GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND THE GLOBAL CITY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZLEM ÖZTEMEL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

MAY 2003

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Bahattin AKŞİT
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Prof. Dr. Sencer AYATA
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut YEĞEN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut YEĞEN

Asst. Prof. Dr.Helga RITTERSBERGER TILIÇ

Asst. Prof. Dr. Nur Betül ÇELİK

ABSTRACT

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND THE GLOBAL CITY

Öztemel, Özlem

M.S., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen

May 2003, 155 pages

In the last two decades, the accelerated global developments in economic, cultural and socio-political era have affected the constitution of citizenship which has been defined in accordance with nation. Therefore, this thesis analyses the debate on global citizenship around the issue of the state of citizenship under the conditions of global city. This thesis focuses on the question 'who is (not) the citizen' or 'who act as citizen' in the space of global cities. In other words, it questions how and by whom citizenship is being challenged and constituted in the context of global cities?

Keywords: citizenship, globalization, global city, global citizenship

ÖZ

GLOBAL VATANDASLIK ve GLOBAL KENT
Öztemel, Özlem

Yüksek Lisans., Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut Yeğen

Mayıs 2003, 155 sayfa

Yirminci yüzyılın sonlarından günümüze; ekonomik, kültürel ve sosyo-politik alanda kendini hissettiren global değişmeler sonucunda; ulus çerçevesinde tanımlanmış olan vatandaşlık tanımı da bu değişimden etkilenmektedir. Bu sebeple, bu çalışma boyunca global düzeyde vatandaşlığın kurulumu, global kentteki sosyal dinamikler çercevesinde tartışılmaktadır. Bu çalışma global gelişmelerin yoğunlaşma noktası olarak kavramsallaştırılan global kent düzeyinde vatandaşlık kavramının hangi aktörler tarafından ve ne şekilde tanımlandığını sorgulamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: vatandaşlık, küreselleşme, küresel kent, küresel vatandaşlık

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mesut YEĞEN, Asst. Prof. Dr. Helga RITTERZBERGER TILIÇ and Asst. Prof. Dr. Nur Betül ÇELİK for their invaluable guidance, encouragement and suggestions at the formation of this study.

Thanks go to all the members of Middle East Technical University for their direct and indirect support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades, the world has been under the effect of global developments in science, health, communication, ecology, economy, culture and politics, the outcomes of which are still indefinite, unfixed and open for new possibilities and problems. My primary aim in this dissertation is to examine the impacts of global transitions on politics of identity around the debate on the constitution of citizenship in global cities.

Citizenship debate has traditionally focused on the following two questions: who are (not) entitled to be citizen in a particular community and what are the rights and duties of citizens. As these two questions indicate citizenship has two main aspects: membership and status. The structural and organisational transitions and possibilities of the globalisation period have accelerated both the theoretical debate and the practical conflict about both aspects of citizenship. The increase in the mobility and proliferation of identities produced new forms of social conflicts pushing for a transformation both in membership and status aspects of citizenship. The picture today is as follows: it is difficult to confine membership to those who either reside on the nation-state territory or who belong to the nation. Likewise, it is

also difficult to identify citizenship with the civil, political and social rights, i.e. the rights which have traditionally been associated with citizenship.

Accordingly, it is argued in the literature on citizenship that the current social and political conditions make it necessary to move beyond traditional approaches to citizenship. It is now widely believed that the condition of political membership as a source of integration has changed in the context of the global era. This last contention has been the main source of inspiration for my dissertation. In this study, I want to see whether citizenship in the global era has gained a new meaning. I want to see whether and to what extent the national conception of citizenship, which has been the most common one from eighteenth century onwards, has lost its credibility. In other words, I want to investigate the limits of a national conception of citizenship in the era of globalization. The hidden motivation behind the discussion on this issue is to see to what extent globalization has generated new identities, new forms of belongingness that transcend the ones conditioned by the nation-state.

However, I have to note that 'what has happened to the national conception of citizenship in the era of globalization' is the most general (or in fact the background) concern of this study. What I particularly want to focus on is the possibility of a global citizenship. In other words, although the constitutive consequences of the decay in the national concept of citizenship are taken into consideration, I basically want to dwell upon the debates on global citizenship. As it will appear below, the debate on global citizenship is carried out around the issue of the state of citizenship under the conditions of global city.

Yet, I need to confine my focus of the study once more. For a more concrete analysis of global citizenship, this thesis focuses upon the dynamics in global cities which arise as crystallisation of global developments. As a level of analysis, global city, which is an interpenetration of various social spaces, is seen as a site for new possibilities and dangers of new conceptualisation. This level of analysis has important contributions to debates of citizenship because it analyses new and contradictory agents in this space. It analyses the actors for new forms of contradiction, new grounds of global identities, forms of rights and duties to define political identities, new institutions and forms of participation for the expression of citizenship in global cities.

In brief, my dissertation intends to examine the likelihood of global citizenship with a particular reference to the state of citizenship in the space of global cities and to see what kind of political identities the global citizenship refers to in the space of global city. In other words, it questions how and by whom citizenship is being challenged and constituted in the context of global cities?

This thesis involves five major parts. While each part has its own particular concern and questions all parts share a major concern: the possibility for a politics of identity in a global context. First part includes a discussion on the different conceptions of citizenship. The topics covered in this part the differentiation of the notion of citizenship in the historical context and the different philosophical approaches to citizenship. Different definitions are analysed to question first the dualities of particular/universal, individual/society, and autonomy/common good and secondly the universality of nationalist conception. The national conception of citizenship is

deeply investigated as it has been the most common definition from eighteenth century onwards. The problems of this conception are highlighted in order to find out the limits of this concept in the global era.

In the second chapter, dynamics of globalisation are investigated to find out its impacts on citizenship. The globalization process is evaluated in terms of increasing economic globalization, accelerated international migration, the rise of transnational corporations, significance of sub-national bodies, and so on. All these are examined in terms of their implications on national identity and the national organization of citizenship.

Third part deals with new possibilities of citizenship in the global era. It tries to define the grounds of a new idea of citizenship. In other words, it analyses the constitutive elements of new conception(s) of citizenship. Thus, the common points and distinctions of new modalities in citizenship debate are examined.

In chapter four, I particularly focus upon the notion of global citizenship. The content of global citizenship as one of the new modalities of citizenship is analysed around the question 'who is the new citizen?' By analysing new basis, institutions and practices of new citizenship; the possibilities and problems of citizenship constituted by new actors are attempted to be investigated.

The last chapter investigates the global city as a level of analysis. Global city is taken into account for a more concrete analysis of the forms of global citizenship. This is because it is conceptualised as a nodal point of the global developments and its specific forms. As the fluidity and particularity of global entities which constitute

global identities are crystallized at this level, global citizenship is realised particularly at this level. This analysis includes the clarification of the conditions of global city in terms of economic structure, work condition, new social structure, new rights and new forms of struggle which have constitutive impacts on citizenship. This makes the global city crucial for a citizenship debate not only in terms of being a new geographical scale but also because the dynamics it involves have dramatic impacts on citizenship at the present state of affairs. It is therefore that new modes of politics of identities are searched. This analysis focuses on the articulation of particular forms at the level of global city. At this multiple intersection of global networks, how the citizenship functions to shape identity or vice versa becomes a crucial point. Different forms of citizenship and identity are connected by means of a multi-layered conception of citizenship, which refers to different forms of belonging.

Since the topics covered in this thesis such as globalization, global city, citizenship are intrinsically multidisciplinary, covering economic, social, political and cultural issues, it has been very much difficult to provide a synthetic analysis of the issue. This is most apparent in my un-crtical examination of the subject. I have mostly tried to provide an exploration of the relevant debates regarding the issue(s) covered in this thesis. Accordingly, this thesis confines it aim to the examination of the possible trajectory of citizenship in the context of globalization. My aim is to attempt to think on the possible future of citizenship instead of providing some clear cut arguments about the new modes of citizenship in today's global world.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON CITIZENSHIP

This thesis investigates citizenship. Any investigation on citizenship inevitably encounters questions such as 'who the citizen is?', 'what the citizenship is about?', 'what are the requirements of being a citizen?', 'what are the entitlements and duties of citizens?' The particular aim of this chapter is twofold: to provide an examination of the changing meaning of citizenship in different historical contexts and to investigate the different philosophical approaches to citizenship. This twofold examination will reveal that citizenship is beyond of being a fixed social and political category.

As to the structure of this chapter, in the first part, I intend to provide a general definition of citizenship. This part elaborates the main components of citizenship. The second part examines the different forms citizenship has assumed in its history. It briefly describes the transformation of the category of citizenship throughout the changing economic, social and political conditions from ancient times to twentieth century. Note however that a particular attention is given to the examination of citizenship in the era of nation-state. The third part scans the different traditions in citizenship. Liberal, Communitarian and Republican approaches to citizenship are to be examined with a focus on their diverse positions

on issues such as pluralism, universalism, individual, community, equality and solidarity. The fourth part has a more critical inclination and it basically investigates the limits of citizenship. The question of limits of national citizenship is the particular object analysis in this part.

2.1 Major Components of Citizenship

However there are different approaches to it, citizenship, in the broadest sense, addresses a set of *practices* (economic, political, cultural, symbolic) which constitute individuals both as component members and as participants in their society (Turner, 1993). More specifically, citizenship is considered as a membership status.

While citizenship refers to both a status and a set of practices, in the literature, it is usually defined in terms of its three major constituents of status (Cohen, 1999; Brubaker, 1992; Marshall, 1992; Walzer, 1983). It is characterized by rights and duties, membership in the community, and the representation of political identities. First, citizenship is analyzed as a juridical legal status including a set of specific rights and duties, which are legally defined so that individual subjects gain the ability or tools to act. Secondly, citizenship as a form of membership is a source of identification within a community which generates solidarity in society. Finally, citizenship with equal membership status in a community requires participation in political decision making.

In what follows, I will examine citizenship in terms of these three main components: namely common status, membership and participation.

The term citizenship is not a natural property of people but closely associated with a status and entitlements gained in the community. It refers to the common status of political equality and participation (Gunsteren, 1998). In this case, the point is the commonality of the status which gives the same rights and duties to all its members. Basically, the rights and duties are the key notions for equal status of citizenship. Status finds both its concrete definition and practical application through rights and duties. The common status of citizenship addresses a set of fundamental and indispensable rights and duties. As Falk (2000: 11) maintains, "citizenship as a formal equal status on the one hand, ensures the full rights of membership and on the other it engages both the protective responsibilities of the state, and duty of individuals to a particular state".

It is evident that individuals gain their formal, legal statuses in the operation of institutional structures (Leca, 1992: 17-8). Citizens get rights and duties from their society and are organized in the institutions of their community. In other words, all members of a political community locate their status to common rights endowed by law. Citizenship status is essentially a "legal and political status of membership in a civil and political community which both makes and also abides by its own laws." (Roche, 1992: 35). This citizenship status bearing on rights guaranteed by law is a measure of equality for all its subjects because these sets of rights and duties are guaranteed by law *common* to all.

Marshall (1992), who is an important figure in the discussions over citizenship, makes a general explanation for the development of citizenship in terms of rights. He associates three sets of rights with citizenship, which according to him

appeared in a process of historical development. According to this evolutionary understanding, in the history of modern citizenship we first see the appearance of the civil element, which refers to the right to perform individual freedoms like property rights, freedom of speech, and access to the legal system. The second one, the political element indicates the right to participate in the exercise of political power such as electoral rights. Finally, the social element is related with access to economic wealth and social security in the distribution of resources. The historical development of these three sets of rights has created their institutional formations such as the law, parliament and the educational system or social services respectively (1992: 74). In Marshall's account, the content of rights and duties expanded progressively.[1] For Marshall, citizenship reached its most advanced form when it was associated with social rights in the welfare state (1992: 100-103). Social rights protect individual rights against market conditions.

As it is evident, the development of these three sets of rights went hand in hand with the development of some particular institutions. Independent jurisdiction, parliament, national education, health care open to all and so on are some of these institutions. Owing to its association with the development of such institutions, citizenship has been important in introducing not only a political equality but also a social one. As it provides a common status and common experience in social life, citizenship operates so as to reduce social differences. Nevertheless, this ability of

---

[1] Note that Marshall's account has been criticized because of its evolutionary inclinations. Also, his approach is found anglo-centric because of its British oriented analysis. For a critique of Marshall's account in these respects see Turner, 1989; Roche, 1987; Giddens, 1985; Mann, 1987; Hindess, 1998.

citizenship is limited. While citizenship provides a common status in terms of rights and duties, the reality in social structure is more conflictual. Ironically, citizenship as an equal status is mainly related with the unequal distribution of resources. For Turner (1994), the motivation of this effort to provide an equality of status lies in the contradiction between the formal political equality and social and economic inequality in class society. Citizenship is "a non-economic concept" (Garcia, 1996: 11), but formal definitions of citizens and the boundaries of rights and duties are determined by conflict and negotiation between social and economic forces. It means that equality in the idea of citizenship is conceived mostly in terms of status but not of resources. As Hindess argues (1993: 25-26),

> ...the sense of equality is not one that requires an equalization of income, power, wealth or other social conditions [...] purpose is not to promote equality of material conditions but rather to guarantee a fundamental equality of status.

On the other hand, as Marshall argues (1992), the recognition of equality of citizenship status can tolerate inequality among social class. As it can compress both ends of distribution and difference by civil rights, citizenship operates to balance the inequalities. It gives equal status in terms of rights and duties while the class system creates inequality in the society. It means that a universal status of citizenship as a means of incorporation and solidarity in society operates to weaken inequality or legitimizes it.

Considering citizenship only in terms of the status it indicates is too narrowing. As it endows the individuals with equal rights citizenship also becomes a mechanism of social integration. It becomes a condition for the construction of solidarity and the

creation of identity in community. It contributes to the construction of social solidarity. Moreover, one may even argue that social order owes a lot to citizenship for the latter generates a sense of common identity and community membership with an integrative effect in the society.

As the practice of citizenship is based on common experiences in society, it creates a sense of belonging. Thus, the practice of citizenship functions as a method of inclusion, which in principle, gives people who differ in age, sex, belief, religion, culture, ethnicity or skin color the same basic entitlements. Also, citizenship based upon equal legal status, rights and duties provides a normative institutionalized meaning for the social membership, specifically for membership of a political community. In the case of nation-state citizenship, for instance, shared nationality becomes the source of the normative basis of integration of all members of a territory into the political community[2]. As Isin (2000: 9) maintains, in the case of nation-state citizenship, citizenship is tied "to a sovereign political entity and to a socially and spatially bounded political community". Therefore on the one hand people with different origins, cultures or beliefs happen to respect common identity because of their membership in the community, and on the other hand, the sovereignty of the community depends on a feeling of full membership in community among individuals in it.

---

[2] As it will be discussed below, this integration is so problematic. Because it is blind to cultural, ethnic, racial, sexual, historical differences. It assimilate or homogenize minorities under the title of nation.

In the community, practice of citizenship gets its full meaning when oriented to participation. It becomes a more holistic concept in the consideration of participation because rights and duties eliminate from their potentially abstract definition but are evaluated in the practice of citizenship. Then citizenship goes beyond solely being a legal status, but becomes a type of political identity. However, this does not mean that participation stresses only a political participation. It addresses political, legal and socio-economic participation.

First, citizenship goes beyond being solely a legal status, but becomes a type of political identity. In addition participation addresses political, legal and socioeconomic participation rather than only political participation. As Steenbergen (1994: 13) correctly argues,

> ...the notion of participation does not represent just a political participation but has a broader sense as participation in public life. Therefore it defines relationships between not only the state and it's citizens but also the citizens and society as a whole in a political context.

As stated above, rights are constitutive parts of participatory citizenship. However, Barbalet (1998: 67) states participation does not application of given rights. In fact, citizenship has an active and passive dimension (Turner, 1989). This two dimensions assigns a tension between an ethic of participation, which follows more active notion, and passive form of participation, which is an application of given rights (Faulks, 2000: 66-67). In other words, the former one designates impacts of citizenship on social classes while the latter one allocates the impacts of social classes on citizenship. Therefore citizenship when ignoring the active participation as a dimension of citizenship becomes passive (Delanty, 2000: 29).

Against, it becomes an active concept when citizenship rights not come from state (or any other authority) but arise from the social struggle.

2.2 History of Citizenship

The roots of the concept of citizenship can be traced back to the ancient Greek city-states (polis) of the fourth century BC. In the original definition, Aristotle (1992), insisted that citizenship is an equal, uniform political status that requires participation in public life. "The citizen achieved equality in the public domain, the world of speech where he was free to engage in political discourse" (Delanty, 2000: 11). In this context, citizens equally represent their own affairs. However, note that while equality was at the core of the definition of citizenship, citizenship in Greek cities was ultimately a privileged status. Although all citizens were equal, individuals in the city were not equal in their access to membership of the community, i.e. to citizenship. As the society was an organic community established on blood ties, the status of citizenship was very exclusive. In ancient Greece, only free men could be citizens. Free men with a "known genealogy" could be citizens provided they were "propertied, the head of a household, and willing to take up arms" (Pocock, 1995:74). Thus, some groups such as women, foreigners and slaves were excluded from getting citizenship status. In sum, citizenship in ancient Greece was a status of political equality yet it was not open to all.

In the history of citizenship, there have been many steps from ancient times to our century. One of the most important steps in due course is the Roman Period, which in terms of citizenship is marked by its inclusiveness. During this period,

while the community enlarged from the city to the empire, citizenship based on kinship transformed so as to include people from different origins. Citizenship was no longer the means of belonging to a small organic community based on common kinship ties or culture. As a more inclusive concept, it was now able to incorporate people from diverse cultural backgrounds, history and origin. As citizenship in Roman states included foreigners or people other than the man in the polis; it represented a more inclusive status than it did in the Greek city (Isin & Wood, 1999). This was because Roman citizenship was defined in terms of legal rights and duties in a political community more than the participation in public life. That means membership got easier at the expense of participation into the community affairs.

As such Roman citizenship is argued to have paved the way for a passive citizenship instead of the active citizenship of the Ancient times. In this case, rights and duties of citizens became the tools of social control and pacification participation into public affairs. In the case of Roman citizenship, Delanty argues (2000: 12):

> The individual in the eyes of law, was a legal being, a citizen, and no longer entailed a relation to politics as a face-to-face relationship with other citizens. With this came a firmer recognition of citizenship as a question of formal equality in the public domain. From then onwards the link between citizenship and democracy was broken

Eventually, the Roman period can be evaluated as a forward movement from the Greek city when we consider the inclusive capacity of the citizenship definition. However, when it is assessed in terms of the dimension of participation it may be seen as a setback from the active Greek citizenship (Castles & Davidson, 2000: 31-32).

In the late middle ages, the development of Universal Church as a religio-political entity allowed the definition of citizenship to depend on a common faith. Membership status and common norms were determined in terms of being the son of the father. "The church replaced the political community as the focus for loyalty and moral guidance" (Faulks, 2000: 20). Therefore citizens came to ask and expect God's and thereby church's protection.

The emergence of the modern central state as opposed to the decentralism of feudal times happened to be a new context paving the way for a new notion of citizenship. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, especially in Europe, states were ruled by absolute monarchs who were believed to have been given their rights and power by God. In this context, people were considered as subjects rather than the citizens, because, they were treated as the children of the patriarchs. The period, starting with the emergence of autonomous European cities and followed by French Revolution and the development of nationalism and the nation-state changed many things in the adventure of citizenship.

The origins of the modern conception of citizenship with its universalistic and egalitarian inclinations can be found in French Revolution. This context which led to the expansion of the nation-state, the content of citizenship opened up to reformulation, and expanded all over the world over four centuries. Even though, this form of citizenship is based on the nation-state and is mainly a western concept, it has created widespread aspirations for the rest of the world. Thus, national concept of citizenship as the most common form of citizenship needs further elaboration.

Citizenship has been historically related with the emergence of nation-state, its democratic political institutions and ideologies. From the seventeenth century the modern notion of political participation and membership is empirically and theoretically related to the nation-state. As Turner (1989: 193) argues, "the development of the concept of the political citizen was an important adjunct to the historical development of the nation-state." The emergence of the national citizenship has been related to the ideology of liberalism in market society, and nation-state. On the one hand, liberalism has enforced the egalitarian and universal nature of citizenship (Faulks, 2000: 29-27). On the other hand, the "nation-state has been the powerful instrument of social closure" (Brubaker, 1992: 23). In the national concept of citizenship, both the normative basis and organization of citizenship are embodied in a national context.

The organization of citizenship is realized in nation-state as a bounded political community. The nation-state became a political unit which is responsible not only for the distribution of resources and legal, equal rights but also the fulfillment of duties. Since the legal concept of national citizenship is defined in the boundaries of nation-state, rights are recognized within national jurisdiction. Then, national concept "stands for nation state itself and its legal and administrative apparatuses" (Roche, 1987: 366). In addition, as the nation-state became the main reference of all aspects of society such as economy, politics, culture or social relations, it went beyond of merely being a territorial organization solely based on legal rules in bounded space. It turned to become a site for membership.

The normative ground of the national concept of citizenship has been the notion of nationhood, which refers to an image of a common background and future. Therefore, the partnership of nation and state provides some grounds for the realization of citizenship by combining the equal rights for everyone, solidarity and collective identity and political participation.

As the narrative above indicates, the current and predominant relationship between citizenship and nation-state seems has been radically historical. In other words, there seems to be no natural or necessary relationship between the two. This suggests that the same relationship is still open to further historical developments. As a matter of fact, the events of the last few decades in all over the world testify this historical nature of the same relationship. In the context of recent developments in the world of nation-states, the national model of citizenship is being questioned.

After 1980's global dynamics have challenged the authority of nation-state discourse concerning nation-state citizenship. Global economy accelerated international migration and the increasing significance of transnational organizations has opened a way for the rise of some new agents in politics. In this period social groups other than the nation have been empowered. Local, regional or ethnic, cultural forms of organizations have been recognized in addition to the nation-state[3] (Delanty, 2000:135). Therefore, the idea of nationhood is challenged by particularities, loyalties or transnational discourses in order to include more

---

[3] This refers to the recognition of minorities under the name of the nation, recognition of their particular identities other than their national identity.

categories (Linklater, 1998; Isin, 1998). Also, the extent of individual rights in state territory has been challenged by more universal rights such as human rights and transnational organizations (Soysal, 1998). In turn, it is argued that the nation-state fails to cope with the challenge of these particular and transnational categories. As a result, the monopoly of national citizenship has been questioned on the basis of not only membership but also political sovereignty.

2.3 Traditions of Citizenship

As Turner (1994) maintains, different routes to modern politics have given rise to different types of citizenship. In this respect, three main philosophical approaches to citizenship (the liberal-individualistic, the communitarian and the republican) and two comparative traditions of nationhood (French and German) are distinguished on the basis of the way they achieve articulation of ideas on citizenship.

In the debate on citizenship, the liberal model is distinguished on the basis of its stress on the rights and equality of individual members of society. The communitarian tradition is marked by its emphasis on norms, solidarity and shared responsibility. Lastly, the republican conception gives priority to participation into the public life. In social life, both the direction of action and the direction of authority orientation decide the priorities of that approach. Power can be concentrated in the state, in society or the individual. Thus, the configuration is determined according to the controlling capacity of the state and public or local bodies for each tradition.

The Liberal tradition conceives of the individual as the source of action and authority. The stress on the individual is essential to this approach in the sense that everything comes after it and remains secondary because individuals are deliberated as autonomous, free and equal beings. Individual is conceived of a being autonomous in the sense that s/he is able to decide about himself/herself. Individual-citizens, according to this standpoint, act to promote their self-interests and to maximize their own benefits by using their own definition of good (Gunsteren, 1998: 17). It follows from that then the individual is understood to be rational and has the capacity to realize what s/he really wants. This is why the issue of freedom is so emphasized in this tradition. Then there is a strong stress on equality as the basis for the construction of freedom. All individuals are equally free and they have the same basic rights. This is the motto of this approach to the issue of citizenship.

