

Developments in the Theory and Practice of Citizenship

Developments in the Theory and Practice of Citizenship

Edited by

Simon McMahon

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Developments in the Theory and Practice of Citizenship,
Edited by Simon McMahon

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2012 by Simon McMahon and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-3745-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-3745-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Chapter One	1
Introduction: Developments in the Theory and Practice of Citizenship Simon McMahon (King's College, University of London)	
Part One: Unpicking Theories of Universal Citizenship	
Chapter Two	21
Universalising Citizenship as Identity? Francis Luong (University of Lausanne)	
Chapter Three	43
Examining how 'Universalist' Conceptualisations of Citizenship Paradoxically Lead to Social Exclusions in Theory and Practice: The Shortcomings of the French Declaration Athanasios Gkoutzioulis (King's College, University of London)	
Part Two: Citizenship in Policy and Practice	
Chapter Four	63
Transnational Cooperation between Slovenia and Italy: What Difference Does It Make? Elisabetta Nadalutti (University of Bath)	
Chapter Five	85
Participation and Citizenship: A Case Study Gemma Jamieson and Martin Fortis (University of Westminster)	
Chapter Six	111
Changing Conceptualisations of National Citizenship and Naturalisation in the UK: An Anthropological Perspective Zoe Khor (Birkbeck College, University of London)	
Contributors	135

LIST OF TABLES

Fig. 1: Overview of the Participatory Budgeting case study..... 100

Fig. 2: Aims of Participatory Budgeting in the case study..... 104

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is a collective effort that has come together over the course of the last few months. It is only fair that the support and patience of those involved be recognised in such a project.

Developments in the Theory and Practice of Citizenship began life as an attempt to bring together a collection of theoretical and empirical studies of citizenship in order to critically engage with current practice and academic debates, as well as illustrating new avenues for research. The task of exploring these questions was undertaken at the Department of European and International Studies at King's College London in its call for papers for a conference titled *Developments in Contemporary Citizenship*. The hard work and eager collaboration from the department's PhD research group was vital and the event could not have happened without (in no particular order) Paolo Chiochetti, Lorenzo Fusaro, John Cooper, Aude de Caunes, Kadri Kaan Renda, Athanasios Gkoutzioulis and Jason Xidias. We would also like to thank the department's resources and research manager, Dorothy Pearce, for her friendly and knowledgeable support with logistics, as well as Christoph Meyer and Nagore Calvo for generously offering their time and help.

The book is intended to be a platform giving space for new research and researchers to be showcased, and as such each chapter is entirely the product of the authors' endeavour. Even so, I would also like to thank the contributors for their patience at my fussiness and for their willingness to read, discuss and re-read and re-discuss their chapters. Two anonymous reviewers were also incredibly helpful and constructive in their feedback. Hopefully the work will pose questions and provide avenues for further work in the future.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: DEVELOPMENTS IN THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF CITIZENSHIP

SIMON McMAHON

KING'S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

The institution of citizenship is undergoing a period of intense scrutiny in academic studies as well as in political practice. Since the late 1980s and early 1990s it has been the subject of a surge in social science studies, leading Kymlicka and Norman to define it “the ‘buzz word’ among thinkers on all points of the political spectrum” (1994, 352). Similarly, Favell declared that “everybody” was talking about citizenship and its relation to “very fundamental questions about the unifying values, cohesion and identity of liberal democratic states” (1998, 5).

Today, these fundamental questions remain absolutely relevant. Globalisation, international migration, socio-cultural pluralism and regional devolution have made it increasingly difficult to determine the boundaries and identities of nations, whilst declining electoral participation, the managerialisation of politics, the rise of the citizen-as-customer and the decline of the welfare state suggest a confusion of the rights, benefits, duties and obligations tied to membership of a political community. We also find ourselves amidst the declared Death of Multiculturalism and a continued need to understand tensions arising from ethnic and religious (particularly Muslim) pluralism. Meanwhile, policy-makers urge for civic responsibility and ‘active citizens’, whilst members of social movements call for a more equitable, equal and participatory democracy. The importance of this context to the academic understanding and political practice of the citizen is the inspiration for *Developments in the Theory and Practice of Citizenship*.

