

Marisa Borges  
PhD Candidate, FEUC/CES – University of Coimbra  
[marisaborges@ces.uc.pt](mailto:marisaborges@ces.uc.pt)

Prepared for delivery at the SGIR 7<sup>th</sup> Pan-European Conference,  
Stockholm, September 9-11, 2010

(Work in Progress: Please do not quote or cite without permission. Comments are most welcome)

***From national to cosmopolitan: the blueprint of space in citizenship debates.***

*Space has always been a constitutive element of political life. It is a founding element of states, polities and communities and it shapes identities, belongings bounds and relations. In citizenship, the national space has defined the political community of a certain state and a polity of homogenous and equal individuals. Hence, state and space merge in the definition of national citizenship through the dual capacity to include or exclude individuals. However the challenges of globalization, such as the flow of people and the interconnectedness of world affairs have challenged the exclusivity of national citizenship, in terms of belonging, definition and practice. Critical approaches towards this exclusivity have emerged and proposals of other citizenships were conceived. This paper seeks to analyze the role given to space in these different approaches. We aim to unfold the different conceptualizations of space presented and how it has evolved from a physical definition to a hybrid mixture of symbolic and imagined spaces. Specifically, we aim to analyze how space is a blueprint of citizenship studies and how it can contribute to acknowledge plural political existences and demonstrations.*

## ***Introduction***

Space has always been a constitutive element of political life. How we think of space and structure our actions accordingly has been responsible for defining relations, creating practices and identities and drawing borders amongst humans. This physical and political process of bordering is structural to the westphalian system of states and the creation of the national political space has been tied to modern citizenship.

Notwithstanding the role of the state in politics, one must acknowledge that its exclusive status is being daily challenged by phenomena related to globalization. The growing movement of peoples across borders, the global economy and the interconnectedness of world affairs challenged traditional borders and political communities. Hence, not only has the state sovereignty been under revision but also the exclusivity of national citizenship has been criticized and undergone profound transformations. Several contributions echoed broader concerns and positioning in citizenship studies.

This paper seeks to survey these critical contributions and analyze the role given to space in these different approaches. We aim to unfold the different conceptualizations of space that are present or unintentionally created in citizenship debates, reassessing the blueprint of space in citizenship definition and recreation. Accordingly, this paper is structured in three moments. First, we look to the approaches that have crystallized the national space as the space of citizenship and how it has defined citizenship in terms of status and practice. In a second moment we will consider the challenges posed to the national space and its exclusive relation to citizenship, and analyze the contributions that seek to define citizenship according to these challenges. Finally, in a third moment, we will retain the main contributions to reflect upon space-citizenship relation, Our purpose is to understand how citizenship debates have reconfigured the space and its relation to politics in order to enrich and draw attention to further spaces of political action still under-valued in current analysis.

***Space and Citizenship: the national domain***

The question of citizenship is not new or even recent in political theory. Antiquity coined the term in order to define the political nature of (some) individuals and its relation with governance systems. The concept evolved along different processes of bordering and governing spaces until it achieved the status of modern citizenship that came to recognize in the national space the focus of citizenship definition and practices. Although this coincidence has become common sense, it is indeed the result of historical events and reflects broader concerns and developments in political science and theory. Liberalism and civic republicanism have carried the concept in political theory, defining the meaning and purpose of citizenship while emphasizing different dimensions.

Liberalism, and the citizenship it proclaims, is centered upon the individual and the needed guarantees towards the coercive power of the state. Belonging to the state's political community implies recognition of state's political authority and sovereignty but also requests assurances towards them. Citizenship means, then, the pursuit of private goals and interests but under the mediation of the state, i.e., with the protection of individual rights (Heater, 1999: 6-7), guided by the goal of maximizing individual freedom (Schuck, 2002: 132) through the establishment of a universal individual equality. Hence, liberal citizenship becomes a matter of creating rules and recognizing rights in the individual-state relations. The principles of political utility referred in Locke and even in Hegel's writings mark the understanding of state existence and relevance, since they allow individuals to preserve their private life with the status of citizenship despite the acceptance and reproduction of state's political organization (Habermas *apud* McAfee, 2000:94).

Obviously, liberal citizenship is strongly attached to other values of liberal theory, more specifically the values of private property and the role of the market in social life. Accordingly, liberal citizenship grew involved in an apparent tension between the promise of equality in politics and the challenging consequences of the free market (Heater, 1999: 9-11).

T.H.Marshall developed his analysis in the aftermath of World War II, but he evoked an historical perspective to citizenship in order to analyze how citizenship

had solved some contradictions between capitalism and the promise of equality (Marston and Mitchell, 2004: 97; Isin and Wood, 1999: 26-28; Turner, 1993: 6). In *Citizenship and Social Class* (1950), Marshall seeks to explain how two fundamentally contradictory conditions, equal and universal citizenship and class inequalities, had lived together and how, in a moment so delicate as the post-war environment, this tension could be once again mediated. His argument is based upon a tripartite understanding of citizenship rights' evolution, distinguishing the civil, political and social rights and its impact on class inequality (Stewart, 2001: 191). The analysis shows an evolutionary vision towards the rights that came to constitute citizenship: the civil dimension had its first developments in the 17<sup>th</sup> century while the political rights appeared with greater emphasis in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries and the social rights are connected to the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (Turner, 1997: 11). A special emphasis is given to the development of the third category and social inequalities. The development of social rights provided an egalitarian status to citizenship that transcended the traditional status of class and assured an accommodation of the tensions between market and equal citizenship (Marston and Mitchell, 2004: 98; Heater, 1999: 12-13). These rights go beyond a simple notion of welfare rights: social rights assurance goes beyond specific moments of hardship; they are universally attached to individuals through their membership in state's political community (Shafir, 1998: 14).