In the view of liberal tradition, rights operate to protect the individual subjects from the illegal intervention of each other and of the state to grasp freedom. The formal aspect is something essential for a liberal conception of citizenship. As Faulks argues liberals constitute citizenship according to "the idea of the egalitarian individual's direct relationship with state to construct a rights based theory" (Faulks, 2000: 25). In this context, institutions are considered to enable the development and application of rights. Formal organizations, central authority and state effect society weakly against free equal individuals. Actions and organizations are considered for the act of free individuals but not for formal structures. Thus, while the individual is the bearer of rights, in liberal polity, the nation-state is the guarantor of rights (Işın & Wood, 1999). As Oldfield (1990: 2) summarizes:

> The function of the political realm is to render service to individual interests and purposes, to protect citizens in the exercise of their rights, and leave them unhindered in the pursuit of whatever individual and collective interests they might have.

Owing to its stress on individual and its autonomy, liberal understanding is vulnerable to the following question: if social solidarity and participation are overlooked, as liberalism does, is it possible to have a true citizenship? Liberalism has, of course, its reply to such critiques. However distanced to instruments of incorporation such as a strong central authority, the liberal tradition argues that voluntarism, market conditions and the right to exercise rights could be the main driving force for solidarity in a community. To this standpoint, market requirements and opportunity structures through legal arrangements of equal participation would lead to incorporation in society. Citizens have the right to participate in the political realm in order to get their resources and opportunities, as they are assumed to be aware to express their idea in the political era.

However, it is still a fact that its emphasis on free, equal individuals generates some problems. Are citizens independent beings? Isn't there any basis for their preferences or decisions? How can individuals be prevented from destroying each other to realize their individual benefit? These remain to be plausible questions when a liberal understanding of citizenship is concerned. Also as all members of society are assumed to be free and equal citizens, liberal tradition is bound to overlook the issue of real inequalities. Faulks (2000: 86) claims that liberals cannot recognize how citizenship fails to respond to all individuals equally in society since they focus upon individuals. In fact, one of the most important failures of the liberal

approach is the problem of hidden social inequalities and difference in the relations of free individuals.

Lastly, in the liberal tradition, the fact that individuals have distinct social identities is not taken into consideration when citizenship is at stake. Citizens are considered as homogenous individuals as if they are members of the same community having common norms. Different group identities such as ethnicity, religion, or social class are not considered when the rights of citizens are discussed. Instead, as citizenship is believed to be an issue of public sphere, the peculiarities individuals bring from their particular spaces are not given any credit. Therefore, the liberal approach is argued to be blind to group identities and group based membership rights and duties in a particular community for the definition of citizenship. As Işın and Wood (1999) argue, as many citizens seek more rights for their various identities, this creates a challenge to the idea of homogeneous individuals as the sole bearer of equal rights.

In the debate on citizenship, the communitarian approach privileges the idea of community instead of individuals[4]. As Delanty clarifies (2000: 24), "what is distinctive about communitarianism is the rejection of individualism and

---

[4] It should be remembered that this is related with the transition of people into citizens. As it is known every nation provides ways of becoming a citizen. For most people citizenship is a matter of birth, while it is determined according to two rules. The first one is *jus sanguinis* -law of the blood-; and the other one is *jus soli* -law of the soil-. Under *jus sanguinis*, people take their parents' nationality regardless of place of birth. On the other hand, the rule of *jus soli* says that people are citizens of the nation in which they are born. In other words, *Jus sanguini* is a right by which nationality or citizenship can be recognised to any individual born to a parent who is a national or citizen of that state. *Jus soli* is a right by which nationality or citizenship can be recognised to any individual born in the territory of the state.

contractualism". Mouffe (1992: 226) also suggests that the communitarian objection to the liberal tradition mainly focuses on the impossibility of individuals without noticing the constitutive quality of community. While the liberal approach tries to guarantee the legal status of citizenship, the communitarian one focuses on the solidarity in community.

As it is implied, liberal and communitarian approaches have fundamentally different conceptions about the individual. Against the liberal tradition, the communitarian notion of citizenship both criticizes the sovereign, autonomous definition of citizen, and denies the idea that the common good is the collection of the separate interest of autonomous individuals. Contrary to the individual trying to maximize their interests, communitarians emphasize the dependency of individuals on community, common values and cultural particularities.

Accordingly, the communitarian approach suggests that being a citizen means belonging to a historically developed community (Gunsteren, 1998:19). Individuality is derived from it and determined in terms of that. It is not isolated or independent from being a part of the community. Since the community determines the individual, their autonomy is assumed to depend on the community. As Sandel maintains (1982: 150):

> The members of a society are bound by a sense of community is not simply to say that a great many of them profess communitarian sentiments and pursue communitarian aims, but rather that they conceive their identity – the subject and not just the object of their feelings and aspirations- as defined to the same extent by the community of which they are a part.

Communitarian approach privileges community against individuality to motivate solidarity. Individuals form their identity along with others' from a common

tradition. They participate in the community as if they are parts of a whole. In the communitarian model, citizens as an integrated part of the community can represent their identity in commonly recognized institutions. So, the state is elaborated as being responsible for the common good and public interests.

As it is evident, communitarian approach privileges the whole over parts. So, it avoids the problems of individuality (Gunsteren, 1988: 20-21). However, from the liberal point of view, this conceptualization is seen as a restriction of freedom. Although it avoids the problems of individuality it undermines the distinctive character of citizenship, plurality of communities and the combination of membership. There are various particularities in the society based upon multiple loyalties and their intersections. Then, their existence or formation in a single community becomes problematic from the community based approach.

The Republican way of thinking criticizes both of the above. Both the free and autonomous individual of liberal thinking and the communitarian idea that individual becomes an individual through primarily being in a community are criticized. While the liberal conception of individual is believed to fail to take the collective identities and collectivities into account, the communitarian standpoint, it is claimed, fails to consider the varieties and particularities among the individual members of the community. Whereas for the republican approach the conception of citizenship requires to see both aspects. As Işın & Wood argue (1999: 9):

> On the one hand, there are the various kinds of universalism that exalt the inviolable moral worth of individuals above and beyond any collective or civic identity. On the other hand, there are the forces of exclusivity and

particularism that celebrate and affirm just those forms of group identity that distinguish individuals from one another.

Therefore, the Republican standpoint argues that neither liberal nor communitarian tradition can exhaust citizenship in its entirety for these two aspects constitute the indispensable dimensions of citizenship.

The Republican tradition is seen as a mid-point between these standpoints it criticizes. As it ultimately follows neither an individualist nor a collectivist way of thinking, it realizes that the notion of free autonomous individuals and egalitarian ones do not have to be in contradiction or conflict. Citizens are able to exist as individuals to define their position in the community. In this perspective, Dower (2000: 556) characterizes four features of the Republican way of thinking about citizenship. Citizenship, according to this conception, has to do with the following: equal rights in a political community, the duty to respect other's rights and corresponding obligations, the duty to work for a common good, and to participate in political life. As it appears the first two of the above four are stressed by the liberal tradition as well. However, the Republican tradition is marked with its attempt to combine these liberal insights with the notions of shared fate and solidarity, which are emphasized by the communitarian approach (Cohen, 1999: 246).

However, what is more characteristic in the case of the Republican approach is its stress on political participation. Political participation and the rules of democracy are considered as the most important agent in both the protection of citizens' rights and membership in a community. As Delanty (2000: 33-35) argues,

commitment and participation in public life occupy the position given to identity in communitarianism but it takes a more political form found in the idea of moral responsibilities. Furthermore, the individual is seen as an active agent in political participation in the political community. Sovereign and self recognized citizens act to protect their rights with a feeling of belonging to a community in which they are active citizens. Being an active citizen requires "a demos, a 'we' to which individual citizens feel they belong, in whose deliberations they have voice for their individual rights" (Cohen, 1999: 246). Therefore active citizenship is organized both to provide a common good and guarantee the liberty and the difference.

However, for some authors such as Gunsteren, republican citizenship is also not free from shortcomings. There it is argued that insufficient attention is paid not only to the fulfillment of private life, but also the particular meaning and diversity of other communities (Gunsteren, 1998:21). It is realized that as political participation to the community is determined in terms of the bounded community of nation-state, entities transcending the boundaries of the nation-state are problematic. Because "the circle of people endowed with full participation rights has everywhere remained narrower than the class of persons subject to law" (Newman, 1996: 32). Equal rights or participation to public are limited for only some people having requirements for bounded community but not include all the people under the common authority.

Similar to this comparative modeling of three philosophical approaches to citizenship, Brubaker (1990) develops an exemplary pair of France and Germany. He focuses on the formation of nation-state in the case of French and German to

analyze the relations between different conceptions of citizenship and nationhood. French conceptions of nationhood and citizenship is related with the politicization of nationhood in the pre-Revolutionary France. Republican contents of citizenship is unitarist, universalistic and political but not culturalist. The nation, in this tradition has been conceived in relation to the institutional and territorial frame of the state: political unity, not shared culture, has been understood to constitute nationhood. (Brubaker, 1990: 316). Therefore political constitution of citizenship entails an cultural assimilation for ethnic minorities or immigrants.

On the other hand, German tradition is distinguished from the French tradition by its Volk-centered and differentialist features. It is characterized by the idea of a homogeneous community (*volk*) where nationality and citizenship combined. Therefore, German tradition neither an originally a political concept nor depend on the idea of citizenship.

> This pre-political German nation, this nation in search of a state, is conceived not as the bearer of universal political values, but as an organic, cultural, linguistic, or racial community as an irreducibly particular *Volksgemeinschaft.* (Brubaker, 19990: 317).

France and Germany have been regarded as two antagonistic kinds of nationhood. While the French conception of nationhood is universalistic, institutional, rationalists, and assimilationists, the German conception is particularistic, organic, differentialist and Volk-centered. Furthermore, German and French nationhood also differ in their definitions of citizenship. The specific ethno-cultural dimension of German tradition fails to integrate the egalitarian, democratic, nationalist and statist aspects of citizenship (İçduygu, A., Çolak, Y. and Soyarık, N., 1990). German

citizenship is restrictive toward non-Germans, while French is expansionist toward non-French. However, French tradition is state-centered and assimilationist.

For Turner (1993) this diversity is mostly due to the way the public and the private is articulated and affected by the concept of nation. As it is known, the sphere of the private is usually associated with particularity, difference and self-interest. Whereas the public sphere is identified with sameness, equality, common good and solidarity. In the theory of citizenship, the division of public and private spheres is a question of the priority of individual rights over the good for the whole society or vice-versa. It has to do with the problem of representation of private interests or the public one which is formed by the general interest of society. Different approaches to citizenship are distinguished in terms of the way they articulate universality and particularity or public and private. In this sense German tradition emphasizes the private (the family, the religion) and also considers the idea of the state as the source of public authority. But, French tradition stresses the citizens of national identity.

Briefly, having an overview of different traditions on citizenship, it is seen the debates regarding citizenship have focused on dualities such as the ones between liberty and solidarity, the individual and community, difference and equality, and private and public spheres of life. In an attempt to overcome these dualities, Faulks (2000: 165) proposes a more holistic approach of citizenship and argue that each side of these dualities is mutually constitutive instead of being intrinsically conflictual. Also, Skinner (1992) argues that the citizenship concept can be constructed out of the dichotomy between individual liberty and rights on one side and civic activity and political community on the other by reconciling this tension.

Therefore, it is not necessary to constitute citizenship ultimately either by individuals without common public-concern or a single substantive idea of the common good (Mouffe, 1992: 230).

2.4 Limits of National Citizenship

Citizenship has been considered as a legal status based on uniform equal rights of every citizen who has membership status by belonging to a particular community. Then, from the formation of nation-state, becoming a citizen refers to membership of a nation and to a bounded territory of the state. Since, citizens participate in social, economic, cultural and political life in nation-state, forms of participation are connected to the national context. In this context, there are many questions concerning how different citizens of a particular state are recognized with their equal status, how their rights are defined as common to all? Although, there is a number of ethnic groups, languages, traditions, social positions and identities in any and every community, citizenship ignores these varieties and with an assumption that they all share something at the public sphere. Accordingly, citizenship is bound to become a limited concept in some aspects. This limitation is to be analyzed below under three titles: exclusion, homogenization, and formalism.

When we consider citizenship as a special and privileged status of membership, we imply both its inclusive and exclusive quality at the same time. As Turner underlines (2000a: 132-133), citizenship is not only an inclusive bond for the allocation of numerous entitlements but also an exclusionary basis for building solidarity and creating identity. It includes some while excluding others because, while it operates

in the space of equal rights and solidarity, it creates an exclusionary force of non-membership. Citizenship actually defines frontiers between those who are in and who are out in the sense of belonging, and sameness. In this framework, in terms of its membership aspect, citizenship is necessarily a particularistic, and exclusive concept (Cohen, 1999). In other words, exclusion and inequality becomes one part of citizenship as a principle of membership (Brubaker, 1992: 24-25). The definition of who the citizen is simultaneously indicates who the other, the non-citizen is.

In the modern state, the construction of national citizenship as a formal status of membership is related with the sovereignty of state in its territory and the exclusion operates on the grounds of nationality. Then the combination of state and nation become the basis of the exclusionary aspect of citizenship. However, this does not necessarily mean that it includes all people or groups inside its territory. There are also other types of exclusion, which cannot be accommodated only outside the boundaries of the nation but also inside it (Delanty, 2000; Oommen, 1997). In other words, "all those subject to the authority of a given state cannot be meaningfully thought of as occupying the same status as being 'included' to same extent" (Stewart, 1995: 67). In terms of the sovereignty of the territorial nation-state, inequality and exclusion operates in the two major ways. National citizenship excludes both aliens (with respect to their nationality) and minorities (with respect to their gender, culture, ethnicity or identity). This is why the operation of exclusive territoriality and sovereignty challenges the notion of common rights guaranteed to all human beings, and even to the citizens of a particular state.

On the other hand, the constitutive pillar of the idea of citizenship that 'membership to community is common to all' indicates that citizenship has much to do with unification. Likewise, equal status of individuals stresses that citizenship has again much to do with homogenization of individual members of society. Accordingly, it is a fact that citizenship in the era of nation-states is characterized by its homogenizing power. This power of citizenship has something to do with the fact that it emerged in a context where we see an amalgamation of liberal politics and capitalist economy.

According to Steenbergen (1994: 148), capitalism undermines hierarchical and particularistic institutions and values. Also, through exchange relationships, it promotes the growth of an universalistic culture and contributes to the emergence of individualism by emphasizing the autonomy of the consumer. Which means capitalist economic relation contributed to the promotion of individualism and universalism, which in turn became very central for citizenship in modern age. Likewise, liberal politics, with its emphasis on formal equality among individuals, contributed to the same process.

When this liberal politics and capitalist economic relation converged in the space of the nation-state, the latter and nation-state citizenship became the grounds for the processes of such homogenization and uniformity. It is plain that these processes were carried out on the basis of a sharp distinction made between the public and private spheres. In the context of citizenship, the former sphere of society is based on first political rights and obligations of individuals and state, while the latter one is based on particularity and difference. While cultural groups and other

forms of minorities are considered to be restricted to the private sphere; the public is considered a collective space where man unites with others in the order of law for their common good (Castles & Davidson, 2000). Then, private refers to either autonomy of the individual or a free space away from state intervention. As Rawls (1985: 241) argues, the political refers to "universalism, which means equality and abstraction from cultural particularity and difference". Thus, difference is to be restricted to the non-public identity. So, as particularistic identities were restricted to the private world, citizenship became public and universal but blind to differences.

As considered above, while the modern conception of citizenship promotes equality, it remains blind to some hidden forms of exclusion in terms of ethnicity, gender, race, class, culture, the poor and even the disabled. For Brubaker (1992), against the external, formal, equal status of citizenship among members of a national community, the exclusionary character of citizenship is concrete and substantive. Excluded groups cannot become full citizens by achieving formal equality. Some groups or identities with common formal citizenship rights guaranteed by law are excluded in their social practices because citizenship status does not maintain rights for expression of their particular identities and for the complete meaning of citizenship. Here, Young (1989) argues that equal citizenship rights do not lead to a social justice and equality. Although, legal citizenship guarantees equal rights provided by law; it does not provide full participation with equal opportunities.

Although minorities get full legal rights, discrimination continues. Formal rights for minorities who have a marginal economic, social or political position may not correspond to concrete practices. Minority groups and particularities continue to

be seen as full members of the community as the citizenship concept is defined around law, but the distribution of minorities in occupations, residences, social, educational or cultural institutes imply exclusion in public. They have unequal access to economic, social, cultural relationships and effective political participation in the community. Thus, when citizenship is considered nothing more than a legal status, it has many failures with respect to particularities and differences (Garcia, 1996; Brubaker, 1992), because, first the rights of citizens do not correspond to all members in full civil, political or social spheres.

On the other hand abstractness of citizenship as a formal status does not lead to abandonment of its juridical expression. The juridical side of citizenship is not eliminated because access to formal citizenship status is still important. Dagger (2000: 32-35) argues that being a citizen primarily requires a body for certain rights and certain duties corresponding to the legal status of citizens. Thus, against the danger of social exclusion, the guaranteed status of formal citizenship is the first step to full membership.

To conclude, when the limits of citizenship are considered, the main problem is the inability of the national concept to recognize the differences other than the national one. In the boundaries of the nation-state, there are internal discriminatory practices such as differences of color, ethnicity, sex, gender, age, and employment status, etc. Although these differences are hidden by the notion of formal equality, as Cohen suggests (1999), in the practice of citizenship, this hiding causes a separation between a first-class and second-class citizenship. It is evident that groups like ethnic minorities or immigrants become the second-class citizens. Steenbergen

(1994) calls the first class of citizens as 'master citizens', while the second one as 'subjects'. This is conceptualized as a result of the formation of 'de-facto' forms of exclusion during formal participation in the national context. It should be noticed however that subjects or secondary class citizens are not fully excluded; they cannot achieve full citizenship either.

Much of the contemporary debate on citizenship concentrates on this hidden separation, which threatens the authority of national citizenship. Even though, it is considered as universal and equal, in practice, national citizenship does achieve a full representation of all the members of the community. One of the most important difficulties on national citizenship is its multileveled exclusion. This is why it is not possible to capture the dynamics of citizenship in the one- dimensional language of exclusion and inclusion or citizen and non-citizen (Turner, 1994). The exclusive character of citizenship cannot be resolved at a single institutional level with some unidimensional approaches.

The above examination of the limits of national citizenship demonstrates that, citizenship in the national context has for some time been under pressure because of its exclusive nature. As more and more people fail to achieve to enjoy citizenship status, depending on their poverty, sex, occupation, ethnicity, boundaries of 'who is a citizen?' within the modern paradigm of citizenship have been blurred. These problems, which are inherent in the national conception of citizenship have become the reasons for some recent forms of tensions in the era of globalization. As the meaning, scope and content of citizenship have always been subject to historical change, we can argue that citizenship in today's world is about to enter a new phase

of structural change. In other words, citizenship remains to be an open social category.

CHAPTER III

GLOBALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP

As citizenship is regarded as an historical concept but not a natural attribute, this chapter analyses forms of citizenship in a specific historical context, which is characterized by global trends. Generally, this chapter aims to recognize the meaning of globalization in society. More specifically, the first part of this chapter, analyses the content of globalization, in order to cover its impacts on society. It examines not only its material indications but also its conceptual evaluation in the literature to understand whether 'there is such a thing or not'. Then, it analyses quite different meanings of globalization and approaches to globalization process.

The second part of this chapter deals with the major consequences of the globalization process. Its outcomes, including its effects on citizenship, are analyzed under four headings. Changes in the economic organization are questioned with its socio-political outcomes. Also, increasing international migration is examined along its reasons and social outcomes. As well as increasing importance of supra-national organizations against national organizations, recognition of sub-national bodies and particularities is studied in order to observe their effects on national categories.

The third part concentrates on the impacts of these results on the national order. It focuses on the changing role of the nation-state on national citizenship. The last part of this chapter briefly questions the possibility of a new citizenship paradigm.

3.1 Dynamics of Globalization

During the 1980s, new flows known as Thatcherism and New Right thinking came to be dominant on the political agenda. The welfare state prevailing the post war period collapsed. According to neo-liberal policies, applications of Keynesian economy and welfare state policies became problematic and were increasingly abandoned. Besides, the decline in corporatist state arrangements, government expenditures and social support for public goods, the notion of citizenship based on expended social rights started to be seen as problematic.

Likewise, the power dynamics in the world changed radically in the last two decades. As a result of the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the end of the cold war, the biopolarity in the world order dissolved. This breakdown of Communism led to especially in Eastern Europe, the emergence of new nations, regroupings and new regimes.

These recent economic and political restructuring have had major effects on the world order. Decentralization of capital, the decline of stable employment conditions, long-term unemployment, new production technologies, a trend towards increasing income inequality and limitless flow of money have caused a movement of people, information, technologies and cultures. The impacts of these movements were accelerated by the new developments of information technologies like TV

stations, the Internet, computer networks and satellites. Global movements like world music or the growth of global sporting competitions such as the Olympic games, the Nobel prizes, Greenpeace, are some examples of global organizations. All this flow of things transcended the limits of national borders. In addition, increasing nuclear, chemical, conventional and military technologies as well as new waste products and health risks, necessitated inter-societal regulations (Urry, 1998). Therefore, as suggested by Gunsteren all these required a repositioning of the sovereign nation-state (Gunsteren, 1998). On the other hand, these new dynamics 'dramatically shrink time-space' (Urry, 2000) for global movements.

The rise of these global organizations, global networks, global corporations, global brands, global money markets, global life-styles indicate that there is a global reconstruction of economic, political and cultural relationships that could not be expressed within the national order. What follows is an examination of such changes which have eroded the national boundaries of economic, political, social and cultural action.

In literature, a well-known definition of globalization is provided by Anthony Giddens (1998: 137), for whom globalization is the "stretching out and compression of time and space". This compression and intensification of the world has prompted a consciousness of the world as a global space. It seems that "the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of social life" (Held, 1995: 13) define the very essence of globalization. As the people in the global world are incorporated into a 'single world society' (Albrow, 1996), people began to conceive "the entire world as a single place" (Robertson, 1992: 38). It is

evident that this way of thinking about globalization conceives the world in global era as a single harmonious space. However, many authors emphasized an opposite process in relation to globalization. To many scholars, globalization also implies a deep fragmentation of meaning and cultural forms. In the writings of Friedman (1993) and Robertson (1992), for instance two opposite aspects of globalization are observed. For Robertson (1992) globalization is both the particularism of the universal and local application of universal forms. Friedman (1993) signifies encompassment of the globe in the cultural era as well as encompassment of the local in material terms. Therefore, in the application of the globalization perspective, there does not exist such a thing as an homogeneous world-state. As a result of the promotion of particularities, globalization is also understood as an area of differentiation and multiplicity. "It is marked by an organization of diversity rather than by a replication of uniformity. No total (not to say partial) homogenization of systems of meaning and expression has occurred" (Hannerz, 1999: 237). Instead, it is suggested that the globalization process can be seen as one of diversity and fragmentation and as a network of social relationships, meaning, people and goods among the regions of the world. As a matter of fact, the globalization debate questions whether these diverse forms of interactions may lead to a global order or not. In what follows, I will sum the different views on the possibility of this global order.