Citizenship can be conceptualised in a broad sense as a status of equality between members of a political community or according to a

narrow definition as a legal status of formal membership to the polity of a particular state (Bauböck 2010, 847; Kymlicka and Norman, 1994, 353). In this volume, citizenship is generally understood according to the broad definition. However, this does not mean that the narrow one should be ignored. Indeed, it is from the tension between citizenship as a broad normative project of inclusion and as an exclusive, bounded, and usually national, legal status of equality that many of the questions to be addressed arise (Sassen, 2006, 290). It is here that, in an age of globalisation, we potentially find a challenge to the boundaries of the nation-state (Soysal 1994, 1996) and a questioning of the claimed liberal values of policies for managing socio-cultural diversity (Adamson et al., 2011, Joppke 2010, Triadafilopoulos 2011).

Consequently, we ask: what is the relationship between globalisation, the state, the political community and the individual? How do states continue to exert influence over the statuses, duties and cultural identities of the members and aliens of the polity? Can interaction in local settings escape from state control and define citizen roles ‘from below’? We engage with these questions from distinct perspectives, whilst highlighting through empirical case studies how the practice of citizenship plays out in society.

This introduction provides a summary of some of the key debates which have reinforced the significance of the concept of citizenship today. It covers the relevance of citizenship in contemporary political debates, highlighting the tension between a “revival of nationalism” framing citizenship as an exclusive identity by posing the question of who belongs in the national community (Zapata-Barrero 2009, 5), and the search for spaces of inclusive and equal political participation in a time of huge disparities of wealth and opportunities (Joppke, 2009, 37). It is also intended to set out a brief theoretical overview and put forward an understanding of citizenship as a social practice to be analysed through contextualised discourses, rituals, laws, and institutions. This will act as a loose interpretative frame for the following chapters.

Developments in the politics of citizenship

The dominant perspective of much Twentieth century academia has followed that presented in T.H Marshall’s seminal piece *Citizenship and Social Class*, reflecting the idea that “there is a kind of basic human equality associated with the concept of full membership of a community” (1992 [1950], 7). Such equality was formally conceptualised as a range of political, civil and social rights and duties, and was ensured in practice

through the representative, legislative and welfare institutions of the nation state. Political communities have also been frequently understood as sharing a common (national) identity, defined through a series of shared characteristics such as history, language, cultural norms, values, institutions and so on, which would promote a sense of unity and legitimacy for the spread of common policies and shared rights (Smith 1991). In this sense, citizens have been typically understood as culturally-similar equal members of a united political community bounded by the territorial and bureaucratic reach of the nation state.

Nevertheless, contemporary developments have challenged these core principles. Firstly, there has been a challenge to the perceived cultural unity of the citizenry. During the 1980s a growing normative political philosophy of liberal democracy saw as its central task unpicking the issue of how states can and should manage this new cultural and value pluralism (e.g. Rawls 1973, Walzer 1983). At the forefront was the Rawlsian ideal of a race and ethnicity-blind state, behind a veil of ignorance in order to eradicate any value bias (Rawls 1973). However, subsequent multiculturalists argued that the laws and institutions of the nation state itself were innately biased towards the cultural norms and traditions of the majority population, in detriment to the cultural differences of minority racial, ethnic, religious, and identity groups. In doing so, they contested the internal unity of the polity and the ability of the state to provide the conditions for equality between citizens. Their suggested response was differentiated rights to recognise and accommodate minority groups (see for example, Appiah 1994; Kymlicka 1995; Kymlicka and Norman, 1994; Taylor 1994).

Over this period immigration has occupied a central role in this rejuvenation of the concept of citizenship (Bauböck 2006, 2010, Bauböck and Guiraudon 2009). From the guestworkers of the 1970s who chose not to return from West European countries, to the ever-present skilled and unskilled foreign labour in contemporary global cities; from the family reunification of migrants' kin, to flows of refugees under international rules and norms, governments have repeatedly had to acknowledge the structural presence of foreigners in their national populations. In response to the incorporation of culturally diverse and varied populations some governments have offered access to rights and welfare as a pathway to integration. By affecting the social status and everyday lives of foreigners, from granting access to public services to offering the opportunity to participate in local politics, these policies draw the social boundaries of citizenship. On the other hand, moreover, through the establishment of citizenship tests other governments have reversed this integration logic,

redefining access to the rights of national citizenship as a reward for already assimilating to the host society.

These policies categorise the status of natives, citizens and immigrants and “mark a distinction between members and outsiders” (Bauböck, 2006, 15). They reiterate the challenge of managing relations between distinct ethnic, religious and racial groups, and constitute an attempt to contest the challenge posed to the state’s territorial integrity and cultural unity by globalisation. Yet they also reveal the contradictory values at the heart of liberal states which, as Joppke has noted, are “inclusionary and democratic to the inside [... but] necessarily exclusionary and undemocratic to the outside, rocks of facticity that defy universal justice and human rights” (1999, 2).

