

THE POSSIBILITIES OF ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS IN
THE GLOBALIZATION PROCESS

KÜRESELLEŞME SÜRECİNDE ALTERNATİF VATANDAŞLIK
KAVRAMLARININ İMKANLARI

BÜLENT UĞUR BAL

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat Borovalı (Tez Danışmanı) :
Doç. Dr. Ayhan Kaya :
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar Uyan :

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih :

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 93

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

- 1) Küreselleşme
- 2) Modern Vatandaşlık
- 3) Ulus Devlet
- 4) Küreselleşmenin Çoğul Süreçleri
- 5) Alternatif Vatandaşlık Kavramları

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

- 1) Globalization
- 2) Modern Citizenship
- 3) Nation State
- 4) Multiple Processes of Globalization
- 5) Alternative Concepts of Citizenship

To My Family

ABSTRACT

The main concern of this thesis is to examine the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts in the globalization process. In this respect, it is argued that the comprehensive globalization process has both challenged the constrained nature of modern citizenship and opened up a convenient ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts. In order to elaborately analyzing these effects of globalization, this thesis conceptualizes it as the totality of multiple processes rather than an unique process. In this context, three processes of globalization (the processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, cultural denationalization, deindustrialization) have played a central role within the context of debate of alternative citizenship concepts. Firstly, the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation which define the current erosion of the nation-state monopoly over the political power have challenged the national-belonging aspect of modern citizenship. Besides, this process has introduced a convenient ground to discuss the new citizenship concepts (European, Global/Cosmopolitan, Urban citizenships), based on the new forms of belonging and set of rights and duties. Secondly, the cultural denationalization process which defines the current erosion of culturally and linguistically assimilative power of nation-state has challenged the individual rights aspect of modern citizenship. Besides, this process has introduced a convenient ground to rethink the vitality of group rights-based multicultural citizenship. Thirdly, the deindustrialization process which defines the transferring manufacturing base of global capitalism from the core-capitalist countries to semi-peripheral, peripheral ones has laid foundation for the mobilization of political opposition around the new social movements. So, the new social movements-based alternatives (Radical Democratic, Ecological citizenships) have appeared to extend the content of citizenship concept towards the new social concerns of post-industrial society (the issues of ecology, gender and ethnicity).

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, küreselleşme sürecinde alternatif vatandaşlık kavramlarının imkanlarını tartışmayı amaç edinmiştir. Bu bağlamda, küreselleşmenin hem modern dönemin başat kurumlarından biri olan modern vatandaşlığın sınırlı doğasına meydan okuyan, hem de alternatif yurttaşlık kavramlarının imkanlarını tartışmaya yönelik uygun bir alan açan kapsamlı bir süreç olduğu iddia edilmektedir. Küreselleşmenin bu yöndeki etkilerini daha ayrıntılı kavrayabilmek adına, bu olgu, yekpare bir süreçten daha ziyade çoğul süreçlerin toplamı olarak kavramsallaştırılmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, “alternatif vatandaşlık kavramlarının imkanları” tartışmasında önem arz eden küreselleşme olgusuyla ilintili üç farklı süreç dikkate alınmıştır: birbirilerine bağımlı olarak yol alan siyasal iktidarın mekansızlaşması ve mekansal olarak yeniden örgütlenmesi süreçleri, ulusal kültürün çözülüş süreci ve endüstrisizleşme süreci. Birinci olarak, siyasal iktidar üzerindeki ulus devlet tekelinin çözülüşünü tanımlayan siyasal iktidarın mekansızlaşması ve mekansal olarak yeniden örgütlenmesi süreçlerinde, modern yurttaşlığın ulusal aidiyet boyutu erozyona uğratılmaktadır. Böylece, bu süreçler, yeni aidiyet biçimlerine ve yeni hak ve sorumluluk setlerine dayanan, Avrupa Vatandaşlığı, Kent Vatandaşlığı, Küresel/Kosmopolitan Vatandaşlık gibi yeni alternatif kavramları tartışmaya yönelik uygun bir alan açmaktadır. İkinci olarak, Ulus Devletin kültürel ve dilsel açıdan farklı olanı benzeştirme yeteneğinin erozyona uğradığı ulusal kültürün çözülüş sürecinde, modern yurttaşlık bireysel haklar yönüyle birleştirici özelliği kaybetmektedir. Bu bağlamda, bu süreç, topluluk temelli haklar fikrine dayanan Çokkültürlü Vatandaşlık kavramını yeniden güncel kılmıştır. Üçüncü olarak, küresel kapitalizmin emek yoğun sektörlerinin merkez kapitalist ülkelerden yarı-çevre ve çevre ülkelere kayışını ifade eden endüstrisizleşme sürecinde, gelişmiş kapitalist ülkelerde siyasal muhalefet yeni toplumsal hareketler etrafında şekillenmeye başlamıştır. Gelişmiş kapitalist ülkelerdeki siyasal muhalefetin doğasıyla ilgili bu değişim, sanayi-sonrası topluma içkin duyarlılıkları (ekolojik, toplumsal cinsiyet, etnisite vb. konular) kucaklayacak Radikal Demokratik Vatandaşlık, Ekolojik Vatandaşlık gibi yeni toplumsal hareketler temelli alternatiflerin ortaya çıkışını beraberinde getirmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Murat Borovalı for his valuable guidance and advises throughout the research.

I would like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Ayhan Kaya and Assist. Prof. Pınar Uyan for their valuable suggestions and comments.

I wish to express my gratitude to my father, Orhan Bal, my mother, Emine Nuray Bal, my older brother İlkey Bal, whose love and patience enabled me to complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE CONSTITUTION OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP.....	7
2.1. THE MAKING SENSE OF CITIZENSHIP AS A MODERN ARTIFACT.....	7
2.2. THE PHILOSOPHICAL GROUND OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: THE THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT AND IDEA OF NATURAL RIGHTS.....	16
2.3. THE SPATIAL GROUND OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: NATION- STATE.....	22
2.4. THE HIGHEST STAGE OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: WELFARE STATE.....	27
3. THE CHALLENGES OF COMPREHENSIVE GLOBALISATION PROCESS TO THE MODERN CITIZENSHIP.....	36
3.1. THE MAKING SENSE OF GLOBALISATION AS THE MULTIPLE PROCESSES.....	36

3.2. DETERRITORIALISATION AND RETERRITORIALISATION PROCESSES, AND THE RISE OF MULTI-LEVEL POLITIES.....	
.....	38
3.3. CULTURAL DENATIONALISATION PROCESS AND THE RISE OF MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY	42
3.4. THE DEINDUSTRIALISATION PROCESS AND THE RISE OF NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.....	48
4. THE ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS IN THE GLOBALISATION PROCESS.....	53
4.1. CLASSIFYING ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS IN THE GLOBALISATION PROCESS.....	53
4.2 THE PROCESSES OF DETERRITORIALIZATION AND RETERRITORIALISATION, AND THE ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS TO TRANSCEND THE NATIONAL-BELONGING ASPECT OF THE MODERN CITIZENSHIP.....	54
4.2.1. EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP.....	55
4.2.2. GLOBAL/COSMOPOLITAN CITIZENSHIP.....	60
4.2.3. URBAN CITIZENSHIP.....	66
4.3. THE CULTURAL DENATIONALISATION PROCESS AND AN ALTERNATIVE CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP TO TRANSCEND THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS ASPECT OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: THE MULTICULTURAL CITIZENSHIP.....	68

4.3.1. MULTICULTURALCITIZENSHIP.....	69
4.4. DEINDUSTRIALISATION PROCESS AND THE NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS-BASED ALTERNATIVES AGAINST THE MODERN CITIZENSHIP.....	77
4.4.1. ECOLOGICALCITIZENSHIP.....	77
4.4.2. RADICAL DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP.....	79
5. CONCLUSION.....	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	90

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The citizenship has been one of the most significant concepts in the modern society. This concept can be briefly described as the collection of rights and duties which define the membership form of the political community. Besides, if we remember the fact that the political community is historically based on a set of exclusionary and inclusionary strategies, the citizenship is the key concept in terms of these founding strategies. Through this concept, the beneficiaries of scarce resources of the political community are determined. Due to this characteristic of citizenship, it becomes the focal point of the social struggles and conflicts throughout the history. Although the historical origins of citizenship trace back the Ancient Greco-Roman civilization, it has reached of its universal and comprehensive nature in the modern era. So, it could be identified as a modern artifact. This fact makes way for the conceptualization of “modern citizenship”.

The content of modern citizenship expanded within the political, legal confines of the nation-state. Moreover, in parallel to the rise of the nation-state as the dominant political organization of the modern world politics, the modern citizenship has turned into one of the major universal concepts which shaped the identity of modern individual. Today, a range of new social dynamics, such as the emergence of distinct belonging forms, social concerns and the categories of right have challenged the established representative power of modern citizenship on the individual (Üstel, 1999, p.13). In this thesis, by identifying these new social dynamics as reflections of the current globalization process, the challenges of this comprehensive process towards the modern citizenship are discussed. In this respect, it is argued that due to

its constrained nature, the modern citizenship has deprived of ability to overcome the problems imposed by the globalization process. However, as Turner (1994:198) argues, the citizenship is a dynamic concept which has been open to the new social developments. In this respect, a lot of distinct citizenship concepts have appeared in the literature of citizenship studies to transcend the constraints of modern citizenship against the challenges of globalization process. In the light of a strategy of selective literature review, this thesis chooses six cases from the literature of citizenship studies (European, World/Cosmopolitan, Urban, Multicultural, Radical Democratic, Ecological citizenships) in order to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts in the globalization process. So, drawing on the comprehensive examination of these six cases, this thesis sets out answering these research questions: in which spheres have these alternative concepts aimed at transcending the constrained nature of the modern citizenship? And, what extent have these alternative concepts offered the possibilities to transcend the constraints of modern citizenship in the globalization process?

This thesis asserts that firstly, the clarification of the constrained nature of modern citizenship is essential to answer these research questions. In this regard, the constitution of modern citizenship is critically examined in the second chapter of this thesis. And, it is claimed that the constitution of modern citizenship can be discussed in the modern era within three different contexts: the theory of social contract and idea of natural rights, the nation-state and the welfare state. After determining three constitutive bases of modern citizenship, the first of them, the theory of social contract and idea of natural rights are conceptualized as the philosophical ground of modern citizenship. Moreover, the contributions of these political theories to the rights and the individualism aspects of modern citizenship are revealed. Secondly,

the nation-state is conceptualized as the spatial ground of modern citizenship. In the modern era, the political community corresponds to the nation-state. And, the modern citizenship defines as the collection of rights and duties which shaped the membership form of nation-state as a political community. Like the previous political community practices, the political, legal boundaries of the nation-state are determined by a set of inclusionary and exclusionary strategies. In terms of these strategies, the modern citizenship has been as the key concept. However, in relation to the peculiarities of the formation process of nation-states, the practice of modern citizenship has become different from one nation-state to another. In this respect, the citizenship practices of distinct nation-states are examined in the concerning section of this chapter. Thirdly, the phenomenon of welfare-state is conceptualized as the highest stage of modern citizenship. In the aftermath of the attachment of welfare provisions to the capitalist state mechanism in the second half of the Twentieth-Century, the advanced capitalist societies entered into the era of welfare capitalism in which both the content of modern citizenship expanded in terms of the new category of social rights, and the major segments of advanced capitalist societies began to benefit from the new right categories of modern citizenship. In the further stage of this new era, the emergence of a range of new social dynamics, such as the rise of environmental, ethnicity, gender issues, have challenged to the political credibility of modern citizenship, based on the limited categories of civil, political, social rights.

In the third chapter of thesis, the challenges of the comprehensive globalization process towards the constrained nature of modern citizenship are examined. In order to elaborately analyzing these challenges, the globalization is conceptualized as the totality of multiple processes rather a unique process. In this context, it is argued that three processes of globalization, the processes of

deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, cultural denationalization and deindustrialization, have challenged the constrained nature of modern citizenship. On account of their erosive effects on the modern citizenship, they have introduced a convenient ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts. Firstly, the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation which define the erosion of the nation-state monopoly over the political power are examined. In a consequence of the assumptions of the dominant governing paradigm of the current globalization process, the neo-liberal governance, the supra-territorial and the sub-national polities have shared the political power of the nation-state today. So, the emergence of multi-level polities have both eroded the national-belonging aspect of modern citizenship and opened up a legitimate ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts (the European, World/Cosmopolitan, Urban citizenship), based on distinct belonging forms and the set of rights and duties.

Secondly, the cultural denationalization process which defines the current erosion of linguistically and culturally assimilative power of nation-state is analyzed. Due to the growing international mobility of people and cultural interchange in the globalization process, most of contemporary democratic societies have turned into the multicultural societies. In these societies, the traditional assimilative policies and institutions of the nation-state, such as the modern citizenship, have deprived of ability to integrate the immigrant and the indigenous-originated ethno-cultural communities towards the majority society. This process has introduced a convenient ground to rethink the vitality of group rights-based multicultural citizenship for the sake of the social cohesion of contemporary multicultural societies. Thirdly, the deindustrialization process which defines the transferring of manufacturing base of

global capitalism from the core capitalist countries to the semi-peripheral and peripheral ones is examined. As a result of this new reorganization of global capitalism, the proportion of working class in the contemporary advanced capitalist societies has dramatically decreased. In the absence of working-class based social movements, the political opposition has mobilized around the new social movements (ecological, radical student, immigrant, feminist movements) which have struggled for the extension of the constrained right categories of modern citizenship towards the environment, gender, ethnicity issues. This demand of the new social movements has opened up a legitimate ground to discuss the new alternatives, such as the Radical Democratic and Ecological citizenships.

In the fourth chapter of thesis, six alternative citizenship concepts (European, Global /Cosmopolitan, Urban, Multicultural, Ecological, Radical Democratic Citizenships), which are classified in accordance with the three processes of globalization (deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, cultural denationalization, deindustrialization) are elaborately analyzed. Firstly, the European, Global/Cosmopolitan, Urban Citizenships which have gained significance in the processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation are discussed. In this respect, it is claimed that these concepts have aimed at transcending the national belonging aspect of modern citizenship. Secondly, the multicultural citizenship, which has regained vitality in the process of cultural denationalization, is discussed. In this context, it is argued that this concept has aimed at transcending the individual rights aspect of modern citizenship. Thirdly, the Radical Democratic and Ecological citizenships, have gained significance in the process of deindustrialization, are examined. They have been conceptualized as the new social movements-based alternatives which have aimed at the limited right categories of modern citizenship. In the conclusion (fifth chapter), in

the light of the outcomes of the discussions which were made in the three research chapters of thesis, the main research questions of thesis is set out being answered.

CHAPTER 2

THE CONSTITUTION OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP

In this chapter of thesis, the constitution of modern citizenship is examined. Before clarifying the constitutive bases of modern citizenship, the citizenship is firstly conceptualized as a modern artifact which is owed its existence to a range of distinct processes in the modern era. Following this fact, it is argued that the modern citizenship is constructed on three constitutive bases: the theory of social contract and idea of natural rights, the nation-state, and the welfare-state. Firstly, the theory of social contract and idea of natural rights are envisaged as the philosophical ground of modern citizenship. Secondly, the nation-state is conceptualized as the spatial-ground of modern citizenship. Thirdly, the welfare-state is envisaged as the highest stage of modern citizenship.

2.1. THE MAKING SENSE OF CITIZENSHIP AS A MODERN ARTIFACT

The concept of citizenship has reserved a significant place in the modern society. In the framework of a simply and uni-dimensional logic, this concept can be defined as “a bundle of entitlements and obligations which constitute individuals as fully fledged members of a socio-political community, providing them with access to scarce resources” (Turner, 1994, p.1).¹ Beyond this simplistic definition, citizenship is a very complicated concept that embraces a broad political, historical, sociological scope. Then, there has been a vast literature in the social sciences, called the “citizenship studies” to clarify the nature of this concept.

¹ The citizenship etymologically refers different meanings in the different languages. In French, citizenship (citoyen) refers the inhabitant of city. Similarly, in English, citizenship refers the inhabitant of city. On the contrary, in German, citizenship (bürger) is affiliated with the bourgeoisie (bürgertum). In this context, citizenship refers the individual who leaves from the protective family structure to attend the sphere of economic competition and struggle, the civil society. In this context, citizenship defines the membership of the bourgeois civil society (Üstel, 1999, p.58).

In the literature of citizenship studies, there have been a range of distinct and controversial approaches which sought to explain the constitution and the nature of this concept. However, the boundaries of this vast literature can be determined through visiting the major opposite intellectual poles. In this context, one of the most significant constitutive parts of this literature is the Marshall's and Mann's opposite citizenship definitions. According to the social liberal scholar, Marshall, citizenship has been as the collection of the right categories which are constituted from below.² The struggles of distinct social classes for acquiring rights have laid the foundation for the constitution of citizenship in an evolutionary process. So, in the eyes of Marshall, by integrating the distinct social classes towards the modern society, citizenship is functioned as an instrument of social cohesion in the modern era. On the other hand, Marxist scholar, Mann objects to the theoretical position of Marshall and argues that the concept of citizenship is the outcome of a ruling class –bourgeois- strategy which aims at masking the deep socio-economic inequalities fuelled by the industrial capitalism and domesticating the radicalized urban working class.³ So, in the eyes of Mann, citizenship is a concept which is constituted from above. And, by masking the deep socio-economic inequalities in the modern era, it functions in favor of the interests of bourgeoisie. As it was seen in the Marshall's and Mann's distinct citizenship definitions, citizenship is a very controversial and multi-dimensional phenomenon.