This current new level of organization of the global world is diversely evaluated by different approaches. While for some it is a rule of the market or cultural imperialism of West, for some others globalization is a new opportunity for different

identities, diverse cultures, and various perspectives. The former approach implies a sense of imposition while the latter one entails an area of mutual exchanges and a multilateral meaning of globalization.

The critical approaches to globalization emphasize the impossibility of globalization and the negative aspects of globalization. An exemplary of this first approach is the one given by Hirst and Thompson (1996). They argue that the symptoms of global transactions do not justify the acceptance of globalization's existence. Instead, they believe that the rise of contemporary international transactions and international trade is an outcome of a historical continuity. That is they believe a global trend was always there. Besides, they display that the multinational companies are still concentrated in Europe, Japan or the USA and they still operate in the framework of laws and general infrastructure provided by the states. Hence, they argue, since its scale is still limited to a small part of the world and since the independent states still define the flows of capital, it is not possible to speak about a global economy.

Globalization is also considered as a Western economic and cultural dominance over the rest of the world. The declining economic sovereignty of nation-states, the rise of new forms of inequalities, the emergence of a new underclass and 'Coca Colonization' of the world prompted an economic and cultural incorporation of the Third World (Holton, 1998). People now are passive consumers. Ritzer (1993) also speaks about 'McDonaldization' as a global culture. This critical approach to globalization emphasizes the homogenizing potential of it. As Santos (1999) argues this negative approach perceives globalization as a process

which emanates from above and which leads to hegemony of global Western forms over fragmented local forms and cultural identities.

However, global cultural homogenization theories are criticized because of their inability "to account for the rise of counter-movements emphasizing national difference and the continuing cultural appeal of particular countries and localities" (Holton, 1998 p: 196). For Appadurai (1990) the homogenization argument fails to recognize new local variations and diverse forces from various metropolises brought into new societies instead of 'commoditization' and passive consumerism. Eventually it can be concluded that the Westernization argument detects only one aspect of globalization. Whereas there is more than this in globalization.

On the other hand, the fragmentary features of globalization are also underlined. Against the thesis of progressive homogenization of cultures, it is argued that there is also a tendency for the promotion of the particular and the fragmented forms of experience. Therefore, global economic developments such as, a decrease in spending in terms of welfare politics, the possibility of participation in the international division of labor and market economy and new dynamics of business are evaluated as a new chance for the reorganization of national economic dynamics. The shift of power from national to regional or transnational is seen as a chance for distanceless, borderless interactions. Appadurai (1990), for instance, believes that these features of globalization provide particular cultural groups with models for their own organization and identity formation. Lash and Urry (1994) also point out that the emergence of new transnational organizations and social

movements are evaluated as vehicles for the creation of new politico-cultural identities, institutions or forms.

However, I believe that an overemphasis on the accelerated circulation of people, commodities, capital, money, identities and images through borderless global space is bound to culminate with ignoring the relatively stable frontiers and barriers in front of globalization. It has to be conceded that the global developments cannot be separated from forms of relatively fixed and immobile territorial organizations or state regulatory institutions. Assessing the merits and deficiencies of both perspectives, my contention is that globalization may not be reduced to a monolithic process. In my view, the globalization process can be defined neither as a hegemonic structure nor completely unbounded collection of particular agents. But, it can be seen as an interaction of the universal and particular, which realizes globalization having more than one dimension.

3.2 Consequences of Globalization

3.2.1 The Reorganisation of the Sphere of Economy

In the present world there are real empirical signs indicating increasing intensity, extensity and velocity of economic dynamics leading to some novel socio-political and structural processes. For many authors, the opening of borders for capital and the rapid move of finance capital, improvements in the technology of communication and transportation, and so on represent the emergence of a new phase of capitalism, which is sometimes called 'disorganized capitalism' or post-

fordizm (Lash & Urry, 1994; Offe, 1984). Although, it is difficult to define the boundaries of the global economy because of its interconnectedness, globalization in the economic sense is strongly related to the breaking down of barriers against the flow of finance and industrial capital. Moreover, the expansion of newspapers and magazines especially in terms of electronic communication technologies, virtual reality and the velocity of information transfer around the globe accelerate this circulation of commodities, capital and labor which are demanded by multinational corporations operating within various countries. As Appadurai exemplified (1990: 297):

> Technology, both high and low, both mechanical and informational, now moves at high speeds across various kinds of previously impervious boundaries. Many, countries now are the roots of multinational enterprise: a huge steel complex in Libya may involve interests from India, China, Russia and Japan, providing different components of new technological configurations. The odd distribution of technologies and thus the peculiarities of these technoscapes, are increasingly driven not by any obvious economies of scale, of political control, or of market rationality, but of increasing complex relationships between money flows, political possibilities and the availability of both low and high-skilled labor.

The most direct effects of the globalization of the market and financial sector, innovations in technology and the multicentral organization of manufacturing industries are detected in working conditions. As Featherstone (1990) maintains, the expanding service producing sector, instead of goods producing, entails the emergence of a new category of professionals such as international lawyers, corporate tax accounts, financial advisers and management consultants which shift employment conditions, new locations of employment, job definitions and wage hierarchies altering previous ones. Moreover, as many authors recognize that change

in working conditions has a specific form (Wilson,1997; Sassen1999). Economy in developed countries emphasize the centrality of highly educated labor and highly specialized services as well as the presence of a large supply of lowly educated workers. The labor market increasingly polarizes into low-wage and high wage sectors, while the rate of unemployment ascends in undervaluing sectors and some parts of the globe, and new activities start up in previously undeveloped sites. The spatial concentration of these two divided economic classes causes an increase in social tension.

To be brief, the rise of a global economy with its transnational production technologies, globally articulated production, new communication technologies, service or delivery strategies, and so on generated a shift in economic and working conditions.

In the current expansion of economic globalization, it would be wrong to evaluate the shift in economic conditions just in terms of its economic consequences without emphasizing socio-political outcomes. As suggested by Brodie (2000: 113), the "new global economy distinct social and political manifestations and it requires political surveillance or regulation." Thus, a new level of economic interdependence leads to new coordination in other fields of policy, rights, identities or definitions. In this context, declining boundaries against the flow of the new economic structure is not independent from its own structural requirements. Thus, for Brenner (1999: 436), the term globalization,

> ...refers to a double –edged, dialectical process through which: the movement of commodities, capital, money, people and information through geographical

> space is continually expanded and accelerated: and, relatively fixed and immobile spatial infrastructures are produced, reconfigured and/or transferred to enable such expanded, accelerated movement.

In this sense, the intervention of transnational or global categories on the economic structure of nation-state is crucial because they challenge the autonomy of the nation-state in forming economic poles. Urry (1998) points out that in the nation-state, economic globalization causes the break down of coherent political interference into the economy. Then, many states are no longer able to bring their industries under socio-economic control without global dynamics. Furthermore, the operation of global economy is strongly related to transnational migration, international agreements and institutions.

3.2.2 International Migration

One of the significant aspects of globalization is the rapidly increasing mobility of people across national borders. Many people such as tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guestworkers and other moving groups constitute these shifting groups. More than ever, after World War II the process of migration has become significant in various parts of the world. The United Nations and the International Organization for Migration estimate that some 150 million people, or 2.5 percent of the world's population, live either temporarily or permanently outside their countries of origin. Some 80 million to 97 million of these are estimated to be migrant workers and family members. Another 12 million are refugees outside their countries. Besides, with globalization, numbers of migrants are increasing. According to United Nation data, in 1965 the number of migrants were 75 million, in 1985 this number was 105

million and in 2000 it increasingly reaches 168 million[5]. The increasing flow of people has been facilitated by the magnitude of labor migrations. Workers as well as technicians, executives or professionals from less developed to well developed countries have been agents of increasing international migration. On the one hand, there are numerous flows of skilled and trained persons from developing to developed countries. The phenomenon of migration of high-qualified manpower is expressed by the term 'brain drain' (Bhagati and Wilson 1989 Income Taxation and international Mobility Cambridge, MA, MIT Press). The higher the level of skill/training professions like engineers, medical personnel and scientists usually tend to predominate in the flow of people.

On the other hand, since the 1980s, in some countries, while high skilled people with prospects of finding appropriate jobs have been one of the main components of international migration, low-skilled workers have had little chance of getting formal sector employment. Well-paying skilled jobs are crossed by the lower wages "on-call, part time, flexible labour force" (Bourgue, 1992: 160). As Castles and Davidson (2000) clarifies, many people have become unemployed or work in insecure and marginal workplaces. This flexibilization of labor is also expressed in the form of temporary and seasonal employment with number of immigrants. New

---

[5] For exact figures about this issue, see "United Nations, Trends in Total Migrant Stock Revision 4, 1999 and unpublished estimates at www.soc.upenn.edu

arrangements in work conditions[6] by the effect of international migration have strong effects in the social and political life.

In this perspective, international migration transform the composition of contemporary societies into a complex and heterogeneous category which challenges nationally bound concepts of citizenship. Firstly, the membership status of immigrants from other nations questions whether the granting of citizenship status and rights is conceptually related to formal membership of the nation state. Because the diverse membership of immigrants causes an increasing demand for instances of full membership. Brubaker (1990) specifies this demand as a proliferation of status of partial membership, while Hammar (1989) indicates that there are soaring numbers of persons with dual citizenship[7]. I think in this evaluation, the point is that these trends on the grounds of membership deviate from nation-state membership. The legal status and membership status assigned to immigrants are different from the boundaries of the nation-state. Many authors such as *Hammar* (1990) have argued that international labour migration has caused advanced industrial states to erode the distinction between citizen and 'alien'. As a result a significant number of 'non-citizens' have gained access to a variety of rights including social rights and limited political rights which is usually reserved for

---

[6] Individuals with their highly skilled and flexible workforce lead to the emergence of low-cost and high-quality infrastructures and lifestyle. This significant structure of the migrant economy change social organization of national community.

[7] Dual or plural citizenship means holding citizenship in one or more countries in addition to native country. Some countries like Canada or America formally recognize dual citizenship status. That is a person can have the rights and duties that adhere to a citizen in several countries in which he/she is a citizen.

members of the nation. This situation contributes to the reconfiguration of what it means to be a citizen in contemporary world.

Secondly, with the effect of accelerating international migration, the dissociation of uniformity of citizenship status has been challenged in another way. Populations have become more heterogeneous and culturally diverse as a result of immigrant flows that increase cultural differences between the new comers and the indigenous people (Wilson, 1997). Also, moving between different cultures requires new types of disposition and means of orientation. In addition, religious or traditional cultural forms reactivate among many immigrants as a response to social, cultural or political exclusion. For example, according to (Castles & Davidson, 2000) they strengthen their linguistic or folkloric practices as a resource for survival and resistance. Therefore, the modern myth of national homogeneity has been undermined by the massive international migrations during the last half-century.

Thirdly, legally the administrative acknowledgement of potentially permanent status of immigrants is also distinctive (Miller, 1998). Stewart (1995: 67) realizes that, although it is clear that all of the people are subject to the authority of a given state, they "can not be meaningfully thought as occupying the same legal status, as being included to the same extent". Other than the single category of citizenship, there is more accurate distinction between foreign nationals, denizens and citizens in the society. Denizens are foreigners with a legal and permanent resident status. Immigrants can recover their legal status and gain many of the rights of citizenship by long-term residence entitlements but they cannot get formal

membership status (Hammar, 1989). So, there is a new legal status, which is more than foreigner status, but less than citizen status.

However, Soysal (1994) points out that resident non-citizen status may include many rights such as the most basic civil rights, freedom of speech, assembly, association and claims to social rights, cultural expression and even local voting in some countries. Also, non-citizens and even illegal aliens have the right to have rights in various international and national codes:

> Many rights that used to be constructed exclusively as the rights of citizens are now deemed to be the rights of persons that must be respected everywhere. [...] This can be understood as a healthy and desirable dissociation of the status of legal personhood from one's formal citizenship status (Soysal, 1994: 134).

On the other hand, Castles and Davidson (2000) express that people who belong to a society, as workers, taxpayers, parents and even political participants may not have any real existence in the decisions that affect their lives because, social, economic, and cultural differences deny their chance of gaining the same citizenship status in a modern meaning.

Correspondingly, the position of various immigrant categories is frequently precarious, because they are formally bound to economic and social systems though they are on indefinite citizenship status. Although nation states still protect their unity and membership status by controlling the inflow of foreigners and the range of rights and privileges of migrants, for many authors (Soysal, 1994; Brubaker, 1992; Delanty, 2000; Miller, 1998), there is a blurring line between citizen and non-citizen in a national context. Many aspects of international migration such as the status of immigrants and their rights have been elaborated in the effects of human rights,

international agencies, treaties and conventions. In favor of new supra-national and sub-national territorial configurations, the exercise of power over national borders is limited. So, the national scale of accumulation is questioned in terms of these considered dynamics.

3.2.3 Supra-national Organizations

In the field of global movements, an increasing number of transnational organizations operate for new regulations in transnational market security arrangements, international relations and human rights. Transnational or regional economic blocks such as the "trade free zones of EU, the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA), and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)" (Castles & Davidson, 2000:171) work to reduce obstructions against the global economy. In addition, many authors demonstrate that, the increasing flow of capital, commodities, people, work force, technologies, ideas, images, and the sources of authority of citizenship rights and obligations have been expanded from nation-state to other transnational organization such as World Bank, International Monetary Foundation, United Nations, UNESCO, CNN, Greenpeace, Amnesty International, etc.

It is argued that these community wide institutions have increasing direct effects on the regulations in the internal territorial spaces (Isin, 2000; Urry, 2000; Held, 1995; Delanty, 2000). It simply means that states and national codes are under the influence of these transnational institutions through international agreements, supranational courts and their regulations. This is because they reduce the barriers of

national sovereignty in economic, socio political, cultural and even juridical eras by challenging the idea that the state is the single instrument for expression of citizenship practice. For example, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice in Europe restrict state sovereignty through their intergovernmental organization (Turner, 1994).

One of the most specific examples of globalization in socio political issues is the widening effect of the idea of humanity and human rights. During the regulation of economic and political relations in supra-national institutions, human rights grew significantly as a universal norm through the international community. Cohen (1999:260) considers that human rights created by international agreements and supra-national bodies constitute an "international symbolic order, a political-cultural framework, and an institutional set of norms and rules for the global system that orients and constraint states". In addition, global humanitarian agencies promote indigenous rights; particular or local claims against nationally constructed rights and human rights over nation-state citizenship rights. Therefore as Turner (2000b) argues this alternative discourse of human rights and humanity confronts the language of nation-state citizenship.

From the other point of view, it is a fact that nation-states are the major parts of the foundation, funding and operations of the regulatory bodies discussed above. For example, members of the UN, IMF, WTO or EU and their decisions are represented nationally. Even though the normative basis of transnational entities limits the power of national forms, as Alter claims (1996:24), "it remains the case that states

are the entities that implement civil and political rights and provide for social rights."

However, the significant point is that transnational bodies function as something more than the simple sum of the independent members. As Held argues (1995), the member states are no longer the sole centers of power within their borders. Although nation-states are their primary agents, their decisions, functions or nature are determined at the global level. Correspondingly, this global order limits national independence and national sovereignty, as a result of the power shift from national governments to transnational bodies. Supranational, quasi-governmental bodies and regional organizations prevent nationally codified governments, courts, and rights to be the highest authority. So, membership, which is territorially defined in terms of nation, is no longer the ultimate end. In turn, as Falk argues (2000), the idea of citizenship has been shifting to a transnational locus.

In sum, it is argued that, globalization is characterized by the movements of power centers both from national to transnational or regional areas and from national to local institutions. Then, this transformation leads to some challenges to the authority of national territory.

3.2.4 Sub-national Bodies

Globalization has opened up new political spaces for local actors. The sub-national levels have been growing and becoming powerful new voices in the contemporary world. According to Turner (1992: 184) the global developments "weaken territorial ties between people and the state in a variety of ways by shifting the locus of

political identities. In a series of cultural flows, previously isolated homogeneous cultures encourage identity reactions around differences of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and race. This, of course, has been eroding any universalistic conception of the individual. The revival of the particularities within nation state borders, contemporary proliferation of individual life styles and the idea of the uniqueness or particularity has limited the universalism of modernism. So, the result has been a proliferation of local or particular identities.

For Young (1989, 1999) the differentiation of culture, which is an inevitable outcome of this process, creates new levels of multiculturalism[8] which is a particular social condition of racial and ethnic or cultural diversity. As Turner (1994) and Cohen (1999) state this emphasis on differentiation in social structure and dehierarchization of cultural systems reduced the homogeneity of the population. In the contemporary age, other developments also advanced differentiation of particularities. First, not only recognition of minorities in national territory has found a voice but also more and more social groups have become rootless. It means that, minority groups can include both marginalized people as a result of their weak legal and social positions from past discrimination and large immigrant populations throughout the major centers of the global system. In addition, the increasing number of supra-national legal bodies, international law organizations, and non-

[8] Multiculturalism, in a general sense, can be called as a perspective which is composed of the interplay desirability of cultural plurality, and the plural and multicultural constitution of each culture. It values the diversity of people maintained through racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation and/or class differences in the society.

governmental organizations recognized interdependency of these new subjects. As many authors realize, there is

> ... a right of individuals or groups such as indigenous people and minorities who are citizens of the member states to appeal to supra –national courts and other political bodies to protect their rights against their own polities" (Cohen, 1999: 259).

It simply means that the reaction of both immigrants and indigenous people for their social, cultural or political inclusion at the supranational level intensifies the role of regional agents.

In this context, the state through the practice of the sub-national and supra-national actor is "partly eroded in terms of its political sovereignty and cultural hegemony" (Turner, 1994: 157). Many minority movements expressing various languages, traditions and histories have undermined the ideology of distinct and autonomous national cultures. Thus, neither homogenization preventing the expression of distinctiveness nor national basis of exclusion is at the core of the citizenship definition any more. As Delanty points out (2000: 121):

> The most important challenges for citizenship are the double task of devolving national citizenship downwards to subnational units such as regions, cities and localities, on the one side, and on the other side transferring citizenship upwards.

In this sense, as one of the contradictory outcomes of global practices, there is a powerful tendency toward regional autonomy and localism in the contemporary world. However, the relation between the global and the local is very complex and problematic because, the local can be seen both on a resistance point Fraser (1993) to globalization and an integral part of globalization. The local can represent a community, a discursive field, a level of government, or the city in order to advance

the idea of community. Then, there are no grounds to assume that local can rest outside the process of globalization. Similarly, Robertson indicates, "the process of globalization involves the invention of locality" (Robertson, 1990: 29). So, the local is very much included within the global. In fact, the global and the local are in an interaction of drawing each other, rather than excluding the other. Friedman (1993) suggests that since integration into the global system usually implies displacement, and the disarticulation of diverse local structures, local difference and particularity will be obliterated by the globalization process on the basis of socio-cultural integration and political representation. Local becomes important in global. Therefore, the global enables the local forms to incorporate and interact with each other, while the local enable the global are operate at many levels.

In sum, the dynamics of global economy, an accelerated expansion of global communications, international migration of people, the rise of supra-national organizations and non-governmental organizations, all these have been challenging the authority of national order. Moreover, multiculturalism and polyethnicity against the monocultural forms, the explosion of difference around gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and race have eroded the idea of universalism of any sort. These obviously have been pushing for a change in the spatial organization of political power and social relations (Giddens 1990).

3.3 Globalization and the Weakening of National Order

The changes discussed up to this point may be put as in the following. First, capital has become a global category. Which means nation-state is in difficulty to control

the movements of capital. Secondly, the massive international migration in the last few decades eroded the classical mode membership to a territorially well-defined nation-state. Third, the territoriality and the sovereignty of the nation-state have been eroded because of the increasing power of supranational and sub-national legal and political organizations. Finally, the rise of the struggle for the right to have ones own culture and group rights has weakened national identity.

As the above summary indicates, the impact of globalization on the categories of nation-state and national identity is of great importance. The nation-state is now considered to be obsolete in terms of both efficacy and moral legitimacy (Archibugi & Held, 1998; Held, 1995; Soysal, 1994; Falk, 1994; Cohen, 1999). The nation-state, it is argued, has no longer its previous decisive place because global economic and political power transcends the nation-state. The nation-state, Falk (1994:138) argues,

> ...is less and less autonomous in the world system, being penetrated by a variety of transnational forces (from drugs to ideas) beyond the control of even the strongest governments. Internally, territorial boundaries are now so heavily and multiply penetrated that it is no longer convincing to draw sharp dividing lines between state, region and the world.

Many researchers (Albrow, 1996; Appadurai, 1990; Ohmae, 1995) believe that the flow of things, the dynamics of globalization changed citizenship and nation-states *irreversibly*. The nation-states, these scholars argue, cannot regulate activities within their boundaries because the expanded global economy and its consequences lead to the erosion of the state territoriality. The by-product of all these changes has been the weakening of national citizenship too. Similarly, Turner (2000a) argues that, owing the developments mentioned above, the constitutive elements of national

citizenship have been under threat. In his view, globalization recasts national patterns of both belonging and status. Citizenship entitlements and identities based upon national modes of loyalty and commitments are being weakened.

In contrast to this view on the current state of nation-state, some other scholars posit that the nation-states still retain their power in organizing the affairs in the territories they control .In the words of Holton (1998: 134), for instance, "while, state sovereignty is highly conditional on global patterns of interdependence, the state as a political institution is far from being submerged, either by global capitalism or by transnational political organization". The state, this second view argues, may be reformulated to construct new forms of policies or organizations, but it does not change its regulatory control over its territory. It retains its sovereignty against global or national developments. Thus, nation-states are still important sources of political sovereignty in social policy, public order, and participation in daily life. What is more important in this second view is that it holds the idea that the nation state remains indispensable in the constitution of citizenship (Gunsteren, 1998).

To my knowledge, the strong versions of both of these two approaches cannot capture the complexity and vagueness of effects of globalization. I believe that the nation-states are still crucial actors for they remain to be the legal-jurisdictional- centers of power. Accordingly, the sovereignty of nation-state is still an important source of membership. That means, access to full citizenship in nation-state remains significant. Although global developments have adjusted the context in which the state governs, the state still continues to be the institution able to

organize citizenship. As Faulks (2000) argues the nation-state is still the primary context for the exercise of rights and duties for the individual citizen.

On the other hand, it is still evident that nation-states are getting weaker as well. There is no doubt that the global practices have limited the capacity of states against the transnational state system. The autonomy of nation-state has decreased in the spheres of economy, environment, defense and so on. States have been taking fewer decisions without consultation of international law, international organizations, big multinational companies, and trans-national civil society. They no longer ultimately fulfill exclusive sovereignty as they once used to (Stewart, 1995). Owing to this complex nature of the relationship between globalization and the nation-state, I believe that both edges of the argument, i.e. both the idea stressing the dissolution of state territoriality and the one ignoring the decrease in the importance of state territoriality, cannot grasp the actual results of globalization on the making of citizenship in this new era.

In the contemporary era, the citizenship debate in terms of nation and nation-state focuses on the growing tension between nationality and the state. This tension enforces a separation between the citizenship as the organization of membership and citizenship as the basis of membership. For Soysal (1994, 2000) while the former refers to legal status and rights, the latter explains the ground of identities. She argues that the sense of belonging and identification with national, ethnic, regional or other entities still remain significant. However, the basis and legitimization of membership rights have been transferred to a universal level. She maintains that "the material realization of individual rights and privileges is primarily organized by

the nation-state, although the legitimacy for these rights now lies in the transnational order" (Soysal, 1994: 143). For her, citizenship is not based solely on nationality in the global era but on human rights because nationhood is being replaced by universal personhood. This is why Soysal speaks about the limits of citizenship.

Similarly, Held and Archibugi (1998) argue that while seats of power, authority and decision making processes remain in the individual states, the basis of identification extend beyond the borders of states. In other words, the nation-state is responsible for the implementation of individual rights but, particular claims on rights transcend the nation-states.

