

# GLOBALISING CITIZENSHIP: THE IMPACT OF GLOBAL MIGRATIONS ON CONCEPT FORMATION

Simona BEZJAK<sup>1</sup>

COBISS 1.01

## ABSTRACT

### **Globalising Citizenship: The Impact of Global Migrations on Concept Formation**

Answers to the question of what it means to be a citizen are as old as political theory itself. These answers have changed throughout history because citizenship is an open and unstable concept, which is provided its contents and meanings based on diverse political relations and contexts, in interaction with which it is formed and changed. For centuries the concept of citizenship has been associated with the nation-state and nationality. Today, this modern notion of citizenship has been challenged by globalisation and global migrations. Contemporary global transformations give rise to a new form of citizenship that is not constituted exclusively around the ideas of territoriality and belonging. The main thesis of this article is that a theory of citizenship for a multicultural and global society must be based on the separation between citizenship and nationality. Global citizenship should be understood as an inclusive political community without any claim to common identity and belonging. We identify some major theoretical implications of global migration through which we can understand the need for contemporary conceptual changes that marks a rupture with the ways in which we have previously considered citizenship. By exploring the intersections of citizenship, community, and migration, we aim to deconstruct the contradictions of national citizenship and their simplistic transference to the global level in order to find ways of achieving new concept of imagining and practising political citizenship without belonging.

KEYWORDS: citizenship, globalisation, global migrations, political concepts, political community

## IZVLEČEK

### **Globalizacija državljanstva: Vpliv globalnih migracij na formacijo koncepta**

Odgovori na vprašanje, kaj pomeni biti državljan, so stari toliko kot sama politična teorija. Ti odgovori so se spreminjali skozi zgodovino, kajti državljanstvo je odprt in nestabilen koncept, ki svojo vsebino in pomene dobiva na podlagi različnih političnih odnosov in kontekstov, v interakciji s katerimi nastaja in se spreminja. Koncept državljanstva je bil stoletja povezan z nacionalno državo in nacionalnostjo. Tovrstno moderno predstavo državljanstva danes spreminjajo globalizacija in globalne migracije. Sodobne globalne spremembe ustvarjajo novo obliko državljanstva, ki se ne konstituira izključno preko idej teritorialnosti in pripadnosti. Temeljna teza članka je, da teorija državljanstva za multikulturno

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Simona Bezjak, PhD is a researcher in the field of Political Science. Her main research interests include political concepts, theory of the state, theories of global citizenship and citizenship education. E-mail: simona.bezjak@fdv.uni-lj.si.

in globalno družbo mora temeljiti na ločitvi med državljanstvom in nacionalnostjo. Globalno državljanstvo je treba razumeti kot inkluzivno politično skupnost brez sklicevanj na skupno identiteto in pripadnost. V članku identificiramo nekaj temeljnih teoretskih implikacij globalnih migracij, s katerimi razlagamo potrebo po sodobnih konceptualnih spremembah, ki pomenijo prelom z načini, na katere smo do sedaj premišljali državljanstvo. Z raziskovanjem povezave med državljanstvom, skupnostjo in migracijami dekonstruiramo kontradikcije nacionalnega državljanstva in njegove preproste preslikave na globalno raven, da bi našli načine, s katerimi je mogoče misliti in izvajati politično državljanstvo brez pripadnosti.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: državljanstvo, globalizacija, globalne migracije, politični koncepti, politična skupnost

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Citizenship is one of the most significant concepts in political science through which the fundamental categories of life in the political community are defined and practiced. This means that citizenship affects the other concepts and the political reality in a given political context (cf. Bartelson 1995). Political concepts are always in relationship with other concepts and the broader social, economic, and political context, in interaction with which they are created and changed (cf. Skinner 1969; Koselleck 1999; Foucault 2001; Lukšič and Pikalo 2007). Because citizenship is a dynamic, relational, rhizomatic, and open concept, in this article the possibilities of a post-modern concept of citizenship arising from the current globalisation processes are discussed. Such an interpretative methodological approach shows that citizenship cannot always have the same conceptual content because it changes according to the different usages depending on the different discursive and material conditions of the formation and circulation of discourse (Skinner 1969, Koselleck 1999; Foucault 2001; Bevir 2002). Thus, the concept of citizenship is always a set of political relations in a given context.

The history of the concept of citizenship is as old as politics itself, although its content is constantly changing. So the modern conception of citizenship, which is linked exclusively to the modern state and political participation in common or public affairs (Balibar 1988: 723), while still prevalent, is only one form of citizenship. Contemporary changes in the political context, which is becoming increasingly global, have a significant impact on the transformations of the concept of citizenship and on the way in which we perceive it. In recent decades several countries have revised their laws and practices concerning the rights and obligations of citizens; others have changed their rules for access to citizenship for immigrants, their children, and other minorities (Castles and Davidson 2000: 2). There have always been some fundamental ambiguities in the concept of citizenship, but this did not seem to matter much as long as the political context of the nation-state appeared stable (Castles and Davidson 2000: 2). Today, the global context reveals these contradictions and opens the theoretical field for reflections on new forms of citizenship that correspond to the world in which we already live. Thus, globalisation has become the contemporary context for the theory and practice of citizenship.