² For further information, see Marshall, T. Humphrey (1994) "Citizenship and Social Class", vol. I., in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

³ For further information see: Mann, Michael (1994) "Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship", vol.I, in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Another significant debate in the literature is concerned with the historical origins of citizenship. A group of scholars envisage this concept as an outcome of the philosophical legacy of the Ancient Greco-Roman civilization. Furthermore, they emphasize on the logical continuity in the philosophical sense between the citizenship practices of Ancient Greco-Roman civilization and the modern citizenship. An opposite group of scholars object to this theoretical position. And, they argued that concept of citizenship came into existence in consequence of a range of radical economical, political, philosophical transformations in the western world that we called them under the heading of modernity. In this context, they assert that the concept of citizenship is purely the actor of modernity (Turner, 1994, p.7-8).

The citizenship definition of Faulks, which could be classified within the theoretical position of the first group, gives a significant perspective to discuss the historical origins of this phenomenon. As Faulks (2000:28) argues, the nature of this phenomenon could be understood through examining the historical evolution of the relationship between the ruling and the ruled classes, in other words, the historical evolution of the concept of political community. In a historical account, the political community is based on some inclusionary and exclusionary practices. Within the framework of these exclusionary and inclusionary practices that form the political community, the beneficiaries of the scare resources are defined. In this respect, citizenship is a key concept in terms of these inclusionary and exclusionary practices. By citizenship phenomenon, the set of rules that determines the belonging relationship between individual and political community is defined.

The theoretical perspective of Faulks allows us to trace the historical origins of citizenship concept back the Ancient Greco-Roman civilization. We can find

citizenship as both a concept in the Ancient-Greco-Roman Philosophy and an institution in the Greek city-state or Roman Empire. In Ancient Greek civilization, the political community corresponds to city-state (polis). Furthermore, there were two distinct types of city-state model or two distinct types of relationship between the ruling and the ruled classes. The first model of city-state was Athens which was governed with the direct-democracy practice. In Athens, participating in the practice of direct-democracy was perquisite to be citizen. Second city-state model was Sparta which was governed with the authoritarian rules. In Sparta, the concept of citizenship is depended on the principle of loyalty. Individuals could obtain the status of citizenship in the event of they bravely fight for Sparta (Özkazanç, 1998, pp.74-5). It became apparent that there has been a logical similarity in the philosophical sense between the divergence points of Athens and Sparta city-state citizenships in the Ancient Greek civilization, and the divergence points of traditions of the civic-republican and the liberal-individualist citizenship in the modern era. The founding principles of Sparta citizenship is resembled with the tradition of civic-republican citizenship in modern era, based on the principles of the priority of social benefits and the primacy of the individual duties. Similarly, the founding principles of Athenian citizenship are resembled with the tradition of liberal-individualist citizenship, based on the principle of priority of the individual rights (Özkazanç, 1998, p. 76). For this reason, we could claim that the legacy of Ancient Greek civilization, to the some extent, contributed to the philosophical constitution of modern citizenship.

As it was revealed in the theoretical perspective of Faulks above, citizenship is the key concept for the exclusion and inclusion practices that form the political community. Following this theoretical perspective, it could be asserted that the

citizenship practices of Ancient Greek city-states contained an elitist nature, depending on the gender and class-based discrimination. In Ancient Greek city-states, the limited portion of society, which was composed of property-owner men, could acquire the status of citizenship. So, slaves, peasants, women and “barbarians” were excluded from acquiring the status of citizenship (Turner, 1990, p.211). The discriminatory, elitist understanding of citizenship in the Ancient Greek city-states could be seen in the statements of Ancient Greek philosophers. For example, Aristotle defined citizen as a man “who enjoyed the right of sharing in deliberative or judicial office”. And, citizens were those “all who shared in the civic life of ruling and being ruled in turn” (quoted in Heater, 1999, p.108). The citizenship definition of Aristotle implied in the practical sense that only property-owner men could have had the capacity to govern and in turn to be governed. Similar to the Ancient Greek city states, in Roman Empire, the acquisition of citizenship was defined in terms of the principle of property-ownership. So, the ruling class, patricians could have only acquired the status of citizenship. And, this discriminatory citizenship practice caused the political rebels of subordinate class, plebeians (Turner, 1999, p.211).

As it was discussed above, the historical origins of citizenship phenomenon traced back the Ancient Greco-Roman civilization. Nevertheless, the citizenship practice of this period consists of a quite exclusionary character and constrained nature. In this context, drawing on the theoretical position of second group of scholars in the debate of the historical origins of the citizenship concept, this thesis argues that the concept of citizenship reaches of its universal and comprehensive nature in the modern era. In order for supporting the validity of this argument, the most appropriate source of reference is the “citizenization” concept of Nispet. He (1994:14) argues that “citizenship in the West is more than simply a condition or status; it is a process, with

identifiable phases in time and with contexts in history which unite it in some degree with other processes such as secularism, individualism.” Attaching other significant historical transformations in the modern era, such as the birth of enlightenment thought, the rise of nation state to the definition of Nispet, we can exactly contextualize the “citizenization” as a multi-dimensional process in the modern era. Similar to Nispet, Heater (1999:63) explains the emergence of citizenship concept in the light of a range of significant historical transformations in modern era. These are, a) the radical liberal movement in England strengthening the tradition of political freedom and paving the way for the modernization in the parliamentary form of government; b) the industrial revolution and increasing political consciousness among the working class; c) the French Revolution and its results; d) socialist doctrines and movements, through having an ambivalent effect, on the one hand organizing the working class in parties and unions, on the other hand viewing the state-citizen relation as contrary to proletariat mentality; e) the German idealist philosophy, emphasizing the primacy of state and the ethical basis of duty, which have provided new sets of arguments on the relations between individual and state.

Drawing on the arguments of Nispet and Heater, it is argued in this chapter that the universal and comprehensive citizenship is a purely modern artifact. As a result of a range of historical transformations, the ruling practice and the concept of political community radically changed in the modern era. While individual, as a member of subject, was equalized as “nothing” in the hierarchical, static structure of the pre-modern society, he was legally equalized with the other members of the political community in the modern era under the status of citizenship, based on a framework of comprehensive rights and duties (Üstel, 1999, p.55).

The main claim of this chapter is that the constitution of modern citizenship could be discussed within three distinct contexts. These are the social contract theory of the enlightenment thought, the dominant political organization of the modern era, the nation- state and the welfare state of the Twentieth-Century. Firstly, the social contract theory of the enlightenment thought could be defined as the philosophical ground of the modern citizenship. The natural rights theoreticians of the enlightenment thought, such as Locke and Rousseau, laid the foundation for the theory of modern democracy by refusing the god-given and the hereditary political authority. And, they envisaged the constitution of political community on the basis of a social contract which was occurred between the sovereign and the individual. In the light of a social contract, the individual would transfer the political rights to the sovereign. In return, the sovereign would protect the natural, inevitable rights – right to property, life and liberty- of individual. The constitutional democratic systems of Europe which appeared in the aftermath of the bourgeois democratic revolutions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were mainly inspired by the social contract theory of natural rights theoreticians. Due to the emergence of these constitutional democratic systems, it was firstly codified in the modern history that every individual had a set of certain rights (natural rights) against the political authority. This early category of rights paved the way for the rights aspect of the modern citizenship. In this context, although the natural rights theoreticians, such as Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, rarely used the concept of citizenship in their studies, thanks to their contribution to the establishment of bourgeois democratic constitutional systems, the social contract theory of the enlightenment thought could be described as the philosophical ground in which modern citizenship was constituted.

Secondly, the dominant political organization of modern era, the nation-state could be described as the spatial-ground of the modern citizenship. In opposition to the previous political organizations in the pre-modern era, the model of the nation-state derived its legitimacy from a distinct and new principle: “the sovereignty rested on essentially the nation” Beginning with this new political organization, the concept of nation was firstly attached to the territorial state. And, the nation was envisaged as the political community of the nation state. In this context, nation, as a political community, was established on some inclusionary and exclusionary practices. In terms of these exclusionary and inclusionary strategies that drawn the boundaries of nation, the key concept was citizenship. Along with this concept, the set of rules that determined the membership status of nation was defined.

Thirdly, the welfare state of the Twentieth Century could be defined as the highest stage of modern citizenship. In relation to the development of welfare state in the advanced capitalist societies, both the content of modern citizenship expanded, and the vast segments of the modern society began to benefit from the extended right categories of the modern citizenship. In order to clarify the symbiotic relationship between the welfare state and the modern citizenship, the most appropriate source of reference was the sociological citizenship analysis of Marshall. By envisaging the modern citizenship as a body of rights and duties, he proposed to divide the concept into three parts; civil, political and social (Marshall, 1994, pp.9-11). According to his analysis, the rights aspect of modern citizenship has expanded in an evolutionary historical process. In this respect, he describes the evolution of citizenship rights from civil in the eighteenth century (freedom of speech, the right to own property) to political (right to elect and to be elected) in the nineteenth century, further to the social sphere (social security, economic rights) in the twentieth century. Following

the perspective of Marshall, it could be asserted that the modern citizenship reached of its the highest stage during the comprehensive welfare state of the twentieth century. The comprehensive welfare provisions were attributed to modern state mechanism in the post-Second World War era to legitimize the Keynesian demand-sided economy policies. In this new era, called “welfare capitalism”, the overwhelmingly majority of the advanced capitalist societies benefited from the social rights aspect of modern citizenship as a function of Keynesian demand-sided economy management. However, if we looked back the citizenship definition of Faulks, the modern citizenship was based on the some inclusionary and exclusionary strategies during the welfare capitalism as well. The boundaries of the modern citizenship in this new era were drawn by the economic rationality of the Keynesian economy management. In this context, while “male, white, blue collar workers” and their families ,for the first time in the history, had the chance to benefit from the social rights aspect of modern citizenship in relation to the full employment principle of Keynesian demand-sided economics, some segments of modern society, such as the migrants, ethno-cultural minorities, underclass people were excluded from the employment opportunities of the labour market in terms of their racial, sexual, socio-economic differences, so that they were excluded from benefiting social-rights aspect of modern citizenship as well. After determining three constitutive bases of modern citizenship, these bases are elaborately analyzed in the following sections of this chapter.

2.2. THE PHILOSOPHICAL GROUND OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: THE THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT AND IDEA OF NATURAL RIGHTS

The natural rights philosophers of the enlightenment thought, Locke and Rousseau could be perceived as the founding-fathers of the theory of the modern democracy. Although theoretical stances of these philosophers had significant divergence points in relation to the political, historical peculiarities of their countries, in essence, both of them refused the god-given and the hereditary political authority, and proposed the constitution of the political community on a distinct legitimate ground: an idea of social contract (Touraine, 2000, p.65). In this respect, they envisaged the constitution of the political community via a social contract which would be occurred between the sovereign and individual. Within the framework of this social contact, the individual would transfer the political rights to the sovereign, in the return; the sovereign would protect the “inevitable” natural rights (right to property, life and liberty) of individual. In the case of violation of the natural rights of individual by the sovereign (this principle was especially more concrete in the Lockean version of social contact), the individual had the right to resist the political authority of sovereign (Şenel, 1996, pp: 335-340). It became apparent that the theory of social contract corresponded to a great advance in the theory of modern democracy in terms of two reasons. Firstly, the theory of social contract envisaged the ruling practice as a relationship between the political authority and individual rather than the subject. Secondly, the theory of social contract, for the first time in the western political philosophy, proposed that the individual had certain rights against the political authority. These significant contributions of natural rights theoreticians to the theory of modern democracy could be also taken into account as the philosophical ground in which the modern citizenship was constituted. Though Locke and Rousseau rarely

used the concept of citizenship in their studies, the individualism and the rights aspects of modern citizenship derived their essences from these principles of the theory of the social contract (Touraine, 2000,pp.67-8).

In order to exactly contextualize the contributions of the theory of social contract to both the constitution of modern democracy and modern citizenship, a historical perspective is necessary to clarify the process that culminate in the economic, political domination of bourgeoisie in the modern era. Because, the emergence of the theory of social contract in the western philosophy coincided with the rise of bourgeoisie against the aristocracy in Europe. Beginning with the sixteenth-century absolute monarchy era of the European history, the bourgeoisie had begun to gain economic power against the aristocracy. During this era, the aristocratic feudal order was purified, and the political unification process, which was required for the expansion of industrial and commercial capitalism, initiated. After the bourgeoisie gained enough accumulation of capital to become the dominant economic class in this era, it sought to establish the political domination as well as the economic domination in the age of revolutions (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries). In this respect, the “British Glorious Revolution of 1688” and the “French Revolution of 1789” could be seen as the outcomes of the bourgeoisie’s struggle for gaining the political domination against the absolute monarchy and the aristocracy. Along with these bourgeois democratic revolutions, the absolute monarchy era came to an end, and the parliamentary democratic systems which guaranteed the political rights of bourgeoisie were established in Great Britain and France (Şenel, 1996, pp.283-4). The establishment of the bourgeois parliamentary systems in Europe could be

conceived as a significant breaking point in the historical evolution of the relationship between the ruling and the ruled classes. Because, for the first time in history, the relationship between ruling and ruled classes were codified within the framework of constitutional texts. The “Bill of Rights” of English Glorious Revolution, the “Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen” of the French Revolution had been the initial examples of these constitutional texts. Although the “American Revolution of 1776” came into being as a result of the struggle of the American bourgeoisie against the British colonialism rather than the indigenous aristocracy, the “American Bill of Rights” could be attributed to these initial constitutional texts. All of the constitutional texts derived their essences from the theory of social contract and the idea of natural rights. In this respect, the idea of natural rights was articulated in the American context as the “life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, in the French context as the “life, property, security, resist to oppression” (Heater, 2004, p.65). The contribution of the theory of social contract to the establishment of the constitutional parliamentary systems could be conceived as the philosophical ground in which the modern citizenship was constituted. Because, firstly, along with parliamentary democratic system, the ruling practice was defined as a political relationship between the political authority and individual. This principle laid the foundation for the individualism aspect of modern citizenship. Secondly, the nature of this political relationship was determined within the context of a set of codified rights and duties. This principle paved the way for the rights and the responsibilities aspects of modern citizenship.

It could be argued that in addition to the individualism and the rights/duties aspects, the ambivalent character of the modern citizenship borrowed its essence from the theory of social contract and idea of natural rights as well. Although the core of the

theory of social contract depended on the principle that every individual had a set of rights against the political authority, the modern citizenship, philosophically legitimized by this theory, had an exclusive character in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this new era, property-owner men could have only acquired the status of citizenship (Heater, 2004, p.67). This meant in the practical sense that the members of a specific class (bourgeoisie) had a set of “natural rights” against the political authority. This status was granted to the majority of society in the nineteenth century in the aftermath of the emergence of organised working class movements and working class-based upheavals.⁴ On the issue of the contradictory relationship between the bourgeois understanding of human rights and citizenship, and the industrial capitalism, Marx (1994) argues in the *Jewish Question* that the discourse and the practice of the bourgeois human rights and citizenship aims at concealing the economic and the social inequalities in the sphere of civil society. This skeptical view of Marx dominated over the outlook of the socialist left on the modern citizenship. Until the emergence of the New Left in the 1970s, the socialist left perceived the modern citizenship as a part of the ruling-class strategy which sought to mask the contradictory nature of capitalism (Üstel, 1999, p.52).

In relation to the historical peculiarities of the French and the English bourgeois democratic revolutions, two distinct types of citizenship tradition came into existence in the western political philosophy: the traditions of Anglo-Saxon liberal individualist citizenship and the Francophile civic republican citizenship. In the case of England, the constitutional parliamentary order was founded with a moderate revolution which culminated in a compromise between the aristocracy and the

⁴ The women community of the western countries barely acquired of the comprehensive rights of modern citizenship in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The political women movements, such as the suffragettes in England played a crucial role for the acquisition of these rights (Üstel, 1999, p.128).

bourgeoisie. In this context, this characteristic of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 enabled the emergence of the tradition of Anglo-Saxon liberal individualist citizenship which emphasized on the priority of the individual rights. Drawing on the Lockean version of social contract, this tradition envisaged the citizenship as a status which was derived from a social contract. According to this tradition, citizen (individual) has been as the sovereign and morally autonomous being. In relation to the existence of a social contract between the state and citizen, the main concern of the state was to protect the natural rights of citizen “are required both for human dignity and for possibility of citizens being effective agents in the world” (Oldfield, 1994, p.188). In return, the main duties of citizen were to pay taxes, respect the natural rights of other citizens, and attend the defense of polity when it was under the threat. Beyond these limited duties, the citizen had no obligations to the state and the society. Participating in the political activities of the public sphere was a voluntary option for the citizen (Oldfield, 1994, p.190). As it was seen in these characteristics, this tradition envisaged the citizenship within the framework the classical liberal principles of the negative rights and the priority of the private realm. In this respect, Heater defines this tradition as follows:

In the tradition of liberal individualism, the acquisition of citizenship status doesn't necessitate abandonment of the pursuit of self-interest. Public and Private spheres are kept distinct, and citizens are under no obligation to participate in the public arena if they have no inclination to do so. Nor have citizens any defined responsibilities vis a vis their fellow citizens... if the liberal state is expected to feel only a limited obligation to the state *pari passu* the state is expected to impinge on the citizen's life only in a feebly way (Heater, 1999,p.7).

