrant women.

Third, Chapter 8, “Politicising social reproduction: radical feminisms and solidarity with the struggle of the families of missing migrants”, securitization, and outsourcing of border-crossing control”, focuses on visa policies, bilateral agreements and monitoring technologies, all as governmental practices contested by radical feminist organising around the disappearance and death of migrants at sea, and treats the cases of the missing Tunisian migrants – still pending since the Tunisian revolu-
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tion in 2011 – and the solidarity with the movement organised by their families.

Chapter 9, “White subjectivities in radical feminist struggles on the governing of irregular migration”, explores white radical feminist practices of identifications and the perspective of racialized women on whiteness. It accounts for the disjuncture experienced by white radical feminists between their own social position of racial privilege and their resister positionality against racist structures, reflecting on the making of their subjectivities, and the racial ‘boundaries’ informing their use of ‘gender’.

Chapter 10, “Conclusion”, closes the dissertation, providing three main reflections: (1) it evaluates the main empirical findings of this study on the interplay between the governing of irregular migration and radical feminisms in contemporary Italy; (2) it assesses the value and limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis as a method in terms of knowledge building and critical engagement with feminist politics; (3) it identifies areas for future research.
2.1 Introduction

A key challenge in feminist theorizing is how to break through monolithic conceptualizations of ‘gender’ and to reveal the multifaceted character of this concept – both when it is understood as an analytical category utilized in the Social Sciences, and when as a socially constructed category employed in everyday life. This chapter takes on this task, approaching ‘gender’ as a “free-floating signifier” (Hall 1997a), and thus emphasizing that the signification of this category varies according to contexts, politics, and epistemologies (Scott 2013). It especially brings into focus the relevance of the changing, and contentious, meanings and functions of ‘gender’ in intersection with ‘race’, reflecting on their implications for questioning and re-interpreting social phenomena and processes, and constructing political subjectivities. From this vantage point, the chapter tackles key epistemological problems in feminist theorizations on ‘gender’, and presents a theoretical approach to assess the multidimensional use of this concept in contemporary radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration into Italy.

The chapter presents and justifies the epistemological and theoretical basis of this study – premised on the idea that ‘gender’ can be known from different situated perspectives that, depending on contexts, may show diverse epistemic advantages and limitations. First, it demonstrates that radical feminist narratives – grounded in lived experience of struggle against the governing of irregular migration into Italy – have produced a body of situated knowledge useful to identify, comprehend, and explain diverse uses of ‘gender’ in this governmental process. Second, the chapter explores the contents of ‘gender’ examining this concept as both a category in-and-of itself, and one that is mutually con-
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stituted through the interaction with ‘race’. Third, it emphasises the need to identify the functions performed by ‘gender’ in the context of the governing of irregular migration scrutinising the transnational composition of this category. In a nutshell, the chapter suggests bringing into focus the multidimensionality of ‘gender’ by attending to (a) the ways in which the contents and functions of this category may shift in response to the current modes of governing irregular migration, and (b) the corresponding shifts of the epistemological lens through which the categories of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ are seen.

Section 2.2 builds on Standpoint Theory to define the study’s chosen epistemological position, one that rejects the notion of an independent objective social reality in favour of an approach that recognises the ways power relations affect epistemic agents and the knowledge they produce. It illuminates epistemic advantages and limitations of narratives grounded in lived experiences of struggle, revealing their capacity to shed light on the meaning-making of ‘gender’ as an unfolding process. Section 2.3 draws on Intersectionality, Materialist Feminism, and Critical Race Theory to provide a framework for an analysis of ‘gender’ capable of capturing the meanings of this term at the intersection with race, and to show how inter-categorical and intra-categorical analyses of Intersectionality can be brought together. Section 2.4 combines insights gained from Border Studies, Migration Studies, and Transnational Feminism to elucidate how the concept of ‘gender’ may function in ways that both naturalize and challenge the current framing of cross-border migration as an object of governmental power. This requires distinguishing the presence of methodological nationalism – as a tendency to consider the nation-state as the sole container for social processes – at the level of representing systemic inequalities, and at the level of identifying social actors within the system of governing people’s movements across borders (Wimmer and Schiller 2003, Sassen 2010). Section 2.5 closes the chapter, summarizing its main arguments.

2.2. Knowing ‘gender’ from a standpoint

This section defends this study’s epistemological choice of taking radical feminist narratives as its main source of knowledge to comprehend the signification of ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration into contemporary Italy. These narratives voice interpretations, considerations,
and queries around the governing of irregular migration into Italy from a gendered perspective, and they are grounded in lived experiences of struggle. These lived experiences express the simultaneity of being affected from multiple social positions by specific gendered governmental practices and rationalities, and being capable of engaging in political struggles against these. From this vantage point, the section considers the analyses and interpretations of the governing of irregular migration that have emerged from these experiences of struggle as a source of situated knowledge about (a) gender power relations, and (b) the signification of ‘gender’ as a social category itself.

To justify this argument, this section proceeds in two stages. First, standpoint epistemology and its tenets are briefly introduced in order to explain how they inform the structure of this research endeavour (2.2.1). Specifically, the epistemic potentialities and limitations of using narratives produced in the context of struggle as a source of knowledge are discussed in regard to their value of illuminating the gendered and gendering mechanisms of the contemporary mode of governing irregular migration. Second, feminist standpoint and transnational critiques of crude conceptions of objectivity are presented in a succinct form, highlighting the suggestion to treat experience-grounded narratives as a resource for questioning and reinterpreting the meanings of social categories (2.22). The relevance of contextualising these narratives against the backdrop of local and transnational histories is explained in relation to their potential for transforming the meaning of ‘gender’ as a social category.

2.2.1 Standpoint theory and the epistemic benefits and limits of narratives grounded on lived experiences of struggle

Standpoint theory of knowledge, or epistemology\(^\text{13}\), provides this study with key arguments to cast narratives, based on lived experiences of

\(^{13}\)Significant scholars in this field such as Collins (1990, 2004), Harding (1991, 1993, 2001, 2004), and Hartsock (1998) prefer to speak about feminist standpoint theory instead of feminist standpoint epistemology because they “identify epistemology with attempts to claim neutrality and certainty for knowledge of external reality” (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002: 67). However, the present study uses these terms interchangeably, to highlight the inseparability of theories, epistemologies and power.
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struggle, as a meaningful resource for the production of critical scientific knowledge. This feminist epistemology emerged in the US in the 1970s and 1980s in response to the need of the feminist movement for a method to name “the oppression of women grounded in the truth of women’s lives” (Hekman 1997: 356). This epistemology articulates a clear connection between experience and knowledge under the assumption that experience gathered from specific standpoints – achieved collective consciousness about the structuring of power relations – grants certain relative epistemic advantages. At the time, these claims offered an alternative vision of scientific truth and method in comparison to those of masculinist modern Western science, thus providing legitimacy to the knowledge created in the feminist movement. As explained by Bowell (2013: online):

“It is no historical accident that feminist standpoint theory emerged in academic discourses more or less contemporaneously with the feminist consciousness movement within feminist activism. This demonstrates the way in which feminist standpoint theories are grounded in feminist political practice”.

Here, standpoint theory is used to emphasize the logical flow between: (1) social, historical, and political locations as key factors in shaping epistemic agents and their knowledge, thus enabling an understanding of scientific knowledge as a combination of situated perspectives; and (2) the generation of new and relevant insights about the complexity and multifaceted character of ‘gender’ as a social phenomenon experienced from diverse locations. By inference, the narratives produced in the context of radical feminist struggles against the contemporary governing of irregular migration are seen as constituting an important source of knowledge useful for the illumination of gendered and gendering mechanisms of these governmental practices and rationalities.

Feminist standpoint theory makes two main claims. The first claim is the situated knowledge thesis, which argues that a “social location systematically influences experience, shaping and limiting what we know, such that knowledge is achieved from a particular standpoint” (Intemann 2010: 783). The notion of a standpoint derives from Marx and Lucaks’ idea of the standpoint of the proletariat and is further elaborated by feminist standpoint theorists who argue that “knowledge is grounded in historical socio-political locations and that women occupy a social location that affords them a multifaceted access to social phenomena”
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(Mamo 2005: 358). In other words, social locations are relevant, but not
decisive to determine one’s social, political and material conditions of
knowledge. Instead, knowledge is considered achieved through a stand-
point, understood not simply as a perspective, but as a form of critical
awareness of the ways power structures shape social locations and the
ways the resulting social locations influence knowledge production
(Wylie 2003, Harding 2004). As a result, the social locations from which
standpoints may emerge depend on context, as they cannot be estab-
lished a priori and need empirical verification. Likewise, the categories
defining a social location must be considered in their specific context so
as to avoid essentialist definitions. Furthermore, the knowledge pro-
duced from a standpoint is both social and normative. It is social because
standpoints are collectively achieved: in fact, collective discussions are
key to identify the connections between individual experiences and social
structures, and a view about these connections is at the heart. Simultan-
eously, this knowledge is normative inasmuch it requires a commitment
to comprehend how power structures influence the objectives of know-
ledge production, which is used to bring about their transformation

The second claim is the epistemic privilege thesis, which asserts that
the standpoints of the oppressed and marginalized\(^{14}\) are epistemically ad-
vantaged in relation to other perspectives, given certain limits and within
specific contexts (Intemann 2010). This argument is rooted in the Marx-
ist argument on the ‘double vision’ of the oppressed, which claims that
experiences of oppression grant a ‘double vision’ endowing the op-
pressed with an epistemic advantage to know not only their own lives,
but also those of the dominant group (Anderson 2015). In particular,
epistemic advantages are seen deriving from the fact that members of
oppressed or marginalised groups may have special experiences that arise
from their position as ‘insider-outsiders’: they must develop some know-
ledge of the assumptions that build the worldview of dominant groups
in order to survive; however, they often have experiences that clash with
dominant worldviews and thus produce alternative accounts of the
mechanisms governing social life (Hill Collins 1991, Wylie 2003, Intem-

\(^{14}\) References to the standpoints of the oppressed and marginalized imply a “mul-
ti-axis standpoint approach that captures the simultaneous, multiple oppressions
such as race, class, and gender that affect people’s vantage points on reality”
(Archer Mann and Patternson, 2015: 223).
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ann, 2010). Specifically, this epistemic benefit is thought to be significant for identifying and assessing assumptions about the social world that have been systematically concealed from view as a result of power dynamics. Yet, the insider-outsider advantage must be contextualised and considered relative to the dominant group, specific and limited in scope to the sort of experience the subjects of knowledge have access to, and open to criticisms and revisions. Overall, feminist standpoint epistemology aims at not only correcting exclusionary tendencies in the process of knowledge production, but also challenging dominant discourses and worldviews and the relations of power they contribute to establish, maintain, and legitimize (Intemann 2010, Stone-Mediatore 1998).

These “contextualist” versions of the two theses have emerged in responses to critiques and challenges – especially the “bias paradox” critique – raised to earlier versions of standpoint theory (Rolin 2006: 2, Anderson 2015, Antony 1993, Longino 1999). According to this critique, previous versions of the epistemic privilege thesis relied “on the assumption that there is a standard of impartiality that enables one to judge some socially grounded perspectives as less partial and distorted than others” (Rolin 2006: 126). This assumption clashed with the situated knowledge thesis, which suggests that “all knowledge claims are partial in virtue of being grounded on a particular perspective on social reality” (Rolin 2006: 126). Kristina Rolin (2006: 135) unravelled this aporia, proposing a contextualist version of standpoint theory. More specifically, Rolin (2006: 127) re-defined standards of epistemic justification of socially grounded perspectives as context-dependent in order to “assess the relative merits of two or more socially grounded perspectives”, combining commitment to diversity and responsiveness to criticism in order to be able to correct assumptions when they are appropriately challenged. In short, Rolin’s (2006) solution to the bias paradox recognises that epistemic justification “takes place within a particular context of background assumptions, methods, and values” (Intermann 2010: 787). The two theses presented above incorporate this insight in diverse ways: first, the situated knowledge thesis requires that we define the context of scientific inquiry where the selected standpoint can offer a critical evaluation of power structure; second, the epistemic privilege thesis clarifies that the validity of the epistemic advantage of a standpoint must be relative and limited in scope and time (Intermann 2010).
Building on the situated knowledge thesis, this study takes radical feminist narratives as a standpoint from which situated knowledge about ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration into contemporary Italy is produced. Radical feminist politics is here considered as a standpoint insofar as this political position demonstrates an awareness of the following dynamics: 1) current rationalities and practices governing irregular migration produce differentiated hierarchical social locations, where gender – interlocking with race – plays an important role; 2) social locations are the ground from which diverse forms of knowledge about the governing of irregular migration have emerged; and 3) these different and partial knowledges may be collectively discussed among those affected – from both positions of privilege and of subordination – to connect individual experience with social structures. In this respect, a standpoint is conceived here as a perspective gained through the experience of a collective political struggle, identifying how the governing of irregular migration systematically affects different social groups, for which reasons and with which consequences. From this conception of a standpoint, radical feminist narratives grounded on lived experience of struggle are considered a relevant source from which an understanding of knowledge production – itself a process – is derived.

Drawing on the epistemic privilege thesis, radical feminist narratives are here viewed as enjoying an epistemic advantage inasmuch as the experiences in which they are grounded offer a sort of double vision, close to the insider-outsider position, on the modes through which irregular migration is governed in a gendered way. This double vision derives from two main factors. First, these narratives arise from a ‘concerned’ sensibility to gender and gender-based forms of oppression, which offers an advantaged position to observe the gendered character and nature of diverse governmental rationalities and practices. Second, giving value to the social position of subjects in struggle, they bring into view tensions and contradictions between the effects of the governing of irregular migration on the lives of people involved in the process of struggle, and the ways in which this form of governing is justified and legitimised. Based on this premise, this study sees radical feminist interpretations of the governing of irregular migration as enjoying an epistemic privilege that is specific, and limited, to multifaceted gender power relations in processes of justification, and enactment, of governmental rationalities and practices targeting irregular migration.
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A key limitation of this epistemic privilege, extensively discussed in this study, regards the implications of social positions of racial privilege on the production of situated knowledge on ‘gender’ in the governing of irregular migration. As highlighted by the sociologist Alana Lentin (2014: 82), the structural privileges enjoyed by “white, male, straight and cis-gendered [activists] do not dissipate in the context of progressive activism and indeed are often exacerbated due to the very expectation that they will be less dominant and divisive”. The same statement may easily be applied to the process of knowledge production involving white radical feminists who, even when fighting against the contemporary governing of irregular migration, may be blinded by their racially privileged position to the racist dynamics underlying this form of governing. Hence, without concluding that privileged social positions preclude development of any double vision in the context of experiences of struggle, the theoretical approach is sensitive to the dangers and to the need to review the scope of the epistemic privileged that is claimed.

To recapitulate, this study argues for the epistemic advantages of radical feminist politics in identifying and discussing the political tensions and contradictions arising from the gendered and gendering assumptions inscribed in the governing of irregular migration. In doing so, the study seeks to provide both the evidence of human suffering and agency that is excluded from the dominant discourses on free and controlled movements across borders, as well as to challenge the categorizations used in those discourses.

2.2.2 Re-signifying social categories

Discussing the relation between the realm of experience and that of discourses provides this study with the epistemological means to demonstrate that radical feminist narratives grounded in lived experience of struggle help us to question and reinterpret the meanings of ‘gender’. Specifically, the works of standpoint theorist Nancy Hirschmann (1997, 2004, 2008) and transnational feminist Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1991a, 1991b, 2003, 2013) are a point of reference as they cast “experience” as being both a discursive and material factor which may have the potential to deconstruct and reconstruct dominant social categories. This approach to experience must be located against the backdrop of two opposite epistemological evaluations of the concept of ‘experience’, understood as the two extremes of a continuum. On one side, the purely em-
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...piricist perspective takes ‘experience’ as reflecting reality and thus as a resource of indubitable evidence to correct inaccurate or incomplete accounts of facts. On the other side, the postmodern position considers ‘experience’ as a form of representation of existence that does not exist outside of discourses and thus as a discourse to be deconstructed to identify the social categories underpinning the dominant discourses that this experience – even unintentionally – reproduces and naturalizes (Stone-Mediatore 1998, 2007).

The main contribution of Hirschmann (2004: 325) concerns her conceptualization of “experience” as embodying both discursive and material realities: “while experience exists in discourse, discourse is not the totality of experience”. As she notes, there is “something in experience that escapes, or is even prior, to language” (Hirschmann 2004: 327). This “something” is a “material moment”, requiring the analyst to highlight the contextually and historically grounded character of material reality (Hirschmann 2004: 327). More precisely, she explains that this “material moment” “provides women a place to stand, even if only momentarily, [so as] to see how we participate in our own social construction in ways that are both destructive and constructive” (Hirschmann 2004: 327). In other words, Hirschmann (2004) refuses to collapse experience into discourses and sustains the existence of a material reality. As a result, her approach enables us to take discourses as means to re-interpret experience, and experience as a resource to re-interpret discourses – yet maintaining that such re-interpretations can be communicated only through language.

Similarly, Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1991a, 1991b, 2003, 2013) emphasizes that experiences and discourses mutually inform and mediate each other. She elaborates on how narratives of experience can offer resources to reinterpret and interrupt the logic of dominant discourses (Mohanty, 2003). In particular, she develops two main arguments supporting the idea that ‘Third World’ feminist struggles constitute a “compelling site of analysis” (Mohanty, 2002: 509). First, she recognises that ‘experience’ can be a source for discursive agency by considering its capability as being “not only shaped by hegemonic discourse, but also [containing] elements of resistance to such discourses; elements that, when strategically narrated, challenge the ideologies that naturalise social arrangements and identities” (Mediatore, 1998: 124). Second, Mohanty clarifies that ‘experience’ can be a source of agency as long as two main re-
quirements are satisfied: (a) situating and contextualizing ‘experience’ in relation to local and global structures of power and histories; and (b) giving attention to the specific geopolitical location of a given ‘experience’.

In Mohanty’s words (2003: 122), “experience must be historically interpreted if it is to become the basis of feminist solidarity and struggle, and it is at this moment that an understanding of the politics of location proves crucial”. She contends that only when narratives are situated in relation to concrete social and political processes and histories do they help to reveal and discuss the tensions between dominant discourses and personal experiences, hence gaining “an imaginative space” that surpasses a dominant understanding of the world (Stone-Mediatore, 1998: 130).

Following Hirschmann’s considerations (2004), the study claims that radical feminist narratives grounded in lived experiences of struggle against the governing of irregular migration can have a critical role in learning about ‘gender’ in this governmental process. In particular, it holds that these struggles enable participants to share and discuss their own situated and embodied experience of the effects of governmental power. This experience is elaborated, interpreted, and communicated through narratives. As a result, a space of confrontation that has both material and discursive dimensions is created. Precisely the articulation of both these dimensions allows participants to simultaneously recognise, deconstruct, and re-interpret dominant discourses. In this vein, this study seeks to gain deeper insights into radical feminist engagements with the domain of governing irregular migration to understand how they simultaneously identify the gendered and gendering mechanisms embedded in governmental rationalities and practices, and help to bring about the transformation of the dominant meanings of ‘gender’.

In line with Mohanty’s view, the study adopts the standard of contextualising narratives. Accordingly, radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration are set against two main historical processes: first, the construction of cross-border migration as an object of policy-making and managerial practices that contributed to the definition and institutionalization of the nation and its gendered and racial boundaries (Chapter 4); and second, the involvement of diverse feminist struggles in nation-building processes and their role in reproducing and challenging the national boundaries (Chapter 5). This work of contextualization provides the means to identify the points of tension and con-
tact between radical feminist narratives and dominant discourses. Likewise contextualization also helps to discern the role of these narratives in transforming the social meanings of ‘gender’ – especially in relation to the dominant colour blind or raceless approach to migration. To recap, the epistemology adopted gives attention to material power structures, as well as to issues of language, cultural representation and subjectivity.

In summary, this section discussed main tenets of contextualist standpoint epistemology as well as feminist critiques of ‘objectivity’ in order to justify the epistemological choice of taking radical feminist narratives grounded in lived experience of struggle as a main source of knowledge in this study. In particular, such narratives are taken as discourses emerging from a standpoint that provides epistemic benefits within particular limitations. Epistemic benefits derive from the capacity of these narratives to locate areas of incoherence and contradiction between a subject’s own experience of specific governmental rationalities and practices and their claimed functionality. At the same time, specific epistemic limitations of these narratives mean that the knowledge they produce is context-dependent, partial, specific in scope, and with room for improvement. Taking this aspect into account, radical feminist narratives, based on experience of struggle against the governing of irregular migration, are considered proposals for building a critical understanding about this governmental process and the signification of ‘gender’ as a space of contestation itself.

2.3. Knowing ‘gender’ from its contents

This section elaborates on the contents of the ‘gender’ category, which is here treated as a “floating signifier”, whose relationship with its signified is understood as “socially constructed” and “culturally and historically specific” (Hall 1997a and 1997b: 32). Accordingly, ‘gender’ is conceptualised as having “multiple and conflicting meanings”, serving different purposes and rationales (Scott 2013: 109-110, Nicholson 1994, Haslanger 2000, 2012, Amigot and Pujal 2011, Scott, 2013). Hence, the section argues for the relevance of exploring the signification of ‘gender’ in intersection with ‘race’ in radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration. The aim is to interrogate the uses of this category against the backdrop of specific historical trends such as dominant
trends of racial Europeanization, the hegemony of the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism, and the Italian colonial amnesia.

The section argues for combining the inter-categorical and intra-categorical approaches to the study of “the complexity of social life” (McCall 2005, Yuval-Davis 2013, Carastathis 2016). While sharing common tenets, these approaches enable us to focus on different and complementary facets of social analysis: that of “people’s positioning along socio-economic grids” and that of “people’s experiential and identificatory perspectives” (Yuval-Davis 2013: 7). The section argues that bringing together these diverse aspects of the social domain enables the analysts to surface more complex and nuanced signification of ‘gender’. Specifically, it elucidates that, even if ‘gender’ and other categories have their own irreducible ontological bases, they always mutually constitute each other within specific historical situations (Yuval-Davis 2013: 7).

### 2.3.1 The inter-categorical approach to intersectionality

The inter-categorical approach takes as its starting “hypothesis” the potential existence of inter-group differences and inequalities (McCall 2005: 1785). Consequentially, its main task is to identify and explicate both “relations of inequality among already constituted groups” and “changing configurations of inequality along multiple and conflicting dimensions” (McCall 2005: 1784-1785). Given its focus on structural relations, this approach inevitably requires the provisional definition and use of categories, although “imperfect and everchanging as they are” (McCall 2005: 1785). Yet, how does this approach satisfactorily respond to “critiques of the homogenising and simplifying dangers of category-based research” (McCall, 2005: 1786)? Briefly stated, it focuses on relations of inequality through “comparative multi-group studies”, locating the

---

15 It deserves to be highlighted that the concept of ‘intersectionality’ shares central concerns with standpoint theory and the two can coherently articulate with each other. As explained by Nira Yuval Davis (2013: 5): “Epistemologically, intersectionality can be described as a development of feminist standpoint theory which claims, in somewhat different ways, that it is vital to account for the social positioning of the social agent”. Of course, the two theoretical perspectives also presents some differences as “intersectionality theory [is] interested even more in how the differential situatedness of different social agents constructs the ways they affect and are affected by different social, economic and political projects” (Yuval Davis 2013: 5).
source of complexity in the investigation and comparison of both “the multiple groups that constitute [each] category” (e.g. women, men, trans persons for the category of ‘gender’; and white and racialized subjects for the category of ‘race’) and the “more detailed social groups” that are constituted across categories (e.g. racialized women, white women, and so on) (McCall 2005: 1786-1787). This approach allows bringing into focus inequalities between and within groups, hence providing an instrument to construct a theory of social stratification: “intersectional analysis does not prioritize one facet or category of social difference” (Yuval-Davis 2011: 4), allowing one to focus on both those in privileged and those in subordinate positions.

This study applies the inter-categorical approach to analyse radical feminist narratives of struggles that engage the contemporary governing of irregular migration in Chapters 6, 7, and 8. In particular, it focuses on representations of relationships of inequality between and within groups and critically discusses their limits and potentials. It takes off from pre-established definitions of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ as analytical categories indicating specific social groups and relations of inequality between them. In the process of documenting how radical feminist narratives identify and construct multiple social groups, these pre-established definitions will be used as points of contrast to show variations within and across these categories. The objective will be to identify, analyse, and explain possible silences and amplifications in radical feminist representations of relationships of inequality between and within social groups, and to reflect on their implications for the signification of ‘gender’.

This section suggests temporary definitions of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ as analytical categories whose meanings are clearly rooted in the tradition of social constructionism, which treats these concepts “as social as opposed to physical category[ies]” (Haslanger 2017: 304). This allows analysts to clarify “how members of the group are socially positioned and what physical markers serve as a supposed basis for such treatment” (Haslanger 2012: 251). These proposed definitions intend to expose the social structures and processes that constitute social groups in order to bring into perspective relations of inequality (Haslanger 2012). These

---

16 Clearly, the inter-categorical approach to complexity does not escape the need for simplification. Indeed, it sets a neat “trade-off between scale and coherence” as the incorporation of any category into the analysis implies the exponential growth of the size and complexity of the study” (McCall 2005: 1786).
definitions do not provide explanations and causal accounts of gender and racial relations of domination, but prioritise clear conceptualizations in order “to elucidate which gender concepts best help feminists achieve their legitimate purposes thereby elucidating those concepts feminists should be using” (Makkole 2016: online, Haslanger, 2012).

Gender
To begin with, ‘gender’ is taken to designate that sphere of power relations that produces sex or sexual difference as a mark naturalising men’s domination of women (Haslanger 2012, Mathieu, 1989, Delphy 1993). In other words, gendered subjects are those whose social position of domination or subordination is marked and justified by certain sexual “bodily features” that are presumed to be evidence of the subjects’ “biological role in reproduction” (Haslanger 2012: 234). This understanding of gender indicates social relations that are not rooted in biology, but that are built on historical processes. For example, these relations may refer to the appropriation of women’s time, labour, and products of their bodies as well as to the imposition of their sexual obligations and caring duties (Guillaumin 1995, Witting 1992). According to this materialist perspective, depending on context and the modes in which gender intersects with other social relations of power, the systematic oppression of women may take shape along diverse dimensions (economic, political, social, legal, et cetera); it “may have a very different meaning, and it may position one in very different kinds of hierarchies” (Haslanger 2012: 251). Therefore, biological categories are seen as functioning to naturalise and therefore occlude relations of domination and subordination.

Haslanger’s definition takes ‘gender’ to denote any social construct implied in the male/female distinction – including sex (Nicholson 1994, Mikkola 2016). It stands in stark contrast to understanding of ‘gender’ as a “contrasting term to sex”, which creates an opposition between what is socially constructed and what is biologically given (Nicholson 1994: 79, Mikkola 2016). Among the many critiques of the gender/sex opposition, the one which has been synthesised under the label “commonality problem” or “particularity argument” is especially significant to this study (Mikkola 2016: online). This critique recognises that ‘gender’ always results in interaction with other categories indicating relations of inequality, and that this “interaction configures specific experiences” determining women’s heterogeneity beyond any supposed sexual
commonality (Amigot and Pujal, 2011: 6). Although this critique productively opens the ground to think about the hierarchies crossing the women category, it also calls into question the “viability of the women category”: how can feminists “speak and make political demands in the name of women, at the same time rejecting the idea that there is a unified category of women”? (Mikkola 2016: online). Haslanger’s definition of ‘gender’ explicitly addresses this problem, arguing that there is something that women qua women share, which is not related to biology, but a matter of occupying subordinate social positions, heterogeneous and complex though they are (Haslanger 2012, Mikkola 2016).

This definition of ‘gender’ is particularly useful to operationalise the inter-categorical approach to study radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration for a number of reasons. First, it builds the necessary foundations to develop an analysis of social stratification (Yuval-Davis 2013). Particularly, it provides an understanding of ‘gender’ as a social relation of power, which potentially allows the possibility to show the connections existing between diverse social positions determining the empowerment of some and the disempowerment of others. It also avoids the production of analyses that only bring into focus the marginalised, taking their experiences as mere “evidence of oppression or difference”; locating instead these experiences within local and transnational relations of domination (Mohanty and Alexander cited in Mediatore-Stone 2007: 66). Second, this materialist definition of ‘gender’ stresses that deconstructing dominant understandings of the sexes as natural, different and complementary also allows for questioning the institutionalization of heterosexuality – therefore posing the relevance of ‘sexuality’ to any thinking about ‘gender’ (Juteau-Lee 1995, Adkins and Leonard 1996, Alcoff, 2011). This helps to enlarge one’s view about definitions of gendered subjects so as to consider – next to women and men – also trans and non-binary gender persons who break the dominant male/female binary. Furthermore, attention to the ‘gender’ category as connected to issues of sexuality provides insights regarding structural connections existing between ‘gender’ and ‘race’ via ‘sexuality’. As discussed later, “it is via sex that certain groups are reproduced and others are not”17.

17 See Alana Lentin’s (2015) article “Race, class, gender and the ‘white left’”:
http://www.alanalentin.net/2015/10/21/race-class-gender-and-the-white-left/
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Race

Moving to discuss ‘race’, this category is used here to indicate the sphere of power relations that institute somatic and morphological characteristics as a mark naturalising one group’s domination of “otherwise racialised” subjects (Haslanger 2012, Lentin 2015a: 4). Said differently, dominant and otherwise racialised subjects are those whose social position is marked and justified by somatic and/or morphological characteristics “presumed to be evidence of ancestral links to a certain geographical region” (Haslanger 2012: 278). These bodily features, that may refer to “skin colour, hair type, eye shape, physique”, are “genetically insignificant” but “take on evaluative significance concerning how members of the group should be [hierarchically] viewed and treated” (James 2017, Haslanger 2012: 237). Therefore, the ‘race’ category identifies social relations that are not rooted in genetics, but that are built on historical processes of identities formation by way, and through, the exercise of domination and subordination such as colonialism and slavery, or through the production of national borders filtering identities upon entry (Lentin 2015b). In particular, whether and how a group, or an individual, is racialised “will depend on context” (Haslanger 2012: 251): some groups may be racialised for a limited time span, racial distinctions may be drawn “on the basis of different characteristics” in diverse settings, and they may be associated to different forms of domination (Haslanger 2012: 251). The signification of ‘race’ is thus a dynamic phenomenon that changes in conjunction with changing historical and social circumstances (Hall 1997a). As in the case of ‘sex’, the production of meanings

---

18 In this view, all subjects are racialized, including whites. Yet, in order to point out the invisibility of whiteness in Europe, the terms ‘racialized person’ or ‘racialized group’ are used in this study to refer to subjects racialized as non-whites, indicating their differential and unequal treatment in social, political, and economic matters.

19 Of course, diverse genealogical reconstructions of the idea of ‘race’ exist. One case in point is that of the work of the decolonial theorist Aníbal Quijano on the emergence of the idea of ‘race’ after the beginning of the colonization of the Americas. According to this author, the category of ‘race’ has first been applied to indígenas in the Americas. Yet, in this case, ‘race’ mainly referred to general phenotypic traits. Then, with the consolidation of the slave trade, phenotypic traits became codified as skin colour and “[colonizers] assumed it as the emblematic characteristic of racial category” (Quijano 2000: 534).
around ‘race’ is not seen as a simple epiphenomenon of material and concrete relationships, but as the activity of indicating and justifying the structuring of relations of domination and appropriation as being “natural” and “legitimate”.

This definition of the concept of ‘race’ must be contextualised within the debate between eliminationists and conservationists, who reflect on the dangers and opportunities of employing the concept of race in both academic and public debates (James 2017). Haslanger’s definition is located in the conservationist field, which recognises that ‘race’ is a highly significant social construct constituting both a terrain of domination and resistance (Lentin 2015a, James 2017). In contrast, eliminationist positions argue for disregarding the ‘race’ concept as “leading ultimately to the solidification of categorizations that have no bearing in biological facts” (Lentin 2015a: 1401). The main disagreement between these leanings rests on whether to conceptualise ‘race’ as a “purely biological concept” or not, with the eliminationists supporting the former argument and conservationists the latter (Lentin 2015a: 1401). Within this frame, conservationists understand the making of race at the level of both biology and culture since they recognise that “racism uses a panoply of explanations to make its case, blurring the boundaries between the genetic and anthropological” (Lentin 2015a: 1402). As a corollary, they argue that discarding the concept of genetic races as false may not lead at all to eliminate racial hierarchies and their “intimate recurrent experiences” (Lentin 2015a: 1404). In this sense, the project of some to overcome ‘race’, or to provide better concepts, is seen as missing the point that “race is not of interest for what it is, but for what it does”: namely “ordering and dividing populations in order to manage and control them” (Lentin 2014: 8). Coherently, Haslanger’s definition stresses the function performed by ‘race’ as a matter of power relations.

Haslanger’s definition of ‘race’ helps to apply the inter-categorical approach to study radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration in diverse ways. First, it enables analysts to rely on the category of ‘race’ as a mark indicating a structural relation of domination importantly connected to the governmental processes. In doing so, it responds to the systemic tendency in continental Europe to replace the category of ‘race’ with references to ‘ethnicity’, ‘culture’, and ‘religion’, because it affects both academic and public discourses (Bilge 2014, Lentin 2014). This trend is based on the assumption that the naming of ‘race’ implies
the affirmation of its biological truthfulness and consequently contributes to its social reproduction. However, while avoiding the term ‘race’, other categories such as ‘ethnicity’, ‘nationality’, ‘culture’, and ‘religion’ may be taken to function as mere euphemisms of ‘race’ inasmuch as they can be understood as having a natural basis and producing insurmountable and incompatible differences. As a result, the absence of a discourse on ‘race’ does not automatically correspond to the absence of racism, rather it constitutes a severe impediment to effectively address it (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991, Hesse 2004, Goldberg 2006, Lentin 2008, El-Tayeb 2011, Bilge 2013). Second, Haslanger’s definition of ‘race’ importantly participates in apprehending the structural connections existing between ‘race’ and ‘gender’ via ‘sexuality’. In fact, by referring to ‘race’ as a form of grouping justified through references to ancestry, this definition sets the stage to think of ‘sex’ as a “technique” to separate the racially inferior and superior and a means to “control populations” (Lentin 2015b: 6).

In synthesis, this study adopts Haslanger’s definitions of ‘gender’ and ‘race’, which delineate the ‘cognitive boundaries’ of these analytical categories. These ‘cognitive boundaries’ indicate specific relations of power that each category implicitly or explicitly adopts as its own ontological base. In the case of ‘gender’, the production of categories based on sexual difference express the adherence to an ontology that naturalizes “sex” as biology. By implication this ontology also naturalises men’s domination of women, trans and non-binary gender persons. In the case of ‘race’, the production of somatic and morphological characteristics as a mark also naturalizes the domination of one group on otherwise racialized subjects.

The study will use the definitions discussed above to analyse radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration from an intercategorical perspective, with a focus on the multi-group relations that are constructed in these narratives vis-à-vis the relations of inequality identified by the proposed definitions. The goal is to offer some reflections on possible silences and amplifications in radical feminist representations of relations of inequality among social groups within and across the categories of gender and race, and to reflect on their implications for the ‘cognitive boundaries’ of ‘gender’ as a social category constructed in radical feminist narratives.
2.3.2 The intra-categorical approach to intersectionality

The intra-categorical approach directs itself at using categories in complex and critical ways. It was raised in black feminist theorizations in response to the need to account for lived experiences “at a neglected point of intersection of multiple master categories” (McCall 2005: 1780-1782). It uses traditional categories “to name previously unstudied groups at various points of intersection”, while also revealing “the range of diversity and difference within the group” discussed (McCall 2005: 1782). This approach recognizes the relevance of structural inequalities, even accepting that categories indicating these inequalities cannot satisfactorily account for the complex and diversified composition of groups “no matter how detailed the level of disaggregation” (McCall 2005: 1782). It thus manages the complexity of the social world by focusing on the individual level where, in the intersection of multiple categories, each category only “reflects a single dimension of each” individual (e.g. white Italian woman) (McCall 2005: 1781). Said differently, this approach concentrates on “an individual, or an individual’s experience, and extrapolate[s] illustratively to the broader social location embodied by the individual” (McCall 2005: 1781). Overall, the intra-categorical approach avoids “the fully deconstructive rejection of all categorization”, while it remains skeptical of “the homogenizing generalizations that go with the territory of classification and categorization” (McCall, 2005: 1783). As synthesised by McCall (2005: 1783): “the point is not to deny the – material and discursive – importance of categories but to focus on the process by which they are produced, experienced, reproduced, and resisted in everyday life”.

The intra-categorical approach is employed here to analyse radical feminist identifications and the modes in which the gender-race intersection is instantiated in these identifications – as will be done in Chapter 9. This approach is used to critically discuss the identifications of social actors produced by white women in radical feminist struggles and the related strategies of political organising that these identifications presuppose and produce. In contrast to those groups subject to intra-categorical analyses, The social location of those producing these identifications is not that of an invisible group. Yet, its position of domination and privilege is often invisibilised and normalised, and it thus deserves to be brought into view and discussed. Nonetheless, the focus on intra-categorical approach to intersectionality is not employed here with the objective of revealing the heterogeneity of white women in
radical feminist struggles as a group. The main point in question is primarily to assess whether and how their identifications of social actors – based on the mutual constitution of gender and race – provide the possibilities for taking distance from racist practices and structures, and within which limits. In other words, attention to the ways in which white women in radical feminist struggles identify social actors is based on the belief that this can shed light on (a) the ways these women negotiate their own agency in respect to the effects of power structures, and (b) the implications of these negotiations for their signification of ‘gender’ as a racialised category.

To bring into focus these negotiations and their implications, this study employs to the notion of ‘subjectivity’. This notion helps us to bring together two opposite conceptions of the ‘subject’: “the subject as subjected to power, and the subject as imbued with the power to transcend the processes of subjection that have shaped it” (De Genova et al. 2015: 29). My study simultaneously recognizes (a) the action of systemic factors, including the role of governmental rationalities and practices, in shaping subject positions, and (b) the power of the subject to exceed and negotiate these positions, and articulate alternative accounts and representations. Hence, it employs “subjectivity” as a concept to explore how white women in radical feminist struggles negotiate their own subject positions produced by the governing of irregular migration through their identifications of social actors. Concretely, it discusses how these identifications explain and allocate responsibilities for conflicting differences and inequalities at the intersection of gender and race, showing their implications for negotiating and re-interpreting the concrete meanings of ‘gender’ in intersection with race.

In sum, the theoretical approach proposed is to explore the boundaries and meanings of the ‘gender’ category in intersection with ‘race’ at the level of both structures and subjectivities. By treating ‘gender’ as a floating signifier, this category is analysed in terms of the different purposes it may serve. ‘Gender’ has thus been discussed in relation to its potentials and limits for exposing specific relations of domination and subordination, and for constructing identifications of social actors that enable subjects in struggle to negotiate the effects of structural power relations on them.
2.4. Knowing ‘gender’ from its functions in reifying the ‘nation’

This section expounds on the conceptualization of the functions of ‘gender’ in the context of the governing of cross-border migration. It makes a theoretical proposal to explore feminist signification of ‘gender’ focusing on the category’s composition and transformation in respect to transnational dynamics. It argues for the importance of examining whether and how the concept of ‘gender’ is used as an instrument of methodological nationalism for comprehending systemic inequalities, and the making of subjectivities connected to the governing of irregular migration. The main aim is to direct attention to whether and how radical feminist apprehensions of ‘gender’ – in intersection with race – naturalise the ‘nation’ in ways that justify or challenge governmental rationalities and practices of irregular migration.

Two operations are conducted for this purpose. First, drawing on Border Studies and Migration Studies, the section claims that processes of reification of the ‘nation’ are at the roots of the construction of cross-border migration as an object of state management and control. In this context, the significance of questioning methodological nationalism for any critical discourse on the governing of irregular migration cannot be ignored, mainly because it helps to vet the criteria on who belongs and who do not. Second, drawing on Intersectionality and Transnational Feminism, the section discusses the modes to interrogate radical feminist narratives about their methodological nationalism in conceptualising ‘gender’, and its intersection with ‘race’, when engaging the governing of irregular migration.

2.4.1 The gender-race intersection in the making of cross-border migration as an object of governmental power

The emergence of ‘cross-border migration’ as a special object of policy-making attention is a relatively recent phenomenon (Corti and Sanfilippo 2009, Moatti and Kaiser 2009, Torpey 2001). While people’s initiative of movement has been relatively ‘free’ and the political and institutional debate over its management has a pluri-millenial history, state regulation of cross-border migration as a positive right has a shorter life (Corti and Sanfilippo 2009, Moatti and Kaiser 2009, Torpey 2001). In particular, the
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creation of a body of legal norms establishing who may cross a border, how, when, and where has emerged in Europe only with the affirmation of the modern nation state. Notably, modern nation states’ regulations of cross-border migration have taken a specific configuration based on: 1) the differentiation between those defined as nationals and non-national subjects, and 2) the conceptualization of the presence of non-national subjects within a state’s territory as a “factor of subversion” to state order (Sayad 2010: 167).

By recognising the interplay between the construction of nations and the organization of modern states, this sub-section illustrates how the reification of the national community has worked to naturalize and justify the illegality and unacceptability of unauthorized non-nationals in the territory of nation-states, giving particular emphasis to the centrality of the gender-race intersection in this process (De Genova 2015, Puri 2004, Balibar 2011). To support this argument, the sub-section combines culturalist approaches to nationalism, which recognise the “imagined nature of the nation” and its power to create “external and internal lines of exclusion structured along dimensions of race, gender” and other so-

---

20 “Nation states” are here defined as not merely “states governing multiple contiguous regions by means of centralised, differentiated, and autonomous structures; this notion [also] uses the concept of state-based or politically forged nations’ (Puri, 2004: 36).

21 If until the end of the nineteenth century, migration was subjected to little or no restriction, the economic crisis that crossed Europe before the turning to the twentieth century led to restrictive policies regarding labour migration. Border closures and colonialism were two different sides of a competitive strategy between European empires in a context of competing expanding markets. The tension among antagonistic imperial projects, that culminated in the First World War, brought states to fear transnational activities as threatening their political stability and territorial integrity. Revolutionary politics following the War, the 1929 crises, as well as rising fascist regimes augmented states’ perceptions of migrants as security risks under the idea that outsiders could potentially foment internal dissent. Later, at the end of the Second World War, the emergence and consolidation of welfare systems led some to view foreign labour as a force destroying the connection between a people and its system of social security (Wimmer and Schiller 2002, Zincone and Caponio 2006).

cial power relations (Puri 2004: 66-67), with insights from the Autonomy of Migration approach.

According to culturalist approaches to nationalism, the nation, or national community, is a social construct that acquires meaning in the context of the discourse of nationalism and the working of modern states (Brubaker 1996, Puri 2004, Gellner 1983). The nation is the product of the discourse of nationalism inasmuch as this discourse constructs, maintains, and reproduces communities that are imagined through three main supposed characteristics: (1) endowed by an invariant essence, which is externally distinct and internally homogeneous; (2) located in a bounded, coherent, and separated space; and (3) produced by inevitable and necessary historical processes (Özkirimli 2010, Calhoun 1997, Yuval-Davis 1997, Anderson 1991, Gellner 1983). At the same time, the nation is engendered, and reified, by specific rationalities pertaining to the working of modern states: (1) the institutionalization of the connection between a social group – imagined as sedentary – and a defined separate space where the identified group becomes the object of governmentality, i.e. subject to the rationalities and practices of governing by the state; (2) the enforcement of a specific set of rights and duties through the state's monopoly of legitimate violence, which regulates the primacy of national loyalty over other types of commitments; (3) the organization of a nationalised labour market, which restricts the possibility of work by reference to national belonging, thus regulating access to and distribution of resources (Hesse 1997, Özkirimli 2010, Wimmer and Schiller 2002). On the whole, the encounter between nationalism and the modern state is a key terrain to reveal how, starting from the construction and reification of national communities, the phenomenon of people’s border-crossing is formulated as a problem to which modern nation states need to attend.

Importantly, consistent changes in states’ approaches to migration have occurred in the contemporary period with relevant effects on the construction of ‘nations’. First, states do not represent anymore the only actor involved in the governing of cross-border movements of people: also international agencies, non-governmental organizations, and private companies are implicated in today's management of border crossing (Bigo 2002, Andrijasevic and Walters 2010, Mezzadra and Neilson 2013) Second, allegiance to the nation state does not constitute anymore the main criteria guiding a state’s regulation of migration: as already discussed, a labour and skill definition constitutes a much more prominent
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criterion (Truong and Gasper 2011). Third, in the contemporary period, national borders do not only serve to prevent unauthorized entry by non-national subjects, they also function in regulating the time and speed of migration (Panagiotidis and Tsianos 2007, Mezzadra and Neilson 2013). As a result, state borders do not perform the role of barriers between insiders and outsiders anymore. Instead, they work as filtering mechanisms and means of stratification that engender multiple processes of “internal exclusion, differential inclusion, segregation and potential social advancement within a hierarchical framework” (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013, Giuliani 2016: 5). Simultaneously, increasing nationalism has emerged as an effect of the weakening of “sovereign powers of protection and containment” that makes states react by “offering the spectacle of a clear and strong inside/outside […] distinction comporting with national borders” (Brown 2010: 70).

In the context of the “growing trend of ‘people on the move’”, the changing functions of borders and the growth of nationalism have made the distinction between national and non-national subjects, which has never been clear-cut, into an even more contested terrain (Yuval-Davis 2013: 39). Indeed, “the increasing blurring of the line for insiders-outsiders” (Yuval-Davis 2013: 39), which increases the degree of the nation’s heterogeneity, requires nation states even more to confront internal differences across the national body as well as to select certain external differences to convert into Otherness (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991, Bauman 1992, Billing 1995). In this perspective, the intersection of gender and race acquires renovated prominence for the making and remaking of national boundaries through the “schema of genealogy” (Balibar 1991: 100). Within the logic of nation states, it is the “connections of generation” or the “filiation of individuals” transmitting “from generation to generation a substance both biological and spiritual” that allow representation of populations “in the past and the future as if they formed a natural community, possessing of itself identity of origins, culture, and interests” (Balibar 1991: 100, Balibar 2011: 3). In this frame, the construction of social inequalities in terms of racial differences enables states to establish and legitimate distinctions “between genuinely and falsely national” (Balibar 1991: 100). The gendered reproduction of the “nation” is thus shaped by racism as a “necessary internal supplement to nationalism” in that “it assists the national objective of imposing political
and cultural unity” over nationalized social formations (Balibar 1991: 54, 2011)\textsuperscript{23}.

Specifically, the role of racism in the gendered reproduction of national collectivities affects the differential involvement of women in various national projects in important ways and at various levels\textsuperscript{24}. At the level of biological reproduction, women may be treated as “biological producers of children and people” and therefore “bearers of the collective” (Yuval-Davis 2003: 12). In this sense, depending on the type of national project enforced and on women’s racialization, they “might be encouraged, discouraged, or sometimes forced to have or not to have children or […] to have children of a particular sex” (Yuval-Davis 2003: 12).

Second, at the level of cultural and social reproduction\textsuperscript{25}, women may be seen as “cultural carriers” of national groups given their social role in the socialization of children which guarantees the inter-generational transmission of national cultures (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1989: 9, Ozkirimly 2010: 180). As a result of the “central importance of social reproduction to culture” (Yuval-Davis 2003: 17), specific racialised mothering and parenting styles may be encouraged, while others are stigmat-
ised according to the specific values that national projects aspire to transmit from generation to generation (Yuval-Davis, 2003). At the symbolic level, women may also be taken as signifiers of national differences. This “burden of representation” constructs certain women – depending again on their racialization – as bearers of national honour and it entails the development of specific codes and regulations defining proper womanhood (Ozkirimly 2010: 180, Yuval-Davis, 1997: 15). Overall, the intersection of gender and race in the politics of nationalism and the process of nation-building significantly affects subjects and the making of subjectivities.

In sum, the gendered reproduction of racialised groups results as a key process for the naturalization of national communities and the construction of cross-border migration as a problem that nation states need to attend to (Al-Tayeb 2011, Balibar and Wallerstain 1991, Goldberg 2009, Lentin 2015, Quijano 2000, Yuval-Davis 1997, 2011). This recognition establishes the theoretical significance of exploring the degree of methodological nationalism in radical feminist narratives that contest the current governing of irregular migration. It requires us to bring into focus radical feminist awareness of the pressures exercised by a multiplicity of structural forces to naturalise state borders as well as the categories of national and non-national subjects. This recognition sets the validity of contextualising radical feminist narratives against the backdrop of two main processes: first, the process of the state building of Italy, to bring into perspective the racialized making of the Italian national community, as it will be done in Chapter 4; and second, the construction of feminist approaches to nationalism, which gives a key entry point to the later examination of radical feminist struggle against the governing of irregular migration, as it will be done in Chapter 5.

2.4.2 Identifying methodological nationalisms

Accepting that the construction of cross-border migration as an object of government is rooted in the naturalization of the nation state invites us to reflect not only on how gendered and racial structures and subjectivities are involved in this process of naturalization, but also on how gender and race as social categories in-and-of themselves may function as potential instruments of methodological nationalism. This attention to the making of gender as a social category requires that one discusses “the centrality of nations, nationalisms, and the national scale” (Conway 2008: 69).
209-210) in diverse gendered discourses on the governing of migration by bringing into focus how diverse conceptualizations of gendered social relations are thought as “embedded within, enabled by and contribute to cross-border [and transnational] dynamics” (Patil 2011: 850). When gender and race have been proven so central to the production and reproduction of nationalized social formations, critiques of the naturalization of the nation as “the fixed and stable order of social and material life” cannot leave out of consideration the uses of gender in intersection with race (Kim 2007: 117-118). Therefore, this sub-section proposes diverse theoretical instruments to investigate uses of ‘gender’ as a social category that may be apprehended as “taking place inside the boundaries of contemporary nations/states, or as being defined by nationalized societies or cultures” (Kim 2007, Kim-Puri 2005, Mitchell 1997).

First, examining the relation between ‘gender’ as a social category and the ‘nation’ allows analysts to identify diverse shortcomings and merits in the conceptualization of gender that may reveal implicit methodological nationalism. Main shortcomings in the conceptualization of gender relate to the use of this social category for: first, homogenising national groups and reifying nations; second, normalising and reproducing hegemonic notions of a particular nation or nationalism; and third, denying the challenges, contestations and contradictions that take place in the process of production and reproduction of national borders (Kim-Puri 2005, Kim 2007). Besides, the chief virtue of conceptualizations of ‘gender’ that may reveal the overcoming of implicit methodological nationalism related to identification of linkages and connections across national contexts so as to grasp how social phenomena, processes, and locations “shape various spatial settings in a contradictory and unequal manner” (Kim, 2007: 118). The relevant implications of such a preferred focus on relations and processes across scales is that, “unlike nation-to-nation comparisons”, relations and processes “do not presuppose equivalence” – hence they do not minimise differences across contexts and they allow analyses that do not fall into the trap of universalism (Falcon and Nash 2015, Kim-Puri 2005: 148). In fact, the idea of linkages or relations is not simply “to identify similarities or differences across related phenomena”, but “to call attention to the complex, sometimes contradictory, and often unequal interconnections that exist across cultural settings” and social locations (Kim-Puri 2005: 149).
Second, acknowledging multiple scales of analysis may function to incorporate a transnational dimension in the conceptualization of ‘gender’ (Mahler et al. 2015; Patil and Purkayastha, 2015). According to Mahler et al. (2015: 1), intersectional analyses are importantly enhanced “when [research subjects’] standpoints are examined simultaneously at multiple social scales, including the intimate, local, national and transnational scales”, since intersections among diverse social relations of power “can and typically do shift as we move across scales”. In their opinion, this multi-scalar intersectional analysis exemplifies the relevance of explicitly situating the object of intersectional researches within the geopolitical space – hence challenging the “nation-state as an a priori unit of analysis” and “highlighting processes especially ‘above’ but also ‘below’ the nation-state that are central to its very construction” (Mahler et al. 2015: 4). In doing so, these scholars also warn against indiscriminately select scales of analysis, because not all scales “are likely to be of importance, or of equal importance, at any given time” (Mahler et al. 2015: 6). Therefore, they divert attention “on the transnational feminist focus on histories and context” and invite to identify “historically contingent factors affecting contemporary constellations of social relations as they map power relations intersectionally across national divides” (Mahler et al. 2015: 4).

Drawing on these theorizations, the section leads to the plan to examine the conceptualization of ‘gender’ in the radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration in Chapter 6, 7, 8, and 9, in order to explore any surfacing of methodological nationalism in radical feminist political interventions at both the level of structures and subjectivities. In particular, the section invites us to consider whether, how, and why these narratives deploy a transnational and intersectional sensibility through the presence of the following elements: first, awareness of the historicity of the Italian nation state and its changing policies toward the movements of people, as a resource to question the reification of the nation; second, consideration of other scales of analysis besides the national and local dimension, to grasp the transnational nature and effects of governmental rationalities and practices regulating irregular migration; third, attention to linkages and relations in order to discuss the connections between various social positions, such as those of citizens and migrants, within and across the boundaries of nation states. In sum, discussing the presence of such elements in radical feminist narratives aims at bringing...
into focus their potentialities and challenges in regard to applications of
an intersectional approach free from methodological nationalism.

Summing up, this section has advanced a theoretical proposal to ex-
amine the functions of ‘gender’, focusing on this category’s composition
and transformation in respect to transnational dynamics. Specifically, it
has indicated has offered a grid to interrogate radical feminist conceptu-
alizations of ‘gender’ in Italy in terms of their functions for naturalising
the nation at the level of systemic inequalities and subjectivities. Further-
more, it has argued that any critical analysis of people’s movements
across borders requires questioning processes of reification of the ‘na-
tion’ that naturalise the construction of migration as an object of state
control. It has offered the modes to verify how conceptualizations of
‘gender’ as a social category may be involved in the reification of the na-
tion, and how methodological nationalism may be overcome.

2.5. Concluding remarks
The key objective of this chapter is to argue that an informed and critical
use of ‘gender’ in the specific socio-historical context could lead to more
clarity on the boundaries and meanings of the ‘gender’ category and on
its functions in the context of the governing of migration, and therefore
can serve both analytical and political ends. Section 2.2 justified the
study’s epistemological choice of taking radical feminist narratives of
struggle as its main empirical source, explaining that they provide critical
understandings of the gendered processes and phenomena they engage
in, while also offering motivations to take action against the oppressive
elements of the contradictions they illuminate. Section 2.3 has proposed
a theoretical approach to reflect on the boundaries and meanings of the
‘gender’ category in intersection with ‘race’ at both the structural and
subjective levels, that allows one to discuss the limits and potentials of
how feminists recognise diverse intersecting oppressions and formulate
political projects that coherently take account of these intersections. Sec-
tion 2.4 has advanced a theoretical proposal to examine the functions of
‘gender’, focusing on this category’s composition and transformation
within the transnational dimension. In doing so, it has established the
relevance of questioning methodological nationalism, as a necessary step
towards the de-naturalization of the making of cross-border migration as
a problem at the centre of the political agenda of modern states. The
chapter has, also, approached gender as both an analytical and a social category that functions at multiple levels; and, in particular, it argues for taking the representational level as a door to access the structural and subjective levels.
Chapter 3

Research methodology and ethics: narratives, power, and contexts

3.1 Introduction

This research is a qualitative interpretative study and focuses on discourses and other social practices as meaning making activities that allow the world to be understood and acted upon by individuals and collectivities (Yanow 2015, Mills 2003). The methodology adopted is highly informed by Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This is a family of problem-oriented and interdisciplinary approaches to the study of social phenomena through discourses, which is directed to denaturalise dominant world views and the relations of power they contribute to establish, maintain, and legitimise (Wodak and Meyer 2009 and 2016). It finds its origins in disciplines such as critical linguistics, conversation analysis and ethnography of speaking and gathers insights from diverse sources such as Bernstein's sociology of language, Habermas' theory of communicative and strategic action and Foucault's conceptions of power/knowledge (Van Dijk 2007, Krzyzanowski 2010). The multifarious background of CDA has produced heterogeneity in both its theoretical grounding and methods, from which the research methodology has eclectically picked up the tools conceived as more appropriate to pursue the proposed research objectives in specific cases. Especially, this study has built on several strands in CDA based on Foucauldian ideas due to their focus on the social functions and effects of discourses as technologies of power (Wodak and Meyer 2009 and 2016).

This chapter discusses the ways in which the epistemological and theoretical pillars of this study are coherently translated into specific methodological tools in order to pursue the proposed research objectives. To this end, it presents and justify the ways in which the research collected, analysed, and interpreted its chosen data, radical feminist narratives on
the governing of irregular migration into contemporary Italy. Section 3.2 proposes the theoretical grounding of the research methodology, with special attention to the concepts of narrative, power, and contexts. Section 3.3 describes the techniques of data gathering that were employed during fieldwork and it identifies completeness as the guiding criterion used to ensure research quality. Section 3.4 explains the adopted procedures for data analysis and interpretation with reference to the inter-categorical and intra-categorical approaches to intersectionality and insights from Transnational Feminism. Section 3.5 makes explicit the working of power in the process of designing, conducting, and writing this piece of research, focusing on the “social embeddedness” of both the researcher and research institutions (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 7).

3.2 Theoretical grounding of the research methodology

This study takes discourses as its main data. It understands discourses or “language used in speech and writing” as social “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 258, Foucault 1974: 49). It looks at radical feminist politics in today’s Italy as a standpoint that produces situated discourses on the governing of irregular migration, and constructs and applies specific meanings of ‘gender’ as structure of power and source of identification. Importantly, it conceptualises discourses as both “socially constitutive” and “socially conditioned” (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 258). As a result, radical feminist discourses are seen as triggering important symbolic and material effects in that, in the course of re-interpreting the meanings of ‘gender’ produced and disseminated by the governing of irregular migration, they change collective and individual senses of the world, and generate desires and practices of transformation. Simultaneously, the production of radical feminist discourses is understood as interacting with existing material or extra-discursive forces given that discourses are tied to social conventions and their production and circulation is mediated by power and social inequalities: for example, coercion and repression can pose strict restrictions to the possibilities of changing behaviours as a result of the power of meanings (Hall 1997b, Jäger and Maier 2009 and 2016, Vijayan 2012). Placed against this understanding, the section examines the relation between discourses, power and contexts, to clarify the study’s horizon of comprehension of processes of signification.
More specifically, this study considers the discourses produced by radical feminisms as narratives giving form to their experiences of struggle. Narratives are thus defined as discourses that position social actors in specific times and places and, in a broad sense, “give order to and make sense of” their lived experiences of struggle and the governmental rationalities and practices engaged in the process (Bamberg 2012: 77). Significantly, discourses as narratives are seen to perform two main functions which enable one to do research both with and on narratives. First, they provide access to “the realm of experience, where speakers lay out how they as individuals experience certain events and confer their subjective meaning onto these experiences” (Bamberg 2012: 77). From this vantage, radical feminist narratives are seen as producing partial and situated interpretations of gender and other structures in the governing of irregular migration. Second, they show “the realm of narrative devices that are put to use to make sense” of speakers’ experiences and identifications (Bamberg 2012: 77). Thus, radical feminist narratives are approached as discourses that offer a view on the specific strategies constructing identifications of social actors, which allocate responsibilities and explains relations of inequalities. In sum, narratives are seen as providing an entry point to both experiences and their representations, without reducing one to the other – in line with the epistemological position presented in Chapter 2.