Since every concept is a composite whole (Deleuze and Guattari 1999), in this article we present a several elements arising from the processes of globalisation and changing the modern theoretical foundation of thinking about citizenship. Paying particular attention to the formation of global or transnational citizenship, we show that the very practices of current global migrations generate qualitative conceptual changes of citizenship because they bring new definitions of political belonging, political community and the relationship between people, territory and state.

## 2 THE PROCESS OF FORMATION OF THE CONCEPT OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

In recent years, the concept of citizenship has become the focus of political discourse and political science considerations mainly because of its relationship to the closed conceptual scheme of the nation-state. Since political concepts are products of the specific time, space, and language which express the dominant political relations, it would not only be unusual but also inappropriate to understand citizenship today in the same way as we did in the 18th and 19th centuries. The problem lies in the fact that the concepts do not merely describe the world, but also actively co-create it (cf. Skinner 1969; Koselleck 1999; Bartelson 1995; Bevir 2002). This social cycle or double hermeneutic shows that once concepts are formed, they filter back into the everyday world and change the way people think (Giddens 1987: 20). Therefore, it is important that we understand concepts over their historical span (cf. Balibar 1978; Braudel 1980). Moreover, if political concepts are seen as a multilayered semantic sediment from an accumulation of discourses, then a genealogical approach (cf. Foucault 1977) also comes to appear to be a crucial step (Kalmo and Skinner 2010, 11) on our way to understanding the concepts of citizenship. Only then can we make assumptions about current uses and conceptual changes, because concepts, meanings and changes are not generated according to any internal, independent dynamic of their own but through the accumulation of discursive practices.

Discourse is not only a logically-structured semantic system but it is primarily a social practice that produces a discursive whole in the form of concepts, terminology and coherent sets of meanings, which are institutionalised in a particular context (cf. Foucault 1977; 2001). So, discourses and concepts do not have a 'true', original, or single meaning. They obtain their meanings by being used, that is by the circulation of discourse. Thus, "one cannot speak of anything at any time" (Foucault 2001: 49). This means that today the formation of the concept of global citizenship is generated by the new discourse, i.e. a set of theoretical articulations, practices and institutions which define a new way of speaking about citizenship. This kind of discursive and conceptual shift is related to the transition from the national to the global perspective. In contemporary literature several different terms are used to indicate this shift, e.g. global, transnational (cf. Balibar 2004b), postnational (cf. Sassen 2002), multinational (cf. Harty and Murphy 2005), multicultural (cf. Kymlicka 2010), transpolitical (cf. Stoker et al. 2011) and cosmopolitan (cf. Osler and Starkey 2005) citizenship. This also implies that the new discourse, which found its conditions of existence in the current processes of globalisation, is semantically and conceptually heterogeneous.

The formation of concepts, their uses and meanings, is always the result of the political struggle for the future social articulation or *Gliederung* (Foucault 1977; Koselleck 1999; Bahtin 2005). Because the concepts are not merely derived from political reality but also respond to a constantly changing political context and political relations, the dominant way of thinking about citizenship depends on the dominant political power relations. Therefore, citizenship has been a focal point of political struggles and ideological conflicts throughout the history of political thought. This also means that today the persistence of the modern or national concept of citizenship is no less a political gesture than the demand for its global redefinition.

When we refer to such a globalisation of citizenship, we speak about the conceptual change rather than the global extension of national citizenship. It is becoming evident today that citizenship has multiple conceptualisations, and only some of them are linked to the nation-state. So, the conceptual separation of citizenship from nationality, i.e. the denationalisation of citizenship, allows citizenship to escape from the territorial trap in which the national concept of citizenship was caught.<sup>1</sup> The current

<sup>1</sup> The genealogy of the modern or national concept of citizenship developed in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries was linked to the formation of the modern nation-state and the ideology of nationalism. Citizenship was thus defined as a mutual legal relationship between the individual and state. This kind of nationalization of citizenship

need for the transformation of the modern concept of citizenship is not based solely on the new global political constitution, which makes it impossible to concentrate political power in one place. It is also related to the processes of immanent transformations of the modern state, national belonging and identity (Castles and Davidson 2000; Sassen 2002; Balibar 2004b). One of the elements that contribute significantly to these transformations are global migrations, which make current political communities increasingly multicultural and less exclusivist in the sense of national belonging and identity.

With regard to the process of formation of the political concepts, we can say that there are constantly in motion. This movement of concepts is generated by their relationship with the various theoretical and non-theoretical elements from which they are composed (Deleuze and Guattari 1999; Patton 2000, Foucault 2001). That is, the concepts are open multiplicities composed of various singularities, i.e. the elements and the relations between them. Each concept is the sum of these elements, their point of coincidence, condensation and accumulation. There is no concept with only one element, although the removal or adding of one component may change the concept (Deleuze and Guattari 1999: 25–7; Patton 2000: 12). The way in which these various elements are related to one other depends on the political choices that generate different concepts of citizenship.