Yet, although the nation-state loses much of its previously unchallenged authority; for nationality, the picture is rather different. There is no sign indicating the absolute collapse of the category of nationality. For Delanty (2000:94), "both the nation and the state are in a strong position –and may be advanced by globalization and its contradictory paths – but what is in fundamental crisis is the nation-state". At this point, his remarks are striking. Delanty (2000) sustains that neither the nation nor the state is dying. What is dying is the nation-state as a single geopolitical entity. Likewise, Castles and Davidson (2000) also propose a divorce of nation and state, which means that the disjunctive relationship between nation and the state requires a theory of citizenship for a global society based on the distinction of citizenship identity and rights because citizenship based on membership and participation in the territory of the nation-state is seen inaccurate. Thus, this separation assumes new types of state and citizenship that are not constituted around national territoriality and belonging. However, note that this distinction is questioned by Faulks (2000)

for whom the modern state and nation has been intimately connected. To her, these two are historically and empirically mutually constitutive.

3.4 The End of Citizenship Paradigm?

As discussed above, the forms relevant in the national order is no longer the sole representative of citizenship. Citizenship is no longer seen as necessarily bounded to nationality and enclosed by nation-state because both the basis of membership and political organization, in the global context, transcend the boundaries of national conceptualization. This argumentation does not declare the end of neither the formal legitimization and organizational power of nation-state nor the national identity. However, as argued by many scholars (Archibugi & Held, 1998; Falk, 1994; Held, 1995; Turner, 1994), it challenges the hegemony of national construction of citizenship from the eighteenth century.

In the global era, contrary to the self-sufficient, autonomous, uniform citizens and bounded, sovereign authority of the nation-state, the multiplicity of membership and the system of interconnected states are more promoted. So, first, citizenship needs to consider that people may have multiple, contradictory or overlapping identities instead of a single one because the idea of homogeneous, unidefined subjects closed over nationally defined population have been eroded. Secondly, traditional operation of citizenship has been altered as a result of emergence of the multiple systems of power. Bodies other than the national one like regional or supranational have also become decisive in the making of citizenship

because contemporary requirements of citizenship are increasingly satisfied not at the national level but also at the level beyond the national one.

This is why, the 'end' (Soysal, 1994) or 'fragmentation' (Delanty, 2000) of the citizenship paradigm have started to be stressed in the literature. However, I contend that the dissolution process of national citizenship can also include constitutive elements of the citizenship paradigm including diverse identities, political bodies and authorities. If dissolution and emergence are the two aspects of the same process, this considered dissolution in the authority of integrated concept suggests an opening up of new discourses on citizenship. This argumentation accepts the dissolution in the single authority of national concept as a single for of citizenship, but also intends to discover the forms for the survival of citizenship. In other words, it does not state the end of the citizenship paradigm but looks for supplementary forms of citizenship which may be the source of reformation of citizenship paradigm. Therefore the study of the emerging forms of citizenship practices with their integrative effects in multiple levels is uncertain and open for investigation.

CHAPTER IV

NEW MODALITIES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

This chapter questions the possibility of citizenship at a global level. My investigation will revolve around the following questions: What are the legitimate grounds of citizenship in the age of globalization? What are the new possible forms of citizenship? What is the potential site for politics of citizenship?

In this framework, this chapter includes three main parts. The first one analyses the key elements of globalization, which can be the source of a new citizenship discourse. It defines these constitutive elements as follows: differentiation and particularization, the problem of universality and uniformity, and the multiple levels of organization of citizenship. The second part of this chapter specifically questions the necessity and possibility of a new conceptualization of citizenship which goes beyond the classical form of citizenship. In the third part, I will provide an examination of these new modalities of citizenship.

4.1 Constitutive Elements of Dissolution Process

In the context of citizenship in the global era various basis of inclusion have become significant for identities including the national one. As citizenship is a bounded concept in a world where its boundaries have become porous and fluid, the problem

mostly concentrates on the possible forms of solidarity. For some authors like Hettne (2000:36), the question is "how such a composition of forms can be operative as long as the nation-state retains its monopoly over territorial sovereignty". For others (Turner, 2000; Brodie, 2000) the problem is not the nation, but the idea of community as a source of sovereignty and capitalization of the citizenship concept. They basically question whether citizens can be committed to any political community-state, city or region- in the social and cultural fragmentation of the global era.

4.1.1 Differentiation and Particularization/ Recognition of Diversities

Numerous and massive movements such as the flow of people, goods, money, information across nations have transformed the ground of citizenship. Globalization promotes difference and plural forms against the national order which refers to an ethnically and culturally more homogenous community. It brings about increasing fragmentation and differentiation in the traditional forms of a given community. The pushed the modern nation-state and the corresponding concept of citizenship to recognize the diverse and conflicting demands. Differentiation in a social community means the rise of heterogeneity at the expense of sameness and standardization.

As implied in the previous chapter, citizenship debate points out the proliferation of particular group identities and membership formations, which diffuse these particularistic practices on the basis of different community formations such as the ethnic community, woman community, gay community, business

community. The diversity of ethnic minorities as well as immigrants and indigenous people reconstruct the boundaries of citizenship practice. Also a new politics of identity shapes citizenship as an outcome of identity movements. Besides, cross-cultural awareness between places enforces the emergence of bounded communities and solidarities, on the basis of a common set of values and standards, common cultural and ethnic grounds. While citizenship is connected to a particular political community, it indicates at the very same a group of people with particular identities and the cultural belongings. This produces a tension between the sameness the community implies and the heterogeneity introduced by the existence of multiple identities and belongings. Accordingly, there is a tendency in the citizenship discourse to recognize social pluralism, diversity and multiculturalism as opposed to the universalism of the classical understanding of citizenship.

Young (1990), who criticizes the universal status of the national conception of citizenship, argues that this universal status fails to provide equality for all citizens. As it imposes a particular social, cultural or an ethnic identity on a group of people with different identities, it actually strengthens inequality. Thus she argues that citizenship in the contemporary age has to transform so as to involve social heterogeneity and multiplicity of identities. She proposes 'differentiated citizenship' in this context. Differentiated citizenship is the one which enables the representation of group identities in terms of gender, ethnicity or common way of life. She believes that citizenship in the present age has "to take up group identity seriously, for it is groups that constitute individuals" (Young, 1990: 45). As this contention indicates, differentiated citizenship challenges the universalizing (homogenizing) effects of

citizenship which does not recognize any category other than the individual in the public sphere.

A similar suggestion is made by Will Kymlicka in his 'multicultural citizenship' (1995). There Kymlicka acknowledges the importance of culture and group identity –chiefly ethnic identity- for membership in a community. He insists on culture as a 'primary good', and on rights derived from cultural interests. In other words, his argument guarantees the representation of 'own culture'. Like Young, he comes to the conclusion that citizenship cannot merely rely on an abstract notion of individual for membership to community takes place through some cultural or social bonds. However, the way he sustains the importance of group identity is peculiar in that he suggests to recognize group identities only if the latter corresponds to a cultural identity. He argues that cultural identities, in the form of *national* minorities, need to be extended special group-differentiated rights, besides the traditional individual rights, in order to preserve the values of cultural identity and equality for their members. By the recognition of cultural identity ethnic and national minorities demand recognition and support for their cultural identity.

However, the idea that citizenship has to be expanded so as to recognize group identities or group rights is far from being a real solution. In fact it produces its own problems. A first problem has to do with the definition of the groups or identities which deserve to be recognized by a differentiated or a multicultural citizenship. Which of the existing groups are to be recognized by the citizenship in a particular community is a serious question. It is plain that the recognition of all identities in a community through citizenship is impossible. This brings us to the

second big problem emanating from the idea that citizenship in today's communities may not rely on a simple recognition of an abstract individual. This problem has to do with the question of unity in a community. It is evident that the differentiated citizenship and multicultural citizenship raises the question as to the possible source of unity in a multicultural multinational society. The determination of single group identity among others is uncertain. Faulks (2000) contends that individuals have not based on one identity and social role. Then, political position based on a single fragment of multiplicity of identities is rejection of complex identity. Therefore, for him, Kymlicka and Young fail to define why and how diverse groups are settled, because there is no informed way to determine the groups, which have such a decisive role. Likewise, Heater (1990) maintains that group differentiated citizenship cannot be integrative. He (1990: 295) believes that it "ceases to be a device to cultivate a sense of community and a common sense of purpose." Instead, he proposes multiplicity of civic identities and multiplicity of loyalties to prevent the separation of identities and the disunity in the era increasing social diversity. It does not justify only one identity among others but mediates their interaction, because, the breakdown of necessary correspondence between national community and identity proliferate multiple forms of membership that do not relate to any unique form solely.

In his reflections on the discussion on the place of the duality between particularity and universality in citizenship, Delanty (2000: 145) argues that one of the most important dangers in the promotion of heterogeneity and particularity is the "the false universalism of an empty world culture or the romanticism of the

particular." In other words the championing of heterogeneity and particularity may end up with the subordination of the equality and universality to "contingency of prevailing identities" Malik (1996: 258), or vice versa. Therefore, in the global moment, promotion of cultural variety occurs when cultural forms still retain their cultural bonds to away from the universalism.

4.1.2 Universality and Uniformity

Contemporary debates in citizenship do not only champion particular identities and the politics of their recognition. A sort of opposing inclination is also the case in the current debate. For instance, the idea of personhood/humanity as the ground for citizenship in the current age has also become a respectable one in the recent literature on citizenship (Turner, 1994; Melucci, 1986; Soysal, 1999). Then, one of the most characteristic features of contemporary citizenship formulations is the emergence of more universalistic conceptions based on personhood and universal human rights, which is institutionalized on various international codes and laws.

Ironically, the increasing submission of particular identities is defended by treatment of the idea of universal personhood. Membership based on humanity means that every person could get universal rights and responsibilities out of their particular membership and historical bonds within any community. Since all of the particular identities have membership status of humanity or personhood, each of them recalls universal rights. For Soysal (1994; 1999) individuals and collective identities through their particular identities are driven by the universalistic discourse of personhood and human rights. In other words, universal personhood discourse

reinforces particular identities and claims. Then, particular and group based claims are legitimated and organized in the universalistic discourse of personhood.

However, this idea of personhood is also one of the "weaknesses and incompleteness of the basis of arguments" on citizenship (Delanty, 2000: 80). Cohen (1999: 264) warns us that humanity, even if it is used as personhood, is a thin concept for the participation and solidarity of identities. When claims on universal identity (and rights) are applied to citizenship, there will be nothing left for the competence to articulate certain codes. So, certain key rights and their dynamics of distribution must be decided for proliferating sites of making citizenship. Also, this kind of unity, which is naturally attributed, prevents any further attempt to construct any other unity.

In sum, as the narrative above indicates the current debate on citizenship focuses on the tension between a search for equality and recognition of diversities, between the construction of unity and expression of particularity, and between relativism and universalism. Citizenship today is impelled to represent difference as well as equality. The coexistence of these seemingly conflicting tendencies indicate that citizens try to be equal and yet different. It is therefore that, there are both a discourse of humanity which refers to equality of individuals and a discourse of difference referring to group identities.

In this sense, I contend that globalization necessitates a citizenship concept beyond this distinction so that the normative basis and institutions of citizenship can be able to motivate people to act together with different people. It questions how

long it is possible to define both individual equality and collective difference, how does the local autonomy of people differentiated through their culture, religion and life-style couple with the promise for cooperation of independent relations among these locals.

4.1.3 Demand for New rights

As I have noted in the preceding chapters, the notion of rights has always been the constitutive component of citizenship. Citizenship means having rights[9]. Now this general framework of citizenship is also being impelled to change. As Turner maintains (2000), in the contemporary era we see a new discourse on the extension of rights associated with citizenship. Because of the increasing diversity in ethnic cultural terms, citizenship rights are now asked to involve cultural rights, identity rights, woman rights, children rights, human rights, animal rights and so on. Also, they include the right to the maintenance of different customs and life-styles, the right to equality in education, the right to intercultural communication (Castles & Davidson, 2000: 126). Such rights guarantee individual's access to their own language and culture even if they are minority.

This discourse of rights also invokes the discourse and institutions of the human rights. While, in modern concept, human rights and citizenship rights were separated from each other, in contemporary era, human rights are considered as rights of citizenship. As Delanty puts it (2000: 68):

---

[9] For example, it has been argued that citizenship in its traditional form is usually associated with three sets of rights defined by Marshall: the civil, the political and the social rights.

> Contemporary developments suggests a gradual blurring or de-differentiation of citizenship and human rights which now presents a major challenge to citizenship as a membership of nation-state... Human rights are now overriding/re-shaping the rights of citizenship.

Human rights discourse is based on the idea of personhood. In other words, this closeness of human rights and citizenship rights is parallel with the increasing idea of individual as human being. It means that everyone is supposed to have rights on the basis of personhood. Citizenship in this extended sense refers to "the situation in which human rights are embedded in political structures and thereby in principle to implement and defend by legal means" (Hettne, 2000: 37). Then, the transnational level is one of the main grounds of legitimacy for citizenship rights as human or personhood rights. Regional institutions, such as European Union, which is the most common example, can grant extension of active formal rights even by law. For example, European Union guarantees the right to move and reside freely among the member countries and provides social benefits and social services to all residents in accordance with the rules laid down by community law and national laws and practices.

On the other hand, although rights-based approaches about extension of citizenship are criticized because of its formality, passivity and unidimensionality[10],

---

[10] Rights based approaches are criticized, because of their inability to represent the multidimensionality and fluidity of the contemporary world. Rights based analysis is considered as unidimensional, but instead social practices that generate or underpin such rights are conceived as important, because, these practices which transcend formal definition are constituted through contradictory practices. Therefore, citizenship involves social practices as a means of access through education, ownership, property rights, minority rights etc., not only the rights of individuals. For further elaboration see Urry (2000) Global Flows and Global Citizenship and Turner (2000) Review Essay: Citizenship and Political Globalization

Cohen (1999: 254) argues that different kinds of rights and duties come from many different social practices. Claim on expansion of rights emerges first from civil rather than from political and juridical actors. Rights still make a difference in the representation of human beings. They are functioning on the globe, in nations or cities as things or tools for citizenship participation in the community. Rights enable people to act as agents by invoking or using them. Rights matter analytically as an indicator of citizenship. So, the extension of citizenship can be analyzed by extension of rights.

A second critique argues that the human rights discourse by itself cannot replace citizenship, because a new set of duties is entailed as well as the rights. It means that preservation of rights does not ensure the responsibilities and network of political participation, which is necessary to construction of social unity. Faulks (2000: 146) argues that citizenship includes the relation of rights, responsibilities and participation. Human rights based upon personhood addresses a very passive model of rights but not activate reciprocal responsibilities. For example, environmental movements are one of the important cases in the developments of new set of responsibilities. For Falk (1994: 128-129), environmental movements differ from other social movements when we take care of the notion of responsibility. While the other minority groups such as blacks, women, ethnic, minorities stand up for their own rights, ecological rights are taken into account by others. Therefore, extension of rights also requires the extension of duties, obligations or responsibilities.

Eventually, this extension of both a new set of rights and a new set of duties proposes a formation beyond social, political and civil rights. As Delanty (2000: 69) argues, the basis of extension is the abstract version of principle of equality and emerging principle of difference and collective rights. In multicultural societies the driving force behind the extension of rights is the right to equality and right to difference.

4.1.4 Multiple Levels of Organization

In addition to a differentiation in terms of rights and membership, we also see that the scope of citizenship in the present age has become broader so as to involve different levels and institutions. Citizenship today is now arranged on multiple levels (Connoly, 1995). While the institutions and the ultimate organizational ground of modern citizenship are associated with nation-state, the recent condition is different. Citizenship in contemporary era, as Jenson (1997: 631) argues, requires "an amalgam of compatible political institutions, policy making practices and patterns of political representation." While citizenship within nation-state is still important, it is now first covering multiple aspects of social life other than the juridical one, and secondly it now takes place in the multiple sites of political representation.

Citizenship today is no more merely a legal membership status. It is oriented to cover multiple aspects of social life such as economic, political and cultural which allows us to re-conceptualize the concrete economic, social and political forms situated in specific places (Brodie, 2000: 125). Also, today, there is a

multiplicity of bodies that are attempting to manage or organize citizenship. Accordingly, the scope of citizenship today has enlarged and it occupies a complex position of different institutions such as state, regional organizations, voluntary organizations at national or transnational levels. In fact, this is why Delanty (2000) proposes a multi-leveled citizenship. This de-centered model allocates mainly three levels of governance: sub-national, national, and transnational. For him, sub-national and regional forms of governance are best for direct citizenship participation. While, national governance is still one of the most important levels. Citizenship cannot be extended without state intervention, because, rights and responsibilities are still applied primarily at this level. Also, transnational governance which is between cosmopolitanism[11] and; national- subnational level, is an area of growing importance. Transnational level is the only place for some of the key challenges such as global regulation of justice, migration or human rights.

An approach to see citizenship in a multi-leveled organization rather than a single one makes possible to see the exertion to membership and rights. It refers to simultaneous and interconnected struggle; for both membership or identity and admission to rights that are distributed by state and occasionally local and transnational institutions (Shafir, 1998: 23). In this formulation, citizenship status is

---

[11] Cosmopolitanism is concerned with disclosing the cultural, ethical and legal basis of political order in a world where political communities and state matters, but not exclusively. it dates at least to the stoics' description of themselves as cosmopolitans. They believe that human beings living in a world of human beings and only members of polities. Also, contemporary cosmopolitanism is understood as the capacity to mediate between national cultures, alternative discourses and institutions. For more information see David Held (1995) Democracy and the Global Order.

seen not as a necessarily leveling and universalizing concept but as a complex system.

4.2 New Modalities of Citizenship

As discussed above it is now widely believed that the traditional ties among individuals, national identity and the nation-states have weakened. As more and more individuals want to reproduce their social, cultural and ethnic identities citizenship fails to be a satisfactory bond between individuals and the nation-state. As diverse cultural forms put pressure for recognition, as multiple loyalties begin to emerge and as new organizational levels other than the nation-state become attractive, citizenship is pushed to change in diverse ways. This prompts new modalities of citizenship being proposed. 'Neo-Republican citizenship' (Gunsteren, 1998), 'European or Constitutional citizenship' (Steenbergen, 1994), 'Transnational citizenship' (Soysal, 1994), 'Ecological citizenship' (Steenbergen, 1994), 'Regional citizenship' (Hettne, 2000), 'Cosmopolitan citizenship' (Held, 1995), 'Urban citizenship' (Işın, 2000), and 'Global citizenship' (Falk, 2000) are some of those new modalities suggested. In what follows, I will try to provide a general examination of these new modalities.

Neo-Republican Citizenship

Neo-Republican citizenship rests on an assimilation of elements of different traditional notions of citizenship. For Gunsteren (1998: 24), first, the idea of citizen as a member of political community is the communitarian element included in neo-Republican citizenship. It functions to guard the structure in which other

communities perform their activities. Then one of the tasks of this citizenship is the solidarity in advance of community. Second, the element of the republican concept concerns choice and plurality. In the case of neo-republican citizenship, it organizes plurality in their mutual interaction in public domain for the reproduction of citizens by the rules of *jus soli*. Then, neo-republican concept proposes an autonomous and loyal modal of citizenship. As it deals with diversity of loyalties, it extends the concept for all people as long as their particular local identities. Neo-republican citizenship requires only a political position of equality and not social equality. As its goal is political equality, it promotes a narrower conception of citizenship.

Transnational Citizenship

The model of post-national citizenship emphasizes the shift in individual rights and obligations from their historical location in the nation-state to universalistic plane, which transcends the boundaries of particular nation-states. In this perception, logic of national citizenship is transferred to logic of personhood. As transnational discourse and institutions organized on a world level, it promotes human right as a ground of legitimacy. According to Soysal (1999) post-national model defines itself with reference to difference from the national one in terms of various dimensions. First of all, membership is based on universal personhood but not based on shared nationhood. Although membership is still organized at the national level, national citizenship bounded on nation-state territory has now fluid boundaries. Secondly, rights come from multiple states instead of a single one. Both of these features of transnational citizenship can best be observed through the example of guestworkers. Here Soysal underlines the fact that these workers enjoy multiple belongingness, in

the sense that they use the rights given to them both by their native country and the one they actually live in. Number of migrants moving from one country of origin or destination to another, gets a more universal model of membership which is bounded on notion of person's rights. Because of the divorce of nation from the state, and identity from rights, transnational citizenship requires multiple levels of participation.

European Citizenship

The debate on European citizenship questions the possibility of collective political action in distinct national boundaries. European citizenship is a kind of quasi-citizenship. It does not neglect rights on the national scale but main focus of rights shifted to supra-national entities. This means a division between economy and administration at supra-national level and political integration at national level. European citizenship is a two-level model in which supra-national rights depend on national member-state level. At the same time, there is also an attempt to create European cultural identity. Relations among members of different nationalities increase the multicultural diversity in societies, but, the tension which is the product of cultural diversity may activate new movements. Then European citizenship is seen as a step for the realization of supra-national citizenship.

Regional Citizenship

Instead of being globalized, today's world, according to Bjorn Hettne (2000), is a regionalized world. In his view, a regionalized world order instead of global one is able to promote global cultural pluralism because distinct identities with a capacity

as an actor have the chance of constructing regional formation or community (Hettne, 2000: 45). However, there is still importance of territoriality in new regionalism. This community does not erase the function of nation-state as it is still useful at decision making levels.

In fact, there is an intricate relationship between regionalization and globalization. This new regionalism emerges as a response to the process of globalization and its eruptions in society. Thus, regionalism is evaluated as a step on the way to "global order in which humanity finally becomes an actor or at least acting intersubjectively" (Hettne, 2000: 37). So, citizenship is extended to include new rights like human rights, embedded in political structures defended by legal means.

Urban Citizenship

As a result of the relative concentration of political power in either transnational or local levels, many theorists have reconsidered new spaces other than the territory of the nation-state. In this reconsideration city appeared to be a privileged space of analysis. Accordingly, the issue of citizenship at the level of city also turned to become a crucial topic. Scholars such as Anna Bounds and Robert A. Beauregard (2000), Brodie (2000), and Engin F. Işın (1999), for instance, aim to elaborate a model of citizenship in the urban public era as a ground of territoriality. Urban citizenship purposes a normative and bounded model of citizenship operating among the actors in the city and the public realm of cities. Because of its moral dimension, urban citizenship is grounded on the city as public space where behaviors and

interactions of people are governed by common bonds, identities belongingness and voluntary associations. Therefore, capacity of urban citizenship is determined by the struggle for public space. For Brodie (2000: 125-126) urban citizenship privileges the public realm because of its capacity to encourage people to act collectively. Furthermore, because of the discursive character of public sphere, urban citizenship guarantees democratic citizenship. The city in which people are concentrated or power and production centered are proposed as the place of democratic citizenship.

Cosmopolitan Citizenship

Cosmopolitan citizenship (Held, 1995) is proposed as a response to the failure of an effective democracy in the global order. As the global system is seen as "overlapping networks of power" (Held, 1995: 271) neither modalities of international relations nor global order are believed to be able to solve the challenges of globalization. Instead, some clusters of network of power including health, social, cultural, civic, economic, political form the basis of empowering legal order. Thus, democratic rights are no longer limited to the territoriality of nations but have been expanded to more complex globally organized entries. The key to solution is the notion of 'cosmopolitan democracy' or 'cosmopolitan governance' requiring global, national and local levels of organization.