Importantly, discourses and structures are seen as mutually influencing each other, without being reduced to one another. Their interplay is apprehended as mediated by power and “premised on an open system of articulation characterised by variable, or complex, forms of determination” (Olssen 2014: 40). Two main complementary concepts help to approach this interplay as mediated by power: power as government, and agency as including subjectivity. First, the concept of power as government refers to any “more or less calculated and rational activity”, undertaken by plural authorities and agencies, which employ a variety of techniques and discourses to shape behaviours, “for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences” (Dean 1999: 11). Importantly, this concept of government – here expressed as “governing” to highlight its processual

---

26 It should be noted that narrative analysis is historically not closely linked to CDA, and is much older. There are some recent attempts to systematically connect the two (Souto-Manning, 2014).
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character – allows analysts to consider discourses as technologies of power capable of shaping human conduct, thus generating social practices with specific functions and effects.

Second, the concept of agency as subjectivity conveys the understanding about individual and collective subjects as being not only produced by governmental activities and logics, but also capable to negotiate, craft, and “cultivate their own selves and identity” (Inda 2005: 10). This approach to agency indicates discourses as practices of freedom to reject, modify, and/or transform the effects of government (Ong, 2005). As a result, radical feminist narratives are here seen as “sites of struggle” that help to re-negotiate the subject positions produced by the governing of irregular migration, paying attention to the social functions and effects of these same positions (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 10).

To comprehend and assess the relevance of radical feminist narratives as sites of struggle requires the acknowledgement that “discourses” emanate from “interactions between social groups and the complex societal structures” in which they are engrained, which leads one to analytically consider these narratives as historically-embedded practices (Phillips 2002: 4). Specifically, ‘context’ is here thought about in terms of “the dynamic relation between physical settings and discursively founded actions undertaken by individuals or groups” (Krzyzanowski 2010: 78). Importantly, this conceptualization confers to context a “constructive nature”, i.e. context cannot be taken as a given, but as something being “based on subjective factors and reliant on the dynamic processes of discursive negotiations” (Krzyzanowski 2010: 78). Therefore, contexts are not apprehended here as “some kind of objective condition or direct cause” that explain the emergence of specific discursive configurations; rather they are seen as “inter-subjective constructs designed and ongoingly updated in interaction by participants as members of groups and communities” (Van Dijk in Krzyzanowski 2010: 78). This perspective leads us to conceive the relation between contexts and radical feminist narratives as follows: radical feminist narratives are seen as actively re-contextualising the governing of irregular migration into the field of gender and race relations; while the researcher has creatively contextualised these narratives in the history of racialization of Italians and the approaches to ‘race’ of women’s and feminist politics with the intent to clarify the perspective they offer.
Summing up, the above-mentioned considerations on the concepts of ‘discourse’, ‘power’, and context form the theoretical grounding of the research methodology and importantly shape the methods here employed for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. First, taking narratives as main data has led me to conceptualise the individuals and groups involved in the research as narrators, whose spoken and written discourses are here transformed into texts for analytic purposes (Polkinghorne 2005). Second, doing research with and on narratives has entailed clarification that this study relied on analytical procedures that are both content-oriented and linguistically-oriented (Kryzanowski 2010). Third, taking discourses as both technologies of government and practices of freedom, thus as sites of struggle, has required that the study tries to identify specific linguistic aspects of power through a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data (Wodak and Meyer 2009 and 2016). Fourth, recognition of the historical character of discourses has required integrated attention to context in all the phases of data collection, analysis, and interpretation (Wodak and Meyer 2009 and 2016). Overall, these claims invite us to reflect on the activity of researching and its role in bringing into focus and criticising the working of power in social life – a topic to be discussed in the last section of this chapter.

3.3 Data collection

This section presents the research techniques employed to select research participants and collect their narratives of struggle as well as relevant material for contextualization during 12 months of fieldwork from December 2012 to November 2013. These techniques include: (1) purposive and snowball sampling; (2) in-depth interviews and focus groups discussions (FGDs); (3) archive and internet searches. Overall, the process of data collection resulted in 16 in-depth interviews and 6 FGDs, involving a total of 36 research participants who produced both personal and collective narratives. It deserves to be specified that my own involvement in radical feminisms and migration related-discussions and campaigns since 2007 has offered me an insider status that has impacted the process of data collection in diverse ways, gaining me the trust of research participants as well as access to additional contributions and sources. On the whole, the chosen criterion to assess the quality of the process of data collection was that of ‘completeness’.
3.3.1 Sampling techniques and sample composition

In order to select research participants, two main sampling techniques were combined. First, the purposive sampling technique was employed, selecting units of the sample according to the researcher's own judgement, in order to collect information about major cases of radical feminist struggles engaging the governing of irregular migration (Teddlie and Yu 2007). Specifically, research participants were identified relying on my personal contacts built during my own involvement in radical feminisms prior to this research. Second, the snowball sampling technique was employed to enlarge the research sample so as to gather information on issues as they emerged as significant during the process of researching (Teddlie and Yu 2007). To this end, interviewees were asked to activate their own political and personal networks in order to suggest other people to contact, who might share experiences and reflections relevant to the research. Finally, the sampling phase was closed when, during the analysis phase, it was confirmed that the examination of new data was not producing new findings (Wodak and Meyer 2009 and 2016).

The criteria identified to involve individuals in the sample were the following: (1) participation in struggles related to irregular migration and its governing; (2) positioning of these struggles in the field of radical feminisms as a feminist discursive space characterised by the search for radical changes in the current political, social, cultural, and economic organization; (3) recognition of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ as intersecting power relations implicated in the governing of irregular migration; and (4) relatively long experience in feminist politics. Importantly, as this sample was constructed with non-probability techniques, it does not claim any representativeness in relation to the entire discursive space of radical feminisms nor any of its cross-sections. Instead, the main criterion used for assessing the quality of the sample has been completeness since I closed the process of sample construction when no evidence of new themes emerged from addition of new data.

The final sample, which involved 36 participants, was characterised by a certain heterogeneity. First, it included some subjects who did not respond to all the criteria identified. This served to illuminate other characteristics of the core sample that, without comparison or contrast with slightly or consistently different experiences, would have not emerged. Second, the sample presented a certain degree of internal diversity that was inferred from participants’ self-definitions, clarifying the political
and social locations that participants themselves recognised as the base of their own situated gaze.

About political background, two-thirds of research participants acknowledged that, beside their experience in feminist politics, they have or had been involved in diverse radical movements with queer, anti-racist, communist (often closed to the workerist tradition which stands at the base of the AoM approach), or anarchist leanings and outside of political parties, unions, and formal organizations. These diverse political experiences considerably influenced participants’ perspective in understanding the governing of irregular migration from the discursive field of radical feminisms. For example, those with a communist background appeared to especially focus on the connection between migration and work-related issues, whereas an anarchist orientation often translated in attention to links between migration and the repressive action of state institutions such as centres for administrative detention. Similarly, previous political experiences also influenced the political practices adopted by participants, and facilitated connections between diverse movements. For instance, those with a background in anarchist politics expressed a clear preference for direct actions – like attempts to stop deportation flights – and those who had been active in queer and anti-racist movements provided their network of contacts to support trans migrants. This multifarious background of activists in radical feminisms was spontaneously described, by at least ten participants, as a resource. Indeed, the combination of plural perspectives – although sometime seen as cause of disagreements and conflicts – was mostly appreciated for enabling the construction of a more complex gaze.

Furthermore, a minority of seven participants reported about being engaged in formal political organising or in both formal and informal contexts. Interestingly, one research participant widely discussed the pros and cons of her “hybrid situation” as activist in radical feminisms and social operator working within a detention centre (Interview n° 9). She recognised that her position as activist enabled her to openly raise critiques to and conflicts with state institutions as her possibility of action was not dependent on institutional funding and permissions. At the same time, she explained that working inside a detention centre enabled her to concretely change the lives of several women notwithstanding institutional constraints. In contrast, in her experience of radical political organising, she often remained only on the level of political ideology. Be-
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sides, she and other two interviewees stressed that struggles outside and against institutions may be strengthened by the supportive action of those working within institutions with a critical approach. Overall, identifying and discussing the contradictions underlying each political positioning has been described as essential to bring about change. Finally, two interviewees defined their engagement not as political, but as cultural and social, placing great emphasis on the construction of meanings as an issue of power that has great impact on both the personal and collective dimensions.

In terms of gender, the sample included only persons who self-identified as cis-women, but six participants reported about politically organising with trans-women, trans-men, and/or non-binary persons, thus acknowledging the influence of queer politics on radical feminisms.

Most research participants were white Italian women, yet also a small group of five racialised women, both with and without Italian citizenship and with a background as migrant or refugee, was involved in the study. Among these racialised women there was one Afro-American, one from Pakistan, two from Somalia, and one from Cameroon. This sample composition, while reflecting the general white character of radical feminisms in Italy, intended to give space to the perspective of racialised groups. However, I did not define racialised women as radical feminists since racialised participants did not explicitly employ this label to introduce themselves and four of them described their involvement with radical feminists as circumscribed to specific issues or mobilizations.

Then, the great majority of participants had their residency in the North or centre of the country, although some of them originated from the South. This trend clearly reflected the geography of my own network of contacts that has been highly influenced by my residence in Milan. In two cases, Southern geographical origin was presented as the base for experiencing anti-Southern racism. A few Italian research participants had their residence abroad, but nonetheless were actively involved in struggles taking place in Italy thanks to online communications and travels.

The sample included research participants of different ages, from people in their 20s to people in their 70s, and their political experience spanned from a few years to decades of engagement - thus reflecting the intergenerational characteristics of radical feminisms.
About class, participants had different backgrounds. At least two thirds of the sample – including both white and racialised – were highly educated and, among them, eight may be defined as public intellectual figures. In addition, most participants in their 20s, 30s, and 40s shared a condition of precarity in different labour sectors.

In relation to religion, white Italian participants did not define their orientation. Given the numerous points of tension existing between Catholicism – the most common confession in Italy – and feminist politics, I assumed they were atheist or agnostic. Instead, three racialised participants defined themselves as Muslim and, although they were not practicing, they highlighted the political relevance of their identity in a period of dominant and rising Islamophobia. In doing so, all of them stressed the heterogeneity of Muslims, questioning stereotypical representations of Islam.

3.3.2 In-depth interviews and focus group discussions

During fieldwork, I conducted 16 in-depth interviews and 6 FGDs involving – as already said – a total of 36 research participants. In-depth interviewing was the first chosen research technique of data collection due to its discovery oriented approach, which allows analysts to extensively explore the respondents' perspectives and their descriptions, explanations and evaluations of the events, phenomena, and processes discussed during the interview. FGD was the second chosen research technique due to its synergistic character, which enables to generate data through group interactions, exploring diversity of views. In preparation for conducting in-depth interviews and focus groups, key characteristics of both chosen research techniques were identified as overlapping: use of open-ended questions allowing research participants to extensively elaborate on the topic discussed with flexibility; adoption of a semi-structured format that allows an interactive conversation; recorded responses in order to later attentively reflect on them (Guion et al. 2001, Ritchie et al. 2013). Overall, both in-depth interviews and FGDs were considered as generative processes where new knowledge is created through collaboration between the researcher and interviewees in the first case, and through interactions among group members and the researcher in the second case (Ritchie et al. 2013). For example, in all cases, research participants importantly contributed bringing to my attention the relevance of various issues I was not considering.
In order to prepare both in-depth interviews and FGDs, I clarified the purpose of involving within the research each of the research participants or groups, and I prepared a list of topics for discussion. In short, this list included the following points: (1) the subject or group's participation in activities of kinds which addressed the topic of the investigation, in order to reconstruct diverse episodes of feminist interventions about the governing of people’s movements across borders; (2) the subject or group's perception of the meaning produced by and through the activities described, in order to grasp their understanding of the governing of irregular migration; (3) the subject or group's motivations and desires to engage the activities described, in order to bring into focus their reasons to engage this governmental process in relation to their own positionality; and finally (4) the subject or group's difficulties in the activities described, in order to understand the contradictions experienced by the subject while engaging the governing of irregular migration.

After this preparation, I wrote emails to contact the subject, or group, to involve them in the research, presenting myself as a feminist activist from Milan doing a PhD in The Netherlands and explaining the objectives and rationale of the research. Besides, I informed the subject or group about the reasons and objectives of my request in relation to my knowledge and understanding of their own experience. Commonly, I used to conclude the email asking whether the subject or group could suggest any relevant reading material as a preparation for the interview as well as the names of other relevant subjects to interview on the topics mentioned. After this first contact, most of the subjects and groups replied and accepted to be interviewed. In some cases the request was ignored or declined. When it was explicitly declined, the reasons presented regarded the personal situation of the subject contacted and did not relate to the proposal itself. In terms of time and setting, most of the interviews lasted about two-three hours and they were conducted in houses or bars sharing food and drinks with the interviewee. In almost all occasions, the interviews were recorded, except when the interviewees explicitly asked otherwise. In many cases, the recording of the interview was interrupted for a short period or periods due to privacy or security reasons.

After conducting the interview, I transcribed the conversations recorded or the notes taken when it was asked not to record the conversation. Subsequently, I shared the transcripts of interviews and FGDs with re-
search participants via email, asking whether they wanted to make some changes, add or eliminate parts of the interview or FGDs. In some cases, the transcripts were returned with corrections and additions.

### Table 3.1

**In-depth interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups or organizations</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Venticinqueundici, Tavolo Migranti, Comitato Anti-razzista</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>January 10, 2013; September 19, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalia, Noi non siamo complici, Migranda</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>February 6, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baba Yaga, Le Venticinqueundici</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>February 10, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinamenta</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>April 2, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sommosse</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>May 23, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cittadini del Mondo*, Baba Yaga, Mai State Zitte, Comitato Anti-razzista, Noi non siamo complici</td>
<td>Massa Carrara</td>
<td>July 2, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Venticinqueundici</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>August 16, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; video call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progetto Amazzone*</td>
<td>Palermo</td>
<td>September 8, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; video call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativa BeFree*</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>September 10, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Onda Rossa</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>September 12, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruppo del Corale Femminile sulla Guerra</td>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>September 20, 2013</td>
<td>Non-recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Venticinqueundici</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>September 24, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; video call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher and journalist</td>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>October 2, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruppo del Corale Femminile sulla Guerra</td>
<td>Savona</td>
<td>October 25, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>October 28, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; video call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruppo del Corale Femminile sulla Guerra</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>October 29, 2013</td>
<td>Recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Guerra, Cittadini del Mondo* face to face.

* Formal associations

Table 3.2
Focus Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group involved in the FGD</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sommosse, Bella Queer</td>
<td>Perugia</td>
<td>May 18, 2013</td>
<td>2 participants; recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migranda</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>June 30, 2013</td>
<td>5 participants; recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>July 4, 2013</td>
<td>5 participants; recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultoria Autogestita</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>July 24, 2013</td>
<td>2 participants; recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centro Donna L.I.S.A.*</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>September 11, 2013</td>
<td>3 participants; non-recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruppo del Corale femminile sulla guerra</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>September 25, 2013</td>
<td>3 participants; recorded; face to face.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Formal associations

3.3.3 Archive and internet searches

The secondary data employed in this study consisted of radical feminist communication statements, flyers, and zines, which were gathered from archive and internet searches, regularly accessing relevant blogs, websites and mailing lists\textsuperscript{27}. During in-depth interviews and FGDs, hard-copy and online materials – books, published essays, and monographs – were also suggested for consultation and they were used as secondary sources.

\textsuperscript{27} I mainly refer to blogs and sites managed by radical feminist groups as well as individual activists. Some examples are: https://flat.noblogs.org/, https://noinonsiamocomplici.noblogs.org/, https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/, http://marginaliavincenzaperilli.blogspot.it/, https://sonia.noblogs.org/, http://www.nicolettapoidimani.it/. This site is instead an interesting source on zines: https://anarcoqueer.wordpress.com/
Finally, access to the personal archives of many of the subjects interviewed provided further relevant material. In general, secondary sources were employed to triangulate data so as to capture different dimensions of the same phenomenon.

3.4 Data analysis and interpretation

The procedures adopted in this research for data analysis and interpretation are now elucidated, differentiating among (1) contextualization, (2) content-oriented analysis, and (3) linguistically-oriented analysis. In presenting content-oriented and linguistically-oriented analytical methods in CDA, and their combination, this section explains how the analysis findings were interpreted with reference to the inter-categorical and intra-categorical approaches to intersectionality and insights from Transnational Feminism. Specifically, the section sheds light on the passage from analysis to interpretation explaining which specific linguistic categories have been considered apt to operationalise the research questions. Overall, the section guides the reader through the whole study, indicating the chapters that present the contextualization, analysis, and interpretation of the data selected.

First, this study recognises the methodological importance of reflecting on contexts in order to analyse discourses. To this end, all the texts analysed – communication statements as well as transcript of interviews and FGDs – were located within different levels of context combining information gathered from literature reviews, secondary and primary data, and personal insights gained thanks to my insider status (Wodak, 2008: 93). First, the broader historical and socio-political setting, in which discourses are embedded in and relate to, is brought into focus in Chapters 4 and 5. These chapters respectively deal with processes of racialization triggered by human mobility and citizenship regulations, and the intertwining of feminist and nationalistic politics within the history of the Italian nation state. Their rationale is to bring into focus the continuing relevance of race and gender for the working of nation states and the discourse of nationalism. Indeed, as argued in Chapter 2, these two elements are key to the constitution of migration as an object of government, and thus their historical configuration is thought to significantly illuminate key aspects of radical feminist struggles on cross-border movements of people and their governing. Second, the social and institutional
frames of the specific radical feminist struggles considered in Chapters 6, 7, and 8 are discussed there. In particular, each of these chapters presents a specific radical feminist struggle, shedding light on the governmental rationalities and practices that it engages. Finally, interdiscursive and intertextual relations between different types of discourses and texts as well as the immediate context of the text are acknowledged while presenting the analysis findings in Chapters 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Overall, attention to long term historical perspectives is considered key in order to grasp the complex meaning-making of gender in intersection with race and from a transnational perspective.

Second, the study engaged the texts selected in terms of content-oriented or thematic analysis. In particular, it mapped out discourse topics defined as arguments that conceptually summarise the texts considered and specify the most relevant information (Van Dijk, 1997). Discourse topics in radical feminist narratives were identified by inductive analysis, decoding the meanings of text passages through several detailed readings and later organising them into lists of key themes and sub-themes (Krzyszanowski, 2010: 81). Again, my insider status made easier to identify relevant topics. This level of analysis served to research narratives, for understanding how radical feminist politics comprehended the social functions and effects of the governing of irregular migration in terms of the gender-race intersection. This type of analysis is employed in Chapter 5 to present diverse gendered and racial constructions of the ‘nation’ produced in the field of women’s and feminist politics. Then, content-oriented analysis is also used in Chapters 6, 7, and 8 which present and map the critiques developed by radical feminist politics – building from their experiences of struggle – to diverse governmental rationalities and practices: the gendered securitization of in-migration, administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking, securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control. Importantly, thematic analysis is especially directed to bring into focus how radical feminisms de-naturalise and re-interpret the governing of irregular migration and its underpinning. Finally, content oriented analysis is also employed in Chapter 9 to bring into view the perspective of racialized women on whiteness as a part of the making of white subjectivities in radical feminists’ struggles. As will be explained later, specific tools of linguistically oriented analysis, and insights from the inter-categorical approach to intersectionality and
transnational feminism, are used to interpret the meanings of gender as structure and source of identification.

Third, this study approached the data collected though linguistically oriented or other in-depth analysis, thus doing research on narratives. To this end, it combined three main methods of discourse analysis, assuming that triangulation of methods enhances the analysis findings’ depth and validity.

The first method employed was Self and Other Presentation in discourse, which relies on Reisigl and Wodak’s theorization (2001) and Wodak et al.’s empirical work (2009). It allows analysts to bring into focus constructions of sameness and difference in the narratives examined. This method approaches positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation as two complementary discourse strategies reflecting a “more or less accurate and more or less intentional plan of practices […] adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim” (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 5). These discursive strategies are identified through the following analytical categories: (1) reference and nomination: the process of naming and labelling social actors and locating them in discourses; (2) predication: the act of ascribing diverse characteristics to all those previously named and labelled; (3) argumentation, that is the use of topoi or general arguments and conclusions to justify positive or negative predications; (4) mitigation, as modalities employed by speakers or authors to mitigate or fortify their means of verbal and textual expression; (5) perspectivation, that is the identification of the perspective employed by speakers or authors which illuminates their direct or indirect involvement in the social categories and realities constructed in discourse (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 5-7).

The second method engaged was Representation of Social Actors. It is based on van Leeuwen's framework (2007) regarding actors’ representation and enables analysts to shed light on how the discursive construction of group boundaries among social groups suits the interests and purposes in the texts examined. In particular, three main strategies of representations were considered significant for the purposes of the analysis: (1) inclusion, exclusion, foregrounding, backgrounding, and suppression of social actors were taken as key factors to comprehend the type of group boundaries considered worthy of attention by the author/speaker; (2) attribution of specific roles to actors, especially in terms of activation and passivization, was seen as relevant to identify
how texts attribute the role of agent and that of recipient of actions, stressing power positions and placing responsibilities; (3) differentiation or indetermination of social actors were taken as factors indicating the degree of heterogeneity within social groups that was recognized in the texts (van Leeuwen 2007, Reisigl and Wodak 2001).

The third method adopted was Narrative Analysis. It is based on the work of Greimas (1966) on narratives’ functions and spheres of action. It looks at how and why characters, actions and events are delineated and relate to each other, assuming these depend on the underlying assumptions and values of the text, which together create certain meanings (Titscher 2000: 127). Specifically, it was employed to uncover assumptions and values informing texts and the meanings they produced. It is based on the recognition of six typical actants, that are roles in a story that, once identified, help to grasp the “meaning-bearing” structure of the text (Greimas 1966). These actants, which are not necessarily personified in actors, interact across space and time and can according to Greimas be of six different types:

a. destinator (sometimes called sender), the source or initiator of the rules and values that inform the text;
b. receiver, the repository or carrier of the values that inform the text;
c. subject, the main figure in the narrative;
d. object, what the subject aspires to;
e. adjuvant, forces that support the subject’s efforts;
f. opponent (sometimes called traitor), the impeding forces.

Generally, discourses as narratives are thought to propose a plot which sees the subject who directs itself to the object, while being supported by the adjuvant and impeded by the traitor. In this frame, the destinator embodies the values informing the text, which are carried and imparted by the receiver (Titscher 2000: 125-134).

These three linguistically-oriented methods were used in conjunction with inter-categorical and intra-categorical approaches to intersectionality as well as attention to methodological nationalism in order to interpret radical feminist significations of gender as a social category indicating intersectional and transnational structures of power and sources of identi-
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fication. In general, the application of these methods was facilitated by my insider status which gave me familiarity with the language and concepts employed by research participants.

To identify meanings of gender as an intersectional and transnational structure, the study has used the three tools of CDA mentioned above, as serving different functions.

First, perspectivation of Self and Other presentations was employed to bring into focus the standpoint from which radical feminist narratives elaborated their critique to the governing of irregular migration, the cocontent of which had already been identified thanks to content oriented analysis. This step of analysis served to clarify the epistemic benefits and limits of radical feminist standpoints and their reading of the social functions of gender – in intersection with race – in the governing of irregular migration. Indeed, identifying the authors/speakers’ perspectives permitted me to specify the scope of situated radical feminist narratives.

Second, attention to radical feminist strategies of inclusion, exclusion, foregrounding, backgrounding, and suppression of social actors’ representation within and across the categories of gender and race served to explore the complexity of radical feminist structural analyses. Specifically, it brought into focus the relations of inequality that feminist narratives recognised and/or failed to identify, so as to discuss these narratives’ strengths and weaknesses in terms of structural analysis.

Third, identification of the spatial and temporal settings where social actors’ interactions take place in radical feminist narratives was employed to identify radical feminist uses of scales of analysis. In doing so, elements of methodological nationalism underpinning radical feminist narratives were brought to the surface. These findings are presented and discussed in conjunction with theories of inter-categorical intersectionality and feminist transnationalism in Chapters 6, 7, and 8.

Subsequently, to identify meanings of gender as an intersectional and transnational source of identification, the study used the following tools of discourse analysis as serving different functions. First, Narrative Analysis attention to actants as roles in a plot story served to bring into focus the main messages of radical feminist narratives, uncovering main assumptions and values of the texts considered. Second, the analytical categories proposed by methods of Self and Other presentation and Rep-
representation of Social Actors were used to identify the boundaries of the social groups represented in the texts analysed. In particular, identifying gendered and racial boundaries of the social groups served to understand, by inference, the concrete meaning that the categories of gender and race acquired in the narratives considered, according to the intra-categorical approach to intersectionality. Third, combining the findings of Narrative Analysis with those of Self and Other presentation and Representation of Social Actors served to clarify how radical feminist narratives justify the construction of group boundaries in accordance to their chief values.

Focusing on identifications of radical feminist subjectivities, this step of analysis served to clarify one main point of discussion: tensions between radical feminists’ social locations and their ethical values. This discussion is presented in Chapter 9, which elaborates on the disjuncture experienced by white radical feminist subjects between their own position of racial privilege and their anti-racist values and principles, and the implication of this disjuncture for their own sense of agency. Finally, triangulation of data allowed me to further deepen the analysis of implications of the radical feminist practices of identification recognised through discourse analysis.

To sum up, this section has presented and justified the chosen procedures to analyse and interpret the data gathered during the fieldwork phase. These procedures consisted in the contextualization of data, and the analysis of these data through content-oriented and linguistically oriented methods. The section has paid particular attention to clarify how the analysis findings were interpreted in conjunction with the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 2. In particular, it has clarified the functions of the methods of linguistic analysis employed in order to respond to the research questions informing the study. Given the problem-oriented character of CDA, identifying the linguistic categories relevant to operationalise the research questions has required a constant back and forth movement between theory and empirical data. Overall, the section has attempted also to guide the reader through this work indicating which specific chapters discuss the data analysis and interpretation.
3.5 Ethical considerations on power in scientific knowledge production

As the process of knowledge production is intimately linked to power, it requires critical awareness of the ways power relations shape social locations and the ways the resulting social locations influence knowledge claims. This recognition inevitably leads analysts to problematize the “social embeddedness” of both the researcher and research institutions (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 7). Confronting this problematique and making explicit my main motivations driving this study and discussing the tensions encountered in the process are important to generate insights on the character of power articulated during the process of knowledge construction itself.

These tensions refer to two main spheres: (1) the researcher’s location and positionality, and related consequences in terms of specific choices concerning the research epistemology, methodology, and theory; and (2) the institutional structures in which the researcher is located and the related effects on the construction of scientific knowledge as a social practice. Relying on these considerations, this section shows the significance of making “research interests and values explicit and their criteria as transparent as possible”, to the end of producing critical scientific knowledge, able to de-naturalise dominant discourses and unequal social arrangements (Wodak and Meyer 2009: 7).

To situate myself as researcher there is no better way than explaining the personal sense and meaning of this study, which derives from my direct involvement in radical feminist activism and some of the struggles here discussed. The viewpoint adopted in the context of this study, which discusses radical feminist perspectives on the governing of irregular migration, is definitely internal to this politics. The resulting partial overlapping of research subject and research object confers to this study a strong self-reflexive character and it has certainly numerous implications for designing, conducting, and writing this same work. The first and, perhaps, the most significant of these implications regards my motivation to conduct this study, which I take as an opportunity to reflect with some distance on what, in my experience, I found the most blurry and fuzzy aspects of this politics: the disjuncture I live between my own social position of racial privilege and my resistor positionality against racist structures. In the course of this investigation, I recognised that many
Research methodology and ethics

participants in the research shared similar concerns, but often with different shades. Thus, this work is intended to bring together these diverse and necessarily partial perspectives, not so much for elaborating precise answers, but for identifying sharper interrogations and required further work. As for any possible answers, there will be other times and spaces beyond the pages of the present study.

One main tension I experienced while designing, conducting, and writing this piece of research was related to my own social location as white woman, which defined my own critique to racism as developed from a position of privilege in unequal power relations. In response to such recognition, I decided to not discuss racism predominantly focusing on the suffering of people who are being subject to a bi-directional process of racialization, vertically through their relations with state institutions and their agents, and horizontally through relations with groups in society. This would have entailed to participate in reproducing the victimising representations, further naturalising their condition of victims. Instead, I tried to examine my own relation to political, social, and economic structures which have long victimised people subject to practices of racialisation. This research focus has been operationalised by analysing white radical feminist subjectivities in the struggles engaging the governing of irregular migration through various precautions. In particular, I set as an objective of my fieldwork to collect data that could make visible how “guilt, power imbalances, doubts, and fear” play out in constructing white radical feminist subjectivities (Wong 2017: online). Furthermore, I inserted in the research the perspectives of racialised subjects on white feminist political organising so as to bring to the fore the epistemic limitations of this latter standpoint. In sum, I tried to critically look at white radical feminist practices bringing to the fore their race-related contradictions.

Interestingly, during the editing of this work, I came to realise that the same contradictions I observed in white radical feminists’ narratives and identifications were present in my own writing too. In particular, I recognised a certain resistance on my side to consistently define as white the radical feminisms involved in the research, and I acknowledge a clear preference for defining social actors employing political categories – thus emphasising their positionality instead of posing political and racial categorization on the same level. Once I realised my own subconscious concealment of whiteness, I paid attention to the ‘underlying thoughts’
behind my writing choices. Specifically, I observed the subconscious association between the naming of whiteness and self-deprecation as if defining myself and other radical feminists as white would have implied diminishing my and others’ efforts to challenge and undermine racism. Acknowledging that this subconscious association was in direct contrast to the arguments developed in the study about the key relevance of countering the denial of whiteness as a position of privilege, I decided to revise the categories used to define the feminisms involved in the research and to acknowledge such revision as a necessary step to clarify the significance for whites to continuously question the forms and effects of their writing and activism instead of resting assured that anti-racist intentions and declarations constitute a safeguard against “the operations of white power” (Yancy 2008: 229).

Another tension I have confronted in the process of researching and writing concerned my own shifting identity as both research subject and object, which raised reflections around the concept of authorship. Specifically, I understood knowledge production as a necessarily collaborative and social activity, even if academic authorship is demanded and allocated in a strongly individualised mode (Nagar and Swarr 2010). To stress this point, I decided to maintain research participants’ anonymity as a way to reject an individualistic conceptualization of knowledge production. Besides, I emphasised that – precisely due to their social dimension – the narratives collaboratively constructed by radical feminist politics are not mere providers of information, but also generators of analyses and interpretations; indeed the collective confrontations embedded in the process of political organising allow activists to build a critical perspective by identifying commonalities of experience as systemic effects of power structures on social groups.

Furthermore, I accepted that writing a doctoral thesis is an individual activity that inevitably raises issues connected to the authority of the writer to represent others. Thus, the “theoretical absence and empirical presence” of research participants, who are commonly thought of as object of research rather than as subjects able to theorise, was tackled by emphasising continuities between theory and praxis, for example pointing out the practical needs addressed by the selected theoretical framework and the significance of feminist political organising for defining the types of theory that propel political actions (Nagar and Swarr 2012: 6, Alexander and Mohanty 2010: 26).
Additionally, a tension experienced in the process of investigating concerned my double role as researcher and activist, and its political and practical implications. Here, academia and social movements were not thought to be mutually antagonistic locations from which to produce knowledge, but neither was seen as free of contradictions (Leyva Solano 2010). Especially, I recognised that Feminist Studies and other fields of studies that emerged from radical social movements have often become a way to enhance individual academic careers more than to foster social justice projects, and a way to legitimize the current organization of universities as their marginal presence in study curricula has accorded legitimacy to academic institutions that pursue policies in open contradiction to the political agenda of many such fields (Mohanty 2013, Edufactory 2008).

In order to face these political challenges, I attempted to adopt different strategies that may facilitate the pursuance of socially relevant research. First, I decided to conduct this research in the context of the PhD programme in Development Studies at the International Institute of Social Studies, in The Hague, due to its attention to processes of social transformation in the Global South from a Global South perspective. Indeed, I believed that such attention could benefit this work, providing stimuli to provincialise Eurocentric perspectives (Chakrabarty 2009). Second, I decided to maintain the research design as open as possible to suggestions from the activists involved in this project so as to address collective interests in knowledge production. Third, I was committed to not make the time required to write this study be at the detriment of (1) my participation in group efforts to sustain the same project of transformation treated in this study, and (2) my reproductive labour as mother, the recognition of which is an important stake in feminist struggle. The outcome of such choice has been to lengthen the writing of this dissertation, yet this is believed to have given coherence to the work of scientific knowledge production as a social practice.

In this process, my insider status to the discursive field of radical feminisms presented both advantages and disadvantages. It especially offered me access to further sources, additional trust from my interviewees, and greater ability to understand and interpret data. Indeed, sharing with participants my personal and political reasons to conduct this study has served to create a political and ethical connection that made them especially open to discuss their experience as well as related contradictions.
and limitations. Yet, proximity to research participants also raised diverse challenges. For instance, it made difficult to effectively select the relevant information to introduce participants and their discourses to outsiders. It also made me over-cautious in raising critiques, especially given that differentials in age and experience between me and many research participants who appeared in my eyes as especially authoritative and influential. In general, comments from both other scholars and research participants have been especially precious to identify the strengths and weaknesses of my insider status and accordingly improve the study.

The last tension experienced related to the contextualization of this study within the current depoliticization of radical theory and antiracist feminist thought triggered by the convergence between postmodernism and neoliberalism (Mohanty 2013, Bilge, 2013, Mirowski 2013). As pointed out by diverse scholars, while postmodernism has argued for the “dismissal of systemic analysis of institutional processes as necessarily reductionist and totalling”, neoliberalism has tried to “disallow the salience of collective experience or redefine this experience as a commodity to be consumed” (Mohanty 2013: 967-969). As a result, postmodern production of representational analyses exclusively focused on “ruptures, fluidity, and discontinuities”, and neoliberal celebration of “difference without consequences” or “recognition without redistribution” have been problematized as leading to rearticulate radical theory in an “ever adaptive hegemony without altering [the] structure” of this hegemony.28 (Mohanty 2013: 983, Bilge 2013: 409). In response to these trends, the study’s contextualist version of Standpoint Theory has been used to address issues of oppression, appropriation and exploitation based on experiences of subordination and struggle with two precautions: first, remaining attentive to contexts so as to avoid overgeneralizations and

---

28 In particular, Bilge (2013: 407) develops her argument in relation to intersectionality and she states that “a depoliticised intersectionality is particularly useful to a neoliberalism that reframes all values as market values; identity-based radical politics are often turned into corporatised diversity and tools leveraged by dominant groups to attain various and ideological and institutional goals; a range of minority struggles are incorporated into a market driven and state sanctioned governmentality of diversity; diversity becomes a feature of neoliberal management, providing managerial precepts of good government and efficient business operations; knowledge of diversity can be presented as marketable expertise in understanding and deploying multiple forms of difference simultaneously”.
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forms of determinism; and second, adopting a multilevel approach in order to always connects issues of representation to power relations, practices, and structures. Overall, these provisions are believed sufficient to guarantee that this research participates in the production of critical theory.

In conclusion, paying attention to the working of power in scientific knowledge production contributed to clarify the meanings of the adjective “critical” to define the quality of the knowledge here produced. Specifically, this chapter defined this study as “critical” inasmuch it displays awareness about the working of power through language and representation unfolding in the phases of data collection, analysis, and interpretation as well as in the process of research designing, writing, and editing. As a result, the chapter showed that my accountability as researcher directly depends on my capacity for self-reflection to gain such awareness. Yet, it must be said that any critical effort in producing knowledge cannot escape to be felt somehow as “pointless” and “inadequate” when we live in a “world that sentences some to premature death” and that is not going to be easily transformed by our intellectual labour, as critical it might be (Ahmed 2017: online). Then, precisely “from the humility acquired from a sense of what we cannot do, we make do, […] use the tools we have, and […] sharpen them by analysing what is” there to be changed (Ahmed 2017: online).
Race, citizenship, and mobility in the history of the Italian nation state

4.1 Introduction

This chapter traces the historical development of Italian normative apparatuses regulating human mobility and access to citizenship as tools for identifying, racialising, and governing nationalised populations. To this purpose, it conducts two operations. First, the chapter examines human mobility and citizenship regulations in term of the distinctions they trace between national and non-national subjects as well as between regular and irregular forms of people’s movements. In doing so, it illuminates the role of these measures in identifying the Italian people as a population object of government. Second, the chapter contextualises the history of these legal distinctions against the backdrop of structural dynamics that have triggered processes of racialization of the Italian population. It thus makes visible processes of categorization of the Italian Self and/or the non-Italian Other as socially defined groups sharing supposedly fixed somatic and/or cultural characteristics linked to ancestry. The chapter emphasises the character of racialization as a phenomenon of longue durée that is fostered by the coexistence of multiple forms of racialization.

---

29 As indicated by Colette Guillaumin (1995) in order to bring into view distinct racial identity politics, processes of racialization may be both “hetero-referential” and “self-referential”. Hetero-referential processes point out the racialization of the Other as belonging to an inferior race, concealing the racialization of the Self (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013). Self-referential processes indicate the racialization of the Self as representative of a superior race. Such a distinction serves to clarify the double directionality of racializing processes (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013). Yet, these distinct forms of racialization “never appear in their pure form, but are always intertwined, permeated with particular exigencies and aims, and with the cultural and social structures that are entrenched” (Giuliani 2010: 126).
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people’s movements alongside the historical formation of the Italian state, and that has important effects on the subjectivation of citizens and in-migrants into today’s Italy.

The chapter provides an answer to the first research sub-question: how have legislative measures on human mobility and citizenship racialised the Italian national community since the foundation of the Italian nation state? It conducts a literature review promoting the reciprocal collaboration of Migration History, Migration Studies and Postcolonial Studies as these fields of inquiry have not been fully communicating. This review is organised in three main sections addressing citizenship and human mobility regulations during three chronological phases, each one mirroring a diverse institutional set-up of the Italian state. Section 4.2 treats the monarchic-liberal regime that began with the constitution of the Italian Reign in 1861 and ended with the arrival to power of fascism in 1922, reflecting on the nation-building process after the political and territorial unification of the country. Section 4.3 deals with the fascist regime coinciding with Mussolini’s governments from 1922 to 1943, discussing the centrality of the imperialist project for the construction of the Italian nation. Section 4.4 examines the republican regime that started in 1948 with the approval of a democratic constitution, engaging the key relevance of Italy’s Europeanization for the country’s nation building process. Finally, Section 4.5 concludes, illuminating continuities and ruptures in the racialization of the Italian nation.

4.2 Nation-building and racialization of Italians during the monarchic-liberal regime

In 1867, Massimo D’Azeglio – one of the founders of the Italian state – wrote: “Now that Italy has been made, it remains to make Italians”. This statement marks the beginning of the construction of the Italian “imagined community” following the political and territorial unification of the country in 1861. Since then this construction has entailed the formation of normative apparatuses which have contributed to identify Italians as a population object of government: (1) legislation on access to citizenship based on the ius sanguinis principle; (2) open measures on inward human mobility tempered by restrictions targeting the poor and subversives. This section elaborates on the interaction of these norms with transnational structural dynamics, giving attention to the effects of
such interaction on the construction of the racial boundaries of the national community. By contextualising each set of norms within key structural processes – (a) the Southern Question, (b) the Great Emigration; (c) Italy’s dependence on foreign investments; (d) reception of Italian emigrants in destination states; and (e) both direct and indirect Italian colonialism – the section illuminates the multiple processes of racialization that crossed and produced Italian identity during the monarchic liberal period of 1861-1922.

The lack of a neat and recognised national identity after the proclamation of the Italian state stems from a number of factors. One is Italy’s position as a Mediterranean country which was a historical crossroads over millennia, of many types of people from numerous corners of Europe, Asia and Africa; especially apparent in Southern Italy. Another key factor is the specific character of the construction of Italy as a modern nation, notably via conquest by the Piedmontese elite. Indeed, the Northern political class imposed its will to emancipate the country from its peripheral position in the European scenario after three centuries of political domination, economic downturn and cultural eclipse. The effects of this long lasting period of fragmentation during which Italians were internally divided according to multiple local and regional identities, and neither shared any common language nor unitary social and economic institutions, persisted also after Unification. Against this backdrop, the elites of the newly born state understood the South as well as rural and mountain areas in the Centre and the North as a sort of cultural, social, and political ‘foreign body’ within the nation. This view responded to their normative ideas of the nation, symbolised by the big urban centres that were growing in the Northern part of the country. In particular, it reflected the key features of the process of Italian nation building, which was centred on the enforcement of strong political and administrative centralism, for the modernization of the country (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013).

Within this context, the legal distinction between nationals and non-nationals was shaped by three legislative measures. (1) The Royal Decree on citizenship, approved in 1865, established that the attribution of Italian citizenship should follow the ius sanguinis principle and this was made to coincide with belonging to the national community. According to this norm, naturalization in a destination state should determine the loss of Italian citizenship. Simultaneously, foreigners’ naturalization in
the Italian state was made possible through discretionary concession by
Italian authorities or through marriage in the case of a foreign woman,
thus sanctioning the patrilineal transmission of citizenship. Then, the
naturalization of foreigners born in Italy combined the ius soli principle
with the ius domicilii of the father who should have had at least ten years
of residency in the country. (2) Law No 23 approved in 1901 relieved
from military duties Italian citizens residing abroad so as to resolve
possible contentions with their destination states and avoid the loss of
Italian citizenship. It also simplified the procedure to reacquire
citizenship for Italian descendants born abroad. (3) Law No 555, ratified
in 1912, reaffirmed the ius sanguinis principle and further facilitated the
re-acquisition of citizenship for descendants of Italian emigrants,
eliminatun the duty to reside in the country (Einaudi 2007, Tintori 2009:
744-751).

As explained in the fields of both Migration History and Postcolonial
Studies, this articulation of the criteria to access, or maintain, Italian
citizenship took shape in the context of the Southern Question and the
Great Emigration. Significantly, post-Unification Italian elites bet on the
economic-industrial growth of the Northern part of the country. This
economic strategy was funded with the extraction of resources from the
economy and agriculture of the South – already hit by the harnesses of
the Bourbon Regime – and it triggered the disastrous effects that go
under the label of Southern Question. As a result, the poor economic
conditions faced by the Italian population – especially the Southern
population – after Unification brought about cross-border movements
of millions of people – particularly towards the Americas. Against this
backdrop, Italian elites understood emigrants abroad as bridgeheads to
acquire new commercial end markets and attempted to manage outward
movements of people in expansionist terms, thus including within the
nation emigrants and their descendants as much as possible. In doing so,
they invented a modernizing destiny for the South of the country,

The expression 'Southern Question' was coined in the 1870s to indicate
the disastrous economic situation in the South of Italy. In general, it indicates
the perception of a difference between the South and the North of the country,
in which the North is considered to be ahead in the path towards progress and
civilization. The imposition of Piedmontese institutions and policies was not
peacefully accepted in the South and it sparked a war of brigandage – violently
repressed by the newly established state (Choate 2010).
through its export of labour power, that was believed to guarantee a substantial flow of remittances, while facilitating the emigrants’ social ascent in destination states like France, the USA and Argentina (Moe 2002, Capussotti 2012, Tintori 2006 and 2009).

Postcolonial scholars highlighted that this legislation on citizenship, while building indissoluble ties linking generations of emigrants to the homeland, made the Italian nation into a race (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013). Anchoring the ius sanguinis rule with a preference for Italian descendants, these measures grounded Italian nationality on a genealogical scheme, extending the boundaries of kinship to the national dimension (Balibar 1991). This “generational connection” was made possible by gendered regulatory mechanisms engaging the biological reproduction of the nation and sanctioning its patrilineal acquisition, hence modelling the idea of nation on the structure of the family and its “division of statuses for men and women” (Balibar 2011: 2-3). Then, the racial qualification of the Italian nation took shape in the frame of transnational representations of Italy as a backward and picturesque “border zone between Europe and the Others” (Moe 2002: 2-4). Responding to these representations, Italian elites projected on Southern Italians the racialising stereotypes of underdevelopment and savagery that, since the 18th century were commonly applied to the entire population of the Italian peninsula. In parallel, they also produced a civilising destiny for the North of Italy, moulded on the image of modern and imperial Europe. As a result, citizenship regulations and historical structural dynamics made the Italian nation ideologically into a race in itself, importantly characterised by the North/South racializing differentiation based on the modernity/backwardness dichotomy (Moe 2002, Capussotti 2012, Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013).

As illustrated by Migration History, measures regarding inward movements of people defined relevant criteria to include foreigners into the country, thus playing a key role in clarifying regular and irregular forms of cross-border human mobility. During the monarchical-liberal period, this legislation was characterised by a certain laissez-faire attitude, which granted to foreigners the same civil rights enjoyed by citizens. Yet, dispositions from the 1865 Civil Code and a public order law approved in 1869, established that foreigners could be rejected at borders only if they did not possess a valid identity document or if they were not considered to dispose of the appropriate means of living. Then, those
already in the country could be expelled in case of criminal conviction as a decision of the judiciary or if they were considered a danger to public order through an administrative sanction decided by the police. As a result, the Italian state's open approach to inward mobility was applied only to those considered to be actively contributing to the Italian social fabric, so as to exclude homeless, vagabonds, nomads, unemployed as well as anarchists and revolutionary socialists from the possibility to freely cross borders (Einaudi 2007, Tintori 2009).

Migration History research contextualised light regulation of inward cross-border movements of people to Italy in relation to two main factors. First, the limited presence of foreigners in the national community was considered unlikely to increase. Actually, this presence accounted to 81,000 people in 1911 and increased to 110,000 persons in 1921 only due to the territorial conquests that followed the First World War – and this over a population of 38 million. Second, foreigners’ consistent economic and financial weight in the national economy, notwithstanding their small numbers, played a primary role in influencing regulations on inward mobility. Indeed, since Unification, the Italian state had found itself depending upon richer European countries to import capital and technologies and many European entrepreneurs and highly professionalised technicians had moved into the country to manage their investments. This made the numerical presence of the main foreign communities depend on the state's political, military and financial alliances. It also translated in privileged relationships with those modern European states like Germany, Austria, the United Kingdom and France, investing in the country and developing its industrial sectors. In sum, regulations targeting inwards human mobility served to limit the presence of those classified as being non-productive, and to import capital and technological know-how (Einaudi 2007, Tintori 2009).

Although the Postcolonial literature that I have consulted does not explicitly discuss the role of legislation on inward movements in the racialization of the Italian nation, it still offers some elements to shed light on this process, regarding the nexus between modernization and racialization. Indeed, regulations on inwards human mobility defined the openness of the Italian community precisely in relation to processes of modernization interesting the Northern part of the country. Thus, conceptualising modernization as a factor enhancing the superiority of Italy’s population – as Postcolonial Studies do – may help to shed light
on the role of regulations targeting inwards human mobility in building the racial superiority of Italians. In this regard, Postcolonial scholars highlighted that policies fostering Italy's competition in the international capitalist economy as a modern nation state automatically aligned the country to the European imperialist project masked under the language of advancement, modernization and salvation. In this frame, modernising policies contributed to improve the racial stock of the country, transnationally “located at the frontiers of black and white races” (Petrovich Njegosh 2012: 14). Hence, the state's regulation of inward human mobility may be seen not only as a means to strengthen the national economy and guarantee social control, but also as tools enhancing the characterization of the Italian nation in terms of racial superiority.

In the project of the country’s elites, this superiority was configured as “unexpressed whiteness” since “the adjective white covered a secondary position in the definition of Italianness” over the whole monarchical-liberal period (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013: 21). Indeed, the racial identity of Italians predominantly emerged through a hetero-referential process, resulting from comparison of the Italian Self through contrast with the Southerners and colonized – explicitly associated to blackness (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013: 21-22). Significantly, this unexpressed white identity was verbalized in public discourses as “national belonging” and “civilization”, posing the Italian nation state in continuity with the Roman civilization, the Renaissance, and the medieval communes – all historical periods in which Italy played a leading role in Europe (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013: 36-37) As revealed by analysing regulations on inward mobility, defining Italian “forms of belonging and civilization” as “European” served to inscribe Italy within the process of European modernization (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013: 21-22). The resulting conception of Italian whiteness showed a combination of biological and historical determinism (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013: 21-22).

Notwithstanding this ideological whitening of Italians by the country’s elites, Italy’s racial characterization at the transnational level remained equivocal during the whole monarchical-liberal period with relevant effects. In the first place, this racial slippage importantly affected emigrants. For instance, in the United States, the US Congress Dillingham Commission advised against Italians’ arrival in 1911 on the
basis of racial arguments, i.e. the supposed Hamitic origin of Southern Italians, which made Italians “unfit” for the American society. In contrast, in Brazil, Italian presence was used as a means to civilise and whiten a racially mixed national group (Trento, 2005). These examples, together with Italian citizenship regulations, exemplifies the double position of Italians as being both racialised and racialisers (Petrovich Njegosh 2012, Luconi 2012). In the second place, racial ambiguity was present also in the Italian colonial experience during the monarchic-liberal period, which manifested in two geographical areas. In Eastern Africa, Italy proclaimed the Italian colony of Eritrea in 1890 but lost the Adwa battle in 1896 against the Ethiopian Empire, considered by historians as the “century’s worst defeat of any European power in Africa”, leading for the first and last time a Western country to pay war reparations to a non-European country (Labanca 2002, Choate, 2010: 6). Then, around the Mediterranean basin, the Italian Kingdom acquired three provinces, today parts of Libya, and occupied the Dodecanese Islands between 1911 and 1912. These colonial missions – between defeats and conquests – further confirmed the fluidity of the whiteness presented as intrinsic to the Italian race by the county’s elite (Petrovich Njegosh 2012).

In response to the ambiguous status of the Italian race, Italian elites manipulated national identity to present Italians as “good people”, incapable of violence and cruelty, and inclined to tolerate any form of diversity, even in the most tragic moments of the national history (Del Boca 2005). This construction was used to explain the Italian imperial defeat and to build the image of a unique Italian way to colonialism in two main ways. First, emigration was instrumentalised in public discourses to justify Italian colonial pretensions as the search for a vital demographic space for the Italian Kingdom. In this frame, the relation between emigration and colonialism functioned as a propagandistic device, connoting the Italian nation as a collectivity committed to a populist colonial project, directed to contain internal class conflicts even though almost none emigrated to Eritrea, Libya or even the Greek islands (Labanca 2002). Along this line, the country’s colonial expansion was publicly presented as a peaceful overseas export of labour power. Second, emigration in the Mediterranean was presented as a means to indirectly promote colonialism. For example, large Italian emigrant settlements in Tunisia were declared after the French colonization in
1881 as evidence of “the existence of an Italian colony, no matter the political leadership” (Choate 2007: 100). The demographic specificity of Italian colonialism allowed some to claim Italy’s imperial motives to be “more deserving and more sincere” in relation to other colonisers (Choate, 2010: 11).

In sum, during the first phase of Italian nation building, citizenship and human mobility regulations played a key role in constructing the boundaries of the Italian national community. In particular, they connected the idea of nation to that of a family of families – held together by blood and kinship relations – making of Italians a genealogical racialised community. Then, these regulations enabled operations of subtraction from and addition to the national body so as to exclude those subjects considered unnecessary or counter-productive to the country’s modernization, and to include Italian emigrants, their descendants and European investors needed to acquire the capital necessary to Italy’s development. In this context, racialising processes played as both symptom of the country’s delayed development and instrument of its advancement. In this regard, the emergence of the Southern Question in reaction to the industrialization of the Northern part of the country in the late 19th century and the construction of emigration and colonialism as vital necessities to emancipate the country well exemplify this trend. In this frame, the racialization of Italians was mainly realized through comparison with Southerners and the colonised and the whiteness of the national identity remained unexpressed. Then, the racial fluidity of the Italian nation at the transnational level characterized Italians as both racialised and racialisers, while also bringing about the myth of Italians as good people - still central in contemporary construction of Italian identity.

4.3 Imperialism and racialization of Italians during the fascist regime

“Now that the empire has been made, it remains to make imperialists” (Isneghi in Poidimani, 2009: 76). This expression, coined in a study on fascist culture in the 1930s, indicates how Mussolini’s regime attempted to shape Italian identity on the base of an aggressive imperialist stance. Here, it refers to the centrality of the imperialist project for the construction of the Italian nation that this section analyses through looking at the normative apparatuses that regulated citizenship and
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human mobility during the fascist regime. In particular, the section focuses on the following measures: (1) citizenship norms that tightened emigrants’ bonds with the homeland; (2) institutional and legal initiatives managing human mobility from above; (3) regulations restraining citizenship in Italian East Africa and Italy after the proclamation of the Italian Empire in 1936; and (4) measures limiting inwards movements to the country. Then, illuminating the interaction of these regulations with transnational structural dynamics, the section discusses the making of specific racial boundaries shaping the Italian national community with reference to: (a) continuation of large scale emigration; (b) imperialism and colonialism; (c) the Southern Question; (d) shortage of capital and abundance of labour power; and (d) urbanization. Overall, the section brings into focus multiple processes of racialization specific to the fascist period of 1922-1943/45.

The project of fascist imperialism took shape in relation to the territorial divisions sanctioned by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. This was understood as a humiliating “mutilated victory” to be countered by consolidating Italy’s position in its supposed legitimate areas of influence: the Balkans, the Mediterranean and Africa. First, Mussolini took an anti-Yugoslavian and anti-Greek position, leading to systematic interferences into the internal political matters of these regions, the occupation of Albania in 1939, the reinforcement of Italy’s position in the Dodecanese, and the aggression to Greece in 1940 (D’Annunzio in Labanca 2002). Second, the regime developed Italy’s Mediterranean politics along two fronts. Between 1928 and 1932, it fought the Libyan resistance with the extensive use of concentration camps, mustard gas and forced deportations up to the re-conquest of the Southern part of the country. In 1941 he organised a military aggression of Tunisia. Third, in East Africa, throughout the late 1920s, Mussolini reinforced its position in Eritrea and expanded its direct control on the internal and Northern part of Somalia. Besides, it also worked to destabilize the Somali-Ethiopian border up to the military occupation of Ethiopia in 1936 – again realised with massive use of mustard gas (Labanca 2002; Collotti and Klinkhammer 2005).

Against this backdrop, a first set of legal measures, engaging the distinction between national and non-nationals in relation to Italian emigrants, consisted of four reforms of the citizenship norms approved in 1912: (a) Law No 108, ratified in 1926, granted to Italian authorities
the power to deprive of citizenship anyone liable to commit actions – outside of Italian borders – considered detrimental to Italian interests or cause of public order turmoil; (b) Act No 1338, approved in 1927, established to further favour the reacquisition of citizenship for those naturalised abroad, fixing six months of residence as the only requirement to re-obtain citizenship; (c) Law No 517, sanctioned in 1935, made it possible for the government to grant Italian citizenship at its discretion for exceptional circumstances. (d) Royal Decree No 1728, approved in November 1938, stated that foreigners of Italian descent were not to be considered real foreigners (Tintori 2006 and 2009, Zincone and Basili 2013). Besides, these provisions were accompanied by a regime sanctioned programme for the “moral valorisation” of emigrants. This policy aimed at fuelling expatriates’ sense of national belonging and consisted in a series of initiatives such as the organization of Italian language teaching programmes abroad, the arrangement of emigrants’ travels to Italy to show the supposed successes of the fascist regime, and the launch of communication campaigns to counter the negative stereotypes targeting Italian communities (Trento 2005).

Overall, these measures functioned to tighten emigrants’ bonds with the homeland (Trento 2005, Tintori 2006 and 2009, Zincone and Basili, 2013).

As both historians and Postcolonial scholars explain, these dispositions took shape in a context of continuing large-scale emigration, imperialism, and Italy’s shortage of capital as a huge limitation to promote Italian expansion through imperialism. Thus, the fascist regime instrumentalised citizenship norms to “create a larger country extending far beyond its official borders” and treated outward movements as an essential means of Italy’s expansion (Derobertis 2013: 64). It used emigrants not only as a means of commercial and cultural penetration, but also as a lever in its external policy so as to influence foreign public opinion in favour of Rome. In other words, overcoming the political agenda established in the monarchic-liberal age, Mussolini claimed the necessity of protecting emigrants in destination countries, and imagined a political role for these groups. This programme was not without results. For example, after Italy’s military intervention in Ethiopia, many Italian emigrants in the US mobilised to support the fascist regime. In short, the regime used citizenship regulations to reproduce the fascist features of the imagined national community outside of the territory,
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making Italian expatriates into fascist colonies ready to be mobilised in defence of Italian interests (Tintori 2006 and 2009; Zincone and Basili 2013).

In terms of racialization, Postcolonial literature highlights that the tightening of emigrants’ bonds with the homeland contributed to strengthen preferences for Italian descendants in regard to the acquisition of citizenship and thus reinforced racialising constructions of Italianess as an hereditary quality. Besides, this legislation confronted the racial ambiguity characterising the Italian population by attempting to both homogenise the Italian people, overcoming internal differences, and elevate its status, challenging representations of the poor Italian emigrant rejected at the borders of powerful states (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013). For instance, Italian language teaching programmes clearly aimed at overcoming national internal divisions and regionalism by discouraging the use of dialects (Trento, 2005). Another example regards changes and innovations in the regime’s institutional language, such as the replacement of the Emigration Commission with an Italians Abroad Head Office in 1927, which intended to confer national prestige to outward movements (Derobertis 2013). This moral re-evaluation of emigration framed Italianness in terms of Mediterranean identity, in contrast with the European approach characterising the monarchic-liberal period.

