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Abstract

The liberal notion of citizenship as the right to vote and belong as a legal member of a community is analyzed from an anthropological perspective. Increased global interconnectedness has enabled populations to migrate between various nation-states. The notion of citizenship has become ever more blurred with globalization and different methods of including and excluding people from political and cultural participation within a nation-state have emerged. The objective of this thesis is to explore the different dimensions of anthropological knowledge and theorization on, among others, the notion of belonging, the nation, the community and the inclusion and exclusion of citizens as linked to the concept of citizenship. Through reviewing a number of these factors from an anthropological perspective, the notion of liberal citizenship is re-examined.

Útdráttur

Acknowledgements

I take this opportunity to express gratitude to James Gordon Rice, the instructor of this thesis. I am thankful and indebted to him for sharing expertise and provide me with sincere and valuable guidance through the course of this project and for inspiring me to extend my anthropological knowledge for the past 2 years. I am also grateful for the invaluable support, understanding and encouragement the people surrounding me have provided me with for the past months. I express my sincere thankfulness to Valgerður L. Sigurðardóttir, Hafliði Ásgeirsson and Hafsteinn Þórðarson for proofreading this thesis and providing suggestions for improvement of the contents. Lastly, I express my appreciation to the professors, assistant professors, lecturers and other employees of the department of Anthropology at the University of Iceland for their generosity in sharing knowledge and for the opportunity to make the past three years’ journey an indispensable part of my future.
Table of contents

Abstract ............................................................................................................................................. 3
Útdráttur ......................................................................................................................................... 3
Acknowledgements ...................................................................................................................... 4
Introduction .................................................................................................................................. 6
1.0 Early influences on the development of anthropology of citizenship ...................................... 9
2.0 Political membership and the notion of belonging .................................................................. 11
   2.1 The nation, the state and the community ............................................................................. 11
   2.2 Globalization, migration, transnationalism and citizenship ............................................... 15
3.0 Anthropological theorization of citizenship .......................................................................... 20
   3.1 National citizenship ............................................................................................................. 20
   3.2 Bio-political citizenship ..................................................................................................... 23
   3.3 Cultural citizenship ........................................................................................................... 25
      3.3.1 Flexible citizenship .................................................................................................. 28
   3.4 European citizenship ......................................................................................................... 30
   3.5 Refugees, asylum seekers and statelessness ...................................................................... 33
4.0 Conclusion and discussion ...................................................................................................... 35
Bibliography ..................................................................................................................................... 37
Introduction

Varied conceptions of citizenship interlink diverse political and non-political debates, both within the academy and among the public. Such discussions take place within local communities, global organizations, city councils’, governments, social movements, and the academy among others (Lazar, 2013). The general notion of citizenship through legal definitions is based on political rights and duties with a respect for the sovereignty of the nation-state (Vincent, 2002). Such rights and duties include the right to vote in national elections, candidacy for official positions within the state, equality among those who hold the same citizenship, full membership to the community and a political belonging within a state (Lazar, 2013). Anthropologists have become increasingly engaged in the academic debate on citizenship, emphasizing the importance of looking beyond the political explanation of citizenship as merely a legal status, rights and membership within a community (Lukose, 2005). Citizenship within the anthropological framework extends the vision towards an understanding of the cultural and social forces (Kipnis, 2004), which, inevitably, become entangled in the complex world of globalization and interconnectedness (Appadurai, 2002).

The different dimensions of citizenship are becoming articulated with contemporary universal norms marked by global economy, neoliberalism, the decline of the nation-state, transnationalism, human rights activism and increased mobilization of human populations (Holston and Appadurai, 1999). In recent years the world has witnessed rapid changes in regard to mobility, and increased numbers of expatriates, migrant workers, and refugees pose questions to the traditional understanding of citizenship (Ong, 2006). The claims of rights and benefits through membership of and belonging to a nation-state have prompted new avenues of inquiry for anthropologists and one focus has shifted towards the limitations embedded in the political definitions of citizenship which do not encompass the existing diversity in the contemporary context (Lazar, 2013). The gap between those who can partake in this global process and those who cannot is growing (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002), and difference and inequality is constantly being constructed and reconstructed. Through highlighting citizenship in order to engage this debate is not to suggest that there are no other ways or factors which contribute important understandings of the structural inequalities in the contemporary world (Kipnis, 2004). Rather the purpose of this thesis is to
show the different approaches anthropologists have undertaken in order to explain the complexities of citizenship and how their scholarship can contribute to a deeper understanding of the phenomena. Further, the relationship of the individual with the state is need to be re-examined in order to understand how various factors and practices construct the diverse and complex dimensions of political belonging.

The thesis is divided into four chapters. The opening is directed towards the intellectual history of academic understandings of citizenship. The notion of citizenship is historically deep in Europe and many approaches have emerged within disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, and political science. The works highlighted in chapter number one are fundamental in order to understand how anthropologists of citizenship have been influenced and how they situate themselves and their theories towards this subject.

The second chapter is divided into two sections. In the first section anthropological conceptions of the state, centralized government and sovereignty are highlighted in order to bring forward the construction of structural conceptions of citizenship and how the legal frameworks work as a tool to include or exclude people from the territory. Conceptions of the nation and nationality will follow in order to create a base for further arguments concerning national citizenship. The conjunction of these two concepts within the framework of the nation-state will be discussed in order to highlight the way nation-states have attempted to create a shared identity among its citizens which supersedes all other identities. Lastly, attention is drawn to Ernest Gellner’s theory of nationalism and Benedict Anderson’s pioneering interpretation of imagined communities, which has influenced many of the anthropologists noted in chapter three. In the second section of this chapter, the aim is to demonstrate how globalization has affected the notion of citizenship from an anthropological perspective by highlighting factors such as immigration, deterritorialization, the detachment of communities, transnationalism, and global flows. The notion of global citizenship is important in order to lay the groundwork for further discussions in chapter three.

The third chapter of this thesis, which is divided into five sections, brings in scholarship from a wide range of anthropologists. The first section concerns the theorization of national citizenship and how nation-states have attempted to maintain a homogeneous identity among citizens through various institutions, including how they have dealt with increased emigration and immigration. The second section is devoted to bio-citizenship and
how anthropologists have highlighted the body in order to understand how various physical identities affect people’s belonging within a community and access to citizenship. The third section is assigned to cultural citizenship. This section highlights the works of Renato Rosaldo and Aihwa Ong who were among the first anthropologists to engage in the field of the anthropology of citizenship. A subsection concerning cultural citizenship is devoted to Aihwa Ong’s influential notion of flexible citizenship. The fourth section draws upon anthropological scholarship on European citizenship. The reason for drawing special attention to this geographical area is due to the uniqueness of the creation of this type of citizenship which extends across a number of nation-states, constructing a notion of supranational citizenship. The final focus is directed at displaced populations, refugees, asylum seekers and statelessness.

