Chapter 17

Gender and the City: The Different Formations of Belonging

Tovi Fenster

This chapter highlights the different formations of gendered belonging as they are expressed in women's and men's daily practices in the city. It emphasizes not only the formal expressions of belonging built in to the different definitions of citizenship or the sacred dimensions of belonging expressed in individuals' and communities' religious and national attachment to territories but also the "everyday" nature of this sentiment that men and women develop in their daily practices in cities today.

This analysis is based on research carried out between 1999 and 2002 in which residents of London and Jerusalem were interviewed regarding their everyday experiences as related to three notions – comfort, belonging, and commitment – with regard to the various categories of their environment, home, building, street, neighbourhood, city centre, city, urban parks (Fenster, 2004). The research is based on a qualitative–content analysis methodology of peoples' narratives about their perceptions of sense of comfort, belonging, and commitment. People told their stories about their lives in the city as related to these categories and from their daily experiences we drew out our understanding on the gendered aspects of belonging in the city. The people interviewed represent both the "majority" hegemonic – that is, the Jewish secular in Jerusalem and the white middle-class English in London – and also the "minority," the "other," whether Bangladeshi immigrants in London or Palestinians in Jerusalem. This wide range of cultural expressions and ethnicities enabled exploration of the multilayered expressions of belonging both in their formal structures as citizenship definitions and in their personal, intimate, private expressions in daily practices in the city.

Why look at these two cities? Because they reflect contrasting images and symbolism. Jerusalem is a home for people of diverse identities, especially in the light of its image as one of the holiest cities in the world, a place of symbolism for Muslims, Christians, and Jews. And it is also a city that is associated with rigidity, perhaps fanaticism, strict rules, and boundaries, which sometimes find their expressions in spaces of *sacred belonging* that sometimes exclude women (see Romann,

1991; Be'tselem, 1997; Bollens, 2000; Cheshin et al., 2000; Fenster, forthcoming). London is a city famous for its globalization impacts and its images of cosmopolitanism, openness, and tolerance, but also for its negative and depressing connotations, especially for non-English immigrants and other types of newcomers (see Raban, 1974; Forman, 1989; Thornley, 1992; Fainstein, 1994; Jacobs, 1996; Pile, 1996). Comparing the narratives of women and men living in these two cities helps to expose the multilayered nature of gendered belonging which is constructed in urban daily practices.

What is a sense of belonging? Probyn (1966, cited in Yuval Davis, 2003) has emphasized the affective dimensions of belonging – not just of be-ing, but of longing or yearning. The Oxford Dictionary defines "belonging" through three meanings: first, to be a member (of a club, household, grade, society, state, etc.); second, to be resident or connected with; third, to be rightly placed or classified to or fit in a specific environment. These dimensions emphasize the membership component of belonging and its multilayered dimensionality (Yuval Davis, 2003). As we see later, in many cases belonging is also associated with past and present experiences and memories and future ties connected to a place, which grow with time (Fullilove, 1996; Crang, 1998).

Side by side with these definitions, there is a large body of literature that deals with the everyday practices of belonging. De Certeau's book *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984) constructs the notion of belonging as a sentiment, which is built up and grows out of everyday life activities. De Certeau terms this "a theory of territorialization" through spatial tactics. In his work he draws the distinction between "place" and "space" as being, somewhat confusingly, that space is place made meaningful (Leach, 2002), or in de Certeau's words: "*space is a practical place*. Thus, the street geometrically defined by urban planning is transformed into a 'space' by walkers" (de Certeau, 1984, p. 117). For de Certeau, corporal everyday activities in the city are part of a process of appropriation and territorialization: "The ordinary practitioners of the city live 'down below,' below the thresholds at which visibility begins. They walk – an elementary form of this experience of the city; they are walkers, *Wandersmanner*, whose bodies follow the thicks and thins of an urban 'text' they write without being able to read it" (ibid., p. 93). This everyday act of walking in the city is what marks territorialization and appropriation and the meanings given to a space. What de Certeau constructs is a model of how "we make a sense of space through walking practices, and repeat those practices as a way of overcoming alienation" (Leach, 2002, p. 284). De Certeau actually defines the process in which a sense of belonging is established, a process of transformation of a place, which becomes a space of accumulated attachment and sentiments by means of everyday practices. Belonging and attachment are built here on the base of accumulated knowledge, memory, and intimate corporal experiences of everyday walking. A sense of belonging changes with time as these everyday experiences grow and their effects accumulate.

A significant aspect of "everyday belonging" develops through men's and women's spatial knowledge of environments. In both London and Jerusalem women's and men's narratives reveal the connection between daily walking practices and a sense of belonging. The knowledge of the area reinforces a sense of belonging: "I know the street, I live here, I know the building, every stone of it.

. . . I know it more and more. A very intimate knowledge" (Susana, thirties, married with one child, Jewish-Israeli, Jerusalem, July 13, 2000). People living in London also mention this intimate knowledge of the area, of its little alleys and shortcuts: "knowing the streets makes me feel I belong," "knowing shortcuts – it shows I know the neighborhood" (Robert, thirties, single, British-White, London, September 1, 1999). Also, people who walk their dogs several times a day mentioned this daily ritual as contributing to their sense of belonging to the area.