A second kind of legislative measures, concerning the distinction between regular and irregular forms of mobility, were provisions directed at managing people’s movements from above, redirecting them towards reclaimed swamplands throughout the country and overseas Italian colonies. For this purpose, a Commission for Internal Migration and Colonization was created in 1931. Through this and other structures, the regime established an organised control over internal mobility, relocating people within the national territory as part of a swampland reclamation project. Specifically, Law No 358 established in 1931 limits to the internal movements of workers and their families from a province to another and Law No 1092 extended in 1938 previous limitations to any type of mobility within a same province and directed to the cities. Besides, fascist governments attempted to limit departures abroad, circulating internal memos in response to the limits posed by foreign countries as in the case of US quota entered into effect at the beginning of the 1920s. After the proclamation of the Empire in 1936, the regime
began boosting outwards movements towards Italian East Africa and Libya. By doing so, the regime established a continuity between internal and outward human mobility and imperialism (Gaspari 2001, Labanca 2002, Trento 2005, Fiore 2013).

Migration History and Postcolonial scholarship showed that this attempt importantly related to the regime’s imperialist project. Efforts to manage internal mobility were connected to the fascist pro-natalist and pro-ruralist project and its conception of national power as connected to the country’s demographic dimension as a factor determining the political and military weight of the nation. Thus, the regime fought urbanism as a cause of reduction of the national birth rate, while also using provisions limiting internal mobility to safeguard the economic stability of the richest areas of the country – where internal people’s movements were directed – and to assure a more effective social control – something difficult to implement in highly populated industrialised areas (Derobertis 2013, Breschi 2007). Besides, the regime sought to reduce outward mobility to distance Italians from emigration – considered to be a condition applying to underdeveloped countries and in contrast with the country’s imperialistic aspirations. When the migratory phenomenon actually downscaled, the regime propagandistically claimed the exclusive merit of a drastic reduction of expatriates although this trend was mainly an effect of measures of border closures enforced by destination states and the 1929 crises. In doing so, it exalted the increased possibilities of employment that it stated to have created in Italy and the colonies. In sum, the management of human mobility from above mainly served as a propagandistic device, symbolising national strength.

As emphasized by Postcolonial Studies, these regulations played a significant function in regard to the racialization of the national community, symbolically overturning Southern Italians’ representations. The valorisation and celebration of rural life contained in pro-natalist and pro-ruralist measures worked to include within the national community peasant models of life that were mainly dominant, at that time, in the South of the country (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013). Similarly, regulations redirecting mass outwards movements aimed at transforming “poor emigrants into landowners and colonisers”, thus whitening the picture of what had been Italy’s internal racialised Other (Derobertis 2013: 64, Gaspari 2001, Labanca 2002, Trento 2005, Fiore
As a result, the racialization of Italians – until the proclamation of the Empire in 1936 – did not promote ideals of racial superiority founded on European modernity, but on Mediterraneity and traditions. Specifically, this superior and whitened Mediterranean identity claimed a direct connection to the ancient Roman empire, presenting the Italian nation as a centre to irradiate a new universal civilization like Rome did in the past (Labanca 2002, Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013). Again, Italian whiteness remained unexpressed in terms of phenotypes and it was constructed through ideas of historical and cultural superiority. In this sense, the governing of human mobility participated in shifting the racialization of the national community in comparison to the monarchic-liberal period and – as discussed below – anticipated the changes in racial politics later brought about by the regime (Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013).

Thirdly, another set of citizenship provisions addressed the classification of national and non-national subjects after the regime’s declaration of Empire. These were four regulations disciplining citizenship in Italian East Africa addressed the juridical status of mestizos: (1) Law No 999 intervened in 1933 to regulate the status of mixed race children of unknown parents and established phenotypic and cultural criteria for the concession of citizenship; (2) Royal Decree No 1019 approved in 1936 assigned the status of subjects to all Italian East Africa inhabitants who were not Italian citizens or citizens of other European states, thus negating to all mestizos the possibility to acquire citizenship; (3) Royal Law Decree No 880 approached the condition of mestizos in 1937, targeting interracial sex and punishing with reclusion from one to five years any Italian citizen engaging in conjugal relations with Italian East Africa subjects; (4) Law No 882 explicitly forbade in 1940 the Italian father to recognise mestizo children and provide for their living, imposing the condition of subjects to children born in mixed unions (Del Boca 2005, De Donno 2006, Zincone and Basili 2013, Luconi 2012). Also two citizenship regulations targeted Jews in Italy within the frame of racial laws: (1) Royal Decree No 1381, ratified in September 1938, introduced special regulations towards foreign Jews, revoked the acquisition of Italian citizenship by Jews obtained after 1919, and prescribed that Jews settled in Italy after 1919 had to leave the national territory within six months; (2) the already mentioned Royal Decree No 1728, approved in November 1938, forbade mixed marriages
(Del Boca, 2005, De Donno 2006, Zincone and Basili 2013 Luconi 2012). Finally, there was one opening measure: (1) Royal Decree No 70 established special Italian citizenship for the Muslim population in 1937, later reconfirmed in 1939 (De Donno 2006).

As explained by Migration History, all these dispositions functioned as instruments of fascist imperialism. First, restraining citizenship measures in Italian East Africa responded to the project of demographic colonialism, imposing segregation in the colonies between colonisers and colonized as a means for redirecting outwards people’s movements towards Italian colonies. Indeed, the regime believed that if male colonizers had the possibility to sexually and emotionally engage with colonized women they would have not brought their families to the colonies, thus undermining the fascist demographic project (Pes 2013). In particular, targeting interracial sex, these dispositions showed the relevance of gender and biological reproduction to the construction of the racialised body of the nation. Second, citizenship measures targeting Jews in Italy and opening to Muslims in Libya were instrumental to the anti-British leaning of the fascist geopolitical agenda. In particular, the regime countered the British project of backing the emergence of a Zionist state in Palestine and expanding in the Mediterranean area, to protest against British support to international sanctions against Italy for the invasion of Ethiopia in 1936 (De Donno, 2006).

Against this backdrop, Postcolonial Studies has stressed that post-1936 citizenship politics defined, for the first time, Italian racial identity not only through contrast with its Others, but also through ideas of homogeneity and purity – leading to the affirmation of Italian superiority not only towards certain groups (e.g. the colonised) but to all human groups other than the Aryans, thus configuring an auto-referential process of racialization. In this frame, the regime considered highly problematic the figure of mestizos insofar it contradicted the colonial dichotomy between colonisers and colonised, making the boundary separating the two more permeable and uncertain. Then, these citizenship norms functioned to homogenise the national body, externalising the racialising stereotypes targeting Southern Italian population and applying them instead to the colonised (Labanca 2002, Poidimani 2009). Besides, these regulations also sanctioned the extraneousness of Jews to the Italian nation and stated the conception of an Italian 'race' standing in itself and unified by a common national
ancestry. Interestingly, all these provisions organised the “defence of the Italian race”, intertwining racial and sexual norms for identifying the Italian Self and sanctioning its superiority. In sum, human mobility and citizenship regulations laid the base to legitimise racial cleansing as an expression of racial solidarity (Del Boca 2005, Poidimani 2009, Zincone and Basili 2013, Petrovich Njegosh 2012, Luconi 2012, Guillian and Lombardi-Diop 2013).

Finally, norms disciplining inward movements to the country represented one more set of human mobility norms contributing to define the Italian nation. Specifically, while confirming previous norms conditioning foreigners’ entrance into the country according to their means of living and public order issues, the regime introduced four novel measures imposing several restrictions to foreign presence: (1) the 1926 Text on Public Security included provisions to control foreigners and political dissidents; (2) Law No 146 published in 1931 introduced a visa obligation to enter into the country and the duty to notify one's arrival and place of residence to public authorities within 72 hours after crossing the frontier; this same legal initiative established that any foreigner committing a crime or disturbing public order could be expelled following a decision of the Minister of Internal Affairs; (3) racial laws introduced in 1938 forbade foreign Jews to enter the country; and (4) administrative implementing regulations approved in 1942 introduced an obligatory permit of residence (Einaudi 2007, Tintori 2009).

As highlighted by Migration History scholarship, norms regulating inwards people’s movements constituted another important instrument to pursue the fascist imperialist project. In the context of a totalitarian regime and international conflicts, fascist governments introduced several restrictions to foreign presence in the country as measures of public security. However, Migration History also showed that regulations on inwards human mobility functioned not only as instruments to guarantee foreigners' adhesion to the regime, but also as tools establishing the country's approach to foreign investments. In particular, economic protectionist policies inaugurated by the regime after the 1929 crises and the nationalization of foreign investments in 1935 explain the increasing tightening of Italian borders also to a wealthy foreign population composed of businessmen, rentiers, and tourists. Besides, the regime showed an increased hostility towards Roma peoples, who were denied entrance into the country for reasons related to public security.
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and hygiene as well as dangerous life habits, thus closing to those individuals who were considered to not be actively contributing to Italian society – in continuity with the monarchic liberal period (Einaudi 2007, Tintori 2009).

Importantly, these observations developed in the field of Migration History have shown that the openness of the national community was strictly linked to instrumental economic logics. Interestingly, these economic rationalities may be taken as indicative of the specific strategies of modernization undertaken by the regime and their underpinning racializing effects. In particular, observing changing approaches to the presence of wealthy European foreigners, especially Anglo-Saxon, brings into focus how the production of the Italian race took shape not only against internal Others as Roma populations, but also against “the plutocratic and reactionary democracies of the West” (Mussolini in Feinstein 2003: 320). In this sense, regulations on inward movements enable to grasp that the fascist construction of a “pure Italian race” – as it was called in the Manifesto of Race that was published in 1938 and signed by ten Italian scientists – reversed the dominant hierarchy between Northern and Mediterranean or Latin European 'races' and defined Italians as “white and simultaneously different in respect to both Africans and white Anglo-Saxons” (Petrovich Njegosh 2012: 25).

In synthesis, during the fascist period, legislation on citizenship and human mobility reinforced the idea of the Italian nation as a family of families. These measures made of Italians a distinct community grounded in blood ties and engaged in asserting its supremacy in the international scene, strictly bounding the national body within and beyond the Italian territory. Again, these regulations enabled to both include and exclude various social groups within the national community: they provided for inserting the South of the country within the national family, whereas they organised the expulsion of political opponents, Roma groups, colonised, mestizos and Jews. In contrast to the monarchic-liberal period, the fascist way to development, founded on the combination of modern strategies and pre-modern traditions, reframed Italianness in terms of Mediterraneity and broke with liberal aspirations to a European model of modernization. Against this backdrop, citizenship and human mobility regulations accentuated the distinct racial character of Italianess both through hetero-referential and auto-referential racism. In particular, processes of racialization reflected
the aggressive imperialist stance of the fascist regime, providing not only for its justification, but also as concrete instruments for its realization. In relation to this latter point, the regime's attempt to strengthen the demographic weight of Italians, combined with the classification of its population as a race standing for itself, clearly shows the ways in which fascism saw the assertion of the Italian nation on the international scene as depending on its racialization.

4.4 Europeanization and racialization of Italians during the republican regime

“Now that Europe has been made, it remains to make Europeans”. In recent years, many commentators paraphrased Massimo D'Azeglio to suggest the need to strengthen a European sense of belonging among Italian citizens. Here, this statement symbolises instead the key relevance of Italy's participation to European politics for its nation building process that this section explores by presenting the normative apparatuses regulating citizenship and human mobility during the republican regime since 1945. Specifically, it focuses on: (1) agreements with European countries to manage from above Italian outward movements during the 1950s and 1960s; (2) enforcement of fascist limitations to internal mobility during the 1950s and 1960s; (3) enforcement of fascist limitations to inwards movements up to the mid-1980s; (4) securitising legislation on inwards human mobility in the frame of the EU since the 1990s; (5) legislation on access to citizenship confirming the ius sanguinis principle and preference for Italian descendants in the 1990s. Afterwards, the section discusses the interaction of these norms with transnational structural dynamics, focusing on the effects of such interaction for constructing the racial boundaries of the nation. To this end, it contextualises each set of norms within key structural processes: (a) continuation of outwards movements during the 1950s and 1960s; (b) mass internal mobility during the 1950s and 1960s; (c) large scale inwards movements since the 1980s; (d) Europeanization; (e) the Southern Question. Overall, the section illuminates heterogeneous processes of racialization influencing the Italian identity during the republican period of 1945-present day.
The origins of Italy's Europeanization are located in the post-war period, when declarations about the superiority of European values were coupled with a pragmatist approach emphasising the benefits that Europe might have brought to the Italian state. In particular, the Christian Democrats – who uninterruptedly governed Italy from the ratification of the Republican constitution in 1948 till the beginning of the 1990s – sustained Italy's integration in Europe along three main lines. First, they presented Europe as Italy's “new home”, thus escaping from the disastrous effects triggered by nationalism during the two world wars. Second, they resorted to Europe as an ethical option in foreign policy to escape the dangers of the Cold War's bipolar antagonism. Finally, Christian Democrats fostered the idea of Europe as Italy's best chance for development, conceived as an instrument to support both the country's modernization and economic growth as well as its political stability. Besides, even with the resurgence of nationalism in the 1990s as a reaction to the end of the Cold War and the beginning of neoliberal globalization, the Italian political agenda continued being conceptualised as “enriched and enhanced by [its] participation in the European project” (Ramerò 1995, Thomassen and Forlenza 2011: 712).

A first set of norms here considered are bilateral agreements concluded by Italian governments mostly with European states, which provided for the institutional organization of outwards human mobility and its negotiation in the international sphere. Main bilateral agreements were: (1) the 1947 Italy-France agreement that organised the arrival in France of 200,000 Italian workers to work in French coal mines; (2) the 1948 Italy-Switzerland agreement which regulated the already ongoing process of Italian emigration, attempting to prevent permanent stay; (3) the 1946 agreement between Italy and Belgium which initially planned the temporary stay of 50,000 Italians in Belgium – a number that substantially increased in the following years; (4) partial agreements between the UK and Italy, each one regulating a specific work sector after 1946; (5) the 1946 Italy-Czechoslovakia agreement establishing the arrival of 100,000 Italian workers in the latter; (6) the 1955 agreement between Italy and the German Federal Republic establishing that the
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31 The historical origin of “European values” is located by some authors in the 1648 Westphalia Treaty, which established the modern state system and articulated the concept of territorial sovereignty, and in the Kantian notion of Perpetual Peace.
latter would periodically decide the number of Italian workers to accept in the country after evaluating concrete needs (Colucci 2008).

As migration historians explain, these agreements took shape in the context of Italy’s instrumental use of outwards people’s movements to support the country’s modernization. In fact, since the end of the second world war and up to the 1970s, Italian emigration restarted once again in the wake of the country’s historical discrepancy between an intense demographic development and a relative scarcity of capitals. In this timeframe, outwards movements were mainly directed towards European but also transoceanic destinations, and they were framed by post-war governments as a “vital necessity” for the country in order to mitigate the effects of massive unemployment, control social tensions, equilibrate Italy’s balance of payments through receipt of remittances from abroad, and identify a solution to the enduring Southern Question (Rumor in Romero 2001: 402). Not by chance, the Italian South was the main provider of exportable workforce, at least since the 1950s. Such an instrumental approach was made possible by the Christian Democrat political leadership, which exchanged workers with raw materials so as to meet North-Western European countries’ need of labour power to launch the post-war reconstruction (Romero 2001; Tintori 2009).

The political instrumentalization of emigration to resolve specific internal economic, political and social issues gave rise to diverse processes of racialization. The Italian state’s intention to make its labour power attractive and competitive on the international labour market brought about the characterisation of Italian emigrants as flexible, non-conflictual and highly exploitable. In the absence of any social guarantee, the Italian workforce remained marginalised in receiving societies during the first decades of the republican period, confirming Italy’s history as European internal Other. Yet, with the country’s integration in Europe and the arrival of new in-migrant groups, the theories on the Hamitic origins of Italians seemed to be relegated to the past. Italian emigrants thus positioned within reception societies as an in-between group in the midst of native citizens and ex-colonised or non-Western immigrants. For example, Italians in Belgium and France were located between natives and North-Africans, in Germany between natives and Turkish, and in the US between the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant population and African Americans. In this framework, Italian communities abroad, aspiring to climb the social ladder and escape any comparison with
groups from the lower strata, often entered into conflicts with the latter. In this manner, the results of Italy's Europeanisation reproduced once again the positioning of Italians in the transnational space as both racialised and racialisers (Colucci 2008, Sanfilippo 2011, Romero 2001).

Secondly, another type of legislative measure, concerning regular and irregular forms of human mobility, proved its relevance during the republican period: fascist provisions on internal mobility. Notwithstanding the fact that the 1948 Constitution sanctioned the right to move freely throughout the country, fascist limitations to mobility remained in force until their abrogation in 1961. These regulations targeted internal large scale human mobility from rural to urban areas and from the South to the North, which mainly took place between the 1950s and 1960s. These internal movements responded to the so called “Italian economic miracle” and resulted from a high productive increment in Northern industries, which was directly connected to the low costs of the labour force and the increased export possibilities derived from Italy's participation in the European Common Market which began in 1957. In this context, fascist legal limitations to internal mobility made labour prices even cheaper: connecting legal waged work to residence requirements, they made internal migration illegal and maintained internal migrants in a clandestine and precarious condition, characterised by high levels of exploitation. As a result, their cheap labour contributed to fuel the industrial development of the North, which assumed again the role of national representative of European modernity and intensified the racialization of Southern migrants as backward and irrational (Alasia and Montaldi 2010). Postcolonial Studies pointed out that the country's development went on to differentially include the South in the North – mirroring, in a way, the role attributed by Italian political elites to Europe itself (Capussotti 2012, Mezzadra 2013).

A third kind of legislative measure, on regular and irregular mobility, became central during the republican period: measures on inward people's movements. Since the end of WWII to the mid-1980s, the Italian state left in force fascist security norms on the matter, but granting to foreigners the same civil rights enjoyed by citizens – a principle already in force during the monarchic-liberal period that was however derogated in 1942. Plus, three new legislative measures were approved to limit competition among national and non-national
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labourers, which were only abrogated in the 1980s, after the Italian state signed the 1975 international convention on the parity of treatment between nationals and foreigners. (1) Law No 25 approved in 1948 confirmed that foreigners could be expelled in case of insufficient or illicit means of living; (2) Law No 264 emanated in 1949 foresaw parity of treatment between foreigners and Italians, but establishing priority for the latter in case of job assignments except in case of Italian descendants and foreigners married to an Italian citizen; (3) Circular No 51 from the Labour Ministry, dated 4th of December 1963, established that foreigners' authorization to work – obligatory for issue of a residence permit – was subordinated to the verification that no Italian worker was available and suitable to cover the job place offered to the foreigner (Einaudi 2007).

These measures mostly responded to a context with limited movements into Italy due to the general economic downturn and the oversupply of labour force in the country. In fact, in the years following WWII, foreign presence in Italy reached its lowest levels with only 47,000 individuals registered in 1951. Then, throughout the 1960s, the first symptoms of emerging inward people’s movements manifested in response to the economic growth of the country, mainly involving three groups of migrants: (1) foreigner students, comprising young Ethiopian and Somali intellectuals; (2) foreign women working as housekeepers, including Eritrean women following “returning Italian families to Italy to continue employment in the domestic service” and women from Catholic countries such as the Philippines and Capo Verde where the Church acted as recruiter; (3) Tunisian seasonal labourers in Sicily working in the fishing sector. Subsequently, during the 1970s, the Italian state experienced a reversal in the traditional patterns of human mobility characterising the country's history, becoming a promising destination and reducing outward movements. The consolidation of Italy as a growing economy marked by demographic decrease and with an augmented labour demand met increasing migrants’ pressure from Eastern Europe and the Global South, causing a steady increase of foreign presence in the country during the following decades (Mezzadra 2010, Merrill 2011).

Since the mid-1980s, five main legislative measures were approved to regulate inwards movements to the country: (1) Law No 934 approved in 1986 regulated foreigners’ rights in terms of access to health services and
family reunion, it ruled on the employment of foreigners, and started a legalization program to regulate the situation of those migrants living in the country; (2) Law No 39 emanated in 1990, the so-called Martelli Act, defined the refugee status, introduced measures to fight irregular migration, fixed parameters for expulsion, and linked the possibility to be entitled to a residence permit to the applicant’s occupational situation; (3) the 1998 Turco-Napolitano law, which set, among other provisions, more demanding requirements to regulate the relationship between employers and workers as well as new norms for expulsions, including the institutionalization of administrative detention centres; (4) the Bossi-Fini law passed in 2002, which amended the previous legislation in a restrictive sense and, among other novelties, made tighter the connection between work and residence permit establishing that only foreigners already in possession of a work contract can enter the country; (5) the 2008 and 2009 Security Packages, which increased the number of conditions that migrants have to accomplish to regularise their situation, and introduced the crime of “illegal entrance or stay” inside the Italian territory. Overall, these measures have moved from addressing inwards human mobility as a labour related issue to treating the phenomenon as a security matter (Grappi 2010).

This articulation of regulations on inward human mobility importantly responded to Italy’s participation in the European Community and the subsequent European Union. The removal of European internal border controls following the Schengen Agreement has implied both the strengthening of controls over people’s movement at the common external border and the reconfiguring of de-territorialised controls throughout the continent and beyond. As anticipated in Chapter 1, the abolition of internal border checks, giving new emphasis to possible security risk, has worked to conflate crime, terrorism and migratory movements. In parallel, the liberalization of state control over private business initiatives has enabled maintenance of an instrumental economic approach to inward movements favouring the entrance of high skilled workers for the advantage of business companies (Bigo 2012, Atger 2008, Rizzitelli 2012). Not by chance, in Italy, the most
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Decision shift in the state's regulation of inward movements towards the securitization of the phenomenon, was introduced after the implementation of the European Schengen border regime in 1995 and Italy's entrance in the Schengen system in 1997 (Grappi 2010). Overall, these provisions have worked to limit freedom of movement to and across Italy in a very selective direction: this is exclusively granted to EU nationals within Schengen, whereas non-national and non-Schengen are placed under diverse types of arrangements which restrict their movement and choice in the labour market to lower-skills occupations in the services and the agricultural sectors (Truong 2012).

As a result, the selective nature of the present governing of migration into Italy and Europe directs its limitations specifically to that segment of the world population that proceeds from the Global South without belonging to the global elite. These individuals, once illegally in the Italian territory, are pressured to accept the most precarious, demanding, dangerous, low paid, and socially stigmatized jobs, creating a cheap and highly exploitable labour force to serve flexible labour demands in the Italian economy (Merrill 2011, Grappi 2012). As commented by both Migration Studies and Postcolonial Studies, these restrictions, targeting exactly those people coming from the same geographical areas where European states have a lengthy history of “direct or indirect colonialism, missionization, international trade and investment”, contribute to reactivate colonial processes of racialization in the present (Merrill 2011: 1152). In the case of in-migration from Eastern and Central Europe, other racialising processes are activated, especially anti-Roma stereotypes and forms of labour racialization based on the association between particular cultural or national groups and specific jobs, e.g. “Ukrainian caretakers” or “Eastern construction workers” (Merrill 2011, UniNomade 2011). These racialising processes work to normalize the social, economic and political subordination of migrants from former peripheries and former socialist countries within contemporary Italian society as well as the legal and administrative practices at the roots of migrants' illegality (Merrill 2011, De Genova 2012b).

This ideological production of an insurmountable racial divide between white Europeans and racialised migrants from the Global South and Eastern and Central Europe is hardly presented as such in the raceless semantic field of the contemporary governing of cross-border human mobility (Al Tayeb 2011, Mellino 2013). One example of this...
COLOUR-BLIND APPROACH IS PROVIDED BY THE SO-CALLED LANGUE DE COTON EMPLOYED BY THE EU TO MIGRATION. THIS DIPLOMATICAL LANGUAGE, REQUIRING THE INTERPRETATION OF DOUBLE-MEANINGS AND UNDERSTATEMENTS, EMPLOYS APPARENTLY NEUTRAL BUZZWORDS LIKE “CHALLENGE”, “OPPORTUNITY”, “MANAGEMENT” OR “EMERGENCY”, AND SUPPRESSES ANY DISCUSSION ON THE ROOT CAUSES OF MIGRATORY MOVEMENTS, OCCULTING A NUMBER OF PROCESSES, SUCH AS THE RESTRUCTURING OF LOCAL MARKETS IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH WITH LOW WAGES AND HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATES AS A RESULT OF MANY FORCES (RIZZITELLI 2012, KAPUR 2010). ANOTHER EXAMPLE IS OFFERED BY THE ITALIAN-LIBYAN FRIENDSHIP TREATY, SIGNED IN 2008 AND RENEWED IN 2012 WITH THE POST-GADDAFI LIBYAN REGIME. ACCORDING TO THIS AGREEMENT, ITALY PLACED SIDE BY SIDE COMPENSATIONS FOR ITS COLONIAL PAST WITH ACCORDS TO OUTSOURCE TO THE LIBYAN STATE THE PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF IRREGULAR MIGRATION. YET, IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE FRIENDSHIP TREATY, “ITALY PAYS 5 BILLION EURO TO LIBYA AS COMPENSATION FOR THE CRIMES COMMITTED IN 30 YEARS OF PRESENCE IN LIBYA AND FOR THE 100,000 DEATHS CAUSED, BUT IT DOES NOT MAKE ANY REFERENCE TO THESE CRIMES” EITHER IN THE TEXT OF THE AGREEMENT OR IN PUBLIC DISCOURSES, CONFIRMING THE ABSENCE OF ANY DECOLONIZATION OF ITS NATIONAL MEMORY.
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33 See the following declaration on the treaty by the historian Angelo del Boca: http://ricerca.repubblica.it/repubblica/archivio/repubblica/2009/03/03/solo-soldi-la-memoria-non-entra.html
“constructing roads and waterworks” while “mixing with indigenous populations without superiority complexes”, has discursively negated colonial anti-black racism (Patriarca 2016: 33). Public reflections and cultural productions on racism after WWII and during the 1950s and 1960s mainly referred to anti-Semitism, with limited allusions to the cases of the US and South Africa (Patriarca 2016). The myth of Italians as good people also functioned to systematically reduce or negate white Italian responsibilities when racism was acknowledged: for example, Italy’s involvement in anti-Semitic persecution was minimised through comparisons with Nazi Germany; similarly, Italians’ self-absolution for the racism experienced by “the sons and daughters of the war” – the first black Italians born on Italian territory from Italian white women and black allied soldiers – was realized through comparisons with racism in the US and the imperialist war in Vietnam (Patriarca 2016, Perilli 2016). As a result, the effects of diverse forms of racism and the racial privileges associated to Italianness have been concealed or minimised.

Finally, one last set of norms contributed in defining the Italian nation during the republican period: citizenship regulations. These dispositions continued to express – with few modifications – the ethos of the liberal period, sanctioning the persistence of the ius sanguinis principle. Main novelties have been: (1) two judgements by the Constitutional Court in regard to the constitutional gender equality principle that in 1975 recognised to Italian “women married to a citizen of another country [...] the right to retain their nationality” and in 1983 “established the right for married women to transfer their nationality both to their children and to their foreign husband” (Zincone, 2010: 22). (2) Law No 91 passed in 1992 introduced new restrictions to the process of naturalization. Indeed, according to this measure, foreigners’ children born in Italy could obtain Italian citizenship only on demand and according to what has been defined ’deferred ius soli’ – that is the requirement of uninterrupted residency in Italy since birth to the achievement of the legal age. Also in relation to the naturalization of residence, the times requested have been doubled – from five to ten years – and the procedure remains discretionary. One point only is less restrictive in this later provision, that is access to citizenship through iure conubii, according to which foreigners can ask citizenship after six months of marriage. Besides, this same measure has maintained a positive discrimination for Italian descendants, attributing a key role to
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Italian communities abroad as an instrument for internationalising Italian small and medium enterprises. (3) Law No 459 approved in 2001 reinforced the preferential treatment of Italian descendants granting them the possibility to vote from abroad in parliamentary elections (Tintori 2009, Colucci 2008).

Remarkably, these regulations facilitating the acquisition of citizenship through Italian ancestry have been reinforced even in recent years, when Italy had already become a country of large scale immigration. In particular, nationalistic ideas that expatriates or their descendants would return enriching the economic sector of the country and beliefs that the 'diaspora' mostly included people still culturally close to their land of origin have favoured Italian racial identity and European belonging as a base to access nationality and exercise political rights (Zincone and Caponio 2006). As a consequence, today in the country, there are at least one million Italians without citizenship rights, which comprise youth born in Italy from non-EU parents and youth arrived to Italy during the first years of their life. Besides, non-EU long-term residents continue being excluded also from participating in local elections (Zincone 2010). Interestingly, recent claims to reform citizenship norms have produced polarised debates and strong resistance to change: not by chance, the bill proposal discussed in Parliament in 2015, which suggested the reform of the ius sanguinis principle in favour of mitigated forms of ius soli and ius culturae, was not approved (Petrovich Njegosh 2016).

Postcolonial research has highlighted how citizenship policies combining familism with the historically asymmetric treatment of Italian emigrants and their descendants do not simply racialise the Italian national community, but they also make mixed-race individuals invisible. In other words, current legislation is seen as concealing racial miscegenation as the latter “calls into question the supposed mutual exclusivity between the categories of Italianess and blackness” (Petrovich Njegosh 2016: 221). Indeed, if the white and black categories only exist thanks to “the interdiction of miscegenation”, then they are clearly “destabilised by the transgression of such interdiction” (Petrovich Njegosh 2016: 219). Against the backdrop of Italians’ racial ambiguity, the concealment of mixed race individuals conduces to make the racial boundaries of the Italian nation less porous and unstable. Interestingly, the relation between citizenship and the category of ‘race’ is significantly mediated by ‘gender’: to become Italian, it is sufficient to demonstrate
In conclusion, during the republican period, citizenship and human mobility regulations have contributed to make Italy one of the many national families pertaining to the broader European community. Indeed, blood and kinship principles have remained central to regulate the concession of Italian citizenship; while, kinship ties have been extended to locate European foreigners in a privileged position within the nation vis à vis non-EU citizens. Since the end of WWII, against the background of a growing insertion of Italy's economy in Europe, the regulation of cross-border human mobility has worked to economically instrumentalise outwards, inwards, and internal movements of people to the end of advancing the country’s modernization. In particular, it worked to place Italy’s development on the model of Western European states. In this context, citizenship and human mobility regulations accentuated the distinct racial character of Italianness mainly through hetero-referential racism that, in the course of time, has shifted its targets, addressing Italian-descent emigrants in the transnational space, Southern Italians in the North of the country, and in-migrants from the Global South. Overall, some of these measures reflected once again the racial ambiguity of Italianness within the transnational space and the persisting and long-lasting effects of the Southern question for racializing the Southern Italians. Again, the presumptive whiteness of Italians remained unexpressed within the country’s political debate due to the political suppression of the memory of Italian colonialism, contributing to the affirmation of patterns of racial Europeanization and the adoption of the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism.

4.5 Concluding remarks
This chapter has answered the first research sub-question, investigating the relationship between Italian nation building and regulations targeting citizenship and human mobility, focusing on their effects in terms of racialization of the national community. Drawing attention to the continuities and breaks characterising state legislation on these subjects, it has provided an historical account of the Italian state's definitions of its national community in order to explain today's racialization of immigrants from the Global South as the progression in the present of long-standing patterns. In terms of continuities, the chapter pointed out the endurance
of diverse elements and dynamics in the process of Italian nation building: (1) familistic and racialising definitions of the nation; (2) economic instrumental treatment of people in movements; (3) constructions of Italians as both racialised and racialisers; (4) primacy of hetero-referential racism to define the national community; (5) unexpressed whiteness of the Italian nation; (6) cultural definitions of Italian superiority based on the use of a raceless language; and (7) persistence of gendered regulatory mechanisms to racially construct Italians. In terms of breaks, the chapter mainly referred to: (1) changing rights and responsibilities of Italians as members of the nation; (2) shifting targets of hetero-referential racism; and (3) varying definitions of Italianness as European and Mediterranean. A main contribution of this chapter has been to show that the racialization of Italians and their Others is not limited to the fascist regime and its Racial Laws, but it stands at the roots of the same notion of liberal citizenship in Italy. In short, the chapter has highlighted how the Italian nation has both “undergone and inhabited race”, notwithstanding the foreclosure of this category in present public debates, hence clarifying the relevance of ‘race’ for any social struggle about the governing of migration (Petrovich Njegosh 2016: 220).
Nationalism, gender, and race in women’s and feminist politics in Italy from 1861 to 2011

5.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses diverse cases of discursive reproduction, contestation, and negotiation of Italian identity and its gendered and racial boundaries from different sides of the spectrum of women’s and feminist politics from 1861 to 2011. To this end, it carries on two actions. First, the chapter historicises the relation between women’s and feminist politics, and nationalisms in the context of the Italian nation state, showing diverse implications of this relation for the racialization of the national community. In doing so, it provides some indications to reflect on the present intertwining of nationalism and women’s politics, and the emergence of a feminist attention to intersectionality. Second, the chapter introduces and examines a debate in the field of women’s and feminist politics that developed in 2011, during the celebration of 150 years of Italian national unity, in reaction to the sexual scandals involving Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister at that time. Particularly, it discusses the contemporary convergence between women’s politics and nationalism in Italy that emerged in this debate, bringing into focus contemporary gendered and racial imaginaries on national insiders and outsiders, and their implications for conceiving the current governing of irregular migration.

This chapter answers the second research sub-question: how did women’s institutional politics and radical feminisms distinguish between national and non-national subjects in terms of gender and race in the context of the debate associated with the 150th anniversary of Italian national unity? Secondary sources are used to provide a historical contextualization of the relationship between nationalisms and women’s and feminist
politics, while primary data are employed to analyse the 2011 debate. Section 5.2 expands upon the consequences of diverse intertwining of women’s and feminist politics and nationalism in the history of the Italian nation state. To this end, it focuses on three phenomena that are particularly relevant to the structuring of social relations of race: colonialism, racism, and multiculturalism. Section 5.3 contextualises the 2011 women’s and feminist debate and scrutinises the representation of social actors in eight political appeals produced by and circulated in women’s and feminist networks in the period January-March 2011. It makes visible relevant insights for discussing the entanglement of women’s and feminist politics, and nationalism, by and through analyses of racial constructions of national Selves and Others, bearing in mind the implications of such distinctions for thinking about migration into Italy. Section 5.4 closes the chapter by synthesising relevant information on the distinction between minoritarian radical feminisms vis-à-vis institutional women’s politics.

5.2. Women’s and feminist approaches to nationalism in the history of the Italian nation state

The interactions between nationalisms and feminisms escape generalizations and depend on contexts, politics, and social locations (Jayawardena 2016, Vickers 2002 and 2006). This section offers some insights on the complexity of this relation focusing on diverse, white or predominantly white, women’s and feminist experiences of struggle in Italy throughout the history of the Italian nation state. Accepting the principle that racism and nationalism stand in a relation of mutual determination (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991), it expands upon the racial implications of diverse intertwining of women’s and feminist politics with nationalism. It discusses this entanglement in relation to three phenomena: colonialism, racism, and multiculturalism. Specifically, the section discusses: (1) women’s and feminist approaches to Italian colonialism during the monarchic-liberal period and the role played by nationalist politics in the elaboration of these feminist political positions.; (2) feminist understanding of racism during the second feminist wave and the effects of implicit methodological nationalism on these understandings; (3) feminist multicultural practices between the end of the 1990s and beginning of the 2000s, and their underlying ideas of national identity and differences. The section has a double goal, notably to exemplify the key role of nationalism in di-
verse historical moments of women’s and feminist politics as well as to provide instruments to grasp the contradictions of today’s approaches to nationalism by women’s and feminist politics – especially to reveal the racial implications of discourses on the ‘nation’ for thinking about the governing of migration.

5.2.1. Women’s approaches to Italian colonialism during the monarchic-liberal period

The formation of nationalist discourses and processes of nation building cannot be comprehended outside of the context of colonialism. In so far as colonialism established unequal relationships between metropolis and colonies, it allowed for the grouping and nationalization of Selves and Others. In other words, nationalistic discourses moulded and legitimised colonial expansion, while colonialism shaped the forms and meanings of nationalistic discourses. Importantly, the construction of national identities through colonialism was deeply interlocked with diverse systems of inequality – based on race, gender, sexuality, and class –, which all contributed to the building of liberal national citizenship. Postcolonial studies on the role of women in colonialism have shown that this process re-define both the subjectivities of women from colonising nations as well as gender roles in metropolitan societies (Strobel 1991, McClintock 2013, Stoler and Cooper 2002). Particularly, resistance, negotiation and complicity with colonialism by women from coloniser countries have informed the relations between gender politics and nationalism in various different ways.

Drawing on this literature, this sub-section suggests to recover the ways in which women’s and feminist cultures engaged with the project of Italian colonialism during the monarchic-liberal stage, highlighting how different political stances towards colonialism entailed diverse conceptions of nationalism. This exercise is believed to offer relevant inputs to later bring into focus today's women's and feminist approaches to the ‘nation’ as a way to take position towards material and symbolic forms of Othering, which are rooted in colonialism and are involved in shaping the governing of migration. As showed in Chapter 4, colonialism, its memory and inheritance form a fundamental historical and theoretical knot to disentangle in order to understand the structuring of contemporary racism against migrants from the Global South. Reconstructing a collective memory on women’s and feminist approaches to colonialism is an
important step to build awareness of the many practices that contributed

to support the colonial project, and to show the significance of the inter-
twining of nationalistic and colonial discourses in order to comprehend

present instances of women’s and feminist nationalism.

For this purpose, Catia Papa’s book “Sotto altri cieli. L’oltremare nel

movimento femminile italiano” (2009) offers very significant elements to
discuss feminist politics in Italy during the emergence and realization of
the Italian colonial project in the liberal-monarchic period, a state milit-
ary enterprise. Throughout her work – the first known research on the
subject – the author examines the emancipationist movement in post-
unification Italy and distinguishes two phases in its approach to the colo-
nial discourse. First, she identifies the elaboration of a feminist anti-colo-
nial stance in the post-unitary period that, although marginal, became
particularly visible through official stances and mobilizations coinciding
with Italy’s participation at the Berlin Congress in 1878 and the Italian
military defeats of Dogali (1885), Amba Alagi (1895) and Adwa (1896).
Second, Silvia Papa recognises the affirmation of a specific emancipa-
tionist adhesion to imperial nationalism, which coincided with the begin-
nning of the war against Libya in 1911 and 1912. On this subject, the
near-totality of the women’s emancipationist movement decided to re-
main silent in regard to the colonial issue. This political choice was
mainly motivated by the strategic attempt to gain the right to vote, aim-
ing to show nationalistic responsibility in front of the colonial mission.
Although the suffrage was not achieved, colonial nationalism conquered
most of the movement’s participants who acted to support the internal
colonial front.

As “Sotto altri cieli” clearly demonstrates, these two phases in femin-
ist positioning on the colonial issue corresponded to different under-
standing of both nationalism and gender politics. In the first phase, wo-
men’s demands for political and social emancipation were deeply con-
ected to the process of national independence and the nationalistic
ideals of Risorgimento, which anchored principles of individual freedom
to claims for collective self-determination. More specifically, feminists in
the post-unification period insistently connected national and women’s
self-determination and identified the roots of their oppression in specific
histories, thus criticising biological difference as justification for exclud-
ing national women as well as colonised women and men from entitle-
ments to citizenship rights. In denouncing the false universalism of liber-
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al nation states, they criticised not only gender, but also racial classifications, supporting the right of peoples to resist colonial oppression. Yet, this anti-colonialism was not free of ambiguities and contradictions. In most of the cases, feminist Orientalist representations of the feminine Other were factually functional to illuminate the progress of Western women, and thereby have contributed to the reproduction of differentialist and hierarchical representations. However, these Eurocentric discourses did not translate into justifications of any form of domination or salvific intervention, and post-unitary emancipationists insisted on unveiling the oppressive character of the idea of Italy as a civilizing country (Papa 2009 and 2012).

In the second phase of the emancipationist movement, the acceptance of the Libyan war as a strategy to promote women’s participation in the public national life side-lined any reflection on women's freedom as occasion to rethink the idea of liberal national citizenship. This is particularly evident in two positions taken by emancipationist supporters of colonialism. First, the equivalence they made between women’s maternal function and men's military role led to uncritical support of the traditional heteronormative paradigm of citizenship. Second, emancipationists' affirmation of maternal instincts as a virtue unknown to colonised people served to avoid any critical discussion on the contradictions between the promise of a universal feminine emancipation and the idea of the supposed superiority of Western cultures. Thus, celebrations of the maternal mission led to understanding women's condition as determined by nature and to conceive women's nationalism as the product of their intrinsic altruism and predisposition to sacrifice in view of the common national good. In this context, although socialist feminists criticised the Italian colonial project, they also showed important similarities with the emancipationist discourse supporting colonialism. Particularly, their understanding of colonialism as an increase in the exploitation of the proletariat, which bypassed any reference to issues of racism and peoples' right to self-determination, led the socialist stream to re-propose the emancipationist equivalence between women and mothers. This especially emerged in their representation of colonial violence through the suffering of the proletarian mother, which subordinated the freedom of both women and colonised to the accomplishment of the socialist cause (Papa 2009 and 2012).
Overall, Silvia Papa's work has offered useful insights in multiple directions to interrogate the present intertwining of nationalism and feminism. First, it has demonstrated that women’s and feminist politics and nationalisms are not necessarily competitors given the diversity of political projects that both discourses may serve. Specifically, it has stressed that their entanglement may produce both limitations and expansions of freedoms in the sphere of gender and sexuality. Second, analysis of cases of women’s and feminist appropriations of nationalistic discourses during the history of the Italian state shows their relevance to the contradictions underlying models of national liberal citizenships. Third, it showed that comparisons and analogies between patriarchy and racism may serve to strengthen or legitimise one discourse of liberation through reference to the other, while opposition to colonialism did not necessarily imply the critique and overcoming of ideas of white superiority and supremacy, but it produced its reinforcement through ideas of progress and development.

5.2.2. Feminist approaches to racism from the 1960s to the 1980s

The relationship between nationalisms and racisms clearly varies depending on contexts and social positions and it is importantly influenced by one's historical and geopolitical location in the global system of colonialism and its contemporary transformations (Vickers 2002). Nationalist discourses entail the delineation of multiple boundaries, and are inescapably intertwined with racial relations of power – a phenomenon arising from the histories of colonization. Indeed, the racialization of both colonisers and colonised was central to denote colonial difference, warrant unequal treatments, and justify colonial rule (Yuval-Davis 1997, Chatterjee 2003, McIntosh 2013). In the contemporary postcolonial context, race continues to play a crucial role in most nationalism, providing a necessary, but insufficient criterion of national authenticity (Balibar and Wallerstein 1991, Hesse 1997, Balibar 2011). This intertwining differently affects diverse gendered subjects. In fact, as discussed in the previous sub-section, women – even if subaltern to the patriarchal system – may assume various social and political positions towards the interlocking of racism and nationalism, including resistance, negotiation, and complicity.

Building on this literature, this sub-section recovers how feminisms in Italy, during the 1960s to 1980s, comprehended race and racism and how their understanding on these matters related to nationalism and its cat-
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categories of thought. In particular, it focuses on the so-called second feminist wave that, in retrospect, has been recognised as widely centred on the agenda of white women (Bertilotti et al. 2006). Discussing the treatment of racism and its intersection with sexism during this historical stage of feminist organising is significant to the construction of an historical approach able to address contemporary feminist engagements of nationalism. Specifically, the sub-section discusses the treatment of race and racism operated by feminists in Italy during the second wave, uncovering their implicit methodological nationalism so as to reflect on their limits and contradictions. This is believed to provide instrument for addressing the ways in which radical feminisms in today’s Italy are implicated in supporting or undermining the reproduction of racism within the national space.

Vincenza Perilli’s essay “L’analogia imperfetta. Sessismo, razzismo e femminismi tra Italia, Francia e Stati Uniti” (2007) is the “first known work on the analogy between women and blacks” in Italian feminisms (Ellena 2011). It provides relevant reflections to understand how the relationship between sexism and racism was thematised in the feminist experience between the late 1960s and the 1980s in Italy. Looking at this time lapse, the author identifies two main feminist perspectives on sexism and racism. These were elaborated in a political context characterised by a heterogeneous plurality of feminist groups that shared a radical critique to emancipationist paradigms and judicial equality (Lussana 2012, Cavarero and Restaino 2002). Against this background, feminist critiques to the formal universalism of institutions entailed the disengagement from the classical vocabulary of politics, including the language of nationalism, as a base for the formulation of political claims and demands. However, in the absence of a specific work on the deconstruction of implicit methodological nationalism, these feminist discourses were not free from the ideological habit of naturalising the nation in political analyses and struggles. Thus, this sub-section attempts to grasp understandings of nation and nationalism underlying the feminist approaches to sex and race, which are discussed in Perilli’s work (2007).

According to Perilli, the first approach to sexism and racism which systematically circulated in feminist culture during the late 1960s and the 1970s discussed the relationship between these categories and related systems of oppression in terms of analogy. In this context, the analogy performed multiple functions. In some cases, it was used as a strategy to
legitimise the constitution of what was then perceived as a new subject of struggle – women – by references to commonality of oppression between women and other oppressed groups whose claims were largely recognised as political. For example, given the internationally recognised success of some anti-racist movements to contest the biological nature of race, comparisons between race and sex were employed by some feminists in Italy to demonstrate the socially constructed character of the category of sex. In other cases, the analogy – or its denegation – was employed to argue for the unity of women across diverse social divisions so as to convey the legitimacy of this subject of struggle. In this regard, equating the condition of black and white men as well as those of black and white women, some feminist groups intended to support the idea of a common condition of oppression determined by patriarchy and argue for universal sisterhood. Clearly, both declinations of the analogy presented severe limits and contradictions: the concealment of the role of racialised women in anti-racist struggles, and the elusion of the specificity of racial forms of oppression (Perilli 2007).

The second perspective on the relationship between racism and sexism, identified by Perilli (2007), emerged from sexual difference feminism, which became hegemonic in Italy during the 1980s. This feminist stream, recognising the falsely universal and masculine characteristics of institutions, attempted to provide for the construction of a feminine symbolic system based, among other instruments, on the practice of ‘affidamento’ or ‘entrustment’ to other women. More specifically, this feminist stream proposed the idea that sexual difference constitutes the central and primary material and symbolic signifier of the social world, under which other differences are articulated. In defence of this argument, it connected sexual difference to a naturalistic paradigm. To convey the idea of a unique specificity of the women's status, determined by nature

---

34 As highlighted by Cavarero and Restaino (2002: 69-77), the idea underlying the thought of sexual difference is that women should not aim to develop egalitarian claims in relation to men and what the masculine symbolic system define as neutral, but to celebrate sexual difference and the positive feminine values embodied by women. An important instrument to realise this objective is the practice of affidamento, which entail the acceptance of disparities among women and the entrustment of women in weaker positions to other women in stronger position, where the former is supported by the latter in her process of liberation.
and not by social, political or cultural factors, it suggested to break any comparison between the condition of women and that of oppressed groups such as Afro-Americans. Thus, the increasing centrality acquired by the category of sex in the form proposed by the thought of sexual difference rendered invisible other systems of oppression and their articulation. Further, the recognition of differences among women as subjective factors, proposed by this feminist current, led not only to avoid discussions on diverse systems of inequality, but also to accept hierarchies among women, thus posing a main obstacle to comprehend the articulation of sexism and racism.

In order to make sense of the contradictions and limitations recognised in both approaches, Perilli (2007) connects the use of the categories of sex and race made by second wave feminisms to the Italian colonial amnesia. In particular, she criticises the substitution – in these feminist discourses – of concrete subjects of anti-racist struggle with symbols as a major corollary of the removal of colonialism from the Italian national consciousness. For example, she notes that feminists made reference not to “young women from Capo Verde exploited in the rich houses of the bourgeoisie in Rome at the middle of the 1970s, but [only to] the Afro-Americans struggling in the US” (Perilli 2007: 11). Hence, she argues that an important limit of the analogy employed by feminists consisted in making reference exclusively to the image of subjects who were in the limelight of the international scene, avoiding any reference to or confrontation with the same problems that these symbols pointed out within the Italian context. This substitution clearly reveals the naturalization of dominant nationalistic discourses within the feminist field. This underlying perspectival nationalism, which implies an acceptance of the nation as the normal, natural and good social container, understands the Italian nation as untouched by racial matters and work to prepare the grounds for today's externalization of race and racism on racialised migrant Others.

In sum, Vincenza Perilli’s essay suggests three further lines of reflection to engage present debates on feminist nationalisms. First, it stresses the relevance of methodological nationalism for the naturalization and reproduction of nationalistic frames. In particular, it points out to the fact that, even if in specific moments of crises nationalism became more manifest, it is ingrained in everyday social environments. Second, it shows the centrality of race in nationalism, even in historical periods in
which racism seems to be external to the national space, when racial Others – whose bodies are seen as carrier of race – are not perceived to inhabit the national territory. Third, it highlights that even when feminisms explicitly recognise the contradictions entailed by liberal and national models of citizenship, when disregarding the interlocking of diverse social relations of power they may re-propose both the same false universalism and imposed dualism that they criticise. In this regard, the position of the thought of sexual difference feminism is particularly illuminating.

5.2.3. Women’s and feminist approaches to multiculturalism between the 1990s and 2000s

Multiculturalism and its widely discussed crises have represented an important terrain to understand the transformation and adjustments of nationalisms in contemporary Europe. Multiculturalism is here addressed under two specific aspects: first, as a governmental rationality composed of a very assorted set of institutional initiatives directed at the governing of cultural diversity to guarantee social and national cohesion; and second, as a social phenomenon indicating the daily lived experience of cultural diversity within nationalised societies. Against the background of 9/11 and the start of the War on Terror, the debate on the crisis of multiculturalism has represented multicultural policies as unable to guarantee social cohesion, setting the lived experience of cultural diversity against ideas of national identity and integrity. In other words, the narrative of a multicultural crisis has reduced political, social, and economic problems brought about by neoliberal globalization to issues of culture, thus supporting the idea of a clash of civilizations. In particular, arguments against “multiculturalism of fact” have been developed on the terrain of gender, presenting migrants' gendered cultural practices as threatening Western liberal values of gender equality (Okin 1999). Hence, this type of approach has favoured the rejection of the cultural diversity brought within the nation space by inwards cross-border people’s movements, and it has translated in diverse attempts to “monoculturalise” European nations, for example through the insertion

---

35 This governmental rationality emerged at the beginning of the 1970s in order to manage the long terms presence of immigrant workers from postcolonial and other Southern countries in the national territories of Western states such as Canada, Australia, the UK, the US and the Netherlands.
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Taking this analysis of the crises of multiculturalism as a point of reference, this sub-section focuses on the conflicts and tensions involving native and migrant women engaged in women's and feminist formal organizations between the mid-1990s and beginning of the 2000s in Italy – when this type of multicultural organising firstly emerged. In particular, it intends to uncover conceptualizations of Italian national identity underlying the conflicts and tensions considered. This reflection is believed to provide an important contextualization to later effectively read feminist understandings of Italianness in the wake of the present crisis of multiculturalism. Indeed, this crisis has produced – both at the national and local policy level – culturalised responses to diverse political, social and economic issues which involve subjects of diverse nationalities. Thus, identifying the signification acquired by Italian nationhood in feminist practices involving both migrant and native women helps us to understand the relevance of cultural diversity in what can be defined “multiculturalism of fact”. This type of operation is considered particularly significant in light of recent critiques to static and homogenising understandings of culture, which underlie policy directed at monoculturalising the nation (Simone 2010, Pitch 2013).

To this purpose, Wendy Pojmann’s book “Donne immigrate e femminismo in Italia” (2010) presents an interesting historical account of the impact of in-migration on women’s and feminist formal organising in Italy. Particularly significant to this sub-section is the author’s description of two forms of women’s organising, which differently involved both migrant and native women: first, cultural centres led by Italian women which attempted to involve migrant women in their activities since the mid-1990s; second, ‘migrant and native’ organizations which were created at the end of the 1990s as a follow up to the national conference “Forum migranti e native, cittadine del mondo”, organised in Turin in 1996 in order to give continuity to the post-Beijing agenda. In regard to both types of organization, Pojmann discusses conflicts and tensions that emerged between migrants and natives, identifying different causes at their origin – including external bureaucratic and material constraints as well as internal imbalanced power relations. These developments occurred in a political context where neoliberal reforms, transferring
tasks from the state to the market, brought about the channelling of feminist political organising – particularly that feminist current close to leftist political parties and unions – towards the constitution of formal and professionalised women's organization (Della Porta 2003). These organizations mainly promoted activities of service supply, giving attention to issues of equality and equal opportunities, while also valuing differences (Della Porta 2003).

In this context, the Italian women-led cultural centres discussed by Pojmann's research – the first type of organization here considered – shared as their common objective precisely the provision of social services and vocational training, alongside the promotion of various cultural initiatives. Thus, the first contacts that these organizations had with migrant women occurred in the 1990s, precisely on the terrain of social services' supply and demand. Commenting on the relation between Italian and migrant women as service providers and users, Pojmann (2010: 116) notes that native women were well aware of the work of criticism developed by Afro-American and Chicana women in relation to the white feminist movement in the US; yet, their “reading of Cherie Moraga and bell hooks” did not translate into the incorporation of different relations of power, beside those centred on gender, within the agenda of these cultural centres. In this regard, the author observes that Italian women’s intention to avoid preconceptions and stereotypes often translated into the neglect of differences among women or in the simple sharing of diverse experiences and traditions, which remained unconnected and cut off from the elaboration of political strategies and theorizations on gender. In sum, Pojmann suggests that these centres did not go beyond a ‘testimonial approach’ towards migrant women's experiences and continued identifying these women as less emancipated and in need of support and education. Further, she also stresses diverse migrants' critiques to organizations managed by Italians, which became multicultural enterprises, engaging in the “business” of multiculturalism without contributing to alter power imbalances (Pojmann 2010: 107-118; 170-171).

The second type of organizations here discussed are native and migrant women’s associations that emerged from the post-Beijing process, which shared much more diversified objectives. In fact, besides the supply of social services, they also engaged in the organization of intercultural and political activities aimed at visibilising the condition of
migrant women and fighting racism. Pojmann presents diverse kind of tensions between Italian and migrant women that arose in organization of these activities. First, she reports about migrants' problematization of the criteria bounding the assignment of funds, which triggered negative forms of tutelage within these organizations. In fact, local governments required Italian women or organizations to take charge of specific political and administrative matters in order to distribute funds, downplaying migrant women's political role. In addition, Pojmann spots the existence of disparities between native and migrant women related to their availability of time and resources, which lead – among other consequences – to different organizational styles in which, for instance, Italian women engaged in endless discussions and spent time in internal fights. Furthermore, Pojmann notices a whole set of problems related to Italian women's prioritization of gender issues, leading to their inability to recognise the specificity of migrant women's condition. For instance, this clearly emerges in the parallelism that Italian women created between the conditions of strangeness experienced by women and those of foreigners in relation to dominant cultural norms. Another example relates to Italian women's insistence on questioning migrants about their foreign origin – proving to disregard their Italian identity. Finally, Pojmann also reflects on the perception of an attitude of superiority showed by Italian women in regard to their knowledge “about how things work” (Pojmann 2006: 161-191).

In all these cases, the conflicts that emerged between Italian and migrant women in the organizational experiences described by Pojmann did not relate to cultural misunderstanding, but to social relations of power. Indeed, in the author's account, Italianness is not related to specific cultural identities and traditions, but to a particularly privileged condition, which include the power to supply services, access to institutional funds, availability of time and material resources, possibility to define political agendas, and so forth. In parallel, non-Italianness is associated to the lack of these privileges. Yet, even more interestingly, Pojmann's research seems to suggest that, in many cases, these power relations are invisible to the eyes of those Italian women involved in multicultural organizing. Indeed, material and symbolic inequalities often appear concealed from view by ideas of cultural diversity. These observations allows to identify interesting queries with which to interrogate present-day debates on women’s and feminist nationalisms.
In particular, they point out the importance of reflecting on the role of the concept of culture in women’s and feminist approaches to nationalism.

To conclude, this section has made a case to investigate the relation between nationalism and women’s and feminist politics, paying attention to show the pronounced heterogeneity of this political field as a constant feature across diverse historical periods. The objective has been to bring into view plural approaches to race and racism from different sides of the feminist and women’s political spectrum. First, the section has showed the continuing relevance of nationalism for women’s and feminist politics under three main aspects: (1) the entanglement of women’s and feminist politics with nationalism may produce both the expansion and limitation of the freedom of specific groups of women; yet, when nationalisms are coupled with adhesion to the project of modernity, they are implicitly associated to ideas of white superiority and supremacy; (2) without awareness of women’s and feminist entanglement with methodological nationalism, racialised subjects may be perceived as external to the nation; (3) implicit women’s and feminist nationalism may bring about the culturalization of social differences and inequalities.

Second, the section has showed that, to the end of comprehending the emergence of an intersectional feminist sensibility to processes of racial Othering, it is necessary to take into consideration the following factors: (1) critiques of colonialism and its effects in the present; (2) past involvements of feminist politics in reproducing racism; (3) attentiveness to static and homogenising understandings of culture within the nation. Overall, these observations, revealing the racial implications of nationalist discourses, represent useful tools to grasp contradictions underlying the alliance of nationalism with feminist or women’s politics.

5.3 Women’s nationalism and its discontents: negotiating the racial boundaries of Italianness in the 2011 anniversary

The relationship of women’s and feminist politics with nationalism became object of intense dispute during the year 2011 (Gribaldo and Zapperi). This section approaches the topic bringing into focus the convergence between women’s politics and nationalism built by the women’s
movement Se non ora quando (SNOQ). In particular, it discusses (1) the political stakes of this convergence; and (2) potentialities and limits of radical feminist critiques to this convergence. The section is especially interested in discussing the implications of the entanglement between women’s politics and nationalism for the construction, contestation, and negotiation of the gendered and racial boundaries of the Italian national community. It reflects on feminist imaginaries about national insiders and outsiders and their repercussions for conceiving the phenomenon of migration and its governing. To this end, the section begins by contextualising the entanglements of institutional women’s politics and nationalism through reference to the sexual scandals implicating the then Prime Minister, and the political position taken by exponents of sexual difference feminism and radical feminisms about this entanglement. It then presents the analysis findings of eight political appeals produced by and circulated in women’s and feminist networks in the period of January-March 2011.