The thesis will conclude with a discussion on how anthropologists can engage in the debate of citizenship in the contemporary context.
1.0 Early influences on the development of anthropology of citizenship

The anthropology of citizenship developed out of political anthropology, but the concept of citizenship has a much longer history within the academy (Lazar, 2013). Early references in the European context may be traced back to Aristotle, who famously stated that the man is, in its pure nature, a political animal. In his political philosophy, *The Politics*, Aristotle concluded that all men long for an association which resulted in the creation of states. Men work the best under law and justice in order to control natural instincts and encourage full development of human capabilities. Citizens, in his analysis, consisted of a relatively small proportion of the community, mainly men entitled to participate in judicial and deliberative office. The state, on the other hand, consisted of a small chosen group of persons considered ‘large’ enough to be able to secure citizens a self-sufficient life conditions (Aristotle, 2013[1962]). The origins of the state therefore lie in the amalgamation of towns to larger units which eventually formed states, as anthropologist Donald Kurtz reflects upon. He also credits Aristotle for possibly being the first to raise awareness of the importance of the state for human beings (Kurtz, 2001).

The 17th and 18th-century philosophers John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau have also had considerable influence on the conceptions of citizenship (Lazar, 2013). John Locke considered the rights associated with the status of citizenship, or membership within the community, to permit individuals to pursue good life and obtain equality, as long as they would not obstruct others on the same path. The role of the state was to guarantee the equality among citizens, in return for participation in the state institutions and by paying taxes (Locke, 2013[1988]). From Locke’s times, the notion of liberal citizenship has been associated with his theory, relating to the individual’s pursuit for equality (Lazar, 2013). Following in Locke’s footsteps, Jean-Jacques Rousseau considered the relationship among citizens and with the state to be a *social contract*, based on mutual understanding and united powers which in the end created a strong unit able to overcome any resistance from the outside or the inside. Rousseau placed individual agency to the forefront by claiming that every man was free. Holding a status of citizenship was thus a choice of an individual, who entered the relationship with the state on his own merits. By entering the *social contract* a man loses his natural liberty as he cannot do absolutely everything he might want to do due
to a respect of the contract, but he gains civil liberty and legal right of property and participation within the state (Rousseau, 2013[1762]).

The intellectual history of academic understanding of citizenship provides an important insight into how anthropologists situate themselves theoretically in research on citizenship with regard to political theory (Lazar, 2013). One of the most common starting points for anthropologists is T. H. Marshall’s sociological theory and definition on citizenship, which was put forward in 1950 (Lazar, 2013; Lazar and Nujiten, 2013; Ong, 1996; Nic Craith, 2004, Rose and Novas, 2005). Marshall’s theorization proposes fundamental questions about the official definitions of citizenship within the legal framework of liberal ideas. He proposes a threefold division of citizenship in order to grasp the aspects which contribute to social inequality within the society: civil, political and social. The civil part encompasses the individual’s rights to freedom, liberty, property ownership and to justice. The political part of citizenship refers to the right to exercise the political powers which citizenship entails, such as voting and participation in political affairs. The social part includes a wide range of rights such as economic welfare, security, education and the right to live according to ‘civilized’ standards of the society (Marshall, 2013[1950]). Marshall moves the emphasis on citizenship as a legal status to a broader image which claims that there is more to it than political membership (Lazar, 2013).

The liberal notion of citizenship, which has been presented above, is a common conception of political belonging in the West in modern times. The liberal citizenship is often equated with citizenship, which is fundamental reasons why anthropologists have engaged in the debates of citizenship within the academy (Lazar, 2013). Further on in this thesis, the various methods and approaches anthropologists use in order to deconstruct the liberal notion of citizenship will be discussed in-depth.
2.0 Political membership and the notion of belonging

In this chapter, fundamental values which influence anthropological theorization on citizenship will be the highlight. In the first section, attention is drawn to the state, the nation, the nation-state and the idea about belonging within a community through a legal membership. In the second section, the focus is moved to globalization, deterritorialization, migration and transnationalism and how these forces call for a reevaluation of the notion of citizenship as a political membership within a ‘community’.

2.1 The nation, the state and the community

The state has been studied and theorized by several early anthropologists and other scholars (Wright, 1994), and it has represented a topic of interest through nearly all paradigms of political anthropology (Kurtz, 2001). The existing data on the process is voluminous and complex (Cohen, 1993), and several different theoretical approaches have been put forward by anthropologists and other scholars to explain the emergence of the state as it is perceived in modern times (Wright, 1994). The ‘state’, or states as it is perhaps more suitable to speak of it in the plural as it has always been the nature of state-society, began to evolve over 5000 years ago. Throughout time, the concept and function of states have developed into a political structure encircled by complex power relations. Factors such as conquests, colonial expansions, redefinition of territorial and cultural boundaries, emigration and immigration have contributed to shaping, defining and redefining the state and its roles (Toland, 1993).

The state constitutes institutions which are concerned with enforcements of order within the community (Gellner, 1983:4), but in general, it can be said that the state is in its nature a politically autonomous unit ruled by a privileged group of people. In order for this group of people to survive and take care of their own interests, it was, and is, necessary to maintain the system of authority and rule over those who do not belong to their group. The charter of moral rights has thus legitimated the dominant group’s cultural right and its power over the people belonging to the state. In the light of that, it can be viewed that the social, economic and political structure of the state is thus created by this group’s ideas of who obtains membership to the state, who is included and who is excluded (Toland, 1993). The state is thus a sovereign system of centralized government which is bound to a
particular territory and governs over processes, routines and daily activities of citizens, creating and legitimating certain social order and discipline (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002).

The existence of the centralized state is generally taken for granted by people in modern times, but at the same time, it is possible to see its contingency and imagine a social gathering or situation without the state’s involvement or presence (Gellner, 1983:5-6). The nation, on the other hand, in its most simple form is understood as a unity of people with shared origins, history, culture, language and identity within territorial boundaries. The nation stretches over the geographical land and is controlled by the state of that particular location (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002). The people of that particular nation are beholders of the ‘nationality’ which define the people who belong within the boundaries of the territory. From the perspective of philosophical anthropology, having nationality is as crucial to the ‘being’ of a man as it is to have a body, and the assumption that every man has, and is entitled to have, a nationality has long been taken for granted (Gellner, 1964:150-151).

Being a national within a community indicates a membership, which is presented in modern times as citizenship. The link between nationality and citizenship has been, since the eighteenth century, the meaning of full membership, political rights and access to institutions of the state within the nation and the community (Holston and Appadurai, 1999). An individual’s possession of citizenship is reflected in the virtue of a passport, or another identification document, or in the rights to obtain such a document from the relevant state institution of a nation. By holding this national identity an individual is legally a member of the community, the nation and the culture. The individual thus belongs within the nation by holding this status and is a subject of the state (Gellner, 1964:156).