Ecological Citizenship

Ecological citizenship is more inclusive than all. This is because ecological citizenship defines the nature as the main territory for the politics of citizenship. Here civil, political, and social rights and duties are defined on the basis of the

relationship between mankind and nature. Steenbergen (1998: 143-144) categorizes three different overlapping dimensions of ecological citizenship. First approach focuses on the extension of citizens as subjects. Although fruitfulness of such an extension is questionable, there is an extension to go beyond the realm of human beings (like animals). Second, one expresses that citizenship includes responsibility. This argument also stresses the participation which is viable if oriented to nature. Then responsibility and participation are accompanied by the growing awareness of the earth as the breeding ground. The third aspect emphasizes the global dimension of citizenship. Ecological citizenship is conceived as an alternative form of global citizenship.

Having discussed different modalities of citizenship now it is pertinent to underline what is common to them. My aim is to display if it is possible to speak about a new discourse of citizenship. It is first of all observed that the new discourse of citizenship emphasizes both the local and the global levels at the expense of the national level. That means citizenship in this new discourse in more local and more global, more particular and more universal at the same time. The emergence of new modalities of citizenship assigns that in this new era of membership what constitutes the basis of citizenship is more particular and universal. Eventually, it gains more global concern, such as universal notion of rights, global protection, the creation of more adequate forms on regional or global levels, as identities and political communities are not seen on the basis of territory. The ties binding citizens into each other and grounds of solidarity to form a community are determined by

universalistic discourses at the global level as well as local and particular connections.

Secondly, the new discourse underlines many social practices other than the juridical one. Which means citizenship in this new discourse is not confined to a legal practice. In this multiplicity of practices, new citizenship is not simply juridical but also cultural and social. In other words, the new concept of citizenship focuses on the norms, meanings, identities or practices rather than on legal definitions. It is argued, for instance that citizenship must be defined as "a form of identification, a type of political identity something to be constructed" (Mouffe, 1992: 229), but not as a simple legal status and legal rights.

Thirdly, new discourse of citizenship emphasizes the need to extend the scope of rights associated with citizenship. It is argued that, citizenship rights need to be expanded so as to include the demands of women, growing ethnic diversity, immigrants and so on. Likewise, the rise of transnational agents, the importance of cultural forms and ecological questions are also asked to be involved into the discussion of the expansion of citizenship rights.

CHAPTER V

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

As it has been discussed in the previous parts, the world has been under the effect of a global economy; international, transnational institutions and global associations; the increasing flow of things, money, people, commodities, ideas, and knowledge. Alongside the impacts of these developments, the order of things has been reshaped on a global scale by causing changes in the way in which citizens act and constitute their society. Since the historical context necessarily determines the possibilities and limitations concerning the boundaries of the concept of citizenship, the contemporary discussion of citizenship is bound to be related to the issue of globalization. The global citizenship is being discussed in such a context.

In this context, after providing an analysis of the impacts of global developments on the contemporary forms of the citizenship, this chapter will deal with the arguments about characteristics of a global model of citizenship. The discussion in this chapter will revolve around the following questions: 'who is the citizen in global era?', 'what are rights and duties of citizen in the global era?', 'what are the forms of membership in global era?'

The first part of this chapter defines the historical context in order to display the driving forces of a global definition of citizenship. The second part examines the

differences and similarities between the model of global citizenship and the other new modalities of citizenship. The third part specifically examines the various images or typologies of citizenship in the recent literature. The fourth part analyses the ground for global citizenship. It questions the normative basis of global citizenship; new rights and duties associated with it; the practice of global citizenship in terms of participation and civil society.

5.1 The Historical Context

The globalization process is not an independent development; nor is the global order an accidental stage. Likewise, the issue of global citizenship is also an outcome of a particular historical process. The new conceptualization of citizenship in the global era is a consequence of late capitalism. As it is evident, the modern concept of citizenship was also a consequence of a certain set of social relations. The development of capitalist relations was the most important of the factors which paved the way for the emergence of the modern concept of citizenship. As Steenbergen argues (1994: 148):

> Capitalism undermined hierarchical and particularistic institutions and values. Through exchange relationships, it promoted the growth of a universalistic culture and by emphasizing the autonomy of the consumer it contributed to the emergence of individualism. In short, capitalism thus generated a set of institutions which favor the emergence of citizenship

In a similar vein, the period of late capitalism and its consequences in social life gave way to the changing paradigms of citizenship in the global era. However, the developments prompted a global conception of citizenship and the idea of global citizenship itself may not be considered as a simple continuation of the

developments stimulating the national conception of citizenship. As Işın and Wood (1999) argue, the development of the global economy and then the complex relations in the formation of new networks created flexible, vague and global bodies and practices. "There are new practices of expression where poetry, literature, film and theatre are wrested from the shackles of large public and private bureaucracies and circulated outside the control" and regulation of national boundaries (Işın & Wood, 1999: 102). Development of new machines and technologies including computer networks, satellites, credit cards, virtual reality and so on has accelerated this regulation (Urry, 1998:65). Moreover, consequences of the flow of people, like immigrants and refugees, across borders of state extend the borders of nation-state which in governing its citizens with its unique name. Likewise, the rise of non-governmental organizations, new information technologies and so on has created new modes of expressions beyond the national codes.

In this sense global citizenship seems to be an extension of the territorial definition of citizenship. According to Urry (1998: 133) the spirit of global citizenship is almost completely deterritorilaized. It is not belonging to a particular political community but to feeling, thinking and acting for human species. For Turner (1993: 2) who does not assign such a broad definition, citizenship is a set of practices which define a person as a component member of society shaped by the flow of resources and persons. Global citizenship includes many points: it has cultural and social aspects as well as juridical. It involves social practices but not only legal status of individuals. It is determined by flows of things, power, and inequalities without prioritizing class divisions. It includes rights and duties for

component membership of societal membership but not individual rights (Urry, 1998: 67). Moreover, global citizenship deals with global problems such as climate warming, energy consumption, nuclear or biological dangers (Falk, 1994: 135). Van Steenbergen (1994) extends its limits to represent the rights of natural objects, animals and future generations.

5.2 Modalities of Global Citizenship

The debate on global citizenship produces the impression that the scale of citizenship has stretched from city to the earth. However, as Steenbergen maintains, (1994:150) this extension of citizenship "from the city via the nation-state and the region to the globe is not just a matter of increase in scale" Rather, the emergence of new spaces for citizenship means the development of a new basis of social organization, new forms of solidarity, belonging and participation, in short new citizenship rights and duties, and hence new modalities of citizenship.

Some new models of citizenship like regional or European can be seen as the initial forms of global citizenship. Hettne, (2000) defines the regional political community as a prior form of global community. In the contemporary world, it is argued, as the territoriality retains its importance, the world order stays regional rather than global. Accordingly, the regional community is considered as an initial form of global citizenship. Likewise, the European citizenship, which is also a regional or supra-national model of citizenship, is also considered as one of the first steps towards the development of global citizenship in the long run.

The discussion of 'cultural citizenship' also says much about the topic of global citizenship. As Turner maintains (1994) parallel with recent developments of globalization and its counter movements such as the flow of cultural goods in the market, the proliferation of identities and life-styles prompted many groups of people to struggle for some cultural rights. Besides, in this new era, societies conceptualize themselves as part of a world system of societies as a part of a global order (Turner, 1994: 157). In this context, many groups of people fight for the rights to participate into the cultural field which is now not limited to nation-state-society. As such, cultural citizenship extends citizenship to another dimension: to global culture.

Ecological approach to citizenship constitutes another ground for a global model of citizenship. In some accounts, the concept of citizenship, which is usually reserved for human beings, is extended so as to involve the category of nature. In Steenbergen's (1994) account of 'ecological citizenship', for instance, nature is placed into the discourse and practice of citizenship. Steenbergen (1994) develops two types of global environmental citizenship: earth citizenship and world citizenship. An earth citizen realizes himself/herself as a living organism aware of his/her organic processes of birth and growth. They have the role of taking care of but not controlling nature. Whereas, the second type of global citizen, the world citizen can be distinguished from the earth citizen in terms of the way he approaches to nature. Nature, according to the world citizen is the place to manage. Therefore, he perceives the globe as a space for global management. It is plain that both versions of ecological citizenship assume some organizations, institutions, rights

and duties and government at the global level. However, as Steenbergen correctly points out the global institutions and organizations have not fully developed to realize articulation of these various rights and duties and their grounds of legitimacy, in the contemporary world.

5.3 Images of Global Citizenship

As previously discussed, global social structure differentiates from national order in terms of economic growth, wealth and poverty, group formation, discourses, social discrimination, segregation, and differential access to resources. Thus, new identities, new social categories, new political groups and spheres of action which originated in racial, ethnic, nationalist, religious, indigenous, sexual, occupational, ecological grounds are proliferated. Which means, in the era of globalization new actors have emerged.

Approaching to the these newly emerging actors from the standpoint of global citizenship, Falk (1994, 2000) outlines a number of different overlapping images of global citizenship. He defines five images of global citizenship as global reformer, global business elite (global capitalists), global ecological manager, regional organizers, and transnational activists.

The global reformer believes that citizenship refers to the human condition. Therefore, citizens equally act for all human species without considering their particular community, state, city or whatever. This type of global citizen supports the political centralization of a world state or strong transnational organization. It proposes better organization of political life in order to overcome the threats of

economic flow and political fragmentation. Thus, this image is based upon the pragmatic and idealistic grounds of legitimacy as extending the political sphere and promoting a better world respectively.

The global capitalist emphasizes the effects of economic globalization on the construction of identities. As a consequence of the global political economy, a new kind of global identity emerges in transnational affairs. Especially, the rise of new professions as a consequence of global economic restructuring has significant impacts on citizenship. These new professionals have increasing control in the major fields of international transactions life such as business, advertisement, arts, science, media, politics, sports, and administration. As their claims to legitimacy and resources are related with their occupation rather than abstract grounds of the state or public, Işın and Wood (1993: 103) call these individuals "professional-citizens". This professional managerial class turns knowledge into cultural capital and forces its values on the common values in society. Global professionals having cultural and economic capital are powerful in the articulation process, claiming rights and imposing their vision significantly on the political space of the city. However, the global elite does not seem to have any civic sense of responsibility for they mostly tend to associate with each other and hence they have a lose sense of membership to a particular civil society.

The third image is of the 'global managers' which has a combination of both environmental and economic dimensions. Various dimensions and institutions come together in the challenge of common problems in the global context. As Falk (2000) contends, at the global level, these various forms such as states, international

institutions and nongovernmental organizations, in their technical managerial effort, act to solve the threats to the globe. Global problems such as ecological problems, energy and resource limitations, global warming and nuclearization form the main patterns of their alliance. While this type of global citizenship is common with the previous two types on many points, it differs from them on their approaches to ecological problems. For Steenbergen (1994: 149) all of them have a distinctive managerial and functional approach. They believe that any problem, one of them is environmental, once can be solved by innovative technology and creative management. However, environmental managers try to control ecological problems much more than the global capitalist. For environmental mangers sustainable growth is the central goal. Thus, for Steenbergen (1994), they are the same in terms of their managerial and functional way of thinking.

The regional organizer is the person working for a regional citizenship, such as the European citizenship. However, the question about this regional type of citizenship is related with its capacity to forge an ideological or normative identity. It is a question for instance whether European integration, which is originally motivated by economic interests, can produce values and norms for a globally organized world. In other words, can this normative potential in the region be extended for the fulfillment of this at a global level?

For Falk (2000, 1994), the fifth type of citizenship is related to transnational activism characterized by the new social movements. Actions based on human rights, environmental problems, the woman question's movement etc. are the examples of actions of transnational activists as global citizens.

As an addition to the typologies discussed up to now, Urry (1998) suggests another typology which is similar to the previous one. He defines seven forms of global citizenship some of which are the same with the ones in Falk's typology. First five of his seven types are the same with Falk's typology[12]. In Urry's typology (1998), the sixth type of global citizenship, the 'global cosmopolitan' has an ideology constituted around openness to other cultures or people. The seventh type, the global green backlash, identifies environmentalist as the new global scapegoat to be critiqued and attacked through the media.

He (Urry, 1998: 69) also reminds that any of these typologies do not exclude each other. All these typologies of global citizenship constitute another one because these images involve their interaction in network relation. Also, these authors try to demonstrate who is potentially able to redefine the boundaries of citizenship. These typologies which is quite different from subjects of the national citizenship address new grounds for constitution of citizenship and new actors.

---

[12] The global capitalist is the person who works for the world unification around global corporate interests. The global reformers try to regulate global capitalism through international organizations. Global environmental managers propose technical solutions to global environmental problems. Earth citizens attempt to take responsibilities for the globe through ethics of care. Also, global networkers who set up and maintain work or leisure networks have non-national forms and are regularized across national borders.

5.4 Basis of Global Citizenship

5.4.1 Normative Basis of Global Citizenship

To stress how to consider the making of global citizenship some constitutive grounds of global citizenship needed to be clarified. It can be analyzed by four major level of realization. First, it has a significant ethical and discursive character. Second, it produces new actors with new rights and duties. Third, it produces new global institutions. Finally, global citizenship has also public attention for the practice of citizenship.

The modern concept of citizenship is a legal concept guaranteeing citizenship status rights and duties in the nation-state. When citizenship is extended to the global scale, there is no juridical definition of a global citizenship status. The lack of a legal definition of global citizenship is tolerated whether by promoting universality of the juridical model or focusing on its normative basis.

The first approach focuses upon the universality principle of juridical representation. The juridical dimension of citizenship is considered to be parallel with the plurality of different status beyond territorial boundaries. Legal personhood is evolved through the universality principle that is inherent in the juridical model of citizenship in order to be more inclusive in the citizenship debate. For Cohen (1999), the extension in the global application of human rights is the example of this enlargement. Global citizenship becomes conceivable on juridical grounds because of the universal application of individual definition.

The second approach focuses upon norms, meanings, identities rather than the legal status of citizenship. Beyond emphasizing citizenship as legal rights, there is "now agreement that citizenship must also be defined as a social process through which individuals and social groups engage in claiming, expanding or loosing rights" (Işın, 2000: 5).

Nigel (2000) assumes there is some kind of global ethic defined according to global rights and duties of humans to one another that cannot be equal with juridical rights and duties in the particular community. He questions the necessity of a legal definition as an only way and proposes a moral conception and its applications. He suggests that there may be some direct and indirect ways of promotion for the realization of ethical goals. Indirect promotion is realized through national institutions. For example, liberal values are protected by economic globalization, human rights are applied by the nation-state, and environmental movements are grounded on national environmental laws. Contrary to indirect promotion, being subject to international law has direct promotion. Although direct promotion is notable, the content of global citizenship does not necessarily and ultimately involve this kind of promotion.

However the normative basis of global citizenship does not reduce citizenship into a moral agent by emptying its political connotations. Being a global citizen is not simply an application of the global ethic. A global conception also needs some forms of institutional expression in a political, legal, economic, cultural and social sense.

In this framework, Falk (1994) develops four levels of extension about citizenship. At the first level, the extension of citizenship to the global level depends on the feeling of the ultimate unity of human experience for the planet, peace, justice and sustainability. Thus, global citizenship includes a normative perspective for the creation of a better world. The second level is related with tendencies towards global integration especially economically. It refers to a series of practical events which globalize our horizon of outlook. The third level is not visible empirically and not a matter of aspiration. For Falk (1994), it is a 'politics of impossibility' which is determined around the necessity of adjustments on ecological protection, energy conservation and accessibility to resources. Then, some types of citizenship are constituted to redesign political choices and behaviors on the basis of nature, ecology and humanity. The final level of citizenship is oriented towards the action or mobilization to realize adjustments which seem impossible at the third level. It encourages politic movement in a transnational or global era.

Accordingly, while globalization has grounds on moral arguments related with humanity, it is more than that normative core. On this ground, global practices and discourse collide with the emergence of new actors, rights and duties and institutional bodies.

5.4.2 New Risks, Rights and Duties

In global conditions, citizenship status as a bearer of rights and duties goes beyond its form in the particular community of the nation-state. These involve not only an

extension of rights and duties for the behalf of global aims but also a creation or reformation of new institutions and types of organizations.

In this sense, Urry (1998, 2000) expands the limits of rights and duties and thereby the formulation of citizenship. He defines citizenship on three related grounds as rights, duties and an additive one; risks. Each category of citizenship normally can be identified in the national conception. But, in the global condition they have uneven and unfair direction especially with regard to increasing particularities.

New global risks are the consequence of the decay of national power in society. Global risks (Beck, 1992; Urry, 1998) are specified to include environmental and health problems which are a consequence of global environmental change, the expansion and transformation of diseases such as aids, the destruction of local cultures through the homogenization of culture in the globe. In addition, the economic consequences of globalization and its social effects such as the collapse of the world market for agricultural products and the development of the finance sector, the formation of insecure wild zones in some parts of the world and even in cities, increasing dependence on environmental protection, food or medical support are part of global risks.

According to Urry (1998), rights at the global level are determined according to various new actors and institutions. These rights include the right to migrate from one society to another without completely loosing their interests when compared with indigenous populations or when they come back to their own society; the right

to represent their own cultural forms; the right to get various products, services, other cultures and icons that can be constituted through diverse actors, images and technologies across the globe; the right to leisure migration that enable people to consume places, cultures or environments of global significance; the right to form social movements with citizens from other cultures and parts of the globe; the right to inhabit environments that is more healthy and safe and also right for future generations.

On these grounds, global human rights which do not depend on a specific national framework and cultural community are the most formally recognized form of rights. In this sense, Hettne (2000) defines global citizenship as a dream because he argues that, global citizenship is possible if human rights are universally respected and protected like an ideally functioning nation-state. However, with the lack of global governmental bodies, universal human rights that have already established can only be a tool for legal sources of legitimization. In fact, the main issue to consider the possibility of the global appliance of human rights is that it opens up a space for the mobilization of various agents at the international level. Universal human rights discourse provides a powerful vocabulary for particular identities' demand of equality and citizenship. This promotion of diversity does not ignore the unity. At this point, Turner (1994: 110) suggests that, the tension between universalism and particularity can be resolved by the demand for universal application of particular rights.

Global citizenship as a more inclusive category works for universal or common goals while it privileges diversities. Thus, for Edwards and Gaventa

(2001), it needs demonstration of differences within a framework of commonality as an organizational principle. For example, the international movement for women's human rights is such a kind of action. It regards to both commonality and particularity and works in a network of local, national and international. Because it affirms not only universality of human rights but also diversity of particular practices.

Rights at the global level also carry with them a set of responsibilities. As the juridical forms of rights are not dominated by external rules, it needs its self-development. Therefore, the set of duties on the global scale seems more extended and more significant than its content in the traditional composition of citizenship. In the validity of global citizenship discourse, duties are necessary for the development of this concept and for the creation of its institutions. Thus, for Nigel, "we have global obligations (whether we recognize them or not) and that relevantly placed agents ought to see themselves as strengthening appropriate institutions" (Nigel, 2000: 12)

In the specific conceptualization of Urry (1994, 1998) global duties include finding out the state of the globe through internationalized information, image and sources; being representative of cosmopolitanism to encourage other cultures, peoples or environments; encouraging various forms of behavior according to culture, region and politics even if they contradict each other; using images, products or narratives considering people as increasingly differentiated citizens of the globe rather than referring to them in terms of their nation, ethnicity, gender,

class and generation; acting on one part of the globe collectively by taking care of the whole globe but not in terms of shared identity and interests.

In the context of rights, duties and risks at the global level, three stages of exclusion can be specified. First, global citizenship discourse does not consider a right-based definition, but also stresses global risks and duties. Second, it is not an abstract legal definition. This situation is parallel with the social practices and emergence of its institutional forms. Citizenship emphasizes the importance of social practices that create and enforce these rights and duties. Thus, the extension of rights and duties is the consequence of diverse, overlapping and even contradictory social practices. Third, rights, duties and risks transcend the boundaries of nation-state and is considered at the global level.

5.4.3 Reformation of Institutions

The emergence of new kinds of political identities entails the construction of new institutions, new basis of alliance and space for action. Since, global citizenship is not conceived as dependent on formal status and territoriality, there are institutions for the moral development of global citizenship. It can be the promotion of the idea of global citizenship. The existence of such discourse can encourage people's self-conception as global citizens. Then, beyond, its normative demands, global citizenship discourse needs to realize its requirements in social structure because, the development of institutions produces both basis of action and reproduction of global citizenship.

At the level of organization, Delanty (2000) and Turner (1989) that the global form of citizenship are characterized by two of its contradictory principles. Power shifts simultaneously both from the national to transnational institutions and to local agents. Then bodies such as international non-governmental organizations and transnational organizations are the most realized forms of institutions.

Global citizenship is associated with a diversity of approaches and outcome sin the sense of identities, rights and duties, and participation. Thus, it is difficult to define a single way or universal path for the embodiment of citizenship. Citizenship can be expressed by the configuration of community institutions, states, national and transnational voluntary organizations and localities.

In this framework, Edwards and Gaventa, (2001) specify two directions for the alliance of diversities. One of them, the vertical, implies alliance at multiple levels: local, national and international. Since each level reinforces the other this produces the most effective and sustainable form of expression of global citizenship. The second, the horizontal networks related to the local agents strengthening vertical links. As transnational solidarity has effect through the horizontal sharing and support in which local voices are empowered across the globe, the construction of links between global decisions and gradually increasing movements from below strengthen the notion of global citizenship.

5.4.4 Practice of Global Citizenship

Then in the development of the new global construction of identities and commitments, the most appropriate forms of participation are one part of the debate.

The emphasis of citizenship on the participation demonstrate less the rights, duties or entitlements that are regulated by nation-states or other forms of government. In this sense, citizenship identity is not derived from a common status, ethnicity or culture but rather from the praxis of citizens who actively participate in the exercise and the constitution of their citizenship (Garcia, 1996). This notion of participation is neither simply directed to the state authorities nor correspond to the global governmental bodies. However, global citizen action that has reasons and motivations is promoted by the attempt to realize a set of rights that is constituted around global norms, treaties and agreements.

Held (1995) defines the site of the politics as the capacity of social agents and institutions to maintain their social environment. It occurs among groups, formal and informal institutions, and spaces whether public or private. Thus, it is expressed in all activities of social life and struggles for resources through responsible action. Therefore from the perspective of participation, global citizenship assigns participation in social, economic, cultural and political sides of life through local, national and global levels. In a more detailed expression of Albrow (1996), it involves organization for global ends or by global means that are focused on the future of the globe and organized through the globe. It begins in daily life, is realized in everyday practices and results in action. As the institutional form is imprecise and rights are not bounded to legal authority, the practice of citizenship is also related with the participation in everyday practices.

> At the global level where institutions and authority of global governance are not so clear, the rights of citizenship are made real not only through legal

> instruments but through the process of citizen action or human agency, itself (Edwards & Gaventa, 2001: 278).

However, global citizens participation is directly or indirectly related with the global institutions that have effects on local, national and regional scales. When the global citizen movement is considered, both it is affected and tries to affect the issues and problems on a global scale and the decisions of global political institutions such as WTO, IMF, and The World Bank.

Eventually, it is necessary to find out the grounds of global modes of participation and spaces of participation. Transnational engagements by non-governmental organizations and civil society including community groups, trade unions, religious and ethnic organizations may become the crucial spaces for the practice of global citizenship without neglecting the existence of nation-state.

The considered form of political participation whether it is parallel with or independent from governments is located in the area of civil society. The concept of civil society is considered to be very close to citizenship in the sense that it needs states to define mutual obligations and rights between the state and people. While in modern terms, civil society requires a legal framework and organization through the state-civil society relation; it transcends the boundaries of the nation-state. However, global citizenship can not completely break the boundaries of nation-satate citizenship because neither individual identities (Miller, 1995), nor group-based identities (Isin & Wood, 1999) can be not completely engaged by global citizenship. Although, it is not possible to talk about constituted forms of global society, the

notion of global citizenship necessitates the identification of global civil society in which new political actors are engaged in collective action in the public sphere.

