

Citizenship, Nationhood, and Non-Territoriality: Transnational Participation in Europe

Riva Kastoryano

► **To cite this version:**

Riva Kastoryano. Citizenship, Nationhood, and Non-Territoriality: Transnational Participation in Europe. PS: Political Science and Politics, Cambridge University Press (CUP), 2005, 38 (4), pp.693 - 696. hal-01370827

HAL Id: hal-01370827

<https://hal-sciencespo.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01370827>

Submitted on 23 Sep 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Citizenship, Nationhood, and Non-Territoriality: Transnational Participation in Europe

Introduction

Since the 1980s, the question of citizenship has taken root as a major theme in the social sciences and as the focus of juridical, political, social, and cultural debates in all democratic societies. In Europe, citizenship has taken different shapes and definitions in its rhetoric, ideology, and practice with regard to immigrants' incorporation into nation-states and their expansion of political participation beyond boundaries relating to home and host country to include a broad European space. Citizenship is also an issue for European construction itself. Within nation-states citizenship has been expressed in different domains extending from the national community to the civil society, even though only "legal" citizenship allows the full participation of individuals and groups in the political community. At the European level, despite the transnational participation of immigrants encouraged by the very nature of the European Union and its supranational institutions and *de*

facto expansion of dual citizenship, the claim for equal recognition as citizens that underlies the political strategies of immigrants remains within the framework of the legitimacy of the

state of residence and citizenship.

The question of citizenship therefore opens the way to negotiations of identities between states and immigrants (Kastoryano 2002). Within nation-states the struggle for equality that citizenship entails is extended to different domains, often turning negotiations of interest into negotiations of identity. For states, it is a question of negotiating the means of inclusion of immigrants into the political community on the basis of a new equilibrium between community structures and national institutions. For individuals, citizenship becomes a principle of equality and a way to struggle against political, social, and cultural "exclusion." It becomes a way to claim recognition as a "citizen," through which the attachment and loyalty to both a national and an ethnic community are expressed, thereby combining a liberal and republican participation (Dagger 1997). Such an understanding of citizenship raises the question of the relevance of the triple link between citizenship, nationality, and identity, hence the link between political community and cultural community, the former as a source of rights and legitimacy, and the latter as a source of identity.

At the European level, the construction of a new political space creates an opportunity for action beyond boundaries, leading to transnational structures of representation and to new negotiations with states—home and host—and introduces the question of territoriality with regard to the practice of citizenship and its relation to nationhood.

This article explores these complex articulations of belonging and the actions generated by the question of citizenship and analyzes the link between cultural and political belonging, between rights and identity and the relevance of territoriality in relation to nation and new expressions of nationalism raised by forms of transnational participation.

Citizenship, Nationality, and Identity

The concepts of citizenship and nationality, two interdependent and "interchangeable" (Leca 1992) concepts within the framework of a nation-state, are defined above all by membership in a political community. This membership takes shape through rights and duties that are embodied in the very concept of citizenship. Its implementation by law implies the integration or the incorporation of the "foreigner" into the national community with which he or she is supposed to share the same moral and political values. Moreover, she or he is supposed to adopt or even to "appropriate" historical references as a proof of belonging and loyalty to the founding principles of the nation, which according to Weber is the only community born of modernity.

Debates on citizenship and nationhood reveal precisely such expectations, whatever historical interpretation and juridical shape is given to citizenship. Based on the example of France and Germany, citizenship and nationhood have been analyzed in ideal-typical terms opposing a cultural and ethnic understanding of the nation to a civic and political one (Brubaker 1992; Dumont 1991). The reality, however, is more complex. Obviously such representations of the nation have explained, and to some extent justified, policies and laws of citizenship in democratic states. But lately, the experience of immigration and settlement along with the claim for recognition of cultural particularities and equal citizenship have changed the understanding of citizenship, and carried its practice beyond its legal definition.

A normative version of citizenship embodies

by
Riva Kastoryano,
Centre National de la Recherche
Scientifique

values and action, “responsibility and civic virtues” (Kymlicka and Norman 1994). Citizenship is therefore not limited to political status and rights related to a national identity; it is also an identity that is developed through direct or indirect participation in the name of a shared interest for individuals and groups, immigrants or not. It is expressed through the engagement of the individual for the common good.¹ Such an engagement can take place within voluntary associations, through community activities (local or broader cultural, ethnic, and religious activities), in short, through an engagement toward the civil society as well as the political community. Citizenship is interpreted, then, as a participation in the public space, defined as a space of communication, of shared power, as well as a space of political socialization and where a “citizen’s identity” is acquired and constitutes a political resource for action and negotiation.