When the words ‘nation’ and ‘state’ are put together we designate a polity as a nation-state and we make the supposition that this phenomenon includes people with a shared national identity who contribute to the routines and discourses within the territorial boundaries of the state. This model assumes that people can only hold citizenship of one state and identify themselves with one nation (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002). There is no clear cut reference point at which time states started transforming and developing into so-called nation-states (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2003), though most frequently it is linked to the 1900s when Western European centralized and bureaucratic states came under the rule of solidary national communities of sovereignty (Nugent, 2007). The anthropologists Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, in their paper Methodological nationalism and
beyond: Nation-state building, migration, and the social sciences (2003), divide this development into phases in accordance with major global and historical transformations, corresponding with conceptions of citizenship. They identify the period between 1870 until the end of the First World War as the beginning of the formation of nation. During this period in Europe and the United States, large railroads were being built and taken into use, allowing development in marketing and distribution of agricultural and manufactured goods. Before unknown diverse corporations, patterns of investment and financing emerged and signaled the beginning of globalization; this will be discussed in-depth further on in this thesis. Focus within nation-states shifted more towards legal equality of citizens, public education and health and emphasis were put on teaching young people rituals and knowledge. Voting rights were extended in many states to a broader group of men than earlier. In short, as Wimmer and Glick-Schiller put it, a nation and a sovereign and national citizenship were being formed. This same time was an epoché of the capitalist and industrial upswing but at the same time a new period of colonialism, followed by mass-migration of laborers from all over the world to the Western societies. The era between the First and Second World Wars reflected an enhanced focus on citizenship as legal membership became crucial for people in order to travel between nation-states and immigration regulations were revised in order to limit foreigners in the country. The distinction between members of the community and those who were excluded, legal residents and illegal trespassers, was seen as essential in order to construct a homogeneous national sentiment and culture. Following the Second World War, patriotism and civic education promoted the idea that each individual should belong to only one nation-state, behold a citizenship from that state and adjust to the national identity and culture of the political community of that territory (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2003). What nation-states have attempted to do is to create a shared identity among its citizens which supersedes and coordinates other identities a person might hold, such as gender, religion, ethnicity and so forth. Citizenship, in that context and perspective, is meant to undermine the local hierarchies of the community to the advantage of national jurisdictions and constitutional relations based on equality of rights among citizens (Holston and Appadurai, 1999).

One of the most influential scholars who has raised critical questions about the nation, the state, nationalism and the sense of belonging within a community is Benedict Anderson. In his famous book, Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread
of nationalism, Anderson (2006[1983]) proposes that the nation is an imagined political community, both as a constitutionally limited and sovereign unit. The universal notion that everyone should be able to acquire, and should have a nationality, has been taken as a fundamental part of our existence, but it can be seen as an imagined phenomena since members of the same nation, independent of its size, will never know everyone else who holds the same nationality even though the status binds them together through this imagined factor and constitutes a feeling of belonging to the national group. The nation is conceived as a limited entity because it has boundaries and is not conceived as coterminal with mankind. It does not involve all human beings, rather includes and excludes individuals based up on factors valued by each of these ‘nations’ or moreover the state authority of this imagined unit. Lastly, the community which the nation is identified with conceives the nation as the horizontal and deep camaraderie in spite of the existing inequalities and exploitations (Anderson, 2006[1983]). Anderson links the rise of capitalism, or more namely print-capitalism, as one of the most important factors in the rise of nationalism and the spread of ideas about different nations and national identities among the population. Up until the nineteenth century, the majority of people in the world could not read nor write. Following capitalism, mass-oriented newspapers emerged and literacy increased among people throughout different social classes of the community. The print-capitalism, through the media, brought images of communities to the public, images which were unprecedented. Through these images, people began to imagine diverse types of communities and nations which were previously unknown to them. Along with increased literacy, mass migration had a significant effect on the development of nationalism (Anderson, 2002[1992]).

Nationalism is a complex term, but can be defined as “a set of beliefs and practices that link together the people of a nation and its territory” (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002:356). Nationalistic views hold that nation and state were designed and made for each other as without the relationship either one would be incomplete (Gellner, 1983). Central to nationalism is the thought that a nation is entitled to its own territory and state which supervises the citizens who claim the territory as their homeland (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002). Anderson claims that nationalism is what has created nations and proposes that we should expand our vision beyond thinking of nations per se, and focus on the cultural systems which precede these imagined communities (Anderson, 1983). The social sciences have been dependent on the images of distinctive spaces of nations and societies and
viewed as a natural division of the world. In modern times, these notions have been challenged as nation-states are increasingly stretching over the ‘natural’ borders assigned to them through the imaginary division (Gupta and Ferguson, 2002), and populations migrate between borders of nation-states (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002). Concepts such as ‘deterritorialization’ (Glick-Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton, 1992), transnationalism (Kearny, 1995; Verdery, 1998), globalization (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002; Appadurai, 2000; 2002) and long-distance nationalism (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002) have emerged in order to grasp the changes which are happening at global scale.

Glick-Schiller and Fouron’s concept of long-distance nationalism overlaps the global changes and how both nation-states and citizens seek to maintain national identities and connections with the homeland independent of their legal citizenship. The long-distance nationalism binds together immigrants and the people in the homeland through national bonds, creating a trans-border citizenry. By highlighting a common national identity, those who migrate away from the homeland still maintain a relationship and claims to the original nation-state. Through these relationships, the imagined territorial unit of the nation-state is blurred as its sovereign power stretches over all boundaries through the citizen which seeks those relations (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002). The deep forces at work in this process and development—economic, social and cultural—are in many ways beyond the control or governance of single nation-states (Anderson 2002[1992]). To an increasing extent, nation-states experience more difficulties in managing the homogeneity of the national identity which its citizens are intended to bear (Appadurai, 2002).

2.2 Globalization, migration, transnationalism and citizenship

Scholars, both anthropologists and within other disciplines, have placed a great emphasis on studying the recent increase of global flows (Appadurai, 2000) and interconnectedness (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002). The current part of the world history, which has been accelerating since the 1970s, is one of globalization (Friedman, 2002). The term of globalization became widely acknowledged among scholars in the late 1980s and continues to captivate their attention (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002). Though global interconnectedness is not recent, as argued by Eric Wolf (1982), recent events such as the fall of the Berlin Wall, the fall of South Africa’s apartheid regime, the introduction of the internet and mobile phones and increased
communication and access between people in different parts of the world, began to influence the creation of a global moral community (Eriksen, 2015). This relatively new notion of an interactive global system has called for academic theorization from different angles in order to grasp the escalating social changes it entails (Thomas and Clarke, 2013). Anthropology provides an important aspect on how globalization can be understood, and among the most noteworthy leading representative within the discipline is Arjun Appadurai. In order to comprehend this manifold phenomena he puts forward a framework of five ‘scapes’, covering the diverse flows of global movements. Ethnoscapes, he theorizes, covers the movement of people, such as tourists, immigrants and refugees, who travel over the ever shifting world. The second one, Mediascapes, refers to the ways information and knowledge travels between geographical spaces through media, newspapers, television, internet and other multimedia. If it were not for the third factor, Technoscape, the information would not flow between people as easily. The technoscape encompasses a complex relationship of economic flow, politics and labor which permits a fluid of both mechanical and informational technology. The fourth scape Appadurai identifies is the Finanscape, which refers to flow of capital, currency, national and international stock exchanges, or in other words, high-speed flow of money throughout the world. The last factor of globalization he identifies is movement of images and ideologies, Ideoscape. This last scape is perhaps the most relevant to the further discussion, but it refers to ideologies of movements, the state and is explicitly oriented at encapsulate state power (Appadurai, 2002[1996])

These scapes described above are descriptive of deterritorialization and displacement and have strong relations with the role of the nation-state in the modern culture of global economy. Mediascapes are utilized by nation-states to placate separatists to protect their own interest by using taxonomic control over diversity, and displaying international and domestic differences. At the same time, most states are pressured by the media, technology and travelling goods and people through this global flow due to the economic advantages of consumerism which benefits from these flows (Appadurai, 2002[1996]). This creates certain complexities for nation-states, which have historically functioned as culturally homogeneous and territorially restricted political spaces. Due to global forces it is becoming harder, or even impossible, for nation-states to produce a national subject and territory defined by cultural heritage and consistent loyalty to the local government (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002),
and the role of each nation or nation-state in the global cultural flow is limited (Hannerz, 2002). One of the main problems globalization entails is this tension between cultural homogenization and heterogenization (Appadurai, 2002[1996]). Nation-state’s difficulties or inabilitys to impose ‘national culture’ onto migrants and incapability to construct a monolithic community has resulted in the fact that most Western nation-states have become hosts of diverse cultures and heterogeneity. The centeredness of Western cultures has been called into questions by scholars, who wonder what it now means to be English, French, German and so forth. Western countries, which have opened up to immigration and provided citizenship to people of different ethnic backgrounds, struggle to maintain the claims about the integrity of a national culture, identity and language in a globalized world (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002).