This area of civil society is mostly characterized by its plurality, interlinkage between local territoriality and transnational agents, and coordination of flexible, complex and multidimensional collective identities. Constitutive bodies in the organization of global society are the various private agents and agents working in the public-private partnership. They may include some parts of state organizations, private associations, non-governmental organizations, and transnational bodies. Therefore, internationally active non-governmental organizations can cooperate with states. This pluralization of agencies and entities involves in many cases new regulations referring to new techniques of public management with regard to political control (Rose, 2000). Thus, it is assumed that the public and private spheres, which were separate, have been overlapping in the context of global citizenship. The idea of global citizenship is realized by the participation in various agents of civil society through the hybridity of separate public and private spheres.

Global citizenship extends its contents, agents, spaces and level of organization by taking into account the variability and flexibility of participation in civil society, because, "civil society is by definition open and inclusive (although voluntary) and facilitates communication between all groups constituting the citizen" (Hettne, 2000: 39). Anybody in society is able to participate and to be citizens. This promotes the idea of fragmentation, difference, and heterogeneity and thereby the plurality of life styles and differentiation of social structure rather than

the sameness and standardization. Turner, (1993) evaluates the space of plurality to prevent tendencies for the creation of new forms of exclusion.

Against the previous models of citizenship that are based on the clear-cut separation between insiders and outsiders, citizens and non-citizens or the creation of other, global citizenship is not necessarily based on distinction of global citizens and others. So, it intends to include even non-human and unborn people in its broadest sense. At this point, Urry (1998) maintains that the historically unique notion of citizenship is considered an impossibility in any significant scale, because, global citizens do not practically exist as nobody as an enemy or other to be excluded cannot be identified. As citizenship is a concept based on the foundation of 'the other' global citizenship will never be mature if the inclusiveness of global citizenship depends on the idea of lacking an enemy.

It is clear that; globalization generates new grounds for membership and sovereignty which challenges the exclusive character of national ordering. However, in the context of exclusiveness, the important thing is recasting of modern patterns of inclusion and exclusion either by tradition, formal rules or social practices. The point is that there is no systematic exclusion (Hettne, 2000; Isin, 2000). On the other hand, the creation and rearticulation of diverse entities in a global era opens up a new way for new alliances, which temporarily includes different agents.

Despite this extension of citizenship both from a local to global level and from living to nonliving things, there are many challenges and questions about how the limits of global citizenship, the realization of rights and duties are effectively

carried out. The rise of civil society at the global scale includes many problems to be detected such as what can be the structure for the legitimacy and accountability of global citizen movements in existing social, political and economic inequalities (Edwards & Gaventa, 2001). There are many questions like, 'how to connect citizens to the global dimension', 'how can we more concretely detect the conditions of global citizenship.

In the light of these questions, global citizenship may be considered as an "illegitimate extension or dilution of the notion of citizenship, because, the conditions in terms of culture, identity and institutions for the emergence of global citizenship do not exist at a global level" (Nigel, 2000: 2). Thus, the idea of global citizenship is criticized as being weaker than the modern conception and even utopian and unrealistic (Miller, T., 1998). Even though the idea of global citizenship is found very genuine and not realistic yet (Heater, 1990), Held (1995) thinks that there is enough empirical evidence that increasing intensity, extensity and velocity of global polities, economy and culture effect the constitution of citizenship. Global citizenship may include utopian elements or exceed realistic existent conditions. But, the idea of global citizenship is constituted parallel with the objection to the reliance of the totalizing concept of citizenship. This does not mean that the global model of citizenship is a necessity but it is a possibility. As Falk (1994) argues, global citizenship includes idealistic elements and when it is considered as bounded by the reality of geopolitics becomes slightly absurd. However, it is more constitutive and has political character when it is conceived as a political project for the future of a political community.

5.5 Role of Locality in Constitution of Global Citizenship

The model of global citizenship is more than the broad, macro-level issue dominating the mainstream. So, it needs to be realized in its multiple localizations.

Global does not simply oppose locality. In other words, the local is one part of the global. Global definitions require "the invention of locality" (Robertson, 1995: 35). Local can only be seen as a "node within the global" (Jessop, 1994: 271). The accelerating movement of commodities, money, people, capital and relatively fixed infrastructures that enable the transfer of these expanded movements are mutually constitutive.

The multiplicity of global citizenship requires concrete, localized forms which are related to the everyday practices of citizenship. It is considered that citizenship can be located on the grounds of a common destiny and coming together (Young, 1990) in the broadest sense. Also it corresponds to a definite form of sovereignty and political space in which certain identities, cultures, ideas and discourses take place (Turner, 2000b). Therefore, the idea of community is based on shared space and common interests advanced for the practice of citizenship. The locality becomes a space for the "reconceptualization of process of the economic globalization as concrete, economic, social and political forms situated in specific places" (Sassen, 1998: x). Therefore, the reconfiguration of economic, social and political constituents of citizenship concentrates on the reconfiguration of centers of power in organizations such as the city.

In other words, common interests, goals, identities, rights and duties, policies and participation can be embodied in a level of organization that is the city as an intersection point of differences. Furthermore, since globalization opens up a new political space for actors with particular and local identities to provide connections to collective action or participation. The new politics promote diverse forms that do not simply focus on difference but are located on the politics of difference. Therefore, consideration of locality and specifically the city for the constitutive practice of global citizenship can have a potential in the globalizing era. This consideration leads us to question the formation of a new type of global politics that is concentrated in global cities.

CHAPTER VI

GLOBAL CITY: A NEW SITE FOR CITIZENSHIP

The city has always been the site for plural forces, pressure groups, conflicting or competing groups and their specific relationships in various historical contexts. In the period of globalization, as the national order of things has changed, national-ordered relations among the city, the state, economic dynamics and socio-political issues have also been substantially reorganized.

By following this argument, this chapter focuses on the complex relationship between globalization, the city and citizenship. In the first part of this chapter, I will provide a brief examination of the changes that took place in the city due particularly to global dynamics. My examination will revolve around the following questions: 'what are the requirements to be a global city?', 'what differentiates global cities from others', 'which cities are likely to be addressed as global cities?' In the second part, I will focus on the socio-economic organization in global cities. I will show how the economic structure is a driving force for the other characteristics of the global city. I will also explore the new occupational structures in the global city. The third part specifically explains what the global city means for the citizenship debate. It deals with the basic grounds of identity formation and emergence of new actors and classes, their rights, and new forms of struggles in the

global city to understand their capacity for the constitution of citizenship. In other words it questions the dangers, possibilities and opportunities of new modes of politics in terms of global city. The final part of the chapter emphasizes that the global city should be taken as a particular level of analysis and hence may not be reduced to a geographical space.

6.1 Emergence of Global Cities

The social transformations took place over the last decade in the world has made city a more strategic site for global entities. In the transition from the earlier to global form of city, some cities which used to be a part of national economic structures have become a unit of global economic system. In the period of globalization, which is characterized by mobility, fluidity and variety, the global economy market and their organizations require specific central places for their operation. As Çağlar Keyder and Ayşe Öncü state, "a set of global cities or world cities has emerged at the intersection of global transaction, networks, mediating between world productive activity and markets" (Keyder and Öncü, 1993: 7). Therefore, city in this era becomes a form of infrastructure in which concentrated global facilities are implemented. Thus, for many authors (Sassen, 2000; Friedman & Wolf, 1982; Isin, 2000; Magnusson, 1996; Castells, 1998) the global cities have appeared to be the strategic nodes in the world of globalization.

This newly-emerging form of city is indicated by means of numerous terms, such as mega-city, world city, imperial city and global city. The variety in terminology is an outcome of diversity in the approaches to define these cities. The

first of such approaches is the one which emphasizes the demographic aspect. Emphasizing the population size of the city, this approach defines the cities with a population over eight million as mega-cities (Taylor, 1999: iii). Castells (1998), for instance, argues that the new global economy has generated new spatial forms or new geographical contexts, which he calls mega-cities. These cities are recognized by "their large agglomerations of human beings" (1998: 403).

A second approach focuses on the integration of these cities to the global developments. To this economic-functional approach, "the enormous size is not the defining quality"[13] in the case of such cities (Castells, 1998: 403). Instead, what is decisive is their economic and social achievement. Although there are a number of cities with an increase in their size, global cities are distinguished by the extent of their integration to global economy and social organization. Despite the increase in their size, what is crucial is their role in the organization of global dynamics. The key criterion is the function but not the size.

> These cities are distinguished because they offer locations for the key individuals, institutions and organizations which manage, manipulate, dictate and determine the formation and reproduction of capitalism across the world (Clark, 1996: 137).

This is why the term global city is extended to a 'space of global accumulation' (Friedman, 1999) or 'regional motors of global economy' (Scott, 1996). However,

---

[13] As Taylor points out Castells departs from other treatment of mega-cities by not defining size as the defining quality. He defines mega-cities as nodal points. However, this leads to confusion between the mea-cities and global cities. for further elaboration of this debate see Taylor (1999) *Worlds of large cities: pondering Castells' space of flows*

this intersection, in many cases, specifies that the global city is a financial, corporate, service center without a full model of its results and causes (Vertowec, 1998). In fact, what is significant is the specific function of cities as a site for infrastructure of activities, firms and jobs required for the global economy. As Clark (1996) correctly points out, what distinguishes world cities is not only their size or the range of the services performed there, but they gain world status because of their outlook and orientation. Global cities provide services and infrastructure for world market. Global cities are the "nodes of the global economy, concentrating the directional productive and managerial upper functions all over the planet; the control of the media; the real politics of power" (Castels, 1998: 403). As a nodal point in global flows, the city functions as a center of command and control over global capital and over local, regional, global and national exchange. Thus, it reinforces new organizational arrangements and activities from economy to politics.

In the literature, this transition is consolidated by "the world city theory" (Cohen, 1981; Friedman & Wolf, 1982) which combines impacts of global economic developments and socio-economic structure of world cities. In its broadest sense, the world city theory tries to detect the changing nature of global capitalism by focusing on the geographical scale of the contemporary city. Friedman (1990) proposes that world city theory deals with the relations between production and the political determination of territorial interests in the era of global management. Therefore, it analyses the organization of new international division of labor, new economic organizations and new articulations of economy-politics. According to Friedman and Wolff (1982) most of the world's active capital is concentrated in

world cities. Hence these regions play a vital role in the great capitalist undertaking to organize the world economy which is marked by a linked set of markets and production units, controlled by transnational capital. World cities are evaluated as the material manifestation of this control. Also, the concept of world cities are expanded by Hall (1984) as "those in which quite a disproportionate part of the world's most important business is conducted" (Hall, 1984: 1).

It is argued that a major outcome of the developments in the geography of the economy has been the fact that the cities or urban networks have become the basic territorial unit of the global economy. In the words of Braudel (1984: 26), the term the world city "denotes the center of specific world-economies, an urban center of gravity as the logistic heart of its activity." Therefore, such cities are seen as the places which "hold the capitalist world economic system together" (Feagin, 1985: 30). Since, many of the resources that are both mobile and embedded in the city are necessary for the global economic activities, these cities provide the required infrastructure for the global economy. They are considered to be a set of material conditions which basically refers to economic activities. The impacts of economic transgression in global cities reflect the massive expansion of role of transnational corporations and the exchange of commodities through the globe. International capital and services gain importance rather than domestic capital and manufacturing correspondingly. Since, increased mobility of capital concentrates in global cities. Thus, manufacturing services shift to business and financial services in cities. Furthermore, what is critical is the concentration of control and management centers in global cities. Extending service sector concentrates their control and command

centers in global cities (Sassen, 1993; Friedman, 1990; Smith, 1998). This means that new condition of the economy requires the growth of major control centers to satisfy its needs and to coordinate the global economic activity. Thus these cities become the nodes of decision-making and control in flow of capital. In terms of world cities, the production of highly specialized services and top-level management constitute the control functions by which cities are ranked.

The control function of cities differentiates from each other and determines their capacity to be a 'global city'. Since the capacity to control is not equal for each city, cities are ranked. In fact as Keyder and Öncü correctly point out, the situation of cities in which the control function of capital are located and labor force and producer's services are included reflect the hierarchy of capital organized on a global scale. Since capital is global and since its spatial organization is hierarchical then the cities are hierarchical (1993: 11). Furthermore, according to world city theories, cities are ranked in terms of their 'global control capability' (Sassen-Koob, 1986: 88). The practice of global control is "the specialized activity involved in producing and reproducing the organization and management of the global system of production and the global labor force" (Sassen-Koob, 1986: 88). In this sense, urban regions are categorized hierarchically in the world scale according to their different levels of integration into the global economy, their participation in new division of labor and their capability to control the world power.

> The cities of the world are thus situated in a system within those which are most global at the top relating to a second level of regionally important cities which receive commands and from the top echelon... The social and economic structure of cities which function at the lower rungs of the hierarchy has probably not changed greatly with the increasing globalization of the

> economy. The same is not true, however for those in the upper levels (Keyder and Öncü, 1993: 11).

This means that the cities at the top of the hierarchy are the major control centers of capital while others below this level are places in which headquarters accommodate international decision-making. So, cities at the top of the hierarchy have distinctive features which characterize global cities among other cities. Many theorists (Hall, 1996; Cohen, 1981; Friedman and Wolff, 1982; Sassen, 1993) have agreement on distinctive feature of global cities and their hierarchical order, there is a wide range of criteria to determine how to measure this hierarchy and thereby how to determine global control capability of a city.

This variety in criteria defining the capacity of cities to become global leads to diverse order of hierarchy in the list of global cities which varies according to different theorists[14]. For Peter Hall (1996) the starting point for the analysis of global urban hierarchy is a set of cities including London, Paris, Randstad, Rhine-Ruhr, Moscow, New York, and Tokyo. He placed these cities at the top of the hierarchy according to their global capacity to influence the politics, trade, finance, communication and culture. This list of hierarchy is more extended in the writings of Cohen (1981), Friedman and Wolff (1982), and Thrift (1981). In his empirical research on the city rankings, Cohen places Tokyo, London and New York at the top defines them as the "predominant world centers of corporations and finance" (1981:

---

[14] As seen below, each theorist has his/her own hierarchical list demonstrating which city is global or has greater potential to be global. Against the multiplicity of these lists, they assign (more or less) same cities at the top of the hierarchy. However, there is a variety in name of cities at the lower levels of hierarchy.

308). On the other hand, he identifies Paris, Frankfurt, Chicago, Zurich, Osaka and Rhine-Ruhr as 'second level' world cities.

The difference between primary and secondary cities becomes clearer in the writings of Friedman (1986) who ranks world cities in terms of their articulation with the global economy. He distinguishes two levels of world cities as well as the core and semi-peripheral countries. He arranges thirty centers as primary and secondary in the core countries (e. g. London, Paris and Madrid, Toronto) and in semi-peripheral countries (e. g. Singapore, Sao Paulo and Hong Kong, Buenos Aires). His hierarchy is determined by the control centers of capital in the new division of labor. So, core and semi-peripheral cities are determined by industrial market economy and upper middle-income market economies respectively. The key criteria in his analysis are being the site for headquarters of transnational corporations; international institutions; rapid growth of business service sector; important manufacturing center; major transportation node and population size.

Similarly, Thrift (1986) separates world cities into three main categories. The first one, truly global centers, contains many head offices of large corporations. These cities are New York, Tokyo and London. The second one is the zonal centers including Singapore, Hong Kong, Los Angeles and Paris. These cities are responsible for business in particular zones rather than in world scale although they are the important links for the international business. The third level is regional centers like Sydney, Chicago, Dallas, Miami, Honolulu and San Francisco. These centers host foreign financial outlets and corporate offices while they do not construct essentialist links in the international business system (Thrift, 1986: 61).

Despite the variations in these lists, there is an ostensible agreement on the status of cities at the top of the hierarchy including New York, Tokyo and London. Since global city is determined as highly concentrated command and control centers in the organization of global economy, the clarity in the position of these three cities is the consequence of organization of global economy.

> International trade is concentrated in the exchanges between Western Europe, the United States and the Asian Pacific, with a clear advantage for the latter region. [...] if we add financial interdependence, technology transfer, and alliances, interlocking and joint ventures between firms, it is obvious that the core of the global economy is a tightly interdependent network between USA, Japan and Western Europe that is becoming increasingly so, constituting what Ohmae (1985) labeled years ago 'Triad Power' (Castells, 1989: 107).

Moreover, Saskia Sassen (1981), who determines the key criteria to be at the top of the global city hierarchy as internalization, concentration and intensity of key locations for finance and for specialist service firms, argues that New York, London and Tokyo are the three global cities which clearly fulfill these criteria in the organization of global economy. By looking at the specialization of producer service firms and organization of the financial industry which are responsible for the formation of global cities, she particularly specifies these core cities – New York, London and Tokyo- as vital centers of management of economic power in the global economy.

As having discussed above, in terms of world city hierarchy, global control centers are mainly discovered in the core countries. On the other hand, there are also lower level cities in the semi-periphery (Cohen, 1981; Friedman and Wolff, 1982; Castells, 1989). However, if we consider historical and geographical contexts of cities, and the historical expansion of global capitalism, there are the non-core cities

which are likely to strengthen their status to be the control centers of global economy. It is a fact that global cities are commercial capitals of world power, but other factors determining their patterns of domination are also crucial. Therefore, historical links, colonial connections and geography are also significant issues in order to list other candidates, or alternative urban entities (Keyder and Öncü, 1993: 19). In this sense, the critic of King (1994) to Friedman's hypothesis has legitimate grounds. For King, core centered approach says,

> ...nothing about other parts of national urban systems with which world cities are connected and which are equally subject to global economic forces...It addresses only one part of the spatial organization of the new international division of labor (1991: 53).

Then he goes further to consider historical and geographical factors, so as to examine the impacts of colonialism in the world city hierarchy. He considers the effect of colonialism in both metropolitan and colonial society on the ground that it specifies a historical mode of production, sets up much of the infrastructure and leads to a significant division of labor for the later world city. In King's view,

> Colonialism establishes the institutions, the banks, corporations, governments, commercial forms, hotels, as well as the educated elites, consumption habits, retailing behaviors, technology, attitudes and aspirations on which global capitalism and subsequently, the world city builds (ibid: 46).

As it appears, King assesses cities' historical and cultural connections as well as their potential to attract global capital and their location in relation to zones of global economy among the criteria of being a global city, whether in the core or not. By doing so, he extends global cities to the developing countries. This is why his potential list of future global cities includes many cities like Shangai, Jakarta, Calcutta, Istanbul, Cairo, Lagos, Bogotá and so on (ibid: 51-52).

Similarly, the work of Beaverstock, Smith and Taylor (1999), which defines world cities in terms of their role in postindustrial production, shows the penetration of global city process to non-core world. While expanding the distribution of world cities to the non-core, their analysis also validates that most of the global cities are in core. In this analysis three major category of world cities as alpha, beta and gamma are listed. Ten alpha world cities, including London, Paris, Tokyo, New York, Chicago, Frankfurt, Hong Kong, Los Angeles, Milan and Singapore, are geographically distributed in Western Europe, USA and Pacific Asia. The same three world regions are represented in the beta world cities, but also with outer cities like Sydney, Toronto, Mexico City, Moscow and Sao Paulo from third world region. A similar pattern is found in the geographical dispersion of the thirty-five gamma world cities. They involve three representatives of South America and Africa, but the rest is from the three major areas of globalization provided Istanbul is accepted as European and Melbourne as Pacific Asia.

In brief, the emergence of global cities is indicated by some main issues. The first is the growth in size of some cities and proliferation of cities in to new territories. Secondly, patterns of production and consumption, and market assume new specific forms in these cities owing to the globalization of economic activity. This is marked by the concentration of the control centers of transnational companies, corporate services and finance sectors. It means global cities function as a command and control center of global economy. Lastly, the role of a global city in the articulation of global economy may also depend on its historical and geographical links and colonial connections.

Having discussed the formation of global cities as a place via its function in global economy, I will now approach the global cities from a perspective which treats the global city as a social process rather than a space. In addition to the fact that they function for economic power, major cities are places in which global business, finance, trade, and government services are arranged. This renders these cities to have a distinctive sociological structure. In the words of Castells (1998), the formation of global cities refers to,

> ... a specific set of relationships of production and management, based on social organization that by and large shares a work culture ands instrumental goals aimed of generating new knowledge, new processes and new products (ibid: 390). [...] These cities articulate the global economy, link up the informational networks and concentrate the world's power. But, they are also the depositories of all these segments of the population who fight to survive, as well as of those groups who want to make visible their declaration (ibid: 404).

The existence of large numbers of members of transnational corporations, financial centers and producer service generate specific social relations. The concentrated operation of global economy engenders a peculiar social structure with new forms of division of labor, income distribution, and ways of life. The section below examines this aspect of the global city.

6.2 Socio-economic Organization in Global Cities

It is argued (Sassen, 1993; Friedman, 1990; Hall, 1984) that the global cities appear as command and control centers of production and distribution of resources. The city becomes the site of new elements of production and use of technology, new structures and locations of employment, and new patterns of trade and investment. The global city is characterized by the growth of finance and service economy at the

expense of others. This includes the rise of professional services such as banking, accounting, insurance, advertising, public relations, consulting, finance, and management. Accordingly, global cities become the sites for the headquarter offices of major banks, multinational corporations, advertising, media, accounting, legal services, arts and science, and so on (Hall, 1996). Moreover, the city site provides services and infrastructure including roads, rail, airports, and telecommunication technologies.

This structure of economy paves the way for an occupational structure remarkably different from the traditional manufacturing. Global economy has strong impacts on occupational structure. As Clark (1996: 7) suggests,

> The organization of the world economy is made possible by and is maintained through an international division of labor in which the tasks which people perform, their working conditions and their rates of pay are determined by the requirements of global capitalism.

It is further argued that the change in the occupational is defined with respect to increasing importance and the extension of professional occupations and service sector employees. As Friedman and Wolff argue (1982: 320), the economy of the global city is characterized by the growth of a primary cluster of high level business services which employ a large number of professionals and staffs of clerical personal, clusters of low level professionals and service workers. However, against the increase in the number and power of high-skilled professional employees, there are also unskilled workers, immigrants, flexible workers, technicians and various groups of ethnic and racial minorities in many cases. In other words, new occupational structure in the global city is composed of professionals and managers

on the hand and low or unskilled workers on the other. In addition, the shift in occupational conditions creates new grounds for unemployment. Thus, through economic restructuring there is an increasing number of unemployed which leads to social deprivation[15].

One of the direct consequences of this new occupational structure is the change in the distribution of incomes. Against the skilled classes with high wages there are also unskilled laborers with low wages and those having unstable jobs. Hence global cities are the places with a population composed of both a well-educated, highly paid elite with a global outlook and a low skilled and low-paid working class in international service sector. It is a place of "exceptional wealth and affluence as well as severe disadvantage and deprivation" (Clark, 1996: 139).

In addition to being a site of economic polarization, the global city is a space of social and cultural diversity. The reconfiguration of economy in global cities has produced some significant socio-cultural changes that altered the previous social structure in the city. The global city has become increasingly filled with economic and cultural multiplicity. In addition to being a site for various forms of work conditions, major cities in the global era include many people from different origins. This increasing cultural heterogeneity is mostly due to large-scale migration to the

---

[15] One of the most crucial consequences of the widespread unemployment is the increasing number of homelessness. It can be simply defined as people who have no place to sleep and no place to call home. Beyond this simple explanation, there are complex social phenomena. Homelessness is the consequence of poverty, high unemployment, few social skills and inadequate pattern of functional relationships and social exclusion. However, the most important factor in the increase in the homelessness is the widespread unemployment, lack of cheap and accessible shelter which is the consequence of growing gap between income, lack of or permanence of job for low skilled person.

global cities. These cities with their denationalized structures become the areas for immigrant workers, managers and professionals besides refugees and minorities. In King's view (1990: 41), "the different national, religious, ethnic, racial and cultural composition of world city populations could have at least as much importance as their mere economic value as labor power in the world city." Echoing King, Soja (2001: 2) argues that the,

> ... increasing cultural heterogeneity, arising from extraordinary increases in transnational migrations, have been the key factors increasing tensions in nearly all the world's major city-regions. Globalization and migratory diasporas[16] have created what are surely the most culturally and ethnically heterogeneous cities the world has ever known.