From a different perspective, John Rawls, in his seminal contribution, *A Theory of Justice* (1971), has tried to recreate liberal theory of rights by denying the simple utilitarian logic of citizenship. Rawls has changed the emphasis of politics to an acceptance of individual diversity. Basically what is stated is that individual rationality does not necessarily induces individuals towards the same understanding of good, and that plural moral conceptions must be acknowledge in the liberal tradition (Shafir, 1998: 6-7). Accordingly, what is proposed by Rawls is a social contract based upon a definition of justice that stresses ethical premises upon which the basic conditions for governing peoples should be based (Buckler, 2002: 187). Invoking a hypothetical original position where individuals are asked

to choose principles of justice to govern society in a non-biased way<sup>1</sup>, Rawls defines two fundamental principles to create a just society: an equal liberty principle, through which basic rights and liberties are guaranteed to all individuals, and a fair equality of opportunities principle combined with the difference assumption<sup>2</sup> (Shafir, 1998:9; Arneson, 2006: 46; Buckler, 2002: 187). For Rawls, society is the primary subject of justice since it contains the basic structures of social life (political system, economic system and family) responsible for people's life prospects (Arneson, 2006: 47). Such a reinvention of social contract assumes that these basic principles are first of all plausible to all individuals and that justice is a shared value that individuals will accept (Arneson, 2006: 48). Since it aims to define basic principles to regulate social interactions amongst autonomous individuals, this social contract based upon justice states a minimal claim about a basic unity of social life, more concerned with what is right than with what is good (Buckler, 2002: 187).

Civic Republicanism<sup>3</sup> has a different view towards citizenship and an opinion regarding the liberal emphasis in the legal dimension. The heritage from Aristotle and its political ideals of civic virtue are present throughout the writings of Enlightenment philosophers and the writings of Rousseau on the topic of social contract. Civic republicanism assumes two fundamental facts: first, civic refers to an engagement of individuals in public affairs and second, there is a system with power sharing mechanisms that prevent arbitrary and autocratic government (Heater, 1999: 44). What is proposed is almost a symbiotic relation between the citizen and the state: citizens can only be free in a republican state and the state's existence depends upon the will of its citizens. Although the form of government is not liquid, the most important is to preserve the republican form of government through the active engagement of individuals in public affairs, considered as a

---

<sup>1</sup> It is assumed that individuals will not favor themselves given the fact that there is no information regarding personal interests.

<sup>2</sup> This difference principle aims to guarantee that social and economic advantages are arranged in the greatest benefit of the least advantage. For Rawls inequalities and differences can only be built upon the individuals different achievements and accordingly the fair equality of opportunities must be ensured for a fair distinction. Hence, the difference logic is a guarantee to the respect of fair equality of opportunities.

<sup>3</sup> In his analysis of the several trajectories of community in political theory, Delanty (2003) includes civic republicanism within the larger connotation of communitarianism. Here we sustain that this approach must be evoked separately in order to address its print in modern citizenship but also in the consideration of the national space.

moral duty towards the republican state and its political community (Heater, 1999: 64). The rule of law is perceived as the ultimate guarantee of individual freedom and self-government: republicans care more about the freedom from domination than the freedom from interference (Pettit *apud* Dagger, 2002: 147). Engagement and rule of law are, then, undeniable conditions for civic republican citizenship taking further a necessary legal dimension of citizenship towards an ethical purpose, a civic virtue that provides an ideal of citizen (Dagger, 2002: 149-150). This basic sense of engagement with political community and the emphasis on citizen participation on governance can be traced in more recent writings. Hannah Arendt clearly subscribed the active citizen image that classic theorists created and believed that this position was compatible with representative government (Delanty, 2003: 82). In fact a number of contributions have re-stated the civic republican idea of citizenship, pressured by the attack of liberal citizenship towards this sense of community (Heater, 1999: 70; Dagger, 2002: 152-153). Sandel argues that the liberal logic of individuals' absolute autonomy fails to recognize an intrinsic relational reality of individuals, responsible for defining loyalties or responsibilities and ultimately responsible for citizens' self-government (Sandel, 1996: 14). Beiner also revives an Aristotelian vision of individuals as political beings, with a necessary civic intervention in political and public life, but distinguishes civic from ethnic identity, hoping to preserve the personal commitment with political community's common good despite personal convictions or aspirations (Beiner, 1995: 14-15).

Both these perspectives have marked the understanding and practice of citizenship in several states throughout the last two centuries. Their differences came somehow manageable when the state was called to define the criteria for citizenship and the rights and duties of its citizenry. Nationalism and nationality criteria were able to recreate the state's political community both as a protective realm of individual liberty but also as a specific space of shared political identities (Heater, 1999: 100). Individuals belonging to a national political community came to be the criteria for defining those who were entitled to citizenship rights and those who were excluded from this status and its benefits.