The existing literature on globalization deals with factors such as detachment of communities, politics and identities from local places, or in other words, deterritorialization. One of the concepts which is particularly important in relation to citizenship in modern times is transnationalism. Overlapping globalization, transnationalism is a term that refers migration and calls attention to political and cultural projects and processes within the nation-state as well as the global society (Kearny, 1995). Immigrants tend to develop and maintain familial, economic, social, religious and political relations with their home country, or other nations to which they have ties, creating a bond between the country of residence and their country of origin (Glick-Schiller, Basch and Blanc-Szanton, 1992). These connections create transnational spaces and increased global interconnectedness (Verdery, 1998). Globalization and changes in the global environment, such as migration, are undercutting states over the world (Dawson, 1999) and the notion of citizenship based on ideas of political rights and participation in a sovereign state has called for reevaluation due to rapid changes on a global scale (Ong, 2002). People who speak more than one language, belong to more than one geographical places, have more than one identity connected to the nation of origin and belong to more than a single political community are the people who have challenged the mainstream notion of citizenship (Hall, 1995) and are representative of the different ways of how the sense of belonging or being a member of a society has developed in a the era of fast flows and global interconnections (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002). Long distance migration is not new in the history of the human species, though it has increased tremendously in the past decades. In the year 2002, an estimated 100 million
people resided outside of their country of original citizenship (Lewellen, 2002), and in 2015
the number has more than doubled according to the United Nations, which claims that over
240 million people are currently living elsewhere than they were born (United Nations,
2015).

The thoughts on citizenship as the entitlement of certain rights within a nation-state
have increasingly been criticized by anthropologists as the fundamental values of citizenship
have become challenged (Ong, 2006). The presupposition that citizenship connects an
individual to a unitary cultural and national identity is thus challenged with transnational
flows (Kearny, 1995) since geographical, or national, limitations of the political conception of
citizenship do not account for the “global assemblage” (Ong and Collier, 2005). According to
the anthropologist Katherine Verdery these global dimensions are challenging the very
notion of citizenship from Marshall’s definition, from being a membership of a nation-state,
and is shifting over to being a postnational concept based on deterritorialized principles. At
the same time, citizenship is fundamental in further understanding the notion of belonging
within a community or a nation-state, and can be used as a way to define who is included in
the society and who are excluded (Verdery, 1998). Transnational migrants who remain active
within their nation of residence, and even achieve a legal citizenship within the host country,
do not necessarily sever their connections with their countries of birth. The identity of the
transnational migrant is thus not influenced by a single nation or culture (Lewellen,
2002:151), which proposes the question of what the notion of citizenship means from the
point of view of belonging to a nation. Citizenship incorporates citizens as subjects of the
nation-state and by that distinguishes between those who those who belong to the society,
and those who do not (Verdery, 1998). Thus, as Aihwa Ong claims, postcolonial transnational
subjects evoke the question of what it means to belong to more than one nation, and calls
for reevaluation of the ties between citizenship and a single nation-state, or even an

Since globalization reached its current heights, nations and their citizens have been
framed with new challenges of national identity, culture and citizenship. Questions have
emerged about how nations define themselves, how they are defined by the international
community, and how a national and cultural identities are created and maintained.
However, these identities are drawn from cultures of the majority and minority groups are
often unable to identify themselves to the nationalized picture (Nic Craith, 2004). The
coercive practices of nation-states are designed to establish a homogeneous national community. By and large this mission has been quite successful in recent history, both in nationalizing people who are born within the state as well as incorporating migrants and settlers within these boundaries. However, in the light of recent increase of global interactions and movement, nation-states function more and more as transit stations where migrants pass through or stop for short time at once. The system of nationalizing people within the state and maintaining certain national culture thus becomes more difficult than before (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002).
3.0 Anthropological theorization of citizenship

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the diverse anthropological approaches to the notion of citizenship. To begin with, attention is directed towards the idea of national citizenship and the way in which nation-states have maintained the integrity of national identity in era of globalization. Second, the diverse factors of exclusion and inclusion within a community through biopolitical citizenship are analyzed via the literature. The third section draws upon anthropological concerns with the cultural perspective of citizenship. A specific subchapter is devoted to Aihwa Ong’s theorization on flexible citizenship in the light of neoliberal forces on a global scale and how it results in increased mobility for some groups, while decreasing participation among others. The fourth section is devoted to European citizenship which encompasses citizenships of a number of nation-states, creating (or attempting to create) a sense of supranational citizenship. Finally, in the fifth section, the focus will shift to questions of statelessness and how anthropologists have theorized about those who either maintain citizenship in a politically unstable nation-state or do not hold membership within any nation-state at all.

3.1 National citizenship

Scholars have raised questions about the notion of national belonging and membership, such as how this process works, what it is that creates emotions towards a nation, and how these values are reproduced and sustained within nation-states (Benei, 2008). A mutual agreement between states and citizens of a national identity is portrayed through the various state institutions such as schools and national media (Kipnis, 2004). Social and cultural scientist Toby Miller (2007) asks how is the idea of national belonging created and maintained by the nation-state, and how national citizenship affects minority groups. These questions are relevant and will be answered in the following chapter.

The world is most frequently viewed as a collection of ‘countries’, each holding its proper name and territorial space. Divided by different colors, the world map outlines each country and gives the viewer an idea of a national society associated with each land space. Each country is the embodiment of its own culture and society, and most often this division is taken for granted as the way our world is. This conventional world map is part of
education systems all over the world and children are taught about different nation-states promoting the ideology that America is where Americans live, England is where the English live, France is where the French live and so on (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002). Nation-states make considerable effort to manage social differences within the community. Democratic ideas promote promises such as equality among citizens and justice on behalf of the state (Holston, 2008), while the nation-states requires citizens to adopt the national identity, speak the national language, participate in political affairs of the state and fulfill the duties required in order to obtain the citizenship of the nation such as paying taxes (Rose and Novas, 2005), participating in military service (Lazar, 2013), and jury duty (Holston and Appadurai, 1999).