The convergence of institutional women’s politics and nationalism treated here emerged in reaction to the multiple sex scandals that implicated then Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi, during his fourth term (2008-2011). This season of scandals began in 2008 when foreign press revealed that, according to phone taps gathered in the context of a judiciary inquiry, the nomination of Mara Carfagna, former showgirl, as Minister of Equal Opportunities allegedly resulted from an exchange of sexual services with Berlusconi. Since then, numerous other sex scandals involving the then Prime Minister became object of public attention. For the purposes of this chapter, the most emblematic case was triggered in Autumn 2010. It saw Berlusconi accused of supposedly paying for sex with an under-age Moroccan woman, Karima El Mahroug, and charged with abuse of authority for having this woman released from police custody after an arrest. Facts concerning this case emerged during an investigation on exploitation of prostitution involving minors, connected to Berlusconi’s private sex parties. This investigation revealed that Karima El Mahroug received money from Berlusconi and that, after being arrested in May 2010 with theft charges, was released on the Prime Minister’s request due to her supposed family connections with then Egyptian President, Hosni Mubarak. These revelations brought the judiciary to in-
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36 This movement never reclaimed a feminist identity and preferred to present itself as a feminist movement.
criminate Silvio Berlusconi, who later defended himself arguing that he was not aware of El Mahroug’s real age, that he financially supported the girl only “to prevent her from becoming a prostitute”, and that he really believed she was Mubarak’s relative. After two years’ trial, Berlusconi was acquitted in appeal on all accounts (Peano 2012: 420).

The relevance of this scandal for the section does not simply rest on its temporal proximity to the debate here analysed, but also in its capacity to reveal the intertwining of sexism and racism in public debates on the Berlusconi sex scandals. Indeed, examples of this intertwining abound in this case: from the wide circulation in the media of justificatory racist jokes about Berlusconi’s sex parties to orientalist critiques of the Prime Minister’s conduct centred around the concepts of “sultan” and “harem” (Gribaldo and Zapperi 2012, Peano 2012). These and other representations depicted the powerful politician as a model of Mediterranean virility, defined by his “unbounded love for pleasure” and “unlimited passion” (Giuliani 2016b: 10). Then, Berlusconi’s media representations of El Mahroug’s life story as a symbol of “social advancement” from the supposed backwardness of her Moroccan and Muslim origins functioned to construct the politician as the “Italian good guy” invested in saving the young brown girl from danger and abuse due to her incontinent sexuality – a construction reminiscent of the myth of Italians as “good people” (Gribaldo and Zapperi 2012: 36, Giuliani 2016b: 11). In particular, media hyper-sexualisation of El Mahroug presented the girl as an opportunist ready to sell herself for “money and success” (Giuliani 2016b: 12). Overall, media narratives systematically concealed the inequality existing between the white heterosexual men of power and the young racialised woman, while never explicitly discussing El Mahroug’s non-whiteness but employing orientalist imaginaries to “tickle the audience imagination” (Giuliani 2016b: 10).

Against this backdrop, at the beginning of 2011, an institutional women’s movement, gathering white women participants from all sides of the Parliamentarian spectrum, emerged under the name Se Non Ora Quando (SNOQ), denouncing Berlusconi’s regime of political and media representations for objectifying women and diminishing the prestige of the country’s institutions. This movement called into question the then Prime Minister’s political accountability, the potential criminal profile of his involvement in the scandals, and his selection of the female political class according to sexual standards. Simultaneously, SNOQ addressed
the role of Berlusconi as owner of most media in the country, criticising the symbolic and material objectification of women produced and reproduced by his television channels. Building on these critiques, SNOQ invited, in different occasions, to manifest indignation toward Berlusconi’s regime of representation as highly offensive to women’s dignity and institutional offices’ reputation. It brought to the fore and literally to the streets – with one million people demonstrating – the idea that offences to the “feminine body and dignity” condemn the Italian nation “to decay and drift from public ethics”. Within this frame, the movement explicitly called to give a definitive push “to the shoulder” of Berlusconi’s government.

Diverse contextual factors contributed to bring about SNOQ convergence between institutional women’s politics and nationalism. To begin with, the scandals’ criminal implications as well as Berlusconi’s private and public conduct came to represent – within Italian political debates – the symbol of a long decay of Italian institutions, which accompanied the lengthy political career of Berlusconi since the 1990s. In fact, the former Prime Minister had been repeatedly at the centre of scandals and trials – from money laundering to corruption and connections to Mafia – which were widely critiqued by the opposition as an institutional problem damaging Italy’s international reputation as well as the nation’s morals. During the first years of the 2000s, this attention to Italy’s reputation encountered the relaunch in public debates of a sense of national belonging, which was supported by the then President of the Italian Republic, Carlo Azeglio Ciampi (1999-2006), in response to secessionist discourses produced by the Northern League party (Sabelli 2012). These factors

37 In particular, it addressed the eroticization of the television imaginary prompted by Berlusconi since the 1980s, associating commercial goods and women to make the former more attractive, that has been for long de-humanising feminine figures at the symbolic level. Besides, it also questioned Berlusconi’s practice of paying back the sexual services supplied by women working in his TV outlets with public funds and political positions as the concretization of women’s symbolical objectification in his television channels.

38 This is an excerpt from the following document, which is one of the data analysed for this chapter: http://snoqmilano.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/ridiamo-dignita.pdf

39 This is an excerpt from the following document, which is one of the data analysed for this chapter: http://snoqmilano.wordpress.com/la-nostra-storia/29-gennaio-2011/
made a renewed nationalism one of the main frames available to SNOQ to criticise Berlusconi. Besides, the celebration of 150 years of national unity, which fell in 2011, opened a discursive space where different phenomena, processes and events tend to be read – more than ever – through nationalistic lenses. As a result, SNOQ represented Berlusconi’s scandals as a political and institutional emergency to be faced through the construction of large political convergences for the national public good.

Moreover, one further phenomenon – recently emerged across European countries, including Italy – may help to understand SNOQ nationalistic leaning: femonationalism (Farris 2012, 2016, 2017, Bracke 2012, Fekete 2006). This consists in “the contemporary mobilization of feminist ideas by nationalist parties and neoliberal governments under the banner of the war against the perceived patriarchy of Islam in particular, and of migrants from the Global South in general (Farris 2012: 185, 2016, 2017). Particularly, femonationalism may explain SNOQ silence on the racist implications of Berlusconi’s scandals and related public debates. Indeed, in this discursive frame, feminist ideas are engulfed into mainstream nationalist discourses to enable the exploitation of migrant women’s, who are encouraged to “conform to Western values” in order to promote their integration and facilitate their role as perfect substitute of native women in reproductive labour (Farris 2016: 177 ). As a result, “deceivingly benevolent campaign in which [immigrant women, and not migrant men,] are needed as workers, tolerated as migrants, and encouraged as women to conform to” dominant social and cultural norms may be seen as creating a contrast between nationalist ideas and critiques to racist and sexist practices targeting migrant women (Farris, 2012: 195).

Critiques to the emergence of SNOQ and its discourse emerged from diverse sides. One main white exponent of sexual difference feminism, Luisa Muraro, intervened in the debate about this institutional women’s movement under two main aspects. First, she opposed SNOQ critiques to women’s “prostitution” as self-diminishing. Instead, she argued that women who participate in markets that reduce the feminine body to a commodity have “their own subjectivity which is not on sale, and for that reason they must be taken into consideration”. Second, she criti-

40 This and the following quotes are excerpts from the following editorial: http://www.corriere.it/cronache/11_febbraio_10/muraro-errore-scendere-in-piazza-per-conto-altri_3957321a-34e9-11e0-b824-00144f486ba6.shtml
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cized SNOQ mobilization for instrumentalising women with the aim of ending Berlusconi’s government as this political strategy assigned to women an “auxiliary role”, that does not really work to construct the conditions for women to be free. Importantly, exponents of sexual difference feminism, did not raised reflections around issues of racism while discussing nationalism. Along this line, the same Muraro has previously defined “racism” as a term that is “too heavy, bringing up rage, suspicions, and guilt feelings that run the risk of posing huge weights on the shoulders of people of good will”\textsuperscript{41}. In doing so, sexual difference feminism clearly rejected any consideration of race as a fundamental power relation affecting the lives of women.

Other feminist critiques emerged from the radical feminisms\textsuperscript{42} discussed in the next chapters, which included mainly white, but also racialised women – yet defined in terms of ‘natives’ and ‘migrants’. Significantly, they contested SNOQ nationalist discourses and produced alternative interpretations of the phenomenon of women’s objectification. In particular, they defined calls to women’s decency as deeply anti-feminist and invited to move the focus of attention from women’s representations to the necessary subversion of gender power relations in all aspects of social life. In this frame, radical feminist interventions did not join claims for ending Berlusconi’s regime, but identified these claims as founded on the suppression of structural problems connected to work, reproduction, migration, and racism that did not simply relate to Berlusconi’s government but to the entire building of Italian citizenship. As a result, they suggested to divert attention to the social conflicts investing gender power relations in intersection with other inequalities (Gribaldo and Zapperi 2012). Interestingly, the debate animated by radical feminist interventions did not only propose different perspectives on the entanglement between women’s politics and nationalism, but – in doing so – it also envisioned different boundaries of the Italian national community.

For the purpose of discussing women’s politics convergence with nationalism and feminist critiques of this, I will present an analysis of eight political appeals circulated in the period of January-March 2011 to organise women’s and feminist demonstrations.

\textsuperscript{41} See: http://www.libreriadelledonne.it/razzismo/

\textsuperscript{42} For reasons of simplicity, sometime I will simply refer to these critiques as feminist.
Table 5.1

Women’s and feminist political appeals circulated during the 2011 anniversary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Mobilitiamoci per ridare dignità all’Italia&lt;sup&gt;43&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>January, 2011</td>
<td>Local - Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Per raccontare un’altra storia italiana&lt;sup&gt;44&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>January 29, 2011</td>
<td>Regional - Lombardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Se non ora, quando?&lt;sup&gt;45&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>February 13, 2011</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Rimettiamo al mondo l’Italia&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>March 8, 2011</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Noi vogliamo tutto</td>
<td>February 13, 2011</td>
<td>Local - Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Indecorose e libere&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>February 13, 2011</td>
<td>Local - Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Per l’accecante visibilità delle donne, con le donne migranti&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>March 1, 2011</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Riprendiamoci le nostre vite indecorose e libere&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>March 8, 2011</td>
<td>Local - Milan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although each document has its own specificities, the section structures the analysis as a comparison between two blocks: texts indicated in the table with the letter (A) were composed by SNOQ or individuals and groups later acknowledged by SNOQ, while texts marked with the letter (B) were compiled by different feminist collectives or widely circulated in feminist networks with a radical leaning. This juxtaposition intends to compare positions in relation to the politics of nationalism. The analysis is centred on the discussion of three main themes across all the selected texts: (1) constructions of the ‘nation’, which provide the general framework through which SNOQ and radical feminisms justify their interven-

<sup>43</sup> See: [http://snoqmilano.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/ridiamo-dignita.pdf](http://snoqmilano.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/ridiamo-dignita.pdf)
<sup>46</sup> See: [https://www.zeroviolenza.it/component/k2/item/12757](https://www.zeroviolenza.it/component/k2/item/12757)
<sup>48</sup> See: [http://www.tramaditerre.org/tdt/articles/art_5765.html](http://www.tramaditerre.org/tdt/articles/art_5765.html)
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tion in public debates; (2) models of femininity, which bring into focus the political stakes of women’s participation in or contestation of nationalist projects; (3) the gendered and racial boundaries of the nation resulting from the intertwining of models of femininity and notions of nation. Overall, this analysis offers relevant insights to explore how diverse approaches to nationalism entail particular conceptualizations of gender and race that shape the comprehension of migration into Italy and its governing.

In the first place, the main distinctive trait of political appeals linked to SNOQ is their insistence on locating critiques of women’s political and mediatic representations within a nationalist frame that asserts and celebrates the existence of the Italian nation. For example, references to the nation appear in three out of four titles of the appeals considered (A1, A2, and A3). As a result, SNOQ contestation of women’s representations is subsumed into the politics of nationalism, the very order of discourse offering legitimation to SNOQ arguments. This frame prescriptively constructs the nation as the locus par excellance for the potential flourishing of ethics and the wellbeing of the national community (A3). In this space, for instance, women are viewed as playing important roles for the economic, social and political advancement of the country. However, their contribution is seen as diminished by the dominant regime of representation in the political and mediatic domain. This is believed to cause “the pollution of social life and of the models of civil, ethical and religious awareness” supposedly characterising the Italian nation (A3). Thus, SNOQ calls women to make visible their “reality” so as to restore both their dignity and that of the nation against untruthful representations (A1; A2; A3; A4). As a result, the nation and its representation provides the horizon for the expansion of women’s dignity and self-realization, while gender discourses come to function as a “reassuring modernist flag” making nationalism appear as a progressive project (Morini 2011).

Texts connected to radical feminisms consistently reshaped and contested SNOQ messages. Firstly, they backgrounded issues of media representation related to Berlusconi’s sexual scandals, while acknowledging the wider role of media in reinforcing both sexist and racist stereotypes. For example, they pointed out media silences on cases of violence perpetrated by white family members or white sex workers’ clients as well as media’s selective concentration on abuses committed by racialised mi-
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grants (B1). In doing so, they introduced within public debates issues of intersecting power inequalities. Secondly, these documents mainly suppressed debates on political representation, diverting their criticisms to unequal distribution of wealth, neoliberal policies, state-sponsored Catholic integralism, institutional racism, patriarchy and heteronormativity (B1; B2; B3; B4). In this frame, they did not construct women as realizing themselves through their contribution to the making of the nation. Instead, they framed the nation as a space where women are affected by different forms of injustice negating the “fundamental guarantees for an existence marked by dignity and freedom” (B2). Thus, these political appeals identified SNOQ nationalism as a rhetorical device that is instrumental to make different social conflicts invisible and to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable claims, thus establishing a threshold for legitimate political demands (B1; B2; B4). In conclusion, radical feminisms framed nationalist and feminist projects as competitors, arguing for the construction of feminist projects of belonging centred on the recognition of women’s desires for self-determination beyond the objectives of specific nationalist projects (B2; B4).

In the second place, turning attention to models of femininity, texts in group (A) mainly picture two contrasting profiles recalling a Madonna-whore type of binary. Thus, “the great majority of women living in Italy” – committed to their role of workers, caring daughters, wife, mothers and citizens – is opposed to an over-represented minority of young women, determined to reach “glamorous goals and easy money by giving up their beauty and intelligence to the one in power” (A3). The former group is defined through the systematic exaltation of its efforts and “sacrifices”, conveying the idea that a good female citizen is defined by her acceptance of duties and obligations towards both the family and the nation (A3). Importantly, this group is considered an outsider to the dominant system of representations and hence invited to claim visibility and space. The latter group is instead believed to potentially benefit from alternative forms of representation because of the “indecent” culture by which society is now detrimentally influenced: in fact, by trespassing decency and respectability, young women are seen as neglecting their “dignity […], intelligence, sensibility and competences” (A3; A1). This construction of the woman subject paternalistically reconciles Madonnas and whores, justifying, in the name of the greater national good, heteronormative modes of conduct in line with bourgeois values of moderation,
control, and social cohesion. As a result, gendered and sexual inequalities are excluded from the order of the discourse, while a universal feminine essence is proposed as a base for women’s solidarity.

Appeals from group (B) construct femininities according to two complementary logics. On the one side, inventories of different women's roles – precarious, care and sex workers, migrants, students and unemployed – tend to construct femininity as the product of specific economic and social structures. On the other side, juxtapositions of qualifying adjectives – such as “rebellious”, “unseemly” and “free” – represent women as active subjects, emphasising perceptions of the self in line with one's own experiences (B1; B2; B3; B4). In addition, these texts contest the Madonna-whore binary proposed by SNOQ and the hierarchy it entails. For instance, the first document equates sex work to other forms of labour so as to counter the marginalization of sex workers: “we are [all] on sale: our arms, our lives, our brains, our bodies are on sale” (B1). Also explicit refusals to define women's sexuality by their relation to masculine pleasure or its functionality for social and biological reproduction calls into question the use of sexuality as a dividing line internally stratifying different femininities (B1; B2; B4). Besides, references to lesbians, trans and non-conventional experience of parenthood include, within the discursive space of radical feminisms, critiques of heteronormative models of conduct (B2; B4). As a consequence, these documents uncover and value the diversity inherent to the woman category and re-frame normative models of femininity in terms of political organization for collective resistance and self-determination.

In the third place, SNOQ political appeals produce the racial boundaries of the nation subordinating and/or excluding migrant women on the base of different conceptualizations of nationhood that never explicitly name race. First, comprehensions of the nation as a territorially defined labour market allow to acknowledge migrants as care workers “who leave their families far away to take care of ours” praising their labour as an act of generosity that enable national women to enter productive labour markets (A4). As a consequence, migrant women's inclusion in the national economy is envisioned as deriving from their subordination to the interests of Italian women’s employers, thus hiding conflicting power inequalities among women themselves. In this frame, it is the relevance of migrant women’s care work within Italian society that accounts for the modes in which SNOQ tolerate the presence of these
national outsiders, yet no concerns is expressed for their labour and living conditions. Second, legal definitions of national borders confirm the absence of such concerns, producing the expulsion of women without papers from the national community. That is the case of SNOQ invitations to demonstrate in the streets exposing “a copy of our identity card” that implicitly makes regular legal status a precondition to publicly take stance against the regimes of representation denounced (A2). Lastly, SNOQ understandings of the nation as raced indirectly emerge in calls to illuminate alternative portrays of the country, making “our faces, the faces of Italian women” present and visible (A2). At the best, this invitation seem to exclude the presence of migrants, Italians without citizenship, and racialised Italians. In particular, two elements allow one to argue that this expression suggests the naturalization of the equation Italianness-whiteness: (1) the unexpressed whiteness defining Italian racial identity; and (2) SNOQ silence on issues of race – even in the context of scandals characterised by recurrent racist and orientalist comments on bodies of colour. In sum, SNOQ understanding of the nation inferiorises and excludes migrant women, shaping its nationalism as a racial-exclusionary politics.

On the topic of the racial boundaries of the nation, radical feminist appeals do not negotiate migrant women’s relation to these borders, but highlight the detrimental effects that the production of borders entails in itself. This message is mainly conveyed by understanding the nation as a space governed according to capitalist, patriarchal and racist principles. For example, critiques to state laws considered harmful of women’s self-determination define the nation as a construct producing shared experiences of oppression that trespass issues of citizenship and nationality to include all those living in the Italian territory (B1; B2; B3; B4). The double burden of “paid or non-paid domestic work and exploitation at the labour place” as well as “subordination and [domestic] violence” are all phenomena viewed as shaping both native and migrant women’s existences within the nation (B3). Still, migrant women’s condition is seen as characterised by certain specificities. In fact, they are the ones that nation state regulations made dependent on their husbands because of family reunion laws and exposed to the possibility of losing their residence permit or being incarcerated and deported for not possessing regular documents (B1; B2; B3; B4). However, the acknowledgement of these specificities leads to different conclusions regarding the relation between
natives and migrants within spaces of struggles. Most appeals recognise the importance of migrant women's presence in feminist spaces of struggle as enriching feminist mobilizations by multiplying the perspectives conveyed (B1; B2; B4). Instead, the text written by both native and migrant women ties both groups more deeply, claiming that “as long as migrant women will be recognised in the roles [of care workers, victims and prostitutes] the freedom of all women is under attack” (B3). This latter position seems to more effectively deconstruct boundaries by showing interrelations of dependence between native and migrant women, thus unhinging racist constructions about white emancipated women saving racialised women.

In short, the analysis revealed two contrasting positions about the encounter of women’s politics and nationalism: SNOQ’s proposed view casts the entanglement of nationalism and women’s politics as allowing the expansion of women’s possibilities for self-realization; by contrast the perspective elaborated by radical feminisms frames these two political projects as competitors. As a result, nationalism appears as an overarching order of discourse able to confer legitimacy to political claims for SNOQ; while radical feminisms perceive nationalism as resulting from a discursive construction that simultaneously produces and conceals both gendered and racial hierarchies within the national space. In all cases, the nation is implicitly approached as a multidimensional concept indicating an imagined community sharing economic, administrative, and political arrangements. However, while SNOQ think the nation in terms of common culture, language, and history, radical feminisms frame the nation as a space of social conflicts where some groups are privileged and other oppressed. Furthermore, both groups of texts fail to explicitly and directly name race or Italian unexpressed whiteness. Yet, while SNOQ political appeals implicitly reproduce exclusionary representations related to Italian whiteness, radical feminisms explicitly include racialised subjects within the nation. Yet, most radical feminist political appeals seem to maintain differentiations between national Selves and non-national Others, failing to recognise connections between these two social locations.
5.4 Concluding remarks

This chapter has responded to the second sub-question, examining how women’s institutional politics and radical feminisms distinguished between national and non-national subjects in terms of gender and race in the context of the debate associated with the 150th anniversary of Italian national unity. To this end, it has analysed diverse cases of entanglement between nationalisms and women’s and feminist politics, bringing into perspective their racializing implications. Moving across three historical periods, the chapter has revealed the long-lasting relevance of such entanglements and it has provided an historical framework to appreciate the relevance of contemporary radical feminisms that call into question nationalism as a framework of reference for their political claims. Analysing the 2011 debate, with a focus on women’s nationalism and related radical feminist critiques, the chapter has shown that (a) adhesion to nationalist politics by institutional women’s politics brings about the reinforcement of exclusionary gendered and racial boundaries of the national community; (b) rejection of nationalism without any problematization of racism by feminism of difference implicitly reproduces exclusionary ideas of the nation; (c) critiques of nationalism, together with attention to power inequalities and social conflicts within and across the borders of the national community, by radical feminisms construct an inclusive approach towards racial minorities, but continue normalising Italian unexpressed whiteness. As a result, the chapter has identified one main issue deserving special attention while examining radical feminist struggles against the governing of irregular migration: unexpressed whiteness as a relational construction that always entails the racialization of internal and external national Others.
6.1. Introduction

This chapter illustrates how contemporary radical feminisms in Italy give meanings to 'gender' as a social category indicating a structure of power, drawing attention to the manners in which it has been used in intersection with the ‘race’ category to establish boundaries among social groups. In particular, it focuses on radical feminist critiques of a specific form of the governmental rationality of security: gendered securitization of in-migration\textsuperscript{50}, which consists in media and legal constructions of male violence against women as an issue of public order requiring the tightening of borders’ control: the gendered securitization of in-migration. The chapter discusses the radical feminist argument that connects gendered securitization to the production and reproduction of male violence against women whose social locations are diverse. This critique and the political mobilizations it triggered may be seen as a sign of the emergence of a specific feminist attention to the governing of irregular migration and its racial dimension. The main aim of this chapter is to scrutinize radical feminist structural analyses, coming to grips with their understanding about unequal group relations that are taking place within and across the categories of gender and race.

This chapter provides a partial answer to the third research sub-question: How do radical feminisms in today’s Italy signify ‘gender’ as structure in

\textsuperscript{50} The chapter prefers to speak about “in-migration” rather than “migration” since it treats specific legal initiatives that mainly address the presence of migrants in Italy, sidelining issues of border-crossing.
the specific struggles they undertake against the gendered securitization of in-migration? To this purpose, its data consist of radical feminist narratives on gendered securitization of in-migration. Triangulation of primary and secondary sources intends to capture different dimensions of the same phenomenon. These data are: (1) first-hand accounts resulting from in-depth interviews, and FGDs; (2) radical feminist communication statements, flyers, and zines; (3) published essays and monographs. My participation in collective discussions within a Milan-based university feminist collective (Cercando la luna), feminist self-defence courses, and a self-managed women’s health centre (Consultoria Autogestita) has been a valuable source of information. In particular, these experiences have provided me with contacts with research participants of different generations, who have shown me that the fight against gendered securitization importantly intertwined with previous struggles – such as those on the organization of domestic work and against the invasion of Afghanistan. As a result, I came to appreciate how the feminist gaze on migration intersected with other transnational issues.

Section 6.2 introduces radical feminist politicization of male violence against women, bringing into focus its causes and characteristics. Section 6.3 presents the national legislative initiatives criticised and contested in the radical feminist debate about male violence against women, for gendering the securitization of in-migration. Section 6.4 presents the radical feminist comprehension of the social functions and effects of gendered securitization of in-migration and its relation to male violence against women. Section 6.5 brings into view the meanings of ‘gender’ as a social category indicating transnational and intersectional relationships of inequality. Section 6.6 closes the chapter, synthesising the main findings and identifying relevant points for further reflection.

---

51 “Flyers” are paper or electronic pamphlets, while “zines” are paper or electronic self-published works, original or otherwise, whose primary objective is to circulate news and ideas to support social and political struggles.
Questioning the subject of security

6.2. “Back to the streets”: causes and characteristics of the contemporary feminist politicization of male violence against women

Male violence against women has been a key point in the feminist agenda in diverse parts of the world. In Italy, at least since the 1970s, feminisms have publicly pointed out the extensiveness and rootedness of this phenomenon in society and began organising on this matter. In particular, they have mobilised against dominant socio-cultural understandings of male violence as men’s exceptional pathological reactions or expression of their natural aggressiveness. In the last few years, there has been a renewed feminist politicization of this form of violence as a reaction to: (1) mainstream representation of male violence against women as a social emergency associated with street criminality and in-migration, and disconnected form dominant cultural and social norms; (2) rise in cases of male violence against women influenced by the “masculinity crisis” and neoliberal reforms; (3) the Vatican’s aggressive promotion of its conservative agenda about gender and sexuality issues concealing the familial and domestic character of most cases of male violence. Against this backdrop, radical feminisms have taken multiple actions, such as: to denounce the significance of domestic violence; to oppose the securitisation and militarisation of irregular migration in general, and in-migration in particular; to give emphasis to non-victimising approaches and to anti-racist organising (Peroni 2015, Poidimani 2015).

At the heart of this chapter are radical feminist responses to the treatment of “male violence against women” as an issue of “public order”, which media and political parties suggest to confront through the implementation of repressive measures. Since the end of the 1990s, this securitising approach to violence against women – especially white Italian women – has been deployed in Italian public discourses in terms of a systemic stigmatization of male migrants as rapists and a call for the implementation of border enforcing measures (Dal Lago, 2001). More re-

The chapter adopts the expression ‘male violence against women’ to refer to a specific form of gender-based violence, which expresses the specific aspects of unequal relations of power between women and men. In particular, it prefers this expression to others such as ‘feminicide’ as it names all the subjects responsible for this specific form of violence. For a discussion on the use of terms such as male violence against women, gender-based violence, and feminicide in the context of feminist politics in Italy, see Peroni (2012).
cently, this problematic frame has operated in ways that legitimise the approval of contentious legislative measures – promoted by both centre-left and centre-right governments – to securitise in-migration. In response, radical feminisms have mobilised to contest these legal initiatives based on the following grounds: (a) the concealment of the fact that male violence against women is a structural phenomenon connected to gender roles and not to migration status or nationality; (b) the prompting of anti-migrant arguments based on the rhetoric of the clash of civilisations that, in itself, can trigger or deepen social unrest (Perilli, 2007b; Simone, 2010; Bonfiglioli, 2011; Peroni, 2012).

Beyond these two causes for mobilisation, male violence against women also seems to be on the rise, visible through statistics. As argued in diverse feminist analyses, this rise is related to diverse factors. One important cause of violence is identified in the “masculinity crisis”, which has been brought about by the growing participation of women in the labour market and the consequent changes in the organization of the family and reproductive labour. In this context, men’s attempts to re-establish control over women have produced an increase in the levels of violence (Federici, 2008; Pompili, 2012). Other factors seen as influencing the rise of male violence are neoliberal reforms and the financial crisis. The dismantling of the welfare state and neoliberal exaltation of market competition, while worsening both men and women’s economic conditions, amplify men’s frustrations, which may be vented on women, and augment persisting women’s discrimination in the labour market – all dynamics that make women more vulnerable to male violence (Danna, 2007; Federici, 2008; Pompili, 2012). In this perspective, the renewal of processes of capitalist accumulation is held accountable for exacerbating

---

53 Even if it remains difficult to quantify the growth of cases of male violence, the findings of Italy’s first inquiry on “Violence and abuses against women within and outside the family” conducted by the National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) in 2006, offered a valid point of reference for feminist mobilizations around male violence against women. Indeed, according to the inquiry, “more than 14 million of Italian women have been object of physical, sexual, and psychological violence during their lives” and “the main part of this violence is committed by their partner – as 69,7% of the rapes – or in familial contexts” and that “only 24,8% of cases of violence have been committed by a stranger”. It must be highlighted that these data refer to Italian women and not foreign women in Italy. See: [http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/appello.html](http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/appello.html)
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patriarchal relations, leading to radical feminists’ denouncement of, and opposition with renewed urgency to, domestic and institutional male violence (Federici, 2008).

An additional element that may account for the contemporary feminist politicization of male violence against women is the Vatican’s revived aggressive promotion of its conservative agenda in the field of sexuality and women’s self-determination. Indeed, this leaning has taken new strength since the publication of the Vatican’s “Lexicon of ambiguous and controversial terms on family, life, and ethical issues”, which in Italy came out in 2003. Together with other communication campaigns – such as the more recent attack to the so called “ideology of gender” – this initiative constituted the Vatican’s response to the achievements for public recognition made by the feminist and queer movements on self-determination. The Vatican’s celebration of the traditional heterosexual family – a rhetoric deeply embedded within the cultural background of Italian society – and the Church’s extended support to this social organization are also resisted owing to the fact that a main object of feminist criticisms and mobilizations for opposition has been the familialistic character of the Italian welfare system. Specifically, radical feminist politics has denounced the role of Vatican’s ideology in concealing the fact that, as a site of biological, social and cultural reproduction, the family can become, under certain conditions, the very site of structural male violence, especially when certain norms of reproduction are contested (Perilli, 2007b; Poidimani, 2007; Garbagnoli, 2015).

In this context, the renewed feminist politicization of male violence against women has taken various forms: interventions in media debates, arrangement of public discussions, production and translation of research materials, construction of national assemblies and meetings, organization of street demonstrations, sit-ins, and other types of mobilization. Significantly, these initiatives have taken place at both the local and national level, following the evolution of the institutional securitising approach to male violence against women. As shown in the next section, radical feminist political organising has moved from problematising the issue of equating, in media and the Law, the migrant with the rapist, to criticising the criminalization of protest movements as a legal measure to fight violence against women. Overall, these mobilizations have attempted to move beyond victim-oriented approaches in order to valorise women’s agency seen through the strategies they have adopted to resist pat-
riarchal oppression. In particular, they have opposed the social construction of men as guardians, and women as guarded subjects, for being associated to militarism and having disempowering effects on women. Specifically, radical feminisms have been promoting women’s self-defence and solidarity as empowering practices to fight male violence, tackling internalised images of weakness and passivity. Besides, they have also established connection with other struggles – for example struggles for reproductive freedoms, or against wars – recognising that the struggle against structural violence must be conducted on multiple levels.

In the period under scrutiny, the main noteworthy initiative confronting male violence against women has been the national demonstration organised by radical feminisms on the 24th of November 2007, in Rome, which brought to the streets about 150,000 participants. Particularly relevant to this chapter is the reaction of this march to the racist sensationalisation of a case of rape and murder of an Italian woman perpetrated by a Roma Romanian citizen. At the time of the demonstration, the perpetrator was turned into a show case, to support political parties’ proposal of security measures introducing expulsion procedures against citizens from countries in the enlarged EU. With a great number of participants and strong determination, this initiative had the merit to highlight within public discussions the position of radical feminisms on the instrumentalization of male violence against women for securitising and racist ends. It provided a perspective on the phenomenon different from that of mainstream media and political parties from both sides of the political spectrum, who explicitly supported the gendered securitization of in-migration and failed to problematize the family as a locus of violence. Of course, this demonstration did not emerge in a vacuum. It was instead preceded and followed by other feminist responses to the persistent political instrumentalization of male violence against women. Among the accounts of these many initiatives, this chapter selects those narratives that are relevant to the “gendering of securitization” as a phenomenon active simultaneously at the discursive and social levels.

54 On post-victimising approaches see: http://www.nicolettapoidimani.it/?page_id=337.
6.3 Making use of the Victims: the securitization of immigration as a governmental answer to male violence against women

I named ‘gendered securitization of in-migration’ a specific and recent tendency of the governmental rationality of security in Italy, which gave ‘gender’ a pivotal role in determining who must be protected against whom, how and why. Particularly, the expression refers to the treatment of male violence against women as an issue of public order, which has been used as a political instrument for the purpose of securitising inward people’s movements. This rationality functions to deploy the meaning of ‘male violence against women’ as a phenomenon that produces a special alarm, which opens the possibility for media and legislators to argue for, and proceed with, the closure of national borders and use of military means to manage migrants’ presence into the country. In particular, it operates through sensationalising specific news items, and promoting the representation of women as victims to be rescued, combined with the equation of the male migrant and the rapist. As will be shown, these meanings are mainly circulated through public discussions in the media and, in five cases, through the proposal or approval of national legislative measures.

The institutional initiative that launched the gendered securitization of in-migration is the Legislative Decree 181/2007 discussed earlier, which was significantly contested in the 2007 feminist demonstration. Indeed, this measure, containing “Urgent regulations on expulsion from the national territory due to public security reasons”, promoted the securitization of in-migration mainly relying on gendered arguments. It gave prefects the power to expel – without in-depth investigations – EU citizens from the national territory in case they committed crimes against persons or properties, configuring an expulsion procedure in violation of the EU directive 2004/58/CE, which sanctions EU citizens’ freedom of movement within the territory of the Union (Lamacchia, 2007). This measure intended to specifically target Roma Romanian citizens in Italy, responding to the “Reggiani’s case” that was highly sensationalised by media. This case became symbol of the social alarm.

ginario?atto.dataPubblicazioneGazzetta=2007-11-
02&atto.codiceRedazionale=007G0200&elenco30giorni=false.
created by the presence of migrants in the country, leading to the legal treatment of the phenomenon of violence against women as a matter of public order to face with the enforcement of borders, as well as to forced evictions of Roma and Sinti camps organised by diverse municipalities and racist attacks on these populations by right-wing and fascist groups (Perilli, 2007b; Peroni, 2012). Repeatedly referred to as the “anti-Roma Romanian” decree, this legislative decree serves as an exemplar of the conflation between violence against women as a matter of public order and enforcement of border control against communitarian citizens who are considered to be a “threat”. The decree was discussed in public debates and approved by Parliament within twenty-four hours (Rivera, 2009: 8). Although this measure was forfeited after two months, the rapidity of its first approval pointed out the high level of social alarm, and the anti-Roma sentiment connected to this case among the public.

A second institutional initiative underpinning the construction of immigration as a gendered threat targeting Italian women is the military operation “Strade Sicure”. This operation was initially approved in August, 2008, subsequently it has been renewed annually. The first approval of this operation was part of a whole set of measures introduced by Law Decree 92/2008 and later converted into Law No 125/2008, with the end of “fighting diffused illegality connected to illegal immigration and organized crime”. “Strade Sicure” introduced the employment of military forces on the national territory – in 2008 about 3,000 units from the military were deployed in main Italian cities – as a means to increase deterrence against street micro-criminality and offer surveillance services in visible sites, including administrative detention centres. In particular, politicians sponsoring this initiative

57 Indeed, since the 1st of January 2007, Romanian citizens can access Italian territory without visa. Since the same date, Romania has entered into the European Union. However, the EU imposition of a 7 years transition period implied restrictions to Romanian citizens’ free circulation in the Union’s territory until 2014. Yet, this restriction did not apply to Italy because of previous accords between the two countries. See: http://www.poliziadistato.it/articolo/352/.

58 See for example the following article: http://www.repubblica.it/2007/11/sezioni/cronaca/tor-di-quinto-unoh/tor-di-quinto-unoh.html

59 The Law No 125/2008 is available here: http://www.camera.it/parlam/leggi/08125l.htm.
Questioning the subject of security

claimed deterrence effects of this operation in relation to sexual crimes – hence implicitly connecting migrants’ presence in the country to acts of violence against women. For example, the Minister of Defence at that time, Ignazio La Russa, while presenting the organization of the operation in the city of Milan and visiting the military post at the city’s Central Station, commented that “Strade Sicure” was a “fundamental step” in terms of “security perception”, especially “considering that just in th[e] area [of the newly established military post] nine women had been raped since the beginning of the month”\(^{60}\). Yet, the main results of police and military joint patrols have been the “exponential growth of check and identification procedures for foreign nationals”\(^{61}\) and the “desertification of public space” (Cammarata e Monteleone, 2013: 98).

A third institutional initiative is Bill No. 1079 “Measures against prostitution”\(^{62}\), presented to the Senate in October 2008 by the Minister of Equal Opportunity, Mara Carfagna, and the Minister of Justice, Angelino Alfano. This bill, among other provisions, proposed to sanction the buying and selling of sexual services in public places as a criminal offence to be punished with a 200-3,000 Euro fine or a 5-15 days arrest. As justification of this proposal, the bill states: “it is precisely street prostitution that, in addition to creating major social alarm, lends itself to exploitation from part of organised crime”. Indeed, as declared by Mara Carfagna, the bill brought forward the view that street prostitution represents “a shameful phenomenon comparable to slavery”\(^{63}\). Hence, it framed again the phenomenon of violence against women – in this case connected to sex trafficking – as an issue of public

\(^{60}\) See this article: http://www.affaritaliani.it/milano/milanopattuglieMI050808_pg_2.html?refresh_ce.

\(^{61}\) In this regard, Bencini, Cerretelli, and Di Pasquale (2008: 19) report that “The Minister of Interior published very significant data concerning the first months of work of ‘mixed patrol’ (police and different branches of the Army). Between the 4th of August and the 28th of September 2008, over 52,000 people were stopped and identified, among which 14,221, more than 25%, were foreigners. […] The lack of balance in the checks is evident if one considers that one Italian in every 1,550 has been checked and 1 foreign person for every 300”.

\(^{62}\) The Disegno di Legge No 1079 is available here: http://www.senato.it/japp/bgt/showdoc/frame.jsp?tipodoc=Ddlpres&leg=16&id=00313179&part=doc_dc&parse=no.
order. The bill has never been turned into law, for it met diverse critiques when publicly presented, especially by organizations dealing with sex work and sex trafficking. In particular, this measure was criticised for “equating the condition of trafficking victims and that of persons who freely exercise sex work”, with the consequence of criminalising sex work and further victimising trafficked subjects (Asgi, 2008: 2).

Another legislative novelty supporting the gendered securitization of in-migration is the Law Decree No 11/2009 introducing “Urgent regulations on public security and against sexual violence and stalking”. Particularly significant is that this measure, also known in the public debate as “anti-rape decree”, explicitly framed male violence against women as a matter of public order and it connected this phenomenon to the presence of irregular migrants in the country. Indeed, this provision stiffened the penalties for sexual crimes and introduced the crime of stalking. Its repressive approach was then reinforced by a government decision to cut resources for women’s centres against violence. Simultaneously, it established the extension to 6 months of the period of administrative detention for irregular migrants. Again, this legislative initiative responded to the social alarm triggered by another news item. This was the Caffarella rape case consisting in the abuse and rape of a minor, in front of her boyfriend, by two unknown persons in a public park in Rome on the 14th of February 2009. Specifically, the fact that the opaque and contested investigation that followed the case led to the arrest and conviction of two Roma Romanian citizens was mainly read

63 See for example: [http://www.corriere.it/politica/08_settembre_11/con-siglio_ministri_approva_ddl_carfagna_c5968e8a-7fd6-11dd-9f6f-00144f02aabc.shtml](http://www.corriere.it/politica/08_settembre_11/con-siglio_ministri_approva_ddl_carfagna_c5968e8a-7fd6-11dd-9f6f-00144f02aabc.shtml).

64 See for example the following article: [http://www.unita.it/sociale/sul-corpo-delle-donne-i-tagli-strangolano-i-centri-anti-violenza-1256692](http://www.unita.it/sociale/sul-corpo-delle-donne-i-tagli-strangolano-i-centri-anti-violenza-1256692).

in the media through the frame of the migrant-rapist and triggered numerous racist aggressions against foreigners (Naletto, 2009). On the political level, the Law Decree No 11/2009 constituted a response to these events. Although the Law Decree conversion into Law No 23/2009 cancelled the extension of the period of administrative detention, this extension was approved a few months later by Law No 94/2009.

Finally, one last legislative measure concerning violence against women treated the phenomenon as a matter of public order, while supporting the gendering of securitization – although not in relation to in-migration. This is the Law Decree 93/2013 introducing “Urgent regulations on matters of security and for contrasting gender violence as well as on matters of civil protection and provinces’ compulsory administration”, which was later converted into Law No 119/2013, otherwise known in the public debate as the feminicide law. Next to very diverse issues, this provision addressed domestic violence, introducing new aggravating circumstances, modifying procedural aspects of criminal law, and proposing limited actions in support of victims of violence. Overall, this provision treated domestic violence in terms of an emergency, ignoring its structural character and social and cultural roots. In particular, through its unique focus on criminal law, this provision focused on the public perception of insecurity and it treats women as vulnerable subjects and not as subjects made vulnerable by violence also in the context of criminal procedures. Moreover, even if this provision abandoned the con-

---

66 The term ‘feminicide’ was coined by the anthropologist Marcela Lagarte (1993) to analyse “the connivance between Mexican illegal narco groups and the State in the mass torture, rape, and killing of hundreds of women around the city of Juarez” (Peroni, 2016: 1564). In Italy, since the beginning of the 2000s the term was initially employed by women’s or feminist groups and organizations. Then, its use was spread in the public debate by the monograph “Feminicide” published in 2008 by the feminist attorney Barbara Spinelli to indicate “any kind of violent behaviour or discrimination against women ‘as women’”.

67 As highlighted by Barbara Spinelli (2013) the government has failed to address the problem raised by numerous “crimes news, which report about women killed after asking for help and presenting charges to the police”. The article is available here: [http://27esimaora.corriere.it/articolo/decreto-femminicidio-ma-la-donna-non-e-un-soggetto-debole-ma-soggetto-reso-vulnerabile-dalla-violenza-e-questo-cambia-le-prospettive/](http://27esimaora.corriere.it/articolo/decreto-femminicidio-ma-la-donna-non-e-un-soggetto-debole-ma-soggetto-reso-vulnerabile-dalla-violenza-e-questo-cambia-le-prospettive/). Another relevant comment by lawyer Valeria Rinaldi is available here:
nection between male violence against women and in-migration, it was instrumentally used to pass a substantial, yet general set of repressive norms unrelated to domestic violence. Significantly, the law contained provisions regarding the criminalization of protest movements and the militarization of territories for promoting monitoring of sensitive sites – advancing one more time the gendering of securitization (Poidimani, 2013).

6.4 “Not in my name”: radical feminisms questioning the subject of security

Criticisms and opposition to these diverse legislative measures have been central in the renewed feminist politicization of male violence against women. The main message of radical feminist narratives on the gendered securitization of in-migration has been precisely that this governmental rationality participates in producing and reproducing the phenomenon of male violence. This claim was elaborated in the narratives analysed, as follows: (1) description of the gendered securitization of in-migration as based on media and state construction of male migrants as a gendered threat; (2) presentation of the effects of this governmental rationality on the debate on male violence; (3) depiction of the material effects of this governmental rationality on women as an heterogeneous group; (4) interpretations of the historical roots of this rationality; and (5) explanations of its current social functions. These arguments have been elaborated with reference to other feminist struggles, especially related to critiques of the contemporary social organization of reproductive labour and the invasion of Afghanistan in the context of the War on Terror.

The construction of male migrants as threatening subjects

According to radical feminist narratives, the construction of male migrants as a gendered threat to defend against stands at the heart of the securitization of in-migration produced by the legislative measures presented in Section 6.3. Specifically, research participants identified two key mechanisms underlying this construction. One is media selective attention to cases of male violence involving migrant perpetrators. In par-
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ticular, radical feminist analyses criticised the discriminatory “media amplification” of news items of gender violence cases implicating “migrant” rapists against both migrant and native women, vis-à-vis the justificatory frame that media commonly employed to treat similar episodes involving “Italian” perpetrators (Perilli, 2006). As pointed out during by a research participant with decades of experience in radical feminisms:

"if you read news items, when it is a foreign man who commits a violent act against women, whether Italian or foreigner, media expose both his name and surname, his curriculum vitae, et cetera. Instead, when the man is Italian, media disclose only his initials; then, the more elevated is the social class to which the Italian man belongs, more he is covered […]. Furthermore, when murders are committed by Italian men, there is all that justificatory apparatus [...] that connects their violence to rampages and moments of insanity" (Interview No 6).

As highlighted by one interviewee who was among the first activists working in Italy on the intersection of racism and sexism, one paradigmatic event was that of Hina Saleem, a young women of Pakistani origins, who was killed in 2006 by her father and other male relatives (Interview No 2). This and other similar cases were used in the media to “consolidate a collective climate of fear and hatred against foreigners”, especially Muslims, supporting the idea of a clash of civilization and proving the “impossible integration of Islam”\(^\text{68}\), while leaving unnamed the root causes of male violence against women (Perilli, 2006; Sabelli, 2012a).

Another mechanisms concurring to the construction of male migrants as a gendered threat is the state’s use of sensationalised cases of ‘migrant’ male violence against ‘Italian’ women to the end of approving securitarian measures to govern the presence of migrants in the country. For instance, communication statements supporting the 2007 demonstration opposed the anti-Roma-Romanian decree for tackling “violence against women as a form of deviance by individuals or a responsibility to be ascribed to the nationality of the aggressors or killers”\(^\text{69}\). They qualified

\(^{68}\) See this article: http://marginaliavincenzaperilli.blogspot.it/2006/11/il-qui-ed-ora-del-patriarcato-hina.html

\(^{69}\) See the press statement issued on the 1st of November 2007 by the organizers of the 2007 demonstration:
this decree as a “racist, petty, and dangerous operation” that “employs the death of a woman, brutally tortured and murdered, to condemn an entire people, the Roma.” Another example concerned radical feminist opposition to the anti-rape decree that followed the Caffarella rape. In this case, a radical feminist activist involved in an independent radio programme on the condition of migrants in Italy commented that this provision, “approved in the name of ‘our’ women”, clearly indicated that “Italian, white, and native women are considered Italian men’s own territory and possession, which must be defended against the ‘rapist foreigner’” and that “such a representation of Italian women is functional to justify social control and xenophobic and securitarian measures” (Silenzio Assordante, 2010: 16). In sum, radical feminist narratives stressed that male violence against women operates as a powerful device to create social alarms, mobilise public opinion, identify friends and foes, and expel non-national men as Others (Peroni, 2012).

On the whole, contesting the construction of male migrants as a gendered threat in legal initiatives regulating the presence of migrants’ in the country enabled radical feminisms to reveal the existence of a specific governmental rationality, which I defined as gendered securitization of in-migration. Such a recognition opened a novel political field for radical feminisms, bringing about the involvement of women, as social and political subjects, into issues of in-migration.

The normalization of male violence against women as a structural phenomenon

Radical feminist narratives showed that the construction of male migrants as a gendered threat resulted in the public concealment of a number of declinations of male violence against women. One phenomenon concealed from view by gendered securitization is structural domestic violence, which was especially discussed during the debate connected to the 2007 mobilization. For example, the appeal launching the demonstration contrasted the institutional framing of violence over women as an issue of “urban security and public order” to the fact that “killings of women” are mostly “perpetrated by fathers, fiancée, or ex-husbands in
the name of love”\textsuperscript{71}. In particular, this text opposed the “securitising and repressive legislative measures” for failing to address male “violence against women [as a form of violence that] is historically and socially accepted” and “perpetrated irrespective of age, skin colour, and status”. In doing so, radical feminist narratives identified the “family unit” as the main locus of violence because of the “power and dependency relations” by which it is marked. Further developing this critique, various communication statements of support to this demonstration criticised Catholic hierarchies for “reiterating the indissolubility and centrality of the family” in public discourses and policy\textsuperscript{72}, warning ironically against the “only non-EU country [which] represents, in its entirety, a dangerous enemy of women: the Vatican”\textsuperscript{73}. Finally, they also discussed “the exploitation of migrant women” in the domestic sphere, thus indicating male violence as exercised not only over family members, but also over “employees” as in the experience of “colf, badanti, and baby-sitters”\textsuperscript{74}.

Another phenomenon excluded from discussions on male violence underlying the securitization of in-migration is precisely the exploitation of migrant women’s reproductive labour within the domestic sphere. In order to explain why silence on the condition of migrant women do-

\textsuperscript{71} Here, the text of the appeal: \url{http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/appello.html}.

\textsuperscript{72} In particular, during 2007, the year of the demonstration, the Catholic exaltation of this patriarchal institution took the form of the “Family Day”, a political initiative gathering the support of politicians from both sides of the political spectrum, which was organized to oppose a legislative proposal, discussed at that time, on the legal recognition of de facto unions, including same-sex unions.

\textsuperscript{73} See the communication statement of the women from the group Facciamo Breccia released on the 16\textsuperscript{th} of November, 2007: \url{http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/adesioni.html}.

\textsuperscript{74} See the following intervention in the debate on the 2007 demonstration: \url{http://marginaliavincenzaperilli.blogspot.com.es/2007/11/che-cosa-miriamo-per-unospostamento.html}. It should be clarified that “colf” and “badante” are two neologisms that emerged to indicate professional figures that have become increasingly central to the organization of reproductive labour in Italian families. The terms “colf” combines the words “collaboratore/collaboratrice” and “familiare” to indicate “domestic workers”. The term “badante” indicates “caregivers” usually employed to look after the elderly.
mestic workers\textsuperscript{75} is highly problematic, my interviewees recalled previous analyses of the globalization of care\textsuperscript{76} as an implicit background to radical feminist critiques to the gendering of securitization (Interview No 6, Focus group No 3, Cartosio 2004, Morini 2001 and 2004). Especially one white Italian research participant who shared diverse experiences of political organising with migrant women mentioned the “profound and intolerable inequalities” dividing “Italian” and “migrant” women, which translate in “economic and sexual blackmails” systematically experienced by migrant women due to their precarious legal status and resulting exploitative labour conditions (Interview No 6, Morini 2004). Additionally, she pointed out Italian women’s blindness towards the conditions of migrant domestic workers as women. In this regard, the following description of Italian women employers by an Italian-Somali intellectual who participated in this study is exemplary:

“These ladies, if questioned about gender issues, I am afraid they would all be champions of women’s freedom: women, if qualified, have the right to work everywhere they want; women’s double function in society (within and outside the house) must be valorised; free mobility and

\textsuperscript{75} Given its purposes, this chapter makes reference only to women migrant domestic workers. However, the feminist debate considered recognizes that waged reproductive labour does not exclusively involves women: “there are many migrant men who work as waiters, maids, and caretakers of the elderly” and there is also a process of feminization of male migrants engaged in domestic labour (Morini, 2001: 25; Poidimani, 2006).

\textsuperscript{76} This reference is to radical feminist interventions in public debates on the increasing relevance of migrant domestic work in Italian society, which took place during the first half of the 2000s. Key elements of this debate were the mass regularization for irregular migrants working as 
colf and badanti foreseen by the Bossi-Fini Law in 2002 and the diverse initiatives organised to oppose the law for linking the residency permit to women’s employment in the care sector – thus enabling particularly exploitative working conditions connected to domestic labour. See for example: http://www.puntodipartenza.net/bigallo.html and http://www.puntodipartenza.net/bigallo1.html. Another element mentioned by the interviewees was the publication of diverse studies on the globalization of care such as the inquiry by journalists “La serva serve: le nuove forzate del lavoro domestico”, edited by Cristina Morini (2001), and the Italian translation of the essays collection “Global women: nannies, maids, and sex workers in the new economy” edited by Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild (2004).
free time must be protected; women’s quota in the Parliament must be
guaranteed so as to reinforce women’s presence in key places where the
destinies of the country are decided; and, naturally, tax allowances and
credits for colf wages must be recognized. [Yet] all these keywords clash
with [Italian ladies’] relations with immigrants in their home. Clearly, colf
are not women, who knows?” (Aden, 2001: 32; emphasis: SD).

Finally, diverse research participants with decades of experience in
feminist politics denounced the complicity of “Italian women and femin-
ists” in re/producing migrant domestic workers’ experiences of exploita-
tion by “avoiding confrontation” on their “delegation of [care work] to
women from the South and the East of the world” and the resulting
“asymmetrical relations” (Interview No 6, Interview No 3, Cartosio 2004). In sum, these points enhanced the scope of the radical feminist
critique of gendered securitization for concealing forms of exploitation
and labour appropriation targeting migrant women.

One more phenomenon concealed from view by gendered securitiza-
tion is the lack of institutional initiatives to address gendered violence in
public spaces. Paradigmatic of this critique was the action-research
“Safety or Security? Quale genere di sicurezza per la mia città?”77, which
was realised in 2009 by the collective Sommosse Perugia to discuss –
among other issues – local urban policies. As emerged during a FGD,
this action-research focused on the gendered character of urban mobility
in Perugia, and it was realised by a group of young women with direct
experience of the gendered risk of moving in specific hours and spaces
of the city. The project denounced that novelties in the institutional or-
ganization of urban mobility, which were intended – according to local
authorities – to improve citizens’ quality of life, failed to address wo-
en's safety. Specifically, the action-research discussed the construction
of a mini-metro connecting the centre of Perugia to isolated neighbour-
hoods where the “high presence of migrants is commonly associated by
media and institutions to criminality and perceived insecurity” (Focus
group No 1). Thus, it showed that this means of transportation "did not
address women's security at night", since it worked only during the day
and it required to be reached by car, functioning instead as a "service to
commercial businesses" (Focus group No 1). As noted by a participant
who was involved in the action-research, this work pointed out the pro-

77 The video realized during the action-research project is available here:
http://liberetutte.noblogs.org/safety-or-security /
pagandistic character of institutional concerns around women's security and the “hypocrital contrast between institutional emphasis on security and the lack of effective solutions” (Focus group No 1).

Overall, radical feminisms disputed the normalization of male violence as a structural problem, showing how its diverse declinations are made invisible by media and institutional construction of male migrants as a gendered threat. This has required radical feminisms to take awareness of the role of the gendered securitization of in-migration in influencing the debate on male violence.

The effects of the gendered securitization of in-migration on women

Radical feminist narratives indicated diverse material consequences of the gendered securitization of in-migration on women as an heterogeneous social group. One main effect regarded the limitations brought to women’s self-determination and safety. For instance, many communication statements supporting the 2007 demonstration argued that if securitising measures intend to protect women, it is because they consider women as weak; however, “women are not weak subjects, they are rather weakened subjects”\(^78\), and entrusting others with their own protection – whether other men in the family or institutions – constitutes a further weakening factor. Besides, a sex workers’ collective denounced the Carfagna bill for criminalizing street prostitution and legitimizing police “prostitute haunts” to “clean the streets”, and their deadly results as in the case of fatal attempts to escape arrests and administrative detention\(^79\). Moreover, as denounced by an activist and organiser of self-defence courses, there have been plenty of cases of violence committed by police and military personnel, such as the aggression and rape committed by the soldier Francesco Tuccia against a young woman in the city of L’Aquila in February, 2012. The fact that the soldier was deployed in the frame of “Strade Sicure” confirmed that “under the pretext of guaranteeing women security against ‘foreigners’, [this operation] increased the dangers faced by women” (Poidimani 2015: online). Furthermore, this activist pointed out that the treatment of women as victims constitutes a “male


\(^{79}\) See the press statement realized by the sex workers’ organization Comitato per i Diritti Civili delle Prostitute on October 10, 2008 in reaction to the Carfagna Bill: [http://www.universitadelledonne.it/cedep.htm](http://www.universitadelledonne.it/cedep.htm).
business opportunity built on women’s fear”, as shown by the multiplication of self-defence courses for women held mainly by “men, who often are ex-army” (Poidimani 2015: online). Finally, in view of overcoming victimising approaches, she invited to show solidarity not only to women who denounced their rapists, but also to women who are under trial for killing their abusers in self-defence (Poidimani, 2015).

Another material consequence of gendered securitization that radical feminist narratives questioned was the creating of hierarchies among women. Specifically, radical feminist groups criticised the role of security measures in causing further “suffering and unease” to women belonging to the social groups targeted: for example, Roma-Romanian women in the case of the Legislative Decree 181/2007 or undocumented migrant sex workers in the case of the Carfagna bill. In this sense, two participants stressed that “security is not just a discourse which instrumentalises women’s bodies, but which also differentiates women because when you speak about women’s security, you are speaking about Italian women – not all women” (Focus group No 1). Indeed, the almost totality of research participants emphasised the relevance of different lived experience at the intersection of various forms of oppression. Additionally, many highlighted the multiplication of hierarchies among women as affecting both migrants and citizens. Firstly, measures such as the anti-Roma-Romanian decree were seen to establish the primary role of “nationality or, better, race, the colour of those who suffer and those who act violence” in discriminating between “first class and second class cases of violence” (Interview No 10; Interview No 3, Interview No 4). Secondly, other measures such as the Carfagna Bill were criticised for enforcing specific “models of behaviour in the name of decency and respectability” which discriminate against non-heteronormative subjects.

80 “Parole di donna, parole di libertà” by Open Mind – Centro di iniziativa GLBT e donne catanesi. Available at: http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/adesioni.html
81 As observed by Poidimani (2008), undocumented sex workers are the main target of dispositions criminalizing street prostitution as they cannot have legal access to private residences given their administrative irregular condition.
82 See the call for the demonstration against male violence against women held on the 22nd of November, 2008 in Rome: www.universitadelledonne.it/som-mosse22-11-08.htm.
and practices cutting across the border between citizens and migrants (Focus group No 1, Focus group No 3).