Hence, it is in the coincidence between state and the national political community that the national space has emerged as the natural political space for citizenship. Citizenship and state are mutually constitutive: citizenship depends on the definition of states and states must institutionalize citizenship. Accordingly, states must be perceived as a specific membership association that defines its jurisdiction through the identification of the citizenry (Brubaker *apud* Stewart, 2001: 188-189). But this delimitation is twofold in its nature: it has this civil membership feature but also needs a geographical clarification that defines the limits of state action. Two features of modern state must be referred here in order to stress the importance of this geographical bordering: sovereignty and state's monopolies. We will not develop here an extended definition of their meaning in political theory, but it is very insightful to relate them with the dual process of bordering abovementioned. First, the principle of state sovereignty, accepted by liberals and civic republicans, creates an apparatus of governance able to impose the rules and guarantee the rights. Secondly, the complex of monopolies vindicated by the state, but mostly the monopoly of the use of force in the rule of law, assures the protection of individuals based upon the principle of equality and universality. Both concepts are crucial in the definition of a political community that accepts these principles and the laws therein defined. But they must be circumscribed in order to define a space of governance, a space of protection and a space of solidarity. Therefore, the external borders of the state define the edges of citizens and state relations (Kratowil *apud* Baubock and Guiraudon, 2009: 443). The national territory is then a functional category of political regrouping around the state, creating a geographical unit of public space (Badie, 2000: 59-60). Thus, the national domain is the space where specific protection of autonomy and protection from domination are assured. More important, the national domain has been the criteria to define those who are part of a political community and its system of protection and those who are not, drawing the line between different political communities and other rules of protection and creating a dual reality of inclusion versus exclusion that significantly marks the question of citizenship.

### ***Rethinking citizenship beyond the national borders: challenges and revisions***

The national domain, and foremost, its exclusivity to define citizenship has been under revision. This progressively intensified questioning happened in political theory but also with the profound mutations in international life. The dynamics of globalization and the complex economic, political and social phenomena brought along have questioned several assumptions of political life and put in motion an irreversible process of reflection and revision that revived the debate around the concept and practices of citizenship. Paradoxically, the concept of citizenship became less clear although its prominence has increased (Heisler, 2005: 667).

Although the scope of this paper does not allow for an extensive debate over globalization and other related events, it is important to consider them in order to understand why and how the national domain of citizenship is being questioned. Hence it is imperative to relate the economic, social and political changes brought by globalization with the pillars of national citizenship: the spatial political community membership, the rights attached to it and the institutions held accountable for them.

The global reach of economic activities and political actions and decisions, international migrations or worldwide communication may appear as common elements of our ordinary life but they have impacted in a decisive way our understanding of citizenship. They have, first, affected the role of state in politics and accordingly its centrality for citizenship. On one hand, faced with the delocalized economy, the growing movement of peoples across borders, the emergence of a global civil society and a human rights rhetoric and the development of global or regional governance arrangements like the European Union (EU), the traditional monopolies of the state and its sovereignty were questioned and necessarily redrawn (Held and McGrew, 2003: 13-14; Klusmeyer, 2001: 2; Linklater, 1996: 82-84; Sorensen, 2006: 210). For citizenship, specifically what was questioned was the exclusive belonging to the national political community and the acceptance of the exclusive national status of citizenship when so many constraints were preventing state's protection in several aspects of rights, when the belonging was becoming such a complex and dynamic process and when

other spaces for protection and participation were emerging. Citizenship studies developed amidst this globalization context, essentially dual in nature and apparently opposed: to a growing global scale of events and relations, and their impacts, matched a fragmentation tendency of spaces and communities (Delanty, 2003: 195).

In the light of such developments and challenges, other perspectives on citizenship studies emerged in order to create a sustained critique towards the common practices of citizenship at the national level. These critiques came to reflect alternatives developed in four fundamental and interrelated axes: first the issue of political community conception; second the range and type of rights; third the agents of protection; and finally the possibilities of representation and participation. Of course, the various contributions that will be referred to do not represent an historical and linear narrative on the evolution of citizenship nor do they represent the abolishment of liberal and civic republican views of citizenship. In fact, all these perspectives have coexisted in a permanent dialogue/discussion throughout the last three decades, at least, and have variations within. What will be presented is a state of the art of an ongoing debate amongst normative and/or analytical proposals<sup>4</sup>.

The communitarian positioning shares some views with civic republicanism. Both consider the legal and individual focus of liberal citizenship overstated. But even though they share some views an important distinction is due. Whereas for civic republicanism the bond that unites the political community is a civic virtue and its engagement and participation in the community, communitarians assume this reasoning but go one step further. It is assumed that the common identities of individuals are shaped within community's norms and conventions that create compelling behaviors. Hence, it is possible to theorize forms of moral consensus that establish authoritative normative principles from the community (Buckler, 2002, 189-190): "Communitarians look to the experience of community for moral

---

<sup>4</sup> Isin and Turner present in the book *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (2002) a structure that divides these proposals in approaches and forms. Janoski and Gran in a chapter of the same book also defend four main approaches, regarding the four main categories of citizenship approaches towards the dimension of rights. Here we do not aim to categorize the contributions but rather to map them, considering the four axes stressed previously.

guidance and promise" (Selznick, 1998: 61). This move "from contract to community" (Dallmayr *apud* Delanty, 2002, 162) assumed explicitly a cultural element in political communities, in a clear statement against Rawls contributions to liberal theory (Delanty, 2003: 75). For communitarian authors, rights in liberalism are too formal and neglect the identity and participation dimensions as the real ties that bind communities, revealing a concept of the self as a social product of pre-existing community (Delanty, 2002: 163). Therefore, citizenship must refute the liberal universalistic premise: it is necessarily the result of a specific community. According to Taylor, the liberal principle of equality must not be obscured with the communitarian difference: he hopes that cultural difference can be accommodated within the state, through the definition of a common good for the majority that respects diversity (Taylor *apud* Delanty, 2002: 164). Nevertheless, the definition of a political community based upon a cultural common good assumed the unity of such community, ignoring the diversity and negotiability of identities and assuming communities as pre-political realities (Buckler, 2002: 190; Isin and Wood, 1999: 8).