As was explained up to now, the new economic structure generates an increase in low-wage workers and jobs with less advanced possibilities against the expansion of high-income jobs. Also, the increase in immigrant workers, new unemployed people and transnational professionals signals a gap in the city. Friedman and Wolf (1982) suggest that the social fact about world city formation is the polarization of social class divisions. This occupational composition is conceptualized as 'dual cities'[17] by Castells (1989: 387) who states that global cities are 'the places of social

---

[16] 'Diaspora' which is widely used in the texts of immigration refers to the common history or background presumably broken in the conditions of migration or exile. It accepts the formation of bounded communities and solidarities – on the basis of cultural and ethnic origins- in the arrival places. In the context of citizenship, the primary orientation for making of citizenship is arisen from the home-bound or ethnic based orientation. To consider forms of citizenship in global city, diaspora as an analytical category reduces the contemporary limits of citizenship although it extends the limits of national citizenship. For further elaboration of this argument see Yasemin Nuhoğlu Soysal "Citizenship and identity: living in diasporas in post-war Europe?"

[17] According to him, global cities are organized in a bipolar structure around two predominant groups. On the one hand, high-skilled, professional labor force and on the other hand mass of unskilled or semi-skilled workers are service the international service sector but are well separated from each other.

polarization'. This polarization refers not only to the inequality in terms of wealth but also socio-cultural practices.

This social polarization, which is caused by a new division of labor, structural change in work conditions, income and their social impacts in a city, is evaluated in terms of social, ethnic, racial and earning and geographical[18] segmentation (Sassen, 2000; Castels, 1989: 26; Delanty, 2000: 82). This segmentation mostly originates in the division of the labor force to a multi-skilled core and labor force. As Friedman and Wolf (1982: 322) suggest that,

> The dual city hypothesis is focused on inequality and polarization of social forces in the city, the primary social fact about world city formation is the polarization of social class divisions, practices, life-styles, ideas, discourses and political spaces.

However, the dual city debate goes beyond the social polarization thesis. First, the critics on the direct dependency of social polarization to the structural change of global economy questions the universality of dualization in cities. Hamnett (1994: 410) who uses professionalisation rather than social polarization, points out that the consequence of the new division of labor is not independent from local culture and the historical tradition of a particular city. Assigning some major cities as global cities does not simply homogenize a few cities and privileges them hierarchically. However, the consequence of global developments can be different among cities in

---

[18] The explosion in the wealth and power concentrated in global cities creates a new geography of centrality and marginality. High-priced urban spaces and key nodes of cities that get massive investments from the state become one side of this social structure in the city while low-income city areas and older suburbs with a lack of resources become the other side. Then it takes the form of central business centers surrounded by suburbs.

different historical conditions. The local autonomy of people and domestic factors are differentiated because of cultural background, religion and life-style. The level of social polarization within any given city will depend on a number of factors, not just the structural changes which have accompanied economic globalization. The impact of local culture and customs as well as the urban history of a particular city will all influence the polarization tendencies, the links between global city emergence and social polarization will therefore be multi-causal and complex.

Secondly, Baum (1997) considers social impacts of other criteria such as gender or migration. According to him, their different articulations to local identities in the global era can influence economic variables and determine the global city. Therefore, the emergence of social struggle in the global city is a complex phenomenon that needs to consider global and local dynamics together and needs to go beyond polarization thesis. All global cities do not have universal forms but they have new common agents, discourses and spaces.

Also, new groups and classes with their distinct life-styles in the city suggest advantages and disadvantages for both poles in society. The crucial point in this approach is the shift from distinctive polarization to a constitutive one because social structure is interpreted as socio-economic diversification and heterogenization rather than polarization. Accordingly, Young (1999) deals with segregation as a possible resource for the reformation of citizenship rights. She argues that geographic and social segregation can be the source of a network of family, neighbors and friends for marginalized groups and individuals. Against the general approach to segregation, she proposes a new network that can be a possible

condition for articulation of new rights. Therefore, the demand for new rights and their expression can constitute the grounds of differentiated citizenship based on both group differentiation and togetherness (or commonality) at the same time.

The socio-economic developments mentioned so far and the social composition they have generated in the global city have produced remarkable political outcomes, the most important of which is the creation of social categories different from traditional ones. As a result of new forms of capital mobility, new technology, and division of labor, there are now new subjects with new claims of rights, there are grounds for new duties, new patterns of exclusion and inclusion which will be discussed for emergence of new forms and sites of citizenship via global cities.

6.3 Making of Citizenship

The recognition of the global city as a political space has become one of the main points of the contemporary debates on citizenship because global cities have become the significant centers of new economic and cultural transitions in society. As a result of this enforcement, new advantage groups, classes and identities are recognized in a political context. The rise of new dominant groups that have new claims of rights causes a reformation in politics. In this sense, movements of new groups encourage a new politics that is realized in a new space of politics because the economic and social transformation in the context of global city requires the reflection of this transition in the political era.

The composition of global cities as intersections of global networks of flows becomes the object of struggles for recognition. The global city has become a space for new actors with the claim of new rights, new political identities and participation practices. As such it has been also the space in which meaning, contents (rights, duties, participation, and membership) and the limits of citizenship are constituted. Thus the question is how the practice of new classes or groups in global cities expand the boundaries of citizenship.

For many scholars (Garcia, 1996; Kymlicka, 1995; Imbrie & Pirch, 1996; Isin, 1999; Beauregard & Bounds, 2000; Cohen, 1981), urban space is related with the reconstruction of the idea of citizenship in the global era. The notion of urban citizenship and the city appears as a strategic issue for the constitution of citizenship. In the analysis of the realization of global institutions such as global citizenship, the global city becomes an important level of analysis because the global city represents a fragmented, disjointed area which "symbolizes the contradictory global flows that brought it into being" rather than the simple urban region or megapolis (Işın & Wood, 1999:100). As a concentrated site of global dynamics, the global city is a responsive space for socio-political analysis of globalization. Cities are also explored as a significant site of citizenship because of their location in and through which "we" selves are made (Imbrie & Pinch, 1996: 6). (Friedman, 1993; Isin, 1999; Beauregard & Bounds, 2000; Sassen, 2000; Garcia, 1996; Cohen, 1981). In other words, the global city becomes the source of identities as it becomes the place in which feelings, ideas, and actions are constituted. In terms of belonging, the city environment provides the sense of belonging to this or that

community in daily life. Thus, membership status, which is the constitutive element of citizenship is directly related to the economic, socio-cultural and political structure of the city.

Işın (2000) argues that the concept of global city in most cases is characterized as a nodal point in the global network of flows and intersection point of various identities, groups, and ideas. For Smith (1998), the global city, instead of being a solid object, is the interplay of differently articulated transnational networks and practices which include local, regional, national and transnational actors, their practices and outcomes. Thus, the global city is considered as a new site for making claims (Sassen, 1996; 1999), as a place for advancing multiculturalism (Sandercock, 1998), as a place for being together with strangers (Young, 1999) and as a strategic place for socio-cultural integration and political representation (Borja & Castells, 1997).

The city becomes a new political space, because the space of city refers to the identities of the city (Magnusson, 1996). In the global context, city is a site of diverse populations and new polities of difference and identity. As Appadurai (1990: 189) maintains, "it is challenging, diverging from and even replacing nations as the important space of citizenship, as the lived space of citizenship, as the lived space not only of its uncertainties but also of its emergent forms". Therefore, in terms of citizenship, the arguments about global cities highlight the emerging modes in which the global city is being politicized. Then the recognition of diverse groups and particularities in urban society and the struggle in their own definition and practices addresses the definition of citizenship. The global cities with a

concentration of different, mixed, strange, non-local issues reinforce a new type of citizenship concept.

Sandercock (1998) argues that the composition of global city involves new political groups making demands for new types of rights and extensions of modern rights. In the variety of identities such as gender, ethnicity, profession, sexuality, there is a struggle for recognition and new rights in terms of these identities. Therefore, the role of the city as a political issue is connected to its stake in the struggle for claims and the exercise of new rights and duties. This is why Işın and Wood (1999) propose that the transformation in advanced capitalism finally leads to the rise of new classes and groups. The global city engenders new forms of capital (financial, cultural, social and symbolic) and is a strategic space for new classes and professions" (Isin & Wood, 1999: 101). Therefore, global cities become strategic sites for the hegemony of new transnational classes and the rise of new identities. Also, the city becomes the space of both the production and consumption of services and new classes and groups within their environment.

However, it is also important to note that for some authors, some factors in the global city tend to weaken the notion of citizenship as well. For example, Dagger (2000: 33) argues that because of its size, the global city includes many people who are strangers to each other. Therefore, as population grows, citizens feel more remote from political life. Also, the division and multiplicity of authority causes geographical and political fragmentation, which fosters isolation. Therefore global city is also a space including difficulties for the cooperation of citizens as members of community.

Similarly, numerous groups in global city are not in an even relationship. Rather they represent the polarized structure of global cities. As was discussed before, separation of high-skilled professionals and low-skilled, unemployed or temporarily employed workers is the most basic ground of dual structure in the city. However, it is evident that the professionals and people of international businesses have a great capacity to control the distribution of resources and power.[19] A leading group in the struggle for new rights defining citizenship in the city is the professional-managerial classes. For Işın (1999, 2000), this class presents the symbolic means of production and determines the cultural capital that is important in the articulation of rights and the imposition of new models of citizenship. Thus, this class defines the grounds that are significant for new rights and political power in the city. The emergence of professionals and managers in global cities is significant for the demand of new rights because they are organized in cities around their professional associations. New rights and duties negotiated within the political space of the city are necessarily mediated by their professional occupation and practices. Therefore, citizenship in terms of status, rights and duties refers to occupation and professional associations, which are organized across boundaries for

---

[19] Işın (1999: 168) argues that unlike the definition of class in terms of land, wage or economic capital, new professionals and managerial groups are specialized according to their competence, skills and cultural capital, even though they are valued economically according to their status and position. This position is also determined by their cultural capital. Işın and Wood (1999: 100) define these social forms as 'cultural capital', which is a kind of skill, reputation, honor, knowledge and cultural background. Cultural capital is quite flexible and transformable. The owners or commanders of cultural capital are able to articulate the rights in symbolic order and even to impose their own approach on people who do not have cultural and economic capital.

professions. Thus, for Beauregard and Bounds (2000), the city expresses a special level of organization of rights and duties.

This demand for new rights requires new claims to citizenship, new forms of membership and participation forms, which encourage new levels of organization (Sassen, 2000). The emergence of new professional-managers as a new class or group and their power to negotiate for their interests in the economic, social and political areas causes new forms of class struggle. This form of struggle is generated in living conditions, administrative and social organization, geography of the city, cultural practices and consumption patterns.

In this context there is a widening gap between classes, types of capital, both within and between cities. In this sense, the case of the global city is significant because it is the most immediate and pernicious form of globalization within the world cities. According to White (1998: 452-453) the new concentration of capital, groups or classes leads to both deepening of marginalization and the emergence of global elite. Then this division creates new political conflict within the cities (Delanty, 2000). Likewise, Isin (1999) recognizes diversity of interests, identities, ideas and their intersection. He (1999: 165) rightly points out, "the city is not only a foreground or a background to struggles for rights but also a battleground to claim those rights". He sees the city as a battleground for different forms of citizenship, because concentrated social differentiation creates multiple membership forms.

In this manner, the constitutive effects of new languages, new practices and new spheres, which are sources of new forms of politics, are seen as a potential for the invention of new forms of citizenship. The global city as a space of politics has

become the space for the negotiation of some new rights and henceforth it signifies some new forms of conflict defining the frontiers of citizenship. Global cities can be defined as political spaces in which different cultures groups and identities are intertwined to articulate different rights of citizenship, basis of membership and modes of organization and politics. In the global network of flows of things, the global cities emerge as concentrated nodes in which new groups, classes, rights, bases of production, consumption and exchange get their forms.

In the literature, the global city and citizenship debate is mostly shaped around the argument that a decrease in the national government and its decisive authority in economic interactions is the outcome of the mobility of capital, labor, management and technology. From this perspective, Friedman (1993) points out that the global movements of these factors alter the previous economic structure and the style of life in cities. Many researchers (Appadurai, 1990; Castells, 1989; Scott, 1996) who assume that global developments ended with decay in state territoriality, emphasize the re-structuring process on the city level. Accordingly, Sassen (1996) argues that economic forces cause new international division of labor which creates new social structures on a global scale. Then she questions the convenience of national city systems as a scale of analysis. From this perspective, there is an opposition between static state territories or institutions and flexible mobile global entities such as transnational corporations or immigrants. The role of the state is neglected because of its static background structure which does not have the flexibility and mobility of global dynamics. Thus, the level of the globe and state becomes mutually exclusive.

In contrast to such perspectives, Walker (1993) suggests that states still remain to be the dominant actors in the global area. In his view, they still have legal supremacy in their relation to economic, cultural, religious, social and political institutions. Therefore, he argues, the global city formation is not independent from the level of the state. Smith (1998: 484) considers global cities according to their relation to the state rather than urban nodes and independent zones. He admits that the state is being reconfigured. Yet, in his view, state did not cease to be the privileged institutional, regulatory and territorial body. Likewise, Brenner (1998, 1999) emphasizes the re-scaling of state territoriality rather than the erosion of it. According to him, states, in their relation with the process of global city formation, have been re-scaled. The configurations of state organizations have transformed to adapt the operation, agents and sites of the globalization process. While the economy and urban hierarchies have been denationalized, the state is still significant for the territorialization of capital. To this view, state continues to affect social, economic and political relations; and state institutions maintain their territorial character by re-territorializing the power onto multiple spatial levels.

In this context, the global city formation is not completely independent from the state territoriality, but they come together in the alliance of social agents and organization of social structure in the global city. However, the public space of global city is more emphasized than the state intervention.

As to the creation of new models of citizenship(s) in urban areas, Holston (1999) moves away from the tension between city and the nation. However, he emphasizes the active role of the public space or civil society for the practice of

citizenship because the main question is the gap between the existing citizenship status and substantive citizen rights and claims on new rights. As the gap increases, classes or groups search for spaces where they can express and organize their daily existence, their own interests, rights, identities and ideas. In the multiplicity of global cities not only the extension of gaps but also the possibility of new articulations opens up a way for the politics of new kinds of citizenships. Therefore, global citizenship is mostly situated in public space and civil society. The politics of the city signifies the function of public space in which individuals and groups express their identities and interests. Since the various forms of this expression of identities and interests are mainly materialized in daily practices and styles of life, their articulation is strongly related with their interaction in public life.

> Everyday sites and spaces that are considered as political such as courtyards, bars, market stalls, shops are transformed into political spaces in which communities articulate associational rights...the central role of associational practices based on relationships of trust, reciprocity and mutual exchange in the development of new forms of rights-claims (Isin, 1999: 169)

Thus, the public area has controlling implications on citizenship because it is a place where many daily practices are exercised. Therefore public era in which people experience their concerns, becomes the grounds in which differences interact and resolved (Bounds and Beauregard, 2000). Also, Rocco (1996) emphasizes the role of associational practices which create the grounds of mutual exchange and the necessary conditions for the creation of new forms of rights or claims. On the other hand, Isin (2000) argues that the spaces of the public do not directly translate these concerns to claims on new rights, but just provide required conditions for the emergence of demand for new rights and the constitution of a new basis of

citizenship. In other words, these practices are the capacity or potential of individuals and organizations for new models of citizenship rather than the basis of a complete social order.

In this sense against the regional, jurisdictional framework, the politics in terms of the city is conceived as an active social construct. As various new classes and groups in the new global economy influence the social structure of global cities, it includes various moments, dimensions and objects that are produced socially. At the intersection of these issues, the global city functions as an active part of this interaction and encourages this process rather than being just a place in which these changes take place.

6.4 Global City: Beyond Local Geographical Place

The debate on globalization with changing status of citizenship has concentrated on the city and particularly on some nodes of global cities. This implies new modes of citizenship. Unlike modern formulation, citizenship concentrated on the global city does not necessarily correspond to the equal legal status within the boundaries of a state. Instead, it is realized at the nodal point of network of flows through the world for organization of market, new production and service conditions, new social groups and the socio-political implications of those entities. This type of network organization is based on the overlapping relation of these entities rather than their distinction.

Forms of citizenship searched in global city are beyond the clear-cut distinctions between actors in global city, local and global. This is because global cities are

concentration points for articulation of global and local as well as economic, social, cultural and political. As Magnusson argues (2000: 295),

> The concept of global city invites us to abandon a number of old distinctions: between the local (the city) and the global, between the economic, the social, the cultural and the political; and between the static (structures, systems, spaces) and the dynamic (movements, time).

In global mobility and network, things interact with each other for the articulation of meaning and power. Therefore, global cities become a part of the order in which flow of things, local forces and their networks interact for the constitution of new forms.

Global city theories try to recognize the new forms of conflicts, exclusion or associations to get knowledge of people, cultures, communities, and the basis of representation. Their analysis is mainly concentrated on the particularities in global cities. They identify many previously disadvantaged groups such as woman, immigrants, ethnic minorities, and new emerging groups like professionals.

In this sense, the global city is seen as a strategic place for economic and sociopolitical practices, which define these people. In the light of these developments in global cities, current analyses try to capture the new forms of social power, new problems, new agents, and new grounds of articulation. Then an analysis about citizenship is open for new possibilities suggested by the global city which is a new political space.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

This study has attempted to reflect on the current state of citizenship in today's world of globalization. This attempt draws on the contention that the normative basis and the institutional organization of the national conception of citizenship, which has been the most common model from the eighteenth century onwards, are in a process of transformation. As the nation-state ceases to be the privileged political authority and as the nation-state territory ceases to be the most privileged political space, the national conception of citizenship is being pushed from a change. It may be argued that the legitimacy of the national concepts, which has always been strictly connected to the partnership between the nation and the state, is under a process of erosion owing to a weakening in the partnership in question.

In the modern tradition, citizenship is conceptualized as a bond which makes individuals the members of a particular community and which endows the members of the community with a common status in the sense that it guarantees equal rights, duties and the basis of participation for them. In its historical development, citizenship happened to denote membership to national community and a formal legal status organizing the civil, political and social rights of the members of the

community. As it indicated membership to a political community, this legal status generated a sense of social integration, social solidarity and common identity.

In the present century, although the idea of citizenship characterized by membership to nation-state-society and civil, political and social rights has still some legitimate grounds, the globalization process has generated a milieu wherein we see the rise of the demands for rights other than those associated with the classical era of citizenship. Likewise, we see that the same milieu has also radically altered the idea of membership to political community. This is mostly because the increasing volume of mobility and uncertainty globalization generated has altered the socio-economic structure and the political community which gave rise to the classical model of citizenship which has traditionally been associated with nation-state membership and civil, political and social rights.

It is now argued that the national conception of citizenship fails to represent citizens in the global era because of its limited ability to recognize heterogeneity, diversity, and the de-facto forms of citizenship. The rise of international migration resulted with a proliferation in the forms of membership statuses. To give a few examples, we now have residents, denizens, dual citizens, and non-citizens in almost all societies. Although they do not correspond to nationality, these forms of membership take place in national contexts. Hence, the limitations introduced by the national conception of citizenship become more urgent, because the multiplication and diversification, and not homogenization characterize the dominant forms of social relations under global conditions, which are characterized by the flow of things. As globalization points to fluidity, indeterminacy and plurality

of forms, it first undermines the ideology of distinct and relatively autonomous forms of national identities and then it erodes the autonomy of the nation state at the expense of the rise of supra-national and sub-national agents. Therefore, this leads to the emergence of new questions about the modes of not only political but also of cultural belongingness. Thus, as Turner summarizes (2000: 132),

> Multiplication of life-worlds raises a question about the capacity of political systems to recognize, embrace and ultimately manage such global diversity within a political framework which requires certain levels of loyalty.

However, note that this productive and destructive nature of globalization does not suggest that the nation-state and national identities have disappeared or will disappear in a while. What we mostly see is the rise of political spaces other than nation-state-territories and the rise of identities other than the ones conditioned by the nation-state-society. What we see again is a decay in the autonomy of the nation-state. Its autonomy is now limited by transnational organizations, transnational corporations, and nongovernmental organizations. Likewise, we see that globalization and the social processes it prompted eroded the homogenous, self-determined citizenship identity. There are now grounds for both rights and identities transcending the national form of rights and identities. To be brief, globalization has challenged the authority of national forms as a sole source of citizenship.

Owing to this impure and complex nature of things, we may argue that current developments are far from giving an end to the citizenship paradigm all together. Instead, what is seen is the formation of new modalities of citizenship, including global citizenship.

In this debate, the emergence of a new global citizenship model is crucial to demonstrate the stretching borders of citizenship and the modern nation-state, the recognition of diverse and contradictory identities, new actors and their demands. In a global context, the question who the new citizen is addresses the new actors including immigrants, aboriginal people, ethnic and racial minorities, religious, ecological and sexual identities, gays and lesbians, new professionals, flexible workers, unemployed and even homeless people.

The global citizenship has to do with some new bases of identity construction, and new demands for the extension of rights and participation, which indicate a diversion from national forms. In this conceptualization, we are dealing with a type of political identity which no longer entails a common status shared by all. Global citizenship goes beyond the matter of justice and equality by combining social and political citizenship. Since the citizen as the bearer of rights and duties is found inadequate, global citizenship entails an extension of the existing boundaries of rights. The point is that the sphere of rights does not simply extend to include various groups but allows the mutual constitution of these identities. Citizenship in this conception becomes the common political identity of various contradictory identities.

By following these arguments about forms of global citizenship and identities in the global era, my analysis is connected to the global city where the global flow of ideas, images, commodities, people, capital and labor concentrates. When the globalization is considered as a time-space compression (Harvey, 1998), it also concerns the relation between global and local. Furthermore, during the

globalization process, some rising centers of space, such as global cities, become a concentration node of this transition. Which means, the most crucial consequences of globalization are materialized in global cities. Global cities do not simply refer to a place but to the materialization and reproduction of specific forms. They become the new zones of cultural and social identities. So, they turn into the location for politics and induce the social and personal dimension of place. Since the city is the site of diverse populations and a site in which the 'other' and 'we' are constructed, it becomes the site of new politics of identity. Global city as a place is the site in which ideas, belongings, actions and struggles are constituted. Furthermore, global city as a responsive space of global flow of things engages representatives of new actors, their forms of memberships and claims on rights, since it is the source of identities. This is why global city is seen as a level of analysis for the recognition of possible forms of citizenship in the global context.

In the analysis of the new forms of citizenships, global cities as command and control centers of the global economy are considered to be distinctive social formations. Although each city has particular functions and structural characteristics coming from their history, location and their national, social and economic characters, they nevertheless share some specific economic and social characteristics. As they are key locations in which global economic power and institutions of global capital located, they offer specific economic structure with new forms of division of labor. Work conditions in global cities have more crucial outcomes than seen at the first glance. Global cities which are the command and control centers of global capital are the nodal point for business and management

centers. Increasing concentration of management centers requires both the employment of high-skilled (mostly high-paid) and service-sector (mostly low-paid and temporary) employment. Impacts of economic transition are more effective when combined with the international migration. Global cities become the places for large numbers of immigrants employed in business and service sectors. Therefore, the social structure in global cities is marked by heterogeneity. Multiplicity/diversity in terms of nation, ethnicity, race, culture or income define the socio-political structure in global cities.