This dimension of belonging, which is based on everyday ritualized use of space, has a clear gendered dimension. Several women interviewed said that they felt much more attached to their environment after they became mothers. As a result of their gendered divisions of roles in the household these young mothers began to use the environment near their home more intensively than before, especially for shopping or taking the children to school or walking with their baby strollers. Their role as mothers is one of the significant aspects of their embodied knowledge as related to the notion of belonging. Their daily household duties made their attachment to the environment stronger because of their gendered division of roles more than for their partners. Men, on the other hand, didn't mention their fatherhood as a significant indicator in their experiences of a sense of belonging to their environment.

In what follows we elaborate on these themes of belonging, looking in particular at the notion of exclusion, the formal one expressed in the different definitions of citizenship, and the personal one expressed in the life-accumulated experience and memory.

Formal Structures of Belonging: The Discourse around Citizenship

Popular definitions of citizenship mention equality, communality, and homogeneity as part of what citizenship means – almost in implicit contrast to notions of difference and cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. Citizenship is interpreted by Marshall (1950, 1975, 1981) as "full membership in a community," encompassing civil, political, and social rights. The discussion on citizenship during the past decade among academics in the field of political science, sociology, and geography is viewed by many as the result of political and social crises, wherein the exercise of power is challenged and thus the widely used definition of citizenship has shifted to a more complex, sophisticated, less optimistic interpretation of exclusions (Kofman, 1995). The idea of citizenship as a formation of national belonging is now used analytically, to expose differences in the *de jure* and *de facto* rights of different groups within and between nation-states (Smith, 1994). The concept is also used normatively to determine how a society, sensitive to human rights, should incorporate its individuals and communities in normative frameworks of belonging.

Does belonging in the context of citizenship definition have a spatial dimension? Expressions of citizenship in space have been coined as "spaces of citizenship" (Painter and Philo, 1995). "Spaces of citizenship" refer to the expression in space of the relationship between the state and its citizens from its social and political aspects of rights, and the ways in which spaces of inclusion and exclusion are defined. Another interpretation of "spaces of citizenship" is the quest for equality; that is, whether all citizens get equal treatment from the state in matters which involve equal access to resources (i.e. the provision of equal access to natural

resources such as land, water, or minerals), as well as equal access to infrastructure, welfare services, education, employment, and knowledge. This relates both to cases of discrimination against those who are defined legally as citizens but do not receive equal levels of state services (such as the Bedouin and the Ethiopian in Israel) and to those whose citizenship is denied (see Fenster, 1998, 1999a). This connects notions of citizenship, (i.e. the formal expressions of belonging) to the discourse around exclusion.

Citizenship, Belonging, and Exclusion

Legitimized forms of exclusion or lack of belonging are expressed in many different definitions of citizenship. Many critics from both the political left and right recognize that citizenship by definition is about exclusion rather than inclusion for many people (McDowell, 1999). Thus, citizenship definitions are identity-related in that they dictate which identities are included within the hegemonic community and which are excluded. Definitions of "full citizenship" – either formally or informally expressed – have negative effects on women, children, immigrants, people of ethnic and racial minorities, gay men and lesbians, and sometimes on elderly people too. Citizenship definitions are also spatial. They dictate in which *representations of space* (Lefebvre, 1992) the rights and duties of citizen are relevant and in which spaces they are not. One such spatial distinction is the separation between private and public spaces, which usually affects women's exclusions in most cultures (Fenster, 1999b). As global urban spaces become more and more diversified in terms of their citizens' identities, these notions of citizenship are becoming more crucial and relevant to the discussion on belonging in global cities.

The various definitions of citizenship can be viewed as one of the legitimate ways to exclude "strangers" by way of clarifying the boundaries between "us" and "them." A conflict is inherent here between the recognition that "strangers" are in fact a socially diverse group of people with different abilities and needs, and the strong belief that in a democratic society we should all have equal access to all goods and resources that society offers. This conflict between equality and difference has its expressions in the gendered dimensions of citizenship. Women's efforts to achieve full "political citizenship," for example, tackle issues of equality and difference, especially in women's participation in formal and informal politics. Women's "social citizenship" also refers to equality in earning and in access to welfare services, while paying attention to the gendered differences in access to these resources (Lister, 1997).

The Spatialities of Gendered Belonging and Exclusions

Space is where we can see most tangibly that cultural citizenship values exclude women – literally. This is because cultural construction of space has inherent in its symbolism the legitimacy to exclude women from power and influence. This section highlights some of these symbolic constructions of space that are formulated by the patriarchy.