The challenge of cultural and value diversity continues to be of utmost significance to debates surrounding citizenship as a nationally-grounded identity and as a tool for managing diversity. The principal problem arising from the multiculturalism approach is the tendency to essentialise cultures and draw false boundaries around categories of citizens in order to define recognisable, homogeneous social groups. This is the same theoretical assumption of the dramatic Clash of Civilizations thesis, which posits that distinct cultures are unable to coexist due to differing norms, traditions, and values (Huntington 1996, 2004). Such a perspective contrasts, however, with a range of sociological and anthropological research finding that identities are contextual and relational, rather than fixed and permanent (e.g. Barth 1969, Goffman 1971, Brubaker 2004). These texts challenge the essentialising assumptions of multiculturalists. In doing so, they also raise the epistemological challenge of knowing whether identity groups really constitute united ‘communities’ and, if they do, whether the representatives who call for differential rights truly stand for their cultural identity and have the authority to act for all of them politically (Pitkin 1972).

The context of this book is one in which this debate has continued as national leaders across Europe and beyond announce the Death of Multiculturalism as the policy frame for managing socio-cultural diversity. Multicultural policies’ tendency towards preserving and accommodating cultural diversity have been criticised for not creating cohesive, unified communities. In October 2010, the German Chancellor Angela Merkel stated that

“Of course the tendency had been to say, ‘let’s adopt the multicultural concept and live happily side by side, and be happy to be living with each other’. But this concept has failed, and failed utterly”

At the same time, her colleagues stated that they were committed to a “dominant German culture” and feared becoming “the world's welfare office” (The Guardian, 17th October 2010). This was followed by David Cameron’s speech on the same issue in February 2011, in which he commented that

“Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream. We’ve failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong.”

Britain and Germany are not the only countries to have followed this route. Among others, in June 2011 it was asked if the acquittal of the politician Geert Wilders from charges of discrimination against Muslims signalled the death of Dutch multiculturalism (Time World, 29th June 2011), whilst in 2008 Andrew Jakubowicz of the Centre for Cosmopolitan Civil Societies in Australia had already mentioned the “slow death” of multiculturalism there too (2008). Such developments constitute an intriguing shift in focus for two countries previously considered bastions of multicultural policies.

Of course, such a dramatic discourse has not suddenly arisen out of nowhere. Despite generalising about the end of multiculturalism as a conceptual framework, these critical debates have particular, nationally-grounded, historical trajectories. Via a discourse of social cohesion and rights, they have frequently not criticised a lack of equality of opportunities or political representation for minorities but instead the failure to assimilate them into the dominant mainstream (Zapata-Barrero 2009, 6). Thus, when David Cameron speaks of the inability of the wider ‘doctrine of multiculturalism’ to create a cohesive society he is in reality speaking of the failures of the specifically paternalistic British race relations to do so, which was never its intended purpose. Indeed, British multiculturalism has been described as a policy of maintaining public order rather than encouraging political participation or a “*modus Vivendi* ethnic pluralism” (Favell, 1998, 115-124). It is important for us to understand the embeddedness of this discourse in the development over time of national contexts, laws, institutions, cultural identities and social practices in order to unpick its claims.

Also particularly significant in fuelling such criticism of multiculturalism has been concern surrounding inter-religious relations with Muslim populations and the fear of Islamic extremist terrorism (see, for example, Norman Lamont’s article ‘Down with multiculturalism, book-burning and fatwas’ in The Telegraph, 8th May 2002). There has been an unbalanced

focus in public and academic debate on anti-terrorism and criticism of Islam as incompatible with liberal values. Studies of extremism seem to suggest that all Muslims have a terrorist potential and a predisposition to become 'radicalised' by those around them. One example is Meleagrou-Hitchens' report of the 'radicalisation' of Anwar al-Awlaki, a preacher who had resided in the USA and the UK and from 2000 onwards had become one of the most important actors in the Salafi-jihadi movement. By arguing that "the distinction between violent and non-violent actors within the Islamist movement ... are unclear, and the boundaries that do exist are blurry and easily traversed" as well as that "the core Islamist diagnosis of the world can, and sometimes will, lead individuals to support organisations such as al-Qaeda" (2011, 8-11), such reports reiterate the overly simplistic and teleological assumption that being of the Muslim faith is an adequate pre-requisite for becoming a terrorist. Rather than engaging with the wider question of why people and organisations of different backgrounds turn to violent terrorism, this vein of research reinforces the perception of the Muslim faith as irreconcilably different to Western values.