Although the question of difference was stressed by communitarians, the concept received much attention and elaboration thereafter, with diverse understandings and political proposals. Feminist writers developed a broad critique of liberal politics and assumptions but the politics of difference was at the center of their arguments (Buckler, 2002: 171). For feminists, some gendered assumptions have perpetuated the historic exclusionary character of citizenship towards women and these exclusionary assumptions can be found in liberal views of citizenship as well on civic and communitarian perspectives. As Pateman stresses, the political exclusion of women and consequentially their struggle for recognition is necessarily derived from their difference (Pateman *apud* Stewart, 2001: 196), meaning the alternative perspectives and needs of women that have traditionally been confined to the private realm of individuals' life (Buckler, 2002: 191). Accordingly, the assumption about political community's unity (being civic virtue and common good for the civic republicans or the cultural unifying bond for communitarians) disregards the difference and becomes oppressive in its politics. Feminists also find somehow oppressive the universalist claim of liberal

citizenship since it masks the structures of domination that in fact preclude the access to citizenship (status and/or practices). Feminists have, then, argued in favor of an engagement of citizenship with the reality of group differences: what is needed is a politics of recognition and difference (Stewart, 2001: 196-197).

This group differencing has in fact received much attention in citizenship studies and in political theory more broadly. Iris Marion Young has matured this idea of group difference in an articulated critique of the liberal citizenship universalistic claim. Young argues that universality has two common understandings: first as generality, defined by opposing what citizens have in common with what differs among them; and second, as equal treatment, referring to the rules and laws that apply to all, despite individual and group differences (Young, 1989: 263-264). Both, however, are in tension with an understanding of the universality as the inclusion and participation for all. The first two perceptions of universality reinforce a double process of exclusion, where the idea of general will exclude those perceived as incapable to adopt this common view and the negligence of the existing differences between groups by the strict use of equal treatment principle perpetuates oppression and disadvantage of the already underprivileged. In order to unequivocally tie universality with inclusion and participation, Young stands for a differentiated citizenship approach, that perceives social groups as a social relations product, necessarily distinguished by their positioning in the fluid power relations, and seeks to assure specific mechanisms to group representation and create special rights that attend their needs (Young, 1989: 264-265; 273).

Kymlicka has also developed an approach that seeks to reconcile the liberal heritage of universal rights with the challenges that ethnic diversity and other identity claims pose to it (Jopke, 2002: 245-246). Regarding some concerns and critiques towards the concept of differentiated citizenship and its impact on the true integrative nature of citizenship, Kymlicka argues that the demands for specific rights is foremost a quest for inclusion in certain political community for most of the groups (Kymlicka, 1995: 169). No state can be perceived as culturally neutral and this recognition forces us to acknowledge that the liberal way of dealing with minority groups and cultures is not fair enough. Special rights must be put in motion in order to recognize and protect these groups within the larger

frame of political community and promote a truly inclusive and cohesive society (Jopke, 2002: 247; Shafir, 1998: 18, Stewart, 2001: 201). The quest for self-government rights are therefore excluded of this inclusion promoting rights, since its purpose is to create a different political community in opposition to the existing one (Kymlicka and Norman *apud* Stewart, 2001: 201). Accordingly, the differentiated citizenship is only perceived in reference to polyethnic rights or special rights of representation, and continues to assume the national domain as the main stage for citizenship and to exclude groups through the societal culture criteria (Isin and Wood, 1999: 9; Jopke, 2002: 248).

The question of differentiated citizenship revolves around an apparent tension between identity and citizenship, mainly with its universal aspirations (Isin and Wood, 1999: 20). Mouffe has developed an approach that seeks to reconcile the principle of differentiation with the definition of universal shared standards and behaviors in the realm of politics, within a frame delimited by radical democracy proposals. Accordingly, Mouffe equates the question of identity and groups formation in a non-essentialist way and demarks herself from the approach of Young and the societal culture of Kymlicka. The social agents are constituted in a necessarily fluid “ensemble of subject positions” (Mouffe, 1993: 77) which creates an identity and processes of identification that can neither be fixed nor given (Lister, 1998: 77). Hence, politics can only exist in this complex ensemble in a mutual constitutive process that Mouffe has identified as agonistic pluralism. In this view it is possible to reconcile a respect for difference but also to create a shared set of values and assumptions, essentially political. What agonistic pluralism introduces is a constant tension between the different groups mediated by the respect of divergent claims and democratic dialogue. The democratic equivalence principle denies citizenship as status: citizenship is a political practice, responsible for the creation of a chain of equivalences able to promote a democratic articulation of groups’ demands (Mouffe, 1996: 96). Therefore, citizenship creates a common political identity through the acceptance of democratic practices and dialogue and individual liberty, despite the different subject positions and the plurality of possible allegiances (Mouffe, 1993: 84). Mouffe imprints a universal dimension to her concept of citizenship based upon

the political agents shared democratic practices and values instead of other pre-given traces of identification (McAfee, 2000: 123).