In the case of France, the parliamentary constitutional order was founded with a radical revolution –the French Revolution of 1789- which culminated in the purification of aristocratic *ancien regime*. And, in opposition to the limited societal character of the British Glorious Revolution, the distinct social classes mobilized during the French Revolution. These characteristics of the French revolutionary

context paved the way for the constitution of the tradition of Francophile civic-republican citizenship which emphasized on the principles of the priority of society and the primacy of the individual duties. This tradition envisaged the citizenship as a practice, drawing from the duties of individual. Drawing on the “general will” concept of Rousseau, this tradition emphasized that the citizen wasn’t morally autonomous and free being. Citizen could be acquired of freedom in the event of fulfilling some socially determined the duties and responsibilities. In this context, citizen (individual) wasn’t prior to the society. In addition, the relationship amongst the citizens relied on the principle of the sharing of a common way of life, based on the republican values rather than a social contract. If individual fulfilled the comprehensive obligatory public duties, he (or she) could become the member of republican political community as a citizen. If citizen didn’t fulfill these obligatory public duties, he (or she) was excluded from acquiring the status of citizenship (Oldfield, 1994, pp.191-3). In this respect, as Habermas argues, the tradition of republican-civic citizenship is grounded on a communitarian, ethical understanding. And, according to this tradition, citizenship is:

a membership in a self determining ethical community. The citizens are integrated into the political community like parts of a whole; that is in such a manner that they can only form their personal and social identity in these horizons of shared traditions and intersubjectively recognized institutions... Citizen can only be realized as a joint practice of self-determination (Habermas, 1994, p.25).

As it was discussed above, in opposition to the emphasis of the tradition of individual liberal citizenship on the principles of negative rights and the priority of private realm, the republican civic tradition grounded the citizenship on the principles of positive rights and the priority of the public realm.

2.3. THE SPATIAL GROUND OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: NATION-STATE

The nation state, as a product of the French Revolution of 1789, has been the dominant political organization of the world politics for three centuries. Although there hasn't been a consensus over the definition of the nation-state in the social sciences, it briefly means "a state is a nation-state as it claims to be a nation's state: the state 'of' and 'for' a particular distinctive, bounded nation" (Brubaker, 1992, 28). As it is revealed in this brief definition, in different from the previous political organizations, within the framework of this model, the territorial state is firstly called with a new concept: nation. And, the political legitimacy of the nation-state is defined with a principle relating with this new concept: the "sovereignty rests on essentially the nation" (Heater, 1999, p.97). By the means of benefiting from the theories of modern nationalism, we can elaborately examine the concept of nation. Nevertheless, in order to contextualize this concept in terms of the constitution of modern citizenship, we can envisage the concept of nation as the political community of the nation-state model. Furthermore, within this model, the membership of nation as a political community is defined around a set of rules and a new status: modern citizenship. Following these arguments, it could be argued that the nation-state has been as the spatial-ground in which the modern citizenship is constituted. In other words, the symbiotic relationship between the nation-state and citizenship laid the foundation for the national-belonging aspect of modern citizenship.

In the literature of citizenship studies, the most cited approach, which is used to clarify the relationship between the nation-state and citizenship, is the historical

approach of Brubaker. Within the framework of this historical approach, Brubaker explains this relationship as follows:

The development of the modern institution of national citizenship is intimately bounded with the development of the nation-state. The French Revolution marked a crucial moment in both. There are several respects in which the Revolution shaped the modern institution of the national citizenship. As bourgeois revolution, it created a general membership status based on equality before the law. As a democratic revolution, it revived the classical conception of active political citizenship, but transformed it from a special into what was, in principle if not in practice, a general status. As a national revolution, it sharpened the boundaries –and antagonism- between the members of different nation states. And, as a state-strengthening revolution, it “immeditised” and codified state-membership. National citizenship, as we know it bears the stamp of all these developments (Brubaker, 1992: p.49).

Brubaker argues that the model of nation-state is “more than a territorial organization, as an organization of membership or as an institution of citizens”. And, within this model, citizenship is “an internally inclusive, externally exclusive institution” (Brubaker, 1992, p.21). It is internally inclusive in that it excludes only foreign persons, who belong to another state. In other words, citizenship institution is an object of closure in modern state, since entrance to a defined territory (state) unconditionally suffrage, military service and naturalization in that territory are all depended on a certain qualification, being a citizen of that defined territory. He (1992:23) argues that territorial closure is vital and essential to the modern territorial state and makes the territorial state different from other modes of membership closures.

As it was discussed above, the nation-state is the spatial-ground in which the modern citizenship is constituted. Nevertheless, it is impossible to mention about one type of nation- state citizenship. In relation to the historical peculiarities of the formation process of the nation states, the distinct types of nation-state citizenship appeared in the modern western history. In order to examine the distinct nation-state citizenships, we can use the historical approach of Brubaker, based on the comparison the French case with German case. According to him, in the case of France, the emergence of

nation coincided with the formation of nation state. So, the French nation is envisaged as a political community which appeared within the territorial and the insitutional confines of the French state. Moreover, the citizenship as the membership status of nation is defined on the basis of the principle of “*jus soli*”. The every individual that was born the in the French territory could acquire the status of citizenship. In this respect, as can be argued, the French understanding of teritorial citizenship contains an inclusive characteristic. Nevertheless, the French citizenship is traditionally based on the values-system of the enlightenment thought and republicanism. For acquiring the status of citizenship, individual has to embrace this values-system, and to relinquish from the usage of ethnic, religious, traditional affiliations in the public sphere. In this respect, the French understanding of citizenship contains an assimilative character (Brubaker, 1992; pp.39-49). As a result of these characteristics of the French understanding of citizenship, France has traditionally implemented open door policy for the naturalization of the migrants in the twentieth century. On other hand, the assimilative character of the French understanding of citizenship which prohibits the representation of the cultural diversities in the public sphere continues to be one of the most significant barriers on way of the integration of migrants towards the majority society (Brubaker, 1992, p.x).

In the case of Germany, the formation of nation state depends on a long historical process. And, in this long historical process, the emergence of nation doesn't coincide with the formation of the nation-state. The emergence of German nation is prior to the formation of German nation state. As a result of this historical peculiarity of the German case, the nation was envisaged as an ethno-cultural community rather political or state-generated. In reaction to the principles of the French revolution and

the enlightenment thought, the German nationalism conceived the nation (volk) as an entity, based on the ethno-cultural determinations, such as race, language, tradition. And, the German understanding of citizenship is defined in the genealogical sense, around the principle of “*jus sanguinis*”. According to this principle, for acquiring the status of German citizenship, individual has to be ethnically German (Brubaker, 1992, pp.54-65). Due to this exclusionary characteristic of the German understanding of citizenship, the migrant community of Germany has lacked of acquiring the status of citizenship until the recent times (Brubaker, 1992, p.x).

In the literature of citizenship studies, another significant study which aims at classifying the characteristics of distinct nation-state citizenships is the citizenship typology of Turner (see: table 1). This typology, in the light of two variables, examines the characteristics of four distinct nation-state citizenships: the French, the English, the American, the German cases.

The first concerns of the passive or the active nature of citizenship, depending on whether citizenship is develop from above (via state) or from below (in terms of more local participatory institutions such as trade unions.) The second dimension is the relationship between the public and private arenas within the civil society. A conservative view of citizenship (as passive or private) contrasts with a more revolutionary idea of active and public citizenship (Turner, 1994, p.199)

Table 1- Turner's Citizenship Typology

CITIZENSHIP			
Below	Above		
Revolutionary French Tradition	Passive English Case	+	PUBLIC SPACE
American liberalism	German Fascism	-	

(Turner, 1994, 218).

According to Turner (1994:218), in French tradition there is a combination of revolutionary active citizenship with an attack on the private sphere of the family, religion and privacy. It emphasizes the priority of public sphere and common good of the society come to the fore. The liberal democratic model, which is exemplified by American liberalism, emphasizes participation of citizens. In this sense, this model of citizenship is developed from below. However, since the priority is given to the individual rights, this model depends on the privacy and sacredness of individual opinion (private sphere). In the passive democracy type, which fits to the English case under the seventeenth century settlement, citizen appears as the mere subject. It shows a passive form of citizenship while emphasis is the public sphere in the creation of the sphere of political activity. The last type is the plebiscitary democracy. It is identified with German fascism in the typology of Turner. Citizenship is given from above. There is minimal participation of citizens under the control of strong and sacred state, and private sphere is emphasized as the context of citizen. The priority is given to notions such as family, religion.

2.4. THE HIGHEST STAGE OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: WELFARE STATE

The welfare state, just as the parliamentary democracy, has been one of the most significant institutions of the modern capitalist society in the Twentieth Century (George & Wilding 1994, p. ix). It was mostly argued that this institution has appeared in the modern society to legitimize the Keynesian demand-sided economy policies in the post-Second World War era. After Keynesian demand-sided economics had become the new “steering mechanism” of the capitalism mode of the production in the post-war era, the state mechanism of the modern capitalist society was entitled of a range of social provisions, such as the public education, the public health, the social security system as a function of the redistribution of income policy of the Keynesian economics. “This specific collaboration of Keynesian demand-sided economics, democratic corporatism and the philosophy of social welfare partially softened the contradictory nature of capitalist mode of production” (Dubiel, 1999, p.117). So, the era of “welfare capitalism” (1945-1973), which was based on a fragile compromise between the capital and labour, initiated in the advanced capitalist societies. This era corresponds to a great advance for the concept of modern citizenship in terms of two reasons. Firstly, in conjecture with the attachment of the comprehensive social rights to the right categories of the modern citizenship, the content of modern citizenship expanded in this era. Secondly, as a result of the economic rationality of the Keynesian demand-sided policy, the large segments of the modern society firstly had the chance to benefit from the new right categories of the modern citizenship. Drawing on this fact, it could be argued that the modern citizenship has reached of its highest stage in the era of welfare capitalism. In this

respect, this chapter substitutes the welfare-capitalism analyses of Jessop and Marshall for conveying elaborately the symbiotic relationship between the welfare state and the modern citizenship.

Following the arguments of the Gramscian theory of the state, Jessop (1990) argues that all of the capitalist state projects depend on two strategic components: the accumulation strategy and the hegemonic project. In this context, the post-war Keynesian welfare state was constructed on the ground of two strategic components: the hegemonic project of “one nation” and the fordist accumulation strategy.⁵ In the aftermath of the outbreak of the Great Depression of 1929, all of the advanced capitalist states suffered from a structural question of the capitalism: the question of underconsumption. The effects of this question (mass unemployment, bank bankruptcies and the steady decline in the production and income levels) didn’t remain within the confines of the economic sphere. The vast social discontentment, triggered by the economic depression also eroded the legitimacy of the liberal democracy. In these circumstances, a new capitalist state project, the Keynesian welfare state became apparent to overcome both the underconsumption question of the capitalist economy and the political legitimacy question of the liberal democracy. The first strategic component of this new state project was the fordist accumulation regime. This new accumulation regime depended on an economic rationality that anticipated the regulation of mass production and mass consumption within the

⁵The accumulation strategy refers to a specific pattern, or model, of economic growth together with both its associated social framework of institutions (or mode of regulation) and ranges of government policies conducive its stable reproduction (Jessop, 1990, p.208)). The hegemonic project refers “a national, popular programme of political, intellectual, moral leadership which advances the long-term interests of the leading sectors in the accumulation strategy while granting concessions to the masses of social base. Though accumulation strategy and hegemonic project frequently overlap and shape one another, the latter has pivotal importance for the overall success of broader project (Jessop, 1990; p.211).

national market in the light of the Keynesian demand-sided economics. The political dimension of this new state project was the hegemonic project of “one nation”. It meant the establishment of the political domination through the articulation of an inclusive political discourse, such the discourses of the “social peace” and the “social welfare” and giving the material concessions to the subordinate classes (Jessop, 1990, pp.205-212). If we evaluate the post-war welfare state analysis of Jessop in terms of the symbiotic relationship between the welfare state and modern citizenship, it could be argued that along with the emergence of the post-war welfare state, the category of comprehensive socio-economic rights were added to the right categories of modern citizenship as a function of the economic rationality of the Keynesian demand-sided economics. Furthermore, the vast segments of the modern capitalist society had the chance to benefit from the comprehensive rights category of the modern citizenship within the framework of the inclusive political discourse of the “one nation”.

The welfare-capitalism analysis of Marshall begins with a basic assumption, concerned with the nature of modern capitalist society: “the contradiction between the formal political equality of the franchise and the persistence of extensive social and economic inequality, ultimately rooted in the character of the capitalist market place and the existence of private property” has always been as the main threat for the survivability of capitalist societal order. This contradictory nature of capitalism has been partially resolved through the extension of the right categories of the modern citizenship (quoted in Turner, 1994;p.201). According to him, the earliest rights category of the modern citizenship, the civil rights (the right to property, the freedom of speech etc.) didn’t contradict with the inequalities of the capitalist

society in the eighteenth century. On the contrary, they were necessary for the maintenance of those inequalities since the civil rights provide the conditions for a competitive market. The second rights category of the modern citizenship, the political rights was attached to the content of modern citizenship in the nineteenth century. Moreover, they didn't contradict with the inequalities of capitalist society as long as they weren't complemented by the social rights. The last category of rights, the social rights was attached to the content of modern citizenship during the welfare capitalism era of the Twentieth Century. In opposition to the earlier right categories of the modern citizenship, the category of the social rights (social security rights, unemployment and retirement benefits etc.) was functioned to restrain the inequalities of the capitalist society. Furthermore, in conjecture with this shift in the content of the modern citizenship, a new understanding of citizenship, the social citizenship appeared (Marshall, 1994, pp.14-19). Nevertheless, as Marshall argued, the social citizenship wasn't functioned as the ultimate political solution to overcome the inequalities of the capitalist society. In this context, there has been a constant clash between the egalitarian character of the social citizenship and the extensive social, economic inequalities of the capitalist market in the existing system (quoted in Turner, 1994, p.201).

While Gramschi sought to clarify the development process of the Fordizm in the US at the beginning of twentieth century, he argued that it had been not only a new type of the capitalist mass production pattern but also a grand collective attempt to create a new ideal mode of the life, compatible with the economic rationality of capitalism (quoted in Harvey, 1997, p.148). Similarly, the welfare capitalism of the post-war era could be taken into account as a collective attempt to create an ideal social model in

the advanced capitalist states. In this ideal model, the majority of labour force was composed of “healthy, male, manual workers” that benefited from the full employment principle of the Keynesian economics. And, the welfare state of post-war era was mainly financed through the taxes, paid by this labour force. In return, the welfare state introduced the comprehensive social provisions, such as the public education, health, and housing to the nuclear family, under the responsibility of the manual worker’s house-wife, in order to reproduce itself and to attend the mass consumption process. However, the migrants, the members of ethnic minorities, underclass people and the single women, which were excluded from benefiting the full employment principle of Keynesian economics in terms of their ethnic, sexual, socio-economic differences, didn’t integrate this ideal model (Harvey, 1997, p.161). In this respect, if we look back the citizenship definition of Faulks, depending on the assumption that citizenship is the key concept in terms of inclusionary and exclusionary political practices, it could be argued that the social citizenship of the welfare capitalism also contained an exclusionary characteristic. The migrants, the members of ethnic minorities, the underclass people and single women lacked of acquiring the status of social citizenship in terms of their disadvantaged positions in the labour market.

In conjuncture with the mid-1970s, the advanced capitalist states suffered from another structural crisis, in relation to the emergence of the “question of stagflation” (simultaneous rise in both inflation and unemployment rates) which would culminate in radically the reorganization of the state-market-society relations. This chapter substitutes the framework of Jessop (1990) again for contextualizing the significance of this re-organization process in terms of the evolution of modern citizenship. As

Dubiel (1998: 113) argued, the conventional recipe of the Keynesian demand-sided economics lost its controlling capacity on the contradictions of capitalism in the 1970s. Moreover, in the aftermath of the emergence of stagflation question, it was perceived as the ultimate source of this structural crisis. In this respect, the Keynesian-welfare state was purified, and a new capitalist state project, the minimal neo-liberal state appeared to overcome the structural crisis of capitalism. According to Jessop, this new state project was composed of two strategic components: the post-fordist accumulation regime and the hegemonic project of the “two nations”. The Post-fordist accumulation regime was based on the supply-sided economy policies, such as tax cut, de-regulation, and the privatization of economic enterprise. The political dimension of this new state project, the hegemonic project of “two nations” meant the constitution of the political domination with the consent of the limited portion of the society and without needing the redistribution of income policies and an inclusive political discourse, such as the social peace, the social welfare (Jessop, 1990, pp.211-213). As a result of the realization of this new state project in the advanced capitalist societies, the social provisions of welfare state and the concept of social citizenship were put under the question.