The most common are private/public devices, which for many women in different cultural contexts mean the construction of permitted/forbidden spaces (Fenster, 1999a). The "home" is the "private" – the women's space, the space of stability,

reliability, and authenticity – the nostalgia for something lost which is female. "Home is where the heart is and where the woman (mother, lover) is also" (Massey, 1994). The "public" is perceived as the white, middle- or upper-class, heterosexual male domain. This sometimes means that women in both Western and non-Western cities simply cannot wander around the streets, parks, and urban spaces alone, and in some cultures cannot wander around at all (Massey, 1994; Fenster, 1999a). In many social constructions, women belong to the "private" only. A lot has been written about the different definitions and perspectives of the public/private (gendered) divide: its cultural orientation (Charlesworth, 1995; Fenster, 1999b); the associations of public spaces with the political sphere (Cook, 1995; Yuval Davis, 1997); its roots in Western liberal thought and different forms of patriarchy (Pateman, 1988, 1989); and feminist perspectives. Most feminist interpretations critique the public/private divide and argue that this distinction is actually a false one, but one that is invoked largely to justify female subordination and exclusion and to separate the abuse of human rights at home from the public (Bunch, 1995; Hyndman, 2003). The arbitrary nature of private/public divides becomes even more apparent in global economies as services, spaces, and activities such as health, childcare, and elderly care that used to be "public" in industrialized welfare states are now privatized (Eisenstein, 1996). Another point raised by feminist critiques regarding this division is its separative connotation between the state, the market sector, and the provision of welfare services and the patriarchal separation (Lister, 1997).

Such symbolic spaces of private and public are mostly relevant with regard to the practicalities of gendered belonging, as they play major roles in the construction and defense of cultural and ethnic collectivities. They are often the symbol of a particular national collectivity, its roots and spirit (Yuval Davis, 1997). Therefore, women's spatial mobility is very much dictated if not controlled by these cultural symbolic meanings of space. In this way, cultural and ethnic norms create "spaces of belonging and dis-belonging" which then become, for example, forbidden and permitted spaces for women in certain cultures (Fenster, 1998, 1999b). The boundaries of these spaces are usually dictated by the *male* "cultural guards" of society (Fenster, 1999b).

How is space culturally constructed as an entity in which women and men feel a sense of belonging or dis-belonging? First and foremost, it is the very intimate space – our bodies – that is culturally constructed (Sibley, 1995). This means that norms of cleanliness, dirt, odor, and modes of dressing which reflect values of shame and disgrace with the body covering actually become norms of inclusion and exclusion. Bourdieu (1984) analyzes the importance of cultural notions of an "appropriate" performance of the self. He argues that "the body is the most indisputable materialization of class taste" (Bourdieu, 1984). He developed the concept "habitus" to describe the distinguishing aspects of behavior, taste, and consumption which are combined to create flexible, rather than rigid, categories of "class." These categories reproduce themselves by display of certain tastes and the foundations of the body, its size, volume, demeanor, ways of eating and drinking, walking, sitting, speaking, etc. It is through the bodyspace that certain cultural habits are transformed depending on one's own identity and class – and gender. Thus, through body activities the boundaries between private and public and between who belongs and who does not are underlined. "Eating, like the other sin of the flesh, sex, has

been constructed as a notoriously privatized activity" (Valentine, 1998). It belongs to the home or any other "privatized spaces" within the public domain but not to the street. Valentine argues that the custom of eating serves to regulate the boundary between the "private" and the "public" and what is "forbidden" or "permitted" in those spaces.

In what follows we analyze how these binary categorizations effect daily practices of women in men in London and Jerusalem.

Gendered Belonging and Memory

My home, memory, ownership, family, friends . . . I don't belong anywhere else.

This was Aziza's response to the question "What makes you feel you belong to your home?" Aziza defines herself as a Palestinian. She lives in West Jerusalem. She has Israeli citizenship although she doesn't identify herself as an Israeli. What are her reflections on her sense of belonging?

In spite of the associations of "belonging" in "the holy city" of Jerusalem with notions of sacredness, rituality, religious territoriality, and conflicts, we can identify in Aziza's narrative the meanings of "everyday belonging," the private secular sense of belonging. Aziza actually related to the multidimensional meanings of this sentiment. As a Palestinian citizen of Israel she talks about her home and associates it with memory. It could be her personal home but perhaps she also related to a national communal "home," a place of belonging and memory for the Palestinians in their homes before 1948 when the state of Israel was established.[1] Her personal sense of belonging here is associated with notions of nationalism and citizenship. We have elaborated earlier on the connections between belonging and citizenship. Here we can mention another dimension of belonging which is associated with nationalism, a link that has gained attention in the literature especially with regard to the discourse around citizenship and human rights of indigenous people (Fenster, 1999a; Read, 2000; Yuval Davis, 2003). Belonging in this respect is linked to notions of participation and inclusion in the construction of citizenship identity and membership in one's own nation. The notions "politics of belonging" and "politics of recognition" are related to such a rationalization.