Therefore, a normative approach to citizenship extends its understanding and its expression in social and cultural domains to include them into the political. According to Kymlicka (2002), the extension of citizenship to ethnic communities today is a way to integrate these communities in a common national community, as was the case with the reconsideration of citizenship with regard to the participation of social class analyzed by T. H. Marshall. On the other hand, actors devise strategies for participation according to legal citizenship applied in nation-states. In France and Germany, for example, immigrants develop different tools and devise different strategies for political participation. In France, access to citizenship is based on a relatively easy process of naturalization and the practice of *jus solis* for the young generation immigrants, leading to direct participation whereby they can act as an electoral force. In Germany, on the other hand, until very recently restrictive citizenship laws included the interdiction of dual citizenship for those who wished to maintain the citizenship of their country of origin, prompting activists to develop “compensatory” strategies.² Such strategies entail a search for indirect participation that implies a participation in the civil society through mobilization within voluntary associations as a way to assert a collective presence affecting public opinion and political decisions on their behalf. However such a “social citizenship” that initiates the exercise of citizenship and includes foreigners in its existing corporate structures translates into an indirect participation with regard to purely political citizenship.³ Only legal citizenship carries the right to equal direct participation in the political community in the full sense of the term. It is acquired, for foreigners, through the process of naturalization, a process that takes into consideration the length of their stay, their contribution to the society, and a “natural” identification with the national community.

A citizenship that expresses itself in both community and national institutions runs against the traditional analysis of republican citizenship that blends political involvement and national sentiment, because citizenship is systematically attached to its structure, the nation-state, where identity-based and political aspects are blurred. But at the same time the empirical reality of citizenship implies a conceptual and interpretative polyvalence. Whether citizenship is political, judicial, social, or economic and its content identity-based, cultural, or juridical, this combination boils down to a sense of loyalty directed at once toward the group, the community, civil society, and the state. It is through their interpenetration that the actors’ strategies emerge.

Thus citizenship in practice and as discourse is linked to the phenomenon of exclusion, to ways to counter social exclusion and to foster political inclusion. On the other hand, citizenship as civic participation does not always theoretically preclude the expression of collective identities. All the more so since migrants who arrived in different European countries in the 1960s and their descendants publicly express their attachments to the country

of origin, a linguistic, ethnic, or religious community, or a local community, as well as to a transnational community and the European Union. Their participation combines both the interests of an ethno-religious or cultural community and the political community. The principle of new ethnic identifications defined in religious or national terms from local to transnational becomes one of the stakes of citizenship open to negotiation.

Such an evolution brings to the fore a multiplicity of allegiances that all plural democratic societies face. These have crystallized around debates on dual citizenship, mainly in Germany. For the group, dual citizenship is founded on a logic that has two consequences: it transforms nationality into an identity rooted in the country of origin and it makes of citizenship an entitlement within the country of residence: identity vs. rights. On such a view, citizenship becomes simply a legal status, and nationality is merely defined along the religious, ethnic, or cultural lines that constitute the identity of the home country. In Germany, for example, by demanding dual citizenship, Turks define citizenship as a judicial tool that gives them political representation and nationality as an ethnic identity. Dual citizenship flows therefore from a duality that appears, *a priori*, contradictory but is in fact complementary: the construction of a minority status and the creation of a citizen’s identity. Both emerge within the country of residence’s institutions. How, then, can the relationship between citizenship and nationhood be defined? A citizenship linked to the nation of the home country thereby de-territorialized, or a citizenship related to an ethnic community seeking recognition not only within the national political community but on a European and international level, therefore de-nationalized and de-territorialized? Such a question suggests that ethnic communities become “transnational nations” derived from the interaction between home and host countries and with a broader space of transnational participation.

Citizenship, Transnationalism, and Territoriality

Dual citizenship relates *de facto* to transnationalism. The increasing fluidity of borders has led immigrants to develop transnational networks linking the country of origin to the country of residence and to participate actively in both spaces. In this perspective dual citizenship stems from political participation in both political communities, which brings to light multiple membership and to some extent multiple loyalties: to the home country, to the country of residence, and to the transnational community itself. Dual citizenship becomes the institutional expression of and the basis for transnationalism.