During this transformation process, the concept of social citizenship was challenged by two distinct and new ideological positions: the new right and the new left. Firstly, the new right critique of the social citizenship is examined. The new right approach, which was composed of the specific collaboration of the neo-conservative political thinking and the neo-liberal economics, has been the dominant political ideology of the western right-wing parties since 1970s (Heywood, 1997, p.47). According to the new right approach, the spheres of the economy, politics and

society overlapped during the era of welfare capitalism. This characteristic of the welfare capitalism era violated the liberal principle of the self-organised society. In addition, in the “state-directed” welfare-society, citizens were obliged to rely on the benefits of welfare state. This characteristic of the welfare state violated the liberal principle of the primacy of the ethical, economical autonomy of the individual (Üstel, 1999, p.84). In the light of these critiques, the new right approach proposed a new understanding of citizenship, the “active citizenship” to supersede the social citizenship understanding of the Keynesian welfare state era. According to this new understanding, the state mechanism had to be detached from the social provisions. The question of the social welfare had to be conveyed to the sphere of civil society. In this new social structure, the main duty of citizen was to pursue his/her interests in the sphere of economy as the active entrepreneurs, take care of family bonds, and respect to the laws. In this respect, for the active citizenship understanding of the new right, the ideal citizen was the citizen who had the minimal relationship with the state and the politics (Özkazanç, 2000, pp.3-5).

The one of the most significant points which must be mentioned, the understanding of the active citizenship was also accepted by the dominant political ideology of the 1990s, “third way version of the social democracy”. The ideolog of the third way, Giddens reformulated the understanding of active citizenship in accordance with the necessities of the current neo-liberal globalization process. According Giddens, neither the social citizenship understanding of the Keynesian welfare state era, based on the comprehensive unconditional benefits, nor the active citizenship understanding of the new right, based on the minimal rights have been adequate the grasp the needs of individual that lived in the current riskful society. In this respect,

the understanding of active citizenship must be reformulated within the context of new concept of “positive welfare” to transcend this impasse. Instead of the redistribution of income policies, the state directly must invest the human capital to fulfill the social welfare. In return, the citizens must pursue their economic interests in the sphere of economy as the active risk-takers. As it was seen in these characteristics of third way, it envisaged a kind of “workfare capitalism” to replace the welfare-capitalism; and a kind of active citizenship, based on the principle of the “no rights without responsibilities” (Özkazanç,2000, pp.6-7). In this context, Giddens argues:

Old-style social democracy...was inclined to treat rights as unconditional claims. With expanding individualism should come an extension of individual obligations. Unemployment benefits, for example, should carry the obligation actively to look for work, and it is up to government to ensure that welfare systems do not discourage active search.... Benefit systems should be reformed where they induce moral hazard and a more active risk-attitude encouraged, where possible through incentives, but where necessary by legal obligations (Giddens, 1999, p.65).

Another ideological approach which challenged the social citizenship phenomenon of the era of the welfare capitalism has been the new left. This ideological approach appeared at the beginning of the 1970s as a reaction to both the totalitarian and bureaucratic nature of the Soviet reel-socialism experience and the loss of the revolutionary character of the euro-communist parties. The main claim of the new left approach was that the all variants of the state-centered left projects (reel-socialism, Keynesian social democracy) inherently turned into totalistic, authoritarian structures by reproducing the traditional power relations. Moreover, they didn't serve to emancipation project of humanity. Another significant claim of the new left approach was that the working class lost its revolutionary potential during the era of the welfare capitalism. In this respect, this approach celebrated the migrants, underclass people, the ethnic minorities, women, which were subjected to the discrimination and

the domination in terms of their socio-economic, ethnic, sexual differences, as the new revolutionary subjects of the modern capitalist society (Heywood, 1997, p.266). The new left critique of the welfare state depended on the assumption that the welfare benefits were standardized for the mass needs of the industrial society with the little flexibility to address different social and cultural contexts, and were centrally controlled by the bureaucratic organizations. Due to these characteristics of the welfare state, it wasn't perceived as an egalitarian, democratic institution. In addition, the social citizenship phenomenon of this era was grounded on the massively defined, standardized socio-economic rights. Instead, the new left approach proposed that both the welfare state and citizenship must be reconsidered on a new ground that would promote the new concerns of the post-industrial society, such as gender, ecology, ethnicity debates ((George & Wilding 1994, p. 11). This perspective of the new left has enabled the radical openings for the alternative citizenship concepts of the new social movements, such as the ecological citizenship, world citizenship, which we will discuss in the following chapters of this thesis.

CHAPTER 3

THE CHALLENGES OF COMPREHENSIVE GLOBALISATION PROCESS TO THE MODERN CITIZENSHIP

The main arguments of this thesis mainly derive from the idea that the comprehensive globalization process has challenged the constrained nature of modern citizenship, and introduced a convenient ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts. In order to more elaborately conveying the challenges of globalization process towards the modern citizenship, in this chapter, it is conceptualized as the totality of multiple processes rather than an unique process. In this respect, three processes of globalization –the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, the process of cultural denationalization and the process of deindustrialization- are examined in terms of their effects on the concept of citizenship in the following sections of this chapter.

3.1. THE MAKING SENSE OF GLOBALISATION AS THE MULTIPLE PROCESSES

Today, the globalization has been as the key concept to conceive the current political, economic and social transformation processes. In consequence of this key-function of the globalization, a range of distinct theoretical approaches have competed to clarify the nature of this concept. In this chapter, instead of a minimalist concept of globalization which defines the increasing political, economical, cultural interconnectedness among the societies, the maximalist globalization concept of Brodie is substituted. So, globalization is conceptualized as the totality of multiple processes which has challenged the whole established concepts and institutions of the modern era (Brodie, 2000). In this respect, by taking three processes of globalization (processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, cultural denationalization and

deindustrialization) into consideration, it is argued that this comprehensive process has challenged the founding bases of the modern citizenship, and opened up a convenient ground to discuss the possibility of alternative citizenship concepts.

In this chapter of thesis, firstly, the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation which define the current erosion of the nation-state monopoly over the political power are examined. As an outcome of the dominant governing paradigm of globalization process, the neo-liberal governance, the supra-territorial and the sub-national polities have shared the political power of the nation state today. This process has both eroded the national belonging aspect of modern citizenship, and laid foundation for the alternative citizenship concepts, based on new forms of belonging relationship. Secondly, the cultural denationalization process which defines the current erosion of cultural and linguistic assimilative power of the nation-state is examined. Today, due to the growing international mobility of people and cultural interchange, the traditional assimilative policies and institutions, such as the modern citizenship, haven't succeeded in integrating the indigenous and immigrant originated ethno-cultural minority groups towards the majority society. In this context, this challenge of cultural denationalization process could be envisaged as a new momentum to rethink the integrative function of citizenship in the contemporary multicultural societies on the basis of the forms of group rights-based differentiated citizenship. Thirdly, the deindustrialization process which describes the changing international division of labour of global capitalism is examined. Today, the manufacturing base of global capitalism has been transferred to semi-peripheral and the peripheral countries to benefit from the comparative advantages of these countries. As a result of this new spatial organization of global capitalism, the proportion of manual workers in the advanced capitalist societies has dramatically

decreased. In the absence of working class-based social movements, the political opposition in the advanced capitalist societies has begun to mobilise around a range of new social movements (the peace movement, the environmental movement, second wave of feminism, radical student movement, the movement of animal rights etc.). These new social movements have criticised the limited nature of the right categories of modern citizenship (civil, political, socio-economic rights) and struggled for the extension of right categories of modern citizenship towards the issues of ecology, gender, and ethnicity.

3.2. DETERRITORIALISATION AND RETERRITORIALISATION PROCESSES, AND THE RISE OF MULTI-LEVEL POLITIES

As it was discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the nation-state has been as the dominant political organization of modern politics since the eighteenth-century. This political organization traditionally derives its legitimacy from its claim of the absolute sovereignty within a defined territory (Falk, 2000, p.5). Drawing on this claim, the nation-state could be conceived as the unique holder of the political power that would organize the rights and duties of the members of community, living in a defined territory. In other words, individual, as a citizen, can be only bound to the nation-state. However, the absolute sovereignty claim of the nation-state (within a definite territory) has been challenged today. Because, the current neo-liberal globalization process is commonly linked to “the erosion of the capacity of the nation states to exercise sovereignty over the domestic policy and territorial boundaries or buffer its citizens from an increasing predatory and unpredictable international economy” (Brodie, 2004, p.323). If we take symbiotic relationship between the absolute-sovereignty claim of the nation-state and the national-belonging aspect of

the modern citizenship into account, this process has generated new outcomes to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts.

It could be argued that the erosion of the nation-state sovereignty is closely connected to the spatial reorganization of the political power in the current neo-liberal globalization process. Along with the internationalization of capital and the rise of complex interdependence amongst the national economies in the comprehensive globalization process, the governance of organised capitalism, based on the historical coincidence amongst the national territory, national economy, state sovereignty, citizenship rights and democracy, has come to an end. Furthermore, in conformity with the new logic of global capitalism, a new form of governance, the neo-liberal governance has become apparent. In this new era, the monopoly of the nation-state on the political power (the absolute sovereignty claim of the nation-state) has been detached. And, the political power has shifted from the national up to transnational and down to the local (Brodie, 2000).⁶ Before elaborately analyzing this process, it must be emphasized that the purification of the regulative state of the era of organised capitalism through a range of neo-liberal policies, such as privatization, de-regulation, could be also evaluated as an extension of the erosion of the political power of the nation-state. That is because, due to the realization of these neo-liberal policies, the market mechanism has gained ascendancy over the public policy. So, the current capitalist state has been politically deprived of effective public instruments to meet the democratic demands of citizens (Brodie, 2004, p.326).

⁶ On the issue of the changing role of the nation-state in the globalization process, in opposition to the arguments of the “hyper-globalist” scholars, such as Brodie; Hirst and Thompson (1995) argue that the nation-state has been still recognized as the legitimate source of the political power by the international agreements. Moreover, both the international regulatory agencies at the supra-territorial level and the local and the regional administrative bodies at the sub-national level have still relied on the consent of the nation-states in terms of political accountability. For further information see: Hirst, Paul and Thompson, Grahame (1995) “Globalization and the Future of the Nation-state”, *Economy and Society*, vol.24, no: 3:408-442.

Brodie puts forth the concepts of processes of the “deterritorialisation” and the “reterritorialisation” in order to clarify the current shifts in the political power on the vertical axis, both upwards to the international/transnational and the downwards to the local.⁷ According to her, on the one hand, the neo-liberal globalization process represents the shift of the political power from a territorial framework (nation-state) to a deterritorialized political space “which is increasingly detached from our lived experience of geographic space” (Brodie, 2000, p.112). And, he conceptualizes this process as the deterritorialisation of the political power. In this process, a range of supra-territorial organizations, such as the WTO, the IMF, the World Bank, the European Union (EU), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) have been entitled of the vast economical and political autonomy over the nation-states by the binding international agreements. For the sake of the efficient operation of the global neo-liberal governance, these supra-territorial bodies have had capable of constituting the common policies on behalf of the nation-states. The content of these binding common policies have been overwhelmingly compatible with the assumptions of the dominant paradigm, the neo-liberal economics, such as the liberalization of trade and the national tariffs, the deregulation, the privatization, tax cut. In this respect, the nation-states have mostly lacked of constituting autonomous national policies beyond the package of the uniformed neo-liberal policies recommended by the supra-territorial political organizations. In other words, the

⁷ In the literature of the social sciences, the “deterritorialisation” as a functional concept is used in the different meanings by the distinct scholars, such as Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Arjun Appadurai, Janine Bordie. We can find the most well-known usage of this concept in the globalization studies of the social anthropology. In this area of the social sciences, this concept generally refers to a weakening of ties between the culture and the space in the globalization process. For the outstanding example of this kind of the usage of this concept, see: Appadurai, Arjun (1996) *Modernity at Large Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

nation-states have deprived of exercising their national sovereignties in some key areas (Brodie, 2000, pp.113-4) (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p.21).

In addition to the deterritorialisation process of the political power, we simultaneously witness the shift of political power from the nation-state downwards to the local. Brodie conceptualizes this process as the “reterritorialisation” of the political power. In the comprehensive globalization process, the international regime of accumulation of the capital, which is constituted by the neo-liberal governance, has allowed the free circulation of transnational capital through a complex network amongst the distinct localities. In this complex network, instead of the nation-states, a range of significant urban areas have placed as the nodes of the free circulation of the transnational capital. In response to this new configuration of global capitalism, the responsiveness of the municipalities and the local administrative bodies towards the global economic changes has gained the significance. In this respect, by expanding the political autonomy of municipalities and local administrative bodies, the political power has reterritorialised to increase the responsiveness of them towards the global economic changes (Brodie, 2000, pp. 115-118).

The erosion of the nation-state monopoly over the political power and the rise of multi-level polities (at the supra-national and the sub-national levels) in the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation have generated new outcomes in order to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts which would transcend to the national-belonging aspect of the modern citizenship. That is because, for the individual, the rise of multi-level polities means the emergence of the distinct belonging forms, based on a set of new rights and duties. In this respect, one of the most significant approaches was put forth by Soysal.

According to her, due to the growth of guest working across many societies, greater global interdependence and the emergence of universalistic rules and conceptions regarding human rights formalized by international codes and laws (such as the UN, UNESCO, ILO, EU, Council of Europe, Geneva Conventions, European Human Rights Convention and so on), the national citizenship (the modern citizenship) is losing ground to a more universal model of membership (the post-national citizenship) located within an increasingly de-territorialized notion of a person's more universal rights (Soysal, 1994, p.3). If we envisage Soysal's concept of post-national citizenship as a description of the eradication process of the uniqueness of the belonging relationship between the nation-state and the citizenship, "in the post-national citizenship era", we can discuss a range of alternative concepts of citizenship within the context of the multiple belonging relationships between the individual and the multi-level polities. In this regard, in the concerning section of the next chapter, the concepts of the European, Cosmopolitan/Global, Urban citizenships are examined as the alternative concepts which set out transcending the national-belonging aspect of the modern citizenship.

3.3. CULTURAL DENATIONALISATION PROCESS AND THE RISE OF MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

As it is discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the dominant political organisation of the modern era, the nation-state is constructed on the basis of idea that the boundaries of territorial state are congruent with the boundaries of nation. And, within the confines of this political organisation, the political community is envisaged as the "nation" by the nationalist political and intellectual elites. While the concept of nation is used as synonymous with the political community, the

underlying point is its ethno-cultural particularity whose differentiates it from the other nations. In this respect, it is claimed that the nation is an ethno-culturally homogenous and particular community which lives in a given territory (the nation-state). In conformity with this logic, the citizenship status of the nation-state is defined as the membership form of the ethno-culturally homogenous nation. Nevertheless, in opposition to these ideas of the nationalist political and intellectual elites, in exception for a few nation-states, such as Japan, Korea, Norway, none of the nation-states are historically constructed on the basis of an ethno-culturally homogenous population. In this context, most of the nation-states have had a major ethno-cultural community, which usually gives its name to the nation-state, as well as distinct minor indigenous and immigrant-originated ethno-cultural communities.⁸ In response to this historical fact, nation-states have traditionally set out homogenising the ethno-cultural diversities in favour of a major ethno-cultural community through the processes of acculturation (voluntary assimilation) and assimilation (Castles & Davidson, 2000, pp.12-15).

By the late 1960s and the 1970s, due to the emergence of the mass labour immigration towards western countries and the rise of civil rights movements, some western countries officially abandoned from the policies of the ethno-cultural assimilation, and recognised their societies as the multicultural ones. In this context, they put into practise a set of policies to guarantee the representation of the ethno-cultural diversities in the public sphere. In the current globalisation process, the question of the recognition of the ethno-cultural diversities within the political

⁸ Today, there are approximately 200 nation-states and 6000 languages in the world. If we take into consideration the fact that in the most cases, the language is the major indicator of the ethnic group, we see that the number of ethnic groups is overwhelmingly higher than the number of the nation-states. In this regard, this fact invalidates the nationalist idea that the territorial boundaries of the nation-state are congruent with the boundaries of nation, identified with a major ethno-cultural community (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p.12).

framework of nation-state has reached a new phase. Because, the globalisation process has fastened the erosion process of the linguistic and cultural assimilative power of the nation-states by accelerating the international mobility of people and the cultural interchange. And, through taking this aspect of globalisation process into consideration, it could be asserted that this process has introduced a convenient ground to reconsider the vitality of multiculturalist policies and a concept of multicultural citizenship in the contemporary democratic societies.