Aziza also mentions belonging as associated with ownership. In this context, a sense of belonging to the physical environment can also be associated with an emotional attachment created between a person and a physical place which is based on the person's subjective meanings of that place. Belonging here is linked to its material and physical aspect. In addition, Aziza mentions a sense of belonging as connected to family and friends. Belonging here is linked to the people living at home more than to the physical home. Aziza finally says: "I don't belong anywhere else." Indeed, the notion of belonging is associated with the discussion on inclusion and exclusion, issues that are developed below.

For Suna, an Egyptian living in London, belonging is also multilayered. She says: "Belonging is very complex, subtle, nothing concrete, often it is familiarity with, memory from childhood with palm trees, I feel more belong [to the childhood landscape] as it is more familiar to me" (Suna, forties, single, Egyptian (British), London, July 29, 1999). Here Suna connects belonging to the notion of memory. It is perhaps

one of the most explicit expressions of a sense of belonging and a part of one's own identity. Memory is either "real" – that is, a personal memory of childhood's reminiscences – or it is a "symbolic memory" – which in the narrative of another woman, Eleonore, consists of memories of ancestral graves:

> No sense of belonging to the house I live in . . . I have a deep sense of belonging to the town of my family where "the graves are" – there I feel rooted, sense of belonging to where my mom lives. . . . I ask myself "where do I belong?" and I don't know! (Eleonore, fifties, single, British-White, London, September 1, 1999)

Sandercock (1998) connects belonging and life in the cosmopolitan city. She mentions three elements in the city which are crucial for creating a feeling of belonging: city of memory, city of desire, and city of spirit:

> Memory, both individual and collective, is deeply important to us. It locates us as part of something bigger than our individual existences, perhaps makes us seem less insignificant, sometimes gives us at least partial answers to questions like: "Who I am?" and "Why am I like I am?" Memory locates us, as part of family history, as part of a tribe or community, as a part of city building and nation making. Loss of memory is, basically a loss of identity. (Sandercock, 1998, p. 207)

Memory in fact creates and consists of a sense of belonging. It could be a short-term memory based on intimate knowledge, which builds upon everyday life practices, of daily use of the streets, the paths, the pedestrians, and the city center. This is a corporal memory because it engages bodily experiences in using these spaces: walking, driving, cycling. It is also an identity-related memory as it engages experiences affected by one's own identities as a woman, gay, black, disabled, etc. Memory is also long term. It goes back to the past and consists of an accumulation of little events from the past, our childhood experiences, our personal readings and reflections on specific spaces, which are associated with significant events in our personal history. Such memories build up a sense of belonging to those places where these events took place. Thus Suna, who is an immigrant living in London, develops a sense of belonging and attachment to her childhood places, where her past memories took place, as a major part of her identity. This role of memory as part of one's own identity or as part of a collective identity of the community is becoming more and more evident in people's narratives:

> What makes me belong to my home is the people I love and they love me, the objects I love, colors, things which are part of my past – experiences, part of my home in me. (Suzana, thirties, married with one child, Israeli-Jewish, Jerusalem, July 13, 2000)

> I feel I belong to the Old city of Jerusalem as it brings memories from school days and boarding school, we used to go there every week. It makes me feel connected, it brings memories of my school days, in front of the Orient house. I used this area a lot in my life. (Saida, thirties, single, Palestinian-Muslim-Arab, Jerusalem, December 30, 2000)

For both Suzana and Saida memory becomes part of their own identity but also part of their collective identity. For Saida in particular, who as a Palestinian currently lives in what she experiences as daily oppressions and humiliations, memory

to places she "territorialized" in her everyday practices in childhood is almost the only possibility to feel attached and connected to the city. Because of the political situation in Jerusalem her past memories become the essence of belonging to the city more than her current rather limited everyday practices.

Claim, Belonging, and Exclusion in Public Spaces

Can claim to a space be perceived as a form of belonging? A claim over "public" space is one of the expressions of belonging in everyday life. Such a claim is usually "informal," taking place as part of casual daily encounters between people or groups. It usually takes place when individuals wish to appropriate sections of public settings for various reasons, sometimes to achieve intimacy or anonymity or for social gatherings, which are mostly temporary. Claim and appropriation of space are a construct of everyday walking practices that de Certeau notes. These practices, which are repetitive, connect belonging with what is labeled by Viki Bell (1999) as performativity. Performativity means a replication and repetition of certain practices and it is associated with ritualistic repetitions with which communities colonize various territories. These performances are acted in certain spaces and through them a certain attachment and belonging to place is developed (Leach, 2002).

Space-claiming is also a class issue. It can take various forms of appropriation and territorialization. These are the implicit but sometimes explicit rules of inclusion and exclusion that play a role in the structuring of society and space in a way which some find oppressive and others appealing. One such example is the big shopping malls in many cities around the world, which are actually meant to serve the needs of certain groups in society while making efforts to exclude others (youth, poor, lower class, blacks, immigrants, etc.), and achieve that by introducing a lesser or a greater degree of surveillance. Public parks in big cities are another example of public spaces which are "appropriated" by middle-class people, excluding the poor and the homeless (Zukin, 1997). These spaces are usually guarded and watched with the intention of excluding those who are not following the norms. Thus, as Yuval Davis (2003, p. 3) mentions, "the politics of belonging form norms of inclusion and/or exclusion that result out of boundary formation which differentiates between those who belong and those who do not, determine and color the meaning of the particular belonging." The "boundaries of belonging" are usually symbolic and they may change according to the needs and goals of the hegemony. The power to exclude, which is based on "the boundaries of belonging," becomes in many cities the power of urban planning, of monopolizing space through zoning, and the relegation of weaker groups in society to less desirable and attractive spaces (see Fenster, 2004).

