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Introduction
Over the last fifteen years or so, globalisation became a key term in the social sciences. Nevertheless, some important questions still remain open, for instance about its effects on the constitution of political communities and membership, i.e. the question of citizenship. Is it possible to maintain the same concept as in the Westphalian world of sovereign states? Do we face an age of cosmopolitan citizenship (Linklater 1996, 1998) or simply the end of citizenship at all (Soysal 1994)? Or should we rather take a middle route somewhere between revolutionary and no change at all?

All books reviewed in this article claim for the last option. All authors promote a post-national reformulation of citizenship and all see the European Union (EU) as the arena, where this could be first realized. At the same time, all authors face two kinds of problems: they remain rather fuzzy about implicating their suggestions and their concepts inherently demand fundamental changes of identities ranging from abandoning existing identities to adopting new civic virtues. Nevertheless, it will be argued that Gerard Delanty comes closest to an acceptable solution because he does not only deal with globalisation as condition but also with the concept of citizenship in itself and, in addition, he delivers a normative standpoint. Thus, his concept provides orientation and a strategy when confronted with the complex challenges, dynamics and transformations of globalisation.

Globalisation and the demand for a new kind of citizenship
The following part explores the different views on globalisation and why it requires rethinking citizenship.

Regrettably, Richard Münch stays rather silent about the nature and the elements of this extensive transformation neither does he point out in detail which of its features affect citizenship and political community. Instead of delivering a comprehensive account of its
multiple dynamics, globalisation is treated as an unambiguous and obvious given. He sketches a rather simplistic and descriptive account of a crisis of the nation state, which loses its capacity for social integration and is breaking apart into group particularisms along class, ethnic, religious and regional lines (p. 1. At the same time a new transnational regime is emerging that will, at best, guarantee fairness and equality of chances but not welfare for everybody like Western European welfare states. The only chance for Europeans to confront this “world of fiercest competition” (p. 2) is to substitute their weakened states with a stronger EU.¹ Because national identity ensured the social cohesion of nation-states, the creation of a common European identity is seen as the key task.

Altogether, Münch’s account is almost “hyper-globalist” (Held et. al. 1999). According to this perspective, globalisation is inevitably leading towards global convergence, whereby states become weak and unable to protect their citizens against global pressures and therefore, according to the most radical interpretation, ultimately irrelevant. However, Richard Münch cannot present a satisfactory explanation for this emerging transnational regime and why a strengthened and more state-like EU should be the remedy. Unfortunately, this lack of theoretical groundwork affects the whole study thereby hindering a comprehensive approach of citizenship in a global world.

Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson present a more detailed image. Instead of assuming a single linear process causing the end of the state, they start with a catalogue of various ongoing processes: the emergence of a global economy, revolutionary changes in communication technology, the formation of regional economies and markets, the development of supranational institutions and legal norms, a growing significance of human rights and democracy and finally, the emergence of a global commitment to a common set of values (p.4). But the global spread of these trends neither results in a common global consciousness nor does it help

¹Strangely enough, Münch sees this emerging transnational regime at first posing a threat to the European welfare states, while it could evolve into new chances for developing countries.
to level economic, educational or health inequalities. On the contrary, in addition to the gap between industrial countries and the Third World, new scales of inequality emerge within northern societies as their welfare states come under pressure. This simultaneous spread of global trends and new inequalities also fuels a growing alienation between net and Self (Castells 1996) that explains conflicts between particular identities, new nationalisms or “tribalisms”.

Three aspects are especially relevant for citizenship. First, as the central economic dynamics transcend national borders and become uncontrollable for national governments, the autonomy of the nation state is called into question. Second, the ideology of distinct and relatively autonomous national cultures dissolves. Even though Castles and Davidson call the idea of the homogenous nation a myth that never existed in practice, homogenisation and the construction of national identity are at the core of every nationalist project and basic ideas of nation-building and patriotism. As national identities increasingly erode, the world faces the simultaneous spread of global values and the re-ethnisation of culture on sub-national levels. The third aspect constitutes the core of their argument: a rapid and immense growth of human mobility across borders. The world faces large-scale migration of all kinds of groups (e.g. refugees, migrant workers, highly skilled specialists) to all parts of the globe. What is new is not migration itself but its changed dimension in terms of quantities, global range and frequency. Such large numbers of migrants cannot eventually be assimilated into the national population. Moreover, migrants come from increasingly distant areas- geographically as well as culturally: “The colonized Other is returning to the metropoles and becoming part of their populations and societies” (p. 9). This new dimension of global mobility and the permanent presence of collective Others in multi-ethnic societies demands a radical rethinking of citizenship.
Gerard Delanty takes a quite different perspective. For him the need for rethinking citizenship originates in citizenship and globalisation at the same time. Moreover, regarding globalisation he is the only one transcending a descriptive perspective and analysing underlying driving forces.