It becomes apparent in the modern era that the question of the recognition of ethno-cultural diversities within the political framework of the nation-state is closely connected with the contradictory nature of the modern citizenship, based on a peculiar mixture of the political liberalism and nationalism. In this respect, we must briefly examine the contradictory nature of the modern citizenship to conceive this question in the contemporary democratic societies. For the liberal view, the citizen is a rational individual who is freed from his/her cultural milieu. In order to guarantee his/her rights, he/she individually obeys to the authority of the state. In turn, the state recognises the individual as the citizen, and burdens a minimal set of obligatory duties to him/her. Beyond this minimal set of duties, the state has no right to oblige the individual in order to pursue a specific common good. Because, the rational, free individual is immune from the collective cultural bonds. In this respect, if we conceive the modern citizenship as a belonging relationship between individual and state within the context of a set of rights and duties, for the liberal view, the ethno-culturally neutral character of the state is precondition to maintain this reciprocal belonging relationship (Tambini, 2001, pp.203-5). These ideas of the liberal view lay the foundation for the individual rights aspect of the modern citizenship. Nevertheless, the liberal view has been inadequate to explain the other aspects of the

modern citizenship. Contrary to the liberal idea of the ethno-culturally neutral state, the nation-states usually take for granted the culture of a major ethno-cultural community as their national cultures. Moreover, the official ideology of the nation-states, the nationalism claims that the citizen could only make sense of individual rights and duties within the national culture that is defined ethno-culturally on a homogenous ground. In this respect, the citizen in the nation-state could be described as not only the individual bearer of a set of rights and duties, but also the individual bearer of a national culture that is identified with the identity of a major ethno-cultural community (Kukathas, 1997, pp.406-7). Due to this characteristic of the nation-state, the modern citizenship doesn't introduce a convenient ground to represent the ethno-cultural diversities of minor indigenous and immigrant-originated ethno-cultural communities.

By the late 1960s and the 1970s, the political credibility of conventional assimilative policies of the nation-state and the integral component of these policies, the institution of modern citizenship began to erode in the western countries in terms of two main reasons. Firstly, in the post-war era, the large amount of foreign labour force was "imported" to the western nation-states to meet the labour deficit of their economies. So, the ethno-cultural structure of these nation-states turned into a more heterogeneous character. Secondly, as an integral part of the "civil rights movements" in the late 1960s and the 1970s, the indigenous ethno-cultural minorities of the western nation-states began to struggle for the abolishment of assimilative policies and official recognition of their identities (Rex, 1991, p.6). In this regard, it was argued by the opponents of the assimilative policies that state-centred voluntary and obligatory assimilation processes didn't offer a democratic and just solution to integrate the members of minor indigenous and immigrant originated communities

towards the majority society. Even though the members of ethno-cultural minority groups were legally equalised with the members of the majority society by acquiring the status of the citizenship, this fact didn't ensure the recognition of the identities of the ethno-cultural minority groups (Rex, 1991, p.11). So, the opponents of the assimilative policies of the nation-state demanded for a new kind of citizenship that would overcome the tension between the political equality aspect of the modern citizenship and the question of the recognition of the ethno-cultural diversities in the multicultural societies

In relation to the deepening of the question of the recognition of the ethno-cultural diversities in the 1970s, western nation-states needed new policies to realise the social cohesion. In this context, the major western countries (the USA, the Great Britain, Australia, and Canada) abandoned from the assimilative policies, and called their societies as the multicultural ones. Furthermore, they implemented the practises of positive discrimination and multicultural citizenship which would allow to the representation of the ethno-cultural diversities in the public sphere (Rex, 1991, pp.14-5).⁹

In the current globalisation process, these practises have offered a vital role to realise the social cohesion for all of the contemporary multicultural societies. That is because, as Tambini (2001:1999) argued, "the nation state's capacity for cultural national-building and assimilation of the linguistically and culturally different has been drastically in recent years". He conceptualises this challenge of the

⁹ The nature of the multiculturalist practices in the western nation-states has been severely put under the question as well. For example, according to leftist critics, multiculturalism has usually been as a rhetoric which disguises inequality and ghettoization, or a means of marking groups as minorities so that they can be controlled, manipulated or subject to unequal treatment (Rex, 1991, p.19). In this respect, for a summary of the multiculturalism critiques of the different intellectual positions see: Ayhan, Kaya, "Ulusal Yurttaşlıktan Çoğul Yurttaşlığa, in G. G. Özdoğan and A. Kaya (eds), *Sınırları Tanımayan Sorunlar*, (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları).

globalisation as the “process of cultural denationalisation” (Tambini, 2001, p.199). The most visible signs of this process have been the growing international mobility of people and the cultural interchange. On the one hand, in the current globalisation process, the volume of all kinds of migrations (temporary and permanent movements, labour migrations and refugee exoduses, individual and family flows, highly skilled specialists and manual workers) have enormously increased. Moreover, such migrations led to settlement in nearly all highly developed countries and in many parts of the less developed regions. On other hand, due to the rapid advancements in the spheres of transportation and communication, the cultural interchange across the national borders has fastened. In this context, in the globalisation process, it is impossible to mention about a fact of autonomous national culture within the political framework of the nation-state (Tambini, 2001, pp.198-199). In response to these challenges of cultural denationalisation process, the nation-states have no enough time to implement the conventional practises of assimilation and acculturation. So, the multiculturalist policies have maintained their centrality to realise the social cohesion in the contemporary multicultural societies. Drawing on this fact, the concept of the multicultural citizenship (group rights-based differentiated citizenship) is examined as the integral component of the multiculturalist practises in the concerning section of the next chapter.

3.4. THE DEINDUSTRIALISATION PROCESS AND THE RISE OF NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

As it was mostly emphasized in the literature of social sciences, by the 1970s, the world capitalist system began to suffer from a structural accumulation crisis. In response to overall effects of this crisis, the “steering mechanism” of the era of the organised capitalism (the era of welfare capitalism), the Keynesian demand-sided economics lost its capability of mitigating the contradictory nature of capitalism. And, this structural crisis was overcome through the assumptions of the supply-sided neo-liberal economics which projected the radical transformation of the social order of the era of the organised capitalism. In this neo-liberal transformation process, the key concept was “deindustrialization process” which defined the shift from the fordist production patterns to the post-fordist ones in the advanced capitalist countries.

For the followers of the neo-liberal approach, this structural crisis was closely concerned with the “rigidity” of the model of state-directed economy in the era of organised capitalism, based on the mixture of the Keynesian demand-sided economics and the fordist mass production patterns. In order to overcome the high inflation and the mass unemployment effects of this structural crisis, the state interventions (the Keynesian macro-economic measures, welfare costs) over the market forces had to be minimised, and a flexible accumulation regime had to be constituted to guarantee the free circulation of capital. Following these assumptions of the neo-liberal approach, a uniformed set of neo-liberal economy policies (the purification of the comprehensive welfare measures, tax cut, deregulation and deindustrialisation) was put into practise in the all of the advanced capitalist countries (Harvey, 1997, pp.200-202).

In comparison with the other neo-liberal policies, the de-industrialisation policy, which aimed at transferring the manufacturing base of the international capitalism from the core-capitalist countries to the semi-peripheral and peripheral ones in order to benefit from the comparative advantages of these countries, has played a more central role in the neo-liberal transformation process in terms of two reasons. Firstly, this policy laid foundation for the current neo-liberal globalisation process by changing radically the nature of the international division of labour of capitalism. Secondly, this policy has altered the social structure of the advanced capitalist countries by transferring the traditional labour-intensive sectors from the core-capitalist countries to the semi-peripheral and peripheral ones. As a result of the realisation of this policy in the advanced capitalist countries, in stead of the manufacturing, the service sector became the leading sector. So, the proportion of the manual workers in the social structure of the advanced capitalist countries has dramatically decreased (Harvey, 1997, p.203). In this regard, drawing on these overall effects of deindustrialisation policy over the societal structure of the advanced capitalist countries, it could be described as a comprehensive transformation process which eroded the whole integral concepts and institutions of the era of organised capitalism, such as the social citizenship, class-based politics.

In conjecture with the realisation of the deindustrialisation process, the advanced capitalist societies have entered into “post-industrial” era.¹⁰ One of the main departures of this era from the previous “industrial era” is concerned with the nature of the social movements. In this new era, in stead of the working class-based social movements, the social opposition in the advanced capitalist societies has begun to

¹⁰ The well known concept of “post-industrial society” was firstly defined in the social sciences by the French scholar, Alain Touraine. According to him, the main characteristic of the post-industrial society is dealt with the pluralisation of the social movement types. Unlike the previous industrial society, the struggle between bourgeoisie and the working class hasn’t been as the unique dynamo of the social movements in the post-industrial society (quoted in Crossley, 1995, p.151).

mobilise around a range of new social movements (the peace movement, the environmental movement, second wave of feminism, radical student movement, the movement of animal rights etc.) (Crossley, 2000, p.149). In comparison with the social movements of the industrial area, the new social movements have had distinct characteristics as follows: Firstly, the new social movements have mobilised around the flexible, non-hierarchical political organisations and campaigns rather than the political parties or trade unions. Secondly, these movements have struggled for the political change in a specific social sphere rather than total transformation of the social order. Finally, unlike the specific socio-economic rights demands of the social movements of the previous industrial era, the new social movements have struggled for the extension of the right categories of the modern citizenship towards embracing the environmental, gender, ethnicity issues (Crossley, 2000, pp.151-153).

In the literature of social sciences, the distinct theoretical approaches have competed to clarify the nature of the new social movements.¹¹ If we take the close relationship between the rise of new social movements and the “post-industrial condition” into consideration, the theoretical approaches of Hirsch and Offe introduce an outstanding perspective to conceive the nature of the new social movements. According to Hirsch, the rise of new social movements could be described as a reaction to both the bureaucratisation and the “massification” effects of the previous era of organised capitalism and the co-modification effect of the neo-liberal era. In this respect, the new social movements sought to overcome alienation and regulation, and promoting human emancipation through a radical form of politics (quoted in Buechler, 1995, p.450). Drawing on this argument of Hirsch, the new social movements could be identified as the defensive movements that seek to

¹¹ A brief summary of the distinct theories of new social movements, see: Buechler, Steven (1995) “New Social Movement Theories, *The Sociological Quarterly* vol.36/no:3, pp: 441-466.

protect the social life from the power-centred surveillance and regulation projects. According to Offe, the rise of the new social movements is concerned with the “pluralisation of social contradictions” in the post-industrial era. In addition to the “labour-capital contradiction”, the distinct social contradictions, which derive from the environmental, gender, ethnicity, human rights questions, have shaped the contemporary nature of the post-industrial society. So, the new social movements have mobilised around these new social fragmentations (quoted in Bora, 1990, p.50). Offe’s theoretical approach also introduces a convenient ground to conceive the rising activism of new social movements in the current globalisation process. Today, the globalisation process has proceeded on the basis of a range of distinct, global contradictions (the north-south division, the global environmental questions, the question of universality of human rights, and the question of the reform of the United Nations etc.). In response to the “globalisation of the distinct social contradictions”, the citizens of the distinct nation-states have mobilised around the campaigns of global new social movements, such as ATTAC, Amnesty International, World Social Forum, to overcome these global contradictions and realise a just globalisation process.¹² In this process, global new social movements struggled for the recognition of a range of rights and responsibilities by the supra-national organisations rather than the nation-states. In conclusion, following these arguments, the new social movements-based alternative citizenship concepts (the examples of Radical Democratic and Ecological Citizenship) in the globalisation process are examined in the concerned section of next chapter.

¹² Concerned with the activism and campaigns of the outstanding new social movements in the globalization process see: Şen, Bayram (2005) “Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler”, *Birikim*, September 2005, pp: 44-47.

CHAPTER 4

ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS IN THE GLOBALISATION PROCESS

As it was discussed in the previous chapter, the multiple processes of globalization – the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, the process of

cultural denationalization and the process of deindustrialization- have eroded the constrained nature of modern citizenship, and opened up a convenient ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts. In this chapter, six alternative concepts of citizenship –European, Global/Cosmopolitan, Urban, Multicultural, Radical Democratic, Ecological Citizenships- are taken into consideration. Following the openings introduced by the multiple processes of globalization, these alternatives are classified and examined.

4.1. CLASSIFYING ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS IN THE GLOBALISATION PROCESS

In consequence of a range of significant historical developments, such the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the appearance of neo-liberal globalization process, the rise of international economical and political integration, the concept of citizenship has regained a significant position in the social sciences since the 1990s. The growing attention of the social sciences in this direction is especially concerned with the inability of modern citizenship to overcome the problems, fuelled by this overall changing process. In this respect, a range of distinct alternative concepts of citizenship have been put forth in the literature of social sciences in order to transcend the constraints, dealing with the nature of modern citizenship. In this chapter of thesis, by taking into consideration the challenges of multiple processes of globalization towards the modern citizenship, the alternative concepts of citizenship are classified.¹³ Firstly, in relation to the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation

¹³ In this thesis, the possibilities of alternative concepts of citizenship in the globalization process are discussed within the context of six cases. These cases are chosen and classified by taking into consideration the effects of multiple processes of globalization -interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, the process of cultural denationalization, the process of deindustrialization- on the evolution of citizenship concept. Depending on the volume and the content of the study, new alternative concepts of citizenship, such as Transnational, Feminist, Multiple citizenships, could be attributed to these kinds of classifications which is based on the relationship between the globalization and the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts.

and reterritorialisation and the rise of multi-level polities, the concepts of European, Global/Cosmopolitan and Urban citizenship which challenge the national-belonging aspect of modern citizenship are examined. Moreover, the European citizenship is evaluated as the first “real” practice which has been the candidate to replace the modern citizenship. Secondly, in relation to the cultural denationalization process and the rise of multicultural society, the multicultural citizenship (group rights-based differentiated citizenship) which challenges the individual rights aspect of modern citizenship is analyzed. Thirdly, in relation to the deindustrialization process and the rise of new social movements, the Radical Democratic and Ecological citizenships are examined.

4.2 THE PROCESSES OF DETERRITORIALIZATION AND RETERRITORIALISATION, AND THE ALTERNATIVE CITIZENSHIP CONCEPTS TO TRANSCEND THE NATIONAL-BELONGING ASPECT OF THE MODERN CITIZENSHIP

As it was discussed in the previous chapter, as a result of interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, multi-level polities (at the supra-territorial and the sub-national levels) have gained autonomy against the nation-state. In terms of the evolution of citizenship concept, this process introduced a convenient ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts which will transcend the national-belonging aspect of modern citizenship. In this respect, the three cases,- European, Global/Cosmopolitan, Urban Citizenships- are examined in the following sections as the alternatives which will transcend the national-belonging aspect of modern citizenship.

4.2.1 EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

The European Union (EU), which was established in 1993 with the “Treaty on European Union” (the Maastricht Treaty), has been the most outstanding political integration process of the world politics today. The origin of this process has traced back the European Economic Community, founded in 1957. In the initial phase, the European integration process came into being as merely an economic community that was composed of six-member states. In the following phases, the European integration process has widened and deepened. And, in the post-cold war era, it has transformed to a political union –the EU- that is composed of the twenty-seven member states. Today, the EU is described as a *sui generis* political organization, based on a set of long-term economic and political objectives. In this sense, the two opposite theoretical approaches (the supranationalism and the intergovernmentalism) have competed to clarify this particular nature of the EU.¹⁴ According to the supranational approach, the European integration process initially came into being as a regional economic integration process. And, the deepening and the widening of the integration process amongst the national economies and the rise of interdependence have resulted in both the supranational institutionalization and the political integration. In the contemporary nature of the EU, the supranational institutions (notably the European Commission) have got capable of making binding decisions for the member states in some respects. Due to this characteristic of the EU supranational institutions, the EU has had a strong tendency to evolve into a federal polity. By contrast, the intergovernmental approach proposes that the level and the speed of the European integration process depend on the political will of the

¹⁴ In addition to the theories of supranationalism and intergovernmentalism, there have been a range of distinct theories of European integration –the Confederalism, Institutionalism, and Consociationalism- in the literature of the European studies. Nevertheless, these theories have been as the middle range theories that are positioned between the poles of supranationalism and intergovernmentalism. In this respect, the theories of supranationalism and the intergovernmentalism reflect two main distinct visions of the European integration. For further information see: Rosamond, Ben (2000) *Theories of European Integration* Houndsmills: MacMillan Press.

member-states. Although the supranational institutions of the EU have had a set of the common policies and objectives to coordinate the member-states, the content of these policies and objectives has had a limited effect. Moreover, the member-states have still possessed strong political autonomy to make decisions in compatible with their national interests. In opposition to the “United States of Europe” envision of the supranational approach, the intergovernmental approach proposes that the member nation-states will continue to be the main driving force behind the EU in the future (Rosamond,2000,pp.12-16).

Both the supranational and the intergovernmental approaches have contributed to grasp the distinct aspects of the contemporary nature of the EU. In this context, while we examine the European integration process, instead of merely relying on one of these approaches, we must presuppose that the nature of EU could be exactly conceived on a ground that is determined by the constant tension between the intergovernmental (national) and the supranational (post-national) approaches. Drawing on this fact, this section of the thesis is to examine one of the most significant components of the EU, the “EU citizenship” which was formally introduced with the Treaty of Maastricht in 1993. In this respect, all member state nationals can enjoy a series of rights attached to this new legal status. This legal status is constructed on two characteristics. Firstly, the individual must be the national of a member state in order to acquire this legal status. There isn't any other possibility to acquire it. Moreover, the member states retain to be the single authority for the determination of who is the eligible for the acquisition of the national citizenship (the modern citizenship). Secondly, the EU citizenship is a complementary status that doesn't replace the national citizenship (the modern citizenship). In other words, the EU Citizenship introduces a set of complementary

rights that is added to the right categories enjoyed by the nationals of member states.

These rights can be summarized as follows:

The every citizen of the Union will have the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the member states.

The every citizen of the Union will have to vote and stand in local government and European Parliament elections in the country of residence.

The every citizen of the Union will, in the territory of a third country in which the member state of which he is a national isn't represented, have the right to be protected by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any member states.