Cosmopolitanism has been revived in the last decades also focusing on universal practices and common democratic values in the light of recent changes and phenomena. The idea of a world citizen has been a part of citizenship utopian imagination and Kant and its proposal of perpetual peace is perhaps one of the most important references for cosmopolitanism (Isin and Turner, 2002: 8). But the term and its proposal have been revived through the realities attached to globalization. In fact, current approaches are deeply engaged with the human rights international expansion, with global civil society movements and with the compromise with democratic global governance. Most of the defenders of cosmopolitan citizenship are concerned and unsatisfied with the engagement of nation-states with global ethics and rights (Linklater, 2002: 323-324).

David Held structured the case for cosmopolitan democracy with a liberal inspiration. He argues that globalization captures the fundamental changes that are currently shaping the nature of political relations and political communities and accordingly the meaning and place of the democratic political community needs to be re-evaluated (Held, 1999: 93). Assuming the dispersion of effective power, the existence of cross-boundaries communities, the disjuncture in the formal authority of the states and the structures of authority in national and regional levels, the changes in sovereignty and the cross-cutting loyalties and the existence of boundary challenging issues, Held acknowledges the need for a common structure of governance that simultaneously assures a cluster of rights and obligations: "for democratic law to be effective it must be internationalized" (Held, 1995: 232). Thus, the implementation of a cosmopolitan system of governance must be defined as a necessary achievement and citizenship must acquire a plural significance in belonging in order to make possible the access to several forms of political participation (Held, 1999: 100; Held, 1995: 272). A cosmopolitanism that embraces the international quest for democratic international governance is a reconstructed proposal, based upon values and moral assumptions and their possible acceptance but also concerned for the

definition of a community tied by and within its compromise with democracy (Thompson, 1998: 191-194).

Linklater has also developed sympathy for a cosmopolitan approach to citizenship. He departs from Hedley Bull's neo-medievalism thesis in order to characterize the challenges posed to European states' monopolies and sovereignty. For Linklater, one must consider some remarks made by Bull when he describes the system of overlapping authorities in order to understand how the monopolies of states are being affected by global issues and processes and how this will affect the definition of states' political communities (Linklater, 1998: 115-120). Hence, the nature of bonding elements in political have been altered and the perspective of new forms of political community is no longer utopian: it reflects the post-Westphalia complex reality and the emergence of plural concepts of community and citizenship (Linklater, 1998: 120). Linklater supports his approach on critical theory and the necessary relation between transnational democracy and the struggle against modes of exclusion (Linklater, 1998: 121; Linklater, 2007: 45-46). He uses Habermas' concept of dialogic communities in order to defend transnational democracy as the system able to promote dialogue and recognize difference and go beyond the borders of national states (Linklater, 1998: 121-122). Cosmopolitanism, under the guidance of critical theory, becomes then the widening of the political community to those traditionally excluded from the national state delimitation. In this sense, cosmopolitan citizenship can become the expression of global engagement, political and social inclusion and can push further the quest for rights in the international space (Linklater, 2007: 113-119).

Benhabib has tried to develop an approach to cosmopolitanism that envisages the mediation of difference through a kantian morality in law, i.e. "thinking of cosmopolitanism as the emergence of norms that ought to govern relations among individuals in a global civil society" (Benhabib, 2006: 20). Considering the current challenges to state sovereignty, Benhabib stresses the apparent contradictory state of affairs: while in some dimensions state sovereignty is largely eroded by transnational dynamics, it still is vigorously asserted internationally as a valid unit and place of politics. What we are assisting is a disaggregation of sovereignty, of its elements, which necessarily leads to a parallel disaggregation of citizenship: the

domains of citizenship – rights, belonging and identity – are no longer necessarily entangled and dependent of state sovereignty (Benhabib, 2006: 45; Benhabib, 2005: 675). But even though these are “part and parcel” of the same landscape, they have different normative logics. Hence the disaggregation of citizenship and its decoupling of the nation state cluster imply an extension of public autonomy to those individuals who formerly did not possess it (Benhabib, 2005: 676). Citizenship becomes a matter of residency rather than of belonging, which allows for a multiplication of ties to locality, region and to transnational institutions (Benhabib, 2007: 30). What is needed, then, is a connection of the local-national-global through democratic iterations, responsible for a constant redefinition of perceptions and understandings and also for a mediation of universal norms with the will of democratic majorities (Benhabib, 2006: 47-49). Accordingly, citizenship can only emerge as an expression of popular sovereignty and democratic agency within these multiple sites and within a republican federalist project, engaged with human rights and cosmopolitan law and supported (and recreated) by an actively democratic global civil society (Benhabib, 2007: 33).