Discussing different strands of globalisation theory two main dynamics of global transformation can be detected: one political-economical the other socio-cultural. The first is a worldwide expansion of markets and capitalism causing a loss of control of states (Sassen 1992) as well as disorder and new inequalities (Bauman 1998). Overly optimistic (hyper-globalist) appraisals (Ohmae 1990, 1995; Fukuyama 1992) about its integrative nature and a new global order are rejected. The second is rather based on post-modern or post-colonial than economic considerations. Rather than the emergence of a homogenous global culture (Inglehart 1977) socio-cultural globalisation should be seen as two-edged process: even though there are some empirical signs of a global culture, the global age is better described as an age of diversity and fragmentation. The end of the territorial restraining powers of the state releases a vast amount of new forces consequently causing deep fragmentation of meaning and identities. Limits of geography or space are largely overturned and cultures are exposed to each other.

Capitalism and democracy act as the main driving forces but, according to Delanty, have been largely ignored by the sociological globalisation–literature. While the destructive potential of unrestricted capitalism (as economic pursuit of profit) seems obvious, it is argued that even democracy (as rule of the majority) contains a negative potential, especially when it turns into nationalist and exclusionary regimes as in many post-communist countries. These countries are just one example of the erosion of the nation state and of democracies not embedded in civil societies. Citizenship is not only seen as membership in a community but as membership in a civil society that is a legally constituted civic community, which mediates between state and society thereby domesticating capitalism and democracy. Thus, the challenge of the global age
is to prevent the corruption of democracy by exclusionary new nationalisms. In short, the combined threats of rampant capitalism and new nationalism demand for a rethinking of citizenship, especially in a deterritorialised world where Self and Other have to coexist permanently in the same society.

These concerns about the multicultural reality of present societies and about particularism and new nationalism as source of conflict is a common feature of all books reviewed here. They state them as main reasons for rethinking citizenship. Two additional insights about their general ideas of citizenship can be deduced. First, all see culture and identity playing an important role. Any new conception of citizenship has to address the present fragmentation of meaning and identities. And second, this distinguishes them from more universal conceptions of cosmopolitan citizenship (Held 1995, Linklater 1998). The next part will examine their ideas of citizenship and their answers to its global challenge in more detail.

**The different answers**

Generally speaking, citizenship can be defined as the institutionalised relationship between the members of a political community and their polity. It is about rights, duties, access and belonging (Wiener 1998). This remark is necessary because the authors reviewed in this article do not share a common definition of citizenship. Obviously, the proposals for a global citizenship will differ depending on the aspect particularly emphasised.

**Search for new political community and identity**

Richard Münch is more or less exclusively emphasizing the identity-element of citizenship. The best remedy against the crisis of the state is then to create a new socially integrated political entity capable of coping with all the internal and external factors that caused the crisis.
He argues that every idea of the nation and every national identity is linked to a specific “mode of integration” (p. 3) defining how immigrants and Europe should be integrated as well as how a particular country should be integrated into Europe. These specific historical patterns determine the further historical development and institutional change of a specific state. As driving force Münch identifies a general need to construct consistency between ideal and reality. His strategy is then to examine the prospects of a new political community by analysing the historical developments of Great Britain, France, the United States and Germany along his key variables idea of the nation, national identity and mode of integration.

If the EU has to substitute the state, a structural identity change is the crucial precondition. Even though it is uncertain as to how this European identity may look, the conditions of its emergence can be sketched out. Münch does this by formulating eleven theses but most of them may be criticised for being either banal, flawed by globalisation’s assumed finality or, especially in the case of his economic model of identity growth, simply to artificial to be of greater value. In order to examine Münch’s model of a European identity, only the last two are of interest. Thesis 10 and 11 basically state that a European identity will be more abstract and separated from original societies. It will be medialised (thesis 10) insofar as identity will be communicated but not actualised through action. The more communication about European identity exists without any connection to effective action the more it will become a virtual identity (thesis 11). However, these medialised and virtual processes of identity production also contain a pretty high risk of inflationary communication about identity without any reference to actual action. This approach to European identity is unsatisfying because it puts all his stress on identity but at the same time presents an inadequate conception of identity unable to fulfil these requirements. Instead of a promising new approach for a world in transformation, a disappointing top-down approach of imposing a (weak) identity through symbolic politics.
and PR is presented. Given this weak conception of globalisation, identity and citizenship, this project is more than unlikely to succeed.

Moreover, the study as a whole lacks coherence and its case studies suffer from methodological flaws. First, it is questionable as to whether historical developments on a national level can be extrapolated to future developments on a transnational level. Second, it is the question if a future development of a European political community and identity is of the same nature as nation-building processes of the past. In other words, all cases rather demonstrate the reasons for different historical formations; hence presenting them as evidence for ongoing processes of convergence is not convincing.

