



Theories of Citizenship: Problems of Membership and Political Boundaries

Rainer Bauböck

Second Term: 8 Jan - 30 Mar, 2007

Thu 11–13 am

In a broad sense citizenship can be defined as a status of equal membership in a self-governing polity, as a bundle of rights and obligations attached to this status, as a shared identity in diverse societies, and as a set of civic virtues and practices that sustain political freedom and self-government. Throughout the seminar we will trace historical lineages of ideas about citizenship. The main focus of the course will, however, be on contemporary problems of differentiated, overlapping and nested memberships in internally diverse and externally interdependent democracies.

11 January: Introduction: Contemporary problems of citizenship theory

The popularity of citizenship as a concept in academic and popular discourse during the 1980s and 1990s has blurred its meaning. In this first unit, we will discuss various dimensions and conceptions of citizenship. The task is to see how these relate to each other and how they are combined in different political theories and ideological stances. We will then discuss how contemporary citizenship debates are related to boundary problems in democratic polities.

reading:

Bauböck, Rainer (2001) *Recombinant Citizenship*, in: Martin Kohli and Alison Woodward (eds.) *Inclusions and Exclusions in European Societies*, Routledge, London: 38-57.

18 January: Republican citizenship and civic virtues:

The republican ideal of citizenship as stated by Aristotle, Machiavelli or Rousseau emphasizes the active involvement of citizens in governing their polity. John Pocock has pointed out that we have inherited from antiquity two contrasting notions of citizenship: a Greek conception that emphasizes the activity of collective self-rule and tends to be ethnically exclusive, and a Roman one that emphasizes legal status and privilege and is expansive. In this unit we will discuss whether this gap can be bridged by contemporary civic republicanism.

reading:

Pocock, J. G. A. (1992) *The Ideal of Citizenship Since Classical Times*, reprinted in Ronald Beiner: *Theorizing Citizenship*, 1995: 29-52.

Kymlicka, Will (2002) *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, second edition, chapter 7: *Citizenship Theory*: 284-326.



25 January: Citizenship dilemmas of the welfare state

In his seminal essay on social citizenship and class, T.H. Marshall argued that civil and political rights have been complemented with social rights as a third dimension of citizenship. Social citizenship is both constraint on, and a legitimation of, class inequality. Critics have objected that social citizenship is a historically contingent achievement and that it creates dependent rather than active citizens. They have also pointed out that Marshall's argument presupposes a homogenous national culture and a closed welfare state. Can social citizenship survive in contexts of heterogenous and deeply divided societies exposed to globalization?

reading:

Marshall, T. H. (1949/1965) *Citizenship and Social Class*, in: *Class, Citizenship, and Social Development*. Essays by T.H. Marshall, Anchor Books, New York: 71-133.

1 February: Citizenship dilemmas of multiculturalism.

Most liberal and republican theorists have distinguished a public sphere in which citizens are free and equal and oriented towards the common good from a realm of civil society where citizens are members of different groups and associations and pursue their particular interests. The ideal of undifferentiated citizenship has been challenged in the 1990s by feminist theorists and by claims that multiculturalism requires public recognition of group differences and specific minority rights. Iris Marion Young and Brian Barry represent these contrasting claims about differentiated citizenship. Chandran Kukathas defends a third libertarian position that argues for radical toleration of diversity but denies that cultural groups have any claims to rights.

reading:

Young, Iris Marion (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy*, Oxford University Press, chapter 3: *Social Difference as a Political Resource*: 81-120.

Barry, Brian (2001) *Culture and Equality*, Polity Press, chapter 2: *The Strategy of Privatization*: 19-62.

Kukathas, Chandran (1997) *Cultural Toleration*, in Will Kymlicka and Ian Shapiro (eds.) *Ethnicity and Group Rights, Nomos XXXIX, Yearbook of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy*, New York University Press, New York and London, 69-104; and response by Michael Walzer: 105-111.

8 February: Freedom of movement and access to membership

Liberal citizenship is internally inclusive but externally bounded. Liberal theories of justice have given different answers to the question whether external closure can be justified. Michael Walzer distinguishes between admission to the territory and admission to membership and suggests that territorial borders must remain at least potentially closed in order to keep the boundaries of membership open for newcomers. Joseph Carens argues against this view that from a perspective of global justice closed borders for immigration turn liberal citizenship into the equivalent of a feudal privilege. We will discuss in this unit how the controversy over the legitimacy of immigration control relates to norms of self-government and citizenship inclusion.

reading:

Walzer, Michael (1983) *Spheres of Justice. A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*, Basic Books, New York, chapter 2: *Membership*.