One final material effect of gendered securitization that radical feminist narratives presented was the undermining of alliances among women from diverse social locations. In this regard, the article “The perception of femicide and violence among trafficking victims” stands out, written by Isoke Aikpitanyi (2013a), a Nigerian woman who, after experiencing the condition of being an irregular migrant and victim of trafficking in Italy, has been promoting the self-organization of victims and former victims of trafficking. This text was an intervention in the public debate on femicide – before the approval of the Law Decree 93/2013 – that circulated also in diverse radical feminist blogs and websites. In this piece, Aikpitanyi wrote that “the fact that more than one hundred Italian women are killed every year is obscene, but if Italian women were killed with the same frequency with which Nigerian women are killed, the total number of women killed in Italy would be four thousands”. Further, she argued that it would be desirable that Italian women “who are running in politics” were aware of these diverse perceptions for “[they] prefer to do as much as possible to represent us, taking all the space” while “[we] would like to represent ourselves directly”. In fact, Aikpitanyi stressed that Italian female politicians’ active opposition or inactivity in relation to migrant women’s self-representativeness increases the isolation of migrant survivors of violence. This is considered especially counterproductive given the connection existing between the conditions of Italian and foreign women: indeed, since it is against prostitutes that men mostly vent their violence, Aikpitanyi (2013a) provocatively declared that “each African woman raped is a white woman saved” from family violence. Thus, Aikpitanyi stresses the necessity to think about the fight against femicide from diverse perspectives, clarifying the linkages existing between these diverse conditions.

---

83 This contribution by Isoke Aikpitanyi is not mentioned in the context of this chapter to the end of suggesting that the activism promoted by victims and former victims of trafficking is part and parcel of radical feminist politics as there is not a systematic connection between these diverse activisms. Instead, the acknowledgment of this speech in a discussion on radical feminist politics reflects the fact that this and other contributions by Aikpitanyi have represented a relevant stimulus for radical feminisms.
In short, problematizing the effects of the gendered securitization of in-migration on women as an heterogeneous group led radical feminists to question and challenge, from an intersectional perspective, the subject of security and underlying conceptualization of who is made insecure, how, why, and with which effects.

The historical roots of the gendered securitization of in-migration

Radical feminist politics discussed the historical roots of the gendered securitization of in-migration, referring to histories of colonialism and slavery, and especially the War on Terror.

On the histories of colonialism and slavery, radical feminist narratives made diverse connections to gendered securitization, showing that “racist and de-humanising devices that were formed during the fifty years of the [Italian] colonial experience in Africa” are today reactivated “on the skin of migrant women and men in the name of security” (Poidimani, 2009: 7-8). For example, in regard to the approval of the anti-Roma-Romanian decree and the evictions of Roma camps following the Reggiani’s case, radical feminist communication statements condemned securitizing discourses for promoting a “fascist conception of society where [national] women’s bodies become the site for the construction of national identity” as mere “instruments for the reproduction of a wider [and homogeneous national] community”\(^{84}\). They also contested the gendered criminalization of migrants underpinning the anti-Roma-Romanian decree for separating “native” and “migrant” women “in the name of a ‘race’ to defend”\(^{85}\), thus explicitly recalling the justificatory rhetoric of Italian colonization in the Horn of Africa during the fascist period that has been discussed in Chapter 4. Yet, these narratives mostly problematized the contemporary inheritance of processes of racialization rooted in the period of Italian fascism, sideling instead attention to colonial racism during the monarchic liberal period or, anti-Southern racism and racism against Italian emigrants. This tendency seems connected to the prioritization, in feminist imaginaries, of the Partisan struggles against historical fascism (Lentin 2004). The result is a conceptualization of racism


\(^{85}\) MaiStat@Zitt@. Available at: http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/adesioni.html
as an externalised phenomenon that is exclusively acted by political others and experienced by migrants from the Global South (Lentin 2004).

Besides, radical feminist narratives also showed an incipient attention to transnational connections illuminating similarities between the framing of migrants as rapists in the context of securitizing actions and the myth of the “black rapist”, which surfaced in the US after the abolition of slavery to justify Afro-American lynching and guarantee their exploitation (Sabelli, 2012: 150). Indeed, representing black men as hypersexualised subjects endowed with the “desire to possess white women”, this myth clearly resembles the current Italian legislation treating male migrants as a gendered threat (Sabelli, 2012: 150).

Next, the radical feminist narratives described previous analyses of the “Enduring Freedom” operation in Afghanistan, launched in 2001 by the Bush administration, as the implicit background of the critique that radical feminisms later directed at gendered securitization. In particular, the text “Women’s choral on war” (2002: 38) stands out as an important collection of various fragments of a conversation on the war, involving an “informal group of women with diverse ages, nationalities, educational trainings and personal experiences”. This conversation was published as “multicultural materials” on the invasion of Afghanistan with the intent of conveying “a unique and unified voice” on the conflict to help overcome the imposed partition between gendered victims and saviours that sustained the justification of the war (Women’s choral on war, 2002: 45). In the words of its protagonists, some of whom participated in this study, this work constituted “an important passage in regards to feminism and anti-racism” (Interview No 6): for “Western women”, it represented an occasion to break with the role of "imperial ladies" (Interview No 6) and for “non-Western women” it was an opportunity to "bring our own perspective as they [Western women] did not know anything about our worlds and cultures" (Focus group No 6) and to restate once again that the "Muslim world is not monolithic" (Focus group No 6).

What especially matches the interests of this chapter about the “Women’s choral on war” (2002: 40) is its problematization of the attempts to legitimise the invasion of Afghanistan on gendered grounds. The document noted that the US justified the armed intervention as “a war ‘to liberate women’”, “our Afghan sisters” – as they were addressed by the
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US first lady at that time, Laura Bush\textsuperscript{86} (Choral, 2002: 40). It described the arguments disguising the conflict as an attempt to project it as “a feminist war”:

“The syllogism is simple: Bin Laden is a terrorist and an enemy of the West; Bin Laden is protected by the Taliban; the Taliban does not only protect Bin Laden, but it also locks up women; Bin Laden is the biggest women’s enemy. He is two times bad. And the Taliban is two times bad” (Choral, 2002: 40).

Furthermore, the document commented that the real burka in this war is not the one worn by Afghan women, but that under which “the real motives of the war are hidden: oil, strategic accesses and, above all, control” (Choral, 2002: 40). Hence, the Choral retraced the roots of these rescuing fantasies: “They [the US and NATO countries had] practiced with the ‘humanitarian war’, where they used the same trick. At that time it was about safeguarding the human rights of an ethnic minority, now it is about women” (Choral, 2002: 40).

Significantly, the Choral identified the strategies that media and politics employed to support this instrumentalization of Afghan women to the end of legitimizing the War on Terror, while also clarifying their implications. In particular, the text pointed to both the demonization of men and the victimization of women in Afghanistan, which underlies the politics of liberating women. As synthesized in a quote by Sunera Thobani\textsuperscript{87} (2001) “in the West [Afghani women] become nothing but poor victims of this bad, bad religion, and of [these] backward, backward men” (Thobani in Choral, 2002: 40). From this follows the invisibilization of any subject outside of this model. For example, the document commented on the reception in Italy of Sima Samar, well known woman’s and human rights advocate, who “was not ok for the newspapers, at least until her political investiture”: “she was not enough a ‘sad refugee’, not enough ‘war exotic’, she did not wear the burka” (Choral, 2002: 39). Additionally, the text recognized how the rhetoric of rescuing

\textsuperscript{86} This excerpt, quoted by the Choral (2002: 40), is from Ms Laura Bush’s Radio Address on the 17\textsuperscript{th} of November, 2001 and it is available at: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=24992.

\textsuperscript{87} This fragment, quoted by the Choral (2002: 40), is from Sunera Thobani’s speech at the “Women’s resistance: from victimization to criminalization” Conference, Ottawa, and it was given on the 1\textsuperscript{st} of October, 2001. It is available at: http://print.indymedia.org/news/2001/10/923_comment.php.
women makes appeal to men’s sense of ownership of women: “the concept is always this: ‘Defend your women!’” (Choral, 2002: 43). Third, the publication acknowledged that the framing of the invasion of Afghanistan as a sort of feminist war constitutes an attempt to make women in the West to line up as “how could [Western women] dodge from saving their ‘Afghan sisters’?” (Choral, 2002: 40). Overall, the document identified gender as a privileged terrain to establish the pretended superiority of the West, and thus its moral duty to militarily intervene for the sake of the Other.

Summing up, it is easy to recognize a parallelism between the discourse elaborated in the Choral to criticise the gendered justification of the military invasion of Afghanistan and radical feminist narratives engaging the gendered securitization of in-migration. Both critiques indicated that these justificatory arguments construct the Other as patriarchal and backwarded: in the former case the role of the villain is attributed to the Taliban, in the second case to the migrant rapist. Besides, they clearly identified that this legitimization is based on the ideational production of women as victims and a consequent invisibilization of their agency – in the military invasion of Afghanistan the victims are recognized as Afghan women, and in the discourse of gendered securitization they are fundamentally Italian women. Finally, they pointed out that this justificatory discourse frames Western security forces as the heroes of the story, while concealing that military and securitising interventions would inevitably increase patriarchal violence. In both cases, they elaborated a response based on the construction of a united front between Western and non-Western women, while recognising the unequal relations of power between the two groups. Overall, the identification of the historical roots of the gendered securitization of in-migration enabled radical feminisms to situate their struggle in relation to long term and transnational processes of racialization.

**The social functions of gendered securitization**

Radical feminist narratives showed diverse social functions of gendered securitization of in-migration and its relation to male violence against women. For example, the organisers of the 2007 march explained that gendered securitization functions hiding the “dangerous deterioration of the relation between women and men” within and outside the domestic space, thus leaving unaddressed the use of male violence as an instru-
Questioning the subject of security

ment of control over women. A radical feminist group discussing the gendered and sexual character of citizenship during a conference argued that this governmental rationality enables “to manage social conflicts as a civilizational clash” disguising and hiding gendered and racial processes of appropriation of labour, bodies, and resources, through essentialist and fixed representation of the cultures and gendered norms of migrant populations, based on colonial and imperialist imaginaries. To make a similar point, another radical feminist group highlighted that the connection between criminality and in-migration established in the process of gendering securitization worked to obscure the condition of “migrant women who work as maids or caretakers and who are systematically exploited and heavily harassed by the good Italian people”. Finally, this same group identified the effects of the gendering of securitization as making invisible various other transnational phenomena, such as “the flourishing industry of sexual tourism involving home-grown men in search of children and young girls to buy for little money in Romania, Cambodia, or Brazil” or “the highly paid Italian soldiers that in war or peacekeeping missions reproduce colonial behaviour and treat women as war booty”. On the whole, indicating the social functions of the gendered securitization of in-migration radical feminisms casted the struggle against male violence as an intersectional project engaged in re-framing the same subject of security as intersectional and transnational safety.

In conclusion, radical feminist narratives showed how the meanings of “male violence against women” as a social phenomenon have been politically deployed to securitise in-migration. First, they contested the construction of male migrants as a gendered threat, opening a novel feminist field of political mobilization that has brought about the involve-

88 An excerpt from the following appeal: http://www.controviolenzadonne.org/cvd-old/html/appello.html.
89 A/Matrix intervention in the conference “Dentro e fuori le democrazie sessuali” organised by Facciamo Brecia and held in Rome on May, 28-29 2011 http://www.facciamobreccia.org/content/view/532/88/ (last access January 2014).
90 MaiStat@Zitt@ (2007). Available at: http://ogo.noblogs.org/gallery/4590/opuscolo_msz.pdf.
91 MaiStat@Zitt@ (2007). Available at: http://ogo.noblogs.org/gallery/4590/opuscolo_msz.pdf.
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ment of women, as social and political subjects, into issues of in-migration. Second, they disputed the normalization of male violence as a structural problem as produced by gendered securitization, taking awareness of the role of this governmental rationality in influencing the debate on male violence. Third, they problematized the consequences of the gendered securitization of in-migration on women as an heterogeneous group, questioning the subject of security and underlying conceptualization of who is made insecure, how, why, and with which effects. Fourth, they identified the historical roots of gendered securitization, revealing the need to confront long-terms, and transnational processes of racialization. Finally, they indicated the social functions of gendered securitization, casting the struggle against male violence as an intersectional project engaged in re-signifying the same idea of security.

6.5 Gendered securitization of in-migration and the meanings of ‘gender’ as structure

How do radical feminist narratives on the gendered securitization of in-migration give meanings to ‘gender’ as structure? To answer the question, this section examines: (1) the perspectives employed within the texts discussed in the previous section that, once identified, clarify the standpoints from which gender is constructed as a social category; (2) the strategies of Representation of Social Actors – such as inclusion, exclusion, foregrounding, backgrounding, and suppression of social actors – that bring into view the multi-group relations of inequality between and within gendered groups, shedding light on the intersectional dimension of ‘gender’ as conveyed by radical feminist narratives; (3) spatial devices indicating the setting where social actors are located that, enabling to identify the spatial scales of analysis employed in the narratives examined, shed light on their transnational dimension. Finally, the section ends by identifying the epistemic benefits and limitations of radical feminist narratives so as to bring into focus strengths and weaknesses of their signification of ‘gender’.

First, consideration of social actors’ perspectives showed that the narratives analysed were produced from the viewpoint of radical feminists – mostly Italian white women –, and migrant racialised women organising in relation to their condition of being women and migrants and racialised Other – sometimes in connection with radical feminists. The former point of view, that of the white Italian radical feminists, is
that of a subject who becomes aware of the multiple processes in which she is caught: being instrumentally used to justify the oppression of other subjects, enjoying indirect, but immediate material benefits from this oppression, while, at the same time, paying a price for these advantages in terms of personal safety, self-determination, and integrity. Critical reflections on these experiences leads to the story of a gendered and raced subject who comes to terms with the fact that specific transnational social, political, and economic processes bring about her own double experience of racial privilege and gendered oppression.

The latter point of view is that of a subject who is conscious of being positioned at the entanglement of diverse power relations that make her condition invisible: migrant domestic workers unseen as women, migrant sex workers banished from the streets, Muslim women unnoticed as subjects in struggles, et cetera. Critical considerations on these experiences tells the story of a subject confronting her systemic invisibility, who is engaged in bringing up her own perspective and establishing connections between her invisibilised situation and that of potential, but often blinded, allies. Overall, both situated perspectives are taken here as standpoints inasmuch they display awareness about the structuring of power relations.

From these two standpoints, radical feminist narratives participated in shedding light on power structures in diverse domains. In regard to the constitution of labour markets, these narratives showed the role of gendered securitization in differently including migrant women, in subordinate positions within labour markers connected to domestic, care, and sex work. They also made visible how gendered securitization produces business and working opportunities in very different sectors, from urban mobility to personal self-defence courses.

About construction of national identity, radical feminist narratives contested dominant representations of male violence as supposedly extraneous to Italian culture but inherent to the cultures of migrants. Simultaneously, they criticised any association between women and nationalism, and their fight to not be used for building a notion of a homogeneous national community took advantage of critical readings of racialising processes during the fascist period. However, lack of engagement with other historical phases, particularly the monarchic liberal period, or phenomena such as Southern anti-racism and racism against Italian emigrants, produced a conceptualization of racism as
something distant, impeding to gain awareness of the centrality of whiteness in the construction of Italian identity.

Furthermore, these narratives were particularly attentive to valuing the agency of commonly victimised subjects. For example, they carefully countered both victimising frames that propose to entrust women’s security to police forces, and criminalising frames that paint street sex workers as threatening subjects. Yet, they did not simply celebrate and idealise the agency of “Italian” and “migrant” women, but also considered the structural causes explaining the diverse conditions of these subjects. For instance, speaking of migrants’ domestic work, the narratives connected migrants’ vulnerability to economic and sexual blackmails to the nature of governing of irregular migration, the downsizing of welfare provisions, lack of “Italian” women’s conflictuality in promoting the gendered redistribution of household responsibilities, and so on. In short, these standpoints shed light on the role of gendered securitization in constituting both productive and reproductive labour markets, negotiating national identities, and conceiving the relation between agency and structure.

Second, focus on strategies of Representation of Social Actors in radical feminist narratives on gendered securitization shows how they clearly recognised the role played by both gender and race in producing relations of inequality. The foregrounding of “Italian and migrant women” brought attention to sexual difference and geographical origin as key factors to define social actors’ position produced by gendered securitization. In this frame, the working of gender immediately emerged from references to sexual difference as a key to indicate gendered roles in relation to violence, as well as in domestic, care, and sex work. Similarly, the functioning of race indirectly surfaced in radical feminist critiques of gendered securitization, showing the association of provenance from a certain geographical region to supposedly inherited national, cultural, and religious features. Yet, with few exceptions, the radical feminist narratives marginalised or expelled from the order of discourse references to somatic and morphological traits, conforming to the same colour-blind language employed by gendered securitization as a governmental rationality. The result of this silence on the “visual markers” of racial Otherness is the concealment of Italian racialised minorities (Al-Tayeb 2011: 22). Indeed, contrasting Italians and migrants, with no explicit reference to race, leads to assume that racialised bodies
only pertain to the category of migrants, condemning racialised Italians to be considered as “perennial newcomers” (Al-Tayeb 2011: 25).

Notably, attention to silences and amplifications in the representation of relations of inequality has revealed that these narratives give more prominence to gendered inequalities. Inclusion of social actors such as “Italian women employers” and “migrants as rapists” introduced elements of complexity showing that gender power relations are not merely about men oppressing women, but that white women may oppress other racialised women, and racialised men may also be oppressed in gendered terms. However, these narratives visibly foregrounded the effects of gendered securitization on white and racialised women, while they backgrounded these same effects on racialised men. This choice contributed to prevent an analysis of how the gendered securitization of in-migration influence racialised men as both subject and object of violence. Furthermore, inclusion of “Italian husbands, fiancée, fathers” as well as “policemen, military, and ex-army” showed awareness about the privileges enjoyed by white Italian men in terms of irresponsibility towards domestic violence and access to job and business opportunities. Overall, the identified strategies of Representation of Social Actors in radical feminist structural analysis of gendered securitization helped to reveal complex unequal relations, highlighting the intersectional effects of this rationality between gendered groups.

Third, the spatial settings in which social actors are located in radical feminist narratives expressed a certain sensibility to transnational issues, while retaining elements of methodological nationalism. Particularly, these narratives made one of their major points to contest the associations made between specific sets of gender relations and specific nations and cultures – including religious cultures – as they criticised gendered securitization. Thus, they abstained from making gender as a means for homogenising national groups and reifying nations, while warning against the role of gendered securitization as a governmental rationality in reinforcing women’s dependence on men independently from the culture of origin. Additionally, these narratives have repeatedly proven their attention to cross-border dynamics as well as diverse scales of analysis. For instance, they have reflected on international sexual tourism, peace-keeping missions, wars, cross-border trafficking, and so on. Moreover, they have also shown an emerging awareness of the
political significance of identifying interconnections between social positions instead of simply verifying the existence of differences. For example, attention to Aïkipitanîy’s (2013) call to approach the phenomenon of male violence against women from diverse perspectives eschews universalising the experience of limited groups of women. However, while these narratives did not present the Italian national community as homogeneous, and made social conflicts across the national body visible, they showed less engagement in breaking homogenising understanding of migrants and their social conditions – for example they rarely referred to internal differences related to class and nationality. In this sense, feminist narratives retained elements of methodological nationalism.

In sum, the narratives that I have collected and examined have been proved to be a source of knowledge about the working of gender and race in the gendered securitization of in-migration. Epistemic benefits of these narratives have regard their capacity to reveal significant contradictions between the functionalities claimed by gendered securitization and the social experiences of their actualization. These narratives persuasively claimed that legal initiatives claiming to protect Italian women from racialised male violence played a substantial role in reproducing male violence as well as racist violence against both migrant men and women. They also argued that gendered securitization functions as a mode for concealing social conflicts in terms of a clash of civilizations. Importantly, such epistemic benefits have been considered as relative to institutional and media discourses on male violence against women.

Besides, three main epistemic limitations have been identified: first, radical feminist narratives’ lack of engagement with diverse experience of racism and the historical inheritance of the liberal monarchic phase of nation-building, which laid the foundations for the construction Italian unexpressed whiteness and its concealment; second, their inclination to adopt the same colour-blind language employed in the governmental rationality of gendered securitization, which missed to problematize the exclusion of the racialised form the body of the nation; and third, their tendency to homogenise the migrant group and the social condition associated to this subject location, which failed to fully deconstruct dominant representations of migrants, thus de-potentiating their critical approach to the gendered securitization of in-migration. In short, these epi-
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stemic benefits and limitations well indicate the strengths and weaknesses of radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ as structure.

6.6 Concluding remarks

This chapter has showed how radical feminisms in today’s Italy gave meanings to ‘gender’ as a structure of power, while challenging the subject of security in struggles against the gendered securitization of in-migration. In this context, ‘gender’ has emerged as a key site of political contestation. Particularly, this category has been used: (1) as a means to classify and govern populations, legitimising discrimination towards racialised groups represented as intrinsically oppressive based on gender identity; and (2) as an instrument to name, substantiate, and act upon a specific form of oppression and the governmental rationalities implicated in the reproduction of this oppression. In particular, the radical feminist narratives approached the phenomenon of ‘gender’ as necessarily and always intertwined with other power relations, especially race, both in governmental and oppositional processes. Furthermore, they presented the centrality of the governing of in-migration for the re-articulation of contemporary gender relations in destination societies. They clarified that the effects of gendered securitization, aimed at managing human mobility, are not limited to those labelled as migrants. Instead, they disclosed the consequences of this governmental rationality for a plurality of subjects, focusing especially on women – both citizens and migrants. In conclusion, proving the close relation existing between gender and securitization, these narratives enhanced the understanding of the modes through which gender as structure – in intersection with race – is produced, reproduced and normalised in the context of one specific governmental rationality. This theme will be further developed in Chapters 7 and 8, discussing additional relevant meanings of ‘gender’ in other radical feminist struggles against the governing of irregular migration. This will serve to provide a more extensive and informed answer to the third research sub-question. Moreover, the consequences of limits and contradictions in radical feminist significations of ‘gender’ as structure will be treated in detail in Chapter 9, further qualifying the scope and limits of the epistemic advantage of radical feminist narratives.
7 Challenging institutional gender-based violence: radical feminisms and solidarity with migrant women in struggle

7.1 Introduction

Following the discussions on radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ as a category indicating a structure of power, this chapter focuses on the experiences of radical feminisms in organising around administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking. These governmental practices are seen to bring about the production and reproduction of institutional gender-based violence against undocumented migrant women. This radical feminist critique developed as a form of solidarity in reaction to the struggles of undocumented migrant women in administrative detention and it is the expression of a conscious radical feminist attention to the specific ways in which the lives of undocumented migrant women are shaped by gender-based violence. These forms of violence mainly consist of police abuse and sexual exploitation in administrative detention, criminalization of migrant women survivors of male violence, and infantilization of trafficking victims. Overall, the chapter’s attention to representations of relationships of inequality intends to bring into focus the strengths and weaknesses of radical feminist politics in terms of structural analysis.

This chapter presents additional empirical findings to respond to the third research sub-question: How do radical feminisms in today’s Italy signify ‘gender’ as structure in the specific struggles they undertake against administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking? The data used in this chapter consist of radical feminist narratives on border security and humanitarian governmental practices and on migrant women struggles against these practices. To capture different dimensions
of the same phenomenon, primary and secondary sources were triangulated. These sources include: (1) first-hand accounts resulting from in-depth interviews, and FGDs; (2) secondary sources covering radical feminist communication statements, flyers, zines; and (3) published essays and monographs. Participating in protests and collective discussions against administrative detention (with the feminist group Le Venticinqueundici) as well as my participation in other struggles for women’s self-determination in reproductive issues (with Consultoria Autogestita) have put me in contact with women who have been engaged for years in the struggle against migrant detention centres. Their long-term experience has enabled me to clarify the novelty represented by feminist solidarity with the struggle of migrant women as well as the fact that it involved only a minority of feminist activists.

Section 7.2 introduces the experiences of struggle of four migrant women: Preziosa, Joy, Faith, and Adama. Preziosa and Joy’s stories are about violence and abuse perpetrated by police personnel in the context of administrative detention, though Joy’s story also sheds light on the practice of protection of trafficking victims. Faith and Adama’s stories exemplify how administrative detention can be a response to women’s opposition to their abusers. Section 7.3 places these experiences of struggles in the context of the establishment of the governmental practices of migrants’ administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking. Section 7.4 presents the apprehension in radical feminist narratives of the social functions and effects of these governmental practices and their relation to institutional gender-based violence against migrant women, giving attention to effects of these practices on the constitution of both productive and reproductive labour markets. Section 7.5 brings into perspective the meanings of ‘gender’ as a social category indicating transnational and intersectional relationships of inequality. Section 7.6 concludes, pointing out the epistemic benefits of the narratives analysed and identifying relevant points for further examination.

### 7.2 Four stories of migrant women fighting back against institutional gender-based violence

Since the introduction of administrative detention and expulsion in Europe of irregular migrants, which in Italy occurred in 1998, migrants and solidarity groups have staged protests and struggles against such
practice (Quadrelli 2007). The first known record of migrants’ struggles of this type refers to the revolt that took place in December 1999 in Trapani at the centre Serraino Vulpitta, which cost the life of six migrant detainees (Sossi 2002). Since these incidents, there have been countless accounts of uprisings, escapes, hunger strikes, self-harming protests, and non-cooperative conducts. Similarly, starting from the establishment of these centres, there have been diverse forms of opposition to administrative detention organised by solidarity activism at both the local and national level: public denunciations, demonstrations, production and circulation of research material, internal-external information exchanges, economic support to detainees, external support to internal struggles, sabotage to the administrative detention industry, and external attempts to stop deportation. These plural practices reflect the heterogeneous approaches which have coalesced into a movement against administrative detention. These approaches span from revolutionary positions demanding the closure of these centres and the opening of frontiers, to more reformist tendencies calling for the improvement of the conditions of detainees, while recognising the political rationale underpinning administrative detention as a policy and the detention centre as an institution (Interview No 1, Interview No 4, Interview No 6, Interview No 10).

In this context, the alliance between detained migrant women and radical feminisms may be seen as an emerging phenomenon, triggered by many factors, among which the forging of connections between actors in different streams – especially radical feminisms and the generalist movement against administrative detention. This latter movement, which over the years has seen the involvement of individual radical feminists, has been engaged in maintaining contacts with detainees inside detention centres in order to support their struggle from outside. This practice of communication has also been used by radical feminist groups and networks to establish contacts with migrant women rebelling against practices of state violence deployed in administrative detention and in protection of trafficking victims. These feminist experiences of struggle have been moving on a double level: at one level, they focused on supporting
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individual migrant women; at another level, they also carried out general
political battles to shut down detention centres, halt deportations, and
stop state practices of gender-based violence. Eventually, some of these
struggles succeeded in liberating the women imprisoned, and repressive
measures were implemented to silence the radical feminists involved in
these political experiences (Noi nonsiamocomplici 2010).

The stories of struggles presented below help to illustrate the charac-
ter of alliance between detained migrant women and radical feminisms,
as shaped by responses to state actions attempting to control people’s
movements across borders. They bring to the surface the functioning of
administrative detention and the protection of trafficking victims as a
gendered and gendering process in governmental practices. This helps
deepen the understanding of the structural relation between the govern-
ing of irregular migration and migrants’ experiences. Furthermore, the
encounter between radical feminisms with migrant women-in-struggle
importantly transformed the radical feminist politicization of male viol-
ence against women previously discussed in Chapter 6, focusing on the
specific condition of migrant women.

Preziosa

The story of Preziosa, a Brazilian transwoman, is the story of perhaps
“the first person [in Italy] to press charges against policemen, including a
police inspector, in migrants’ detention centres” for violence and abuses
during her detention (Interview No 6). She was taken into custody in
June, 2008, in the Milan-based administrative detention centre. The
episode which was the subject of Preziosa’s police report dates back to
the 10th of July, 2008. On this day, Preziosa was attacked, beaten, and
insulted with racist and transphobic remarks by the police personnel in
the detention centre. Owing to the protests made by other inmates and
outside the centre, at late night she was finally brought to the Emergency
Room in the closest hospital. The day after, the 11th of July, 2008, the
police inspector – present at the beating the day before – summoned
Preziosa and another woman who witnessed the episode. After

94 The word trans or transgender is used to refer to people whose gender
identity and expression are different from the sex they were assigned at birth.
Instead, the word cis or cisgender is employed to refer to people whose gender
identity and expression coincides with the gender they were assigned at birth.
apologizing, the inspector “invited” the two women to refrain from officially reporting the episode; subsequently he verbally communicated their immediate release in conjunction with the handing of an expulsion order from Italy to them. Preziosa returned to the hospital to get a medical report. With the support of activists from the Milan Anti-racist Committee, which also included radical feminists – mostly white –, Preziosa pressed charges against the racist and transphobic insults, the abuses and violence committed by policemen, as well as the failure in the duty of care by the Red Cross personnel – present in the detention centre at the moment of the episode but refusing to call an ambulance until the internal and external protestors raised their demands. As jointly agreed with her lawyer, Preziosa filed a request for urgent procedure, which was approved, thus recognising her report as being well-founded. Subsequently she was subjected to repeated questioning as injured party. Yet, she was never granted a residency permit for justice reasons, i.e. a particular residence permit which allows the defendant, or the injured party, to participate in a trial. Given that it is precisely a responsibility of the police to grant this type of residence permit, it was highly unlikely that the same police division to which the defendants belong to would allow the trial to take place. Eventually, Preziosa returned to Brazil as she felt exposed because of her irregular administrative status and feared retaliations. Consequently, the trial was suspended due to lack of witnesses in the spring 2010 (Poidimani 2008a and 2008b).

**Joy**

The story of Joy played a key role in “making public” the systemic character of sexual abuses in migrants’ detention centres in Italy (Interview No 6). Indeed, Joy, a Nigerian woman trafficked to Italy for sex work, in August 2009 reported for attempted rape Vittorio Addesso, the Chief Inspector of the Milan-based administrative detention centre, where she was taken into custody in the 2009 summer. Her denouncement took place during the trial examining the charges against herself and nine other inmates for staging an uprising within the detention centre on the 13th
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95 Art. 11, Implementing regulation No 394/99
of August, 2009. This revolt, for which all the defendants were condemned from six to nine months of prison, was launched against the lengthening of the period of administrative detention from two to six months, foreseen by the Law Decree No 11/2009, which became effective precisely during that period. Helen, another internee who witnessed the attempted rape and was charged with staging the uprising, confirmed Joy’s story during the trial. Then, because of their allegations, both women were charged with defamation by the judge. Having served the terms of imprisonment sentenced for the uprising, between the 11th and 12th of February 2010, Joy and other inmates\(^{97}\) were transferred to other detention centres where they continued to be threatened with deportation. In mid-March 2010, a deportation was attempted to Joy’s detriment, notwithstanding her application for a residency permit as a trafficking survivor, and her right to a residency permit for justice reasons, based on the report she filed against Vittorio Addesso. The intervention of radical feminists – in great majority white Italian women from diverse generations and organised in the network Noinonsiamocomplici\(^{98}\) -- succeeded in preventing her deportation at the last minute. Indeed, since her denouncement of Vittorio Addesso, radical feminists in different cities had been organising to support Joy’s struggle. Furthermore, during her detention, Joy’s family in Nigeria was punished by traffickers, who killed two of her relatives. After long months of struggle within and outside the detention centre, Joy obtained a residency permit as victim of trafficking, while Vittorio Addesso was acquitted on all counts with a blatantly racist sentence. This verdict contested not only Joy’s credibility on the ground of her personal character – a “violent Nigerian girl” – but also the character of her witness, Helen, who was not supported by “any [other] white race or Nigerian friend”\(^{99}\) (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010).

\(^{97}\) Mohamed El Abouby committed suicide upon learning he would have been returned to administrative detention after being released from prison.

\(^{98}\) This blog was created by the network supporting Joy’s struggle and it makes available relevant sources on the case: http://noinonsiamocomplici.noblogs.org/

\(^{99}\) Here, the whole justification of the verdict is available:

Chapter 7

Faith

The story of Faith well exemplifies the selective character of institutional attention to the problem of male violence over women and thus the instrumentalization of women's bodies and lives for other ends. Faith is a young Nigerian girl, who had been living in Italy since 2007. In July 2010, she was taken into custody in the Bologna-based administrative detention centre. Her detention followed a police intervention for domestic violence, which was solicited by her neighbours who heard Faith screaming while she was defending herself against her attacker. Once the police arrived the perpetrator was arrested on the spot, and Faith was taken into custody based on two previous unfulfilled expulsion orders. Once in the detention centre, Faith applied for asylum through her lawyer. Four years prior to her detention, she left her country of origin to escape a likely conviction and capital sentence for causing the death of her attempted rapist – a man in a very powerful position in Nigeria – in self-defence. Despite her asylum request, on the 20th of July, 2010, Faith was deported to Nigeria. After the deportation, in September 2010, individual women and feminist groups – including formal organizations – circulated an appeal "to activate with urgency all diplomatic measures to protect Faith’s right to live"100. Then, feminist collectives denounced the lack of public attention paid to Faith’s deportation in comparison with the media campaign raised to support the case of Sakineh101 -- an Iranian woman condemned to death for adultery102. In particular, they explained this asymmetry by making reference to Italy's diverse geopolitical interests in Iran and Nigeria. While Iran is considered a Western enemy, Nigeria is an extremely significant economic partner for ENI (Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi) – the Italian multinational oil and gas company. More specifically, radical feminists commented on the role of ENI as

100 See for example: http://www.womenews.net/tutelare-il-diritto-alla-vita-della-giovane-donna-nigeriana-faith-aiworo/
101 See for example the appeal written and promoted by Amnesty International to demand the suspension of the death sentence in the case of Sakineh: http://www.amnesty.it/Sakineh-Mohammadi-Ashtiani-la-sospensione-della-condanna-non-basta
"bringing electricity to our houses at the cost of looting Nigerian resources and impoverishing its population, creating the conditions for emigration to Europe" (Silenzio Assordante 2010: 15). Yet, despite this and other initiatives, there has not been any further news or development regarding Faith’s situation.

Adama

The story of Adama also tells of the “double violence” to which migrant women are subjected, both as a “women” and a “migrant”\textsuperscript{103}. In addition, it signals the passage of Italian policy to a diverse institutional approach to the governing of cross-border human mobility, supporting its securitization through humanitarian interventions. Adama is a Senegalese woman who has been living and working in Forlì since 2006. On the 26th of August, 2011, she filed a report to the local Carabinieri Office pressing charges against her partner for having robbed, beaten, and raped her. According to Adama, her partner had abused her for years under the threat of reporting Adama’s irregular situation to the police. On the same day at the moment of her report, she was taken into custody in the administrative detention centre in Bologna on the basis of being without a regular residency permit. On the 16th of September, her lawyer "requested to enter the detention centre, accompanied by doctors and an interpreter, in order to verify her health conditions and formally take down her statement regarding the violence"\textsuperscript{104} she experienced. This request was accepted on the 25th of October, when Adama formally pressed charges against her attacker. Then, on the 25th of November, 2011 – the International Day Against Violence Against Women – the informal group Migranda and the formal association Trama di Terre circulated an appeal demanding Adama’s immediate release and the granting of a residency permit. Migranda is mainly composed by both Italian white women and racialised migrant women, with the former participating with greater continuity, while Trame di Terre includes “women ar-
7.3 Victims or criminals: administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking

Two governmental practices connected to the regulation of migratory movements have transpired through the stories presented above: administrative detention of unauthorized migrants and protection of victims of trafficking. Detention centres for unauthorized migrants in Italy were established by Law No 49/1998 under the name of Centri di Permanenza Temporanea (Cpt), later modified in Centri di Identificazione ed Espulsione (Cie) with Law Decree No 92/2008. These centres were conceived as custodial structures for foreign citizens whose legal permission to stay in the country is ambiguous, to enable the process of identity verification. These foreign citizens include those facing a possible expulsion, whose case is not yet decided, and those already sentenced to measures of expulsion but for whom the order is not immediately executable.

Since their establishment, the management of these structures has been entrusted to private entities, associations or cooperatives charged with guaranteeing health assistance, structure’s maintenance, cleaning, and food distribution. According to the law, these private entities are held accountable to Public Administration Offices, but they act outside of any established and uniform standard framework. At the time of the introduction of administrative detention, the maximum internment peri-
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105 See the description of the association Trame di Terre: http://www.tramediterre.org/itl/indices/index_39.html

106 See the following news items: http://www.bolognatoday.it/cronaca/adama-kebe-libera-cie-bologna.html and http://www.radiocittafujiko.it/adama-e-libera
od was fixed at two months. In the following two years, the length of internment was modified as follows. In 2009, Law No 94/2009 extended the time of administrative detention from two to six months. This legislative initiative followed the “Caffarella rape” case, and was framed as an anti-rape measure as discussed in the previous chapter. Two years later, Law No 89/2011 Decree raised the permitted period of detention to eighteen months in response to the ruling of the EU Court of Justice on the El Dridi (2011) case. The ruling declared the case to be incompatible with European directives on the treatment of the irregular condition of migrants as a criminal offence, something established by Law No 94/2009\textsuperscript{107}. This increase of the period of detention, during the timeframe of interest to this dissertation, indicates that the sanctioning and punitive purposes acquired over time by this institution reflects the intensification of the process of securitizing cross-border human mobility as well as its gendering (Masera 2014)\textsuperscript{108}. Overall, migrant detention

\textsuperscript{107} This provision introduced the crime of clandestine immigration which entails a fine from 5,000 to 10,000 euros and one to four years imprisonment for undocumented foreigners who, after being ordered to depart, remain in the country. Such a measure was then depenalised in consequence of the 2011 El Dridi case, a direct claim in front of the ECHR against Italian provisions for criminalization of migrants (Curia.europa.eu website).

\textsuperscript{108} Subsequently, in 2014, there has been a novel reversal of this trend of escalation of the time of administrative detention, when the maximum period was fixed at 3 months by the 163/2014 Law. This change was anticipated by the Documento Programmatico (DP) prepared by a task force organised by the Ministry of Internal Affairs in 2012 and published in 2013, which recognised the existence of numerous criticalities in the functioning of administrative detention: especially the "economic costs that the administration must cover for the maintenance and preservation of detention structures, which are often object of acts of vandalism by the internees", and the “lack of effectiveness in the identification and expulsion of irregular migrants” (DP 2013: 12-13). The document thus suggested to combine repressive measures with the improvement of conditions in detention centres so as to make more effective the institution itself, considered "essential for an efficient management of irregular migration" (DP 2013: 6). Without discussing in details this new course, which does not fit the chosen temporal frame of interest, its recognition allows us nonetheless to sharpen the focalization of the period under discussion in this study. Indeed, this change of approach suggests the centrality of the uprisings, fires, and massive breaks out, which have made migrants’ detention centres a problem of public order since their establishment.
centres are recognized as imposing demeaning and degrading conditions to detainees, while their utility in identifying and expelling irregular migrants is broadly considered inefficient, especially given their high economic costs (Medu 2013).

The second significant governmental practice considered is protection of victims of trafficking, which was nationally introduced by Article 18, Legislative Decree No 286/1998, and later specified by Article 13, Law No 228/2003. In addition, EU Directives 2004/81/EC and 2011/36/EU have also provided for the protection of human trafficking victims at the EU level. This legal instrument allows the issue of a residency permit for humanitarian reasons to a foreign citizen who is exposed to violence or serious exploitation which can endanger the safety of this person. Threats to safety can be a result of the attempt to elude a criminal organisation, or a result of declarations made during criminal proceedings. This residency permit lasts 6 months and can be renewed and changed into a work or study permit. The novel element of this provision is that it foresees two tracks to realise the residency permit for humanitarian reasons: the former condition depends on the victim’s judicial report, while the latter does not, thereby allowing for the avoidance of likely retaliations after the release of the report, on the condition that the applicant adheres to a specific social programme. In the first case the residency permit is issued by police offices on the proposal of the Public Prosecutor, while in the second case it is issued on the proposal of an organization willing to take on responsibility of placing the victim in a social programme and subsequent monitoring. The social programme aims to provide both temporary and long term assistance promoting social integration and job placement actions. Although the non-rewarding character of this legal provision makes Article 18 a unique legal measure internationally, its application has involved diverse problems: first, the wide discretionary evaluation of the applications received gives room for a very diversified set of practices throughout the national territory; second, judicial authorities’ pronounced preference for the judicial track has often caused police offices to reject those applications that do not include a victim’s report (Asgi 2013).
7.4 “End detention, halt deportations”: radical feminisms joining migrant women in the struggle against institutional gender-based violence

Supporting the struggles of migrant women, radical feminisms widened and transformed previous practices of politicization of male violence discussed in chapter 6. Indeed, their engagement with cases of women in administrative detention or under the principle of protection of victims of trafficking has helped to reveal the manners in which governmental practices can contribute to the production and reproduction of institutional gender-based violence against migrant women. This message was developed in the narratives analysed as follows: (1) description of diverse forms of institutional gender-based violence, connected to administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking, which target undocumented migrant women; (2) presentation of structural conditions that enable these forms of violence; (3) arguments about the significance of these forms of violence for understanding the working of gender and race structures both at the national and transnational level; (4) discussion of the effects of these forms of violence on productive and reproductive labour markets. Importantly, these narratives devoted special attention to issues of reproduction, elaborating on the implications of diverse welfare and demographic policies.

Contesting institutional gender-based violence against undocumented migrant women

Radical feminist narratives identified various forms of institutional gender-based violence and abuse targeting migrant women. One is police sexual violence – including sexual abuse, sexual assault, and rape – against cis and trans migrant women in administrative detention centres and outside. As recalled by an activist who has been involved in the generalist movement against administrative detention, “it was known since 1999 that women were exposed to sexual abuses in migrants’ detention centres, it was so starting from the opening of these structures”. In fact, during that year, the dossier Corelli Anno Zero\textsuperscript{109} (July 1999) denounced that “po-

\textsuperscript{109} See for example this dossier compiled by Noinonsiamocomplici on violence against migrant women inside and outside detention centres: https://noinonsiamocomplici.noblogs.org/gallery/5927/dossier_tutto_2009.pdf. It contains an excerpt from “Corelli Anno Zero”.
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licemen used to exchange phone cards with oral sex services” (Interview No 6). Two research participants reported that recent contacts with women in administrative detention confirmed this trend (Interview No 4; Interview No 10). For example, they recalled that detained women confront continuous sexual blackmail by civil and police personnel as any request or application is described as having a price\textsuperscript{110} (Interview No 4). A fanzine written by the network Noinonsiamocomplici also explained that when prostitution within migrants’ detention centres is a choice, as it is in the case of many trans women, sexual services are sold at much lower prices, to the point that these centres are defined as “blowjob discount stores” (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 9). Finally, this same document indicated that police sexual abuses continues outside the walls of administrative detention as street checks for document verification are “an occasion for police forces to obtain free sexual services under the threat of expulsion” – especially targeting undocumented women obliged to do street sex work by trafficking networks (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 4). One research participant described “the relation between migrant women [in administrative detention], and policemen and social operators as that between prostitutes and clients” (Interview No 4). During a national assembly on administrative detention, radical feminists commented that “if patriarchal society commonly classifies women according to the double standard whore-saint, this is not the case for migrant women in administrative detention as they are only and always treated as prostitutes”\textsuperscript{111}.

Criminalization of undocumented survivors of male violence is another form of institutional gender-based violence. Through their involvement in Faith and Adama’s struggle, radical feminisms shed light on migrant women’s particular condition of vulnerability to both domestic and institutional violence owing to the current legislation on people’s mobility across borders. One main point raised by a group who supported


Adama’s struggle regarded “police reports and police interventions”, which are rarely a practicable option for migrant women to end a situation of violence (Focus group No 2). Indeed, if the woman in question is undocumented, the likely outcome of an official report or emergency intervention is administrative detention. In case of a woman with a residency permit for reasons of family reunification, the outcome might not be different. In fact, this sort of administrative condition make the woman “juridically dependent” on her husband and, if she wants to break this, she needs to find an alternative to the residency permit for family reunification (Focus group No 2). Usually, this means to find a job and then commute the permit for family reasons to a permit for work reasons. However diverse obstacles to job placement, including “the burden of reproductive work”, make administrative detention an ever pending risk. Similarly, all migrant women, including those with a regular residency permit for work reasons, are “constantly under risk” of losing their job and thus ending up in a migrants’ detention centre (Focus group No 2). Additionally, activists organising in solidarity with Joy recognised that migrant women’s criminalization also responds to the “interest of state institutions in covering [up] structural gender-based violence connected to administrative detention” (Poidimani 2011: 40). Indeed, referring to Vittorio Addesso’ acquittal, feminists argued that the fact that the judiciary system defined Joy as an “unreliable witness” exemplifies the connection existing between legal unreliability and power relations of gender, race, and class (Poidimani 2011). Overall, radical feminisms pointed out how far the criminalization of migrants makes migrant women more vulnerable to diverse kinds of gender-based violence.

“Assistentialism” and the “infantilization” of protected victims of trafficking are one last phenomenon of institutional gender-based violence pointed out by radical feminisms(Interview No 6, Interview No 4). They highlighted that the logic underpinning the humanitarian character of the social programme foreseen by Article 18 is similar to that allowing the reproduction of male violence against women: indeed, entrusting the applicant’s emancipation to other subjects, this legal measure treats the applicant herself as inherently weak and unable to take care of her own
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112 See the article ‘Qualificarsi per un lavoro di base’ published in the journal edited by the collective Migranda: https://migranda.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/n-1-giugno-2011.jpg
person. In the words of an interviewee who participated in supporting Joy’s struggle:

"The institutional exit path from trafficking constitutes a sort of new life where you undergo an infantilization and adolescentization before you can live as an autonomous subject. [...] There are two phases [in the social programme]. In the first phase, you are completely infantilised: for example, you have a completely controlled time schedule and you have to account for your expenditures. [...] Then, in the second phase, when you become a teenager, you get the house keys but still cannot drink any type of alcohol" (Interview No 6).

In short, the institution of the social programme foreseen by article 18 is seen as leaving little or “no space for self-determination”, imposing a “less intense form of control” in comparison to administrative detention but nonetheless situating the applicant in an inferiorised position, where she must “constantly entrust someone else for her own acts and decisions” (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 2).

This reading of Article 18 presents some common ground with the analysis of this legal measure provided by self-organised trafficking victims and former victims. In fact, as commented by Isoke Aikpitanyi, contrary to what is commonly assumed, Article 18 “is not the best legal measure against women’s trafficking in Europe, it is instead the main obstacle for Nigerian women to exit” their condition of exploitation. In particular, “we are not prejudicially against reporting traffickers, but we are against the obligation to do so” and this obligation, even if not required on paper, is put into effect when “many women, particularly Nigerian women, do not obtain support without reporting” (Aikpitanyi 2013b: 2). Indeed, according to Aikpitanyi (2013b: 2), only “one woman in ten” obtains a positive result after applying for Article 18 and this is extremely problematic as "women do not feel guaranteed as penalties for traffickers are small and short" and they "fear retaliations against their own families in Africa". Moreover, another criticism brought by Aikpitanyi against the current application of Article 18 regards its paternalistic approach to trafficking victims, which clearly reflects that social
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operators and cultural mediators involved in the social programme very rarely have a personal background in trafficking. This bias results in “less concrete” and “effective” interventions, and in the devaluation of victims and former victims' experiences (Aikpitanyi 2013a). Overall, radical feminisms connected administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking to the re/production of violence against migrant women. In doing so, they clarified that a comprehensive feminist approach to the phenomenon of male violence cannot overlook the specific condition of migrant women.

Discretionary power enabling institutional gender-based violence

Radical feminist narratives explained institutional gender-based violence against migrant women as enabled by the broad discretionary power that police and NGOs personnel enjoy while they are in charge of managing administrative detention, intervening in cases of domestic violence, and applying Article 18.

On administrative detention, one research participant working as social operator within a detention centre to intercept victims of trafficking commented that: “it is the large degree of discretion associated to these centres that makes [gender-based institutional violence] likely” (Interview No 9). Similarly, according to supporters of Joy’s struggle, the practice of sexual blackmail that Joy’s struggle made public is fundamentally enabled by the fact that policemen and detention centres managing personnel can act in those places as “absolute and untouchable monarchs”, taking advantage of the clear power differential existing between them and incarcerated migrant women (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 7). In other words, “there is a system that allows [staff to exercise violence], and it is thus at the discretion [of the individual policeman or social operator] whether there are harassments and retaliations or not” (Interview No 9). Consequently, migrants’ detention centres are seen as a potential “hunting reserve” for police forces and social operators, who can harass and rape migrant women at will (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 8). Then, Faith and Adama’s struggle that the criminalization of migrant women survivors of male violence is another phenomenon deeply connected to police discretion in enforcing control measures. For instance, the participant working inside a detention centre criticised the recent provision foreseen by the Feminicide Law\textsuperscript{115}, which has supposedly expanded the protection accor-

\textsuperscript{115} Article 4 Law No 242/201.
ded to trafficking survivors, sanctioned by Article 18, to domestic violence survivors, for offering very poor guarantees to migrant women applicants. In fact, this measure established that such permit can be revoked “in case the condition of danger becomes less pressing” or in case of “incompatible behaviours on part of the applicant” without explaining what “less pressing conditions of danger” or “incompatible behaviour” mean, hence leaving space for “extremely discretionary interpretations” (Interview No 9).

On the application of Article 18, Adama’s story is exemplary of this discretion. Indeed, in her case, the will of the Minister of Internal Affairs to promote Adama’s release from administrative detention led to an unconventional interpretation of Article 18, never extended to similar cases before, thus showing the discretionary power underpinning this legal measure. However, research participants commented that police and judiciary discretionary powers are more often used to criminalise migrant trafficking survivors. For example, the participant working inside a detention centre declared that specific fallacies of Article 18, which “does not account for the recent changes undergone in regard to the trafficking phenomenon”, have amplified “police discretionary power” and the “criminalization of trafficked women” (Interview No 9). More specifically, she explained that this provision targets women exploited on the Italian territory and it fails to account for the transnational dimension of sex trafficking. As a result, she emphasized that “women who had been exploited in Libya or Greece and who would have been exploited also in Italy if they were not taken into administrative detention are exposed to deportation”. In this regard, she reported cases in which women with this background were deported as police gave priority to their irregular condition rather than to the fact that they denounced traffickers (Interview No 9). Besides, on the role of NGOs offering social programmes to applicants, the network Noinonsiamocomplici (2010: 2) remembered, for example, that Casa delle Donne in Bologna and Casa delle Donne in Modena rejected to take on responsibility in Joy’s case because of the “complexity of the situation”. One interviewee interpreted this type of argument as a reference to Joy’s report against the Chief Inspector Vittorio Addesso and as a choice of these NGOs to not create conflicts with the police and Ministry of Internal Affairs. As a result, they denounced that Joy risked a deportation, which was prevented at the last
minute only thanks to the intervention of another organization (Interview No 9).

In sum, radical feminisms identified institutional discretionary power as a key enabling factor of gender-based violence against migrant women. This served to clarify the systemic and structural dimension of this form of violence.

Understanding the condition of migrant women in destination societies

According to radical feminisms, learning about the functioning of administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking offers important insights to comprehend the general condition of migrant women—in Italian society.

Discretionary power is one main feature charactering administrative detention, that importantly affects the lives of migrant women also in the broader social domain. For instance, speaking of women’s anti-violence centres, the research participant with a background as social worker in these structures explained that “most of these NGOs do not accept undocumented women, especially if there is no possibility for a future regularization” and that, if in some cases they do so, “it is because of the personal initiative of single social workers” (Interview No 9). In particular, she highlighted that this arbitrary approach depends on the fact that these NGOs “rely on public funds, which often come with the condition of addressing the needs of women regularly resident in the national territory” (Interview No 9). Another example of institutional discretionary powers regarded migrant women’s access to voluntary interruption of pregnancy and pregnancy medical assistance. Moreover, research participants organising in the field of women’s health remembered that the National Health System accords to migrant women—both documented and undocumented—the right to free health cares. Yet, they reported that, whether for ignorance or in bad faith, in the daily routine practice “hospital information desks often deny these services to undocumented migrant women and re-direct them outside of hospitals towards humanitarian associations” (Focus group No 4). Overall, radical feminist narratives hold the view that migrants’ detention centres are “total institution[s] mirroring—in a more violent and distorted manner—the articulation of gender, race and class power relations” in society at large, showing “the extent to which Italian society is built on racism” (Interview No 6).
The production of gender differences as a mechanism for the governing of populations is another element of administrative detention that radical feminist narratives showed to be widely implemented in society. In particular, according to these narratives, the lower number of uprising registered in cis and trans women’s sections within detention centres is importantly related to the systemic practice of police sexual blackmail against migrant cis and trans women. Research participants in direct contact with women held in detention argued that police sexual blackmails operate preventing alliance building between male and female sections since the daily practice of sexual blackmail makes women appear as “unreliable” and “more interested in obtaining immediate advantages rather than participating in collective struggles” (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 8-9; Interview No 4). Besides, they linked the low number of women’s rebellions to the fact that migrant women in detention are usually “more isolated and sedated with drugs” than migrant men “as they [the former] are considered – as it happens to all women – hysterical, uncontrollable, and moody as well as naturally inclined to sexually arouse male detainees”\textsuperscript{116}. the network Noinonsiamocomplici (2010) indicated that the management of the detained population in migrants’ holding centres is based on the re/production of internal differentiations among migrants based on the line of gender, and that these dividing mechanisms are present also outside of detention centres’ walls. Certainly, it also recognised that isolation of detained populations takes these mechanisms to the extreme (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010).

Neo-colonial geopolitical relations were one additional factor connected to administrative detention that radical feminist politics indicated as significant to comprehend the condition of migrant women in the broad social domain\textsuperscript{117}. For example, in the frame of Joy and Faith’s struggles, activists criticised the role of the “Nigerian Embassy in enabling deportations” by authorising, “against economic compensation [by Italy], the expulsion of women and men without considering the risks they may incur returning to their country of origin”\textsuperscript{118}. Faith’s deportation notwithstanding a pending asylum request well exemplifies the offsets of this “conniv-


\textsuperscript{117} See the following radio broadcasting: http://www.radiocane.info/leni-joy-ele-deportazioni/

\textsuperscript{118}
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“...ance” between Italy and the employee(s) of the Nigerian Embassy. As highlighted by the network supporting Joy, this treatment of deportable subjects importantly depends on the position of their country of origin in the map of Italy’s geopolitical relations (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010). On this subject, the network linked Nigerians’ mobility towards Europe to the role of multinational oil and gas corporations, such as the Italian ENI, in appropriating the country’s oil and contaminating local natural resources (Silenzio Assordante 2010). Significantly, during an interview with an independent radio, Joy spoke of a country which has been made “too dangerous, too poor, and too mafioso” by this model of “development”. This radio programme was produced by activists supporting Joy who underlined the environmental disasters produced by ENI in Nigeria, recalling for example that in 2005 the company was sentenced for its activities of gas-flaring, which were recognized to violate the people’s right to life and dignity. Simultaneously, they exposed Italian media and political celebrations of ENI’s corporate environmental responsibility, bringing into focus the 2010 deal between ENI and the Lombardy region to market a new type of less contaminating diesel fuel, for concealing the neo-colonial conduct of this company outside of Italian borders. On the whole, as synthesized by Aikpitanyi (2013a: website), this situation speaks of “old and new colonialisms that have stolen our resources, corrupted politics, and almost cancelled our dignity”.

In short, understanding the general condition of migrant women in Italian society by learning about the functioning of administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking allowed radical feminisms to

---


119 See the flyer ‘Pacchetto sicurezza? La questura bolognese condanna a morte una donna che si ribella a uno stupro’ which was distributed during a sit-in on August 2, 2010 in Bologna: http://www.ondarossa.info/newsredazione/bologna-la-questura-bolognese-condanna-morte-una-donna-che-si-ribella-unostupro

120 See again: http://www.radiocane.info/leni-joy-e-le-deportazioni/

121 See for example: http://business-humanrights.org/en/gas-flaring-lawsuit-re-oil-companies-in-nigeria


203
establish the centrality of the struggle against these governmental prac-
tices in the field of feminist politics.

**Questioning the effects of institutional gender-based violence on reproductive labour markets**

Radical feminist narratives discussed the effects of institutional gender-
based violence especially on the constitution of reproductive labour mar-
kets and the living conditions of migrant women in Italy.

To begin with, various radical feminist documents and statements stressed the connections existing between diverse social positions in care and services' labour markets determining the disempowerment of some and the empowerment of others\(^1\). Recognising that “most women detainees are trafficking survivors, or undocumented domestic workers and caretakers”, they pointed out a number of processes shaping gendered and racialised labour markets in Italian society (Donne-feministe-les-biche contro i Cie 2010). For instance, radical feminisms highlighted the role of administrative detention in increasing the diversity of the labour supply and expelling the surplus workforce in sex labour markets. They stressed that detention centres and deportations guarantee the continuous change of “young and fresh” bodies in the street for “nine million Italian clients” (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 8). Another example regarded the role of administrative detention in depreciating the migrant workforce in the care and sex labour sectors. Research participants involved in supporting Joy’s struggle reported the personal experiences of

\(^1\)On this matter, radical feminisms importantly built on the critique – also supported by the generalist movement against the closure of frontiers – concerning the role of both securitising and humanitarian governmental practices in depreciating the migrant labour force by making it illegal. As explained by interviewee: “Migrant detention centres do not serve the purposes for which they were built, but they surely serve some purposes. If the numbers of identifications and following deportations are low in relation to the declared objectives, I do not think that this [situation] is only related to the inefficiency of Italian institutions. I think there is a project, a repressive project, in maintaining [migrant] people under blackmail: if you easily lose your permit, then you are led to be more submissive in irregular labour contexts; you do not have the possibility to denounce what happens to you because you fear to be deported. […] In this way the [migrant] person is less strong, is invisible, and invisibility makes profits.” (Interview No 9). See also: http://www.radiocane.info/leni-joy-e-le-deportazioni/
numerous undocumented women detainees about “systematic blackmails” that women employers exercise to “keep [migrant women] working [in exploitative conditions] and to send them away at discretion” (Interview No 4, Interview No 6). Besides, Noinonsiamocomplici (2010: 9) underlined the role of sexual blackmails in detention centres in “making the surplus workforce productive before expulsion” so that “white women employers can have their servant and become emancipated” and “jailors in uniform can enjoy free ‘flesh’ at their disposal”¹²⁴ (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 9). Additionally, the network also acknowledged the function of administrative detention and protection of trafficking victims in producing working opportunities for Italian citizens. It stressed the profits made by private entities managing detention centres, which receive from the state around 75 Euro per day per internee as compared to the very poor investments in services provided to detainees¹²⁵ (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 5). At the same time, it recalled Aikpitanyi’s (2013a: website) observation about the fact that “many Italian women and men have had the possibility to work in the reality of trafficking with a wage, while only very few victims and former victims have had this same opportunity”.