Transnationalism is important in relation to European integration. Citizens and residents participate in the European Union’s politics through transnational networks combining identity—be it national, religious, or both—and interest. This is also due to the very nature of the European Union, where the idea of supranationality has given shape to a transnational civil society within which networks of solidarity (national, regional, religious, or professional) compete, interact, and cover the European space. The politicization of each of these networks has led to the formation of transnational, de-nationalized public space. In this space, thanks to the density of communications between actors from different traditions, transnational communities can socialize politically and the same actors can learn the trade of a new political culture that takes shape outside the nations and their institutions, creating a new political identification that is de-nationalized and transnational. The identity of a transnational citizenship is expressed through the fight of transnational actors for equality and human rights, seeking at the same time a unified identity in search of legitimacy before supranational institutions. Paradoxically, a unified identity for a transnational community leads to a particu-

larity that becomes the basis for building a “transnational nation”: non-territorial and its nationalism translates the transnationalization of communitarian feelings.

Transnationalism and Europe raise the question of territoriality with regard to participation and citizenship.⁴ First of all, transnational organizations create a space for political participation that goes beyond national territories. They re-map a “political community” that is Europe, albeit transnational and therefore de-territorialized and/ or re-territorialized. From this perspective, territory becomes a broader, unbounded space, where nation-states and supranational institutions interact, and where transnational networks build bridges between national societies and Europe (Kastoryano 2004). As for citizenship, it implies, in the view of the activists involved in building such a network, a role of responsibility in the construction of a new “community of faith”⁵ that is supposed to represent the European Union and is expressed by the “will to live together.”⁶ Just as it was at the formation of a national political community, this implies the expression of their will to live together on a *de facto* multicultural (including residents with legal status) and democratic space (Kastoryano [1998] 2005; 2002b).

The question of European citizenship has led to the elaboration of concepts such as postnational, cosmopolitan and/or transnational membership, and constitutional patriotism, all concepts that came along with the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992. These concepts remain, however, normative. In legal terms, the Treaty defined the status of “citizenship of the Union.” According to Article 8 of the Treaty, a “citizen of the Union” is whoever holds the nationality of one of the member states. In principle, citizenship of the Union requires the national citizenship of one of the member states. Thus the Treaty maintains the link between citizenship and nationality as is the case in nation-states. But the practice of citizenship of the Union brings an extra-territorial aspect into play with regard to nation-states: again Article 8 (8a–8d) of the Treaty gives the citizen of the Union, the right to move, reside, and work freely in the territory of a member state as well as the right to vote and run for office in local elections and in European Parliamentary elections based on residency (i.e., in the territory of a member state of which he or she is not a citizen, but just resident). The extra-territoriality of the concept of citizenship is expressed by its practice, that is, political participation beyond territorially limited nation-states, therefore de-territorializing the national community or re-territorializing the European space. As Preuss (1998) has pointed out, territoriality becomes the basic means of the citizenship of the Union.

Extra-territoriality is precisely what gives transnationalism its strength. Like dual citizenship, it institutionalizes multiple allegiances and dissociates citizenship from nationhood and territoriality. Within the European Union this multiplicity of allegiances and spaces for political participation include the home country in the repertoire of citizenship. In fact, European citizenship, as a more global concept of membership than nation-states, introduces the allegiance of immigrants to their home country into the bargaining process in the same way that they express their allegiance to their state of residence and to the transnational community in which they are involved. The countries of origin participate in building a transnational community and encourage extra-territorial citizenship. For example, countries like Turkey, Morocco, and Pakistan, in relation to their émigrés settled in Europe, have changed their citizenship laws, introducing dual citizenship in their constitutions in order to maintain emigrant loyalty by inducing them to maintain their original citizenship. Even though such processes can be sources of tension between home and host countries for countries that reject dual citizenship, the home country contributes openly to the construction of a “diaspora” and, contributes to the design

a “diasporic identity” that is expressed by the attachment of its citizens—former or current—to the homeland. Such extra-territoriality is at the core of transnationalism. It keeps the legality of the citizenship of the country of origin, but only on its territory; its de-territorialization abroad becomes a resource for identity and mobilization for individuals and/or groups of immigrant descent. Within this perspective the nation is linked to the citizenry of the home country.

At stake is the integration of the state (both states) into a global space (Ong 1999, specifically Chapter 8). Take the case of Turkey, for example. Four million Turks have settled in different European countries to form a new category called “Turks abroad” by the Turkish authorities and the media. The Turkish government aims to maintain the attachment of the émigrés to national ideologies—secular, expressed by official rhetoric on Kemalism, and at the same religious—by insuring a permanent allegiance to what is called “moderate Islam” by national official circles as well as the international media as a reaction to Islamism developed in immigration. Turkey’s goal is to maintain national citizenship values abroad; it is a way of sustaining the link between citizenship and nation, but extra-territorially. In other words, external to the nation, external to the territory, but yet a citizen. In this case, at stake is Turkey’s place in the European Union. Such a “de-territorialized” belonging nourished by the Turkish state constitutes a resource for negotiations. For countries of settlement, at stake is the inclusion of transnational activities into the national community and the “re-territorialization” of nationhood. Generally speaking, transnational nationalism supported and entertained by states has become an inevitable issue in international relations.