Do the narratives of belonging as related to public spaces refer to any of the above notions of "everyday walking practices," "performativity and belonging," "senses of exclusion and inclusion"? Let us look at how people in the two cities narrate their sense of belonging, especially as related to their neighborhoods. In both cities people associated a strong sense of belonging with a desire for homogeneity. This is the case in both secular and ultra orthodox neighborhoods in Jerusalem, and in Banglatown in London, a neighborhood that mirrors the cultural sense of belonging of its Bangladeshi residents.

How do the Bangladeshi people, for example, express their sense of belonging to their London neighborhood? In spite of the fact that they usually express ambivalent feelings toward a sense of belonging to their home in London (see elaboration in the next section), they feel a strong sense of belonging to their neighborhood sometimes more than to their home. This is because the Bangladeshi community in the East End of London have formulated a community or a "network of belonging" similar to what they had back home in the Sylhet district in Bangladesh (Forman, 1989). The social composition of the residents of the Brick Lane–Spitalfields area is made out of people from nearby villages from the same district in Bangladesh. This is probably why Ahmed, who has lived in the area for the past 30 years, says: "Yes, I feel belong to the Brick Lane area but sometimes I feel that this is actually part of Bangladesh. I live in this area and the family who live below us is from my village, the other family is from the next village and so on" (Ahmed, forties, married with six children, Bangladeshi-British, London, August 7, 2001).

The Bangladeshi immigrants have formulated their own "networks of belonging" in the global city – London. It is a neighborhood-oriented network and it keeps their old community ties and their imagined sense of belonging to their homeland. Elsewhere (Fenster, 2004) I have elaborated on how "physical spaces of belonging" have been created by the Bengali people in "Banglatown" constructing spaces and services that serve the cultural and ethnic needs of the community, such as food stores, traditional cloth shops, street names in Bengali, music stores, mosques, and travel agencies for their frequent travels to Bangladesh. Banglatown has become in many ways a representation of spatial belonging and difference, mostly dictated and shaped by the males in the Bangladeshi society, leaving the women to their private domains. This is expressed in the dominant presence of men in the streets of Banglatown. Women also walk in the streets but it is primarily male space. The fact that most Bangladeshi women are dressed traditionally also makes it a restricted space for women; that is, for most of them the traditional dress, which is dictated and guarded by the males, is a prerequisite for their walking in public spaces.

Similarly, the ultra orthodox neighborhoods in Jerusalem can also be seen as a reflection of belonging but, as seen later, these formations of spatial belonging exclude women especially because of their clothing; in contrast, the Bangladeshi in Banglatown don't seclude people of other cultures and don't enforce their norms and traditions as much as the ultra orthodox people do in their neighborhoods in Jerusalem. Walking in the Brick Lane area one can notice the mixture of women's clothing. Some Bangladeshi women are dressed traditionally but other women are dressed in Western style. It is the same as in other public spaces such as Hyde Park in London, which is used by a mixture of people of different identities, such as the Arab Muslim population who live nearby and people of other identities who equally share the use of these public spaces.

In Jerusalem, the ultra orthodox sense of belonging is more gender-exclusive. In these neighborhoods, it is women's clothing that becomes the most explicit and visible element of exclusion. It reflects cultural norms and determines where it is forbidden for women to go if they are not dressed according to the specific norms dominant at these spaces. This situation is echoed in women's narratives. All the women we interviewed living in Jerusalem, Jewish and Palestinians alike, mentioned

the *Mea Shearim* (Hebrew for one hundred gates) neighborhood of the ultra orthodox Jews as the place with extreme expressions of spatial *exclusion* and a space most forbidden for them. The "guards of honor" do not trust women's own judgment as to what "modest clothing" means and therefore they elaborate: "long sleeved shirt," "no trousers," "no tight skirts," etc. In some of the shops there is a clear sign saying: "It is forbidden for women dressed immodestly to enter this shop" (see elaboration in Fenster, 2004, forthcoming).

Immigrants and Indigenous Gendered Belonging

The articulation of "belonging at home" for the Bangladeshi immigrants living in London sheds another light on the different meanings of a sense of belonging for immigrants and a sense of belonging for indigenous people. *The meaning of belonging at home* is a complicated issue for them to define. As immigrants they perceive "home" not as a house or a flat but more as homeland; home is perceived as an emotional place, not as a physical one. Those who were born in Bangladesh and came to London during the 1970s as children find it hard to relate to the notion of belonging at home in its narrow meaning.