Beck (2002) has also centered his cosmopolitan argument on the apparent contradictory nature of contemporary world politics. He identifies two periods of political modernity according to the legitimacy source of international politics: the first age of modernity, founded upon states’ sovereignty and international law, and the second age, cosmopolitan and dominated by the human rights rhetoric. For Beck we are currently in the “muddle between old order based on international law and the new order based on human rights” (Beck, 2002: 65). In this second age, plural narratives of modernity are accepted since the traditional narrative, based upon territoriality, collectivity and borders, is being questioned. It is amidst this process of constant redefinition that individuals define their identity and difference: through a process of overlapping identities and conflicts (Beck, 2002: 75). In this sense, the question of democratic cosmopolitan governance remained: how to achieve collective binding decisions in this individualized global scenario? For Beck the socialization of risk is the ultimate element responsible for the viability of the cosmopolitan project. The global socialization of shared risks not only impels to necessary decision-making processes but also has a hidden

community building aspect. Hence the process–concept of “cosmopolitanization” is already in motion if one regards the regulation and impact of certain movements and measures. But this process-concept must be perceived as relational, where the cosmopolitan changes and movements are connected to blockages and resistances triggered by them, in a reflexive analysis. Therefore, cosmopolitanism, as presented by Beck, is foremost an interactive relationship of constant redefinition (Beck, 2002: 81).

The rough draft of citizenship debates presented here reveals common concerns, broad assumptions and different proposals. The contributions above mentioned have been targeted by constant critiques, creating in fact a constant debate around the topic of citizenship. At the centre of this debate, remain the axis we have previously enunciated and the resilience of the national domain of citizenship in current politics. Despite the variety of contributions presented, these perspectives sought to redefine citizenship, attending to fundamental changes and challenges in political reality and to rearticulate the elements of political community, rights, actors and participation. These re-articulations are fundamental to reconsider space and its relation with citizenship.

### ***Reassessing the blueprint of space in citizenship debates***

The national domain has traditionally encapsulated the political space inside the borders of the state. The principle of sovereignty and political community created a symbolic significance to space in citizenship that matched material geographic features: the political space suited the physical delimitation of states as political units. When addressing the ongoing debates surrounding citizenship and the changes that are stressed along, one questions what the condition of space in citizenship is. The debate we roughly portrayed in the previous section of this paper testifies a shared concern with questions of belonging to political communities, the expansion and extension of rights and the existence of different agents of protection and possibilities of representation and participation. These broad concerns and debates propose and unfold in different spaces where citizenship is being built and is being practiced.

The effort to rethink citizenship beyond the national cluster has important implications for the relation between space and citizenship. Soysal departs from guestworkers' experience in European countries to defend a reconfiguration of citizenship in post-national terms (1994). In this post-national citizenship the territorial boundaries of membership in the political community are fluid despite the maintenance of state borders, since there is not an obligatory congruence between territory and membership. This fluidity is sustained through transnational sources of legitimacy that affirm human rights as the criteria for rights rather than nationality (Soysal, 1994: 192-200). This by no means implies the disappearance of the nation-state since the national space remains as the primary reference for rights enforcement and the organization of membership. In fact, Soysal states that this apparent paradox between the parallel existence of a post-national membership and the nation-state reflects the institutionalized duality between human rights and state sovereignty in the global system: "The same global-level processes and institutional frameworks that foster post-national membership also reify the nation-state and its sovereignty" (Soysal, 1994: 206).

Sassen defends a different position concerning the repositioning of citizenship in face of emergent subjects and spaces for politics (2000). For Sassen the globalization and the human rights emphasis have made possible a new discourse of rights that is, together with the widening of the inclusion project, transforming citizenship and its relation with nationality. In fact one must consider that since the globalization affected the territorial and institutional features of the state, citizenship has also changed, although it remains centered in the state (Sassen, 2000: 16). According to Sassen, rather than a single project of post-national citizenship, we can identify two distinct dynamics and trajectories: post-national and denationalization. Sassen develops this approach of denationalization, assuming the change of national as foundational for citizenship and focusing on the "global city" as the strategic site for citizenship transformation in globalization ages (Sassen, 2006: 305-306). For Sassen the global cities are creating new structures of power and also rhetoric and operational openings for those traditionally excluded, creating new possibilities for citizenship practices and identities (Sassen, 2000: 21-22).

Aiwha Ong has also addressed the re-articulations of citizenship in face of globalization and its impact in considering spatial elements. According to Ong, the once tied components of citizenship are becoming disarticulated with each other and articulated with universalizing norms defined by markets, neoliberal values and human rights (Ong, 2006: 500). This re-articulation produces distinctive environments where political claims are made through pre-existing political membership or through universalizing criteria. For Ong the confluence of global processes of territorialization and deterritorialization is responsible for this re-configuration of citizenship, creating assemblages as the site for political mobilizations and claims (Ong, 2006: 500-501). These assemblages are contingent upon the specificity of the re-articulations, creating a heterogeneous political landscape where citizenship claims take place through the universalizing criteria of neoliberal values and human rights. Hence, for Ong “the sites of citizenship are not defined by conventional geography”: multiple assemblages of disparate elements create new political spaces (Ong, 2005: 699).

In fact, it is not a matter of dismissing the national as a space of politics and citizenship: it is foremost the recognition that space must echo the changes posed to citizenship. An overview of citizenship debates and the way space has been conceived, implicit or explicitly, shows plural understandings that follow the reflection and the changes that citizenship has undergone and presents perspectives that go beyond simple geographical determinants without denying it. The questioning of national belonging exclusivity, the assumption and recognition of difference or the acknowledgement of global dynamics with local expressions has marked the citizenship debates but has also contributed to think differently about space and its relation with citizenship.