* * *

Could transnationalism give shape to a new form of nationalism that differs from the highly territorialized nationalisms of the 19th and 20th centuries? Transnational communities are constructed around shared references and bring to the fore a feeling of belonging to a “deterritorialized nation” with identity claims that are nourished by new expressions of nationalism. Together, they lead to a redefinition of the link between territory, nation, and political space, challenging the nation-state as well as a territorially-defined political structure.

But transnationalism and an extra-territorial citizenship generate negotiations between transnational actors and states. For transnational actors, a transnational action becomes a political tool leading them to act from “outside.” For states, transnationalism is a way to include identity issues developed in a minority situation into their political strategy and “re-territorialize” them or themselves act as “de-territorialized” actors in order to maintain the loyalty of transnational actors and of any nationalist expression beyond their political border. It becomes for states a way to integrate into the process of globalization.

Thus the paradox: Even if transnational logic and its expression of nationalism try to circumvent national politics and weaken the state, the state remains the driving force of the process of globalization. Despite its limited autonomy due to normative pressures of supranational institutions, despite an increasing interdependence between the internal and external in political decisions, the state remains the main actor for negotiations defending its interest and its sovereignty within and outside of its borders. It remains the legal source for citizenship despite dual citizenship. But transnational communities and their “nationalization” have become an important source of identification, resistance, and mobilization, a source of power stemming from the mobility of individuals and groups in opposition to the immobility of states. Therefore, couldn’t the de-territorialization of citizenship generate new tensions between states and communities and, more generally, new tensions in the international system?

Notes

1. Citizenship as a subjective feeling of membership and citizenship as engagement. See, Leca (1986).

2. Though Germany has applied the principle of *jus solis* for children born on German territory since 2000—if the parents have been official residents for the last eight years—it is too soon to predict its political impact. Likewise, even though the process of naturalization has been made easier, and the number of naturalized foreigners increased, it is still soon to measure their political and electorate impact.

3. Habermas makes the typology between “passive citizenship” and “active citizenship.” The former finds its legitimacy in the development of the welfare state and does not include participation in the political community. The latter requires an “active citizenship,” in J. Habermas (1995).

4. See the Introduction of M. Berezin, in M. Berezin and M. Schain (2004).

5. In reference to Otto Bauer.

6. Inspired by E. Renan’s famous phrase “Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?” “What is a nation?”

References

- Berezin, M., and M. Schain, eds. 2004. *Europe without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship, and Identity in a Transnational Age*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brubaker, W. R. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dagger, R. 1997. *Civic Virtues: Citizenship and Republican Liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dumont, L. 1991. *L'idéologie allemande: France-Allemagne et retour*. Paris: Ed. Gallimard.
- Habermas, J. 1995. “Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe.” In *Theorizing Citizenship*, ed. R. Beiner. Albany: State University of New York, 255–283.
- Kastoryano, Riva, ed. [1998] 2005. *Quelle identité pour l'Europe? Le multiculturalisme à l'épreuve*, 2nd edition. Paris: Presses de Sciences-po.
- . 2004. “Transnational Networks and Political Participation: The Place of Immigrants in the European Union.” In *Europe without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship, and Identity in a Transnational Age*, eds. M. Berezin and M. Schain. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 64–89.
- . 2002. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2002b. “The Reach of Transnationalism.” In *Critical Views of September 11: Analyses from around the World*, eds. Eric Hershberg and Kevin Moore. New York: Free Press, 209–224.
- Kymlicka, W. 2002. *Contemporary Political Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W., and W. Norman. 1994. “Return of the Citizen: A Survey on Recent Work on Citizenship Theory.” *Ethics* (January): 352–381.
- Leca, Jean. 1992. “Nationalité et citoyenneté dans l'Europe des immigrations.” In *Logiques d'Etat et immigration en Europe*, eds. J. Costa-Lascoux and P. Weil. Paris: Kimé.
- Leca, Jean. 1986. “Individualisme et citoyenneté.” In *Sur l'individualisme*, eds. Pierre Birnbaum and Jean Leca. Paris: Presses de la FNSP, 159–213.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Preuss, Ulrich K. 1998. “Citizenship in the European Union.” In *Re-imagining the Political Community*, eds. D. Archibugi, D. Held, and M. Köhler. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 138–151.