Nevertheless, the case studies point to one important aspect: introducing membership based on residence is a common strategy of adapting to the new conditions of diversity.

**Liberating the individual through expansion of rights and civic virtues**

While Richard Münch exclusively stresses identity as key element of citizenship, Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson come down a different route. At first sight, their motives are identical: coping with diversity and the erosion of the nation-state. However, they pursue a different goal. For them, citizenship is not only membership in a specific community but a societal process driven by the aim to control a continuously changing societal environment. Conceptually borrowing from T.H. Marshall (1950), Castles and Davidson present a historical image of this dynamic as a steady expansion of rights from ancient Greece until today.\(^2\) In this context, even the challenge of globalisation should be met with a further expansion of rights. While citizenship is by definition seen as all-inclusive and democratic concept, it was its unfortunate connection with the nation that produced what the authors call the “warrior-citizen”. He (typically male, of course) is the result of an enclosed community that seeks to defend itself against ominous Others. Therefore, citizenship always produced exclusion despite

\(^2\) However, it has to be noted that their reconstruction is not very reliable, especially in its picture of the middle ages.
its inclusive and democratic essence. Now, the disconnection of citizenship and nation could facilitate new forms of conviviality. It would first result in more open and democratic states with flexible belonging based on residence instead of nationality and, second, in new forms of democratic participation (on various levels and in various contexts) transcending state borders. Social rights are especially highlighted because substantial citizenship requires a certain status of wealth while poverty leads to de facto exclusion even where formal inclusion is guaranteed.

Unlike Münch, Castles and Davidson do not seek a substitute for the declining national state but assess its crisis as opportunity for further emancipation of the individual. Short, their concept of post-national citizenship is mainly an expansion of rights and a maximum of inclusion.

Even though they propose a concept mainly based on rights, they concede that identities matter, too. Nevertheless, their attitude is rather anti-communitarian and the role of particular identities is rather one to overcome. In fact, a more profound change is necessary. A new model of global citizenship has to be accompanied by new civic virtues: tolerance, mildness, trust and love. Hence, adjustment of citizenship to the conditions of globalisation is not only a legal or political but also an educational project— “…conviviality in an age of difference can come from education to a global citizenship” (p. 223).

While this open society is out of reach in most parts of the world, it is achievable in the EU. Nevertheless, the goal of post-national citizenship, inclusion and democracy should always be treated as global enterprise. In fact, Castles and Davidson see a general potential in other regionally integrated economies and markets like NAFTA or APEC.

**Fragmented citizenship, public spheres and “civic cosmopolitanism”**

Unlike Münch and Castles and Davidson, Gerard Delanty starts with a discussion of citizenship detecting three main theoretical perspectives: a liberal one emphasizing rights and duties, a communitarian one emphasizing participation and identity and finally, critiques of this
liberal-communitarian debate mostly based on feminism or radical democracy. Highlighting this contested and politicised character of citizenship in itself is a major strength of Delanty’s approach.

Because liberal and communitarian conceptions still depend on the state as territorial reference point, the additional perspective of cosmopolitan citizenship beyond the state is introduced as starting point for the analysis of global citizenship. Most forms of cosmopolitanism take on aspects of radical democracy and all share some common ground: all assume the separation of citizenship and nationality and take residence for the only citizenship criteria. While many of them suffer from overestimating new forms of governance and global civil society, it is rather likely that the state will retain its role but it should be modified and complemented with new forms of citizenship. In order to substantiate the claim for the post-national change of the state, Delanty turns to the human rights discourse and its influence on the new context of citizenship.

Some important aspects should be highlighted. First, the human rights discourse has entered the sphere of national legal systems, thereby undermining the sovereignty of the nation state. In the process, the clear distinction between citizenship and human rights is blurred and a legal pluralism in the sense of different overlapping and interpenetrating legal systems emerged. Second, post-modernity and the development of a contextualized, contingent and decentred Self point at the possibility of a multi-layered post-national citizenship. If the Self is no longer seen as uniform but constructed, also human rights lose their universal foundation of natural law and a universal human essence. If the Self and human rights are constructivist projects they are locally differently implemented and demand for the reconciliation of the principles of the right to equality and the right to difference. This aspect leads to a third point, the prospects of universalism. Even though human rights lost their rootedness in natural law and universal humanity, cultural relativism is not the only alternative remaining. Instead, there is still the alternative of a differentiated universalism. If we see cultures as overlapping layers of values
and as contested in many spheres (Connolly 1995) it is still possible to promote social transformation and the expansion of human rights as global normative structure rooted in social consensus.

Together with the portrayal of globalisation as deterritorializing dynamic and the erosion of the nation state mentioned above, these points set the conditions for post-national citizenship.