Carens, Joseph (1992) "Migration and Morality: A Liberal Egalitarian Perspective" in Brian Barry and Robert Goodin, eds., *Free Movement* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf): 25-47.



22 February: Migration and transnational citizenship

In the early 1990s some authors (e.g. Yasemin Soysal, Saskia Sassen, David Jacobson) argued that citizenship is increasingly devalued and replaced by postnational forms of membership and rights that include resident aliens. Against this view, Christian Joppke, Patrick Weil and others have demonstrated that international convergence with regard to alien rights and access to citizenship is still primarily driven by domestic institutional and normative developments in liberal states. In this debate, I have proposed that liberal responses to migration in sending and receiving states lead to transnational (rather than postnational) modes of citizenship, which are characterized by overlapping memberships in distinct polities. I have also suggested a criterion of stakeholderhood for addressing the normative problem how to allocate citizenship in migration contexts.

reading:

Bosniak, Linda (2000) "Universal Citizenship and the Problem of Alienage", *Northwestern University Law Review*, vol. 94, no. 3: 963-982.

Bauböck, Rainer (2003) "Towards a Political Theory of Migrant Transnationalism", *International Migration Review*, vol. 37, No. 3, 2003: 700-723.

1 March: Federalism and multilevel citizenship

Most theories regard citizenship as unitary membership in a polity that is itself a sovereign member of the international state system. Yet, historically, citizenship has often been attached to membership in smaller political communities embedded in larger entities. The American Revolution has created a new model of nested citizenship with simultaneous membership in autonomous constituent units and in a federal union. For James Madison, federalism provided a remedy against the tyranny of factions. Yet already John Calhoun called for a revised conception of federalism with concurrent majority rule. Alfred Stepan has recently argued that American federalism is in many ways exceptional and should not be regarded as a normative model for other societies. We will discuss three dimensions along which federal arrangements can be distinguished: constituent unit autonomy, federal power-sharing, and multilevel citizenship.

reading:

Elazar, Daniel J. (1987) *Exploring Federalism*, The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa and London: 1 – 38.

Stepan, Alfred (1999) 'Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the U.S. Model', *Journal of Democracy*, vol. 10, No. 4, October 1999: 19-34.

8 March: Plurinational citizenship

Plurinational states are characterized by the co-presence of competing nation-building projects within the same political territory. While cultural, ethnic and religious diversity generate demands for differentiated citizenship, plurinational constellations lead to contestations about the internal or external boundaries of the polity itself. Do plurinational states have a claim to territorial integrity when faced with demands for secession? Do national minorities have a claim to territorial or cultural autonomy? Should conflicts be resolved through promoting integration (by strengthening cross-cutting cleavages), through consociational power-sharing (by promoting elite cooperation) or through federal devolution?



reading:

- Kymlicka, Will (2001) *Politics in the Vernacular*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, chapter 5: Minority Nationalism and Multination Federalism, p. 91-119.
- Lijphart, Arend (1995) Multiethnic Democracy, in: Seymour Martin Lipset (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Democracy*, vol. II, Routledge, London, p. 853-865.

15 March: Supranational EU citizenship

As an attempt to create a supranational polity composed of independent states, the European Union is federal arrangement *sui generis*. Union citizenship has been described as either an innovative postnational membership or as a mere appendix to the nationality of the member states. After reviewing briefly the classic debate between Grimm, Habermas and Weiler about the nature of EU citizenship, we will discuss how political integration creates a new set of differentiated citizenship statuses and rights, and whether the current hierarchy, in which Union citizenship is derived from member state nationality is sustainable and normatively defensible in a more deeply integrated Union.

reading:

- Weiler, Joseph H. H. (1999) "To be a European Citizen. Eros and Civilization", in: *The Constitution of Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK: 324-357.
- Bauböck, Rainer (2007) "Why European Citizenship. Normative Approaches to Supranational Union", *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, forthcoming.

22 March: Cosmopolitan citizenship

In the Stoic tradition, cosmopolitanism was a moral outlook that did not require building global political institutions of government and citizenship. Since the Enlightenment political theorists have, however, debated whether the growing global interdependency of human societies calls not merely for universal rights but also for democratically accountable political authority at the global level. In this final unit, we will discuss whether a nested conception of citizenship should be extended to the global level.

reading:

- Nagel, Thomas (2005) 'The Problem of Global Justice', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, vol. 33, no.2: 113-147
- Benhabib, Seyla (2004) "On hospitality: rereading Kant's cosmopolitan right", in: *The Rights of Others*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK: 25-48.
- Archibugi, Daniele (1998) "Principles of Cosmopolitan Democracy", in: Daniele Archibugi, David Held and Martin Köhler (eds.) *Re-imagining Political Community. Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy*, Polity Press, London.