Educational systems in nation-states often serve as an important factor in creating certain types of citizens and educating them in national history, language, political and economic system and culture. Numerous anthropologists have raised questions concerning the roles of schools within nation-states and asked how they shape nationhood, and create emotions among inhabitants toward the nation and pride of their nationality. It is not uncommon that students are assembled in their schools every day to sing the national anthem of the country. In fact this is a widespread tradition in different nation-states through the world (Benei, 2008; Lukose, 2005; Lazar, 2013). Véronique Benei, in her ethnographic work in India, encountered this tradition in all schools she visited during her time on the field. In fact the same sort of routine was performed among diverse schools. Children, led by a teacher, would start by singing the national anthem, holding their hands out horizontally as if they were pledging in court and later on bodily movements or gymnastics were done in the rhythm of the song. Benei considers these actions an incorporation of national sentiment, creating a patriotic sentiments among children (Benei, 2008). In most Western democratic nation-states in 1960s and 1970s, a major goal of citizenship education existed, where the aim was to create a dominant mainstream culture which was shared by all groups in the society (Banks, 2008). In fact, national schools have long been the center of development of national identity and civic commitment, along with being the main institutions within a nation-state in creating citizens. Even though the virtues promoted vary between nation-states such as different languages, history and emotional dispositions, in most cases they have the same goal: to educate citizens with the particular moral, political and economic characteristics valued by the state (Lazar, 2013).
Citizenship education takes place in other arenas than schools, such as local voluntary organizations, political participation, language classes and education for immigrants, which we will return to later on in this thesis. One institution is perhaps more noteworthy at this stage, military service, which has served as one of the central institutions for citizen education and construction in nation-states all over the world. Historically, military service has been one of the main responsibilities of citizens and often the key to inclusion and the right of citizenship. At the same time, it has been a way of exclusion, in particular a systematic way of depriving women of full citizenship as in most cases their access to this institution has been restricted (Lazar, 2013; Benei, 2008). On the whole though, as pointed out by several scholars, the demand of citizens to participate in military service often builds up patriotic emotions towards the nation-state. Citizens, willingly or unwillingly, devote their life to the protection of the nation-state, which in turn often provides the citizen with a 'good' citizenship, a certain status and pride within the community (Maman, Ben-Ari and Rosenhek, 2001:3-5;110).

Central to the nationalization of identity which is promoted through the values of citizenship is the idea of the nation as a neutral framework and a community. This national community is seen as the foundation which constitutes common good among citizens. It requires citizens to perceive themselves as a part of the community, sufficiently similar to other citizens who hold the same membership. It requires active participation in the state's institutions and in return citizens obtain rights within the nation-state. This view of liberal citizenship is under strain as the gaps of economic and social inequalities have been growing at tremendous speed for the past few decades (Holston and Appadurai, 1999). In quite a few Western democracies in modern times, nation-states are placing a great emphasis on strengthening a sense of belonging and assimilation to the 'cultural' or 'national' identity as an attempt to control the increased diversity within the society due to mass-migration into the areas (Kymlicka, 2011), as diversity can be seen as a threat to the sovereignty (Rosaldo, 1994b). Managing the diversity and difference present within the territories of multicultural nations is becoming one of the greatest challenges of the nation-state (Suárez-Orozco and Qin-Hillard, 2004) and many states have tried to protect themselves by eroding senses of nationhood among immigrants in the country by restricting several rights such as minority languages, traditions, religions and identity (Kymlicka, 2011).
3.2 Bio-political citizenship

The social and cultural aspect of the human body has been central in many anthropological researches for the past decades (Lock, 1993). Within the field of anthropology of citizenship the notion of the ‘normalized’ body has been central (Rabinow, 2005), and the way culturally and socially constructed images of bodies create hierarchies within a society (Lock, 1993; Thomas and Clarke, 2013) and creates various forms of exclusion based upon physical factors (Thomas and Clarke, 2013; Kipnis, 2004; Inda, 2002). Michel Foucault’s definition of bio-power has influenced a broad range of anthropologists to consider how body politics are embedded in the notion of citizenship (Inda, 2002; Lock, 1993; Rabinow, 2005; Ong, 2003; 2005), and has had a deep-rooted effects on anthropological research and theorization of the body (Lock, 1993). Foucault through his writings on bio-power claims that with the rise of capitalism in the eighteenth century, states required control of citizen’s bodies in order to be capable of optimizing forces and development and claim power to govern over the people residing within the territory (Rabinow, 2005). The many state institutions, such as schools, the military force, hospitals and other units, regularized certain types of bodies, resulting in a ‘normalization’ of the ideal body within the community. Foucault’s bio-power thus means, in the most literal sense, to have power over bodies through subjugation and control over populations (Lock and Nguyen, 2010). The normalization of a certain type of a social body plays the key role in a systematic classification of people in modern society (Rabinow, 2005). Subjection of the body in modern states, viewed through bio-political citizenship, is thus a method to marginalize groups of people through discursive politics of the national and social body, resulting in exclusion of people who possess physical identities which fall outside the frame of the normalized body (Inda, 2002).

The liberalist meaning, and understanding of a ‘citizen’ as a member of a nation-state who is entitled to legal and political rights within the community on equal basis to other people holding the same membership, becomes more complicated in praxis than it looks at first glance. Citizenship does not provide the same treatment and the possibility to claim the same rights for everyone holding the legal status and various forms of exclusion can be detected through the lens of bio-sociality (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002; Rabinow, 2005). The desire of cosmopolitanism followed by global flows and increased migration has in fact turned to the opposite, and anthropologists have focused on unmasking the deep structural
inequalities which have emerged through nationalism, racism and xenophobia (Thomas and Clarke, 2013).

American citizenship has been in the forefront in anthropological research on biocitizenship through race and ethnicity. The debates about citizenship in the United States have revolved around the historical slave trade, racial differences and mass-immigration to the country (Isin and Turner, 2007). Anthropologist Aihwa Ong claims that racial logic has always been present in the United States of America. Shaped by the historic encounters, groups of immigrants from different ethnic backgrounds have faced nationalism built on racialized ideology, placing people of ‘color’ in a lower rank than the culturally constructed Anglo-Saxon, Christian and white identity which has been embraced in the United States as the most ‘deserving’ group of people, in their search for sense of belonging within the community (Ong, 2003). The social construction and reproduction of racialized dominance, following the colonialism and slavery trade, has called for anthropological studies on ‘whiteness’, as John Hartigan phrases it. The notion of ‘white culture’ has been consistent in the Western part of the world through the longtime of Western governance and hegemony over the rest of the globe. The incorporation of ‘white’ identity has established an image of this race, carefully situating those individuals who belong to the group on top of the hierarchical system. At the same time people of other ‘color’ or ‘race’ are socially and culturally defined in contrast to the ‘white’ group as “the Others” (Hartigan, 2000).

Migrants of color who enter the United States have faced subordination, independent of their class background or legal citizenship. In many cases, even though immigrants achieve full legal citizenship within the United States, they are still seen as foreigners, but not as equally deserving citizens in a political and economic sense (Basch, Glick-Schiller and Szanton-Blanc, 2006[1994]), as often they are not considered to be full members of the nation or the community due to the fact that they hold both biological and cultural identities different from the embraced national identity (Glick-Schiller and Fouron, 2002). The social body of the majority group, therefore, becomes the unit against which all newcomers are measured and valued. By viewing American citizenship through bio-political rationality, the various forms of exclusion in the community through discursive construction of ‘normalization’ is exposed (Inda, 2002).

The construction of racialized ideas challenges notions of ‘common humanity’ and reduces the social and cultural to the biological by differentiating among people by their
physical appearance, as anthropologist Didier Fassin notes. In his research on French citizenship, Fassin claims that nationality is no longer the factor against foreigners or immigrants area measured, but rather racial and physical identities. Racialization, he claims, is a reality in French society and the fundamental value is the construction of ‘otherness’ opposing the dominant bio-political body. Discrimination and exclusion in the community is not directed in general against foreigners, but rather against people who are considered illegitimate members of the nation-state, based on skin color, religion or even foreign-sounding name, independent of their legal status, citizenship or nationality (Fassin, 2001).