Furthermore, what is important in this structure is the emergence of specific dual socio-economic structure. Global cities simultaneously involve both a multinational, well-trained, and a high-paid labor force and a flexible, transient, uncertain, short-term, low-paid labor force. Global cities are thus marked by a set of polarizations and a fractal geography, while it includes the heterogeneity of diverse forms required for new forms of articulation. There is a polarization in social, ethnic, racial or cultural issues although it is mostly characterized by the division of labor. No doubt, the relationship of these two groups of people with the global city is structurally different. New professionals who get greatest opportunity for the personal enhancement and social status are more critical actors to redefine the boundaries of citizenship.

In this scheme, although the global model is seen as economic enforcement, it is more than an economic concept, because it is also characterized by a differentiation in the modes of life-style, cultural forms, social coherence etc. Thus, while the global cities intersect economic, social and political processes, they also

involve the complexity, flexibility and fluidity of contemporary social and economic life. In the end, citizenship forms in the global city indicate the repercussions of the economic, social and cultural transitions to the political environment.

The result of new forms of the mobility of things and new socio-economic conditions is the rise of new sources of identities, new spaces, new groups and classes, claims for new rights, new conflicts for recognition, and new forms of struggle. Since the global city is the site of conflicts for the recognition of identities and the demand of new rights for new actors, it becomes a part of the practice of articulation of political identities and conflicts in demand for their recognition. Because of these new forms, the global city becomes crucial as a site of politics. New identities, groups or classes with their contradictory social practices in the city push for the extension of boundaries of citizenship. The diversity and heterogeneity of actors in the city have put pressure so as to extend the limits of citizenship to a global model. All this indicates that the global cities are the sites for the definition of new modes of citizenship.

However, one huge question remains: how to reconcile diversity, introduced by globalization (of cities), and equality, a *sine quo non* of citizenship? I believe that the future discussion on citizenship, including the global citizenship, will necessarily focus on this question of reconciliation.

REFERENCES

Abercrombie, N., Stephen, H., and Turner, B. S. (1986) *Sovereign Individuals of Capitalism*, London: Allen and Unwin

Adler, D & Rubenstein, K. (2000) "International Citizenship: The Future of Nationality in a Globalized World", *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 7(2): 519-548

Albrow, M. (1996) *The Global Age: State and Society Beyond Modernity*, Stanford: Stanford University Press

Alter, P. (1989) N*ationalism*. London: Arnold

Amin, A. & Thrift, N. (1994) "Living in The Global" in Amin, A. & Thrift, N. (eds) *Globalization, Institutions and regional Developments in Europe*, New York: Oxford University press

Appadurai, A. (1990) "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in Featherstone, M. (eds.) *Global Culture: Nationalism and Modernity*, London: sage Publications

Archibugi, D. & Held, D. (1998) *Re-Imaging Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Aristotle (1992) *The Politics*, London: Penguin

Arnason, J. (1990) "Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7: 207-36

Barbalet, J. M. (1988) *Citizenship: Rights, Struggle and class Inequality*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press

Barbalet, J. M. (1993) "Citizenship, Class Inequality and Resentment" in Turner, B. S. (eds) *Citizenship and Social Theory*, London: Sage

Baum, S. (1997) "Sydney, Australia: A Global City? Testing the Social Polarization Thesis" *Urban Studies*, 34 (11): 1881-1901

Beauregard, A. (1995) "Theorizing The Global –Local Connection" in Knox, P. Taylor, P. (eds) *World Cities in a World System*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Beauregard, A. & Bounds, A. (2000) "Urban Citizenship" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) *Global Democracy and the Global City*, London: Routladge

Beaverstock, J. V., Smith, R. G., Taylor, P. J. (1999) "A Roster of World Cities" *Cities*, 16 (6), 445-458

Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk Society*, London Sage

Beckouche, P. (1997). "Globalization and Economic Change in **Paris**." Paper presented at the Workshop on Global Cities, CUNY Graduate Center. New York at policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/fainstein/ papers/inequality.pdf

Beiner, R. (1995) (eds) *Theorizing Citizenship*, Albany: State University of New York Press

Borja, J. & Castells, M. (1997) *The Local & The Global: Management of Cities in The Information Age*: Earthscan Publication

Bottomore, T. (1992) "Citizenship and Social Class" in Moore, R. (eds) *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto

Brenner, N. (1998) "Global Cities, Glocal States: Global City Formation and State territorial Re-structuring in Contemporary Europe" *Review of International Political Economy*, 5 (1): 1-37

Brenner, N. (1999) "Globalization as Reterritorrialization: The Rescaling of Urban Governance in the European Union" *Urban Studies*, 36 (3): 431-452

Brodie, J. (2000) "Imaging Democratic Urban Citizenship" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) *Global Democracy and the Global City*, London: Routledge

Brubaker, W. R. (1989) "Citizenship and Naturalization: Policies and Politics" in Brubaker, W. R. (eds) *Immigration and Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*, Lanham: University press of America

Brubaker, W. R. (1990) "Immigration, Citizenship and the Nation-State in France and Germany: A Comparative Historical Analysis" *International Sociology*, 5: 379-407

Brubaker, W. R. (1992) *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Castells, M. (1989) *The Informational City*, Oxford: Blackwell

Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of Network Society*, Cambridge: Blackwell

Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000) *Citizenship and Migration*, London: Mcmillan Press

Castles, S. & Godula, K. (1972) "The Function of Labor Immigration in Western European Capitalism" *New Left Review*, 73: 3-21

Castles, S. & Miller, M. J. (1993) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in The Modern World*, New York: Guilford Press

Civicus organization at www.civicus.org

Clark, D. (1996) *Urban World, Global City*, New York : Routledge,

Cohen, L. C. (1999) "Changing Paradigms of Citizenship and the Exclusiveness of the Demos" *International Sociology*, 14 (3): 245-268

Cohen, R. B. (1981) "The New International Division of Labor: Multinational Corporations and Urban Hierarchy" in Dean, M. & Scott, A. J. (eds) *Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society*, New York: Methuen

Connoly, W. E. (1995) *The Ethos of Pluralization*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press

Dagger, R. (2000) "Metropolis Memory and Citizenship" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) Global Democracy and the Global City, London: Routladge

Dahrendorf, R. (1994) "The Changing Quality of Citizenship" Steenbergen, B. V. (1994) (eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication

Delanty, G. (1998) "Review Essays- Dilemmas of Citizenship: Recent Literature on Citizenship and Europe" Citizenship Studies, 2 (2): 353-358

Delanty, G. (2000) *Citizenship in a Global Age*, Buckingham: Open University Press

Dower, N. (2000) "The Idea of Global Citizenship- A Sympathetic Assessment" Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations, 14 (4): 553-568

Edwards, M. & Gaventa, J. (2001) *Global Citizen Action*, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publications

Falk, R. (1994) "The Making of Global Citizenship" in Steenbergen, B. V. (eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publications

Falk, R. (2000) "The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization" Citizenship Studies, 4 (1): 5-17

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

Featherstone, M. (ed.) (1990) Global Culture: Nationalization, Globalization and Modernity. London: Sage

Featherstone, M. (1992) "Postmodernizm and Aesthetization of Everyday Life" in Friedman, J, & Lash, S. (eds) *Modernity and Identity*, London: Blackwell

Featherstone, M. (1995) Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity, London: Sage

Featherstone, M., Lash, S., Robertson, R. (1995) *Global Modernities*, London: Sage Publication

Foweraker, J. & Landman, T. (1997) Citizenship Rights and Social Movements: A Comparative Statistical Analysis, New York: Oxford University Press

Fraser, N & Gordon, L. (1994) "Civil Citizenship Against Social Citizenship?" in Steenbergen, B. V. (eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage

Fraser, N. & Gordon, L. "Contract versus Charity" in Shafir, G. (eds) *The Citizenship Debates*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Fraser, N. & Lecay, N. (1993) The Politics of Community: A Feminist Critique Of The Liberal-Communitarian Debate, Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Friedman, J. (1986) "The World City Hypothesis" Development and Change, 17: 69-84

Friedman, J. (1990) "Being in the World: Globalization and Localization" in Featherstone, M. (eds) *Global Culture: Nationalization, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage

Friedman, J. (1993) "Order and Disorder in Global Systems: A Sketch" Social Research, 60 (2): 205-235

Friedmann, J. (1999) "Transnationalization, Socio-political Disorder and Ethnification as Expression of Declining Global Hegemony" International Political Science Review, 19 (3): 233-250

Friedman, J. & Wolff, G. (1982) "World City Formation: An Agenda for Research and Action" International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 6: 306-344

Garber, J. A. (2000) "The City as a Heroic Public Sphere" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) Global Democracy and the Global City, London: Routladge

Garcia, S. (1996) "Cities and Citizenship" International Journal of Urban and Regional Research , 20: 7-21

Giddens, A. (1990) *Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Giddens, A. (1998) The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy, Cambridge: Polity Press

Globalization and World Cities Study Group and Network at www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc

Global city-Regions Conference: Conference Theme paper and abstracts at http: www. sppsr.ucla.edu

Gouldner, A. W. (1965) Enter Plato, Classical Greece and The Origins of Social Theory, New York: Basic Books

Gunstern, H. V. (1994) "Four Conceptions of Citizenship" Steenbergen, B. V. (1994) (eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication

Gunsteren, H. V. (1998) A Theory of Citizenship: Organizing Plurality in Contemporary Democracies, Colorado: Westview Press

Hall, P. (1995) "Towards a General Urban Theory", in Brotchie, J., Batty, M., Blakely, E. (eds) *Cities in Competition: Productive Sustainable Cities For The 21st Centoo*, Melbourne: Longman

Hall, P. (1996) *The World Cities*, London: Weidafeld & Nicolson

Hall, T. & Hubbard, P. (1996) "The Entrepreneurial City: New Politics", New Urban Geographies in Human Geography, 20: 153-174

Hammar, T. (1985) "Dual citizenship and Political Integration" International Migration Review, 19: 438-450

Hammar, T. (1986) "Citizenship: Membership of a nation and of a State" International Migration, 24: 735-747

Hammar, T. (1989) "State, Nation and Dual Citizenship" in Brubaker, W. R. (eds) *Immigration and The Politics of Citizenship in Europe and North America*, Lenhom: German Marshall Fund and University press of America

Hamnett, C. (1994) "Social Polarization in Global Cities: Theory and Evidence" Urban Studies, 31 (3): 401-424

Hamnett, C. (1996) "Social Polarization, Economic Restructuring and Welfare State Regimes" Urban Studies, 33: 1407-1430

Hannerz, U. (1990) "Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture" in Featherstone, M. (eds) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, London: Sage Publications

Hannerz, U. (1992) Cultural Complexity: Studies in The Social Organization of Meaning, New York: Colombia University Press

Hannerz, U. (1996) Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places (Comedia), London: Routledge

Heater, D. (1990) *Citizenship*, London: Longman

Heater, D. (1996) World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Ideas in The History of Western Political Thought, London: Macmillan

Held, D. (1995) Democracy and the Global Order: From Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance, Cornwall: Polity Press

Hettne, B. (2000) "The Fate of Citizenship in Post-Westphalia" Citizenship Studies, 4 (1): 35-46

Hill, R. C. & Kim, J. W. (2000) "Global Cities and Developmental States: New York, Tokyo and Seoul" Urban Studies, 37(12): 2167-2197

Hindess, B. (1993) "Citizenship in The Modern West" in Turner, B. S. (eds) *Citizenship and Social Theory*, London: Sage

Hirst, P. & Thompson, G. (1996) *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Holston, J. (1999) (eds) *Cities and Citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Holton, R. (1998) *Globalization and the Nation-state*. London: Mcmillan

Imrie, R. (1996) Disability and The City: International Perspectives, New York: St. Martin's Press

Imrie, R. & Pinch, S. (1996) "Identities, Citizenship and Power in Cities" Urban Studies, 33 (8): 1255-1262

Isin, E. F. (1997) "Who is The New Citizen? Towards A Genealogy" Citizenship Studies, 1(1): 115-132

Isin, E. F. (1998)"Governing Toronto Without Government: Neoliberalism and Municipal Government". Studies in Political Economy, Summer: 169-191

Isin, E. F. (1999) "Introduction: Cities and Citizenship an a Global Age" Citizenship Studies, 3 (2): 166-167

Isin, E. F. (2000) "Governing Cities Without Government" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) Global Democracy and the Global City, London: Routledge

Isin, E. F. & Wood, P. K. (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*, Wiltshire: Cromwell Press

Jenson, J. (1993) "De-constructing Dualities: Making Rights Claims in Political Institutions" in Drover, G. & Kerans, P. (eds) *New Approaches to Welfare Theory*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar Publishers

Jessop, B. (1994) "Post-Fordism and the State" in Amin, A. *Post Fordism,* Oxford: Blackwell

Keyder, C. and Öncü, A. (1993) *Istanbul and the Concept of World Cities* Frederich Ebert Foundation: Istanbul

King, A. D. (1999) *Global Cities: post-imperialism and the Internalization of London*, London: Routledge

Knox, P. L. (2002) "World Cities and the Organization of Global Space" in Johnston, R. J., Taylor, P. J., Watts, M. J. (eds) *Geographies of Global Change*, Oxford: Blackwell, 328-338

Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kymlicka, W. & Wayne, N. (1994) "Return of The Citizen: A Survey of recent Work on Citizenship Theory" Ethics, 104 (January): 352-381

Lash, S. & Urry, J. (1994) *Economies of Science and Space*. London: Routledge

Leca, J. (1992) "Questions of Citizenship" in Mouffe, C. (eds) *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*, London: Verso

Lee, S. (2000) "Globalization and the global city: Meeting the Challenges of Twenty-First Century" East Asia: An International Quartetly, 18 (2) : 18-36

Linklater, A. (1998) *The Transformation of Political Community*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Magnusson, W. (1996) The search For Political Space: Globalization, Social Movements and The Urban Political Experience, Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Magnusson, W. (2000) "Politicizing The Global City" in Isin, E. (eds) *Democracy, Citizenship and The Global City*, London: Routledge

Maier, C. S. (1988) (eds) Changing Boundaries of the Political, Essays on the Evolving Balance Between The State and Society, Public and Private, in Europe, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Malik, K. (1996) *The Meaning of Race*, Basingstoke: Macmillan

Marshall, T. H. (1992) *Citizenship and Social Class*, London: Pluto

Massey, D. (1994) "Double Articulation-A Place in The World" in Bammer, A. (eds) *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Melucci, A. (1986) Challenging Codes: Collective Action in The Information Age, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Miller, D. (1995) *On Nationality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Miller, T. (1998) Technologies of Truth: Cultural Citizenship and the Popular Media, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Mittelman, J. (1997) (eds) *Globalization: Critical Perspectives*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner

Mouffe, C. (1992) "Democratic Citizenship and The Political Community" in Mouffe, C. (eds) *Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community*; London: Verso

Newman, O. (1996) Creating Defensible Space, Washington Dc, Department of Housing and Urban Development at http://www.fanniemaefoundation.org/programs/hpd/pdf/hpd_0804_briggs.pdf

Offe, C. (1984) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. London: Hutchinson

Ohmae, K. (1995) The End of The Nation-State: The Rise of Regional Economies, London: Harper Collins

Oldfield, A. (1990) *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and The Modern World*, London: Routledge

Oldfield, A. (1998) "Citizenship and Community: Civic republicanism and The Modern World" in Shafir, G. (eds) *The Citizenship Debates*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Oommen, T. K. (1997) Citizenship, Nationality and Ethnicity: Reconciling Competitive Identities, Cornwall: Polity Press

Pauly, L W. & Reich, S. (1997) "National Structures and Multinational Corporate Behavior: Enduring Differences in the age of Globalization" International Organization, 5 (1): 1-30

Petrella, R. (1995) "A Global Agora vs gated City Regions" New Perspectives Quartetly, 12 (1): 21-23

Pocock, J.G.A. (1995) "The Ideal of Citizenship Since Modern Times" in Beiner, R. (eds) Theorizing Citizenship, New York: State University of New York Press

Pocock, J. G. A. (1998) "The Ideal of Citizenship Since Classical Times" in Shafir, G. (eds) *The Citizenship Debates*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Rawls, J. (1985) "Justice and Fairness: Political not Metaphysical " Philosophy and Public Affairs, 14: 3-29

Rawls, J. (1998) "Justice as Fairness in the Liberal Polity" in Shafir, G. (eds) *The Citizenship Debates*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Ritzer, G. (1993) *The McDonaldization of Society*. London: Sage

Robertson, R. (1990) "Mapping The Global Condition: Globalization as the Central Concept" in Featherstone, M. (eds.) Global Culture: Nationalism and Modernity, London: sage Publications

Robertson, R. (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage Publications

Robertson, R. & Lechner, F. (1985) "Modernization, Globalization and The Problem of Culture in World-systems Theory" Theory, Culture and Society, 16: 363-399

Rocco, R. A. (1996) "Latino Los Angeles: Reforming Boundaries/Borders" in Scott, A. J. & Soja, W. (eds.) The City Los Angeles and urban Theory at the End of Twentieth Century, Berkeley: University of California Press

Roche, M. (1987) "Citizenship, Social Theory and Social Change" Theory and Society, 16: 363-399

Roche, M. (1992) Rethinking Citizenship: Welfare, Ideology and Change in Modern Society, Cambridge: Polity Press

Rose, N. (1996) "The Death of Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government" Economy and Society, 25 (3): 327-356

Rose, N. (2000) "Governing Cities, Governing Citizens" in Isin, E. F. (ed.) *Global Democracy and the Global City*, London: Routledge

Ruppert, E. S. (2000) "Who Governs The Global City" in Isin, E. F. (eds) *Global Democracy and the Global City*, London: Routledge

Sassen,S. (2002) "Locating Cities on Global Circuits" in Sassen, S. (eds) *Global networks, Linked Cities New York*, London: Routledge, 1-36

Sandel, M. (1982) *Liberalism and The Limits of Justice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sandercock, L. (1998) Towards Cosmopolis: Planning For The Multicultural Cities. New York: John Wiley

Santos, S. B. (1998) "Towards a Redistributive Democracy" Politics and Society, 26 (4): 461-510

Sassen, S. (1991) *The Global City*, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Sassen, S. (1993) "Miami: A New Global City" Contemporary Sociology, 22: 471-480

Sassen, S. (1994) *Cities in a World Economy*, Thousand Oaks, Pine Forge

Sassen, S. (1996) "Cities and Communities in the Global Economy" American Behavioral Scientist, 39 (5): 629-639

Sassen, S. (2000)a "The Global City: Strategic Site/New Frontier" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) Global Democracy and the Global City, London: Routladge

Shafir, G. (1998) *The Citizenship Debates*, London: University of Minnesota Press

Skinner, Q. (1992) "On Justice, The Common Good and The Priority of Liberty" in Mouffe, C. (eds) Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community, London: Verso

Smith, M. P. (1998) "The Global City-Whose Social Construct is it Anyway?" Urban Affairs Review, 33 (4): 451-478

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

Soysal, Y. N. (1998) "Toward a Postnational Model of Membership" in Shafir, G. (eds) *The Citizenship Debates*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Soysal, Y. N. (2000) "Citizenship and Identity: Living in Diasporas in Posy-War Europe" Ethnic and Racial Studies, 23 (1): 1-15

Steenbergen, B. V. (1994) (eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication

Steenbergen, B. V. (1994) "Towards a Global Ecological Citizen" in Steenbergen, B. V.(eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication

Stewart, A. (1995) "Two Conceptions of Citizenship" British Journal of Society, 46 (1): 63-79

Susser, I. (1998) "Inequality, Violence and Gender Relations in a Global City: New York, 1986-1996" Identities, 5 (2): 219-248

Taylor, C. (1994) *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Taylor, P. (1995) "World Cities and territorial States: The Rise and Fall of Their Mutuality" in Knox, P. & Taylor, P. (eds) World Cities in a World System, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Taylor, P. J. (1997) "Hierarchical Tendencies Amongst World Cities: A Global Research Proposal" *Cities*, 14(6): 323-332

Taylor, P. J. (1999) "Viewpoint Worlds of Large Cities: Pondering Castells' Space of Flows" *Third World Planning Review*, 21(3): iii-x

Tobiasen, M. (2000) "Global Citizenship-An Analytical Conceptualization" paper presented at European Consortium for Political Research, Copenhagen

Turner, B. S. (1989) "Outline of a Theory of Citizenship" Sociology, 24: 189-217

Turner, B. S. (1994) "Postmodern Culture/Modern Citizens" in Steenbergen, B. V. (eds.) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publications

Turner, B. S. (1997) "Citizenship Studies: A General Theory" Citizenship Studies, 1 (1): 5-18

Turner, B. S. (2000)a "Cosmopolitan Virtue: Loyalty and the City" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) *Global Democracy and the Global City*, London: Routladge

Turner, B. S. (2000)b "Review Essay: Citizenship and Political Globalization" Citizenship Studies, 4 (1): 81-86

Turner, B. S. (ed.) (1993) *Citizenship and Social Theory*, London: Sage Publications

Urry, J. (1998) "Globalization and Citizenship" (draft) published by the Department of Sociology, Lancaster University at http://www.comp.lancester.ac.uk/sociology/soc009ju.html

Urry, J. (1999) "Globalization and Citizenship" *Journal of World-systems Research*, Vol: 2, p: 311-324 at http://csf.colorado.edu/jwsr

Urry, J. (2000) "Global Flows and Global Citizenship" in Isin, E. F. (eds.) Global Democracy and the Global City, London: Routladge

Vertovec, S. (1998) "Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities" International Social Science Journal, 50 (156): 187-200

Walker, R. B. J. (1993) *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, New York: Cambridge University Press

Walker, R B. J. (1997) "Plural Cultures, Contested Territories: A Critique of Kymlika'" Canadian Journal of Political Science, 30 (2)

Wallerstein, I. (1995) *After Liberalism*. New York: New Press

Walzer, M. (1983) *Spheres of Justice*, New York: Basic Books

Walzer, M. (1993) *Thick and Thin: Moral Argument at Home and Abroad*, Nore Dame: University of Notre Dame Press

Walzer, M. (1998) "The Civil Society Argument" in Shafir, G. (eds) *The Citizenship Debates*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Watson, S. & Gibson, K. (1995) (eds) Post-modern Cities and Spaces, Oxford: Blackwell

White, J. W. (1973) *Political Implications of Cityward Migration*, Beverly Hills, Sage Publications

White, J. W. (1982) *Migration in Metropolitan Japan*, Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies

White, J. W. (1998) "Old Wine, Cracked Bottle? Tokyo, Paris, and the Global City Hypothesis" Urban Affairs Review, 33 (4): 451-478

Wilson, R. (1997) (eds) Human Rights, Culture and Context: Anthropological Perspectives. London: Pluto

Wilson, W. J. (1994) "Citizenship and The Inner City Ghetto Poor" Steenbergen, B. V. (1994) (eds) *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage Publication

Wilson, W. J. (1996) When Work Disappears: The World of The New Urban Poor, New York: Knopf

Young, I. M. (1989) "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship" Ethics, 99: 250-74

Young, I. M. (1990) *Justice and Politics of Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Young, I. M. (1995) "Together in Difference: Transforming The Logic of Group Political Conflict" in Kymlickia, W. (eds) *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Young, I. M. (1999) "Residential Segregation and Differentiated Citizenship" Citizenship Studies, 3 (2): 237-252

Yuval-Davis, A. (1997) *Gender and Nation*, London: Sage