The relation between citizenship and space has been depicted in terms of scale, moving upwards and downwards the national level (Kofman, 2003: 397). The spatial scale in citizenship was traditionally focused on the national level, following in fact a general trend in political science that commonly assumes the state as the unit of analysis. Notwithstanding the fact that the national scale remains valid, rethinking space in citizenship necessarily pushes us to consider other scales where citizenship is formed and where its practices are unfold. This does not mean

that every contribution stresses a single scale or that they represent a consequential logic of evolution and expansion. In fact, the distinctive spatial feature of citizenship is the overlapping of its scales. The global city of Sassen or the assemblages described by Ong are strong images of this fusion of scales, where the local sphere is connected to global dynamics and movements that ultimately change the national domain. The cosmopolitanism defended by Linklater, with the emphasis on systems of overlapping authorities, also echoes this fusion. Also, the prominence of processes of empowerment and struggles at the local level and the action of social movements across scales also testify how citizenship has been considered across spatial scales and how scale is central to the production and maintenance of citizenship formations: discourses and practices of citizenship can be forged at one specific scale and be effective at another (Marston e Mitchell, 2004: 110; Kofman, 2003: 397).

The overlap of scales in citizenship is deeply connected with the ability to engage and make claims at different spaces, either echoing local struggles at the global level or bringing universal claims to the local domain. This is not only a geographic delimitation but it is also a process of identification, recognition and/or solidarity at different levels that testify the complexity of citizenship construction at different scales. It's a process where the question of belonging or the demand of rights and participation interact with emerging actors at different levels of political life. The European citizenship is perhaps the immediate image that crosses our minds if one seriously considers the multi-scaled nature of citizenship. Although is still a process in motion, it seeks to conceal the national with the regional scale of politics, giving citizens the possibility to move across scales and forging citizenship in reference to other institutions beyond the state. But the relation of human rights regimes and discourses with citizenship is also an interesting element to consider if one focuses on the overlapping nature of scales. Human rights regimes have proved to be crucial to the expansion and extension of citizenship rights, not only through internationally binding compromises translated in citizenship rights in the national domain, but also through its use in political struggles across scales by individuals or groups.

These different and plural latitudes of citizenship present cross cutting elements that must be considered in order to comprehensively grasp the way space defines citizenship and its practices. The question of power and its relation with space and the social-cultural meanings this relation produces are fundamental to consider and recognize the spaces where citizenship is being shaped and practiced. Here we consider power in its possible demonstrations, not only as domination but also as the ability to act, as agency. Space unveils the power relations, the mechanisms of governance of differences but also shapes individuals ability to act. Hence, the type of space depends on how power relations are structured, the positioning of different actors within them and how individuals interact and act amidst that specific scenario.

The effort to map these different political spaces has no exclusive connection with citizenship reformulations. In fact, the categorization of different political spaces has necessarily been an emerging topic in political geography and political science. This mapping process seeks to define a typology based on the existing political institutions (formal versus informal political spaces) or according to their purpose (spaces of participation, for example). The reassessment of space in citizenship provides crucial elements to this process of recognition, pointing to multiple types of spaces. This multiplicity is defined through the relation between existing institutions or actors and the challenges of recognition, protection and participation. The multiple interactions create different spaces where the material geography is bounded with political purposes: the political spaces created by the global city of Sassen and the concept of assemblages developed by Ong show this tendency.

Mapping citizenship has become a complex but necessary mixture of material features with imaginative geographies of actions and relations. The overlapping nature of spaces in citizenship, in terms of scales or types, reflects the complex stage where citizenship finds itself. The persistence of the national and its relation with other features of citizenship has necessarily altered the relation between space and citizenship and contributed to the plural expressions of space in citizenship definition and practice. Moreover, taking into account citizenship debates throughout the mapping and recognition of these somehow new political

spaces creates a unique opportunity to deepen the research focusing on the subject and its ability to act. Addressing the issue of political spaces through citizenship lenses allow us to focus on the way agency is affected by the different political spaces, where the issues of belonging, rights, agents and possibilities of representation and participation unfold.

### ***Conclusion***

Far from the exclusive legitimacy of national political domain, citizenship has imagined spaces according to its own complex changes and challenges. The question of belonging, the different frameworks of rights, the possibilities of participation or the plurality of actors have been fundamental not only to reconsider the evolution of citizenship but also to redraw the maps of recognized political spaces. Additionally, the phenomena associated with globalization reinforced the pressing nature of these elements when reconsidering the spaces where politics happen.

This paper aimed to recognize the contribution of citizenship debates to a broad reflection on spaces where political relations occur. This association has allowed for a growing recognition of different scales and types of spaces where political action and participation can take place. Citizenship did not start these debates around the existence of yet un-recognized political spaces. But what seems clear is that citizenship has evolved through a quiet acceptance of their existence. The fact that those either excluded from citizenship status and politics or unsatisfied with the state of affairs pushed the question to different levels, engaged the debate with a silent process of recognition of plural political spaces, beyond the traditional national domain.

Thus, important clues for further research emerge out of this reflection. The dynamics and possibilities pointed by the current relation of citizenship and spaces impels us to deepen the analysis in order to understand and map the possible combinations of elements that structure individual and group political agency.