One such element, which provided the contents of the modern concept of citizenship, was the specific modern relationship between the people, territory and state. This relationship was essential for the equation of citizenship and nationality (Balibar 2004b). Even today, its longevity is semantically expressed and institutionalised in the Slovenian language. Furthermore, its continuity is ensured primarily by the juridical understanding of citizenship as a legal relationship between the individual and the state.<sup>2</sup> However, the current practices of multiculturalism and global migration flows indicate that such an understanding of citizenship is conservative and reactive because it does not take into account the dynamic of the concept of citizenship discussed above. Therefore, if we look at citizenship using post-modern conceptual methodology, we can understand it as a process which is co-created by these practices. From this perspective, it is also important that the legal understanding of citizenship opens itself to a view that considers the theoretical structure, process of formation, and contemporary elements which constitute the concepts and their meanings.

### 3 TOWARDS A GLOBALISED AND DENATIONALISED CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP

Because the concept of citizenship is open to change, we argue that current globalisation processes have challenged the concept of modern citizenship, and introduced a new theoretical basis to discuss the possibilities of an alternative concept of citizenship, which is not rooted in the territorial closure of the modern state. In the last three decades, a weakening of the ties between citizenship and state has become evident. Globalisation as a set of multiple processes resulting in increasing political, economic,

---

made citizenship synonymous with nationality. Pursuant to this particular historical feature of the concept of national citizenship, the term citizenship still refers to the membership in the nation-state or the national political community, despite the fact that such a conception of citizenship is no longer adequate to understanding the dynamics of membership and belonging in a globalised world (Sassen 2002; Balibar 2004b).

2 In contemporary societies, the legal understanding of citizenship is dominant. It is characterized by a strictly technical recognition of the legal status of individuals, who are recognized as citizens and members of the political community only because of this specific status. Since this status is the basis for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, the state has the duty to create the laws to determine who are citizens and non-citizens (Sassen 2002; Smith 2002; Hoffman 2004; Kymlicka 2010). This kind of juridical logic is both inclusive and exclusive (Wallerstein 2003) because it represents the legal basis for the production of aliens, their political marginalization, detention, and economic exploitation.

and cultural interconnectedness among societies has encouraged the establishment of new global political actors. Additionally, the concept and institutions of the modern state, which remains the principal actor in the globalised world, have been transformed by these processes (cf. Pikalo 2003; Skinner 2010).<sup>3</sup>

However, the practices of alternative notions of political community and membership beyond the nation-state may not necessarily be new, because in some cases they can be found since the beginning of the formation of citizenship as a national institution (Sassen 2002: 277). Currently, these practices are only more evident and prevalent due to the emergence of cross-border or global (real and virtual) networks unwilling to automatically identify with a nation as represented by the state (Sassen 2002: 277). This kind of relaxation of nationally-based and culturally-exclusive membership in the community is also demonstrated by global migration flows. Consequently, modern patterns of political belonging, mobilisation and participation have been significantly changed (Harty and Murphy 2005). Moreover, the processes of globalisation and transnationalisation of politics, including the European Union, have expanded political participation at the supranational level. This in turn means that the national concept of citizenship is no longer consistent with the contemporary political reality to which political science must turn when designing its concepts (cf. Hegel 1821/1989). That is, the elements that constitute the concept of citizenship in a multicultural and global world transcend state borders since the nation-state is no longer the only 'architect' of the concepts of citizenship.

The political consequence of such a thesis is that national citizenship is in double crisis because it cannot adequately respond to the current challenges of citizenship on both the national and transnational level. More than one component that was constitutive for the national concept of citizenship has changed. One of them is the territoriality principle, the nexus between political power and place that was broken by globalisation (Castles and Davidson 2000: 6). In national citizenship, the nation-state was conceptualised as the spatial ground of citizenship. And citizenship was defined as the privileged collection of rights and duties which are tied to membership in a national community. The genealogy of the idea of the territorial limited political community reveals its roots at the very beginning of modern politics and modern political thought, when especially the natural law and social contract theorists (cf. Hobbes 1641/1998; Locke 1690/2010; Rousseau 1762/2001) sought to explain the political constitution of the state and citizens (the people). On this theoretical basis, citizenship has become tied to the nation-state and in fact, a product of the nation-state. As a consequence, the nation is not only an imagined community, as Anderson (1989) says; it has become the only way to imagine political communities (Negri and Hardt 2003: 96).

If the connection between citizenship and nation-state results from the specific modern political gesture, then it cannot be generalized to every concept of citizenship. This applies particularly to con-

---

<sup>3</sup> The genealogy of the state shows that there has never been any agreed concept to which the word state has referred (Skinner 2010, 26). Specifically, the concept of state is not always the same, but changes compositionally according to the different elements which give it its content and form. The state is not a fixed entity, but a multiplicity of institutions, procedures, analyses, reflections, calculations, and tactics that constitute and stabilize it (Foucault 2007: 108). So "the state is far from being a kind of natural-historical given which develops through its own dynamism like a 'cold monster' /.../. The state is not a cold monster; it is the correlative of a particular way of governing" (Foucault 2008: 6). This methodological decentring and decomposition of the state into processes helps us to see that the state is practice, which is inseparable from the set of practices by which the state actually became an ever-changing formation or effect (Foucault 2007: 277; Saar 2011: 39–40). "The state does not have an essence. The state is not a universal nor in itself an autonomous source of power. The state is nothing else but the effect, the profile, the mobile shape of a perpetual statification (etatation) or statifications /.../. In short, the state has no heart, as we well know; but not just in the sense that it has no feelings, either good or bad, but it has no heart in the sense that it has no interior. The state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities" (Foucault 2008: 77). Accordingly, we can claim that theses about the erosion of the nation-state by globalisation processes are sometimes overstated. States still exercise control over their territory and take responsibility for most aspects of their economy, including taxation, foreign policy, repressive and ideological apparatus.