"Home is home there because we are here for economic reasons," says Harun, who is in his forties, married with five children, and who has lived in London for the past 38 years (London, August 7, 2001). He defines his identity as British-Bengali-Muslim. He didn't choose to live in London, he came as a child and stayed because of what he termed "economic reasons," and also because his children were born and live in London and will not go back to Bangladesh. He represents a generation of Bangladeshi who feel trapped between worlds. They didn't choose to move to London and now they can't go back: "We are trapped in a time zone. We can't go forward and not backward" (London, August 7, 2001).

Both Harun's emotional "imagined" home back in Bangladesh and his "real" home in London are places where he doesn't feel he belongs. He can't live in Bangladesh anymore but he doesn't feel "at home" in London. He feels neither British nor Bangladeshi. He is "in-between-homes." A sense of belonging for an immigrant is therefore an ambivalent issue and as such it is different from a sense of belonging of indigenous people such as Hassan. He is a Palestinian who lives in the Old City of Jerusalem in a house that has belonged to his family for the last 600 years. Hassan is in his forties, married with four children. He says: "the house is part of me – the house is me" (Jerusalem, May 3, 2001). For Hassan a sense of belonging to the house is deeply rooted in the chain-history of his family. He says he will never sell the house although it is too small for the whole family because it is part of him, of his identity. Two identities, immigrant identity and indigenous identity, construct two forms of belonging: a dialectic sense of belonging of an immigrant who is also a member of cultural minority, and in contrast a strong sense of belonging of an indigenous person who expresses a strong bonding to his home and city. The two men feel the same sense of belonging to their homeland and home; the difference is that the Bangladeshi left his home and the Palestinian stayed.

As we notice, these are male expressions of belonging, while the voices of Bangaldeshi women are somewhat left out in these narratives. When I asked my

Bangladeshi male interviewees if I could interview their wives they said it is a bit complicated because their wives are not used to talking to strangers and their English is not good enough. From conversations with them I understood that for the Bengali men to allow their wives to meet an "outsider" is probably something that threatens the patriarchal norms in their society. Thus the most clear expression of patriarchy in this research is probably in the absent voices of the Bangladeshi women. Their absence is actually a reflection of their non-appearance in public activities and spaces in the global city of London.

But patriarchy doesn't remain private. It has its explicit expressions in the shaping of public spaces as well. As mentioned elsewhere (Fenster, 2004), patriarchy raises its head when the city's planning, management, and network decline. Several Palestinian women experience a much more rigid and fierce patriarchal atmosphere in the streets of East Jerusalem now than before the Infifada. It is not that the atmosphere in East Jerusalem before this last Intifada (the Palestinian uprising which began in 2000) was totally inviting for women, as patriarchy existed then as well, but lately it became more explicit and rude because of the city's decline, which is very much connected to discriminatory politics of planning and development.[2]

As mentioned above, patriarchy is also visible in the streets of Banglatown in London, and there it is reflected in Muslim women's traditional clothing and head cover and their absence from the public sphere. This is, however, a different type of patriarchy, connected to intercommunity cultural values more than to the ways the "politics of planning" and city management perpetuate these norms in public spaces. Thus the two groups of women, the Bangladeshi and the Palestinian, live in cities which are famous for their flows of commodities, communications, capital, and corporations, yet their lives and the intersection between their cultural and social duties at home and the possibilities of exploiting the choices that the city provides are still very limited.

Finally, a different scale of a sense of belonging is associated with food and spices that are identity-related, especially among immigrants:

> And the spices that I usually eat and cook with . . . Indian spices that you can get everywhere . . . I learnt the names of the spices in English only five years ago when I arrived in London because at home [Canada] I would shop in Indian shops – food makes me feel I belong. (Mandy, 28, single, Canadian-Indian, Jerusalem, June 16, 2000)[3]

One of the first things that immigrants establish when they arrive in a new country is the ethnic food stores that sell specific food and spices. Sandercock (2000) calls this "market mechanisms," which also include services such as lawyers, tax accountants, and shoe repair. London has been famous for its large variety of food stores and restaurants that provide food from around the world. This is one of the consequences of the "Ethno-towns" such as Chinatown and Banglatown, and the broad variety of restaurants and supermarkets established in these areas, which sell food and spices from their places of origin. Jerusalem too has a large selection of ethnic restaurants and places to find peculiar spices. The Old City Markets are known for their diversity of spices, especially those associated with Oriental cuisine. When Mandy was interviewed she lived in Jerusalem and she enjoyed the wide range of spices suitable for her own cultural food, Indian cuisine.