Such a generalised approach has recently been interestingly and ably criticised in a study of young Muslims in London and Madrid who feel that the very values and rights that the liberal state claims to protect are not upheld by the majority society and its institutions (Gest 2010). This diverts the magnifying glass away from 'Muslim difference' and onto the liberal state. It is the state's policy, the author finds, that results in 'apartism' as individuals move away from the mainstream institutions of politics and society due to "the belief that the democratic society and the referent individual no longer hold convergent interests" (ibid, 64). The argument posits, therefore, that it is not Islam but the marginalization of citizens (of any faith) from political and social institutions which can explain destructive anti-system views. These conclusions should encourage academics to critically reassess, rather than heedlessly reiterate, the assumptions which reinforce the constructed ideological barriers between Muslims and 'the West'.

The second challenge to Marshall's principles comes from globalisation and devolution, and their questioning of the territorially-bounded nature of the state, national borders and the terms of membership of the national community.

On the one hand, globalisation theorists such as Sassen have found the nation-state to be decentred and denationalized by liberalising its borders to trade, transferring its power into transnational economic and political institutions and being subjected to international human rights laws (1995,

30). Similarly, Soysal predicated on the establishment of a post-national citizenship due to the decoupling of the principles of nationality and rights following increasing international migration, the awareness of universal human rights, and the emergence of multi-level polities such as the European Union (1994, 1996). In this sense, globalisation theorists reassessed the relationship of the territorial sovereignty of the nation state with the terms of membership of the political community. Normative theorists in this vein have explored cosmopolitanism as the possibility of promoting universal rights to all individuals across national borders, based broadly on a shared conception of civic qualities, fundamental rights and the universal in a post-national constellation (Benhabib 2005, Habermas 2001).

On the other hand and at the same time, regional nationalist movements have challenged the state 'from below' in countries such as Britain, Spain and Belgium by making calls for self-government either through independence claims or demands for devolution. Studies of this dual process of globalisation and devolution have worked towards the conceptualisation of citizenship as a bundle of rights which are granted, interpreted and upheld in distinct ways at different regional, national and supranational governance levels (Bauböck 2009, 2010, Faist 2002, Keating 2009). One example is Spain's immigration policy, which sees nationality, border and visa policies being based at the level of national government whilst integration measures and representative bodies for immigrants are governed at the level of regional Autonomous Communities (Zapata-Barrero 2009, 2011). All of this, moreover, is framed by EU-level visa policies, anti-discrimination legislation and immigrant integration benchmarking, as well as international laws on human rights and asylum. In this setting, state representatives have had chances to restrict immigrant entry and circumvent national judiciaries, pressure groups and public opinion by "venue-shopping" at the EU level and in Third Countries such as Morocco to prevent emigration at the point of origin (Guiraudon 2000, Pérez 2010). Regional actors have also been able to define immigrant integration in cultural terms to legitimise and support their own identity-based nationalist projects (Hepburn 2011). Thus, the status citizens of different nationalities and legal categories are determined by varying political institutions; whereas the *de jure* terms of their membership of the polity are outlined for at the national or supranational levels, the policies and practices for establishing a status of *de facto* social equality are found at the regional and local level. The social status of immigrants in countries such as Spain is dependent on the balancing act of actors and power relations within this complex layered administrative structure.

These approaches embrace the territorial and bureaucratic diversity of ways of regulating the rights and duties of citizens in layered and devolved polities. The multi-level or nested citizenship of the European Union is presented as the epitome of such an arrangement (Faist 2002). Originating from the rights to free movement enabling workers to move across the Community territory for reasons of employment, European Union citizenship was tied at birth to the liberalising single market creation of the integration project (Bellamy, 2004), and only later added to by non-discrimination legislation in the form of the Race Directive (2000/43/EC) and the European Charter of Fundamental Rights. Despite some discussion over whether the EU's citizenship regime constituted an undermining of the nation state (e.g. Maas 2007), it seems clear that this is not the case. There has not been established at the supranational level a full concept of the citizen, social benefits vary from one country to another, there is a lack of the right to vote in national elections outside of one's country of origin, and also the continued capability of national governments to expel foreign EU citizens from their country if necessary (Directive 2004/38/EC). Instead, the rights granted by the EU compliment those granted by national governments, creating a "bundle of rights" sustained by different institutions (Bauböck 2010).