The various factors of identity, such as race, gender, class, disability, ethnicity, sexuality and many more, intersect in various ways, but at the same time share enough logic while viewed through bio-political citizenship in order to justify a common definition of majority and hegemonic identity proposed by the nation-state through various institutions. The prevailing identity within a community thus creates cultural norms and standards in the society through which members are assessed and valued whether they are full members of the community or excluded from participation in certain fields within the nation-state. The utopian vision of a nation which provides liberal citizenship based up on equal rights and opportunities to all people, independent of the various factors of identity such as race, gender, class, sexuality, religion and physical or intellectual ability is thus muddier than what is generally noted (Kipnis, 2004).

3.3 Cultural citizenship

As discussed previously, the legal and political understanding of citizenship is widely recognized as the result of relationship between the state and its citizens. However, as Delgado-Moreira, (1997), Renato Rosaldo, (1994a; 1994b; 2000) and Aihwa Ong (1996; 2006) point out, the longstanding anthropological concern and interest in the phenomena of culture can provide a different perspective and understanding of citizenship. Historically, citizenship has been viewed as a political concept emphasizing the political relationship between the state and an individual. Early sociological theorization often ignored or neglected the cultural aspect of citizenship (Nic Craith, 2004) and rather focused on legal-political aspect, sovereignty and solidarity in a nation-state (Ong, 1996). However, as anthropologists and other social scientists have pointed out, citizenship is, and has always
been, a cultural phenomenon. The cultural aspect can be traced as far back as to the Ottoman Empire in the 13th century, where citizenship and cultural rights were offered to non-Muslims in the society, but denied them political rights (Miller, 2007). In the eyes of anthropologists, citizenship is not less cultural than it is political, legal and economic, as it is an active force within a society that operates in a communal context. Therefore it cannot be viewed solely as a relationship between the state and an individual. The concept of culture in anthropology is typically used in reference of communal activities and ways people of think and talk about collective identities (Nic Craith, 2004). Culture has been one of the defining notions of anthropology, and scholars within the discipline have long emphasized the importance of the anthropological perspective towards a deeper understanding of this manifold and complex concept (Grillo, 2003; Hannerz, 1999). Culture is a process, a shared negotiated system of meanings existing within a society, diffusing nearly every aspect of people’s lives (Lassiter, 2002:44-46). It stretches over all fields of studies within anthropology as culture is an essential feature of humanity (Durrenberger and Erem, 2010) and one of the most important factor in defining the human species from others (Grillo, 2003).

The cultural perspective of citizenship is fundamental for the anthropological conception of this manifold political, economic and cultural phenomena of modern nation-states (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002). Among the first anthropologists who devoted their powers to further understanding of cultural citizenship is Renato Rosaldo, who in his pioneering articles Cultural citizenship and educational democracy (1994a) and Cultural citizenship in San José, California (1994b), outlined the results of his ethnographic work on citizenship among Latinos and other people of color in California, United States of America. During his fieldwork he came to see how the aforementioned groups of people were systematically excluded, subordinated and how they struggled for their political and cultural sense of belonging in the society. Rosaldo’s cultural citizenship, in his own words, “refers to the right to be different (in terms of race, ethnicity, or native language) with respect to the norms of the dominant national community, without compromising one’s right to belong, in the sense of participating in the nation-state’s democratic processes” (Rosaldo, 1994b:57). Thus in contrast to exclusion and subordination, cultural citizenship offers people the possibility to demand legal, political and economic rights of dignity, respect, freedom, well-being and of
belonging within the community. He concludes that the meaning of the concept refers to subordinated communities and people who struggle to achieve full access to the society. The cultural citizenship is thus, in Rosaldo’s hypothesis, a political membership of marginalized people who fight for their sense of belonging within the society through conversation, neighborhoods, churches, activist groups, and other social gatherings (Rosaldo, 1994b).

Rosaldo’s theorization of cultural citizenship is influenced by Stuart Hall’s and David Held’s (1989) article on the matter. They argue that citizenship has emerged as a political and intellectual issue for the dual political system of left and right. Hall and Held assert that the political and economic globalization and the weakening effects it has on the nation-state has created complex politics of citizenship, entailing different definitions of the concept among people with divergent political views. In their proposition the right-winged politics, deriving from Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom, Ronald Reagan and George Bush in the United States, viewed citizenship as the duty and responsibility of an individual. Citizens are encouraged to participate in charity work, philanthropy and individual self-help. The right oriented politics generally do not ask questions about equality and justice within the community, nor about the diversity and inclusion of various groups of people within the community. In contrast, Hall and Held propose, the left-winged politics tend to focus on inclusion and belonging, asking fundamental questions of what these concepts mean in their particular society. Hall and Held emphasized the importance of “politics of citizenship” and the inclusion of marginalized groups of people in the discussion of political and civil rights as citizens in a nation-state (Hall and Held, 1989). Developing the argument further, Rosaldo draws up on Paul Gilroy’s division of first-class citizens and second-class citizens in his theorization. Second-class citizens are generally people who are of other ethnic origin than the majority of the population, non-native speakers and/or of different religion than the official state religion (Rosaldo, 1994a; 1994b). In short, the second-class citizenship has emerged due to the fact that increasing numbers of people in the society, citizens, feel like they do not belong in the community. Numbers of factors such as ethnic origins, language, gender, sexuality and physical or intellectual ability contribute to the feeling of not belonging, creating cultural dimensions among the citizens who do not fulfill the requirements of the dominant first-class citizenship in cultural sense (Miller, 2007).

Inevitably, the idea of a first-class citizens has strong ties to local culture of the dominant group of people in the society (Delgado-Moreira, 1997), as discussed in the
previous chapter on national and bio-political citizenship. The anthropologist Aihwa Ong experienced these dimensions of citizenship when she migrated from her birth country of Malaysia to the United States to seek secondary education in anthropology. As a foreign student, a non-citizen, she was not eligible for loans nor for most fellowships or jobs either. She experienced herself at a disadvantage towards the system in cultural and political sense (Ong, 1996). Her own experience influenced and shaped her later on theorization on citizenship, mainly focused at the cultural part of the phenomena (Ong, 1996; 2002; 2003; 2006). For Ong, the concept of cultural citizenship has a broader and deeper meaning than expressed by Renato Rosaldo. She claims that earlier propositions on the matter have been unilateral focusing solely on unequal relationships and statuses of citizens within a nation-state. According to Ong, it gives the idea that minority groups, immigrants and other marginalized groups within the society are able to avoid regulations and cultural inscription on behalf of the state. Ong proposes a different understanding of the concept of cultural citizenship, supporting her arguments with Foucault’s theorization on ‘govermentality’. Cultural citizenship refers to a process of self-making and being-made between the citizen and the state in existing webs of power-relations (Ong, 1996; 2005). The cultural citizenship is thus, in this context, a reference to cultural practices produced out of negotiations between the hegemonic forms of the state and ambivalent relations which found a criteria of belonging. Ong emphasizes the importance of including historical context in modern research on citizenship, such as European imperialism, Western colonialism and African slavery. The origins of Western ideology of human grouping based on biological factors, resulting in status hierarchies, are the foundation of diverse forms of discrimination in modern Western nation-state’s democracies (Ong, 1996).