Conclusions

This chapter exposes the multilayered nature of gendered belonging in the city. As analyzed above, a sense of belonging can be a personal, intimate, and private sentiment as well as a formal, official, public-oriented recognition of belonging. This chapter thus conceptualizes the different "formations of belonging," both the collective and the personal. Let us conclude the various meanings of belonging as they were highlighted in people's narratives:

- *Belonging as a form of citizenship* is one of the more common interpretations of this term. Official belonging is usually formalized in patterns of citizenship. In Jerusalem, forms of belonging and citizenship are connected to the abuse of human and citizen rights of the Palestinians living in the city, usually by means of politics of planning and development that promote Jewish interests.
- *Belonging and walking practices*. Repetitive daily walking practices are one of the mechanisms of creating an "everyday" sense of belonging. We all belong because we all have repetitive daily uses of city spaces by foot or car or public transportation. Our daily practices help us to draw our "private city" and to underline the intimate allies and paths that we use in our daily practices in the city. Walking practices are usually gendered, as women's daily walking routine is usually dictated by their household gendered divisions of roles, e.g. taking care of the children, doing the shopping, working in the vicinity to the home. This is usually more explicit for young mothers who walk with baby strollers, and for dog owners, whose daily repetitive practices create their sense of belonging to the environment.
- *A sense of belonging is associated with memory*. The place one was born in, the family one belongs to, deeply shape a sense of belonging. Other aspects of belonging are changing: places of living, homes, and neighborhoods. Some components of belonging are short term, while others are based on long-term memories, such as childhood memories. Belonging has its personal aspects, belonging to places and people that are connected to personal experiences, personal memories. A sense of belonging is also collective. It is based on collective memories and shared symbolism of a community. Its significance in one's own life is a result of one's own affiliations, beliefs, and ideology.
- *A gendered sense of belonging is about power relations and control*, even in intimate and private spaces such as home. The larger the category of space the more significant is the role of power relations on one's own feelings of belonging. In public spaces power relations are identified as "claim," "appropriation," "exclusion," "discrimination." Power relations also dictate "the boundaries of belonging." They are formed by the hegemony and exclude the "other," those that are not considered by the hegemony to be part of it, such as Palestinians in Jerusalem and to a lesser extent Bangladeshis in London. The latter feel excluded from the boundaries of Englishness but they do feel included within the "boundaries of Britishness." A sense of belonging and power relations are associated with the "private" – the power to exclude – and the "public" – the power to gain access.
- *"The right to belong"* can be identified as the right of people of different identities to be recognized and the right to take part in civil society in spite of one's

own identity differences, what Sandercock (2000) terms "the right to difference." The right to belong in contested spaces can be perceived as a deeper expression of "citizenship in the global city." The right to belong relates to the situations where one's own rights to equality and one's own rights to maintain identity difference are fulfilled. These rights are connected to communities' privileges to maintain their sites of memory and commemoration and these sites are acknowledged and preserved by politics of planning and development.

- *Belonging and urban planning*. An important connection between a sense of belonging at home and urban planning is the association of order and belonging. Deciding upon the order of things is actually one of the basic activities of physical planning on each level of space and the more people are involved in the decision-making about "the order of functions" in their own street, neighborhood, or even city center the deeper the sense of belonging they develop to these environments. Urban planning is the field where expressions of spatial citizenships and belonging are made. As elaborated in the chapter, Jerusalem's "politics of planning and development" is a tragic example of abuse of formations of citizenship and belonging in the field of urban planning.

NOTES

1 The Palestinians in Jerusalem make up 32 percent of Jerusalem's total population, which was in the year 2000 657,500 inhabitants, 11 per cent of Israel's total population. Jerusalem is the capital and the largest city in Israel, extending over 1.26 million hectares. It consists of the West (predominantly Jewish) and the East (predominantly Palestinian). East Jerusalem was occupied and annexed after the 1967 war by Israeli law, bringing it under its sovereignty and taking the whole and unified Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The Palestinians reject the city's unification by force and see East Jerusalem only as their capital, although using West Jerusalem services. Because of its uncertain status as the capital of Israel in the eyes of international law, the municipality and the Israeli government's "politics of planning and development" in the city has been targeted to maintain a Jewish majority there in what is termed "the battle over demography." The demographic balance in the year 2000 shows the success of these policies: 68 percent of the city's population are Jews, 32 percent are Palestinians.

2 As mentioned before, policies of discrimination against the Palestinians in Jerusalem derive from one of the main targets of the policies of planning and development in Jerusalem, which is to maintain the Jewish majority in the city. The two main channels to realize this goal are a vast Jewish development and expansion and a lack of Palestinian development and improvement. The result is that although Israeli governments declare Jerusalem as united, the city is managed from only one side (Yiftachel and Yacobi, 2002). This means that urban governance, urban economies, and services are targeted on the Jewish inhabitants in spite of the fact that the Palestinians consist of nearly a third of its population. Practically speaking, most economic and planning efforts are targeted on expanding and modernizing Jewish areas as part of the policy of Judaization of large parts of East Jerusalem and its surrounding hills. The means to achieve this goal are many: expropriating Palestinian lands, construction of Jewish neighborhoods or settlements on these lands, restrictions on Palestinian building and land use through the adoption of planning policies, residency regulations and other measures, determining restricted housing capacity for the Palestinian population while encouraging the Jewish population by means of financial subsidies to move to Jerusalem, declaring "open landscapes areas"

near existing Palestinian villages, thus preventing their natural expansion, declaring houses already built in these areas as illegal, and at the same time building Jewish neighborhoods on areas previously declared as green areas.