Furthermore, the extent to which the EU in its current form may be able to establish a unified citizenry is questionable. As noted by Habermas, the lack of a European public sphere or civil society inhibits the development of a European polity, and "as a political collectivity, Europe cannot take hold in the consciousness of its citizens simply in the shape of a common currency" (2001). This is not only a European problem, as noted by Kymlicka and Norman's complaint that there is generally more citizen apathy and less space for meaningful debate and effective participation in many liberal democracies (1994, 362). However, as noted by Nadalutti in this volume,

"Increasingly non-governmental organisations and civil society mobilize at the local-regional, supra-national level and effectively participate within EU Community policies ... Local associations, especially those representing ethnic minorities have thus mobilized in the context of the normative and the legal frameworks developed at the supra-national level to promote cross-border cooperation"

It appears, therefore, that at least in the context of the Italian-Slovenian border there are opportunities for cooperation and development of a civil society 'from below' which is not constrained by national boundaries. This is an important area for future research as it illustrates the relationships

between legal categories, political dynamics and social structures at the local and supranational levels of governance.

The importance of this citizenship ‘from below’ has also come centre-stage in contemporary politics through social movements and protest dynamics (Della Porta, 2006). At a time of economic downturn, many citizens are being asked by their governments to ‘share the burden’ of austerity measures. In response, we find burgeoning movements from *Occupy* in the USA to the *Movimiento 15-M* (also known as the *indignados*) in Spain, which criticise an unequal level of wealth distribution and unrepresentative political processes. Under the slogans “we don’t need Wall Street and we don’t need politicians to build a better society” (<http://occupywallst.org>) and “real democracy now, a Europe for citizens, not for markets” (<http://www.democraciarealya.es>), they bring into question the reality of the status of equality afforded to members of a national (or European) citizenry. These locally-rooted movements have obtained a global reach by forming transnational networks, largely through internet communications.

Whilst much political debate has lamented political apathy and made calls for a more ‘active citizenship’, such grassroots local and transnational protest movements have increasingly staked a claim for a more participatory democracy away from the state. They fit into the wider development of “New” social movements which can be summarised as having

“a critical ideology in relation to modernity and progress; decentralized and participatory organizational structures; defence of interpersonal solidarity against the great bureaucracies; and the reclamation of autonomous spaces, rather than material advantages” (della Porta and Diani, 1999, 12)

By opposing the intrusion of the state and market into social life, these movements stake a claim to their autonomy, and the right to determine their private lives and voice their identities (ibid, 12-13). Within any national setting there is to be found a myriad array of groups, movements and communities which redefine and reinterpret the values, laws, rights and duties of the members of the polity. Local contexts are also brought together through a framework of cross-border information exchange around specific issues (Teune, 2010). These are citizens who make demands on states and supranational institutions, but whose mobilisation and organisation is not necessarily delimited by the boundaries of the national territory. They underline the tension between the individual as free and autonomous, and the citizen as member of a bounded polity

subject to the laws and institutions of a state. Whilst many governments, particularly in Europe, currently emphasise the exclusive, cultural and nationally-grounded aspect of citizenship, these movements from below aspire to openness and promote the principles of rights and participation.

The contributions to this volume contextualise these debates through empirical case studies. They underline the varied, politically contextual and socially-contingent approaches to the concept and practices of citizenship. Citizenship is understood as a social process, developing and changing over time. Such an approach follows the general understanding of citizenship as a form of social closure, a way of distinguishing between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ of the political community, influenced by historical perceptions, institutional rules and discourses of identity (Brubaker 1992, Bauböck 2006).

Just as studies of ethnicity have already shown us, such distinctions are dependent on the maintenance of a boundary between social groups (Barth 1969, Karner 2007, 22). Brubaker’s later work took this further by critiquing theories which presented social groups and the collective identities, ethnicities and nations which defined them as permanent, bounded objects of analysis. Instead, he argues, they exist

“only through our perceptions, interpretations, representations, categorisations and identifications. They are not things *in* the world, but perspectives *on* the world” (2004, 17).

Such perspectives on the world are presented as categories through laws, rules, discourses, institutions, organisations, actions, rituals, and so on. The terms of belonging to these categories, the access of their members to resources, and the exclusion of outsiders from them are contentious issues which political and social actors insistently compete over. The boundaries which define categories such as community, nation and citizenry are in this sense being repeatedly suggested, debated, and defined as power relations and political contexts change over time.