temporary multicultural and globalised societies where people's identities and belongings are multiple and no longer necessarily tied to a single nation (Hoffman 2004; Osler and Starkey 2005). On the other hand, the decline of the exclusive connection between citizenship and nationality can also be interpreted from the viewpoint of the state. In fact, current state transformations lead to the destruction of practices which in the last century represented the main political link between the state and its citizens. We talk about the political mechanisms that institutionalised the Marshall (1950/1992) concept of social citizenship in a strong welfare state and in the idea of democratic correspondence between constituted and constitutive political power. These mechanisms were based on a claim that citizens' privileges, such as rights to employment, health, and education, can be available only to national citizens. The significance of those practices is reduced by the current trend that the welfare state is increasingly inaccessible for citizens and not solely for migrants. This kind of thinning if not decline of Marshall's concept of evolving citizenship towards social rights raises the possibility of a corresponding dilution of loyalty to the state (Sassen 2002: 280). But, in turn, citizens' loyalty may be less important to the state today than it was at a time of modern politics and its need for loyal citizen-soldiers (Sassen 2002: 280).<sup>4</sup>

Although citizenship cannot be equated with identity, the understanding of citizenship as a collective identification with the state often serves as some kind of supplement to the juridical or static conception of citizenship. Within this conception, citizenship is an internally inclusive and externally exclusive status and a key mechanism for the current restrictive immigration policies in a globalised world. It is ironic that global migration, which creates greater cultural diversity in the nation-states, and tends to promote social activity across borders and to challenge exclusive identification of a nation with the legal and political structure of the state, in this juridical logic is therefore restricted, criminalised and presented as the most negative aspect of globalisation (Carter 2001: 100). However, the idea of a citizen who spends most of his life in one country and shared a common national identity is losing ground because there are increasing numbers of *citizens who do not belong* (Castles and Davidson 2000: viii). Accordingly, open, multiple and flexible identities and affiliations undermine the notion of cultural belonging as an essential or even necessary element of political citizenship (Soysal 1994: 165–6; Castles and Davidson 2000: viii). In this way, global migrations redefine the modern patterns of balancing the contradictions of citizenship, namely the contradiction between inclusion and exclusion, between rights and responsibilities, and most importantly, between political belonging as a citizen and cultural belonging as a national (Castles and Davidson 2000: ix). Consequently, the practices of global migrations indicate that the new forms of belonging, which may be a constitutive element of citizenship in a global world, can only be political. In other words, the key question of the formation of global citizenship is a political constitution of a denationalised and globalised political community beyond national borders.

## 4 HOW GLOBAL MIGRATIONS TRANSFORM THE CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP

As was discussed above, the current practices of global migrations have an important theoretical and practical impact on transformations and redefinition of the elements which are constitutive for the na-

---

4 Currently, the state is less and less defined by the distinction between inside and outside, which at the beginning of modern politics was identified by the Machiavellian (1513/1966) thesis that the modern state depends both on good laws (internal order) and a national army (defence and external expansion). Since today the functioning of the state is still dependent on the civic virtue of citizens, which can be cultivated only through their participation in public affairs, military virtue is no longer a condition for external liberty and outward expansion. Therefore, the ideal citizen is no longer the armed citizen, and the ideal warrior is no longer the citizen who identifies himself primarily by his loyalty to the state and its structure of civic values, as was the case in modern politics (cf. Bartelson 1995: 119).

tional concept of citizenship. We shall now analyze how these conceptual changes affect the formation of new or alternative concepts of citizenship. From this perspective, we explain the theoretical implications and political consequences of the form of citizenship that we get when we combine the elements derived from global migration practices. We will focus primarily on three elements: the redefinition of borders, political community and belonging.

#### 4.1 The multiplication of borders

The first and perhaps most important constitutive element of national citizenship is the concept of the border, which has changed significantly in the last few decades through globalisation processes, including migrations. Similarly to other concepts and institutions, borders are not stable, univocal and natural, but multiple in their meanings and functions, and instituted through political practices. It follows from this that they obtain their meanings, functions and also sense through their constant redefining.

Today, borders are no longer a place when one political power ends and the other begins (Balibar 2004a: 411). "The borders of new sociopolitical entities /.../ are no longer entirely situated at the outer limit of territories; they are dispersed a little everywhere, wherever the movement of information, people, and things is happening and is controlled" (Balibar 2004b: 1). This kind of movement of borders from the edge to the centre of the political space (Balibar 2004b: 109) does not mean that borders are disappearing. Rather, they are being multiplied in their functions and locations, and become so diffuse that they have transformed whole states into borderlands (Balibar 2004a). In particular, the context of global migrations indicates that these borders are everywhere, even beyond the traditional state borders, at airports, in shops, in detention centres, in streets, and so on. And even more, they show that the new borders, such as the external borders of the European Union, are stretched far beyond the official (e.g. Schengen) borders; they are located in the candidate countries, in northern Africa and everywhere where the European migration and other policies are implemented.