3 Mandy was living at the time of interview in Jerusalem but has studied before in London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Be'tselem (1997) *A Policy of Discrimination: Land Expropriation, Planning and Building in East Jerusalem*. Jerusalem: Be'tselem.

Bell, V. (1999) Performativity and belonging: an introduction. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16(2), 1–10.

Bollens, S. (2000) *On Narrow Ground: Urban Policy and Ethnic Conflict in Jerusalem and Belfast*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

Bunch, C. (1995) Transforming human rights from a feminist perspective. In J. Peters and A. Wolper (eds), *Women's Rights, Human Rights*. New York: Routledge.

Cheshin, A., Hutman, B. and Melamed, A. (2000) *Separated and Unequal: The Inside Story of Israeli Rule in East Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Charlesworth, H. (1995) What are women's international human rights? In R. Cook (ed.), *Human Rights of Women*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Cook, R. (1995) Women's International human rights: the way. In R. Cook (ed.), *Human Rights of Women*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Crang, M. (1998) Cultural Geography, London: Routledge.

de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Eisenstein, Z. (1996) Women's publics and the search for new democracies. Paper presented at the conference: Women, Citizenship and Difference, London, July.

Fainstein, S. (1994) *The City Builders*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fenster, T. (1998) Ethnicity, citizenship and gender: the case of Ethiopian immigrant women in Israel. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 5(2), 177–89.

Fenster, T. (1999a) Culture, human rights and planning (as control) for minority women in Isreal In T. Fenster (ed.), *Gender, Planning and Human Rights*. London: Routledge.

Fenster, T. (1999b) Space for Gender: cultural roles of the forbidden and the permitted. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17, 227–46.

Fenster, T. (2001) planning, culture, knowledge and control: minority women in Israel. In O. Yiftachel, J. Little, D. Hedgcock, I. Alexander (eds), *The Power of Planning*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Fenster, T. (2004) *The Global City and the Holy City: Narratives on Planning, Knowledge and Diversity*. London: Pearson.

Fenster, T. (forthcoming) Globalization, gendered exclusions and city planning and management: beyond tolerance in Jerusalem and London. *Hagar – International Social Science Review*, in the press.

Forman, C. (1989) *Spitalfields: A Battle for Land*. London: Hilary Shipman.

Fullilove, M. T. (1996) Psychiatric implications of displacement: contributions from the psychology of place. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 153(12), 1516–22.

Hyndman, J. (2003) Beyond either/or: a feminist analysis of September 11th. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 2(1), 1–13.

Jacobs, J. M. (1996) *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London: Routledge.

Kofman, E. (1995) Citizenship for some but not for others: spaces of citizenship in contemporary Europe. *Political Geography*, 14, 121–37.

Leach, N. (2002) Belonging: towards a theory of identification with space. In J. Hillier and E. Rooksby (eds), *Habitus: A Sense of Place*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Lefebvre, H. (1992) *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Lister, R. (1997) *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.
MacDowell, L. (1999) City life and difference: negotiating diveristy. In J. Allen, D. Massey and M. Pryke (eds), *Unsettling Cities*. London: Routledge.
Marshall, T. H. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marshall, T. H. (1975) *Social Policy in the Twentieth Century*. London: Hutchinson.
Marshall, T. H. (1981) *The Right to Welfare and Other Essays*. London: Heinemann.
Massey, D. (1994) *Space, Place and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Painter, J. and Philo, C. (1995) Spaces of citizenship: an introduction. *Political Geography*, 14, 107–20.
Pateman, C. (1988) *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Pateman, C. (1989) *The Disorder of Women*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Pile, S. (1996) *The Body and the City*. London: Routledge.
Raban, J. (1974) *Soft City*. London: Harvill Press.
Read, P. (2000) *Belonging: Australians, Place and Aboriginal Ownership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Romann, M. and Weingrod, A. (1991) *Living Together Separately*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis*. London: Wiley.
Sandercock, L. (2000) When strangers become neighbours: managing cities of difference. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 1(1), 13–30.
Sibley, D. (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion*. London: Routledge.
Simith, N. (1994) Marxist geography. In D. Gregory, R. Johnston and D. Smith (eds), *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Thornley, A. (ed.) (1992) *The Crisis of London*. London: Routledge.
Valentine, G. (1998) Food and the production of the civilized street. In N. R. Fyfe (ed.), *Images of the Street*. London: Routledge.
Yiftachel, O. and Yacobi, H. (2002) Planning a bi-national capital: should Jerusalem remain united? *Geoform*, 33, 137–45.
Yuval Davis, N. (1997) *Gender and Nation*. London: Sage.
Yuval Davis, N. (2003) Belongings: in between the indegene and the diasporic. In U. Ozkirimli (ed.), *Nationalism in the 21st Century*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
Zukin, S. (1997) *The Cultures of Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.