Citizenship too constitutes a process of defining a category of individuals. From above, political and legal institutions propose, define and enforce categorical definitions such as ‘national citizens’, ‘European citizens’, ‘third country nationals’, or ‘aliens’, each of which implies a different range of rights and a different social status. From below, those categorised can also appropriate, subvert, evade or transform the boundaries drawn around them, such as the search of social movements for autonomous space away from state and market control. It is in this way that citizenship can, and this volume suggests should, be understood not just as a legal category but as a contextualised social practice, a process of

negotiation between institutions ‘from above’ and civil society ‘from below’. The narrow definition of citizenship as a legal category cannot, indeed, be separated from its broader conceptualisation as a status of inclusion and belonging: they are both constituent parts of the same process of social closure.

An analytical framework for studying citizenship should therefore encompass a critical assessment of the laws, rights, discourses, institutions, rituals, ideologies and identities through which competing perspectives are expressed, and the varied political, social and cultural settings in which they are embedded. Viewed as such, it should not necessarily be a surprise when national conceptualisations are ‘sticky’ and demonstrate a certain path dependency over time. As noted by Brubaker (1992) and Favell (1998), there are understandings of the ideas and terms surrounding membership of the polity which continue to be embedded in rituals, institutions, laws, languages and public philosophies which are of a national focus. However, these are possible fields of contention, where competition is found over the meaning and content of laws, cultural practices, institutional norms, and so on. In this way, for example, the ritual of a British citizenship ceremony constitutes a flexible space for local as well as national identities to be voiced (Khor, this volume). Also, the European Union offers an interesting case study, where the dual processes of supranational integration and subsidiarity-led devolution have created opportunities for regional and local actors and interests to gain authority and promote cross-border cooperation, thus developing hybrid spaces where national boundaries are blurred (Nadalutti, this volume).

The chapters in this volume, although not offering a wholesale conceptualisation of this sociology of citizenship, offer an illustration of this diversity of venues and processes of citizenship in practice. By combining theoretical and empirical perspectives the contributions are illustrative of the benefits of exploring how normative and formal legal provisions of citizenship are put into practice, and highlight the rich possibilities for reinterpretation and redefinition of citizen statuses in different contexts.

In the next chapter, Luong analyses the contemporary discredit of the idea of multicultural citizenship, as it seems to occur in the Western liberal democracies, and its evolution towards a political will of upgrading and renationalizing the notion of citizenship in the post-2001 period. In a first part, he critiques multiculturalism’s frequent a “culturalist” bias in practice which tends to “essentialize” cultures as coherent ethnolinguistic blocs and discusses the retreat of multiculturalism policies, assessing to what degree these policies have led to socio-economic marginalization and self-

segregation of ethnic minorities. In a second part, he examines the contemporary state campaigns to upgrade citizenship as a tool of integration, moving away from any multicultural “laissez-faire”, and attempting to bind newcomers into a particular nation-state. According to the Joppke’s ‘paradox of universalism’, the only particular identity that newcomers could legitimately be expected to adopt and share is a liberal identity consisting of general rules and principles of liberal democracy, *a fortiori*, devoid of any particular cultural content. However, Luong argues that Joppke, by saying that the state culture is nothing but a universal concept of political liberalism, actually dismisses the cultural nuances of political liberalism and the rising power of culture as a criterion of immigration policy.

In chapter three, Gkoutzioulis’ critical appraisal of the theory of the cosmopolitan universal highlights the particularistic roots which have fed into its implementation in practice. He unveils the theoretical weaknesses of theories of universalism from Archibugi, Held, Kaldor and Habermas, stating that they depart from a particularistic theoretical point of departure. In a wide-reaching argument, he questions the universal equality of status granted by the market according to Marx’s exchange value, and by rationality, according to Habermas. By tying these criticisms into an analysis of the French Declaration of the Fundamental Rights of Man, Gkoutzioulis reveals how an understanding of theoretical universal equality does not always reflect the reality when implemented politically.