All this also proves that the notions of interiority and exteriority, which form the basis of the modern concepts of border, citizenship and political community, are undergoing a veritable redefinition (Balibar 2004b: 5). We may regard it not as the territorial separation between two national states or political identities but rather as the internal dividing line within the states, within the transnational communities like the European Union, within the multicultural and globalised world. The most obvious political consequence of the transformations we have tried to sketch is that today the modern concept of the border cannot be a constitutive element of current citizenship in both its national and transnational forms. Contemporary borders are porous (Castles and Davidson 2000: 24), so they no longer function as walls but rather as membranes and filtration systems (Balibar 2004b: 111). And, as the practices of global migrations show, they operate as a political mechanism of control, regulation and restriction of the free movement of people. In fact, far from the myth of a borderless world, during the current global processes the world has become more open to flows of capital and commodities but more closed to the circulation of human bodies (Mazzadra and Neilson 2008). In this case, the practices of migrants and asylum-seekers, which is, of course, a global issue, dramatically reveals the outdated juridical conception of citizenship enshrined in the legislation of most states (Osler and Starkey 2005: 24). This juridical choice seems to have a direct political relevance: the focus on the modern territorial borders may in fact reduce the visibility of the production of postmodern borders, their effects, and outcomes.

It is possible to argue that the modern concept of the border as a dividing line *between* the territories of two states was replaced with a complex mechanism of a dispersed and fragmented border network everywhere *within* the territory. In other words, borders are being deterritorialised and reterritorialised through different mechanisms and institutions such as detention centres, migration controls, asylum systems, labour legislation etc. So we cannot say that border policies are simply oriented towards the prevention of migration. Rather, they are the main mechanism of social divisions within

societies, which can only operate effectively in conditions where the borders are not completely closed off. Consequently, the role of borders in shaping labour markets is particularly pronounced because the processes of filtering and differentiation that occur at the borders clearly shape labour forces and establish the particular kinds of labour regimes in and across different global and local places (Mazzadra and Neilson 2008).

The new concept of borders and their functions suggests that a form of citizenship which could have the potential to resolve these postmodern divisions can only be conceptualised as an inclusive political practice that is not created on the basis of modern identification techniques, but on the recognition of political rights to all people who live and work in a particular territory.

## 4.2 From national to global political community

The idea of the nation as a cultural community based on common identity, descent, language and historical experiences was a vital element in defining membership of the political community in the concept of national citizenship (Castles and Davidson 2000: 81). The invention of the nation was the result of the French Revolution and the transfer of sovereignty from the monarch to the people. Earlier, when politics had not yet been understood through the liberal ideology of the separation of social spheres, the citizens were incorporated with the monarch (cf. Lefort 1986; Foucault 2003). In principle, citizenship rights and responsibilities were applied to anyone within the territory, so that cultural belonging was irrelevant (Castles and Davidson 2000: 81).

The formation of modern politics and the nation-state has produced a new relationship between individuals and the state, and a new way of defining who belongs to the state. The nation has thus become the only people in the state, an active and constituent core of the state (Foucault 2003: 222–4). And thanks to this process, the political community and citizenship have become nationalised. In this model, the exclusion and production of the Otherness are always a precondition for the inclusion because the definition of political community as a single and unified national community inevitable led to nationalism as a mode of dealing with the relations to non-citizens (Anderson 1989; Balibar 1994; Castles and Davidson 2000). There is also a need to recognize that the nation or the nation-form is not itself a community but the concept of a structure capable of producing determinate community effects, which is obviously something quite different, and we have every reason to think that no structure has ever stopped transforming itself and differentiating itself from what it was at the moment it began to produce its effects (Balibar 2004b: 20–1). Because very few states are one-national, they have produced various nation-building policies to achieve greater national homogeneity and effective integration and assimilation of national minority groups (Kymlicka 2010: 7). The implementation of these policies has varied between soft approaches of promoting national identity and violent approaches which seek to pressure national minorities into assimilating into the majority's national culture. In both cases, the national identity operates as a mechanism of defining who belongs to the national community and who does not.

Today, globalisation processes such as the possibility of increased mobility of people make myths of homogeneity unsustainable because many people who actually have the formal status of citizenship are excluded from full political participation through unemployment, poverty, sexism, racism, or any other exclusionary factors (Castles and Davidson 2000: 127). The mechanism of exclusion changes according to different criteria of belonging. The decisive question then is how to conceptualise citizenship in circumstances in which the practices of exclusion are no longer linked to external state borders. In other words, contemporary societies are facing new challenges to define forms of political community which would allow greater political involvement and participation of all citizens regardless of their cultural specificities or nationality (Soysal 1994; Hoffman 2004).

The first step towards a post-national citizenship detached from its purely national definition and disengaged from all myths of identity is the conceptual opening of the borders of political citizenship.