Moreover, radical feminist narratives highlighted the role of securitising policies in reducing and externalising the costs for reproducing the migrant labour force on migrant women. A women’s collective with a focus on work-related issues argued that the securitisation of irregular migration— which administrative detention represents in its most extreme expression – functions by “reducing the social [and reproductive costs] of the migrant workforce” and promoting the inclusion within labour markets of “workers who are costless in terms of access to welfare ser-

¹²⁵ This critique has been importantly developed also by the generalist movement against detention centres. Among other issues, this movement denounced the strong connection existing between this business sector and local diocesan administrations as in the case of the Catholic association La Misericordia, which manage both the migrants’ detention centres in Modena and Bologna. See: http://www.autistici.org/macerie/?p=27782 and http://www.autistici.org/macerie/?p=26633.
For instance, the drastic reduction of possibilities for family reunions – foreseen by Law No 94/2009 – prevents many migrants to live with their children in Italy, thus unburdening the welfare state from providing healthcare and childcare services for the reproduction of the workforce. Simultaneously, articles written by this same collective stressed that the securitization of irregular migration promote the externalization of the social and reproductive costs of the migrant labour force on “migrant women and global care chains.” For instance, in case of re-united families in destination countries, the costs of reproduction are often covered by women’s unpaid labour. Another example relates to migrant mothers performing paid labour in the care sector. Often, they leave their children in their origin country due to the precarious and exploitative labour conditions they experience in Italy, which prevent them to take care of their own children. When instead they raise their own children in Italy, they are threatened with separation and deportation as happened in some cases to migrant mothers after losing their job and documents (Interview No 4).

Finally, radical feminist narratives pointed out that – next to securitising policies - also demographic policies externalise on migrant women the reproduction of the migrant workforce and its costs. In particular, research participants discussed two cases of government-sanctioned Catholic pro-natalist interventions in welfare health services addressing women’s reproduction against the backdrop of demographic discourses targeting Italian women “for their very low birth rates” and migrant women “for both their ‘excessive’ fertility and abortion rates” (Marchesi 2012: 171). The first case regards the regional legal provision named Protocollo Ferrero that, in Piedmont, authorised the presence of “no-choice vo-

---

127 Among other provisions, this Law introduced further requirements to apply for family reunification. See for example Article 1: http://www.parlamento.it/parlam/leggi/090941.htm.
130 This protocol entitled “Protocol to improve assistance to women who request voluntary interruption of pregnancy” is also named Ferrero’s from the
lunteers”\(^{131}\) within public women’s health counselling centres to convince women not to have abortion. As revealed by an investigation, organised by a radical feminist collective, into the trainings organised by the no-choice movement for would-be volunteers, these training discussed, among other issues, the more effective psychological strategies to convince migrant Muslim women to bring their pregnancy to full term. In fact, “they problematized the fact that, due to their cultural background, Muslim women are less inclined than Catholic women to respond to blaming and guilt feelings” (Focus group No 3). The second case treats recent modifications\(^ {132}\) in the criteria established to access the regional fund “Nasko”\(^ {133}\) that, in Lombardy, regulates subsidies distributed – through the intervention of Catholic pro-natalist organizations – to women who reconsider their decision to voluntarily interrupt their pregnancy. As underlined by a trans-feminist group, given that these recent changes “raised to five years the minimum required time of residence in Lombardy” to apply for this subsidy, they “automatically and intentionally exclude migrants”\(^ {134}\). Overall, these two cases show that migrant women’s reproduction is targeted by different, even opposite, approaches: the first example see the inclusion of migrant women in pro-natalist interventions, while the second example show their exclusion. Nonethe-

---

\(^{131}\) Most radical feminist narratives re-framed the pro-life movement as the no-choice movement to highlight its disregard for women’s self-determination. See for example this communication statement on the Ferrero’s Protocol by the group Sguardi Sui Generis published on November 21\(^{st}\), 2010: http://sguardisuigeneris.blogspot.it/2010/11/di-cosa-parla-il-protocollo-ferrero.html.


\(^{133}\) For more information, see: http://www.agevolazioni.regione.lombardia.it/cs/Satellite?c=Page&childpagename=Regione\%2FMILayout&cid=1213788452443&p=1213788452443&pagename=RGNW\_rapper.

\(^{134}\) See this communication statement: https://ogo.noblogs.org/post/2014/03/28/grande-novita/.
less, both cases fail to address the structurally vulnerable and precarious positions of migrant women in Italian labour markets and society.

Indicating the effects of administrative detention on protection of victims of trafficking on the constitution of and reproductive labour markets and the living conditions of migrant women in Italy, radical feminisms made visible the relevance of reproduction to feminist struggles against the governing of irregular migration.

Summing up, the struggles of women like Preziosa, Joy, Faith, and Adama importantly contributed to make “more transparent” the functioning of administrative detention and protection of trafficking victims, and develop a situated critique to these governmental practices (Noinonsiamocomplici 2010: 2). In particular, they transformed and widened radical feminist understanding of violence against women as a social phenomenon that migrant women experience in specific and particular ways. First, these struggles and related feminist narratives have shed light on how administrative detention and protection of trafficking victims re/produce state gender-based violence against migrant women through systematic forms of abuses and sexual exploitation in administrative detention, criminalization of migrant women survivors of male violence, and infantilization of trafficking victims. Second, they indicated that among the effects of these forms of violence there is the managing of detained populations through the production of gendered differences. Third, they identified the discretionary powers that police officers, judges, and social operators enjoy over migrants as a key enabling condition allowing this violence to be exercised. Fourth, they showed that the system of administrative detention is centrally important in framing the lives of migrant people in Italian society and as a structure in contemporary neo-colonialism. Finally, they reflected on the role of these governmental practices in constituting gendered and racialized labour markets as well as in determining a specific racialized and gendered organization of reproductive labour which externalises on migrant women and global care chains the reproduction of the migrant workforce. Overall, these narratives contributed to make visible and legible hidden structures of domination and exploitation centred on gender and race power relations.
7.5 Administrative detention, protection of victims of trafficking, and the meanings of ‘gender’ as structure

Radical feminist narratives on administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking gave multifaceted meanings to ‘gender’, in intersection with race, in these governmental practices. To reflect on this process of signification, the section examines: (1) the perspectives employed within the texts considered that, once identified, clarify the standpoints from which they construct ‘gender’ as a social category; (2) the strategies of Representation of Social Actors that bring into view the multi-group relations of inequality constructed within and across the categories of gender and race, thus shedding light on the intersectional dimension of ‘gender; (3) spatial devices identifying the locations of social actors, allowing to identify the spatial scales of analysis employed in the narratives, and bringing into view their transnational dimension. The section closes by indicating the epistemic benefits and limitations of radical feminist narratives so as to bring into focus strengths and weaknesses of their signification of ‘gender’.

First, attention to social actors’ perspectives has showed that the narratives analysed were produced from the viewpoint of detained migrant women and trafficking survivors in struggle, and the viewpoint of radical feminists—mostly white Italians—who supported these struggles from outside administrative detention. Clearly, the former perspective was significantly mediated by the latter, and only few material is in the own words of the four protagonists because of the constraints to free expression imposed by administrative detention and protection of trafficking victims. Yet, detained migrant women’s viewpoint definitely emerged as that of a subject confronting multiple forms of gender-based violence, who is determined to fight for her own liberation and integrity in both origin and destination countries. In particular, the main story told by these narratives is that of a subject aware that the forms of institutional gender-based violence she confronts are significantly related to her working condition as sex worker and/or caretaker, and intertwine with colonial history.

Besides, the radical feminists’ perspective is that of a subject gaining understanding about the potential entanglement between feminisms and securitising processes. Indeed, this subject recognises that certain forms of empowerment, which she may access because of her citizen status, de-
mand assimilation and incorporation to the values and practices of established institutions. In this regard, the role played by Casa delle Donne in Bologna and Modena in Joy’s case is exemplary as these NGOs favoured their relation with the Ministry of Internal Affairs over Joy’s safety. On the whole, both situated perspectives are taken here as standpoints inasmuch they display collective awareness about the structuring of power relations.

The narratives produced from these standpoints contributed to shed light on power structures in regard to a number of issues. About the constitution of labour markets, radical feminist narratives showed the double role of administrative detention in differently including migrant women in domestic, care, and sex work, and later excluding them through expulsions and deportations. Furthermore, they have also stressed that administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking create labour opportunities for many Italians, while also allowing processes of appropriation of migrant women’s bodies and labour.

On processes of national identity construction, these narratives pointed out that dominant notions of Italianness are characterised by an ongoing erasure of old and new forms of colonialism, and by the normalization of privileges connected to Italianness. Yet, the absence of an explicit problematization of Italian whiteness, and its historical construction, has revealed a systemic difficulty in directly naming processes of racialization, even in struggles that openly contest racism.

Furthermore, the narratives developed a complex understanding of the agency of migrant women, offering a multifaceted picture of their migratory experience as resulting from both subjective and structural factors. On the one side, they showed how migrant women resisted incorporation into the diverse governmental practices targeting irregular migration, as in the case of Joy’s rebellion against both the extension of the period of detention and Addesso’s attempt of rape. On the other side, they indicated how migrant women may show compliance to administrative detention systems as in the case of sexual unequal exchanges with police agents. Yet, similar considerations on the agency of radical feminist activists who refuse to ally with NGOs and other institutional actors were not brought into focus, limiting the possibility of understanding how forms of complicity or dis-engagement with these governmental practices may take place from this specific political position. In
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sum, the scope of the of the standpoints identified present certain limits in regard to the exploration of whiteness.

Second, consideration of strategies of Representation of Social Actors in radical feminist narratives on administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking clearly brings into view the role played by both gender and race in producing relations of inequality. The foregrounding of “undocumented migrant women” especially puts in the spotlight sexual difference and migrants’ legal status as central factors to define people’s positions with regard to institutional gender-based violence, the social organization of reproduction, and access to self-determination in biological and social reproduction. In this frame, the working of gender immediately emerges from references to sexual difference and sexuality as when radical feminist narratives indicate the diverse forms of violence which undocumented migrant women are exposed to and confront. The functioning of race implicitly surfaced in radical feminist connections between migrants’ legal status in Italy and histories of colonialism and neo-colonialism influencing migratory projects, trafficking mechanisms, and migrants’ condition of arrival and stay. Again, the absence of any association between geographical origin and somatic features represented a key feature of these narrative, which participated in reproducing the concealment of racialised Italian minorities.

Focus on silences and amplifications in the representation of relations of inequality has revealed that these narratives give more prominence to inequalities within gendered groups. For example, the inclusion in these narratives of “Italian police forces and social operators” as social actors enjoying specific privileges – particularly in terms of irresponsibility towards sexual abuses and access to work, business, and funding opportunities –served to foreground intersectional differences within gendered groups. Similarly, inclusion of “Italian feminist organizations” as social actors showing connivance with the governing of irregular migration further indicated race as a structure that matters, emphasising that women’s solidarity and sisterhood is not to be taken as a given in the face of complex hierarchies. Yet, the backgrounding of contradictions confronted by radical feminists due to structural inequalities between them and the undocumented migrant women in struggle they supported, contributed to propose a dichotomous picture of good and bad feminisms, with the risk of obscuring the systemic effects of racism that goes beyond individual and intentional behaviours. Finally, inclusion in these narratives
of racialised men as both allies to racialised women and perpetrators proposed a complex picture of the effects of administrative detention on racialised men. Overall, the identified strategies of Representation of Social Actors indicate elements of complexity in radical feminist structural analysis of the governing of irregular migration, stressing the intersectional effects of these governmental practices within gendered groups.

Third, the spatial setting in which social actors are located in the radical feminist narratives expressed a clear transnational sensibility in their analyses, while showing methodological nationalism as a limit affecting radical feminist political practices. Specifically, these narratives displayed awareness of the complex cross-border dynamics accompanying migrant women’s migratory movements and projects. In this regard, clearest examples are that of phenomena such as sexual trafficking and globalization of care that – in order to be brought into focus – need to be contextualised within origin, transit, and destination countries. Additionally, the radical feminist narratives demonstrated careful attention to read the functioning of the governing of human mobility beyond the borders of the Italian nation state. For instance, they pointed out the failure of Article 18 in addressing the transnational characteristics of trafficking networks and criminalising victims of trafficking exploited before their entrance in the Italian territory. Moreover, these narratives connected the working routine of diverse governmental practices and their dysfunction to specific cross-border geopolitical factors and power relations. For example, in relation to both Joy and Faith cases, they indicated geopolitical stakes connected to oil and gas interests as explaining the Nigerian embassy’s practice of identifying undocumented migrants in administrative detention and the Italian state organization of expulsions, without any concern for Nigerian citizens’ personal safety. However, limits in radical feminist organising beyond national borders have been seen in relation to lack of connections with groups and organizations from the origin countries of migrant women in struggle and loss of contacts with deported women.

In synthesis, the narratives gathered and examined have showed to be a source of knowledge about the working of gender and race administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking in the period 2008-2011. Epistemic benefits of these narratives have concerned their ability to point out relevant contradictions between the functions attributed to administrative detention and protection of trafficking victims,
and migrant women’s experiences of their realization. First, radical feminist narratives underlined the inconsistencies between administrative detention as a governmental practice designed to guarantee security, and lack of concern for safety from institutional gender-based violence, giving attention to the systemic abuses, rapes, and sexual blackmalls that cis and trans women experience in detention centres. Second, they stressed the discrepancies existing between protection of victims of trafficking and its objective to provide shelter from violence and serious exploitation, and the systemic devaluation of the agency of victims of trafficking and their frequent criminalization. Then, the radical feminist narratives approached the identified contradictions, indicating their intended and unintended functionalities. In particular, they interpreted administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking as practices strengthening social control over migrant women, reproducing the conditions causing migrant women’s bodies appropriation and labour exploitation, providing occupational, funding, and business opportunities for Italian individuals, organizations, and enterprises, and externalising the reproductive costs of the migrant workforce on migrant women.

Besides, three main epistemic limitations have been indicated: first, radical feminists’ restricted access to migrant women in struggle, and their lack of contacts with groups and organizations from the origin countries of migrant women in struggle constitute an important material constraint to pursue epistemic diversity; second their usage of a colour-blind language, which resulted in the absence of an explicit problematization of Italian whiteness, leading to the invisibilization of racialized minorities; third, limited discussions of the complexity of the agency of radical feminists, especially vis-à-vis criticism to the actions of some formal feminist organizations, side-lined reflections on the similarities between these two politics, and limit possibilities for self-criticism. In brief, indicating the epistemic benefits and limitations of these narratives has served to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ as structure.

7.6 Concluding remarks

This chapter has shown how radical feminisms in today’s Italy gave meanings to ‘gender’ as a structure of power, while struggling against administrative detention and the practices of protection of victims of traf-
ficking. ‘Gender’ has especially emerged as a tool to indicate both relation of dominance and subordination at neglected points of intersection. In this sense, it has served to bring into focus the internal hierarchies of gendered groups produced and reproduced by the governing of irregular migration. For example, they pointed out the modes in which the process of gender differentiation contribute to make detained populations governable through sexual blackmails and differentiated treatments. At the same time, they underlined the role of the governing of cross-border human mobility in reproducing specific gendered power relations. For instance, they showed how administrative detention and related legal mechanisms contribute to shape both productive and reproductive labour relations, thus establishing the conditions in which migrant women are inserted into domestic and sexual care labour markets. Undoubtedly, in both cases, feminist narratives clarified that the implications of the connections between gender and the governing of migratory movements also concern those who are not labelled as migrants. Indeed, these narratives pointed out that, in the context of the securitization of irregular migration, ‘gender’ is a main site of social conflicts and political struggles, whose stakes are division and discrimination between citizens and migrants, allowing the former to appropriate and exploit the labour and bodies of the latter. In short, elaborating on the close relation existing between gender and the governing of irregular migration, these narratives further enhanced the understanding of the modes through which gender – in intersection with race – is produced, reproduced and normalised. Overall, the findings of this chapter contribute to answer the third research sub-question of this study, adding to the research results already presented in Chapter 6. Furthermore, the identified limits and contradictions in the signification of ‘gender’ as structure will be discussed in details in Chapter 9 to further qualify the scope of the epistemic advantage of radical feminist narratives of struggle.
Politicking social reproduction: radical feminisms and solidarity with the struggles of missing migrants’ families

8.1 Introduction

Following the discussions of radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ as a category indicating a structure of power, this chapter brings into focus radical feminist organising around the disappearance and death of migrants at sea, treating the cases of the missing Tunisian migrants – still pending since the Tunisian revolution in 2011. These migrants had attempted to reach Italy in the aftermath of the revolution. Their ‘missing’ status had subsequently triggered the mobilisation by their families in a fact-finding campaign to know what happened to their beloved members. The chapter elaborates on the political campaign “From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where are our sons?” that was transnationally organised by the missing Tunisian migrants’ families, and by an Italian radical feminist collective which had participated in making visible and sustaining this struggle in Italy during 2011-2013. In particular, it focuses on radical feminist arguments on the link existing between governmental practices of securitization and externalization of border control, the death and disappearance of migrants at sea, and the organization of social reproduction across borders. The aim is to explore whether and how radical feminist narratives in this campaign took cognizance of unequal relations of gender and race among groups, and how they understood unequal relations to be formed within and across these two categories. In doing so, the chapter brings to the fore the strengths and weaknesses of radical feminist politics in terms of structural analysis.

This chapter provides further empirical findings to answer the third research sub-question: How do radical feminisms in today’s Italy signify
‘gender’ as structure in the specific struggles they undertake against the securitising and outsourcing of border-crossing control? To answer this question, the materials used in this chapter include radical feminist narratives on the securitization of irregular migration in the Mediterranean sea and the externalization of border control to the Southern shore, showing diverse aspects of the same governmental practices. The chapter triangulates different sources: primary sources such as first-hand accounts from in-depth interviews with the feminists involved in this campaign; secondary sources covering feminist communication statements, flyers, zines as well as interviews with the families and cultural materials produced by the families; and finally published essays and monographs. My participation in the organization of the whole campaign ‘From one rim to the other’, which included two visits to Tunisia, offered me a comprehensive view of this struggle. In particular, it gave me direct access to the perspective of the families of missing migrants and Tunisian activists – although this access was mediated by translation as I do not speak Arabic and I have only a basic knowledge of French. Thanks to this insider position I especially appreciated the involvement of both Tunisian women and men, and not only women, in a struggle importantly touching reproductive issues.

Section 8.2 reconstructs the struggle of the families of the missing Tunisian migrants and the campaign, which was organized by the Tunisian families and the Italian radical feminist collective Le Venticinqueunidici\textsuperscript{135}. It elaborates on the novel characteristics presented by this

\textsuperscript{135} This collective, whose name indicate the date 25/11, was formed in 2009 after a demonstration contesting male violence, which was held in Milan in occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women. During this demonstration, women exposed a banner stating “Police rape in detention centres” in solidarity with Joy’s struggle, treated in Chapter 7. For that reason, they were violently attacked and beaten by policemen. Immediately after the demonstration, many of the women attacked organised together to further support Joy’s struggle and advance the fight against administrative detention. These women were white Italian from different generation and with heterogeneous social and political background. Over time, although the composition, size, and specific objectives of this group changed, it remained focuses on contesting the governing of irregular migration, bringing together feminist and anti-racist perspectives. This chapter mainly discuss
struggle and the motives that brought a radical feminist collective to support this mobilization. Section 8.3 briefly presents the EU visa regime that has emerged since the 1990s as well as the process of outsourcing migration controls established through bilateral agreements and enhanced by technological monitoring systems. Section 8.4 sheds light on how radical feminist narratives took cognizance of the social functions and effects of the governmental practices taken into consideration. It analyses radical feminist arguments about the role of the governing of irregular migration in shaping the organization of social reproduction across borders. Section 8.5 brings into view the meanings of gender as a social category indicating transnational and intersectional relationships of inequality. Section 8.6 closes the chapter, summarizing the main empirical findings as well as relevant issues that merit further reflection.

8.2 “For our pain, and even more so, for our missing sons and daughters”: the struggles of missing migrants’ families and radical feminist solidarity

The struggle of the families of the missing Tunisian migrants emerged against the backdrop of the 2011 revolution that led to the fall of the Ben Ali regime on the 14th of January 2011, and the immediate migratory movements towards the Italian shores. During this period, geographical proximity has enabled many Tunisian youths – mainly young men coming from the Southern part of the country or the periphery of Tunis – to cross the Mediterranean with much ease by boat to reach Italy. The temporary interruption of maritime border control by Italy and bilateral agreements between Italy and Tunisia, which took place after the fall and flight of Ben Ali, was a main facilitating factor. In many cases, migrants considered arrival to Italy as an intermediary passage, which they had hoped would enable them to later travel towards other European countries, especially France. These movements took an unprecedented frequency and magnitude from February to June 2011, when they lessened and later stopped at the end of September 2011 (Sossi 2012, Garelli, Sossi, and Tazzioli 2013). According to appraisals from the organization the participation of this group in the campaign “From one rim to the other”, which involved seven/eight Italian white women – including myself – from different generations who, at the time of the campaign, were based in Milan and abroad.
Boats4People\(^{136}\), approximately 40,000 Tunisians attempted to cross the Mediterranean during the year 2011. Clearly, these movements and their scale represented a significant challenge to the borders enforced by both EU visa politics and Tunisian legislation, and have allegedly enabled “criminals and characters infiltrated by terrorist organizations”\(^{137}\). In this setting, these forms of movement across maritime borders were politicized by the Tunisian families as a practice of freedom consistent with the ideals of the revolution. In other words, in the face of externalization of border control, migrants’ cross-border movements become idealized as a search for freedom. Significantly, demands for freedom of movement in the post-revolutionary Tunisian context represented an absolute novelty vis à vis previous criminalization of irregular emigration during Ben Ali’s regime (Sossi 2012, Garelli, Sossi, and Tazzioli 2013, Tazzioli, 2013).

The struggle here presented mainly concerned the families – especially the mothers, but also the fathers, sisters, brothers, wives, uncles, and aunts – of migrants who set out from the Tunisian shores towards Italy in the aftermath of the revolution. It firstly involved the families of the youths who disappeared after embarking on five different boats that departed on March 1st, 14th, 29th, 30th and April 29th, 2011. During those days, no shipwreck has ever been attested and, while the families of the missing migrants have not heard any news from their children, they declared to have recognised some of them in the images of Italian and French newscasts showing Tunisians in Italian territory. Hence, in order to search for their missing sons and daughters, the families began their collective action during summer 2011 and, since then, they have continued to do so – particularly staging protests in front of the Tunisian Ministry of Immigration, the Italian embassy and the EU delegation in Tunis showing the photos of the disappeared\(^{138}\). Subsequently, other families of missing youths, departed before and after the revolution,

\(^{136}\) These data are reported here: http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/05/150511115924122.html

\(^{137}\) This is how the Italian Ministry of Internal Affairs, Roberto Maroni, spoke about Tunisian migrants border-crossing: http://www.repubblica.it/cronaca/2011/02/11/news/maroni_problema_tunisia-12329395/.

\(^{138}\) Here some images: https://www.flickr.com/photos/saraprestianni/sets/72157630061695540/
joined the action: they referred to departures on September 9th, 2010, February 11th and May 5th, 2011, and the families of the youths who died in the shipwrecks that occurred on September 6th and 21st 2012. These families synthesised their message as:

“For our pain, and even more so for our ‘missing’ sons and daughters, we want everything that is possible to be done to answer our questions”\(^\text{139}\).

To pursue their demands, the families during these years have produced specific requests to Tunisian, Italian, and EU authorities: specifically, they demanded to access the information gathered and archived by border-crossing control technologies to the end of accounting for the disappearances and deaths of their sons and daughters. Specifically, in October 2011, the families wrote an appeal to the Italian and Tunisian governments asking to crosscheck fingerprints information from Tunisia’s national identity card records and Italy’s immigration records, providing a list with the names of their sons as well as the time and place of their departures\(^\text{140}\). This appeal has then been supported by the radical feminist collective *Le Venticinqueundici* that not only recognized the struggle for free movement as a necessary part of any feminist “discourse of liberation and social transformation”, but also reclaimed the “marked political character” of the apparently private grief publicly exposed by the families of the missing migrants\(^\text{141}\). To press their demands the families and this feminist collective – supported by other feminist activists, migrant activists and Tunisian women in Italy – organized for nearly two

---

\(^{139}\) See the communication statement “We demand your knowledges. A petition by the mothers and the families of missing Tunisian migrants” which was published online on the March 19\(^{\text{th}}\), 2013:

http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1528

\(^{140}\) Here the text of the appeal: http://www.storiemigranti.org/spip.php?article995

\(^{141}\) The encounter between the feminist collective and the families’ movement took place thanks to the travel to Tunisia for issues related to work of one of the members of the collective. In the following documents, the feminist collective explained its reasons to support the struggles of the missing migrants’ families:

http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/files/2011/12/2-appunti-dal-nostro-dibattito.pdf and

years the political campaign “From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where are our sons?” which entailed the organization of protests and public initiatives on the two sides of the Mediterranean.

In January 2012, a delegation of representatives from the families of the missing migrants arrived in Italy to search for their children by entering the sites of migrants’ administrative detention. In March, the Italian authorities declared the fingerprints’ crosscheck had begun. Subsequently, despite the fact that the Italian Ministry of Internal Affairs, Annamaria Cancellieri, declared on the 11th of April, 2012 that the fingerprint comparisons were nearly complete, the families never received any official information from the Tunisian authorities around the result of this verification and the list of those people whose fingerprints were sent to Italy. In July 2012, the families and the activists reiterated their request to receive official information, while also advancing new demands: they also asked authorities to geo-locate the text messages and calls that the families’ received from some of their sons during their journey and to compare the TV images in which the families recognised their children, and the photos of these youths.

In March 2013, the families wrote a petition to the European Union demanding an inquiry commission – including families’ representatives and experts named by the families themselves – in order to follow up

---

On this page, there are main documents, communication statements, radio interviews and newspaper articles regarding the campaign:

http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?page_id=354

Here, the communication statement “Di Cie in Cie. Una delegazione si aggira per l’Italia” wrote by the collective on the arrival of the delegation, which was published on February 2nd, 2012:

http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=634

Here the communication statement “Ostinarsi perché le vite non sono numeri” published by the collective during its travel to Tunisia on July 4th, 2012:

http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1139

Here the communication statement announcing a sit-in organised by the families and the feminist collective in Tunis on July 12th, 2012:

http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1144. Here, the report on the meeting between a delegation of families and the Tunisian Secretary of Immigration occurred on July, 12th, 2012, after the demonstration at the Casbah:


http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1528
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with the inquiry they had made together with some activists. The petition demanded to collect the following information: geo-localization of the boats at the moments in which the phone calls occurred and of the information gathered by migration control technologies for the days indicated; verification of the fingerprints crosscheck as well as access to European dactyloscopic databases; TV images and photos technical comparison; recovering the corpses of people who died in shipwrecks. This request continued being supported in the frame of the campaign “From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where are our sons?”.

At the end of 2013, the feminist collective Le Venticinqueundici split due to disagreements on the modes and opportunities to continue supporting the families’ struggle and some activists are continuing this work on an individual basis. In this same year, the Association Terre Pour Tous was created in Tunis by Imed Soltani, uncle of two missing migrants, to the end of gathering together the families, offering them legal and psychological support, while also documenting disappearances and pressing institutions. Significantly, the name of the association was inspired by one of the main slogans of the campaign ‘From one rim to the other’, hence showing a certain continuity between the two political projects. In June 2015, the Tunisian government instituted an inquiry commission on the matter. At the moment of writing, there has not been

---


148 The name of the association was taken from the slogan brought to the streets in the context of the campaign “From one rim to the other”. It was in turn inspired by an interview released by a Tunisian migrant in administrative detention in Italy during the year 2011, who claimed that he crossed the Mediterranean because the earth is for all. Here the association’s Facebook page: [https://www.facebook.com/%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%B9%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B1%D8%B6-%D9%84%D9%84%D8%AC%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%B9-Association-la-terre-pour-tous-439972149418271/](https://www.facebook.com/%D8%AC%D9%85%D8%B9%D9%8A%D8%A9-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B1%D8%B6-%D9%84%D9%84%D8%AC%D9%85%D9%8A%D8%B9-Association-la-terre-pour-tous-439972149418271/)

149 [http://a30secondi.altervista.org/2016/01/13/165832/?doing_wp_cron=1453905234.4775118827819824218750](http://a30secondi.altervista.org/2016/01/13/165832/?doing_wp_cron=1453905234.4775118827819824218750)

any news on the inquiry conducted by this commission and activists have declared to have few expectations on the real commitment of the Tunisian government. To date, Italian and Tunisian institutions repeatedly expressed their concern for the case of the missing migrants, yet these declarations have not been followed by concrete results.

8.3 Securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control: visa policies, bilateral agreements, and monitoring technologies

In the course of the struggle presented above three main governmental practices connected to the securitization and externalization of migration control have been significantly questioned in terms of their human impact: visa policies; bilateral agreements – particularly the agreements between Italy and Tunisia; and monitoring technologies such as radar, satellites, optical and thermal cameras, et cetera.

At EU level, following the 1990 Schengen Convention the introduction of a visa policy that established a common European visa regime requires citizens from Southern Mediterranean countries – classified among the so-called ‘black listed countries’ – to obtain a visa before reaching the border of a country-member of the EU. Established requirements to grant a visa – such as evidence of sufficient financial resources – represent major obstacles to the migratory projects of would-be migrants who are non-EU citizens. Indeed, for most would-be migrants, the visa system functions as a mechanism that activates the border “at a distance” – even repeatedly – before the would-be migrant enters a given territory (Bigo and Guild 2005). This condition has become normalised in EU governing of irregular migration through patrolling and detection of movements in the Mediterranean, turning this sea into a border area and transforming international waters from what has been defined as “the high sea” into a “transit zone” placed under intense surveillance (Bigo 2014). One of the effects of this visa regime has been the emergence of a multiplication of risky routes at sea pursued by...
migrants in an attempt to avoid detection. This, in turn, has provoked an intensification of forms of maritime control as well as disputes among states over their responsibilities in rescuing people and intercepting boats at high sea – disputes that in many cases have led to deadly shipwrecks (Tazzioli 2013, De Genova et al. 2015).

At the level of bilateral relations, under the pressure by the government of Italy on North African countries, the government of Tunisia entered agreements to cooperate with the externalisation of border controls on the Southern shore of the Mediterranean since the late 1990s. This collaboration took the form of exchange of technical, operational, and financial support as well as preferential treatment with regard to inward mobility quota and development cooperation along specific conditions (Cutitta 2006 and 2008). In this policy framework, Italy and Tunisia signed their first police cooperation and readmission agreement in 1998. Later in 2003, the two countries signed a further police cooperation agreement, which led Tunisia to approve, in February 2004, a law providing severe penalties for organizations that facilitate irregular border-crossing and for individuals who promotes such activities even without profiting. This legal measure also introduced criminal and administrative charges for those who refrain from reporting to the authorities any information concerning irregular border-crossing (Cutitta 2006). Then, subsequent agreements consolidated the two states’ collaboration in securitising “irregular immigration” (Paoletti 2012).

---

153 For example, the shipwreck of the 11th of October 2013, that had 250 victims, was precisely caused by a delay in rescuing operation determined by quarrels among Italy and Malta over their competence. For more information on this case, see the testimony published here: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1647


155 This is the Law No 2004-6, which intervened to modify the Law No 1975-40 that firstly introduced the crime of “illegal emigration” in the Tunisian judicial system (Cutitta 2006). At that time, this provision was intended to control and reduce the huge movements of Tunisian citizens towards France due to the 1973 oil economic crisis and its critical effects on the European labour market. Indeed, during that period, the Tunisian state “turned its economic interests to countries like Libya” and “the first big wave of emigration towards Libya” started (Tazzioli, 2013: 167).
Subsequent to the Tunisian revolution, previous accords were revised granting further relevance to the “migration-development nexus”, a policy approach that emphasises the potential positive effects of migration for development (Tazzioli, 2013). In effect, in 2012, Italy and Tunisia signed a bilateral "strategic partnership" on matters related to economy, mobility and scientific research. In this frame, the regulation of irregular migration is enhanced by development cooperation policies, targeting especially the more disadvantaged regions of Tunisia in the South of the country. Besides, the strategic partnership also foresaw Italy’s commitment to support Tunisia in gaining access to advanced partnership status with the European Union. This was eventually reached in 2014, when the EU and Tunisia signed the Mobility Partnership Programs in order to facilitate, among other objectives, “selected mobility” for specific subjects – such as students and high skilled workers in the knowledge sector – and “joint patrolling of border zones”, thus confirming the outsourcing of irregular migration controls (De Genova et al. 2014: 20). The “eliteness” of this partnership, in line with EU’s policy to build a knowledge economy, reveal “the logic of ‘triage’” underpinning the current governing of migration which selects people “on a basis of economic expediency” (Truong 2011: 34).

Finally, technologies of monitoring constitute another important instrument to promote the control of irregular migration at a distance as well as its externalization to third countries. Indeed, it is through these technological systems that the surveillance of sea borders and consequent operations of boats rescue or interception are enhanced. In this regard, as part of the ongoing European states’ effort to improve control

---

156 The “migration-development nexus” as a policy approach has been adopted by the EU to the end of integrating issues of migration in EU development policy. Already the 1999 Tempere European Council stressed the relevance of “partnership with third countries […] with the view to promote co-development” as part of a “comprehensive approach to migration” (Europa.eu). In 2005, the EU Global approach to migration and mobility set “maximising the development impact of migration and mobility” as one of its key objectives (Europa.eu). As shown in the case of the 2012 Italy-Tunisia agreement, key points of the migration-development nexus include the idea that stimulating origin countries’ development and recruiting high-skilled migrants would provide win-win development effects for both sending and receiving countries (Panizzon et al. 2016).
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technologies, the European Surveillance Border System (EUROSUR),
promoted in 2008 by the European Commission and started in 2013, is
the most comprehensive initiative in the field. Indeed, EUROSUR aims
at improving “situational awareness” of border management authorities
and FRONTEX (fronexc.europa.eu). Its creation responds to lack of co-
ordination and information sharing among diverse surveillance agencies
– organs of member States, private actors and international agencies – to
the end of “tackling irregular migration and preventing loss of migrant
lives at sea”, thus combining securitizing and humanitarian concerns
(fronexc.europa.eu). The practical implications of this monitoring system
mainly regard EU agencies and coastal states’ intention “to detect illegal-
ized migrants leaving the Southern coast of the Mediterranean before
they enter the EU’s Search and Rescue area” so as to avoid that “the cor-
responding [European] states are responsible for coordinating rescues
and disembarking the migrants” (De Genova et al. 2014: 21). As a result,
monitoring systems have made “interception and rescue” as “indiscern-
ible practices”, that, when they are associated to “pre-frontier detection”,
“constitute a new strategy in which de facto push-backs are operated
without EU patrols ever entering into contact with the migrants” (De
Genova et al. 2014: 21, Tazzioli 2013 and 2016). This has been made
possible by EU member states efforts to “make neighbouring states [on
the Southern coast of the Mediterranean] responsible for surveilling, in-
tercepting, disembarking and managing illegalized migrants at sea” (De

8.4. “From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where
are our sons?”: radical feminisms politicising social
reproduction

While supporting the struggle of the missing migrants’ families, radical
feminisms in Italy developed their own narratives on the death and dis-
appearance of migrants at sea as directly related to, and enabled by, the
diverse governmental practices connected to securitization and external-
ization of border-crossing control. This claim has been advanced as fol-
lows: (1) description of the phenomenon of migrants’ disappearance and
death at sea and its political stakes; (2) identification of the political de-
cisions enabling this phenomenon; (3) presentation of its effects on the
organization of social reproduction across borders; (4) discussion of the
normalization of institutional irresponsibility towards migrants’ disappearance and death at sea; (5) arguments about the ethical significance of politicising the issue of social reproduction of human lives. Overall, the aim of this section is to shed light on how radical feminist narratives in the campaign “From one rim to the other” have understood the social functions and effects of these governmental practices through the production of original analyses and interpretations – autonomously or with the families - and the endorsement of analyses and interpretations elaborated independently by the organised families

The systemic character and political stakes of migrants’ disappearance and death at sea

Radical feminist narratives contributed to bring attention to migrants’ disappearance and death at sea within both general public debates and feminist discussions in Italy, showing the systemic character of this phenomenon and its political stakes. They read the human costs of unauthorised travels at sea as the “unjust differentiation between the travels of Tunisians and Italians” – a differentiation that is institutionally established by law and international agreements as well as reproduced due to institutional inactivity to look for the missing, even when their families repeatedly request to do so. Specifically, these narratives pointed out that “the families’ demands [to know about their children’s fate and to mourn them] touch a fundamental partition between lives that matter and lives that do not matter”, posing multiple political stakes (Coronati, 2013: 155).

One is the legitimization of that “desire of freedom”, which brought thousands of Tunisian youth to cross the sea as a continuation of the revolution, vis-à-vis the criminalization and securitization of such movements on both rims of the Mediterranean. As explained by a young Tunisian man in Italian administrative detention: “The earth is not mine, is not yours; it’s neither Obama’s nor Berlusconi’s. The earth belongs to everyone. If I want to breathe the oxygen of Italy, I breathe the oxygen of Italy.”

159 See the video “European peace is not ours” published online by Leventicinqueundici on January 9th, 2013: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E0q6t8GPsQ
Another political assertion is the recognition of the “worthiness of all lives”, meaning devalued migrants’ lives, against the backdrop of lack of effective institutional actions to respond to the families’ requests to localise the missing migrants and identify the dead. One further political assertion is the unsettling of “the border dividing illegal migrants and legal citizens” by illuminating the interconnections existing between these two conditions. Overall, radical feminist narratives argued for “politicising the grief” of the missing migrants’ families by not taking the death and disappearance in the Mediterranean as a “natural” matter, resulting from the dangers of the sea as nature and disconnected from power and political responsibilities. Significantly, indicating the systemic character of migrants’ disappearance and death at sea enabled radical feminisms to construct original forms of political solidarity across borders with significant political stakes.

**Enabling factors of migrants’ disappearance and death at sea**

The campaign “From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where are our son?” problematized diverse governmental practices – visa policies, bilateral agreements, and monitoring technologies – as causal factors that explain the conditions and political decisions enabling migrants’ disappearance and death at sea.

The EU visa regime was discussed in regard to its role in establishing specific geographical hierarchies in terms of freedom of movement. Indeed, as explicitly endorsed by Le Venticinqueundici, the families contested “European policies [that] prevent Tunisians to take a plane or a liner boat with the same freedom allowed to European citizens”. As synthesised by one of the mother of the disappeared, the problem is that “[Tunisians] have to apply for a visa: that is the reason for which they go to the sea”, exposing themselves to dangers; in her view, eliminating

---

160 As clarified later, within the category of lives that should matter, feminists include those of other subjects of struggle with which they build alliances.
visas would mean countering that conception of “the European [as] better than the African or Tunisian”, while it would also enable everyone “to be free”. The effects of the EU visa regime contested by the families do not just relate to boat travels and the risks they entail; visa policies also create multiple processes of dehumanization targeted at those arriving to the Northern shore of the Mediterranean outside of legalised channels. More explicitly, referring to the daily practices of administrative detention, a member of the families’ delegation in Italy declared during an interview that “we [Tunisians who are] here in Italy are ten thousands and [given the modes in which we are treated] we look like dogs, like cows”. He then continued wondering: “Why [are we treated like that]? If we are not humans, then we may as well die and leave Europe free and alone”. These few words well synthesised the discriminatory character of the EU visa regime by state sanctioned mechanisms of “Othering” African migrants vis-à-vis European citizens. Here, beyond the issue of “not having access”, “Othering” has also meant the denial of the needs and concerns of migrants and their families in the process of designing and enacting governmental practices.

The securitising approach underlying bilateral agreements between Northern and Southern Mediterranean countries was diagnosed by the campaign “From one rim to the other” as fuelling hierarchies based on class and geographical origin through the securitarian approach underlying this type of accord. For example, Le Venticinqueundici contested the European rhetoric on the Arab spring, highlighting that, while “Italy and Europe praise the new Tunisian political phase and multiply the meetings in which they promise funding for what they call the ‘democratic transition’ […], they inexorably continue asking for migratory agree-

---

164 The entire interview released by Mounira is at: http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1296. Here son went missing in 2010, after being shipped to Italy. His son has been accused of terrorism by the regime of Ben Ali, as many political opponents before the revolution. Mounira last year took part in the struggle of the Tunisian mothers in search of missing children in 2011.

165 The entire interviewed release by the members of the families’ delegation in Italy is at: http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=634. The selected quotes are by Imed Soltani.
ments”, thus “perpetrating their policies of disappearance”\textsuperscript{166}. At the same time, the collective contested the partitioning between regular and irregular movements operated by bilateral agreements as based on the “dualistic logic” of “support to skilled migration and criminalization” of unauthorised movements (Tazzioli 2013: 122). Indeed, they denounced that the “visa quota established in Italian and Tunisian bilateral agreements to allow a certain number of regular entries in Italy” for high skilled migrants always and already establishes another implicit quota, that of unauthorised migrants who undertake dangerous journeys and die along the way or who are integrated in black markets into extremely vulnerable positions\textsuperscript{167}. In sum, they highlighted the role of bilateral agreements in irregularising and securitising low skilled migration.

Monitoring technologies and identification systems were criticised for their selective use and application. In this regard, Le Venticinqueundici observed that these surveillance tools are “only functional to the governability of bodies” according to the geographical and class criteria identified before, and not to the identification and notification of missing and dead migrants\textsuperscript{168}. For example, they stressed that “Italian institutions, which are used to exchange fingerprints with all the consulates of so-called ‘Third Countries' in order to organise expulsions”, took months “to respond to the demand of collaboration”\textsuperscript{169} made by the families before proceeding with the exchange of dactyloscopic information. In other words, these narratives denounced that fingerprints “do not provide for a language of life” and are proven unable to respond to the families’ requests\textsuperscript{170}. Similarly, this selective use of technologies to the end of making people’s movements across borders governable was further confirmed by the lack of any answer or follow-up by the EU to the families’ demand to form an inquiry commission. Indeed, this request explicitly demanded access to the archives gathering the information collected “by

\textsuperscript{166} See the communication statement “Dégage alle politiche migratorie” published online on May 28, 2012: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1036

\textsuperscript{167} See the communication statement “Fuochi” published online on April 24th, 2012: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1010


\textsuperscript{169} See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=634

\textsuperscript{170} See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1010
the numerous surveillance technology means deployed by the European Union, its member states and its agency FRONTEX across the two Mediterranean shores in order to control migrations. Yet, the knowledge produced by these technologies has not been put at the service of the families’ research, rendering it useless in case of disappearance or loss of lives. In short, pointing out the enabling factors of migrants’ disappearance and death at sea led radical feminisms to question the political decision at the roots of this form of violence.

**Effects on the organization of social reproduction across borders**

The effects of these governmental practices, and European and Italian “indifference and irresponsibility” towards missing migrant persons were contested for affecting the material conditions of social reproduction in origin countries and across borders (Le Ventincinqueundici in Coronati 2013: 155).

To begin with, the political campaign ‘From one rim to the other’ showed how European and Italian unresponsiveness towards the problems caused by their own policies perpetuated the families’ suffering by failing to provide closure. On this matter, the eloquent explanation of the function and relevance of mourning that emerged in an interview with the founder of the association Earth For All should be noted:

“[…] a disappearance is not a death – which eventually one accepts. Facing the disappearance of a beloved person means facing one’s own hope constantly battling with the surrounding silence. […] Family members of the missing demand to know the truth: "Tell me who died, but tell me". […] Living without having confirmation on the death of one’s beloved means feeling that loss every day.”

Furthermore, the campaign also addressed the modes through which the governing of irregular migration operated, resulting in the obstruction of the search for the disappeared. In particular, it illuminated how

---

171 See again: https://leventincinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1528

172 For more extensive discussions on the politics of mourning see: Eng and Kazanjian (2003); Butler (2003 and 2006); Athanasiou (2010).

173 Declaration by Imed Soltani reported without quotes from this online article: http://a30secondi.altervista.org/2016/01/13/165832/doing_wp_cron=1454578106.6176810264587402343750
Politicizing social reproduction

European and Italian lack of concrete institutional responses to the families’ demands reproduces a geographical and colonial hierarchy of affects:

“We are mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers. And we are mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers in the same way that one is such in Europe. But only six of us obtained a visa to go to Italy to try to understand what happened to hundreds of missing young people. For European policies, our love and our pain do not have the same value that would be granted to family members of European young people in a similar situation.”\textsuperscript{174}

Additionally, the campaign shed light on other modes in which European and Italian irresponsibility towards missing migrant persons shapes motherhood and parenting in origin countries such as Tunisia. In this regard, the following excerpt from the chant that Néjia Ouni wrote for her missing son Anis well describes the emergence of motherhood as a location of resistance. In particular, it shows how, from this position, the dominant public-private divide, which confines the expression of emotions and the organization of reproductive activities to the domestic sphere, may be challenged:

“I do not sleep anymore because I imagine my son that never sleeps,
I do not eat anymore because I imagine my son who is hungry,
Every time I cover myself, I imagine my son out in the cold,
Every time I put my shoes on, I imagine my son without,
Oh son, oh son... I miss you.
They insulted me,
They pushed me,
They offended me,
They can also do more, I will never stop looking for him”\textsuperscript{175}

On the whole, social reproduction resulted as a key terrain of conflict in the context of governmental practices promoting the securitization and externalization of border-crossing control.

\textsuperscript{174} See again: http://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1528
\textsuperscript{175} Here, it is available the entire chant in the Italian version as translated by Hamadi Zribi: http://amisnet.org/agenzia/2012/03/29/passpartu-23-dalla-tunisia-un-messaggio-per-litalia/
Normalization of institutional irresponsibility

Radical feminist narratives clarified how the normalization of European and Italian lack of institutional effective actions to locate the missing and identify the dead is manifested and reproduced.

The campaign “From one rim to the other” contested dominant readings of the European Union – its identity, core values, and agenda – for being disconnected from and uninfluenced by the happenings taking place at EU borders and, hence, legitimising EU irresponsibility in this domain. In particular, it criticised the award of the 2012 Nobel peace prize to the EU, which systematically and bluntly ignores the deadly effects that “EU migration policies have provided for, during many years”\(^{176}\). On the occasion of the award ceremony, they organised protests in Rome and Tunis to challenge the conception of peace underpinning this award, one that denies EU responsibility for “the disappearance and death of thousands of people [at sea] and the transformation of the Mediterranean Sea into a marine graveyard”.

The campaign also denounced the politics of numbers underpinning governmental discourses on the governing of irregular migration at sea for fuelling and normalising political irresponsibility towards missing persons. In particular, it argued that these discourses, by treating “the nameless dead at sea” as “the dark side of rescuing practices that everyday receive [instead] many celebrations”\(^{177}\), confine the numbers of the disappeared and the dead in the domain of the approximate, where homogenising representations obliterate the individuality of missing persons (Tazzioli, 2015). In this regard the campaign vocally refused to consider cases of death at sea as statistical standard deviations to not care for, claiming instead that “behind the numbers, there are lives”\(^{178}\).

---

176 See this flyer which has been distributed both in Rome and Tunis on the 10\(^{th}\) of December, 2012, for the protest organised by the families and feminist activists against the assignment of the Nobel prize: [https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/files/2011/12/volantino-A5.pdf](https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/files/2011/12/volantino-A5.pdf).

Here, the video used to promote the protest: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E0q6br8GPsQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E0q6br8GPsQ).

177 Declaration by Imed Soltani reported without quotes from this online article: [http://a30secondi.altervista.org/2016/01/13/165832/doing_wp_cron=1454578106.6176810264587402343750](http://a30secondi.altervista.org/2016/01/13/165832/doing_wp_cron=1454578106.6176810264587402343750).

Additionally, the campaign denounced the common stigmatization of the families as psychologically unstable because of their commitment to search for their sons and daughters. As reported in a communication statement reacting to the extreme protest acted by Jannet Rhimi, mother of a missing migrant, who tried to set herself on fire in April, 2012, the feminist collective observed that “the impression of those who approach the struggle of the mothers, without taking the necessary time to understand it, is that of assisting to a collective delusion” as if attempting to find one’s own children was a sign of mental instability. Similarly, the collective further commented that “not few people, when they see the group [of the mothers] appearing in front of the headquarters of ministries and general secretaries, allude to their madness. 'It is a psychological problem' said a public official to us. 'C’est du n’importe quoi' commented a secretary when she saw them”\(^{179}\). However, according to the group, “it is the language of [governing of irregular migration] that speaks in delirious terms”\(^{180}\) and the families’ search for their own children, alive or dead, operates to unsettle the mindset produced by these rationalities and practices, which treats these persons, not as “concrete beings”, but as “ghosts or fingerprints”\(^{181}\).

Moreover, the campaign also indicated the non-performativity of diverse institutional declarations of concern as being a main obstacle to concretely treat the cases of the missing migrants. Specifically, Le Venticinqueundici denounced that these declarations are invariably accompanied by “ambiguous phrases, non-transparent communications, meetings between Italian or Tunisian institutions and the organised families where there is no clarity about what is communicated”\(^{182}\). In this regard, the meeting of Giorgio Napolitano, the President of the Italian Republic, with some of the missing migrants’ families in Tunis is particularly emblematic. In this occasion, contradictory declarations circulated in both Tunisian and Italian press, making a “puzzle” to understand what Napolitano really communicated to the missing migrants’ families during their encounter: did he cry for the disappearance of the missing migrants? Did he make a commitment to search for the missing? Did he state that migrants’ disappearance was due to low control of Tunisian costs? Did he

\(^{179}\) See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1010

\(^{180}\) See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1010

\(^{181}\) See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1036

\(^{182}\) See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1036
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communicate the negative result of the dactyloscopic comparison? According to the campaign, these “half-truths” and “false truths”, \(^{183}\) created the image of institutional commitment to handle the case of the missing migrants; yet, as these declarations remained vague and were not followed by concrete steps, they ended up undermining the search of the disappeared.

In short, taking awareness of the modes in which the normalization of institutional irresponsibility is manifested and reproduced led radical feminisms to establish the relevance of countering this trend by politicising issues of social reproduction.

**The ethical significance of politicising the issue of social reproduction of human lives**

The issue of social reproduction of human lives against the normalization of the governing of irregular migration and its effects was politicised, building alliances with other movements contesting the structural conditions that make some lives not as worthy to reproduce and safeguard as others.

To begin with, the theme of social reproduction emerged as a relevant topic in the encounter between Le Venticinqueundici and the organised citizens and workers of the city of Taranto, Puglia\(^{184}\), who have been confronting the state of severe pollution and contamination caused by local industries and military bases\(^{185}\). This latter movement claimed to combine attention to human “health and environment’s protection”, together with access to “employment” and “income”. Under the slogan “Our sons [and daughters] are not garbage”\(^{186}\), this struggle rejected the

---

\(^{183}\) See again: [https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1010](https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1010)

\(^{184}\) See, for example, Le Venticinqueundici webpage on struggles over life reproduction: [https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?page_id=1359](https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?page_id=1359)

\(^{185}\) In particular, this movement addressed the environmental disasters produced by the Ilva steel plant, the largest in Europe, which is responsible for 83% of emissions of dioxin in the whole of Italy and a local cancer death rate at 15 % above national levels. Next to Ilva, the Nato local base and its atomic submarines, Military Arsenal, Cementir’s dumps and incinerators contribute to environmental crises in Taranto.

\(^{186}\) See, for example, the report of the demonstration which saw the emergence of such movement: [http://www.labottegadelbarbieri.org/taranto-assassinata-taranto-da-liberare/](http://www.labottegadelbarbieri.org/taranto-assassinata-taranto-da-liberare/)
“occupational blackmail”\textsuperscript{187} to which most citizens in Taranto are exposed. This blackmail coerces people, in a situation of widespread unemployment and poverty, to work under harmful labour conditions in order to survive, while jeopardising the health and wellbeing of present and new generations. In this setting, *Le Venticinqueundici* emphasised the work done by organised workers and citizens in Taranto to “decolonise their own mind” and reject the logic underpinning the blackmail: that is, the prioritization of industrial production and military agendas over human lives\textsuperscript{188}. Specifically, they narratives claimed that such processes of dis-identification, shedding light on the “neo-colonial” distinction between those “who have the right to live and [those] who have only the right to die”\textsuperscript{189}, are important examples to question the current organisation of social reproduction, which also underlies the prioritization of border-crossing control in the governing of human mobility.

In addition, the theme of social reproduction also emerged in the encounter between Tunisian missing migrants’ mothers and the mothers from the movement No MUOS\textsuperscript{190}, which opposes the US Navy military telecommunication system M.U.O.S. (Mobile User Objective System) and the construction of one of its ground stations in Niscemi, Sicily. Significantly, this case made visible diverse material interests supporting the securitization of irregular migration. Meetings between the two movements in March 2013 brought attention to the linkage existing between monitoring tools for the governing of people’s movement across borders and, the risks for human health and ecosystems that these technologies imply via militarism. Indeed, as explained in communication statements prepared by *Le Venticinqueundici*: “the protest of Sicilian mothers from the No MUOS committee intends to preserve their sons and daughters’ health” from the effects of the electromagnetic field created by the MUOS and “to oppose the transformation of Sicily into the outpost of

\textsuperscript{187} See the interview to one of the workers participating in this struggle: \url{http://www.connessioniprecarie.org/2012/11/24/essere-tutti-sindicalisti-intervista-a-cataldo-ranieri-comitato-lavoratori-e-cittadini-liberi-e-pensanti-taranto/}

\textsuperscript{188} See the article “Taranto, il paradigma estremo” published online on December 14th, 2012: \url{https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?page_id=1359}

\textsuperscript{189} See the article “Taranto, il paradigma estremo” published online on December 14th, 2012: \url{https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?page_id=1359}

\textsuperscript{190} See the movement’s website: \url{http://nomuos.org/en}
future wars in Africa” that the MUOS would bring about given its role in facilitating communication with drones and unmanned aircrafts. In this sense, as explicitly claimed by Sicilian mothers, the No MUOS fight is also a fight against “the military construction of a Mediterranean sea symbolising divisions, death, and wars” – including “the war against migrants” (Della Porta and Piazza 2016). In this setting Le Venticinqueundici described the encounter of both groups of mothers as contributing to practice a Mediterranean “unified by struggle and resistance […] to make all lives matter” against “political, economic, military, bordering, and territorial policies that violate the value of people”.

In sum, the political campaign ‘From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where are our sons?’ offered a situated perspective on the relation between diverse policies promoting the securitization and externalization of border-crossing control, and missing and dead migrants in the Mediterranean sea. In particular, this campaign made apparent the role of the governing of migration in shaping the organization of social reproduction across borders. First, it showed the implications of European and Italian “indifference and irresponsibility” towards missing migrants in shaping the material conditions of reproduction in origin countries and across borders. Especially, it pointed out the role of the governing of irregular migration in producing and reproducing migrants’ families’ suffering, articulating colonial hierarchies of affect, and finally making the public-private divide into a terrain of conflict. Second, the campaign explained the normalization of European and Italian institutional ineffectiveness to localise the missing and identify the dead through diverse discursive and practical mechanisms. In particular, it indicated the role of European and Italian institutions in constructing the European identity as disconnected from its borders practices, advancing a politics of numbers that de-personalises missing migrants, pathologising the families’ expression of their grief, and making non-performative institutional declarations of concern. Third, the campaign ‘From one rim to the other’ also identified the structural conditions making some lives not as worthy to reproduce as others as a key terrain of social conflict. Overall, the narrat-
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191 See the communication statement “Le mamme tunisine incontrano le mamme NO MUOS” published online on March 20th, 2013: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1546
192 See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1546
193 See again: https://leventicinqueundici.noblogs.org/?p=1546
Politicizing social reproduction

ives produced in this campaign contributed to make visible and legible hidden structures of domination and exploitation of gender and race connected to the securitization and externalization of border-crossing control.

8.5 Securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control, and the meanings of ‘gender’ as structure

Radical feminist narratives on the securitization and externalization of border-crossing control offered an in-depth signified ‘gender’ in different ways in intersection with race. To grasp these meanings, the section reflects on: (1) the perspectives employed within the texts considered that, once identified, bring into focus the standpoint from which gender as a social category is produced, reproduced, and negotiated; (2) the strategies of Representation of Social Actors that illuminate the relations of inequality between and within gendered groups, shedding light on the intersectional dimension of ‘gender’ as it was signified in radical feminist narratives; (3) temporal and spatial locations of social actors, which are employed to clarify the use of scales of analysis in these narratives, revealing the transnational dimension of ‘gender’ in these narratives. Finally, the section closes by identifying the epistemic benefits and limitations of radical feminist narratives so as to bring into focus strengths and weaknesses of their signification of ‘gender’.

First, in terms of the social actors’ perspectives considered, radical feminist narratives include the viewpoints of missing migrants’ Tunisian families in struggle, and of Italian radical feminists supporting this struggle from the Northern shore of the Mediterranean. The former situated perspective is that of a collective subject who has first-hand experience of the oppressive nature of the governing of irregular migration. From this vantage, the missing migrants’ families operate an ideological break with the ‘securitising common sense’ – dominant on both sides of the Mediterranean – by posing the migratory project of their sons and daughters in continuity with the Tunisian revolution and framing it as an intentional act of freedom that put into practice the idea that the earth belongs to everybody.

The latter situated perspective is that of another collective subject, Italian radical feminists, which is aware of its privileged position within a colonial organization of human mobility, and intends to contribute to a
general process of liberation by dismantling the hierarchical division between citizens and migrants from the space it inhabits. This subject supports the struggle of those directly affected by the measures of governing of irregular migration, through diverse solidarity practices: circulating news about their struggle, strategizing together, endorsing its ideas, organising protests from her own location, and establishing connections between this and other movements that share a similar ethos. Both situated perspectives are considered as standpoints enabling the achievement of a collective consciousness about the structuring of power relations.

This consciousness regards power relations in a number of areas. On the constitution of labour markets, radical feminist narratives stress the prioritization of markets logic in classifying the subjects free to move across borders as in the case of bilateral agreements favouring high skilled workers. They show how these governmental practices establish logics of inclusion that underlie logics of exclusion and differential inclusion and that have important effects on the organization of social reproduction within and across borders.

In regard to national identities, these narratives stress the rather heterogeneous character of nations, making visible processes of identity construction from below, where human mobility across borders acquires a central role in opposition to state’s identity constructions that securitise such movements. For instance, the case of post-revolutionary Tunisian identity indicates that choices of outward mobility are publicly reclaimed as a “revolutionary” practice, thus breaking with previous interdictions to discuss unauthorised travels in public spaces due to criminalising measures. Then, it deserves to be highlighted that these narratives did not established any link between the construction of Italianess and past claims to Italian indirect colonization of Tunisia during the nineteenth century as if this historical fact was noit relevant to comprehend contemporary relations between the two countries.