The remaining chapters are more explicitly grounded in empirical research and represent a passing from the transnational to the local level of analysis. Chapter four sees Nadalutti analyse the way that local actors in the Upper Adriatic region have transgressed national boundaries and redefined their shared values, interests and roles through practice and cooperation. The 1990s have witnessed a strong debate around the emergence of a new kind of citizenship in Europe and she analyses the ways in which identity and citizenship are being reshaped in cross border areas following the implementation of EU cross-border-cooperation programmes and civil society mobilization, with reference to the Upper Adriatic area. First, she offers a brief theoretical background on citizenship. Second, she investigates how different crossborder grass-root stakeholders relate to each other in the process of implementing cross-border-cooperation projects, and through their interaction construct new meanings, interests, and values and revisit their identities. The conclusions to the chapter argue that the constant interaction between societal and political cross/border actors at the local/elite level is leading to greater

mutual understanding, long-term transnational initiatives and an increasing emphasis on shared interests and values.

Jamieson and Fortis take the case study of Participatory Budgeting as a way of investigating and analysing the definition of citizen roles in Britain in chapter five. The Third Way ideology, policy and practice of the Labour government of 1997 to 2010 constitute, they argue, continuations of the neoliberal ideology of their predecessors. An assessment of the normative bases, historical development and reality in practice finds that, despite using the language of participation and community to promise to emancipate citizens and enhance their autonomy, participatory budgeting is centred around consensus, efficiency and managerialism. In this context, the space for meaningful participation is restricted by a perception of citizens-as-customers to choose on pre-decided options. It is claimed that this creates a post-political context which questions the democratic potential of managerial policies. Thus we find exemplified the contradiction between a discourse on 'active citizenship' and a practice which frames the citizen as passive recipient or consumer of public policies.

Finally, in chapter six, Khor analyses the rituals of the naturalisation process in the UK. She explores how in recent years, most notably through the introduction of citizenship ceremonies in 2004 and tests and language courses in 2005, British naturalisation policy and practice has explicitly sought to bring *thin* legal conceptualization and *thicker* civic conceptions of citizenship together. She argues that, "like national borders, national citizenship is not natural, given or neutral, but constructed, contingent and influenced by social, political and economic expediencies". The citizenship ceremony is found to (re)use and (re)create traditional symbols of 'Britishness', as well as being a civic ritual aiming to promote a 'value consensus'. Furthermore, the ceremonies are often locally contextualized, with reflections on the culture, language, and everyday life of the local area. In this way she highlights the differences, tensions and contradictions between national discourses on citizenship-as-identity, the individual's perceptions of belonging in the UK, and the everyday practice of 'life in the United Kingdom'.

References

- Adamson, Fiona B.; Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos, and Zolberg, Aristide R. 2011. "The Limits of the Liberal State: Migration, Identity and Belonging in Europe", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(6): 843-859

- Appiah, K. Anthony, 1994. "Identity, Authenticity, Survival: Multicultural Societies and Social Reproduction", Amy Gutmann (ed.) *Multiculturalism*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 149-164
- Barth, Frederik. 1969. *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organisation of cultural difference*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Bauböck, Rainer (ed.). 2007. *Migration and Citizenship*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press
- Bauböck, Rainer. 2010. "Studying Citizenship Constellations", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(5): 847-859
- Bauböck, Rainer and Guiraudon, Virginie. 2009. "Introduction: realignments of citizenship: reassessing rights in the age of plural memberships and multi-level governance", *Citizenship Studies*, 13(5): 439-450
- Bellamy, Richard. 2004. "Introduction: The Making of Modern Citizenship" in Richard Bellamy, Dario Castiglione & Emilio Santoro (eds.) *Lineages of European Citizenship*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-21
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2005. "Borders, boundaries and citizenship", *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 38(4): 673-677
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, USA: Harvard University Press
- . 2004. *Ethnicity without groups*, USA: Harvard University Press
- Della Porta, Donatella. 2006. *Globalization from below : transnational activists and protest networks*, Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press
- Della Porta, Donatella, and Diani, Mario. 1999. *Social Movements, An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Faist, Thomas. 2001. "Social Citizenship in the European Union", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39(1): 37-58.
- Favell, Adrian. 1998. *Philosophies of integration : immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain*, Basingstoke: Macmillan
- Gest, Justin. 2010. *Apart. Alienated and Integrated Muslims in the West* London: Hurst & Company
- Goffman, Erving. 1971. *The presentation of self in everyday life*, Harmondsworth : Penguin
- Guiraudon, Virginie. 2000. "European Integration and Migration Policy: Vertical Policy-making as Venue Shopping", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38(2): 251-271.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2001. "Why Europe Needs a Constitution", *New Left Review*, 11: 5-26