3.3.1 Flexible citizenship

Aihwa Ong’s criticism of the aforementioned cultural citizenship is backed up with her innovative theorization on flexible citizenship (Ong, 1996; 1999), which stretches the anthropological perspective beyond the political membership in a community (Ong, 1996). Emphasizing the importance of taking existing power relations into account, Ong claims that previous anthropological approaches, especially Appadurai’s approach, have given misleading impressions that all people have the same opportunities and equal
advantages in the global world (Ong, 1999). The line between having and not having a citizenship is becoming blurred due to ‘deterritorialization’, neoliberal values and capitalism (1996), and access to participation in the global flow is limited for people who do not have the economic capital to participate. Ong, influenced by Michael Foucault, uses the term ‘flexible citizenship’ in order to encapsulate these dimensions and theorize about mobile, and non-mobile subjects in the world. ‘Governmentality’, by Michel Foucault’s notion, “maintains that regimes of truth and power produce disciplinary effects that condition our sense of self and our everyday practices (Ong, 1999:6)”. Following this notion, Ong focuses on the way governments shape family relations, economic enterprises and transnational relations in a global era. The concept she uses in order to capture these forces, flexible citizenship “refers to the cultural logics of capitalist accumulation, travel and displacement that induce subjects to respond fluidly and opportunistically to changing political-economic conditions” (Ong, 1999:6).

Recent neoliberal ideas and forces in the global economy have introduced opportunities for many people to participate and take advantage of economic market zones on a global scale. Citizens of diverse nation-states travel between territorially divided spaces to invest money and increase their own economic growth. This shift has pushed nation-states to adjust their immigration limitations and laws in order to open up borders for those people who bring economic wealth or other advantages to the nation-state. These adjustments have opened up windows for elite wealth-bearing migrants who have the capacity to contribute to the national economy to seek to obtain legal citizenship and access to the nation-state in order to facilitate the investment process (Ong, 2006). Especially focusing on Chinese subjects and their participation in this process, Ong observes how the meaning of citizenship has transformed in the light of global markets and mass-migration of workers between borders, along with the different advantages it has for the migrants and how that process is controlled by nation-states (Ong, 1996; 1999; 2002; 2005; 2006).

In the beginning of the twentieth century, Chinese immigrants in the United States experienced a distinction which made them one of the first ethnic groups to be marked as undesirable group of people within the nation-state. At the rise of capitalism and call for increased labor force, Chinese immigrants had been welcomed as desired workers, but eventually became to be considered a competition to the ‘white’ workers which worked within the same industry. With the rise of neoliberalism, the reception of Chinese new-
comers obtained a new status of desire due to the important role many Chinese citizens played in the ‘booming’ economy in the Asia-pacific area. Members of the contemporary Chinese ‘elite’, such as bankers, managers of large corporations and wealthy individuals, have received new opportunities for participation in global economic activities with the adjustments of citizenship laws in many Western countries. In the United States, for example, seminars have been directed at Asian newcomers, suggesting how they can get green cards or citizenship in turn for million-dollar investments. This process of economic accumulation is controlled by the nation-state and global markets, but even though Chinese subjects which partake in this process hold political, economic and legal rights to participate in this transnational and flexible flow, the cultural and social acceptance of their participation does not necessarily accompany the status of citizenship (Ong, 2002[1998]).

Edward Said’s theory of ‘Orientalism’, which concludes that the Orient, or the ‘East’, is one of Europe’s oldest colonies and holds one of the most deep and recurring images and ideas of the Other in contrast to the Western identity (Said, 2003[1978]), influenced Ong to take on a bottom-up and top-down approach in order to understand the dimensions of cultural and social forces entailed in global interconnectedness and flexible citizenship among Chinese people. The top-down approach, described above with the involvement and ‘governmentality’ of the state in the global economy, does not explain fully the agency the individual has in the process. Individuals themselves are active in the construction of the Chinese identity and ‘orientalism’ view both helps them to participate in the global economy and at the same time creates cultural boundaries between the Chinese and the host-country (Ong, 2002).

3.4 European citizenship

Scholars have been claiming, to an increasing extent, that recent practices and developments in Western Europe have shifted towards a more exclusionary regulations than before (Ong, 1996), which up to a certain extent can be traced to the foundation of the European Union (Bellier and Wilson, 2000). In the mid-1950s six countries started an economic cooperation which formed the base of what is called today the European Union. The number of member states has escalated and today this multi-state cooperation accounts 28 member states with over 500 million residents within the borders of the Union (Wilken,
The European Union, formally created the 7th of February 1992 with the Maastricht Treaty, a contract which awarded all citizens of EU member states a European citizenship (Shore, 2000), has opened a window for academic analysis and fostered debates among social scientists (Neveu and Filippova, 2012; Neveu, 2000), and created lively discussion on whether the European citizenship has in fact any real sense (Carter, 2001). The rapid expansion of the confederation, global market forces and neoliberal criteria “have come to articulate entrenched political norms and entitlements”, has made the European Union one of the most driven attempts to convene distinct cultures and polities and form a unified market zone (Ong, 2006). Until recently the creation and understanding of the European Union as a political and economic system has been the main focus in the majority of academic research in this area, and studies of identities, traditions, amalgamation, culture and ideology have been either absent or marginalized in the discussion. The involvement of anthropologists in theorization on the EU has been called for by other disciplines within social sciences in order to understand these dimensions (Bellier and Wilson, 2000). Anthropologists have contributed important knowledge to one of the most high ranked topics in European studies in modern times, European citizenship (Neveu, 2000), which in the postwar era has obtained new and more universal concept than before (Soysal, 1994:1). The anthropological analysis on European citizenship generally challenges the classic notion of binary logic, opposing the civil society and the state (Neveu, 2000).

A common starting point of debates among anthropologists about European citizenship is the national citizenship, which as discussed previously in this thesis, has for long been seen as an inseparable factor in the notion of belonging and holding the status of citizenship (Neveu and Filippova, 2012). The European Union has in fact attempted to create symbols similar to those which nations use to identify themselves. The Union has its own flag and emblem, an anthem of Europe exists, along with coordinated car number plates (Nic Craith, 2004), European currency, newspapers, television stations (Borneman and Fowler, 1997) and the European passport available to the citizens of the Union, to name a few. Stated in the articles of the treaty, citizens are allowed to travel and reside freely within the borders of the Union, they are provided with diplomatic rights to petition in the European parliament, the right to vote and stand as candidates in municipal elections and elections in the European Union, along with conferring obligatory freedom of services, capital, goods and people within the area (Shore, 2000). Along with these rights, creation of a shared European
identity has been essential for the EU in order to avoid fragmentation and conflict between the nations that constitute the Union and their citizens. Without a common identity, it is feared that it might threaten the unity of the federation and risk dissolution of the Union (Delgado-Moreira, 1997). These cultural policies of the EU, aimed at expanding the identification with the European community and its institutions, invite anthropologists to participate in the debate and analysis, as academic ‘experts’ in identity and cultural studies (Wilken, 2012).