The every citizen of the Union will have the rights to petition the European Parliament, and, apply to the Ombudsman.¹⁵

The every citizen of the Union will have the right to write to any European institutions in one of the official languages of the Union and being answered in the same language.

The every citizen of the Union will have the right to access to Parliament, Commission and Council's documents, except in the cases legally agreed.¹⁶

As it is revealed in the analysis of the basic characteristics of the EU citizenship above, the constant tension between the intergovernmental and the supranational tendencies within the institutional framework of the EU has embodied the contemporary nature of the EU citizenship. On the one hand, in conformity with the vision of the intergovernmental approach on the EU institutions, the EU citizenship is a complementary status that has been dependent to the national citizenship (the modern citizenship). For an individual, being the national of a member state is prerequisite to acquire the status of the EU citizenship. Moreover, the EU hasn't put a common nationality policy into force to standardize the distinct citizenship practices of the member states. In this respect, in the light of *jus soli* or *jus sanguinis*

¹⁵ The function of Ombudsman is the investigation of the cases of alleged maladministration by the union institutions and the bodies, which will make the EU institutions more open and democratic.

¹⁶ For further information, concerned with the content of the EU citizenship, see the "EU Citizenship" section of the EU official website: http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/citizenship/fsj_citizenship_intro_en.htm.

principles, the member-states have been free to determine who could be considered as their national, who couldn't. So, the European citizenship has reproduced the exclusionary tendency of the national citizenship (the modern citizenship). Eventually, the vast amount of third country nationals (immigrants refugees, asylum seekers), which have lived in the territory of the member states for the long time, have been deprived of acquiring the status of the EU citizenship due to their nationality (Bhabha, 1999, p.15). Another characteristic of the EU citizenship, which strengthened the assumptions of the intergovernmental approach, has been the limited content of the EU citizenship. If we recall the citizenship definition of Marshall, based on the assumption that the modern citizenship is composed of comprehensive civil, political, social rights, the contemporary content of the EU citizenship is incompatible with this definition. The contemporary right categories of the EU citizenship could be described as the systemic re-articulation of the economic rights that have been enjoyed by the member-state nationals since the early period of the European integration process. The core of the right categories of the EU citizenship, the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the member states has been in the agenda of the political institutions of the European integration process as "the free movement of workers and their dependants within the European economic area" since the beginning of the European Economic Community. Furthermore, this fundamental right hasn't been enforced with the right to vote in the national elections in the contemporary content of the EU citizen citizenship. The member-state nationals, who have resided in the territory of second member-state, have only had the right to vote in the local and the European Parliament elections. This characteristic has revealed the imbalance between the economic rights and political rights in the contemporary nature of the EU citizenship (Bhabha, 1999,

pp.16-17). It could be also taken into account as the persistence of the monopoly of national citizenship (the modern citizenship) on the right categories that is enjoyed by the citizens.

On the other hand, although the contemporary nature of the EU citizenship has had a limited content and the effect, it also contains a significant potential to validate the assumptions of the supranational approach. According to the supranational approach, the integration of Europe corresponds to an evolutionary widening and deepening process. In this respect, whereas there had been no such a thing as the European citizenship in the 1970s and 1980s, today, it has been as a formal status in the *acquis communautaire*. If we recall the dynamic and the developmentary nature of the citizenship concept, the EU citizenship has a strong tendency to evolve a post-national citizenship, depending on the performance of the supranational tendencies within the institutional framework of the EU. From this perspective, as Bosniak (2000:4) argues, despite its limited content, the EU citizenship is a real departure from the model of the national citizenship (modern citizenship). Because, it is the first citizenship practice that has set out establishing a relationship of belonging between a post-national polity and the citizen. Drawing on this fact, the EU citizenship could be also described as the first concrete instance that has challenged the national belonging aspect of the modern citizenship. Nevertheless, the performance of supranational tendencies to transform the EU into a federal polity has been the determinative force on the issue of whether the EU citizenship would evolve into a complete post-national citizenship –the membership status of a federal polity- , based on the comprehensive economic, political, social rights, or not.

4.2.2 GLOBAL/COSMOPOLITAN CITIZENSHIP

The cosmopolitan thought which draws on the ultimate unity of human experience and the universality of justice and peace concepts has reserved a significant place in the western philosophical thought since the ancient times. Despite the long history of this philosophical tradition, it was usually perceived as a philosophical utopia rather than a feasible political project. Especially, during the nation-state-based international order of the modern era, the ideology of nationalism has dominated over the social imaginary of humanity, and the cosmopolitan thought faded away. In the twentieth-century, due to the disastrous effects of the great wars, the cosmopolitan ideas were rearticulated in order to abolish the fact of war and to restore the international order by the liberal internationalist scholars. Nevertheless, this aspiration of the liberal internationalist scholars failed against the real politics. So, the post-war international organizations (both the League of Nations and the United Nations) came into being on a ground that didn't challenge to the absolute sovereignty of the nation-state and the dominance of power politics in the international order. In the aftermath of the long silence of the cosmopolitan ideas in the cold war process, the current globalization process has offered new opportunities for the rearticulation of these ideas. Along with the globalization process, capital, labour and ideas have circulated across the national borders. Moreover, the major actors of this circulation, the transnational forces (multi-national corporations, international organizations and global civil society organizations) have challenged to all kinds of national entities (nation-state, national culture and national citizenship etc.) to realize the global re-constitution. In response to the rise of interdependence and the globalization of risk and opportunity perceptions, the deepening of the international political institutionalization has been perceived as an inevitable process today. In this respect, the cosmopolitan thought has been the most convenient

political framework to discuss the possibility of the deepening process of the international institutionalization (Urry, 2000, pp.72-4).

In relation to the rise of the cosmopolitan ideas in the globalization process, the distinct perspectives which examined the possibility of the global/cosmopolitan citizenship have appeared in the literature of the citizenship studies. As it was discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the modern citizenship has been conventionally envisaged as the membership status of a nation-state (territorially-bounded state). Moreover, while the dominant political organization of the modern era, the nation-state derives its legitimacy from a set of exclusionary and inclusionary strategies, the modern citizenship is the key concept in terms of these strategies. Within the context of the concept of modern citizenship, the beneficiaries of the scarce resources of the nation state are defined. In this sense, as Urry (2000:76) argues, seeking to construct a more inclusive concept, such as the Global/Cosmopolitan citizenship, than the national citizenship (the modern citizenship) is very difficult task. For example, if we envisage a concept of Global/Cosmopolitan citizenship as the membership status of a global polity, it means that all humans in the world are eligible for acquisition of this status. So, the realization of such an inclusive citizenship concept depends on the constitution of a global polity that will distribute the scarce sources of the world on the basis of egalitarian principles. Today, despite the advancement of international institutionalization against the some global questions, there has been no evidence to validate that this process will evolve into a world polity, based on the egalitarian cosmopolitan principles. In the current globalization process, the course of international political institutionalism has been still determined by the nation state-based power politics. Drawing on this fact, while we examine the possibility of the

Global/Cosmopolitan citizenship in the globalization process, we have to conceive it as the bundle of the distinct intellectual positions which seek to examine the potential of the globalization process in terms of the evolution of the modern citizenship rather than a coherent project.

According to the cosmopolitan scholar Falk, there have been three quite distinct images in the current globalization process that introduce significant perspectives on the issue of “what it might mean to be a Global/Cosmopolitan citizen at this stage of history” (Falk, 1994, p.132). Firstly, the image of current global capitalist elite introduces a prominent perspective to grasp the characteristics of a possible Global citizenship. It becomes apparent today that the multi-national corporations have been the driving force of the neo-liberal globalization process. The economic size of these corporations equals to the GDP average of the middle-range national economies in the global economy. Moreover, due to both the liberalization of the international markets and the technological advancements in the spheres of communication and transportation, these corporations have had the capacity to manage economic operations all over the world. In opposition to the national equivalents, the multi-national corporations have been managed by a new generation of global capitalist elite that has had particular characteristics. Firstly, this new generation of the global capitalist elite is a “denationalized” community. It means that in terms of ethnic origin, this global elite has been as a heterogeneous community. Nevertheless, they haven’t attached significance to their essential ethnic or national affiliations. Rather, they rely on the symbols and values of a global business culture. Secondly, they haven’t established a relationship of belonging with a territorially-based political community. Thanks to the advancement in the spheres of technology and communication, they have lived in the global cities, such as New York, Hong Kong,

London, and traveled all over the world to manage global economic operations. Drawing on these characteristics, Falk argues that for the global capitalist elite, the national citizenship (the modern citizenship) has implied to a redundant concept. In addition, they can be described as the proto-Global/Cosmopolitan citizens (Falk, 1994, pp.133-4).

According to Falk, secondly, the image of the activists of the global social movements, such as Greenpeace, Amnesty International, has contributed to grasp the characteristics of a possible Global/Cosmopolitan citizenship. Since the 1980s, global social movements, which specialized on the human rights, the woman rights and environmental issues, have gained significance in the world politics. In addition, the rise of the socio-economic inequalities in the current neo-liberal globalization process has given impetus to the emergence of the new global social movements that struggled against the negative effects of this process. Similar to the global capitalist elite, the global social movements have been as the denationalized communities that are composed of the nationals of the distinct countries. Nevertheless, in opposition to the self-pursuit world-view of the global capitalist elite, the activists of the global social movements have internalized a global civic sense of responsibility against the global social questions. As an outcome of this kind of political consciousness, they have easily mobilized around the global political campaigns, and used a “transnational space” as the sphere of political action. As Falk states, we can also describe the global social activists as the proto-Global citizens. That is because, the emergence of the global civic sense of responsibility amongst the global social activists has offered a significant perspective to envisage the characteristics of a possible concept of Global citizenship (Falk, 1994, pp138-9).

Thirdly, Falk argues that the global reformers, which seek to construct a stronger UN, can be described as the proto-Global/Cosmopolitan citizens. The global reformers are a group of intellectuals (academicians, politicians, and the UN bureaucrats) that perceive the empowerment of the UN “as the indispensable to overcome the chaotic dangers of the degree of political fragmentation and economic disparity that currently exist in the world today” (Falk, 1994, p.132). These intellectuals have proposed to the “project of the cosmopolitan democracy” to develop the democracy and the human rights at the all political levels (global/national/local).¹⁷ According to this project, the democracy is an evolutionary and open-ending process. From this perspective, after the city-state and the nation-state democracy experiences, we have to set out pursuing a project of global cosmopolitan democracy. The realization of this project depends on the transformation of the UN to an effective agent that will have the supreme authority over the nation-states. In this respect, the principles of the absolute sovereignty of the nation-state and of the non-intervention of the domestic affairs of the nation-state, which were emphasized in the UN Charter, have to be revised. And, the UN has to be entitled of expanding the universal human rights and the democracy at the all political levels (Chandler, 2003, pp.333-5). As an integral part of the project of the cosmopolitan democracy, the cosmopolitan scholars propose the concept of Cosmopolitan citizenship. It could be asserted that in terms of the political feasibility, this concept has been as the most consistent proposal in the literature of the current debate of Global/Cosmopolitan citizenship. This concept doesn’t mean the membership status of a world polity that will replace the national citizenship (the modern citizenship). Instead, this concept has set out extending the territorially limited rights of citizen at the level of the nation state. According to the

¹⁷ The most outstanding theoreticians of the project of the cosmopolitan democracy in the academia are David Held, Danielle Archibugi, Mary Kaldor, Richard Falk, Ken Booth, and David Beetham (Chandler, 2003, p.348).

cosmopolitan scholars, the rights of the individual haven't to be merely perceived as the outcome of a belonging-relationship between the nation-state and the citizen in the current globalization process. In addition to the limited right categories of the national citizenship (the modern citizenship), all humans, as the Cosmopolitan citizens, have to benefit from a set of universal rights. In this context, in the light of the principles of the project of the cosmopolitan democracy, the UN has to set out developing an international legal, political framework that will guarantee the universal rights of all humans (all cosmopolitan citizens) without the constraints imposed by the absolute sovereignty claim of the nation-states. In response to this proposal of the cosmopolitan scholars, some skeptical scholars argue that the question of accountability could derive from the entitlement of the UN in this direction. And, the powerful nation-states could exploit the UN in order to intervene to the domestic affairs of the other nation-states under the guise of the "humanitarian intervention". In relation to this critique, the cosmopolitan scholars perceive the "global civil society" as the main agent that will overcome the possible accountability deficit of the UN (Chandler, 2003, pp.341-4).

4.2.3. URBAN CITIZENSHIP

As it was discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, the history of the concept of citizenship was traced back the ancient Greek and the medieval Italian city-states. Along with these early practices of the urban citizenship, for the first time of the history, the set of rules which determined the membership status of the political community (city state) were defined. Nevertheless, during these early practices, both the content of the citizenship status had a limited character, and it was bestowed to

the minor segment of the society. The contemporary content of the citizenship derives its universal and comprehensive character from a range of historical transformations in the modern era. As it was also emphasized in the first chapter of this thesis, one of the most outstanding historical transformations which enabled the constitution of the modern citizenship has been the rise of the nation-state as the dominant political organization of the modern era. In this respect, the modern citizenship was envisaged as the bundle of rights and duties that shaped the nature of belonging-relationship between the individual and the nation-state. In the current globalization process, we have witnessed the autonomisation of the cities from the imperatives of the absolute sovereignty claim of the nation-state (Sassen, 2000). In terms of the evolution of the modern citizenship, this process has challenged to the uniqueness of the belonging-relationship between the nation-state and the citizen, and offered a significant perspective to rethink the possibility of urban citizenship.

It becomes apparent that in the current globalization process, old geographical categories, such as the North-South, the First World and the Third World, haven't provided an adequate perspective to make sense of the current socio-political geography of the world. Because, by dividing the world into discrete, contiguous and contained territorial zones, we haven't mapped out the complex network of the global capitalism. Today, the main driving-force of the globalization process, the transnational capital has been located on a range of distinct "global cities", such as Bombay, İstanbul, Shanghai, Mexico City, New York, London. Thanks to the rapid advancements in the spheres of communication and telecommunication, the global capitalism has operated through a complex and dynamic network amongst these global cities (Işın, 2000, p.3). Moreover, as a result of their vital role in the reorganization of global capitalism, the global cities have differentiated from their

own nation-states in some respects. Firstly, the municipalities of the global cities have been entitled of benefiting from the extensive administrative autonomy in order to meet the “differentiated” needs of these dynamic cities. Secondly, due to the labour immigration towards these cities, the ethno-cultural composition of these cities has turned into a more heterogeneous character (Sassen, 2000, pp.50-1). Drawing on these characteristics of the global cities, it can be asserted that the global cities have been as the most convenient cases to discuss the possibility of a concept of urban citizenship. As Bauböck (2003:139) argues, a concept of urban citizenship could contribute to the evolution of the modern citizenship on account of two aspects. Firstly, we can detach the nationality aspect of the modern citizenship through a concept of urban citizenship. And, the urban citizenship could be granted on the basis of the residence in order to include the immigrant-originated inhabitants of the city. Especially, in the case of the global cities, this aspect of urban citizenship can be envisaged as an effective way to establish a relationship of loyalty between the city and the immigrant-originated groups. In this respect, as Işın (2000:5) argues, it is impossible to mention about the existence of politically independent cit-states in this stage of the globalization process. So, we cannot envisage the urban citizenship as the membership status of an independent urban polity. Nevertheless, especially, in the case of global cities, we can conceptualize the urban citizenship as an additional citizenship status that grants right to vote and stand in the local elections for all inhabitants of city, including non-national immigrant originated people. Secondly, due to the smaller population size of the city than the nation-state, the urban citizenship could be instrumentalised to realize a more active citizenship, based on the democratic participation (Bauböck, 2003, p.140). If we think this characteristic of Bauböck’s concept of urban citizenship along with Işın’s proposal, especially, in the

case of global cities, the realization of a concept of urban citizenship could provide new openings for the practices of local democracy and democratic participation.

4.3. THE CULTURAL DENATIONALISATION PROCESS AND AN ALTERNATIVE CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP TO TRANSCEND THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS ASPECT OF MODERN CITIZENSHIP: THE MULTICULTURAL CITIZENSHIP

As it was discussed in the previous chapter, as a result of cultural denationalization process, the contemporary societies have turned into a heterogeneous character in terms of ethno-cultural diversity. In this respect, the conventional assimilative policies and institutions of the nation-state, such as the modern citizenship, based on the individual rights, have failed to integrate the ethno-culturally minority groups towards the majority society. This process has also introduced a legitimate ground to rethink the vitality of multicultural practices in the contemporary democratic societies. In this respect, in the following section, the multicultural citizenship, based on the group rights, is examined as an alternative democratic way to integrate the ethno-culturally minority groups towards the majority society.

4.3.1. MULTICULTURAL CITIZENSHIP

The multicultural citizenship is a concept which aims at overcoming one of the most outstanding issues of the modern liberal democracy: the question of the democratic representation of the cultural diversities.¹⁸ The major theoretician of this concept, Kymlicka (1996) conceives the re-formulation of the modern citizenship on a new

¹⁸ It becomes apparent that the culture has been as a very complex phenomenon. There has been a range of distinct approaches to clarify this complex phenomenon. While Kymlicka proposes the concept of multicultural citizenship, he envisages this phenomenon as a sphere that includes all kinds of humanistic particularities -linguistic, ethnic, religious-. For further information, see: Kymlicka, Will (1996) *Multicultural Citizenship*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp.76-84.

ground that allows the representation of cultural particularities as the main advance to overcome this “blind-spot” of the modern liberal democracy. In this respect, firstly, we must briefly examine the question of the democratic representation of the cultural diversities in the modern liberal democracy in order to contextualize the concept of the multicultural citizenship.