To put it another way, the practices of belonging must be based on the development of citizenship and not vice versa (Balibar 2004b). This kind of radical redefinition of political belonging has already been implemented in practice. Migrant workers without formal citizenship status are incorporated into various aspects of the social and institutional order. They participate in the educational system, welfare schemes, and the labour market (Soysal 1994: 2). Similarly, we can argue that the political participation is not limited to the members of the national community. When the people constitute themselves politically through protesting against war or through any other political issue, there are not only the nationals but also migrants and other people who live in the same territory. This results in a fact that multicultural and globalised societies must recognize that the Other is a necessary component of their identity and their political community, and thus an essential element of their future conceptualisations of citizenship (Balibar 2004b: 223). Therefore, we face the necessity of collectively inventing a new image of the people, a new image of the relation between membership in the community and the continued creation of citizenship through collective action and the acquisition of fundamental rights to existence, work, and political participation (Balibar 2004b: 9). To a certain extent, this kind of change within the concept of citizenship, which would involve *all* global peoples, is comparable to the historical changes that led to the political rights for women and black people. Since globalisation and global migration have produced transnational communities (Osler and Starkey 2005: 21), such a change could affect their democratization and the reduction of the democratic deficit which is characteristic of these communities, including the EU (Stoker et al 2011).

### 4.3 Citizenship without belonging

As we have seen, recent migration practices indicate that involvement in a political community does not inevitably require incorporation into the national collectivity (Soysal 1994: 3). On the other hand, we have shown that in transnational political communities the concept of citizenship must be based on a universal mode of membership and political belonging. The globalisation processes and the new global migration patterns have developed concepts of citizenship that are at least as novel as national citizenship was at the beginning of modern politics (Castles and Davidson 2000: 156). Although these concepts have not yet been recognized in legal documents, they exist in practice. The global movement of people has resulted in multicultural and globalised societies where the context for citizenship based on belonging to a single nation is being eroded. It is the rapidity and variety of the migration flows that are forcing the formation of a new layer of citizenship above that of the nation – the citizen who does not belong (Castles and Davidson 2000: 156).

The question we are dealing with is not only that of which community the citizenship should be instituted in but that of knowing what the concept of community means and how we should understand it today (Balibar 2004b: 65). As we have seen, nowadays the opposition between an inside and an outside does not define the civic community. An illustrative example is the migrant “workers who ‘reproduce’ their lives on one side of the border and ‘produce’ on the other side, and thus more precisely are neither insiders nor outsiders, or (for many of us) are insiders officially considered outsiders” (Balibar 2004b: 123). This is why the recognition and institution of citizens’ rights have to be organized beyond the exclusive membership to one community and located on the borders, where so many of our contemporaries actually live (Balibar 2004b: 132). From this point of view, which focuses on participation rather than on status (Isin 2009), the important question is permanent access to rather than simply entitlement to citizenship, because this kind of citizenship ‘in the making’ is only possible as an active and collective civil process rather than a simple legal status (Balibar 2004b: 132).

Therefore, the elements that are revealed from the practices of global migrations show that conceptualisations of citizenship within a post-national context have to consider the dissociation of citizenship from the state and identity (Soysal 1994: 165). There are no significant or even sentimental or pa-

triotic relationships to the community because post-modern citizenship is a political process where the citizens are all people who participate in the political community and who simultaneously also constitute this community (Nyers 2008; Stephens 2010). This kind of citizenship does not consist of the passive enjoyment of formal rights conferred upon the citizens because of their membership in the community but rather in the fact that they themselves produce the conditions of a nonexclusive belonging in a new sense of the word (Balibar 2004b: 162). Seen in this perspective, the inclusion of migrants in political citizenship is not a question about who can exercise the right to vote; it is a question of giving the opportunity to people so that they could make decisions concerning their lives (Osler and Starkey 2005: 5).

Through this new mode of belonging, or better, non-belonging, we can reflect on the effects of the insistence on the national citizenship concept and its transfer to the transnational level without having to consider the new elements discussed above. This kind of an attempt was institutionalized within the European Union with the Maastricht Treaty, which prescribes European citizenship as a simple addition to the national citizenship of the member countries of the union. This nation-based 'transnational' citizenship is precisely why this political choice has already shown its conservative and reactionary nature. That is, the EU has produced the contradictory practice where foreigners have become second-class citizens because they are included in the economy and excluded from citizenship (Balibar 2004b: 171). Therefore, the institution of citizenship has become a key mechanism which allows and even encourages the systemic exploitation, marginalization, and inequality of migrant workers. The argument that post-national citizenship must confer the right and responsibility of political participation to every person regardless of his or her cultural and historical ties to the political community (Soysal 1994: 3) has, therefore, a strong material basis.

## 5 CONCLUSION

As discussed in this article, the multiple processes of globalisation in general and global migrations in particular have eroded the national concept of citizenship and opened up a theoretical field for discussing conceptual transformations of citizenship towards transnational or global forms. It was also emphasized that the most salient conceptual transformation, which enabled the formation of modern or national citizenship, has been the rise of the modern nation-state. In this political context, citizenship was perceived as a mutual relationship or political link between the state and individuals. It becomes apparent that current globalisation processes and especially global migrations have transformed the ethno-cultural composition of societies. Within this multicultural and global context, the political community can no longer be perceived only through the institution of the nation and its ideological outcomes in the forms of identities, belonging, nationalism etc.

The practices of global migrations have revealed that national citizenship functions as a mechanism of closure that sharply demarcates states and distributes people. From this point of view, global migrations throw a new light on the contradictions carried by the national concept of citizenship as a legal status and identity that excludes instead of includes people. We have sought to describe some elements that illustrate the way in which the global migrations have transformed the conception of citizenship. Because the content of citizenship is not stable, it might be assumed that the general trend in contemporary societies today is towards denationalised and globalised citizenship practices, which significantly reverses a two-hundred-year-old citizenship tradition. Unfortunately, the practice of European citizenship, which is undoubtedly the first formal attempt to upgrade national citizenship to the transnational level, could not be described as a transnational or alternative political project. European citizenship does not bring a new qualitative conceptual change. Rather, it is a complementary institution to national citizenship and thus an institution which reproduces the exclusionary tendencies of national citizenship.