Having discussed citizenship and its global conditions, what can be said about its post-national rewriting? First, the question of its practical implementation has to be addressed. Again, new forms of political community (based on residence as membership criteria) will most likely emerge in the EU. However, the state will not be substituted because the EU will neither develop a civil society nor a cultural community; it will neither provide the required levels of participation (as claimed by radical democracy) nor social cohesion. As there are no prospects of the EU becoming a real community, a virtual community is proposed. It is important to note that this idea of a virtual community is quite different to Münch’s notion of virtual identity. Borrowing from Habermas, Delanty proposes an institutionalised discourse about identity and constitution of this virtual community located within a European public sphere. The latter is crucial because, while a European civil society is not possible, a public sphere is.

Instead of replacing state citizenship, post-national citizenship should be fragmented in a multi-level system. On the one hand, citizenship is no longer a unitary framework consisting of rights, duties, participation and identity. Instead, these components have become separated from each other and were taken up in other discourses. In the process, there will be different configurations of citizenship corresponding with different levels of governance. While rights and responsibilities will dominate on the European level, participation, belonging and inclusion have to be ensured on national and especially on local levels. The new character of modern cities is particularly highlighted as chance for integration and subsidiarity.
This characterisation of post-national citizenship as fragmented and composed as well as contested and politicised distinguishes Delanty’s approach and is widely ignored by the other studies.

But Delanty’s study does not only analyse the technical requirements of post-national citizenship. Furthermore, it asks about the prospects of cosmopolitanism. While its strong version has to be rejected, this does not mean that communitarian particularism and cultural relativism are the only alternatives available. Instead, Delanty proposes a “self-limiting” or modest version of cosmopolitanism that does not seek to overcome community but seeks a pluralist world of political communities. His “civic cosmopolitanism” incorporates the communitarian critique of universalism as well as the radical democracy critique of communitarianism. Public spheres are central as civic space of public communication and cultural contestation. Civic cosmopolitanism shall work as element of critical reflection within the discourse of national imagery. Delanty characterises it as counter-ideology to nationalism or the attempt to take over the nationalism-discourse. Thus, he formulates not only a conception of post-national citizenship but also an underlying normative perspective that is necessary being confronted with the multiple and complex dynamics, transformations and challenges of our times.

**Conclusions**

After having discussed all these recommendations, it is clear that there is still no definite answer about the future position of citizenship in a global world.

All studies share some common ground: the idea of a post-national reformulation of citizenship, the diverse reality of present societies, the erosion of the nation-state and particularism and new nationalism as sources of conflict. But at the same time, they also share two kinds of problems. First, all studies propose only one concrete practical step: residence as
new citizenship criteria instead of nationality. But they remain rather silent about further necessary conditions and steps. Subsequent essential questions about political responsibility, participation or democratic accountability are not mentioned.

Second, in addition to the practical aspect of basing citizenship on residence, all proposals demand a more foundational change of identities and perspectives. Münch also proposes a strategy how a European identity could be stimulated but fails to convince.

Castles and Davidson call for a whole set of civic virtues and citizenship-education but stay silent about their large-scale realisation. Unfortunately, increased particularism and conflict as reaction to the proposed expansion of citizenship and social rights are not unlikely without these virtues.

Delanty proposes an institutionalised critical discourse and the new perspective of civic cosmopolitanism but no detailed advice how these could be realised. However, even though some questions remain, Delanty’s ideas are the most valuable. The politisised and contested nature of citizenship as well as the critical insights about globalisation’s underlying driving forces represent major strengths of his study. While the conceptions by Münch and Castles and Davidson are mere extensions of political community, Delanty’s concept of a fragmented and multi-layered citizenship also emphasises the role of lower levels and their importance for inclusion, social cohesion and participation. Moreover, his civic cosmopolitanism is less a condition that has to be met in order to guarantee the functioning of a new citizenship-regime but rather a perspective or a normative standpoint. It could be adopted by single individuals or institutional actors and its case could be promoted in different discourses even if “civic cosmopolitanists” are the minority and even in a world facing dramatically increased cultural and religious tensions. In fact, a certain normative perspective constitutes a necessary condition for a reformulation of citizenship and Delanty’s. The discussion above has shown that
citizenship is neither one-dimensional nor a simple analytical term but a political vision that always has to include ideas of the good society. Therefore, citizenship is a historically contingent concept that involves a great portion of normative questions. At the same time, the nature of globalisation does not allow for a simple “technical” solution. Instead, in addition to comprehensive understanding about its characteristics, a comprehensive perspective is necessary that includes normative orientation in a world of multiple and dynamic transformations. While Münch as well as Castles and Davidson leave too many questions unanswered, Gerard Delanty provides a useful starting point for further political as well as academic debate.
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