However, as Catherine Neveu has recounted, one of the main obstacles of this emphasis on shared identity and European citizenship is that the European Union presents none of the characteristics of nation-states, which has for the most parts been one of the defining factors of citizenship (Neveu and Filippova, 2012). The link between nationality and citizenship has been taken for granted by many scholars since modern citizenship was born with the creation of the nation-state, but Neveu considers the link between those two factors not to be essential and moreover confusing (Neveu and Filippova, 2012; Neveu, 2005). The sense of belonging to a nation is not the only way citizenship and membership to a community is constructed, and citizen’s recognition of their rights the diversity of political subjects they claim through citizenship cannot be reduced to ‘nationness’ (Neveu and Filippova, 2012). The way Craith argues for the European identity, Neveu criticizes, and uses the model and traits of the nation-state, essentializes culture and assumes homogeneous identity, inseparable from nationality (Neveu, 2000; 2005). If nationality, or ‘nationness’, and citizenship are viewed as an unbreakable entity that each contribute necessary factors in order to maintain each other, questions about the validity and significance of European citizenship arise since Europe is not a nation-state and does not hold nationality claims. It can either be viewed as an empty and insignificant status which is doomed to failure, a breakthrough which will transform the meaning of citizenship in the future, or, as most commonly considered by anthropologists, a way to unite ethnic realities of a society and integrate them in the political organization. The status and meaning of European citizenship will remain debated as long as there is no homogeneous European identity shared by citizens and inhabitants of the European borders (Neveu and Filippova, 2012).

The European Union faced political challenges in the 1990s with the internal growth of neo-nationalism, antisemitism and Islamophobia. A new discourse on identity arose, focused on overcoming the past of conflicts, repression, war and discrimination was placed
in juxtaposition of the new values of tolerance for religious diversity, multiculturalism, anti-racism and respect for people independent of their status in the society (Wilken, 2012). The European parliament has been active in advocating these values, but has at the same time evoked racism and xenophobia throughout the area. In regulations of the European Union on citizenship of the association, non-nationals are nowhere accounted for. Residents who do not maintain nationality of a member state are excluded from general rights, such as voting, effectively creating a group of second-class citizens and underclass of foreigners (Shore, 2000). Anthropologists have paid particular attention to the attempts to create a common identity within the borders of Europe and the concurrent co-construction of the ‘Other’, situating ‘the West’ and its citizens in contrast to the alienated others who do not fulfill the constructed European identity (Wilken, 2012).

3.5 Refugees, asylum seekers and statelessness.

The awareness of having the rights which citizenship bestows in the political sense becomes ever more visible when the complex situations of stateless and displaced people are examined (Arendt, 2013[1951]). A growing percentage of people in the world are displaced, stateless or classified as refugees. These groups of people make the concept of citizenship, membership and belonging to a community even more complex (Kearny, 1995) as they do not fit any of the frames presented in the above sections of this thesis. Involuntary movements of populations entail complex sociopolitical and cultural relations and processes and have aroused interest among scholars from diverse fields within the academy (Malkki, 1995). Hannah Arendt argued that once the nation-state was born in its modern form, a large group of people stood outside of the frame of membership within the community, especially after the World War II. The people she refers to are stateless, without a political membership and reduced legal protections. Moreover she states that “human being[s] in general - without a profession, without a citizenship, without an opinion, without a deed by which to identify or specify himself - and different in general, representing nothing but his own absolutely unique individuality which, deprived of expression within and action upon a common world, loses all significance” (Arendt, 1994:302).
Her analysis portrays an image of how the creation of states has forged struggle among citizens, or non-citizens and created legality and illegality (or extra-legality), in an arena where the rule of law does not protect many of the rights of those who are excluded or stateless (Petryna, 2005). Political instability and wars are generally the reasons why people involuntarily seek refuge from their homelands in the international community which needs to react to the situation by handling the displaced populations (Malkki, 1995). Following the end of World War II, millions of people emerged without formal political membership (Arendt, 1994) and without a home to return to thus lacked basic claims to citizenship and the right to belong (Lazar, 2013). Displaced populations have most likely existed throughout the human history, but the beginning point of the discussion of refugees and anthropological theorization on statelessness is pinned to the World War II, since the categorization of displaced people as ‘refugees’ emerged at that point following the 1951 convention in Geneva (Malkki, 1995). The classification in the statement defining the term refugee, according to Liisa Malkki, concludes that the concept “...shall apply to any person who[,] ... owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself to the protection of that country or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it” (Malkki, 1995:501).

In order to grasp the difficult situation of stateless people, several anthropologists have devoted their time to study displaced populations. Most recently Seth Holmes and Heide Castañeda (2016) studied the refugee crisis Europe is facing in contemporary times. The flow of refugees and asylum seekers to the Western part of Europe includes hundreds of thousands of peoples who are fleeing war in their homelands. This sudden and increased flow of displaced people to the territory of ‘European soil’ as created anxiety among European citizens and governance due to the diversity it entails. The tragedy of the stateless people has resulted in restrictions of migration into the area and those who receive full permission to enter the area legally are carefully selected, however others are excluded from legal residence in Europe. While some part of the population receives assistance from various states across Europe, the newcomers generally face numerous problems due to culturally and socially constructed image of them as the ‘Other’ in contrast to the hegemonic
identity of European citizens. Terrorism is in many cases equated to Islam and most of the refugees entering the European zone in modern times are Muslims. Recent terrorist attacks in France, among many other events, have created a complex situation for those who seek a new start and an opportunity of political belonging within a community, resulting in marginalization and racism towards refugees and asylum seekers within the territory in modern times (Holmes and Castañeda, 2016).

4.0 Conclusion and discussion

Anthropologists have emphasized the importance of moving beyond the political and legal notion of citizenship in order to reveal the various forms of cultural and social dimensions embedded in citizenship in modern times, as has been shown throughout this thesis. The dimensions of citizenship, viewed through anthropological lenses are manifold, but most generally they provide an important aspect of modern politics of belonging and deconstruct the liberalist notion of citizenship as a concept entailing equality among those who hold the same status. The notion of citizenship thus becomes complex as various forces affect how people perceive their membership, and the underlying cultural and social forces inevitably create hierarchical systems within communities with assistance from the institutionalized and sovereign nation-state.

Citizenship is a method, among others, for including and excluding people based up on diverse factors. It is an expression of hegemonic power, as shown in the subchapter of European citizenship and statelessness, and a way which allows people of certain economic class to participate in the global flows discussed earlier, but excludes others from participation. Citizenship thus underlines hierarchical divisions both within and between different nation-states, favoring privileged groups whilst being merely nothing more than a political right to vote for those who are excluded from participation in the advantages of global flows.

The recent events in the global world, warfare and creation of stateless people, asylum seekers and refugees which mainly head towards the Western world proposes questions about citizenship and the power relations present in the structure of our world. These people’s nation-states have become compromised, and their citizens are fleeing from the territory and seeking membership within other, presumably safer and more prosperous boundaries. The status of citizenship is especially relevant as the official membership in war-
torn nation-states are seen as threatening to Western countries. Is citizenship a matter of human rights, or simply a form of expressing the hegemonic status of Western countries above the rest of the world? Is it yet another way of including and excluding people? This question remains to be researched by anthropologists.

In the course of reviewing literature for this thesis it was noted that there was a lack of anthropological attention to certain dimensions which might contribute to a further and deeper understanding on citizenship. The literature on bio-citizenship focuses mainly on race and ethnicity, while factors such as gender, sexuality, physical ability or disability and age have not been in the foregrounded. Along with lack of approaches towards these factors, recent world events call for the involvement of anthropologists in debates and scholarship on displaced populations. Diverse approaches are necessary, but the notion of citizenship remains crucial for understanding both the development and the effects the displacement and re-settlement might have on people’s lives.
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