As we have seen, the practices of global migrations pluralize and displace the political and ideo-

logical link between citizenship and national belonging. Therefore, what we have made the subject of research, the migrants take as a starting point: political citizenship does not require any ideological affiliation to the political community, since these communities must be constituted politically. In this regard, Rousseau's (1762/2001) theory of the political constitution of people appears to have new relevance today when read according to the contemporary globalised context we live in. And, in addition, as Soysal (1994) concludes, the guestworkers in post-war Europe demonstrate that they are heralds of a new form of post-national membership in the community, based not on particular national belonging but on the discourse of universal human rights. No matter of what form of universality we defend, the political struggle for a redefinition of the concept of citizenship is therefore linked not only to the status or the rights of migrants. This struggle is important because it is a political struggle for the concepts that will define our future common life, and consequently the concepts of political participation and democracy, and the concept of politics itself.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict** (1989). *Zamišljene skupnosti: o izvoru in širjenju nacionalizma*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis.
- Bahtin, Mihajlovič Mihail** (2005). Marksizem in filozofija jezika: osnovni problem sociološke metode v znanosti o jeziku. *Marksizmi in jezikoslovje: Bahtin / Vološinov, Stalin, Williams* (ed. Lev Centrih, Ana Geršak, Jernej Habjan, Ana Jereb, Gal Kirn, Marko Kržan and Matjaž Šprajc). Ljubljana: Agregat, 21–75.
- Balibar, Étienne** (1978). From Bachelard to Althusser: the Concept of 'Epistemological Break'. *Economy and Society* 7(3): 207–237.
- Balibar, Étienne** (1988). Propositions on Citizenship. *Ethics* 98(4): 723–730.
- Balibar, Étienne** (1994). The Nation Form: History and Ideology. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (ed. Étienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein). London and New York: Verso, 86–106.
- Balibar, Étienne** (2004a). *Strah pred množicami: politika in filozofija pred Marxom in po njem*. Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis.
- Balibar, Étienne** (2004b). *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Bartelson, Jens** (1995). *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Bevir, Mark** (2002). *The Logic of the History of Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braudel, Fernand** (1980). *On History*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Carter, April** (2001). *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship*. London and New York: Routledge Press.
- Castles, Stephen and Alastair Davidson** (2000). *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari** (1999). *Kaj je filozofija?* Ljubljana: Študentska založba.
- Giddens, Anthony** (1987). *Social Theory and Modern Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foucault, Michel** (1977a). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (ed. Donald Bouchard). Ithaca and New York: Cornell University Press, 139–164.
- Foucault, Michel** (2001). *Arheologija vednosti*. Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis.
- Foucault, Michel** (2003). *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*. London: Allen Lane the Penguin Press.
- Foucault, Michel** (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel** (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Harty**, Siobhán and Michael **Murphy** (2005). *In Defence of Multinational Citizenship*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Hegel**, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1821/1989). *Osnovne crte filozofije prava: s Hegelovim vlastoručnim marginama u njegovu priručnom primjerku filozofije prava*. Sarajevo: Logos.
- Hobbes**, Thomas (1641/1998). *On the Citizen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman**, John (2004). *Citizenship Beyond the State*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Isin**, Engin (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity* 29: 367–388.
- Kalmo**, Hent and Quentin **Skinner** (2010). Introduction: a Concept in Fragments. *Sovereignty in Fragments: The Past, Present and Future of a Contested Concept* (ed. Hent Kalmo and Quentin Skinner). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–25.
- Kymlicka**, Will (2010). Multikulturene države in interkulturni državljani. *Državljanstvo in globalizacija: k državljanski vzgoji za sodobni svet* (ed. Jernej Pikalo). Ljubljana: Sophia, 3–32.
- Koselleck**, Reinhart (1999). *Pretekla prihodnost: prispevki k semantiki zgodovinskih časov*. Ljubljana: Studia humanitatis.
- Locke**, John (1690/2010). *Dve razpravi o oblasti; Pismo o toleranci*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
- Lefort**, Claude (1986). *The Political Forms of Modern Society: Bureaucracy, Democracy, Totalitarianism*. Cambridge and Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Lukšič**, Igor and Jernej **Pikalo** (2007). *Uvod v zgodovino političnih idej*. Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Machiavelli**, Niccolò (1513/1966). *Vladar*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Marshall**, Thomas Humphrey (1950/1992). Citizenship and Social Class. *Citizenship and Social Class* (ed. Tom Bottomore). London: Pluto Press, 3–51.
- Mazzadra**, Sandro and Brett **Neilson** (2008). Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor. *Transversal* 3: 2008, <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0608/mezzadranilson/en>.
- Negri**, Antonio and Michael **Hardt** (2003). *Imperij*. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.
- Nyers**, Peter (2008). Community without Status: Non-Status Migrants and Cities of Refuge. *Negotiating Community: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Global Contexts* (ed. Diana Brydon and William Coleman). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 123–138.
- Osler**, Audrey and Hugh **Starkey** (2005). *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education*. Berkshire and New York: Open University Press.
- Patton**, Paul (2000). *Deleuze and the Political*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pikalo**, Jernej (2003). *Neoliberalna globalizacija in država*. Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Rousseau**, Jean Jacques (1762/2001). *Družbena pogodba*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
- Saar**, Martin (2011). Relocating the Modern State: Governmentality and History of Political Ideas. *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges* (ed. Ulrich Bröckling, Susanne Krasmann and Thomas Lemke). New York and Abindon: Routledge, 34–55.
- Sassen**, Saskia (2002). Towards Post-National and Denationalized Citizenship. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (eds. Engin Isin and Bryan Turner). London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 277–291.
- Skinner**, Quentin (1969). Meaning and Understanding in the History of ideas. *History and Theory* 8(1): 3–53.
- Skinner**, Quentin (2010). The Sovereign State: a Genealogy. *Sovereignty in Fragments: The Past, Present and Future of a Contested Concept* (ed. Hent Kalmo and Quentin Skinner). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 26–46.
- Smith**, Rogers (2002). Modern Citizenship. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (ed. Engin Isin and Brian Turner). London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 105–115.
- Soyсал**, Yesemin Nuhoglu (1994). *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Stephens**, Angharad Closs (2010). Citizenship without community: Time, design and the city. *Citizenship studies* 14(1): 31–46.
- Stoker**, Gerry, **Chris Armstrong**, **Momoh Banya**, **Derek McGhee**, **Anthony McGrew**, **Andrew Mason**, **David Owen**, **Graham Smith** and **Clare Saunders** (2011). *Prospects for Citizenship*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Wallerstein**, Immanuel (2003). Citizens All? Citizens Some! The Making of the Citizen. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45: 650–679.