In terms of agency, these narratives definitely celebrated the capacity of organization and action of the families of missing migrants. Yet, they did not neglect the power capacity of the governing of cross-border human mobility to re-organise itself in front of resistance, thus identifying difficulties and challenges faced by the organised families of the missing migrants. Simultaneously, they recognised the potential of this struggle in imaging a different world where the “earth belongs to everybody”. In short, the scope of the standpoints identified further extends the radical
feminist critical reading of the governing of people’s irregular movements across borders – examined in the previous chapters – through incorporating the role of the governmental practices considered in constituting labour markets, organising social reproduction, negotiating national identities, and conceiving the relation between agency and structure.

Second, attention to strategies of Representation of Social Actors in the campaign ‘From one rim to the other’ shows how radical feminist narratives have recognised the role played by both gender and race in producing relations of inequality. In particular, the foregrounding of the ‘Tunisian missing migrants’ families’ as social actors illustrates radical feminist attention to the interlocking of gender and race as follows: gender emerges through references to sexual difference, which underlies social actors’ definitions according to their social reproductive roles; race surfaces though references to geographical origin, which explains differential distribution of vulnerability in travelling, and differential treatment of missing persons’ cases. Here, the association between geographical origin and somatic features, which stands at the roots of the adopted definition of race, is suppressed, but evoked through references to geographies of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Significantly, attention to silences and amplifications in the representation of relations of inequality has revealed that these narratives mainly emphasised relations of inequalities within gendered social groups. For example, inclusion in these narratives of ‘Italians’, as social actors who enjoy specific privileges in terms of freedom of movement and whose reproductive roles are silenced, clarifies the greater weight of social relations of race in the securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control. Similarly, the inclusion within these narratives of other Italian subjects in struggle – the organised citizens and workers of the city of Taranto and the mothers from the No MUOS movement –, whose lives are treated as though they do not matter and whose reproductive roles are acknowledged, warns against the automatic overlapping of nationality and race. It clarifies that ‘neo-colonial’ processes of racialization cut across national boundaries – in this case targeting the Italian South. In sum, the identified strategies of Representation of Social Actors indicate elements of complexity in radical feminist structural analysis of the governing of irregular migration.

Third, consideration of the spatial setting in which social actors are located in radical feminist narratives reveals the narratives’ transnational
disposition. Importantly, references to nationalised spaces, international gatherings, public and private locations, emotions and affects show radical feminist uses of diverse scales of analysis from the international to the intimate. This varied focus questions the common view that politically relevant social relations are those taking place inside the boundaries of nation states. For example, radical feminist narratives on the 2012 Nobel peace prize assigned to the EU demonstrated how the effects of EU governing of irregular migration shape European identity partly precisely because these effects are denied. In other words, they clarify that an “internalist” conception of the self, defined from within European borders, is a powerful device to externalise on the outside the problematic aspects of the EU governing of irregular migration, and enable self-absolution (Hall 1991: 18, El-Tayeb 2011: xvii). Moreover, radical feminist narratives’ attention to the embodied consequences of the governing of people’s movements across borders provides alternative ways of representing and understanding the exercise of governmental power and its human effects, bringing into focus the role of the body and affections. In particular, the families and activists’ contestations of the governmental language of numbers exemplified a sort of “feminist geopolitics”, contrasting embodied experiences of grief and struggle to aseptic statistical body counts (Hyndman 2008: 194). Finally, the radical feminist commitment to establish connections between struggles on the two shores of the Mediterranean successfully indicated diverse cross-border interests at stake in the governing of human mobility across borders. For example, the encounter between Tunisian and Sicilian mothers showed another side of the human costs of surveillance and communication technologies, linking issues of reproductive and environmental racism. In short, the methodological transnationalism identified in these narratives functions enlarging the focus of analysis to consider otherwise ignored problems connected to the irregular migration.

In sum, the narratives collected and examined have represented a valuable source of knowledge about the intersectional and transnational dimensions of ‘gender’ as structure in the context of securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control. These narratives’ epistemic benefits have surfaced in relation to their ability to bring into view relevant contradictions between the intended functions of visa policies, bilateral agreements, and monitoring technologies, and the migrants’ families’ experiences of the actualization of such governmental practices. Indeed,
radical feminist narratives denounced that policies enumerating, among their objectives, not only the security of European states and their citizens, but also the humanitarian protection of migrants’ safety at sea, in many ways make migrants’ lives insecure and unworthy. These narratives also highlighted how lack of effective institutional actions to locate the disappeared and identify the dead subtract affective and physical resources as well as control over processes of social reproduction from the families of missing and dead migrants. Significantly, this finding revealed the relevance of gender and especially race for representing relations of inequality across borders. Besides, two main epistemic limitations of these narratives have been indicated: first, lack of engagement with the history of Italian indirect colonization of Tunisia during the nineteenth century, which likely contributes to reproduce the unexpressed whiteness of Italian identity; and second, the absence of an explicit language of race in radical feminist narratives, which reinforce colour-blind critiques to the governing of irregular migration. In short, these epistemic benefits and limitations well indicate the strengths and weaknesses of radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ as structure.

8.6 Concluding remarks

This chapter has shown how radical feminisms in today’s Italy gave meanings to ‘gender’ as a structure of power implicated in governmental practices of securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control. In this context, ‘gender’ has surfaced as a tool to name specific aspects of racial forms of oppression, and to transform this oppression into a terrain of political mobilization. Indeed, these narratives brought first into focus how securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control shape the organization of social reproduction through structural violence. In doing so, they clarified that the differentiation between citizens and migrants, producing gendered and racial inequalities, does not simply take place in countries of destination, but goes back to origin countries shaping the modes in which one is mother and father. Second, radical feminists’ attention to locate social reproduction within the context of specific social, political, economic, and affective constraints produced by the governmental practices considered helps one to appreciate the politicization of such parenting conditions. Indeed, these narratives showed that the families’ organized search for their missing sons and daughters as well as their demands to end current limitations to free circulation
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across borders produce political claims based on the desire of mothers and fathers for seeing their children travelling and living safely. In this sense, the movement of the missing migrants’ families has importantly deepened radical feminist debates about reproduction and self-determination, exemplifying the relevance of looking at structural dynamics and power relations. Overall, the findings of this chapter contribute – together with findings from Chapter 6 and 7 – to respond to the third research sub-question of this dissertation. Then, the identified limits and contradictions in radical feminist significations of ‘gender’ will be treated in detail in Chapter 9 to further qualify the scope of the epistemic advantage of radical feminist narratives of struggle.
White subjectivities in radical feminist struggles against the governing of irregular migration

9.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at subjectivities in radical feminist struggles on the governing of irregular migration. It explores how white women in these struggles negotiate, through their practices of social actors’ identification, their own subject positions produced by these governmental rationalities and practices. The chapter takes the term ‘White’ to indicate a specific social position of racial privilege, rooted in the historical construction of Italy as a nation state, and the homogenisation of the ‘White’ status as ‘Italian’. Particularly, it focuses on the disjuncture white women in radical feminist struggle experience between their own social position of racial privilege and their resistor positionality against racist structures. Thus, it aims at revealing their possibilities and limits for discursive and material dis-engagements with racist practices and structures.

The chapter illustrates how these identifications instantiate the gender-race intersection, accounting for conflicting differences directed and shaped by intertwining power relations. More precisely, it examines the identificatory practices adopted by white women in the specific radical feminist struggles discussed in Chapters 6, 7, and 8 so as to shed light on the meanings that ‘gender’, in intersection with ‘race’, has acquired (Yuval-Davis 2007). Subsequently, it complements the analysis of these identifications by bringing to the fore the perspectives of racialised women on white women’s subjectivities. The chapter uses an intra-cat-

Not all these women located themselves in the field of radical feminist politics. Yet, they have been involved in this research because of having participated in or collaborated with radical feminist political organising or for being con-
The chapter provides an answer to the fourth research sub-question: how do white women in radical feminisms use gender as a source of identification in struggles against the governing of irregular migration in contemporary Italy? To this purpose, main data consist of white radical feminist texts – especially communication statements – and first-hand accounts resulting from in-depth interviews, and FGDs.

Section 9.2 treats white radical feminists’ texts on the gendered securitization of in-migration. It weighs up strategic essentialism as a practice of identification. Section 9.3 deals with white radical feminists’ discourses on administrative detention and institutional gender-based violence against migrant women. It discusses social actors’ functionalization as a practice of identification based on the differentiation between social locations and positionalities. Section 9.4 is about white radical feminists’ texts on the securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control. It discusses transnationalism as a practice of identification. All these three sections analyse selected white radical feminists’ texts with tools from Narrative Analysis, Self-and-Other Presentation Analysis, and Representation of Social Actors Analysis. They reflect on the self-construction of white women’s subjectivities, clarifying how they “employ specific discourses and resist others to protect or enhance their social agency” from the subject positions assigned to them by governmental power (Laine and Vaara 2007: 3). Then, Section 9.5 provides a contrasting view: it presents the perspective of racialized women on white women’s subjectivities, and white unconscious imaginaries of racial Otherness. Finally, Section 9.6 closes with a synthesis of previous considerations on the signification of ‘gender’ as a source of identification and its role in the construction of white women’s subjectivities.
9.2 Speaking from one’s own position? Strategic essentialism in reaction to the gendered securitization of in-migration

This section discusses the findings of a discourse analysis of twenty communication statements concerning the demonstration against male violence against women held in Rome in November 2007. The selected texts are extracted from the fanzine “Libere di agire, capaci di reagire: voci dalla manifestazione contro la violenza maschile sulle donne del 24 novembre 2007”, edited by the Milan-based collective Mai State Zitte (2007).

Table 9.1
Feminist communication statements from the march against male violence against women held on the 24th November 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author of the communication statement</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Rete Controviolenzadonne</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Rete Controviolenzadonne</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Mai State Zitte</td>
<td>Milano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Coordinamento Lesbiche Romane</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Quelle che non ci stanno</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Fuoricampo Lesbian Group</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Collettivo Clitoristrix femministe e lesbiche</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Collettivo femminista La mela di Eva</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Luna e le altre</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Collettivo femminista universitario Figlie Femmine</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Gruppo Donne C.S.O.A. Ex Snia Viscosa</td>
<td>Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Anassim - Donne native e migranti sulle due sponde del Mediterraneo</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Collettivo salernitano di donne Le Onde</td>
<td>Salerno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Osservatorio femminile sulla repressione</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Donne in nero</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16 Open mind - Centro di iniziativa GLBT e donne catanesi</td>
<td>Catania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These documents predominantly cover the position expressed by white women in radical feminist groups from diverse parts of the country, which explicitly contested both male violence and the securitization of in-migration. The section shows that the identification produced in these texts mainly relied on the categories of gender and nationality, and it discusses what these identifications accomplish in terms of white women’s dis-engagement from racist practices and structures, making use of in-depth interviews and FGDs. Specifically, it reflects on radical feminists’ tendencies – identified in Chapter 6 – to employ a colour-blind language in the context of gendered securitization. On the whole, the section suggests that interpreting white women’s construction of group boundaries offers relevant insights to illuminate the production of their subjectivity as people engaged in negotiating the subject position of a victim to rescue, assigned to them by the gendered securitization of in-migration.

The narrative in the texts examined is voiced by white women explaining the relevance of organizing and participating in the national demonstration against male violence that took place on the 24th of November 2007 – already introduced in Chapter 6. According to the principles of Narratives Analysis presented in Chapter 3, the central

---

195 Only one document is written by both “native” and “migrant” women (D12). In all the other cases, there is no explicit reference to the racial social location of the authors, thus suggesting their “Italianness” and “whiteness” as is discussed below.

196 In order to uncover assumptions and values informing text, Narrative Analysis invites to recognize six actants, that are roles in a story that, once identified, help to grasp the “meaning-bearing” structure of the text (Greimas, 1966; Titscher, 2000). As explain in Chapter 3, these actants, which are not necessarily personified in actors, interact across space and time and can be of six different types; (1) destinator, the source or initiator of the rules and values that inform the text; (2) carrier of the values that inform the text; (3) subject, the main figure in the narrative; (4) object, what the subject aspires to; (5) adjuvant,
subject of this narrative are white women who share awareness about the multiple detrimental effects of governmental practices that construct them as subjects to be protected and rescued. This collective subject is also the carrier of the values transmitting the texts analysed. Her objective – connected to her own refusal of the victim role – is threefold: (1) to oppose patriarchal violence against Italian and migrant women; (2) to oppose racist violence against migrant women and men; and (3) to construct alliances with migrant women. Her main opponents are state institutions and media, which use the evidence of white women’s experiences of male violence as a moral instrument to criminalise and securitise in-migration, treating white women as victims to be protected and saved from racialised men. “Migrant women” in struggle – politically organised on the base of shared experiences of patriarchal oppression and racialization – constitute her main adjuvant boosting the struggle against patriarchal and racist violence. Yet, to make this alliance work, white women must simultaneously confront structural and internalised racism as social phenomena, in order to be able to reach out to subjects who stand between the adjuvant role and the opponent role. These are white and racialised women and men who are not politically organised, and who may shift from being opponent to adjuvant on the condition of explicitly breaking any complicity with patriarchal and racist norms. The key message conveyed through this narrative is that opposition to male violence against women and coalition building with racialised subjects require awareness about processes through which different types, and relations, of oppression become intertwined.

‘Gender’ as a primary source of identification and strategic essentialism

The primary feature of white women’s identifications in this narrative is that they primarily define social actors as being “gendered”. This clearly emerges from the words chosen to indicate the main topic of discussion, “male violence against women” (D1; D2; D6; D8; D10; D13; D14; D15; D17; D19). Also nominations and predications of social actors conveyed forces that support the subject’s efforts; (6) opponent, the impeding forces.

Generally, discourses as narratives are thought to propose a plot which sees the subject who directs itself to the object, while being supported by the adjuvant and impeded by the traitor. In this frame, the destinator propose the values informing the text, which are imparted by the carrier (Titscher 2000: 125-134).
the same message. For instance, most nominations of subjects, adjuvants, and potential adjuvants as “women” or “men” definitely confirm the centrality of the gender dimension in these identifications. Similarly, gendered personifications of opponents, such as nominations of the military as the “male soldiers” (D3) or nomination of the police as the “policeman” convey the same message (D15). Also opponents’ predications in relation to their role in reproducing patriarchy confirm the prioritization of the gender dimension as in the phrase: “in the Parliament [the painting] ‘The rape of Sabine women’ continues to be displayed as heinous symbol of male Italianness” (D4). This prioritization of gender in the white women’s identifications, which is clearly linked to contextual factors including the gendering of securitization, raises questions about the status of this category as mere “signifier of identity” and difference or as marker of oppression and privilege, and it puts the politicization of the gender category at stake, opening questions about its boundaries (Erel et al. 2010: 283).

A useful source of insights for an assessment of the status of ‘gender’ in these identifications may be found in radical feminist discussions on the practice of women’s separatism in preparation of the 2007 demonstration. In this occasion, the organizers reflected on whether the whole body of the demonstration, or certain sections, should be composed entirely by women or not, to later reach an agreement about characterising the head of the march as a women’s sector. Significantly, this debate indirectly called into question the manners in which radical feminists have drawn the boundaries of ‘gender’ and have acted upon them, illuminating also the extant political heterogeneity shaping the field of radical feminist politics. This conversation brought into focus both commonalities and disagreements among white women in radical feminisms on the functions of gendered identifications. All participants in the debate recognised the power inherent to the act of naming and the possibility of agency that this act implies. Yet, they diverged on whether “the most critical resistance strategy for disempowered groups is to occupy and defend a politics of location rather than to vacate and destroy it”

197 These discussions involved a great number of women engaged in radical feminist politics, whose great majority were certainly white women. If women who are otherwise racialised participated in this debate, they did not do so reclaiming their racialised position. Thus, the debate is here characterized as ‘white’.
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(Crenshaw 1995: 375). This point lays at the heart of scholarly debates on the travelling and reception of intersectionality in continental Europe. Indeed, acknowledging the functions of identity claims as tools to indicate unequal power relations, and not as oppressive practices in themselves, is considered key to promote political uses of intersectionality, able to engage their socio-historical context of reference (Erel et al. 2010: 283, Ahmed 1998, Puar 2012, Tomlinson 2013b, Lewis 2013, Bilge 2013 and 2015).

Supporters of women’s separatism anchored the separatist practice to “strategic essentialism” as an effective strategy to “take the floor as women”, hence as subjects directly touched by a specific oppression (Poidimani 2007b: 21). Specifically, this strategy was seen as functional to give value to “relations among women as an instrument of liberation”, and to make visible the heterogeneity of the women participating in the march as a “resource” to counter “identitarian delusions” (Poidimani, 2007b: 21). Furthermore, supporters of strategic women’s separatism indicated the relevance of stressing male responsibilities in violence against women in order to invite women to break their own complicity with male domination, and to “force” men to reposition themselves, actively countering dominant male behavioural models as women’s dominators and protectors (Poidimani, 2007b: 21). Besides, they also suggested the importance of “struggling departing from one’s own positionality in the gender system”, a positionality that relates to “awareness about oppression and the desire to struggle against this oppression” (Poidimani, 2007b: 21). Finally, even if they recognised that heteronormativity affects all gender non-conforming subjects, they suggested to treat separately misogynist and homo/transphobic violence because merging the two would entail to “obliterate in an ill-defined mass the diverse specific shapes that gender violence takes” (Poidimani, 2007b: 22).

Critics of women’s separatism saw this practice as counterproductive, arguing that it conveys the idea that the struggle against gender violence is a prerogative of “biological women”, and it fails “to complicate stereotypical understandings of violence” based on “concepts of masculine strength” and feminine “vulnerability” (Giuliani, 2007). In other words, opponents of strategic women’s separatism suggested that, given the lack of common awareness regarding the simplifications inherent in the binary women-men within public debates, the tactical approach to this binary constituted a dangerous strategy, running the risk to obscure “those
acts of cultural, physical, and psychological violence which involve women as lesbians and trans” (Giuliani, 2007). Furthermore, they argued that reading “gender violence” through the women-men binary does not allow to grasp that patriarchal cultures “involve and determine the actions and thoughts of many women” as much as men, and that “the problem is not heterosexual males, but heteronormativity and racism, what there is inside everyone’s head independently from their bodies of women or men” (Giuliani, 2007).

This specific debate on women’s separatism offered relevant insights to comment on white women’s uses of gender given that the texts analysed were written by those groups supporting the practice of strategic separatism. First, this debate revealed the existence of shared understanding, in the radical feminist field, of “gender” as a social construct, with a limited capacity to name different experiences, identities, and social locations, which needs to be complemented with a view on its interaction with other categories. Second, the debate made clear that the prioritization of the gender dimension is contingent to the context considered and the specific goals envisioned by the organizers of the demonstration, which made gender as the difference that most matters in regard to discussions on male violence and gendered securitization of in-migration. Last but not least, the debate illuminated the existence of different radical feminist leanings towards the status of gender categories. On the one side, the practice of categorization is retained to the end of making visible those “relations of domination and subordination” that “still exist and continue to demand analytical and political specification and engagement” (Erel et al. 2010: 283). On the other side, categorizations are refused, as their deconstruction is comprehended as “part and parcel of the deconstruction of inequality itself” (McCall 2005: 1777). In any case, gendered identifications are thought as key elements of discussion in the field of radical feminist politics.

‘Nationality’ as a proxy for ‘race’, and the separation of ‘race’ and ‘racism’

The second significant feature revealed through discourse analysis of white women’s identifications is that the gendering of social actors is frequently associated to their racialization. This is indirectly realised through nomination of the complex heterogeneity of woman and man in terms of nationality. The racialization of feminine subjects is rendered through
the creation of two groups: on the one side, women who are “Italian”,
and “native” and, on the other side, women who are “migrant”, “Roma”,
“Somali”, “Eritrean”, “Muslim” (D1; D3; D11; D12; D15; D16). In par-
allel, the racialization of the masculine subjects is realized in a similar
manner: “Italian” men are counter-posed to “migrants”, “Roma”, “Ro-
manian”, “foreigners” (D11; D12; D14; D16; D17). One significant
factor defining these implicit raced identifications is that they make race
converge with static notions of nationality and culture. This is evident in
arguments about masculine violence as transversal to diverse social
groups. The argument never explicitly named racial hierarchies, but re-
ferred to differences of “nationality”, “geographical origin”, “ethnicity”,
“culture”, and “religion” (D1; D2; D8; D11; D13; D16; D17). Another
feature of these implicit raced identifications is that they often elide or
background racial characterizations of majoritarian groups. For instance,
the “woman” signifier is repeatedly used, without further specification.
This is the case of texts’ references to ISTAT data on male violence
against women, which failed to problematize that these statistics only in-
cluded the experience of women with Italian citizenship and not the ex-
periences of all women living in Italy (D1; D11; D15). Overall, these
identifications raise issues about white women’s adoption of the same
colour blind language employed in governmental regulations on cross-
border mobility, and about the concealment of whiteness and racializing
processes.

To grasp the implications of such identifications, it is useful to read
the race-nationality convergence against the backdrop of the UNESCO
paradigm of anti-racism. Interestingly, the radical feminists’ identifica-
tions examined reveal a certain distance from the UNESCO since, in
connecting racism to state politics, they implicitly moved beyond the
idea that racist discrimination and violence require individual solutions
based on education and knowledge about the Other as means to over-
come prejudices. At the same time, they moved close to the UNESCO
paradigm inasmuch they did not overtly name racial hierarchies. In other
words, they tacitly embraced the idea that mentioning the somatic or
morphological characteristics naturalising racial power relations would
imply the reproduction of racial hierarchies. This contradictory approach
to the UNESCO paradigm suggests a certain disconnection between race
and racism in white women’s identifications, showing that they are influ-
enced by eliminationist approaches to race. This observation reveals a
double standard in regard to the use of the categories of gender and race. Indeed, while strategic essentialism is embraced to make visible gendered relations of power, this is not the case with racial relations as power relations.

Similarly, the backgrounding of raced characterizations of majoritarian groups vis-à-vis the foregrounding of raced characterizations of minorities reveal a differential treatment of gender and race. On the one side, raced identifications explicitly refer to racialised women – even if through the race-nationality convergence – and thus acknowledge the heterogeneity of women’s condition. On the other side, backgrounding or elision of racial characterization of majoritarian groups serves to normalize whiteness and thus sideline the privileges connected to white supremacy. In doing so, these identifications implicitly define the condition of racialized women as particular, and that of white women as the norm.

Besides, they expose the influence of the dominant construction of Italianness as unexpressed whiteness, and European racialization as colour-blindness regarding white women’s identifications (El-Tayeb 2011: xxiv). As a result, a differentiated use of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ as categories is confirmed. In fact, while these identifications used the gender category to allocate clear responsibilities as in relation to “male violence against women”, they did not proceed in a similar manner in the field of race relations since whiteness remain unnamed in the order of discourse.

The paradox of praising the ‘race’ category and yet its limited use

The differentiated use of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in white radical feminist identifications must be considered together with white radical feminist open appreciations of the heuristic potential of ‘race’ as a category for political analysis. First, white women explained how the ‘race’ category enables them to bring into focus and question racist assumptions informing public debates on irregular migration. For instance, they referred to the association between “racism and immigration” that shapes most public discourses on human mobility, representing the “migration phenomenon as an invasion that make ‘Italians as good people’ to become racist” (Perilli and Ellena 2008). In this regard, they argued that naming social relations of race and their socio-historical construction serves to undermine constructions of migrants as the ultimate subjects responsible for the spreading of racism (Perilli and Ellena 2008). Second, at least some white women in radical feminist struggles recognised the relevance
of the ‘race’ category for thematising crucial contradictions crossing the field of radical feminist politics, such as its “prevailing whiteness” (Interview No 2). Third, they also indicated the ‘race’ category as relevant to the understanding of their own lives. For instance, one research participant used race as a tool for “ordering fragments from her own family and personal story”: an “uncle emigrated [from the South of Italy] to Turin” and faced the “humiliating experience” of anti-Southern racism; a “grandfather [...] 'emigrated' to Eastern Africa to participate in Italian colonialism; lastly her own experience of racialising stereotypes while being a Southern young woman studying in Bologna during the 1990s (Interview No 2). In sum, these considerations praised the introduction of the ‘race’ category into the radical feminist toolbox as bringing attention to the social experience of racism that would otherwise remain unnamed. Thus, how to account then for a language voided of the meanings of “race” in a context ridden by racial tension?

One factor that can partially explain this paradox is the recent and uneven character of radical feminist attention to the gender-race intersection. Significantly, research participants clarified that the introduction of ‘race’ into the radical feminist lexicon before the 2007 demonstration had been carried on only “in discontinuous and non-structured modalities”, especially through references to “specific and painful news stories” (Interview No 2, Perilli and Ellena 2008). A case in point was that of Semira Adamu, a very young woman who was suffocated during an attempt of deportation in 1998 (Interview No 2):

“[Her story] was brought in some demonstrations by [radical] feminist groups. Yet, it was a specific episode, which captured attention, but still it did not sediment at the level of [radical] feminist politics. Indeed, these groups simply denounced that also women may be victims of racism, without systematically tackling the relation between racism and sexism” (Interview No 2).

Paradigmatic of this situation is the work realised by Veruska Bellistri, “an Italo-Ethiopian young woman, who edited in 2005 a self-produced book titled “Sistren: storie di femministe e lesbiche provenienti da migrazione forzata e schiavitù”” (Interview No 10). In this regard, an interviewee remembered that:

---

198 See: http://www.grassrootsfeminism.net/cms/node/160
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“In the introduction to this essays' collection, [the editor] tells about having grown up in Italy as an Afro-Italian woman with a queer subject position. In particular, she recounts her daily experience of lacking words to express herself and missing people to identify with. Hence, she explains that publishing translated texts by black feminists and lesbians was precisely intended to address this absence” (Interview No 10).

Given the novel and uneven character of feminist approximations to intersectionality, it is no surprising to encounter a “significant gap” between the recognition of intersecting oppressions and the formulation of a coherent political project (Bouteldja 2013: 2).

Importantly, white women’s troubles with raced identifications are sometimes openly acknowledged in radical feminist debates. For example, in the aftermath of the 2007 demonstration, white women reported about experiencing a clear “difficulty in thinking a (new) feminist subject position that is concretely de-naturalised and de-centred” (Perilli and Ellena 2008). In this regard, they commented that often the “women” category is used in the discursive space of radical feminisms to refer to the experiences of “white, middle class, and heterosexual women” while other experiences are “simply re-naturalised in a myriad of sub-categories: ‘migrant women’, ‘black women’, ‘non-white women’, ‘Roma women’. In their view, the result is that:

“The experience of ‘non-white’ women continues to be perceived as a ‘different’ experience of patriarchal domination […] a sort of variation of [or deviation from] the white norm. Indeed, there is no awareness that de-naturalising sex and race categories implies to deconstruct also […] whiteness. Furthermore, our own excessive use of quotation marks shows that we lack the words to name in politically effective ways these issues. And this recognition poses the problem of translating – in light of the specificities of the Italian context – categories, practices, and reference that have been shaped elsewhere” (Perilli and Ellena 2008).

Similar challenges were also acknowledged at the level of affects and emotions. For example, white women reported that “enthusiasm about the discovering of new perspectives”, sometime leads to “the desire of showing oneself as more ‘black feminist’ than others” and to “acritical, naturalist, and essentialising” uses of gender and race categories (Interview No 2). In parallel, they also problematized that, in some cases, es-
sententialist recognitions of whiteness ended up in self-blaming positions that miss to establish meaningful political connections to concretely change the status quo (Interview No 4). Additionally, they also acknowledged that recurrent references to intersectionality in radical feminist discourses have become “a leitmotiv that is an end in itself”, which seem more about creating a white anti-racist identity rather than producing an anti-racist practice (Interview No 2). This latter point represents another contradiction that scholarly debates on the travelling and reception of intersectionality in continental Europe have pointed out (Petzen 2012). Furthermore, informal comments during fieldwork also reported about “shame” and “anxiety” as emotional reactions to one’s own perceived inability to address racism from the position of whiteness (Fieldwork Notes). Overall, these troubles with the gender-race intersection reveal the lack of awareness about the modes to counter racism from conditions of privilege.

To conclude, the narrative of white women in radical feminist struggle on the gendered securitization of in-migration recognized both the heterogeneity of women’s conditions and their own ambiguous location as both genderly oppressed and racially privileged. Yet, while some white women are theoretically aware of this specific dis-juncture, their own practices of identification mostly failed to reflect this awareness. Through the practice of strategic essentialism, white women reclaimed their own experience of gender oppression as a source of identification as a source of identification that allows them to make visible and contest patriarchal power relations. In doing so, they used gendered identifications to resist the subject position of victim constructed by gendered securitization. Simultaneously, although they acknowledged differences and hierarchies among women, they did not explicitly indicated raced identifications as a means to name and dismantle racist power relations, thus abandoning the practice of strategic essentialism. Instead, employing the race-nationality convergence, they contested the securitizing of in-migration through the same colour-blind language used by governmental practices and rationalities. Interestingly, the white women were aware of some of the limitations characterising their approach. However, their contradictory approach to the ‘race’ category requires deeper confrontation with the present inheritance of the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism, the history of Italian unexpressed whiteness, and European racialization as colour-blindness.
9.3 A place to stand and struggle: social locations, situated perspectives and positionalities against administrative detention

This section discusses the findings of the discourse analysis of the dossier entitled “ABCie: la lotta con Joy, un’esperienza singolare?” produced in 2010 by the feminist national network Noi nonsiamo complici (NNSC). This document covers the position of mostly white women\(^{199}\) engaged in solidarity campaigning and actions to support Joy’s struggle against administrative detention and police sexual abuse. It reports about the working of administrative detention and expulsion, protection of victims of trafficking, and the effects of these governmental practices in society. The section shows that the identification contained in these texts mainly relied on references to social actors’ positionalities, and it discusses – making use of in-depth interviews and FGDs – their main implications for white women’s discursive and material dis-engagement with racist practices and structures in the context of administrative detention. In particular, it reflects on the ambiguity investing the agency of white women that Chapter 7 has indicated as a topic deserving further examination. On the whole, the section argues that interpreting white women’s construction of group boundaries provides significant insights to comprehend the making of their subjectivity as engaged in resisting and negotiating the subject position of potential carrier of material benefits in exchange of complicity with the working of administrative detention.

The narrative told in the document examined is voiced by white women, organised in the informal network NNSC. The main subject of this narrative is Joy, a racialised woman, former victim of trafficking, who had been held in administrative detention, where she faced an attempted rape perpetrated by a police inspector. Her objective is to fight back against diverse forms of male and institutional violence connected to the practice of administrative detention as well as defend her own personal safety from traffickers. In this process, she is supported by diverse adjuvants. First of all, there are the women, mostly white, organised in the network NNSC. As Joy, they are the carrier of

\(^{199}\) This network did not only comprise white women, yet they made up its great majority. Importantly, the presence of otherwise racialised women did not emerge as producing a specific discourse.
the narrative’s values. They support Joy’s specific struggle as well as the general struggle against administrative and gender-based institutional violence, consciously rejecting complicity with the practice of administrative detention and the potential benefits that this complicity might offer. Yet, white women are part of a bigger group of adjuvants that include politically organised women and men, both whites and racialised, who often face intimidations, charges, and convictions because of their engagement. Then, potential adjuvants are all those individuals who experience oppressive conditions due to the existence of administrative detention: migrants who are exploited at work, migrant women who experience sexual blackmails, trafficking victims, migrant men who are treated as potential rapists, and all migrants held in administrative detention. Finally, opponents are those subjects benefiting from the existence of administrative detention: NGOs and private companies that make money through the management of administrative detention centres, state repressive apparatuses whose role is further legitimised by the securitization of cross-border mobility, policemen who use their power to abuse detained women, employers who can easily blackmail the migrant workforce, third countries embassies who facilitate their own citizens’ deportation in exchange for payments and various accords, and so on. In short, this narrative stresses the centrality of administrative detention to the organization of diverse social relations and the relevance of contesting this practice from diverse social positions.

Identifying social actors by their functions in the system of administrative detention

In this narrative, white women’s identifications of social actors are mainly based on the strategy of functionalization, thus defining subjects in terms of the role they play in relation to administrative detention (Van Leuween, 2007). More specifically, adjuvants and opponents are indicated according to their own awareness of systemic inequalities and concrete engagement in struggles or in everyday practices addressing such inequalities and related form of violence. These identifications were realised through diverse nominations and predications. Nominations of adjuvants included “rioters inside Cie”, “women and men held in Cie”, “victims of trafficking”, but also “feminists”, “lesbians”, “anarchists” (NNSC, 2010: 6, 1, 8, 2, 9). These subjects are predicated as “defending themselves from violence”, including “sexual violence”, “struggling
against Cie and other total institutions”, organising “in solidarity”, and facing “blaming”, “intimidations”, “legal charges”, and “expulsion orders” for their participation in struggles (NNSC, 2010: 1, 1, 8, 3, 4). Nominations of opponents included “associations”, “cooperatives”, “Cie managing companies”, “NGOs”, “state institutions” such as the “police” and “judiciary”, “third countries’ embassies” – all subjects executing securitising measure without taking “responsibility for the atrocities committed” in the process, but “profiting” from the implementation of such measures (NNSC, 2010: 1, 6, 2, 5, 3, 4, 1). In sum, social actors’ positionality was taken as the most relevant criterion in these identifications, which assumed agents’ political responsibility in all aspects of life – including one’s private and working spheres.

Additionally, white women’s identifications clearly emphasised that common positionalities cut across diverse social locations. To begin with, these identifications showed the existence of inter-group alliances against institutional gender-based violence. For example, they acknowledged men’s solidarity with sexually abused women in detention: “men held in Corelli intervened against Vittorio Addesso when he aggressively attacked [Joy]” (NNSC, 2010: 7). Similarly, they displayed intra-group differences among Italians in terms of positionalities on migrants’ administrative detention. For instance, they distinguished between Italian women who “struggle against Cie and other total institutions”, and Italian women who make a living for working as social operators in these contexts and who are “persuaded to do good”, even when “administering food with psychiatric drugs” to inmates (NNSC, 2010: 1, 5). Likewise, they also recognised intra-group tensions and intra-group heterogeneity among racialised migrants and the institutions of their countries of origin in relation to their political position on administrative detention. For example, they referred to “former inmates who started working for organizations managing administrative detention centres”, substantially performing the role of “kapo”, and “third countries embassies who facilitated their own citizens’ deportation” – especially the Nigerian embassy (NNSC, 2010: 5, 3). On the whole, these identifications indicated the lack of any strict causal link between positionalities and social positions.
**Building common positionalities and acknowledging privilege**

The white women activists further elaborated on the making of common positionalities, reflecting on the effects of social actors’ functionalization in terms of Self and Other constructions. In particular, this issue emerged when an interviewee commented on the failed attempts by some white women in radical feminisms to meet and involve racialized women in their political activities.

“[When they said] ‘We did everything to meet immigrant women’ […] I realised that it was precisely that ‘we’ which impeded the relation with migrants. If I situate myself as an Italian who is going around in search of migrants because I need to relate to them in order to feel politically correct, of course I will present myself as ‘we’ and I will eternally remain that ‘we’. […] In my opinion, these are very ideological positions and they are factual mental closures supporting the idea that you need to be both the Other and similar to me in order to build a relation. It is not like that. I enter in relation with you if we have something to say and exchange and, above all, if we like each other, because if we dislike each other I do not care from which part of the world you come from […]. It is always that problem of the ‘we’, and we cannot get over it as long as you pose it as something a priori. […] There are many Italian women with whom I do not have anything to say or to share, tell me where to locate this ‘them’? […] According to me, ‘them’ includes women from all the parts of the world, including Italy, with whom I do not have anything to share” (Interview No 6).

At the same time, white women in radical feminisms also emphasised the relevance of taking responsibility for one’s own privilege when building common positionalities across social locations, clarifying that social locations and positionalities mutually influence each other. Indeed, the same interviewee quoted above explained that “pretending that such ‘us’ [gathering together privileged Italian women] does not exist, it is another mistake” (Interview No 6). In other words, she explained that acknowledging privilege is important because it raise awareness about the complicity it asks in return:

“Privilege always asks something heavy in exchange, it asks that you exploit the Other, or that you justify the patriarchy inherent to your culture, because the Other’s patriarchy is worse, and then you do not see your condition anymore” (Interview No 6).
Similarly, another research participant made a point about acknowledging privilege and taking responsibility for it, while also warning against non-performative acknowledgements of privilege:

“The recognition of privilege may be a double-edged sword. On the one side, it may imply self-commiseration or clearing one’s own conscience saying “I have this privilege” but then doing nothing about it. On the other side, I believe that [privilege] is a matter of fact and a necessary point of departure. From the perspective of a white person who lives in Europe and has a European citizenship and passport, privilege is a point of departure […] not a point of arrival. Acknowledging privilege is useful if it is of help to reason about how to dismantle this privilege. However, there are many contexts in which you hear people saying that ‘we are all white’, but then there are no efforts to create different conditions” (Interview No 10).

Reflecting on concrete situations of struggle, white women problematized the effects that the actions of racially privileged subjects may have on the lives of non-privileged ones. For instance, an interviewee referred to an episode in which she worked to stop the circulation of a communication statement “celebrating the release of a migrant woman from administrative detention before this woman even exited the detention centre and arrived in a safe house” (Interview No 9). She explained that “in such a delicate situation” there was the risk that the news might reach traffickers and endanger the woman in question (Interview No 9). She also added that “after getting to know each other better”, those involved in politically organising against administrative detention did not repeat such reckless gestures (Interview No 9). In other words, she pointed out the significance of discussing how diverse social positioning may determine different perceptions of risk as well as different exposures to danger, stressing that such awareness is crucial to avoid jeopardising others’ lives (Interview No 9).

Another example regarded the diversification of solidarity practices enacted by white women in radical feminisms and, more specifically, the writing of solidarity letters to migrants in administrative detention as is commonly done with political prisoners. In this case, white women acknowledged that victims of trafficking may not perceive letters from strangers as a form of solidarity given that “they are especially interested in receiving news from relatives” – often blackmailed by traffickers –
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and “they may not be as fluent as expected in reading and writing”. This other case clarifies that prisoners’ social locations determine different needs, and that one’s own social position may prevent one from recognising this diversity of needs (NNSC, 2010: 8). In sum, both episodes – although very different – exemplified how one’s positionality and values are mediated by one’s own racially situated perspective on reality.

Difficulties and challenges for the building of common positionalities across social locations

Furthermore, white women discussed specific structural limitations that, in their experience, made it difficult to build common positionalities across social locations. In particular, they reflected on the challenges confronted in maintaining contacts with detained racialised women and men as a crucial solidarity strategy to organise external support to internal struggles (Interview No 1; Interview No 4; Interview No 10). They recounted about difficulties in responding to diverse and sometimes incompatible expectations about inside-outside relations that were shaped by one’s social position in respect to administrative detention. Indeed, interviewees reported that held migrants expected concrete solutions to their specific problems from inside-outside relations, while outside activists often expected to strengthen the general struggle against administrative detention (interview No 1; Interview No 4). Such diverse expectations worked together well in some occasions, giving rise to “alliances that changed something concrete in people’s lives”, but they also created tensions and, at times, irresolvable contradictions (Interview No 10). For example, one research participant told about her own sense of “impotence” in front of the daily working of administrative detention encountered during inside-outside contacts:

“The most devastating story was that of S, the woman who had four children here in Italy, who was deported, she was forcibly deported and no one cared about her children because she did not have a regular residency permit even if she had been living in Italy for twenty four years. These things are horrific. We did not succeed in intervening when she called us at five in the morning saying that she was being taken away. Anarchist comrades run to the airport to attempt stopping the flight, but they did not even manage to arrive to the gates. To receive this desperate call in the night – given that we knew her, we had a relationship with her –
was very tough. Then, we had a meeting and we asked ourselves what this struggle meant to us and, first of all, we recognised that we were not in the position of helping concretely these women. They are interested in resolving a concrete situation, that we are not able to solve: we lack an effective network, we do not have money and we cannot offer any type of support. […] Instead, we realised that we could work producing political analyses to make the problem of administrative detention surface [in public debates] as much as possible” (Interview No 4).

Along this same line, white women in radical feminisms reflected on how structural limitations imposed by administrative detention make imprisoned migrants “isolated” or “absent” subjects, whose agency is severely limited and mediated, even by sympathetic actors (Interview No 1; Interview No 5). As explained by one research participant while discussing her fifteen years’ experience in political organising against administrative detention, “inside-outside contacts are filtered by a number of factors” (Interview No 1). There are “the walls, the custodial structure, the Red Cross, the entities managing the detention centre, the police, the army”, but there is also the “centralization of communication” between a few inmates inside and a few activists outside, which is determined precisely by all the factors previously mentioned (Interview No 1). Hence, in her opinion, these structural limitations produce diverse “ambiguities” that activists must confront (Interview No 1). For example, she stressed that activists may control which narrative circulates about internal struggles, thus becoming another potential obstacle to migrants’ ability to speak (Interview No 1). Besides, she also reflected on the implications of emphasising the role of outside activists in supporting inside struggles as contributing to further silence imprisoned migrants. Indeed, she explained that the activists’ strategy to present their role as “determining” in order to attract attention to the struggle they support fails to recognise that “migrants’ struggle have always existed since the establishment of administrative detention”, independently from the presence of outside activists (Interview No 1). In short, the fieldwork interviews importantly shed light on the contradictory effects that outside activism in solidarity with imprisoned migrants may produce given specific structural limitations and related positions of privilege.
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Limits of action in terms of political alliances and strategies of struggle

Additionally, feminists involved in the research also discussed their limits of action in terms of political alliances and strategies of struggle. Specifically, they reflected on two main points that contributed to clarify their conception of anti-racism.

In the first place, some white women in radical feminisms problematized the victimising and para-institutional approach that most NGOs employ to deal with administrative detention. For instance, they criticised these organizations for centring predominantly or exclusively their discourse on the malfunctioning of migrants’ detention centres, deploying a humanitarian discourse that “intervenes on the effects and not on the causes” of this governmental practice (Interview No 4). Moreover, some discussed the fact that most NGOs take the police, the army, and politicians supporting securitising measures as partners to address male violence against women, when these actors openly reject to problematize the root causes of this form of violence:

“One thing is if you interact with these institutions [the police and the army] out of necessity, for example when a woman who suffered violence runs to the police. In this case you must deal with them. Another thing is taking these institutional actors as your chosen interlocutors as does Casa delle Donne in Rome, that organised conferences with the head of Carabinieri, with the police, with judiciary, with the Mayor’s referents for security, and so on. This is something that all state financed organizations do in order to raise money […] But it legitimises the police and the army and their role. […] Women from Casa delle Donne in Rome say that they are with migrant women, but then they support Bersani [politician from the Democratic Party supporting securitising policies] during primary elections: if you support Bersani, you cannot be on the same side of migrant women” (Interview No 4).

Besides, some of the white women in my interviews further criticised NGOs for implicitly reproducing “neo-colonial discourses” about “the good white rich West helping Third World poor” (Interview No 4). Indeed, in the opinion of diverse interviewees, this colonial approach is directly linked to the refusal, exercised by many NGOs, to politicise critiques of administrative detention with reference to market and state sanctioned exploitative practices. Thus, white women in radical
feminisms, who were committed to produce analytical tools to shed light on this and other contradictions, problematized the role of NGOs “in perpetuating racism, while defining themselves as anti-racist” (Interview No 4).

In the second place, various other of the white women took distance from the use of public denunciations as a tool of awareness-raising.

“Believing that public denunciations about the reality of administrative detention may be an effective instrument [to oppose this governmental practice] is naive. This belief does not take into account two conditions. First, what is deemed intolerable and acceptable depends on changing thresholds. Indeed, more you know about something, more you overcome this threshold. This is something I experienced myself: during 2003, I cried in front of a deadly shipwreck, but this does not happen anymore; in 2001, when I entered Corelli I was shaken and upset, but in 2005 I was not. Thus, acceptability thresholds are related to what one is used to, and this is even truer in an era in which blunt images of wars, bombings, and brutalised bodies are extensively used. And if you interact with an acceptability threshold that has become higher with another element of intolerability, you contribute to extend this acceptability threshold, that is inevitable. Hence, public denunciations may work only for a limited period of time. Second, the larger [administrative detention] system has been built on the fact that knowing is not necessarily based on factual knowledge or ignorance. It is something more ambiguous [a sort of continuum] that goes from “knowing” to “denying knowing” passing through “being unavailable to know”, “knowing and not doing anything about what is known”, and “knowing and not being bothered by what is known”. Public denunciations have this fundamental problem: there is not binary opposition between not knowing and knowing, and knowing does not lead to action. Knowing may lead to action for a limited period of time. Yet, there are so many ambiguities between knowing and not knowing that you cannot make a political campaign work simply relying on public denunciation” (Interview No 1).

In synthesis, both these reflections on NGOs humanitarian discourses and public denunciations stressed the relevance of transcending the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism, whose discourse is
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compatible with public political cultures and supports the idea that race and racism are overwhelmingly connected to ignorance and error and that they must be rejected on scientific grounds through educational means (Lentin 2004 and 2015b). Indeed, some white women in radical feminisms unveiled the utility of racism for the reproduction of nation-state power, suggesting the significance of administrative detention to the organization of diverse social relations and the government of populations. Hence, they openly contested any involvement of state apparatuses – such as the police and the military – in their struggles, showing the contradictions inherent in these collaborations. Furthermore, they also rejected the idea that knowing about administrative detention – for instance through the mechanisms of public denunciation – may represent a sufficient strategy to counter racism. In doing so, they avoided articulating their anti-racist practice in terms of an educational mission, opting for the construction of novel analytical tools to illuminate contradictions and the organization of solidarity direct actions. Yet, as already discussed in the previous section, they dismissed the ‘race’ category in most identifications as an effective tool to name their own experience and that of the racialized, hence revealing a persistent tension between feminist recognition of structural racism and their very limited uses of ‘race’ in social actors’ identifications to deconstruct racist discourses and discourses on racism.

In conclusion, the construction of identifications by white women in radical feminist struggles on administrative detention mainly made reference to social actors’ positionality. Indeed, as emerged discussing functionalization as a representational strategy, white women moved beyond identification a priori connected to one’s own social location and defined themselves in relation to their own actions and conducts. In particular, they evaluated the effects of their own behaviours and life choices in terms of resistance, or complicity to, the reproduction of structures of domination. In this frame, social locations constituted points of departure that white women must acknowledge and confront in order to understand how they relate to themselves and others as well as to take consistent and responsible decisions. Hence, recognition of racial privilege may become an opportunity to break one’s own passive complicity with structures of domination. Yet, while being conceptualised as always accountable, the subject position of white women is also defined by the deep tensions in regard to the effectiveness
of their own capacity to take side. Specifically, white women face particular structural limitations that importantly affect their own sense of efficacy in opposing oppressive institutions, which often translates in the arising of feelings of powerlessness and impotence. Yet, acknowledging these important limitations and ambiguities – connected to the privileges of whiteness – should be part and parcel of constructing resistance to administrative detention.

9.4 I am here because you are there: transnationalism as a strategy to counter securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control

This section discusses the results of the discourse analysis of fourteen documents written by the white women in radical feminisms in the context of the political campaign “From one rim to the other: lives that matter – Where are our sons?” during the period 2011-2013. The documents comprise both communication statements and public speeches on the struggle of the Tunisian missing migrants’ families, and they elaborate on the connection between governmental practices of securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control and the death and disappearance of migrants at sea.
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Table 9.2
Communication statements by Le Venticinqueundici from the campaign ‘From one rim to the other: lives that matter – where are our sons?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appunti dal nostro dibattito</td>
<td>20/10/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Cie in Cie: una delegazione si aggira per l’Italia</td>
<td>02/02/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le leggi di Faten</td>
<td>26/01/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidio a Roma</td>
<td>01/04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuochi</td>
<td>24/04/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dégage alle politiche migratorie</td>
<td>28/05/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La lotta delle madri dei Tunisini dispersi e la campagna “Da una sponda all’altra: vite che contano - Dove sono i nostri figli?”</td>
<td>02/06/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostinarsi perché le vite non sono numeri</td>
<td>04/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resoconto dell’incontro tra la delegazione e il segretario dell’immigrazione Jaziri</td>
<td>12/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiedere conto delle vite a chi decide di non farle contare</td>
<td>12/09/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punto della situazione</td>
<td>16/11/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La pace dell’Ue non è la nostra</td>
<td>02/12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogarsi camminando: la nostra pratica e alcune domande sul femminismo</td>
<td>15/12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quando le resistenze agiscono</td>
<td>10/01/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The section shows that the identifications of social actors produced in these texts mainly relied on the categories of nationality, religion, and gender, and it discusses – employing in-depth interviews and FGDs – the implications of these identifications for white women’s dis-engage-ments with racist practices and structures in the context of securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control. In particular, it problematizes the absence of an explicit language of race, spotted in Chapter 8. On the whole, the section suggests that interpreting white women’s con-struction of group boundaries offers relevant insights to illuminate the production of their subjectivity as engaged in negotiating their subject position of beneficiary of unrestrained access to cross-border mobility.

The narrative recounted in the texts examined is voiced by the white women in the collective Le Venticinqueundici, who support and inform
about the struggle of the missing migrants’ families. The main subject of
the story is the group of Tunisian families in search of their missing sons
and daughters, who disappeared after attempting to cross the Mediterr-
anean by boat after the Tunisian revolution (see chapter 8). These famil-
ies have been organising both in Tunisia and in Italy, where a delegation
of parents and relatives is present. Their object is precisely to find the
missing migrants, know about their fate, and bring to life these youth’s
desire of freedom by reclaiming the idea that the earth belongs to every-
body. In this process, diverse adjuvants support the subject in the frame
of the campaign “From one rim to the other”: Le Venticinqueundici, other
radical feminists in Italy, Tunisian women in their countries and abroad,
Italian and European anti-racist activists, Tunisian activists and militant
artists. In particular, Le Venticinqueundici organised solidarity actions from
the subject position of unrestrained mobility. Besides, other adjuvants in-
clude the Tunisian youths who decided to migrate in the aftermath of the
revolution. This collective actor is seen as practicing, and thus implicitly
legitimating, the same desire of freedom that led the missing migrants to
cross the Mediterranean. Hence, both the subject and all adjuvants are
carriers and carriers of the values informing the narrative. Finally, main
opponents to the subject’s aspirations are Tunisian, Italian, and
European institutions: they do not take responsibility for the deadly ef-
fects of the governmental practices of border-crossing control that they
establish and enforce. Overall, this narrative reframes the governing of
irregular migration and its effects as a reproductive issue with profound
impacts at the level of affects and affections.

‘Nationality’ as a primary source of identification and the
backgrounding of racism

One finds that in all the fourteen documents considered, white women’s
identifications of social actors repeatedly employed the nationality cat-
egory. For example, the families carry on their struggle both “in Tunisia
and Italy”, the people organising in the context of the campaign ‘From
one rim to the other’ are both “Tunisian and Italians”, they organise
demonstrations both “in Tunis and Rome”, the Ministries of External
Affairs and Internal Affairs to whom the families and activists made de-
mands are “Tunisian and Italian”, and the institutions which fails to an-
swer the families’ demands are “Tunisian”, “Italian”, and “European”
(D1, D2; D3; D4; D5; D6; D7; D8; D9; D10; D11; D12; D13; D14).
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Clearly, these identifications convey multiple messages as nationality may refer to geographical locations, geopolitical positionality, national belonging, and affiliation to specific political agendas. Further, national categorizations in the texts are also employed in association with temporal indications. By way of illustration, it is noted that social actors are located in a social space characterised by the synchronism of diverse events on the two shores of the Mediterranean or cause-effect linkages that connect diverse events in Tunisia and Italy (D4; D5). In doing so, they convey the message that social actors influence and are influenced by what happens in multiple sites. Overall, this polysemic character of the nationality category suggests that social actors’ relation to space is profoundly mediated by the structures of nation states.

To comprehend the connection between social actors and space in white women’s identifications, it is useful to look at their definition of nationality as a category indicating the position of social actors in relation to the contemporary governing of irregular migration. Indeed, they addressed this category as defining the “deep division separating the inhabitants of the earth between those who have the right to step on the earth’s whole extension, and those who do not have such right” (D3). Likewise, they indicated the Tunisian nationalised space as “one of those territories inhabited by people who do not enjoy the right to a common earth”, as exemplified by the “institution of the crime of illegal emigration, […] which has remained in effect after the Revolution” (D3). These examples suggest that these identifications used nationality as a categorising tool that distinguishes between those whose mobility is securitised and those whose mobility is accepted and enhanced. Importantly, this definition clarifies that the nationality category performed the function of naming specific power relations related to people’s access to unrestrained mobility and, in doing so, they did not reify nation states nor convey nationalistic messages. Yet, they failed to directly indicate which nationalised subjects find their movements securitised, by remaining silent on the processes of racialization that invest these subjects.

In this regard, white women used nationality as entangled with race only at an implicit level to distinguish between attributions that promote or prevent access to cross-border mobility. For instance, their comprehension of the hierarchies produced by the governing of people’s movements across borders as deeply entrenched with “colonialism and colonial histories” indirectly acknowledges the role played by race in determin-
ing access to cross-border mobility (Interview No 1). Another example on the implicit intertwining of nationality and race concerns understanding of these governmental practices as nationalising devices that produce certain subjects in movements as problems in themselves. This argument surfaced in comparisons between the contemporary Othering of migrants and Othering associated to racial domination during colonialism and the Holocaust. For example:

“[We do not propose an alternative to contemporary migration policies] simply because if you do so, you consider somehow migrations to be a problem for which you must find solutions. […] In my opinion, the Shoa experience offers causes for reflection in regards to the problematization of migration. In fact, one hundred and fifty years after the Jew Question had emerged, the Nazi attempted to solve it through a final solution. If you frame [persons] in terms of issues or problems, you then look for solutions. These solutions are not always final solutions, but when you start looking for solutions you dwell into a continuum which contemplate final solutions” (Interview No 1).

However, lack of explicit references to race in these identifications by the white feminists shows their adherence to the UNESCO approach as a missed opportunity to directly and clearly illuminate the colonial roots of irregular migration restrictions and their effects on the lives of both whites and racialized.

Another way in which the race category is used implicitly is through the combination of national and religious characterizations. This is the case of visual representations of Tunisian mothers as veiled women in most photos and videos accompanying the communication statements prepared by Le Venticinqueunidici. Here, the veil, as a religious marker, functions as another proxy for race. Indeed, as stressed by the feminist collective, the veil is systematically used in dominant discourses to “assess the level of emancipation of Muslim women according to dominant Western standards” (D7). In other words, the veil functions as a sign of feminine oppression, which poses Muslim women in positions of inferiority in respect to Western or Christian women. In the radical feminist discourse, the image of the veiled women is resignified coming to repres-

---

\[280\] See for example the video ‘La pace dell’Unione Europea non è la nostra’ here: https://youtu.be/E0q6ht8GPsQ

---
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ent a champion of resistance as when veiled women are showed sieging the Italian embassy. In this case, religion functions as another attribute that, used in conjunction with nationality, enables to negotiate racist hierarchies of femininities.

One final feature characterising white women’s uses of nationality regards the socially and historically constructed character of this category. This point especially emerged during fieldwork interviews commenting the campaign’s slogan “The earth belongs to everybody”.

“Saying that the earth belongs to everybody suggests the refusal of any political solution or norm regulating the common earth, which is indeed of everybody. When we say “it belongs to everybody”, we are not speaking about property nor national belonging. We are speaking about something that is not performed by political philosophy, institutional governmental practices, nor nation states. We are speaking about something that time and again is exercised by people. In my opinion, Tunisian migrants did this after the revolution, and all migrants do this in the moment they migrate. And the mothers continue to do so in Tunisia. […] [Embracing] the idea that the earth belongs to everybody […] would imply a global revolution of political conceptualizations and deep changes in our lived experiences. In fact, we all perceive ourselves as belonging to the structures of nation states, we are all structured as persons who are not on an earth that belongs to everybody. Thus, if we say that the only solution [to irregular migration] is an earth belonging to everybody, then I am fine with this solution. Yet, departing from the idea that the earth belongs to everybody we can only mumble and follow someone who has already put in practice such idea. And the families of the disappeared do so, overturning the [nationalised] political tradition” (Interview No 1).

This excerpt exemplifies approximations to an alternative geography that de-naturalises the “nation” as an imaginary, taking as its point of departure concrete practices of resistance to, or escape from, the enforcement of borders. However, this de-naturalization of the nation remains partial insofar as it fails to bring into view racism as a “necessary supplement” of the reification of nationalised populations (Balibar, 2011: 2).

‘Gender’ and the absent connection of generations
We have seen that another category that does play a key role in white women’s identification of social actors is gender. This category recur-
C H A P T E R 9

rently emerged in the texts examined through nominations of social actors in relation to their family role: “mothers”, “relatives”, “fathers”, “uncles”, “sisters”, “sons and daughters” (D1, D2; D3; D4; D5; D6; D7; D8; D9; D10; D11; D12; D13; D14). These identifications importantly brought into focus the gendered organization of reproduction. In this representation, the category ‘gender’ also surfaces in recurrent nominations such as “women”, “mothers”, and “daughters”, which suggests the authors’ intention to make visible the primary role played by feminine subjects not only in reproductive activities, but also in the campaign ‘From one rim to the other’. Similarly, the campaign’s main slogan “The earth belongs to everybody”, whose Italian version is “La terra è di tutte e di tutti”\textsuperscript{201}, suggests that the effects of the governing of migration touch both women and men, even when migratory movements are mainly masculinised (D3; D5; D6; D7; D8). Hence, registering that white feminists’ identifications posed “gender” as an important dimension of the governing of irregular migration invites to further explore how feminist narratives signify this category and with which implications for white feminists’ anti-racist politics.