- Hepburn, Eve. 2011. "Citizens of the region: Party conceptions of regional citizenship and immigrant Integration", *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(4): 504-529.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of the World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster
- . 2004. *Who are we? The Challenges to America's National Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster
- Jakubowicz, Andrew. 2008. *A stunned silence: the slow death of multiculturalism*, Canberra: Australian National University, available at <http://apo.org.au/commentary/stunned-silence-slow-death-multiculturalism> accessed 20th December 2011
- Joppke, Christian. 1999. *Immigration and the nation-state : the United States, Germany, and Great Britain*, Oxford : Oxford University Press
- . 2009. "The inevitable lightening of citizenship", Ricard Zapata-Barrero (ed.) *Citizenship policies in the age of diversity* (Barcelona: CIDOB) 37-52
- . 2010. *Citizenship and Immigration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Karner, Christian. 2007. *Ethnicity and Everyday Life*. Great Britain: Routledge
- Keating, Michael. 2009. "Social citizenship, solidarity and welfare in regionalised and plurinational states", *Citizenship studies*, 13(5): 501-513.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, Will, and Norman, Wayne. 1994. "Return of the Citizen: A Survey of Recent Work on Citizenship Theory", *Ethics*, 104: 352-381
- Maas, Willem. 2007. *Creating European Citizens*, USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers
- Marshall, T.H. 1992 [1950]. "Citizenship and Social Class", T.H Marshall and Tom Bottomore, *Citizenship and Social Class*, UK: Pluto Press, 3-54
- Meleagrou-Hitchens, Alexander. 2011. *As American as Apple Pie: How Anwar al-Awlaki Became the Face of Western Jihad*, London: International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation and Political violence, available at <http://icsr.info/publications/papers/1315827595ICSRPaperAsAmericanAsApplePieHowAnwaralAwlakiBecameTheFaceofWesternJihad.pdf>
- Pérez, Antia. 2010. "The externalisation of migration control in Spain and its impact on Moroccan and Ecuadorian migration", Ricard Zapata-Barrero (ed.) *Shaping the Normative Contours of the European Union: a Migration-Border framework*, Barcelona: CIDOB, 97-118

- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1972. *The Concept of Representation*, USA: University of California Press
- Rawls, John. 1973. *A theory of justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sassen, Saskia. 1995. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an age of globalization*, New York: Columbia University Press
- . 2006. *Territory, Authority, Rights. From Medieval to Global Assemblages*, UK: Princeton University Press
- Smith, Anthony D. 1991. *National Identity*, London: Penguin
- Soysal, Yasemin. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. University of Chicago Press, London.
- . 1996. "Changing Citizenship in Europe. Remarks on postnational membership and the national state", David Cesarani & Mary Fulbrook (eds.) *Citizenship, Nationality and Migration in Europe*, London: Routledge, 17-29
- Taylor, Charles. 1994. "Multiculturalism", Amy Gutmann (ed.) *Multiculturalism*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 25-74
- Teune, Simon (ed.). 2010. *The Transnational Condition: Protest dynamics in an entangled Europe*, USA: Berghahn Books
- The Guardian, *Angela Merkel declares death of German multiculturalism*, 17th October 2010, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-germany-multiculturalism-failures> accessed 20th December 2011
- The Telegraph, *Down with multiculturalism, book-burning and fatwas*, 8th May 2010, available at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3576323/Down-with-multiculturalism-book-burning-and-fatwas.html> accessed 20th December 2011
- Time World, *Is This the Death of Dutch Multiculturalism?*, 29th June 2011, available at <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2080256,00.html> accessed 20th December 2011
- Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos. 2011. "Illiberal Means to Liberal Ends? Understanding Recent Immigrant Integration Policies in Europe". *Journal of Ethic and Migration Studies* 37(6):861-880.
- Walzer, Michael. 1983. *Spheres of justice: a defence of pluralism and equality*, Oxford: Robertson
- Zapata-Barrero, Ricard (ed.). 2009. *Citizenship policies in the age of diversity* (Barcelona: CIDOB)
- Zapata-Barrero, Ricard. 2011. Teorizando el enfoque español: coherencia de políticas públicas, interculturalidad y gobernanza multinivel, Eliseo Aja, Joaquín Arango and Josep Oliver Alonso (eds.) *Inmigración y*

crisis económica, anuario de la inmigración en España 2010,
Barcelona: Edicions Bellaterra

PART ONE:

**UNPICKING THEORIES
OF UNIVERSAL CITIZENSHIP**