## POVZETEK

### **GLOBALIZACIJA DRŽAVLJANSTVA: VPLIV GLOBALNIH MIGRACIJ NA FORMACIJO KONCEPTA**

Simona BEZJAK

Članek analizira vpliv sodobnih globalizacijskih procesov in še zlasti globalnih migracij na oblikovanje novih konceptov državljanstva. Pri tem izhaja iz metodoloških pristopov, s katerimi je mogoče na koncept državljanstva gledati kot na skupek političnih odnosov, ki se spreminjajo glede na različne kontekste. S tega vidika je državljanstvo predstavljeno kot dinamičen, relacijski in odprt koncept, ki svojo vsebino in pomene dobiva v interakciji z različnimi elementi, ki ga sestavljajo.

Ker je vsak politični koncept sestavljena celota, se postavlja vprašanje o novih elementih, ki jih prinaša novi globalni in multikulturni kontekst. Sodobni procesi globalizacije, med katere sodijo tudi globalne migracije, so danes spremenili nekaj temeljnih teoretskih izhodišč, ki so bila v zadnjih dveh stoletjih značilna za t. i. moderni ali nacionalni koncept državljanstva. Članek je osredotočen predvsem na tri tovrstne elemente, ki prinašajo novo opredelitev politične pripadnosti, politične skupnosti in odnosa med državo in državljani. Za vse tri elemente je značilno, da so bili konstitutivne sestavine nacionalnega koncepta državljanstva, torej specifičnega koncepta državljanstva, ki je spremljal nastanek in delovanje moderne nacionalne države. Sodobni globalni in multikulturni kontekst tako prinaša konceptualno spremembo državljanstva v smeri njegove denacionalizacije in globalizacije. Pri tem pa jasno razkriva, da so danes nacionalne prakse identifikacije in pripadnosti nevzdržne z vidika, da bi preko njih definirali politično državljanstvo v multikulturnih in globaliziranih družbah.

S tega vidika predvsem globalne migracije postavljajo sodobne družbe pred nov izziv, in sicer da spoznajo, da članstvo v politični skupnosti in torej državljanstvo ni vezano na nacionalnost ljudi, ampak na njihovo participacijo pri političnih, to je skupnih ali javnih zadevah. Državljanstvo Evropske unije, ki je prvi poskus institucionalizacije nadnacionalnega ali transnacionalnega državljanstva, se je s tega vidika že izkazalo za konservativno in celo reaktivno politično izbiro, kajti gre zgolj za eno od oblik nacionalnega državljanstva, ki je raztegnjeno čez nacionalne meje brez vsakršnega upoštevanja konceptualnih sprememb znotraj koncepta državljanstva. Tovrstne politične odločitve ne ohranjajo le modernih izključevalnih praks nacionalnega državljanstva, ampak državljanstvo vzpostavljajo kot institucijo in mehanizem, ki omogoča in spodbuja nove delitve znotraj družbe, kjer je ljudem, ki so vključeni v gospodarstvo in druge družbene procese in aktivnosti, sistemsko onemogočena politična participacija pri zadevah, povezanih z njihovimi življenji. Boj za politično vključenost migrantov in ljudi brez statusa zato ni le boj za njihov status in pravice, ampak je predvsem politični boj za novo opredelitev konceptov, ki bodo definirali naše skupno življenje v sodobnih družbah, in to so koncepti državljanstva, politične participacije, demokracije in tudi sam koncept politike.