Importantly, the identifications took ‘gender’ as a meaningful category to indicate resistance to current bordering practices. In particular, they used ‘gender’ to refer to the specific gendered roles in which women and men are socialised in the context of the family as an institution. They did not approach the family merely as a site of women’s oppression, but a “prime source of resistance” (Carby, 1996: 64). In doing so, they overcame “white feminist” conceptualizations of the family defined as “problematic” from the perspective of “black feminists” for failing to acknowledge the particular and specific experience of black women which may find in the family a source of liberation from racism (Carby, 1996: 64). In other words, identifications in the campaign “From one rim to the other” recognised that that Tunisian women and men take up the search for missing migrants precisely from the specific gender roles they perform in the family, which is understood as a site for resisting racist discriminations in terms of freedom of movement. This argument clearly emerged in the comments that a member of the collective \textit{Le Venticin-

\textsuperscript{201} The more gendered Italian version of the slogan responds to the fact that this language has grammatical gender, which establishes the use of masculine nouns and pronouns for mixed-gender groups as well as for neutral usage.
queundici addressed to the public speech pronounced by Faten¹⁰², the sister of one missing migrant, in the frame of an initiative to present the campaign “From one rim to the other”.

“After a year [from her brother’s departure], Faten simply says: I look for my brother who decided to leave our country. […] And while her brother decided, Faten does not speak about ‘clandestine emigration’ nor ‘clandestines’ as many in Tunisia commonly do to indicate those who leave without visas. She does not make any references to state laws, she does not care about them; instead she names the act [of migrating] as a simple decision. With this simple phrase, she establishes the law of decision as the law governing her brother [and other migrants’ behaviour]. […] Then, among the many laws that Faten establishes [in her speech], there is also the law according to which mothers may help their children to franchir le pas, to cross frontiers, to burn borders and states’ laws […]. In this way, [Faten] recalls that migration and burning borders are collective practices not only because many people get in boats [to cross the Mediterranean], but also because behind each one of those, there are [family members] who burn frontiers otherwise” (D3).

Again, lack of explicit references to race in the identifications of social actors weakens this reading of the family as a locus of resistance to racism since it does not explicitly explain that the social reproduction of Tunisian families is treated as undeserving of protection in the transnational space due to the racial connection of generations that is enforced by nation states.

Additionally, white women’s identifications of social actors also engage ‘gender’ with the aim of challenging the public-private dichotomy, and of politicising affects and the body. For instance, ‘gender’ is employed to overturn the association between social reproduction and the private realm, reclaiming pain and grief as a condition to speak politics.

“The expression of grief is often read as a lack of political agency […] However, taking into account the grief produced by migration policies does not mean victimising the people experiencing it. Instead,
Politicising grief means acknowledging that grief may bring to passivity, as when you are in pain you do not spend all the day doing politics, but it may be productive too. In fact, the families have transformed their grief into unexpected ruptures of the ordinary governing of migrations as they protested in ways which were unforeseen” (Interview No 7).

Furthermore, ‘gender’ is also addressed to shed light on the material effects of the enforcement of borders on the bodies of the missing migrants’ families, describing for example the mothers of the missing migrants “acting on their own bodies the exasperation they experience” through “extreme gestures” such as “suicide attempts” and “setting fire to oneself” (D5). Significantly, this attention to the body, its flesh and emotions, render visible the suffering that disembodied statistics and governmental practices ignore, proposing an affective geopolitics of human mobility that compel us to recognise that ‘they’ suffer, survive, and resist just like ‘us’ (Thobani, 2002). However, the ‘race’ category would have helped these identifications to further specify the making of this Self-Other representations.

**Constructing transnational linkages and challenges**

In practice, these identifications based on nationality, sometime religion, and gender opened space for a feminist transnational politics based on two main elements. The first element is rejection of sameness as a base for political organizing. Indeed, white women involved in the campaign “From one rim to the other” expressed the need to “fully question what is feminism, what is a feminist practice, and move beyond the cliché ‘we are women and we take care of women’s issues’” (Interview No 1). In the opinion of one interviewee, this latter position represents instead the “common sense” of mainstream feminism of difference that, being focused exclusively on the [gender] difference, is unable to acknowledge other [relevant] differences” (Interview No 1). In contrast, white women in radical feminisms suggested to recognise that, in society, power structures “are never just related to gender or class” and that, in the context of today’s governing of human mobility, “gender is a less significant factor in relation to [the hierarchies produced by] colonialism” (Interview No 1). Consequentially, they emphasised the necessity to take full responsibility for the fact that “Italian society has never been organized just on gender or class since it had been a colonial society and has a colo-
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...nial history”, and for the Othering of migrants as “one of the main mechanisms of social injustice” in the contemporary world (Interview No 1; Interview No 7). Then, they also framed this task as especially “urgent” since new instruments are required to challenge the reproduction of symbolic and material forms of violence against migrants and those perceived as such (Interview No 1).

The second key feature of these radical white women’s politics is their attention to transnational linkages and connections as a way to promote political organising across social groups. The following excerpt from a fieldwork interview clarifies this point:

“The specificity of starting from the struggle of another woman [as firstly we did supporting the struggle of Joy] is that we could not mirror ourselves in this other woman. And this applies also to the struggle of the Tunisian mothers and families. […] In this frame, your positioning always contemplates the positioning of others, since while you present your own location, you already acknowledge the existence of another location. For example, when you say that you are outside an administrative detention centre, whether you are outside that centre participating in a contestation, whether you are at home reading a book, or in the city centre doing shopping, you are anyway outside that detention centre. But even when you are in such different places outside a detention centre, the detention centre is always there. Your space is never just your space because your space exists thanks to the existence of another space […]. In this way, we did not fall into the trap of acknowledging our positioning without dismantling it. Instead, we asked “what does my space consider? What is it made of? Why can I stay here? Which other places are there in the space I inhabit? Which other places are concealed in the space I live?”. Hence, your own positioning creaks and you must be on two sides, two rims, in two different places at the same time. If your place is given and it is given because other places are concealed, when you discover that your place conceals another place, then it is necessary to confront this ambiguity. Indeed, when you discover that your space silences another person’s space, then you must listen to this other space and this other person. And this other person speaks a language that is necessarily different from the one you speak, because your language is also made by her silence in your space, but this does not mean that this
person is silent in her own space. Hence, you must open yourself to new experiences…” (Interview No 1).

Emblematic of this search for transnational linkages are reflections on what connects the lived experiences of ‘citizens’ and ‘migrants’ (D1). One example of this search for transnational linkages was treated in Chapter 8 and regarded these white women’s construction of alliances with social movements in Italy that contest the structural conditions that make some lives not as worthy to reproduce as others. Another example of construction of transnational linkages was the exhibition “Our fenced lives”\(^{203}\) created by the group *Le Venticinqueundici* to explore and illuminate “the linkages between containment policies that enabled the construction of camps for migrants’ administrative detentions […] and what confines and cages our lives as ‘legal citizens’” (D1). This visual narrative explored multiple experiences of confinement, and enactment of boundaries: administrative detention, practices of push back at sea, evictions of Roma camps, Israeli Apartheid, the invasion of Afghanistan, house evictions, enclosure of public parks, women’s lives restrained by domestic male violence, life time limitations imposed by exploitative and precarious jobs, social isolation, weight limits enacted by fashion standards. This exhibition stated the existence of a continuum between diverse experiences of confinement, making a case for fighting confinement from one’s own position as related to other’s positioning in this continuum. White women proposed this argument referring to this excerpt from the poem “A black woman speaks of white womanhood, of white supremacy, of peace” by Beulah Richardson (1951):

> “So be careful when you talk with me.
> Remind me not of my slavery, I know it well.
> But rather tell me of your own.”

In other words, “Our fenced lives” made a case for building alliances and coalitions from one’s own position without speaking in others’ name, but finding reasons for this alliance in one’s own experience of oppression. In “Our fenced lives”, white women broke with methodological nationalism by bringing into perspective transnational experiences of confinement as affecting what occurs within nations. Yet they did not

make explicit that such a transnational view was made possible by rejecting the racialised boundaries of one’s own national community.

Besides, the white women in the campaign “From one rim to the other” pointed out a number of problems informing their construction of linkages. For example, they described their relation to the families as inevitably crossed by “geopolitical hierarchies” that the governing of irregular migration contribute to reproduce, while also understanding this relation as not solely determined by or reducible to these hierarchies (Interview No 7). As synthesised by an interviewee:

“We did not encounter equality in our relation with the Tunisian families, but this does not mean that we were not together. It was a very strange ‘togetherness’. It was not given by our positioning, nor by sharing the same goals: we were primarily against migration policies, and they were first and foremost interested in finding their own children. […] Yet, with the campaign ‘From one rim to the other’, we had the capacity to meet the families’ movement, which was already there, and to join it, contributing to transform this movement in something else. For this reason, I believe that we really did something together with the Tunisian families” (Interview No 1).

Further, others highlighted more problematic aspects in this relation. Specifically, those who were not able to repeatedly travel to Tunisia, and who could neither speak Arabic nor French, experienced more difficulties in relating to the families and sensing this ‘togetherness’ (Interview No 3). Besides, they also raised questions about the relation existing between this transnational distance and specific difficulties encountered during the campaign. For example, they problematized their own failure in effectively strategizing to cope with the lack of transparent answers on the part of institutions as well as with the non-performativity of institutional declarations of concern and commitment (Fieldwork Notes). In doing so, they interrogated their own distance from the families as an obstacle to confronting this situation: in particular, lack of common discussions and fear of dominating

led to paralysis and sense of impotence (Fieldwork Notes). Finally, they also acknowledged material and time limits in their claims to stay on two rims at the same time, which affected their political engagement in struggles on reproduction and led to confinement on their own rim (Fieldwork Notes).
To conclude, identifications of social actors by white women in radical feminist struggles on the securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control mainly made use of the ‘nationality’ and ‘gender’ categories and promoted a politics of transnationalism. Significantly, white women did not define themselves simply in terms of their own location or positionality, but highlighted how their own location and positionality has been co-constructed by others’ locations and positionalities. This translated in identifications that bring together multiple places – moving from one rim to the other. As a result, white women reframed their privileges in terms of unrestrained access to cross-border mobility as social entitlements produced at the expenses of other subjects, illuminating relations of inter-dependence across social locations. Furthermore, they brought into view that their own position of privilege in the transnational dimension is importantly mediated and qualified by multiple experiences of confinement that affects their daily life. Thus, transnationalism is here interpreted as a way that white women used to negotiate their subject position as nationalised and mobile subjects in the context of securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing controls. Then, white women made a point in recognising other actors’ subjectivities and in consciously avoiding to speak in others’ name. Besides, they showed uneasiness and fatigue in carrying on transnational alliances as well as in facing lack of concrete results. On the whole, lack of explicit engagement with the ‘race’ category made less effective their critique of the reproduction of hierarchies connected to nationalities as something that may be overcome and that must be made an object of struggle.

9.5. White bodies, black gazes: everyday racism and the perspective of racialised women on white women’s subjectivities

This section brings to the fore the perspectives of racialised women in Italy on the subjectivities of white women both inside and outside radical feminist struggles. In particular, it illuminates the experiences of racialised women with white unconscious imaginaries of racial Otherness, taking examples from everyday life, which emerged in the narratives collected during interviews and FGDs. In doing so, the section suggests that a key feature of the subject position of white women is their constant confrontation with three main imaginaries: (1)
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Imaginaries of backwardness and despair, (2) fantasies of rescue, and (3) imaginaries of omniscience. Furthermore, the section identifies the willingness of white women to accept the need for continually questioning their own complicity with these imaginaries as a necessary condition to build respectful coalitions with racialised women. Overall, the section takes the perspective of racialised women as offering insights to understand how subjects who experience racial privilege may develop a critical stance towards their own subject position.

Imaginaries of backwardness and despair

From the outset, the narratives of racialised women pointed out how they constantly confront dominant processes of racialization activated by whites, which are centred on homogeneous images of backwardness and despair. This view was well exemplified by one research participant of Somali origin, who recounted her experience as “immigrant in Milan” as deeply shaped by the colonial dichotomy of civilization and savagery:

“Once a [woman] asked me “did you go to school in bare feet?”.
Another said: “did you go to school or did you learn to read and write in Italy?”.
And I graduated in my country! […] Some people, in the 1990s, believed that we [African people] come down from the trees” (FGD No 6).

The effects of this colonial imaginary that projects primitive behaviours and customs onto the Other does not simply produce inferiorization, but also the erasure of all those experiences that do not align to this stereotype. This clearly emerges when this same research participant reported about how she was treated during an interview by a renowned Italian journalist about her contribution in the book “La serva serve. Le nuove forzate del lavoro domestico” (2004):

“It happened to me to go to that TV show with Gad Lerner […] I went there and there was also another Somali woman. Before starting the TV show, Gad Lerner asked me “How did you arrive in Italy? How many children did you leave in Somalia?”. He was interested in women leaving behind ten children. I said that I am single, that I live and I work here. He thus took away the microphone from me and talked to another Somali woman participating in the interview, who said to have left eight children and to be working at the present as badante [carer]. He asked me if I was working as badante. No, I do not work as badante, I am single, I do not have children and I did not
leave children in Somalia. [Given all of that] I was no good to him. [...] When the TV show started, he was skipping my turn to speak, I was not supposed to intervene, because I was normal to them” (FGD No 6).

Importantly, a research participant stressed that whites’ concealment or dismissal of non-stereotypical experiences serves to whites themselves to avoid to take awareness of and confront their own stereo-typical imaginaries:

“I was coming back from Switzerland by train as I was working as interpreter for the Swiss government. [...] At a certain point, some immigrants – they were Arab – got into the train. It was clear that they had finished a day of work: they probably had just made a shower and they were very tired. I was on the train and behind me there were three or four persons, I believe they were two women and two men. They must have been [sympathisers] of the Northern League. They were saying: “They take away from us work, houses, this and that”. They were speaking like this. Then, I got up. I was well dressed, normally in other words. I said: “You are offending me”. “Why madam?”. “Because you are speaking about the people of my world in a very offensive way. You have the right to your opinion, but at a lower volume, because I do not want to listen it”. [...] “But we are not speaking about you madam”. “It does not matter if you are not speaking about me because I belong to the same world of the people you are offending”. They remained silent and then I sat down. Before getting out of the train, they gave me the hand and said: “We apologise Madam if we offended you”. But they did not apologise to the others. “Excuse us Madam, but you are different”. Yes, according to them I did not represent the immigrant” (FGD No 6).

Similarly, another focus group participant reported that:

“This thing always happens to me at work: “Those immigrants who arrive at Lampedusa...”. Then they [people at work] say: “ But you are not like them, you are different, you work, you speak [Italian] very well, you are nothing like them”. “How is it that I am nothing like them? All the people arriving are from Somalia”. They speak ill of Africa and then they say you are not African. Who decides that? In my opinion, they do so in order to confirm their discourse” (FGD No 6).
In this context, these testimonies showed that the racialised subject who does not fit the negative stereotype of ‘racial Other’ is treated by whites as race-less or “different” from other racialised. This negation of race is extremely significant because it shows that the condition of being racialised is always “fantasised as negative in the white collective unconscious” (Kilomba, 2008: 87).

**Imaginaries of rescue**

Significantly, racialised research participants pointed out how this same attitude of dismissal is widely displayed within feminist circles of various kinds. In this regard, they described white women’s reaction to the public screening at Libera Università delle Donne in Milan of the documentary “La quarta via: Mogadiscio - Pavia” (2012). This documentary, written by Kaha Mohamed Aden and Simone Brioni, reconstructs the story of Somali-Italian intellectual Kaha Mohamed Aden, connecting her personal life story to the intertwining of Italian and Somali histories. One Somali focus group participant remembered that, after the screening, the majority of white women, instead of discussing the documentary, “talked about migrants who do not speak Italian” and the key relevance of Italian language courses as if the artistic product of a naturalised black Italian required to speak about the difficult condition of migrants in Italy (FGD No 6). Interestingly, when confronted with calls to engage the contents of the documentary, given that the meeting was organised to discuss the documentary, many white women reacted highlighting that the documentary director was “an artist” and belonged to “the elite” so as to argue openly that her status of intellectual did not make her an authentic migrant voice as they would have expected from her blackness (FDG No 6; Interview No 11). On this same episode, another focus group participant observed that:

> “From the kind of women who attends such type of meetings you expect a different attitude […]. You think that these women are open-minded and emancipated, emancipated in terms of their thinking, but then they are just like those who were speaking ill of the workers [in the episode of the train]. That is because Kaha does not represent […] the immigrant [as] a poor devil!” (FGD No 6).

What emerges from these narratives is the white women’s desire to see their image of the racialised Other confirmed, and to construct for themselves the role of saviours who help and support poor migrants.
Significantly, an interviewee interpreted white women’s tendency to play the role of saviour as a symptom of the crisis affecting the subjectivities of white women in feminist politics:

“Where are Western feminists? […] They have the potential to produce a new discourse, they know what it means to be discriminated, seen as a race apart, weak and inferior. Western women have experienced what minorities endure and they should have the instruments to bring justice. […] Instead, when these women arrive to places of power, they do not act in accordance to their own experience [rejecting the role of saviour as they contest the white men’s desire to save them]. On the contrary, they think from a male perspective and become ‘uomine’. […] They never ask why in African Parliaments there are more women than in Europe, they just look at infibulation. […] As an African I am interested in observing these dynamics to get things into perspective and scale down [the image of the Western emancipated woman]. Where you are failing, I do not want to fail!” (Interview No 13).

From this perspective, white women’s imaginaries of saving the Other are first and foremost a trap for white women themselves who are blind to their own problems, while also losing the chance of finding solutions to these problems by learning from those constructed as Others.

**Imaginaries of omniscience**

Additionally, the narratives of racialised women highlighted that white women have the tendency to presume and pretend to be always knowledgeable about the Other:

“Once, for example, I went with M and S – [two Italian white women] who I really love – to watch a documentary on Algeria. Western women are used to have one perspective and that's it. It is like that now, but I think they have always done that. That night M kept on saying “I did not know” about the mountain communities presented in the documentary about Algeria. “I did not know there are mountains there, I did not know that they have this habit or this culture”. Then I said to her: “Listen, you don't know everything, you don't know anything, you know only about Italy, outside of Italy you don't know anything”. And they remained [speechless]…” (FGD No 6).
Yet, the narratives of racialised women revealed that it is precisely gaining awareness about this fantasy of omniscience and its harmful effects that may allow white feminists to build coalitions with racialised women. For example, two racialised women participating in the Women’s Choir Against War, discussed in Chapter 6, told that their encounter with the same white women with whom they formed the Choir was made possible by white women’s acceptance of their own limits:

“[We said:] “You do not know our worlds. We know yours, but you do not know ours. For example, we know about who is Dante, but do you know who is Iqbal? And our poets? We know your world, we live here, you do not know ours, we know your religion, your art, your literature, your cinema, and if you ask we may know more than you do. But what do you know about our worlds? Also what you read about us is half fabricated and you do not really know what our way of life means”. Yes, we said this and they remained [speechless], then they became very close friends, but they remained [speechless] for a while. You know, it was true [and they accepted it]! Thus, we started hanging out” (FGD No 6).

To conclude, racialised research participants clarified that that the problem with whiteness as a subject position is not simply the subconscious racism it activates, which is the product of specific histories and structures that go beyond the individual will. The main problem is instead the refusal to accept and take responsibility for the existence of such subconscious racism and its far-reaching consequences on every one of us. Thus, the abandonment of the fantasy of omniscience by white women is seen as a necessary step to generate “exchanges” that depart “from each one’s own experience”, always understood as limited, partial, and specific (FGD No6). Clearly, the possibility of speaking from one’s own position depends on knowledge about one’s own story and location in history, and it is necessarily linked to the capacity to recognise and name this position (Interview No 13). Abandoning pretensions to be always knowledgeable brings to white women reasons to not pretend to be simply in the position of “helping others” or speaking in their name (FGD No 6). Hence, “trusting the subaltern about her own possibilities and capacity to confront and respond to injustice” is a fundamental step white women need to constantly make for building respectful coalitions (Interview No 11). This also implies for white women to develop
carefulness about expecting women to “stay all together behind the same flag” as different experiences of oppression and privilege may well require different forms of resistance and political organising (FGD No 6). In sum, these insights show that white women, in order to confront their social position of racial privilege and their own subject position in the governing of irregular migration, need to deal with their own subconscious racism and deconstruct it while learning about their own histories, her-stories, and contradictions.

9.6 Concluding remarks

This chapter illuminated the construction of white feminists’ subjectivities in the context of struggles on (1) the gendered securitization of in-migration, (2) administrative detention, and (3) securitised and externalized border-crossing control. In particular, it brought into focus the process of construction of these subjectivities by discussing how white women negotiated, in their practices of social actors’ identification, their own subject positions, which have been produced by the governing of irregular migration. These subject positions are those of (1) victims who need rescue from racialised sexual predators, (2) receivers of material benefits from the working of administrative detention, and (3) beneficiaries of access to unrestrained cross-border mobility.

To challenge these subject positions, white women’s identifications of social actors generated different strategies of political organising to address, in each struggle considered, the disjuncture they experience between their own social position of racial privilege and their resistor positionality against racist oppressive structures. These strategies included: (1) strategic essentialism, (2) emphasis on positionality, and (3) transnationalism. The implementation of these strategies presented some limits for white women’s dis-identifications with racism due to their lack of explicit engagement with the race category, and limited awareness on present inheritance of the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism, Italian unexpressed whiteness, and European racialization as colour-blindness. Narratives produced by racialised women on everyday experiences of racism clarified the necessity for white women to constantly question their own complicity with unconscious imaginaries of racial Otherness, as a necessary condition to build respectful coalitions with racialised women.
White subjectivities in radical feminist struggles

In sum, the chapter brought into focus the subjective dimensions of intersectionality, providing important elements to discuss the making of ‘gender’ from an intra-categorical perspective. Indeed, it reflected on the instantiation of the gender-race intersection in concrete situations of struggle by focusing on the gendered and racial dimensions of white women’s subject positions and subjectivities in political mobilizations against the governing of irregular migration. In particular, the chapter showed that the incipient racialization of ‘gender’ as a social category employed in radical feminist politics – notwithstanding its limits and contradictions – has important effects for reframing the relation between white ‘citizens’ and racialised ‘migrants’. In other words, it clarified that, if the governing of cross-border people’s movements constructs this relation as one of complete exclusion or subordinate inclusion of racialised migrants within nationalised societies, the narratives produced by white women in radical feminist struggles construct this relation as transversal, grouping together social agents on the ground of their common awareness of unequal power relations and intentions of liberation. In this sense, the incipient racialization of ‘gender’ becomes an instrument for contesting any form of naturalization of gendered and racial inequalities thanks to the differentiation of social positionings, positionalities, and normative values.
10 Conclusion

10.1 The subject of inquiry

This study has explored the signification of the social category of ‘gender’ in radical feminisms as a discursive space that problematizes the inequalities and violence produced and reproduced by the governing of irregular migration into contemporary Italy. It has examined the modes in which radical feminisms confront and negotiate the meanings that the term ‘gender’ has contextually acquired in the processes of racialization activated through the construction of the Italian nation state and continuously reproduced by current governmental rationalities and practices targeting irregular migration. The combination of several analytical approaches – the Autonomy of Migration approach, Intersectionality, and Transnational Feminism – has enabled this work to bring into focus the strengths and weaknesses, potentialities and limitations of ‘gender’ as a social category employed by radical feminisms to produce structural analyses and practices of identification. In particular, an intersectional examination of the characteristics of these analyses and practices has revealed the implications of the ruptures and complicities that radical feminist narratives have acted upon in response to the language and concepts employed by the ‘governing of irregular migration’. This form of governing continues to have a role in maintaining and reinforcing the same processes of racialization that contributed to establish it.

Specifically, this study has shown that throughout the history of formation of the Italian nation-state heterogeneous women’s, and feminist, politics in Italy have been party to the subtle process of reproducing long-standing patterns of racialization engrained in legal regulations of human mobility. The analysis of radical feminist struggles against the governing of irregular migration in Italy during the period 2007-2013 has
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made visible an underlying tension between the aspiration to fight racism and the sub-conscious reproduction of racializing processes, which plays an important role in the signification of ‘gender’. As an object of analysis, this tension has been understood as part of the realm of negotiating the present effects of long-standing patterns of racialization of the Italian national community, and their gendered reproduction. By placing this tension in the field of feminist epistemologies, the study has sought to scrutinize how ‘gender’ as a social category is understood to interact with ‘race’. Pertinent issues at stake are the particular cognition about ‘race’ that radical feminisms inherited from the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism, and the use of a colour-blind language that resulted from their limited awareness of Italian unexpressed whiteness. In succinct terms, the study has revealed significant contradictions concerning radical feminist interpretations of the relation between ‘gender’ and ‘race’, in order to assess the intersectional character of the radical feminist project of transformation.

This concluding chapter elaborates on the main arguments of the study and indicates its research implications. Section 10.2 establishes the main empirical findings of this study in regard to the meanings of ‘gender’ and its social functions in radical feminist narratives of struggle against the governing of irregular migration. Section 10.3 assesses the values and limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a methodology grounded in Standpoint epistemology. It brings into focus the epistemological benefits and limits of radical feminist narratives of struggle as this study’s main data, and it offers a reflection on my own experience as researcher and the challenges I faced in conducting this study. Section 10.4 brings into focus the theoretical implications of the research findings identified, evaluating their possible original contributions to Intersectionality, Transnational Feminism, and the Autonomy of Migration approach. Section 10.5 identifies areas for future research that would allow us to further elaborate and apply the theoretical implications of this study.
Chapter 10

10.2 Empirical findings on the meanings and functions of ‘gender’

In studying the signification of ‘gender’ in radical feminist narratives on the governmental production of unequal access to migration into contemporary Italy, I focused on the ‘concrete meanings’ of this category as structure of power and source of identification. This means that I paid careful attention to trace the socio-historical frame in which to contextualise, analyse and interpret the meanings of ‘gender’ conveyed by radical feminist narratives. In particular, after showing the key role played by ‘race’ both in the governing of irregular migration and in women’s and feminist politics throughout the history of the Italian nation state, I carefully examined the mutual constitution of ‘gender’ with ‘race’ in radical feminist analyses and practices of identification. In doing so, I also paid particular attention to how ‘methodological nationalism’ can also play a role in establishing the meanings of ‘gender’.

10.2.1 The racialization of Italians in the history of the Italian nation-state

Critical to this work - as suggested by the first specific research question – has been to establish the central role played by social relations of race in the structuring of human mobility and citizenship policies throughout the history of the Italian nation state. In Chapter 4, I scrutinised these regulations in terms of the distinctions they trace between national and non-national subjects as well as between regular and irregular forms of people's movements. Then, I contextualised these legal distinctions against the backdrop of structural processes of racialization that have influenced both the construction of the Italian population and of its internal and external Others. As a result, I provided an historical account of the Italian state's definitions of its national community and racial identity. This analytical focus has served to bring to the fore the long standing and multifaceted patterns of racialization that radical feminisms confront today while struggling against the governing of irregular migration. In other words, I provided the context of reference to assess the meanings of ‘gender’ constructed in radical feminist narratives.

Findings have shown that the racialization of Italianness as unexpressed whiteness grounds the interaction between citizenship and hu-
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man mobility policies, and reflects the structural racialising processes undergone during the liberal-monarchic period that, not only found continuity during the fascist period, but also deeply affected the republican period. First, legal definitions of the Italian nation as a family of families, which is held together by blood and kinship ties maintained across borders and generations, have made ideas of race and national community coincide. Second, legal and material construction of Italian identity through contrast and comparison with shifting internal and external Others, who were or have been explicitly associated with blackness, led to the implicit association of Italianess with whiteness. Third, the institutional representation of the Italian nation state as in continuity with historical periods in which Italy played a leading role in Europe, together with the inscription of Italy in the European process of modernization, provided for the primacy of a cultural definition of Italian superiority and explained the unexpressed character of Italian whiteness. Importantly, colour-blind definitions of Italianness have translated into colour-blind governmental approaches to issues of migration and borders.

10.2.2 The historical status of racial issues in heterogeneous women’s and feminist politics

Another relevant step in this work – addressed by the second specific research question – has been to reflect on women’s and feminist constructions of the gendered and racial boundaries of the Italian imagined community in various moments of the history of Italy as a nation state. In Chapter 5, I examined the racial implications of cases of reproduction, contestation, and negotiation of Italian nationalism from different sides of the spectrum of women’s and feminist politics across diverse historical periods: the monarchic-liberal period, the second feminist wave from the late 1960s to the early 1980s, and the emergence of multiculturalism during the 1990s and 2000s. Afterwards, I analysed a recent case of entanglement between women’s institutional politics and nationalism as well as related radical feminist critiques in the context of the 150th anniversary of Italian national unity. The outcome has been to produce an overview of past and present imaginaries on national insiders and outsiders, bringing to the surface women’s and feminist approaches to ‘race’ and racial issues. In doing so, I provided another context of reference to assess radical feminist attention to the gender-race intersection in relation to other streams in feminist and women’s politics.
Key research findings have indicated the long-lasting relevance of the intertwining between nationalisms and women’s and feminist politics, showing various racial implications of this entanglement for thinking about the ‘nation’ and its racial boundaries. In particular, findings related to the contemporary period have revealed a plurality of present women’s and feminist approaches to nationalism: (a) institutional women’s politics that, while taking nationalism as a preferred frame of reference for its claims, constructs exclusionary gendered and racial national boundaries; (b) feminism of difference that rejects nationalism, but does not problematise racism, thus implicitly accepting exclusionary ideas of the nation; and (c) radical feminisms that problematize both nationalism and racism, advancing an inclusive approach towards racial minorities, but participate in the normalization of Italian unexpressed whiteness. Notably, radical feminisms, with their important limitations, emerge as an interesting exception given the general marginalization of racial issues in the field of women’s and feminist politics.

10.2.3 The meanings of ‘gender’ as structure of power

Another major goal of this study – as indicated by the third specific research question – has been to identify and discuss the meanings of ‘gender’ as a structure of power in radical feminist narratives on (a) the gendered securitization of in-migration, (b) administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking, and (c) the securitising and outsourcing of border-crossing control. In chapters 6, 7, and 8 I examined the narratives on these governmental rationalities and practices and their representations of inequality between, and within, gendered groups, giving attention to silences and amplifications in these representations and the related implications. This analytical focus has served to bring to the fore how radical feminisms comprehended processes of social stratification activated by governmental power, and how this comprehension was expressed in the light of changing configurations of inequalities and their contextual realities.

The findings have shown how the concrete meanings of ‘gender’ as structure have been shifting in response to the objectives set by each of the struggles that we considered. These shifts are related to the governmental rationalities and practices that each struggle engaged with, and the setting in which they took place. As a result, ‘gender’ as a means to name unequal power relations clearly emerged as flexible, really function-
ing as a “floating signifier” that requires us to identify the specificities of each context considered in order to function as an effective political tool (Hall 1997b). More precisely, the flexibility of ‘gender’ has emerged especially in relation to two main aspects – each one influencing the signification of this category: first, the relevance of this social category has been brought into focus as circumscribed and context-dependent; second, the meanings of ‘gender’ have been seen as dependent upon the signification of ‘race’, articulated as an intersecting structure.

The relevance of ‘gender’ for the governing of irregular migration surfaced as specific and limited to certain social domains. Narratives concerning the gendered securitization of in-migration especially gave emphasis to inequalities between gendered groups, questioning gender roles in relation to violence and reproductive labour; at the same time, they acknowledged relations of inequality within gendered groups, identifying specific racial roles in processes of victimization and criminalization of cases of male violence against women, and in productive and reproductive labour markets. By contrast, narratives about administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking particularly foregrounded relations of inequality within gendered groups, showing how the gender-race intersection determines diverse experiences of institutional gender-based violence, and differential access to productive and reproductive labour markets as well as to self-determination in biological and social reproduction. Finally, narratives on the securitization and outsourcing of border-crossing control almost exclusively focused on relations of inequalities within gendered groups, highlighting how they produce specific and racialised experiences of social reproduction characterised by the loss of missing sons and daughters. All these examples have clarified the boundaries of the heuristic value of ‘gender’, which made visible specific relations of inequality triggered or reproduced by the governing of irregular migration.

The research findings also pointed out diverse blind spots in radical feminist narratives that, once addressed, could enhance the heuristic value of ‘gender’. The first blind spot is the backgrounding of the condition of racialised men – both as subject and object of violence in narratives on the gendered securitization of in-migration. This backgrounding prevented radical feminisms to produce analyses of the root-causes of male violence and the modes in which ‘race’ affect the construction of masculinities. The second blind spot concerns the backgrounding of
structural inequalities between radical feminists and migrant women in struggle, in the narratives on administrative detention and protection of victims of trafficking. This puts a limit on the social comprehension of the effects of these governmental practices on the field of feminist politics, which are mainly described through the dichotomous construction of good and bad feminisms. The third blind spot regards the neglect of Italians as racialised subjects who enjoy specific privileges in regard to the organization of social reproduction, which fails to strengthen the idea — conveyed on other occasions by the narratives — that the privileges of some depend on the subordination, suffering, and annihilation of others. In sum, these limitations in the radical feminist narratives indicated specific areas where the heuristic possibilities of ‘gender’ could be expanded to make visible specific relations of inequality triggered or reproduced by the governing of ‘irregular’ migration.

Moreover, the findings have revealed that the meanings of ‘gender’ as a structure of power importantly depend on the signification of ‘race’ as a key intersecting structure. In all those struggles that gave particular emphasis to inequalities within gendered groups, ‘race’ has emerged as a fundamental structure determining unequal access to cross-border migration. However, this structure has been mainly signified through ‘geographical origin’ instead of somatic and morphological characteristics, pointing out the absence of an explicit language of ‘race’ in radical feminist narratives. This inclination to adopt the same colour-blind language employed by the governmental rationalities and practices has been understood as resulting from sub-conscious adherence to the dominant construction of Italianess as unexpressed whiteness. In particular, lack of engagement with the historical inheritance of the liberal monarchic phase of nation-building and colonization, which laid the foundations for the construction of Italian unexpressed whiteness, was identified as a relevant further enabling factor for this trend. The implication of this colour-blindness in radical feminist narratives has been to reinforce the dichotomy citizen-migrant, where the former is implicitly assumed to be white and the latter to be racialised. The outcome is the concealment of racialised Italian minorities and the reproduction of the idea of Italian unexpressed whiteness.
10.2.4 The meanings of ‘gender’ as source of identification

Another key goal of the study – as indicated by the fourth specific research question – has been recognising and interpreting the meanings of ‘gender’ as source of identification in radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration. In Chapter 9, I reflected on how white women in radical feminisms negotiate – by way of and through identifications of social actors – their own subject positions as produced by structural relations of gender and race. This analytical focus has served to show the limits and possibilities of white women’s subjectivities for dis-engaging with racist structures and practices while fighting against the governing of irregular migration. The understanding of these same limits and possibilities has been deepened by discussing the perceptions on the subjectivities of white women produced by racialised women in Italy, both inside and outside the discursive field of radical feminism.

The research findings revealed that each struggle examined has proposed a different strategy of negotiation of the subject position assigned to white women by practices of governing of irregular migration, and that each of these strategies has presented possibilities and challenges that radical feminisms need to confront to effectively build an intersectional approach to the issues and process in question. In particular, recurrent contradictions, characterizing the practices of identification examined, mainly related to the use of a colour-blind language regarding gender, and the influence of the UNESCO paradigm of anti-racism.

Several potentialities of white women’s practices of identification have been noted. The use of strategic essentialism served women identified as white to clearly name gendered inequalities and allocate responsibilities. Functionalization has helped them to theorise resistance from social positions of privilege by giving emphasis to one’s own positionality vis-à-vis one’s own social position. Awareness of, and engaging with, transnational activism has worked to illuminate relations of inter-dependence across social locations and show how cross-border mobility as an entitlement can be produced at the expense of other subjects. In all these cases, the practices of identifications discussed shed light on the gendered effects of governmental power, revealing the relevance of ‘gender’ in the regulation of migration and in countering its naturalization.
Beyond these potentials, specific contradictions in the use of the intersection of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ have also been identified. The main critical point is related to the separation of ‘racism’ from ‘race’: while white women in radical feminisms condemned racism as a structural phenomenon connected to public cultures and state politics, their identifications displayed a clear preference for a colour-blind language, and the concealment of whiteness. In doing so, they appear influenced by the UNESCO approach to anti-racism and, more generally, by eliminationist approaches to race, which support the idea that mentioning somatic or morphological characteristics naturalises racial power relations and contribute to reproduce racial hierarchies. Furthermore, while separating ‘race’ from ‘racism’, the narratives produced by radical feminisms seem unable to effectively deconstruct the pervasiveness of ‘race’ in Italian society, which includes normalising diverse forms of violence against racialised subjects – both citizens and migrants. In short, white feminist identifications surfaced as marked by a persistent tension between their recognition of structural racism and their very limited uses of ‘race’ to deconstruct racist discourses and discourses on racism. The relevance of this contradiction has further emerged thanks to the narratives produced by women who are subject to processes of racialization, both inside and outside radical feminisms. This indicated the key relevance for white women to work on their own awareness of the functioning of ‘race’ and its effects in terms of internalized racism. For white women in radical feminist struggles, accounting for conflicting differences directed, and shaped by, power relations of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ is thus a task of chief importance.

10.2.5 The social functions of ‘gender’

A cross-cutting concern throughout this study has been the role played by methodological nationalism, as an intellectual orientation, in the signification of ‘gender’ in radical feminist narratives. Attention to the functions of ‘gender’ in challenging, reproducing, or negotiating the naturalization of the nation state has been an important measure to grasp how radical feminist narratives can participate in normalising or challenging the construction of cross-border migration as an object of governmental power. Specifically, the presence of the following elements in radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ was noted: (1) awareness of the historicity of the Italian nation state and of changing governmental approaches
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toward the movements of people, as a resource to question the reification of the nation; (2) consideration of other scales of analysis besides the national and local dimension, to grasp the transnational nature and effects of governmental rationalities and practices regulating migration; (3) focus on connections across national contexts, to acknowledge the complex and contradictory aspects characterising national spaces; and (4) attention to the use of the ‘nationality’ category in identifications of social actors, to understand their implications for the naturalization of nation states. As a result, this work has brought to the surface the potentialities and limitations of radical feminist narratives in questioning the naturalization of unequal access to cross-border migration through the signification of ‘gender’.

The study’s multifaceted findings suggest the following. First, it has emerged that radical feminist narratives effectively participated in questioning methodological nationalism. By acknowledging the present effects of historical processes and dynamics for the construction of relations of inequality between and within gendered groups, these narratives have framed the governing of irregular migration as a temporally stratified phenomenon with continuities and breaks. In doing so, they have effectively shown the changing nature of gender relations, thus breaking with ideas of stable and fixed national gender norms. Furthermore, their uses of multiple scales of analysis have worked to question the common view that politically relevant gendered relations of inequality are only those taking place inside the boundaries of nation states. In addition, by establishing connections between social positions across national contexts, the narratives have been able to show how the governing of irregular migration differently affects gendered groups in diverse national contexts. In particular, this sensitivity to connections has allowed them to grasp the functions of ‘gender’ in promoting the empowerment of some and the disempowerment of others within, across, and beyond national spaces. Finally, identifications of social actors through the ‘nationality’ category mainly performed the function of naming specific power relations and, in doing so, they did not reify nation states nor convey nationalistic messages.

Second, the study has shown the influence of methodological nationalism on the language and concepts employed in the narratives as well as on the contexts and practices that they constructed. For instance, identifications of social actors displayed a limited attention to the
intersection of the categories of ‘nationality’ and ‘race’, resulting in the lack of clear explanations of the differential treatment of gendered social actors with different national attributions. The fact that these identifications employed the same colour-blind language of the governing of irregular migration partially contributed to normalise the naturalization of the nation state as the ground on which unequal access to migration is made possible and acceptable. Likewise, inadequate attention to the construction of the nation state has narrowed the comprehension of the functions of ‘gender’ in naturalizing the racial privileges enjoyed by national subjects. Specifically, the lack of consideration of the historical construction of Italian unexpressed whiteness has revealed systemic difficulties in discussing the gendered reproduction of Italians as a dominant racial group. Finally, the investigation has revealed that the development of a transnational dimension of ‘gender’ in radical feminist narratives stands in a relation of reciprocal determination with the adoption of transnational political practices. Given that the possibility to adopt a transnational perspective is directly linked to the opportunity to travel across borders, material constraints are clearly a barrier to access.

10.3 Values and limitations of Critical Discourse Analysis as methodology

As a qualitative interpretative study, this study has adopted Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as its main methodology, together with a combination of diverse methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation to pursue the proposed research objectives.

First, this study has been grounded in the data gathered through in-depth interviews and Focus Group Discussions involving 36 individuals identified through purposive and snow-ball sampling techniques. The data collected were conceptualized as situated discourses produced from a standpoint – collectively achieved in radical feminist struggles against the governing of irregular migration into today’s Italy – that constructed specific meanings of ‘gender’ as structure of power and source of identification.

Second, the study combined linguistically-oriented and other content-oriented analytical approaches in order to bring into focus the situated meanings of ‘gender’ as structure in the governing of irregular migration, and the specific discursive strategies that white women in radical femin-
isms employed to identify social actors and allocate responsibilities for the inequalities identified.

Third, the analysis findings have been interpreted with reference to the Autonomy of Migration approach, Intersectionality, and Transnational Feminism. The epistemological justification of this methodology has been anchored to a contextualist version of Standpoint Theory, which has conceptualized the epistemic benefits of radical feminist narratives within particular limitations, which characterized the knowledge produced as situated, context-dependent, specific in scope, and with room for improvement.

The examination of the data collected has provided an empirical verification of the epistemic benefits and limits of radical feminist narratives on the governing of irregular migration into contemporary Italy. In particular, the epistemic benefits of these narratives concerned their capacity to reveal significant contradictions between the functionalities claimed by the governmental rationalities and practices considered, and the social experiences of their actualization, and to provide an interpretation of the functionalities of the identified contradictions. Importantly, these epistemic benefits have been characterized in relation to the institutional discourses justifying and legitimizing the governmental rationalities and practices engaged by each struggle. As a result, these narratives have been taken as valid sources of analysis and interpretation allowing one to challenge categorizations used by dominant discourses.

Simultaneously, as we have already seen, specific epistemic limitations have been identified contextualizing these narratives against the backdrop of specific histories. In particular, these limitations have concerned the sub-conscious adhesion of knowledge producers to dominant patterns of racialization, with important consequences for the signification of ‘gender’, especially as source of identification. In short, it is important to stress that the main effects of these limitations have consisted in the invisibilization of whiteness as a lack of clear allocation of responsibilities in terms of racist discrimination, exploitation, and violence; and limited attention to the intersection of the categories of ‘nationality’ and ‘race’ resulting in lack of explanation of the differential treatment of gendered and nationalised social actors. On the whole, these limitations have served to identify room for improvement in the knowledge produced by radical feminist narratives.
From these findings, one main value of the methodology adopted and its epistemological grounding has emerged as resting on the conceptualization of research participants as both subjects and objects of analysis and interpretations. This stance has been based on a twofold argument that appears empirically verified. First, content-oriented analysis has shown the epistemic value of research participants’ experience as a resource to reveal contradictions in the logic of dominant discourses. Second, linguistically-oriented analysis and its historical interpretation have shown the epistemic limitations of research participants themselves and their situated knowledges. In this frame, contextualization has been a key element to make the chosen methodological approach epistemologically productive.

Another potential of the proposed methodology has been directly connected to self-reflexivity as an ongoing effort to pose myself, the researcher, as both subject and object of analysis. Indeed, while working to identify the contradictions experienced by radical feminisms in fighting racism from a position of privilege and domination, I have also attempted to reflect on how I deal with these same contradictions while writing this study as a white woman. In particular, I became aware of my own urgency to immediately overcome the contradictions identified. For example, when I recognised the radical feminist narratives as colour-blind, I posed ‘race’ at the centre of my writing – sometime even when it was irrelevant, redundant, or inappropriate. I thus recognised my own difficulties in experiencing the condition of ‘being in contradiction’ with my own political and ethical values as if coherency depended from an individual effort rather than from power structures going beyond my own will.

Recognising this need of proving myself ‘innocent’ of racism made me realise the dangers of posing issues of structural power relations on the level of individual responsibility and morality. Indeed, one or many white persons ‘innocent’ of racism would not equate the elimination of the subordination, exploitation and suffering of racialised subjects. Focusing on the result accomplished by those in position of privilege and domination might function legitimising this same power system, stressing its capacity for improvement - yet an improvement that does not necessarily benefit the oppressed and marginalised. As a result of these considerations, I attempted to accept my own contradictions as an opportunity to remain open to continuously question myself, my use of
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concepts and language, my political practices and methods, my alliances and coalitions. At the same time, I saw the key relevance of giving value to political experiences where migrants and racialised minorities take “unmediated space” and construct the order of discourse of the fight for their own liberation (Zavos and Biglia 2009: 19).

10.4 Theoretical implications

The empirical findings identified have specific theoretical implications, which contribute originally to the different fields of study on which this work has drawn: the Autonomy of Migration (AoM) approach, Intersectionality, and Transnational Feminism. This section presents five contributions made to these bodies of literature, clarifying how they build on each other, so as to argue for the significance of fine tuning their collaboration. In this frame, the AoM approach is seen as key to unravel tensions between the phenomenon of migration and governmental processes, Intersectionality is cast as fundamental to identify the role of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in these social phenomena, and Transnational Feminism is indicated as crucial to bring into focus methodological nationalism specifically in applications of intersectionality. On the whole, the section shows how combining these different analytical sensibilities represent the main theoretical contribution of this work.

In the first place, the study has further elaborated the perspective proposed by the AoM literature, which emphasizes the role of migration in bringing about significant transformations in social, political, and economic domains within, across, and beyond national borders (Mitropoulos 2007, Bojadžijev and Karakayali 2007, Papadopoulos, Stephenson, and Tsianos 2008, Squire 2011, Fassin 2011, Mezzadra and Neilsen 2013, Nyers 2015, De Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles 2014). Considering – in line with the AoM approach – people’s movements across borders as a “creative force” affecting multiple and heterogeneous cohorts of subjects (Nyers 2015: 28), this study has stressed the productive dimension of the tension between mobility and control, presenting its effects on radical feminist politics. Indeed, in response to the contested presence of migrants in the country, their organized struggles and everyday resistance, radical feminisms have taken cognizance of (a) the violent stratifying effects of the governing of irregular migration on different populations, and (b) their influence on the formation of the subjectivities of white Italian women in radical feminist struggles. Specifically, they
have come to understand that this form of governing does not only affect migrants and their families, but also the social position and sense of Self of those subjects treated as ‘citizens’ who enjoy unrestrained access to mobility across borders. Such awareness has emerged throughout the investigation as a fruitful political tool at the disposal of radical feminisms to contest governmental power from multiple social locations.

In the second place, the application of the AoM approach in this study has enabled the analyst to bring into view the fact that the social positions of ‘migrants’ and ‘citizens’ mutually influence each other. This analytical focus has come from further developing one specific argument made by the AoM approach. This argument regards the conceptualization of conditions of irregularity and illegality as products themselves of specific governmental processes, and not of malfunctions or exceptions in the working of borders (Piore 1979, Rudnyckyj 2004, Andrijasevic 2009, Fassin 2011, De Genova, Mezzadra, and Pickles 2015). This conceptualization is particularly fruitful inasmuch it allows the analyst to bring into view the functions of apparent dysfunctions of governmental rationalities and practices (Fassin 2011). The study has further elaborated this argument, clarifying that also conditions of regularity and legality are importantly shaped by the apparent dysfunctions of governmental power, and therefore they should be submitted to scrutiny. This work has thus paid careful attention to reveal how the governing of irregular migration is the effect of a bifurcated system. This system privileges in-migrants who hold citizenship from EU countries thanks to ‘freedom of movement’, and those countries with whom Italy has agreed to specific arrangements of travel options. At the same time, it excludes or includes in subordinate positions in-migrants classified as ‘irregular’. A consequence of this bifurcated system is the unequal distribution of access to mobility across borders, and the formation of segregated spheres of mobility similar to the observations made by Piore (1979) on the dual labour market\textsuperscript{204}.

\textsuperscript{204}The model of the dual labor market, which sees in Piore (1979) one of its key thinkers, rests on the idea that the economy contains two sectors, a primary high-wage and a secondary low-wage sector. According to this model, workers in the secondary sector confront job precarity, changing frequently among jobs and recurrently experiencing unemployment. The strength of the dual labour market theory is that it introduces a broader range of factors, such as race and gender, into economic re-
Conclusion

In the third place, the study has shown the fruitful effects of a dialogue between the AoM approach and Intersectionality for bringing into focus the role of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ in shaping the social positions of ‘migrants’ and ‘citizens’ in more complex terms than simple exclusion and inclusion (Mezzadra and Neilson 2013, Yuval-Davis 2013a and 2013b, Lentin 2015, Giuliani 2016). Specifically, the investigation has shown that gender-based violence and the gendered and racial organization of reproduction are key social domains to consider for grasping the multiple effects of borders in the contemporary context. Importantly, showing that, in these social domains, heterogeneity between and within groups of ‘migrants’ and ‘citizens’ is produced along the lines of ‘gender’ and ‘race’ made it possible to identify various functionalities of borders in a context in which irregular migration is a key effect of governmental power. Awareness of this heterogeneity has been cast as critical to the organization of radical feminist struggles, and for the construction of political solidarity across social locations in the frame of these struggles. As a corollary, attentiveness to conflicting differences between and within groups of ‘migrants’ and ‘citizens’, directed and shaped by intertwining power relations, has shed light on the contradictions and limitations faced by those who struggle against the contemporary governing of irregular migration from a position of privilege in terms of access to cross-border movements, that is always also a position shaped by the effects of ‘gender’ and ‘race’.

In the fourth place, this work has made a contribution to the literature on intersectionality that examines the travelling of this analytic across geopolitical locations (Erel et al., 2010, Patil 2011 and 2013, Ahmed 2012, Puar 2012, Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall 2013, Carbado et al. 2013, Tomlinson 2013a and 2013b, Falcon and Nash 2015, Bilge 2013 and 2014, Millan 2015, Lentin 2015, Wekker 2016, Bilge and Collins 2016). Specifically, it has shown the modes in which migration and its governing have influenced the reception and incorporation of an intersectional approach in radical feminist struggles. This study has thus brought into focus potentialities and limits of radical feminist signification of ‘gender’ in intersection with ‘race’ as a tool to name relations of inequality within and among social groups, and to identify social actors by allocating responsibilities that give an explanation for the relations of inequality identified. The empirical findings have shown that these potentialities and search.
limits are related to the negotiation of long standing patterns of racializa-
tion of the Italian populations and its Others. In other words, although
‘gender’ as a free-floating category has proved to change meanings in re-
response to the contested presence of migrants in the country, their organ-
ized struggles, and everyday resistance, these novel meanings need to be
negotiated with historical processes that act at both conscious and sub-
conscious levels.

Two main examples illustrate this argument and clarify its theoretical
implications. One example concerns the shifting relevance of ‘gender’. This
finding calls into question the critiques raised to cases of adoption and
application of intersectionality in continental Europe, which con-
ceive this analytic as an obligation to always and simultaneously take into
account multiple categories, ignoring that specific social groups in specif-
ic historical situations may find one power structure more pressing and
relevant than others (Bouteldja 2013, Bilge 2013 and 2015). In the frame
of this discussion, radical feminist recognitions of the limited relevance
of ‘gender’ in struggles against the securitization and outsourcing of bor-
der-crossing control represent the sign of a conscious attempt to display
attention to contexts and histories, escaping automatic and acritical ad-
option of intersectionality. Indeed, reducing the consideration given to
‘gender’ in favour of ‘race’, some radical feminist politics proved to be
aware of the fact that racial relations of inequality may take prominence
over those that target women qua women. Significantly, attention to
Italian colonial history and its inheritance in the present has emerged as
the main enabling factor of this particular intersectional sensibility. Then,
the value of this sensibility has emerged even more in comparison to
those mainstream feminist currents that exclusively focus on gender or
that mostly claim for state-enhanced equal opportunities without recog-
nising the involvement of the state in the reproduction of racial hierarch-
ies.

Another major example concerns radical feminist conceptualization
of the boundaries of ‘gender’ in its intersection with ‘race’ as a category
that has remained largely unexpressed. This empirical finding shows the
pertinence to radical feminisms in today’s Italy of scholarly critiques that
contest applications of intersectionality in continental Europe which si-
ence ‘race’ or substitute it with other categories, failing to effectively
name and address racial inequalities (Erel et al. 2010: 283, Al-Tayeb
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and 2015). In particular, radical feminist uses of ‘geographical origin’ as proxy for ‘race’ are seen as inadequate to confront references to somatic or morphological bodily features, which are pervasive in Italy’s public debates and visual media culture, and function as markers naturalising racial power relations. This has resulted in a severe impediment (a) to reshape dominant patterns of racialization of the Italian population, which imagine racialised minorities as external to the national body, and (b) to allocate clear responsibilities for racist discrimination, exploitation, and violence. Notably, the reproduction of these patterns of racialization can be seen as operating mostly at the sub-conscious level and that insight has brought into focus commonalities between radical feminist politics and mainstream feminist currents.

In short, the study has offered clear historical coordinates to contextualise the signification of ‘gender’ operated by radical feminist politics in struggles against the governing of irregular migration in today’s Italy. Indeed, paying attention to local, national, and transnational histories, it has brought into view the ways in which radical feminisms negotiate the present effects of these histories. Importantly, it has clarified the need for radical feminisms to bring historical patterns of racialization to the conscious level so as to negotiate their effects on contemporary struggles in more effective ways. Indeed, without deeper awareness of the present effects of contexts and histories, radical feminisms run the risk of producing an anti-racist identity for white feminists that is more functional to construct a divide between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ feminist politics, producing the intertwining of feminist and anti-racist struggles as a position of moral superiority. Instead, it is argued that bringing into focus ‘unexpressed whiteness’ as a position of privilege that is caught in the production and reproduction of discrimination, violence, and exploitation against migrants as actors who are subjected to processes of racialization would be more effective for the purpose of renegotiating the present effects of long-standing racialising processes.

In the fifth place, the study has made a contribution to the branch of Intersectionality scholarship that, influenced by Transnational Feminism, critically reflects on the transnational dimension of applications of this analytic (Patil 2011 and 2013, Mahler, Chaudhuri, and Patil 2015, Falcon and Nash 2015). Particularly, the contribution made by this study regards the identification of potentialities and limitations of radical feminist conceptualizations of ‘gender’ for negotiating the central position covered by
the ideas of nation and nationalism in the governmental rationalities and practices contested. According to the empirical findings, main potentialities of radical feminist conceptualizations of ‘gender’ concern the role of this social category in revealing ongoing challenges to and mechanisms for the orderly reproduction of national entities and their boundaries, and connections between different social groups across borders which empower some, while dis-empowering others. Bringing into focus this latter potentiality has been made possible by combining the attention of Transnational Feminism to the effects of structures of power across borders, with sensibility of the AoM approach to show the role of changing forms of differential inclusion and exclusion in affecting the reproduction of national boundaries. Instead, the primary limitation of the transnational uses of ‘gender’ in radical feminist struggles has been seen as stemming from narrow awareness of the implications of the intersection of the categories of ‘nationality’ and ‘race’. This has resulted in the lack of satisfactory explanations of the differential treatment experienced by actors of different nationalities in terms of access to mobility across borders. Further, this study has revealed that the development of a transnational dimension of ‘gender’ in radical feminist narratives stands in a relation of reciprocal determination with the adoption of transnational political practices, indicating that material and other constraints to the elaboration of these practices are important to address.

In conclusion, mixing heterogeneous and complementary analytical sensibilities, the study has accomplished several results. It has brought into view the productive dimension of migration, focusing on radical feminist meaning-making activities. Specifically, it has shown how irregular people’s movements across borders may function as a powerful engine to transform the signification of ‘gender’ in radical feminist struggles, stressing that this signification is importantly mediated by the effects of contexts and histories. In doing so, the study has framed awareness of these processes as a key political tool to recognize current limitations of the radical feminist discourse that, once addressed, may strengthen political organizing for social transformation of the contemporary governing of irregular migration and related reproduction of historical patterns of racialization. Significantly, reasoning on meaning-making activities has come with the recognition that the elaboration of political discourses, which name and explain relations of inequality, is just one aspect of political organizing, and not necessarily the most important. In-
deed, meaning-making activities are notably affected by material limitations and constraints, thus their implications for social transformation should not be over-emphasized. Together, these results have enabled the analyst to identify possible directions for future research endeavours that are discussed in the next section.

10.5 Areas for future research

This study has various implications for identifying relevant areas for future research able to provide stimuli and tools to the development of an intersectional politics of liberations. This section presents two main possible directions of inquiry, arguing for both their theoretical and societal relevance.

First, this study suggests the relevance of studies on race, racism and anti-racism in Italy in order to further explore the current negotiation of long-standing processes of racialization targeting Italians as a dominant group and migrants as internal and external Others. This field of inquiry has recently begun to flourish, with the publication of many monographs, collective volumes, and journals (Lombardi-Diop and Romeo 2012, Scacchi and Petrovich-Njegosh 2012, Sabelli 2012, Capussotti 2012, Giuliani and Lombardi-Diop 2013, Curcio and Mellino 2014, Giuliani 2016, Oboe and D’Agostini 2016). Yet, the novel character of this research area means a need for numerous contributions. In particular, detailed examination of the history of anti-racism in the country, especially in regard to the spreading of the UNESCO paradigm and its effects on contemporary anti-racist movements, would especially benefit this literature (Lentin, 2004). In this frame, it would be extremely interesting to further reason on the empirical advantages and disadvantages of political uses of the term ‘race’ with anti-racist objectives as this is emerging as a particularly contested issue (Gilroy 2000, Petrovich Njegosh 2016, Bassi 2016).

Second, the study calls to further explore the application of intersectionality in women’s and feminist politics in Italy, also beyond the issue of migration. This field of research has grown relatively in recent years, producing historical, cultural, and sociological inquiries on heterogeneous feminist currents in Italy and on the relation of white and racialised women (Andall and Puwar 2007, Andrijasevic 2003 and 2009, Pojmann 2010, Perilli 2007 and 2016, Papa 2009 and 2012, Bonfiglioli 2011, Mar-
chetti 2011). Nonetheless, pointing out limited awareness of the current effects and magnitude of racialization in radical feminist politics, this work calls for greater scrutiny of whiteness as a social and political location in feminist struggles for social justice and liberation. Recent analyses of ongoing feminist mobilizations in Italy – such as that of the movement Non Una Di Meno in 2016 and 2017 – have expressed a similar need, highlighting that the construction of an intersectional feminist politics needs to confront the contradictions that are entailed in conducting struggles against racism from the position of whiteness (Tola and Ribeiro Corossacz 2017).
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