For the liberal view, the ideal political community is a community that is composed of free and equal individuals. In this ideal political community, the bundle of the rights which entitles the individual to benefit from the freedom and equality is defined within the legal framework of citizenship status. Moreover, the condition of being citizen for the individual derives the legitimacy from his/her individualistic relationship with the state. In this respect, for the liberal view, as Porter argues, “the organization of society on the basis of rights or claims that derive from the religious, ethnic, and class based group membership is sharply opposed to the concept of society based on citizenship” (quoted in Kymlicka, 1998,p.167). However, we must find out the scope of the relevant political community in order to make sense of these abstract arguments of the liberal view. Despite the emphasis of the liberal view on the universality of the principle of the liberty and the equality, the political community of the equal and free individuals is conventionally defined within the confines of the dominant political organization of the modern era, the nation-state. And, within the political framework of this modern territorial state, the political community of equal and free individuals is envisaged as the “nation”. In this political organization, in opposition to the abstract arguments of liberal view, a contractual relationship between individual and state isn’t unique the criteria for the individual to be citizen. Beyond this abstract relationship, it is envisaged that the individual has a set of determined ethno-cultural affiliations as the member of the nation, and the

citizen in the nation-state. Moreover, the official ideology of the nation-states, the ideology of nationalism conventionally proposes that the individual, as a citizen could only make use of freedom and equality within a cultural sphere that is defined nationally and homogenously (Kukathas, 1997, pp.406-8). This peculiar mixture of the liberal view and the nationalism has shaped the content of modern citizenship in the nation-states.

Nevertheless, with the exception of a few nation-states, such as Japan, Korea, Norway, and Iceland, none of the nation states have been historically constructed on the basis of a culturally and ethnically homogenous population. In addition to a major ethnic group, that usually gives its name to country; the populations of the most of the nation-states are composed of distinct minor ethno-cultural groups. This characteristic of the nation-state is described by Üstel (1999:16) as follows: “the nations, those are more extensive than the nation-states, and the nation-states, those are more extensive than the nations, exist in the modern world history”. In addition to the “indigenous” ethno-cultural diversities, another significant process which has challenged the ethno-cultural homogeneity claim of the nation state has been the increasing international migration. Due to a range of distinct factors (the development of communication and transportation, the labour deficit of the advanced capitalist societies, the wars, the natural disasters etc.), increasing amount of people, as the forced or voluntary immigrants, have set out immigrating and settling in another country since the end of the Second World War. These immigrant communities have especially sought to immigrate and to settle in the western, liberal democratic nation-states due to the prosperous economic and the stable political structures of these countries. And, the some segments of these immigrant communities have acquired of the citizenship status in these nation states. So, the

contemporary social structures of the western, liberal democratic nation-states have contained a more multicultural nature (Castles & Davidson, 2000, 159). In this regard, the democratic representation of the cultural diversities has been one of the most vital questions of the western liberal democratic nation-states today.

In response to the ethno-cultural heterogeneity of the contemporary societies, the modern citizenship, based on a peculiar mixture of the liberal view and the nationalism, hasn't functioned as the instrument of social integration. That is because, within the political framework of the nation state, the ethno-cultural identity of the "majority" society is taken for the granted as the identity of the "nation". Moreover, it is argued that every citizen of the nation-state has been the individual bearer of this collective identity. For any ethno-cultural minority group originated citizen, the meaning of this characteristic of the modern citizenship corresponds to social assimilation rather than the social integration. Because, the modern state has recognized these citizens as not only the individual bearer of the rights and the duties, but also the individual bearer of a national identity that is defined on the basis of a homogenous ethno-cultural ground (Kukathas, 1998, p.409). So, the modern citizenship hasn't introduced a legitimate ground for the representation of the ethno-cultural diversities of the minority groups.

Kymlicka perceives the reformulation of the modern citizenship on a new ground that allows the democratic representation of the ethno-cultural diversities as main advance in order to overcome the question of the social integration of the ethno-cultural minorities in the modern liberal democracies. According to him, one of the most significant aspects of the political liberalism has been its emphasis on the pluralism. This aspect of the political liberalism has differentiated the liberal

democratic regimes from the authoritarian ones. And, if we envisage the ethno-cultural diversities as a kind of pluralism, a concept of multicultural citizenship, based on the group-specific rights, doesn't contradict with the political liberalism. Conversely, this new citizenship concept enlivens the social integrative function of the modern citizenship in the multicultural contemporary society (Kymlicka, 1998, p.169). In this respect, after borrowing the strengthful sides of the official multiculturalism policies that have implemented in the western liberal democracies since the 1960s, he substitutes these policies for the construction of a concept of the multicultural citizenship (differentiated citizenship). This new citizenship concept allows the minority groups to benefit from the forms of the differentiated citizenship, based on the group-specific rights, in order to integrate them towards the majority society.

Before clarifying the content of the multicultural citizenship, Kymlicka tries to classify the types of the ethno-cultural minorities. According to him, two types of minority group, which get eligible for the forms of the differentiated citizenship, have existed in the liberal democratic nation-states. These are the "national minorities" and the "ethnic groups". The concept of national minority identifies the community "which had the previously self governing, the territorially concentrated culture, before incorporating in a large state". The American Indians, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos and Native Hawaiians in the United States; Quebecois and various Aboriginal communities in Canada; Maoris in the New Zealand; Aborigines in Australia, Basques in Spain have been as the typical examples of the national minorities. The concept of ethnic group identifies the community which has integrated in a larger society through the immigration. Today, a lot of the distinct ethnic groups, which immigrated to these countries due to the economic and the

political reasons, have lived in the western liberal democratic nation states (Kymlicka, 1996, pp.11-2).

After determining the types of the ethno-cultural minorities in the modern society, Kymlicka proposes three kinds of the group-specific rights which can be attributed to the right categories of the forms of the differentiated citizenship. These are the “special representation rights”, the “polyethnic rights” and the “self government rights”. Moreover, he makes a distinction between the special representation rights and the polytechnic rights, and the self-government rights. While the former group rights can be attributed to the form of differentiated citizenship that would represent the cultural diversities of the ethnic groups, the self-government rights can be attributed to the form of the differentiated citizenship that would represent the cultural diversities of the national minorities. As Kymlicka (1998:169) argues, in opposition to the national minorities, the ethnic groups (immigrant communities) tend to integrate the majority society. Nevertheless, they suffer from the non-recognition of their cultural differences in the public sphere. A form of differentiated citizenship, based on the group-specific self representation and the polyethnic rights, must be bestowed to the ethnic groups in order to overcome this question. The Polyethnic rights mean the legal and the financial protection of the certain practices associated with the ethnic groups. The recognition of the polyethnic rights burdens two kinds of the obligation to the modern liberal state: the positive obligation and the negative obligation. The positive obligation defines the active financial and the legal encouragement of the modern liberal state for the ethnic groups in order to express their own cultural particularities in the public sphere. The financial support for the ethnic group associations and the festivals, the immigrant language rights in the compulsory education could be conceived as the typical examples of the positive

obligation of the modern liberal state to realize the polyethnic rights of the ethnic groups. The negative obligation defines the recognition of the exemption of the ethnic groups from some legal requirements by the modern liberal state (Kymlicka, 1998, pp.169-172). In other words, the modern liberal state hasn't to incline to homogenize the cultural particularities of the ethnic groups while they fulfill the public duties and they act in the public sphere as the citizens.¹⁹ In this context, Kymlicka (1996:51) argues:

Perhaps, the most controversial demand of the ethnic groups is for the exemptions from laws and regulations that disadvantage them, given their religious practices. For example, Jews and Muslims in Britain have sought exemption from Sunday closing or animal slaughtering legislation; Sikh men in Canada have sought exemption from motorcycle helmet laws and from the official dress-codes of police forces, so that they can wear their turban; Orthodox Jews in the United States have sought to wear the yarmulke during the military service, and Muslim girls in France have sought exemption from school dress-codes so that they can wear the *chador*... These group-specific measures –which I call “polyethnic rights- are intended to help ethnic groups and religious minorities express their cultural particularity and pride without it hampering their success in the economical and the political institutions of the dominant society.

The special representation rights mean the reservation of some seats of the state institutions for the ethnic groups. And, this type of group rights must be conceived as a temporary measure to overcome the disadvantaged and the oppressed position of the ethnic groups (Kymlicka, 1996, p.7). Although the main concern of the Kymlicka's concept of the multicultural citizenship is to integrate the ethno-cultural minorities to the majority society through the group rights, He also conceptualizes the special representation rights as an effective way to abolish the disadvantaged position of the other oppressed groups, such as women, disabled people etc. Drawing on the recent dominant trend in the social sciences that seeks to construct a more inclusive concept of minority, Kymlicka perceives all of the socially disadvantaged

¹⁹ In this respect, Kymlicka objects the liberal view's the dichotomy of the public and private spheres. He argues that although the liberal view theoretically envisages the public sphere as a neutral sphere that doesn't allow the representation of the citizen's cultural diversities, in the historical context, the public sphere(s) of the western liberal democratic regimes comes into being as a sphere that represents the white, able-bodied, Christian male citizen (Kymlicka, 1998, p.174).

and the oppressed groups within the category of minority group that has eligible for benefiting from the special representation rights (Kymlicka, 1996, p.32).

The third group-specific rights are the self-government rights. These rights can be attributed to the right categories of the form of the differentiated citizenship that would represent the cultural diversity of the national minorities. In opposition to the ethnic groups, the national minorities tend to withdraw from the majority society. Furthermore, they claim that they are distinct “peoples” with their own historical rights, territories and the inherent rights of self-government. According to Kymlicka, a form of different citizenship, based on the group-specific self-government rights, must be bestowed to the national minorities to bind them to a larger state. In the practical sense, this form of differentiated citizenship could be only implemented in the multinational federal states. The some section of the government rights is delegated from the federal government to the political authority of the constituent nation. And, if the federal government violates the self-government rights of the constituent nation, it has the right to separate from the federal multinational state. Due to this characteristic of the multinational federal states, the disintegration of them has always been a liable option (Kymlicka, 1996, pp.181-3).As it was seen in the disintegration process of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, this process usually causes the catastrophic results for the nations. In this respect, Kymlicka sets out answering the question: “What would hold such a multination federal state together?” As a preliminary point, he emphasizes that there is no a certain answer to this question. However, the analysis of the democratic practices of the liberal democratic multination states which aim at promoting the social unity without subordinating national differences, gives a significant perspective to answer this question. In this

respect, he draws attention to the cases of Canada and Switzerland.²⁰ In these multi-national federal states, both distinct “indigenous” national minorities and the distinct immigrant-originated ethnic groups have lived. For the members of these ethno-cultural communities, being citizen in these multinational states has been still “exciting and an object of pride”. Because, the civic nature of the official identities of these multi-nation states, that is identified with the respect to the ethno-cultural diversities, hasn’t embarrassed these distinct ethno-cultural communities (Kymlicka, 1998, p.184). Drawing on these cases, it can be asserted that the establishment of a civic common identity, based on the non-essentialist shared values, such as the principles of respect to the ethno-cultural diversities and the democratic pluralism, has been the most reasonable solution to create a social unity amongst the national communities and the ethnic groups in a multi-national state.

4.4. DEINDUSTRIALISATION PROCESS AND THE NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS-BASED ALTERNATIVES AGAINST THE MODERN CITIZENSHIP

As it was discussed in the previous chapter, as a result of deindustrialization process, the portion of the manual workers in the industrial societies has dramatically decreased. In the absence of the organised working-class opposition, the social opposition has begun to mobilize around the new social movements in the contemporary democratic societies. In this respect, the new social movements have sought to extend the content of citizenship concept to enhance the new social concerns, such as the ecological, ethnic, gender issues. In the following sections, the ecological, radical democratic citizenships are examined as the new social

²⁰ Kymlicka argues that in spite of their secessionist tendency, the majority of Quebecers still approve the common identity of Canada. And, he gives the reference to the results of a public opinion survey in 1992. According to this survey, 70 percent of Quebecers still identify themselves as the Canadians abroad (Kymlicka, 1998, p.184).

movements-based alternatives to extend the content of citizenship towards the new social concerns, such as ecological, ethnic, gender issues.

4.4.1. ECOLOGICAL CITIZENSHIP

The ecological or environmental citizenship is a new concept in the literature of the citizenship studies which aims at developing a dialogue between two distinct spheres, the ecologism and the citizenship. The theoretician of this new concept, van Steenbergen (1994:144) argues that the citizenship as a dynamic concept is open to the new debates and the developments. In this context, as a response to the catastrophic effects of the ecological problems, such as the global warming, the mass destruction of rain forests, it can be functionalized as a basic instrument to re-define the relationship of human being with the nature. Moreover, he asserts that the social movements historically play a crucial role in the extension of citizenship rights. “The labour movement in the nineteenth century; and women’s, the gay and civil rights movements in our time have been crucial for the accomplished the equal rights for blacks, industrial workers, homosexuals and women” (van Steenbergen, 1994, p.143). In this respect, the environmentalism or “greenism” as a global social movement will be the strongest force for the development of a kind of ecological citizenship. According to van Steenbergen, the ecological citizenship is constructed on three characteristics, inspired by the political assumptions of the global environmental movement. These characteristics could be taken into account as the grounds in which the ecological citizenship challenges the modern citizenship.

The first characteristic of the ecological citizenship depends on the notion of increasing inclusion. The history of modern citizenship can be described as one of the increasing inclusion. As a result of a range of historical developments in the last

two centuries, all mature and “sane” individuals in the western countries have begun to benefit from the extensive citizenship rights. In this context, the ecological citizenship proposes the extension of the rights-notion of the citizenship towards the non-human beings. According to van Steenbergen (1994:145), the belief in the idea that all living-beings have certain rights is prerequisite to change radically the relationship of human being with the nature and to cease the environmental degradation.

Secondly, the ecological citizenship proposes the extension of the responsibility-notion of the citizenship towards the nature. Human being, as an integral part of biosphere (global ecological system), doesn't merely have certain responsibilities against the other members of the society. For a liveable world, human being must obtain the responsibility for the all living-beings of the bio-sphere. In addition, this new outlook could be also formulated as the “inter-generational responsibility”. The extension of the responsibility of human-being towards the nature could be evaluated as the respect to the “rights of as yet unborn human beings” (van Steenbergen 1994, pp.147-149).

Thirdly, the ecological citizenship emphasizes the global aspect of the environmental problematique. In order to overcome this problematique for the survivability of mankind, the ecological citizenship envisages a kind of world citizen that perceives the world as the breeding ground, as the life-world. In this respect, van Steenbergen (1994:151) perceives the social activists of the global environmental movement as the initial examples of the ecological world citizenship.

4.4.2. RADICAL DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

The project of the radical democratic pluralism, which was formulated by Laclau and Mouffe, has been one of the most significant building blocks for the renewal debates of radical left-wing project in the post-cold war era. By proposing to deepen the liberal democracy within the context of the socialist ideals, this theory has departed from the orthodox Marxism and has become the major constitutive part of the post-marxism debates. Furthermore, in response to the “crisis of class-based left politics”, this project has embraced the new social movements, concerned with the socio-economic, ecological, racial and gender issues, as the revolutionary subjects of the project of radical democracy (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). Today, a lot of the new social movements – the World Social Forum, the Landless Workers’ Movement (MST) in Brazil, the Unemployed Workers Movement (Piquetero) in Argentina, Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) in Mexico- have inspired by this project and adopted it to their programs (Chatterton, 2005, pp.545-8). This section of thesis aims to examine the radical democratic citizenship concept of this project. Similar to the citizenship vision of Marshall, based on the assumption that the egalitarian character of modern citizenship plays a major role to overcome the class inequality of capitalism, the radical democratic scholar, Mouffe perceives the citizenship as the major instrument for the realization of the project of the radical democratic pluralism (Smith, 1998, p.127). In this respect, while we analyse the concept of radical democratic citizenship in this section, we also clarify the basic founding principles of this project.

Before proposing the concept of the radical democratic citizenship, Mouffe examines two the major views of modern citizenship: liberal individualism and civic republicanism.²¹ According to the view of liberal individualism, “citizenship is the

²¹ In the contemporary political philosophy, the liberal individualist view of citizenship is proposed by the libertarian scholars, such as John Rawls. In return to this philosophical position, the republican

capacity for the each person to form, revise and rationally pursue his/her definition of good” (Mouffe, 1997, p.61).The citizens, as equal and free individuals, use their rights to promote their self-interests within certain constraints imposed by the exigency to respect the rights of others. Individual rights can not be sacrificed for the common good, and individual can not be obliged to perform the public service, for such an obligation would illegitimately interfere with his/her liberty. As Mouffe (1997:83) argues, the major strength of the view of liberal individualism is its emphasis on the rights notion of citizenship and the coexistence of different conception of goods. However, this tradition also reduces the citizenship to a mere legal status, indicating the rights that individual holds against the state. In this respect, for the liberals, an idea of political community, based on the notions of public spiritedness, civil activity and political participation is incompatible with the political pluralism and the citizenship tradition of individual liberalism (Mouffe, 1997, pp.84-5).