**Bibliography**

- Arneson (2006), "Justice after Rawls" in Dryzek, J., Honig, B., & Phillips, A.(eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Badie, Bertrand (2000), *The Imported State: the Westernization of the Political Order*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bauböck, R., & Guiraudon, V. (2009). "Introduction: realignments of citizenship: reassessing rights in the age of plural memberships and multi-level governance." *Citizenship Studies*, 13(5), 439-450.
- Beck, Ulrich (2002), "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology in the Second Age of Modernity" in Vertovec and Cohen (eds), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 61-85;
- Beiner, Ronald (1995) "Why Citizenship constitutes a Theoretical Problem in the Last Decade of the Twentieth Century" in Beiner (ed), *Theorizing Citizenship*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1-28.
- Benhabib, Seyla (2005) "Borders, Boundaries and Citizenship". *Political Science & Politics*, 38(4): 673-677;
- Seyla Benhabib (2006), *Another Cosmopolitanism*. (ed. Robert Post), The Berkeley Tanner Lectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press;
- Benhabib, Seyla (2007), "Twilight of Sovereignty or the Emergence of Cosmopolitan Norms? Rethinking Citizenship in Volatile Times." *Citizenship Studies*. 11(1):19-36;
- Buckler (2002), "Normative Theory" in Marsh and Stoker (eds), *Theory and Methods in Political Science*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2nd edition, 172-194;
- Dagger, Richard (2002), "Republican Citizenship" in Isin and Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE Publications. 145-157;
- Delanty, Gerard (2002) "Communitarianism and Citizenship" in Isin and Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE Publications. 159-174;
- Delanty, Gerard (2003), *Community*. London: Routledge;
- Heater, Derek (1999) *What is Citizenship?* London: Polity Press;
- Heisler (2005), "Introduction – Changing Citizenship Theory and Practice: Comparative Perspectives in a Democratic Framework". *Political Science & Politics*, 38(4): 667-670;
- Held, David (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Held, David (1999) "The Transformation of Political Community: Rethinking Democracy in the Context of Globalization", in Dower and Williams (2002) (eds), *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 92-100;
- Held and MacGrew (2003) "The Great Globalization Debate: An Introduction", in Held and MacGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1-50;
- Isin and Turner (2002) "Citizenship Studies: an Introduction" in Isin and Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Isin and Wood (1999), *Citizenship and Identity*. London: SAGE Publications
- Janoski and Gran (2002), "Political Citizenship: Foundations of Rights", Isin and Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE Publications. 13-52;
- Klusmeyer, Douglas (2001), "Introduction", in Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer (eds), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1-14;
- Kofman (2003), "Rights and Citizenship" in Agnew, John *et al* (eds), *A Companion to Political Geography*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 393-407;
- Kymlicka (1995), "Multicultural Citizenship" in Shafir (ed.) (1998), *The Citizenship Debates: a reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 167-188;
- Linklater, A. (1996). Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2(1), 77-103.
- Linklater, Andrew (1995), "Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian European State." in Held, Köhler & Archibugi (eds), *Re-imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 113- 137;
- Linklater (2002), "Cosmopolitan Citizenship" in Isin and Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE Publications. 317-332;
- Linklater, A. (2007). *Critical Theory and World Politics: Citizenship, Sovereignty and Humanity*. London: Routledge.
- Lister, Ruth (1998), "Citizenship and Difference: Towards a Differentiated Universalism". *European Journal of Social Theory*, 1(1): 71-90
- Marshall, T.H, (1950), "Citizenship and Social Class" in Shafir (ed.) (1998), *The Citizenship Debates: a reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 93-11;
- Marston and Mitchell (2004), "Citizens and the State: Citizenship Formations in Space and Time" in Barnett and Low (eds), *Spaces of Democracy: Geographical Perspectives on Citizenship, Participation and Representation*. London: SAGE Publications, 93-112;
- McAfee, N. (2000). *Habermas, Kristeva and Citizenship*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mouffe, Chantal (1993) *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso;

- Mouffe, Chantal (1996), *O Regresso do Político*. Lisboa: Gradiva.
- Ong (2005) "(Re)Articulations of Citizenship". *Political Science & Politics*, 38(4): 697-699;
- Ong, Aihwa (2006), "Mutations in Citizenship". *Theory, Culture and Society* 23(2-3): 499: 531;
- Rawls, John (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sandel, Michael (1996), *Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press;
- Sassen, S. (2002). "The Repositioning of Citizenship: Emergent Subjects and Spaces for Politics". *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 46, 4-25.
- Sassen, S. (2006). *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schuck, Peter (2002), "Liberal Citizenship" in Isin and Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: SAGE Publications. 131-144;
- Selznick, Philip (1998), "Foundations of Communitarian Liberalism" in Etzioni, Amitai (ed), *The Essential Communitarian Reader*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 3-13;
- Shafir, Gershon (1998), "Introduction: the evolving tradition of citizenship" in G. Shafir (ed) In *The Citizenship Debates: a reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1-28;
- Sorensen, Georg (2006), "The Transformation of the State" in Hay *et al* (eds), *The State: Theories and issues*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 190-208;
- Stewart, Angus (2001), *Theories of Power and Domination: the Politics of Empowerment in Late Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Soysal, Yasemin (1994) in Shafir (ed) (1998), *The Citizenship Debates: a reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,
- Thompson (1998), "Community Identity and World Citizenship" in Held, Köhler & Archibugi (eds), *Re-imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Turner, Brian (1993) "Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship" in Turner, Brian (ed), *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: SAGE Publications. 1-18;
- Turner, Brian (1997), "Citizenship Studies: a General Theory". *Citizenship Studies*, 1(1): 5-18;
- Young, Iris Marion (1989), "Polity and Group Difference: a Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship" in Shafir (ed.) (1998), *The Citizenship Debates: a reader*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp 263-290;