Conversely, according to the view of civic republicanism, “we can not perceive our status as political persons without referring to our role as citizens and participants in the life of a political community, and that we can not justify political frameworks without some reference to common goods and ends” (Smith, 1998, p.117). Because, every identity, including citizenship is developed through dialogically relations between the individual or social group and its communal others. As Mouffe asserts, the major strength of the view of civic republicanism is its emphasis on the idea of political community and the political participation. Nevertheless, the civic republican insistences on a substantive notion of common good and shared moral values have totalitarian implications (Mouffe, 1997:83).

civic view of citizenship is proposed by the communitarian scholars, such as Charles Taylor, Micheal Sandel, Alasdair Macintyre, Micheal Walzer.

Mouffe (1997:84) asserts that neither civic republican nor liberal individual citizenship is adequate to grasp the multiplicity of present democratic demands. In order to deepen the modern democracy towards a radical pluralist one, a new view of citizenship, radical democratic citizenship must be developed. In this respect, we don't completely need to discard two major citizenship views. We must borrow the respectively strengthful sides of two major views to construct a new view of citizenship for a radical plural democracy. On the one hand, the emphasis of the liberal individualism on the centrality of the notion of the rights for the conception of citizenship must be acknowledged. On the other hand, this liberal individualist principle must be complemented through the civic republican emphasis on a more active sense of political participation and of belonging to a political community (Mouffe 1997, p.83).

In eyes of Mouffe, an idea of the political community which allows the different conceptions of the good is essential to struggle against the all kinds of inequalities and domination (socio-economic, racial, sexual etc.) and to construct a radical plural democracy. In such a political community, the each oppressed group –women, workers, blacks, gay, ecological, as well as other new social movements- would have the right to pursue its own definition of good –their own differences-. However, before pursuing their own definitions of good, they must recognize the radical democratic principle of “liberty and equality for all” as the common ethico-political values of the political community. While they, as the radical democratic citizens, are identified with the principle of “equality and liberty for all”, the main aim is to construct a collective political identity, the consciousness of “we”. These oppressed social groups, as the radical democratic citizens, would become the constitutive part of the collective identity of “we” through the principle of democratic equivalence. It

means that any of these oppressed social groups wouldn't set out hegemonizing this collective identity. It would function as a common ground, differs them from the undemocratic forces and discourses which negate all of them. In the final phase, the construction of this collective identity would not only overcome all kinds of domination and inequalities but also create the conditions for the establishment of a new hegemony through new egalitarian social relations, practices and institutions (Mouffe, 1997, pp.84-5).

Drawing on the Carl Schmitt's friend/enemy dichotomy, Mouffe (1997:68) argues that every definition of a "we" implies the delimitation of a "frontier" and the designation of "them". In the alternative of radical democratic pluralism, the division between "we" and "them" would derive from the antagonism between the democratic forces -radical democratic citizens- which are identified with the principle of "equality and liberty for all", and the undemocratic forces which negate all of them and dictate their own conceptions of good to all. However, we have to accept the principle of the impossibility of the full realization of democracy and of a fully inclusive political community. The radical democratic citizens would perceive the full realization of democracy and the fully inclusive political community as a "social imaginary" (a kind of common good), "something to which we must constantly refer when we are acting as citizens, but that can never be reached" (Mouffe, 1997, p.85).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This thesis has aimed at discussing the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts in the globalization process. Today, a range of new social dynamics, such as the emergence of new belonging forms, social concerns and the right categories have challenged the constrained nature of modern citizenship. By identifying these new social dynamics as the reflections of current globalization process, this thesis argued that modern citizenship has deprived of ability to overcome the problems imposed by the overall globalization process. In this respect, a range of distinct citizenship concepts have appeared in the literature of citizenship studies to transcend the constraints of modern citizenship against the challenges of globalization process. In the light of a strategy of selective literature review, this thesis derived six

alternative concepts (European, World/Cosmopolitan, Urban, Multicultural, Radical Democratic and Ecological citizenships) from the literature of citizenship studies. In the case of these six alternative concepts, this thesis set out answering two main research questions: in which spheres have these alternative concepts aimed at transcending the constrained nature of the modern citizenship in the globalization process? And, what extent have these alternative concepts offered the possibilities to transcend the constraints of modern citizenship in the globalization process?

Before examining the first research question of thesis, the constitution of modern citizenship was critically examined in the second chapter of thesis in order to clarify the constrained nature of modern citizenship. In this context, it was claimed that the constitution of modern citizenship could be discussed in the modern era within the three distinct contexts: the theory of social contract and the idea of natural rights, the nation-state and the welfare-state. Firstly, the theory of social contract and idea of natural rights were conceptualized as the philosophical ground of modern citizenship. This classic set of liberal democracy theories laid foundation for the individualism and rights aspects of modern citizenship. It was also argued that the constant tension between the political equality aspect of modern citizenship and the real socio-economic inequalities in the modern capitalist societies derived its essence from these effects of classic set of liberal democracy theories on the constitution of modern citizenship. Secondly, the dominant political organization of modern era, the nation-state was conceptualized as the spatial ground of modern citizenship. In this respect, it was claimed that the modern citizenship defined the collection of rights and duties which shaped the membership form of the nation-state as a political community. Like the previous practices of political community, the nation-state was based on a set of exclusionary and inclusionary strategies which determined the

beneficiaries of scarce resources. In terms of these strategies, the citizenship has been as the key concept. Nevertheless, in relation to the peculiarities of the formation process of nation-states, the content of rules, such as the “*jus soli*” (territorially defined citizenship) and “*jus sanguinis*” (ethnically defined citizenship), which determined the acquisition of citizenship status became different from one nation-state to another. Thirdly, the welfare state was conceptualized as the highest stage of modern citizenship. In the aftermath of attachment of welfare provisions to the capitalist state mechanism in the second half of the Twentieth-Century, the advanced capitalist societies entered into era of welfare capitalism in which both the content of modern citizenship expanded in terms of new category of social rights, and the major segments of advanced capitalist societies began to benefit from the new right categories of modern citizenship. Nevertheless, in the further stage of the era of welfare capitalism, the existing right categories (civil, political, social) of modern citizenship failed to satisfy the new social demands, caused by the new social issues, such as ecological, gender, ethnicity issues.

In the third chapter of thesis, the challenges of globalization process to the modern citizenship were discussed. In this respect, it was asserted that the overall globalization process have both challenged the constrained nature of modern citizenship, and offered the new possibilities to discuss alternative citizenship concepts. In order for exactly setting these challenges of globalization, it was conceptualized as the totality of multiple processes rather than a unique process. In this context, three processes of globalization were taken into consideration (the processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation, cultural denationalization, deindustrialization). Firstly, the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation which defined the current erosion of the nation-

state monopoly over the political power were examined. In this respect, it was argued that in this process, as a result of the assumptions of the dominant governing paradigm of the overall globalization process, the neo-liberal governance, the supra-territorial and sub-national polities have shared the political power of the nation-state. So, the emergence of multi-level polities has opened up a convenient ground to discuss the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts, based on new belonging forms and new set of rights and duties. Secondly, the process of cultural denationalization which defined the current erosion of culturally and linguistically assimilative power of nation-state was discussed. In this context, it was asserted that in this process, due to the growing international mobility of people and cultural interchange, the assimilative policies and institutions, such as the modern citizenship, of the nation-state have deprived of ability to integrate the indigenous and immigrant-originated ethno-cultural communities towards the majority society.

So, this process has made possible for rethinking the vitality of multicultural citizenship (group rights-based differentiated citizenship) in the contemporary multicultural societies. Thirdly, the process of deindustrialization which defined the transferring manufacturing base of global capitalism from the core capitalist countries to semi-peripheral and peripheral ones was analyzed. In this respect, it was argued that in this process, the proportion of the manual workers in the advanced capitalist societies has dramatically decreased. Thus, in the absence of working class-based social movements, the political opposition has mobilized around the new social movements (Ecological, Feminist, Peace, Radical Student Movement etc.) in the advanced capitalist societies. These new social movements have aimed at extending the right categories of citizenship concept towards the new issues of post-industrial society, such as the gender, ecology, ethnicity issues.

In the aftermath of discussing both the constitution of modern citizenship in the second chapter and the challenges of overall globalization process to the constrained nature of modern citizenship in the third chapter, the first research question of thesis, that examined the spheres in which the alternative concepts of citizenship have aimed at transcending the constrained nature of modern citizenship, was answered. Firstly, the concepts of European, World/Cosmopolitan, Urban citizenships, which have appeared in the interwoven processes of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation, were discussed. In this respect, it was claimed that these concepts have aimed at transcending national belonging aspect of modern citizenship, and reformulating the citizenship on basis of new belonging forms and set of rights and duties. Secondly, the concept of multicultural citizenship, which has regained significance in the process of cultural denationalization, was discussed. In this context, it was argued that this concept has set out transcending the individual rights aspect of modern citizenship, and enlivening the social cohesion function of citizenship on basis of ethno-cultural group-specific rights. Thirdly, concepts of Radical Democratic, Ecological citizenship, which have appeared in the process of deindustrialization, were analyzed. And, they were conceptualized as the new social movements-based alternatives which have set out transcending the limited right categories of modern citizenship, and formulating a “sensitive” citizenship against the new social concerns of post-industrial society, such as the ecological, gender, ethnicity issues.

The second research question of thesis, which examined the possibilities of alternative citizenship concepts to transcend the modern citizenship in the globalization process, was also answered in the fourth chapter. In this respect, it was argued that amongst the six examined alternative concepts, the concepts of European

and Multicultural citizenship have been as the concrete examples which have competed to transcend the modern citizenship. Since the acceptance of multiculturalism as the official policy at the beginning of 1970s, a range of distinct practices of multicultural citizenship have appeared in the western societies. In the current globalization process, the concept of multicultural citizenship has maintained its vital function of inspiring the multiculturalist practices in the contemporary democratic societies. The European citizenship, which came into force in the Maastricht Treaty of 1993, has guaranteed a range of additional rights for the nationals of the EU member states. Today, it has been as a supplementary status which doesn't replace the national citizenship (modern citizenship). Nevertheless, depending on the performance of the supra-territorial forces in the EU, it has had a strong tendency to evolve into a complete post-national citizenship. Unlike the Cosmopolitan and European citizenships, Urban and World/Cosmopolitan citizenships haven't been as the concrete examples which have competed to replace the modern citizenship (national citizenship). Rather, they could be described as the proposals that have aimed at making sense of the emerging belonging relationships between the individual and, the supra-territorial and sub-national polities by the academic circles. The Urban citizenship has been articulated to develop the practice of local democracy, and the belonging relationship between the municipality and the inhabitants of urban areas. The Cosmopolitan/World citizenship has been articulated to contribute to the current intellectual project of the Cosmopolitan Democracy, based on the idea that an international mechanism has to be constituted in the globalization process in order to guarantee the basic human rights for all individuals. Similarly, the Ecological and Radical Democratic citizenships could be described as the proposals which were articulated as a part of the alternative political envisions of

global and local new social movements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Appadurai, Arjun (1996) *Modernity at Large Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Brodie, Janine (2000) "Imagining Democratic Urban Citizenship", in Engin F. Işın (ed.) *Democracy, Citizenship and Global Citizenship*, New York: Routledge.

Brubaker, Roger (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Castles, Stephen & **Davidson**, Alastair (2000) *Citizenship and Migration, Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. New York: Routledge.

Crossley, Nick (2002) *Making Sense of Social Movements*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Dubiel, Helmut (1998) *Yeni Muhafazakarlık Nedir?* Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Faulks, Keith (2000) *Citizenship*. London: Routledge.

George, Vic & **Wilding** Paul (1994) *Welfare and ideology*, London:Harvester Wheatsheaf .

Giddens, Anthony (1999) *Third Way. The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, Jürgen (1994) “Citizenship and National Identity” in Bart van Steenbergen (ed.) *Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication.

Harvey, David (1997) *PostModernliğin Durumu*, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Heater, B. Derek (1999) *What is citizenship?* Malden, Mass: Polity Press.

Heater, B. Derek (2004) *A Brief History of Citizenship*. New York: New York University Press.

Heywood, Andrew (1997) *Politics*. London. Macmillan Press.

Işın, F. Engin (2000) “Democracy, Citizenship and City”, in Engin F. Işın (ed.) *Democracy, Citizenship and Global Citizenship*, New York: Routledge

Jessop, Bob (1990) *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in its Place*. London: Polity Press.

Kaya, Ayhan , “Ulusal Yurttaşlıktan Çoğul Yurttaşlığa, in G. G. Özdoğan and A. Kaya (eds), *Sınır Tanımayan Sorunlar*, (İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları).

Kymlicka, Will (1996) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, New York: Claredon Press.

Kymlicka, Will (1998) “Multicultural Citizenship”, in Gherson Shafir (ed.) *Citizenship Debates: A Reader*, Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press.

Laclau, Ernesto & **Mouffe**, Chantal (1996) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London: Verso.

Mann, Michael (1994) “Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship”, vol.I., in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Marshall, T. Humphrey (1994) “Citizenship and Social Class”, vol. I., in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Marx, Karl (1994) “On the Jewish Question” vol.I., in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Mouffe, Chantal (1997) *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.

Nispet, Robert (1994) “Citizenship: Two Traditions”, in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Oldfield, Adrian (1994) “Citizenship: An Unnatural Practise?” vol.I., in B. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Rosamond, Ben (2000) *Theories of Integration*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.

Sassen, Saskia (2000) “The Global City: Strategic Site/New Frontier”, in Engin F. Işın (ed.) *Democracy, Citizenship and Global Citizenship*, New York: Routledge.

Smith, Anna Marie (1998) *Laclau and Mouffe: the Radical Democratic Imaginary*. New York: Routledge.

Soysal, Yasemin (1994) *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Post national Membership in Europe*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Şenel, Alaeddin (1990) *Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.

Touraine, Alain (2000) *Modernliğin Eleştirisi*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Turner, S. Bryan (1994a) “Outline of a Theory of Citizenship”, vol. I, in Bryan S. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.) *Citizenship, Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Turner, S. Bryan & Hamilton, Peter (1994b) “Theoretical Debates Commentary”, vol. II, in Bryan S. Turner and Peter Hamilton (eds.) *Citizenship, Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.

Üstel, Füsun (1999) *Yurttaşlık ve Demokrasi*. Ankara: Dost Yayınları.

Van Steenbergen, Bart (1994) “Towards a Global Ecological Citizenship”, in Bart van Steenbergen (ed.) *Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication.

DOCUMENTS

“EU Citizenship” section of the EU official website:
http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/fsj/citizenship/fsj_citizenship_intro_en.htm.

JOURNALS

Bauböck, Rainer (2003) “Reinventing Urban Citizenship”, *Citizenship Studies*, vol.7, no.2.

Bhabha, Jacqueline (1999) “Belonging in Europe: Citizenship and Post-National Rights”, *International Social Science Journal*, vol.51, no.1.

Bora, Tanıl (1990) “Yeni Toplumsal Hareketlere Dair Notlar” *Birikim*, no: 13: 49-53.

Bosniak, Linda (2000) “Citizenship Denationalized”, *Indian Journal of Global Legal Studies*, vol.7, no.2.

Brodie, Janine (2004) “Globalization and Citizenship beyond the Nation-state”, *Citizenship Studies*, vol.8, no.4.

Buechler, Steven (1995) “New Social Movement Theories” *The Sociological Quarterly* vol.36, no.3

Chandler, David (2003) “New Rights for Old? **Cosmopolitan** Citizenship and the Critique of State Sovereignty”, *Political Studies*, vol.51: 332-349

Chatterton, P. (2005), “Making Autonomous Geographies: Argentina’s Popular Uprising and the ‘Movimiento de Traabajadores Desocupados (Unemployed Workers Movement)’”, *Geoforum*, Volume 36, Issue 5: 545-61.

Falk, Richard (1994) “The Making of Global Citizenship” in Bart van Steenberg (ed.) *Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication.

Falk, Richard (2000) “Decline of Citizenship in the Era of Globalization”, *Citizenship Studies*, vol.4, no.1.

Hirst, Paul & **Thompson**, Grahame (1995) “Globalization and the Future of the Nation-state”, *Economy and Society*, vol.24, no.3.

Kukathas, Chadran (1997) “Multiculturalism as Fairness: Will Kymlicka's Multicultural Citizenship”, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 5(4): 406-427.

Özkazanç, Alev (1997) “Refah Devletinden Yeni Sağa: Siyasal İktidar Tarzında Dönüşümler”, *Mürekkap*, no.7: 21-36.

Özkazanç, Alev (2000) “Yeni Sağdan Sonra: Yeni Sol, Siyasal İktidar ve Meşruiyet, *Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Araştırma Dergisi*, no.3:29-61

Rex, John (1991) “The Political Sociology of a Multicultural Society”, *European Journal Of Intercultural Studies*, vol.2, no.1.

Şen, Bayram (2005) “Yeni Toplumsal Hareketler”, *Birikim*, no: 197:44-47.

Tambini, Damian (2001) “Post-national Citizenship”, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (2):195-217.

Urry, John (2000) “Globalization and Citizenship”, *Journal of World-System Research*, vol.5, no:2.

.

