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Introduction
Globalisation and citizenship

Steven Slaughter and Wayne Hudson

In recent decades there has been the growing realisation that the role of the citizen within liberal democratic states has been going through a process of transformation. While many scholars have argued that processes of globalisation are largely responsible for the contours of this transformation, scholarly debate continues about significance of globalisation for citizenship. Globalisation is understood primarily as a process where distant events or influences significantly affect local political and social activity. The primary contention is that various political, social and economic processes of globalisation are disrupting and overwhelming the relationship between the citizens and their state. Other contentions are that these processes of globalisation open up the need for new forms of political responsibility and citizenship beyond the state, as well as the claim that new forms of civic activity are taking place within the processes of globalisation in the form of activists and social movements who articulate their interests and values at a global level.

The purpose of this book is to undertake a wide-ranging examination of the way conceptions and practices of citizenship are being shaped by contemporary globalisation. Its aim is to broaden the debate about the relationship between globalisation and citizenship by examining the impact of various processes of globalisation on citizenship, and analysing not only the increasing problems globalisation presents to citizenship, but also the significant opportunities for citizenship that may be discerned in a more globalised world. In this way, the book seeks to engender a wider discussion on citizenship and the transnational challenges that globalisation poses political agency. It also examines how different concepts, theories and practices of citizenship are evolving in response to globalisation. There are three primary questions that are explored in this book:

- How does globalisation challenge traditional conceptions of citizenship in specific respects?
- What are the theoretical and practical prospects for new forms of liberal, republican and cosmopolitan citizenship within contemporary globalisation?
How is globalisation creating new transnational citizenships and new civil society spaces and what core issues are associated with these practices?

This introduction will briefly examine the central debates surrounding definition of globalisation and the implications of these debates for political activity and the various facets of the idea of citizenship. Then, these differing aspects of citizenship will be related to an overview of the chapters within this book.

Globalisation and politics

A standard text, David Held's *Global Transformations* offers a systematic study of the history and nature of globalisation and suggests that there are three explanations of contemporary global integration (Held et al. 1999: ch. 1). The first is 'hyperglobalisation', a position held by liberals like Kenichi Ohmae (1995) who claim that globalisation represents a recent and near complete extension of liberal values and global markets that are tightly integrating states and people around the world. The second position is a sceptical set of observations which suggest that the hyperglobalist conception of globalisation is overstated and largely a myth because the level of global integration during the 1990s was less than the period of 1870–1914 (Hirst and Thompson 1996: 2). Realist sceptics are keen to point out that far from there being a world where markets have trumped states, there remain significant differences between the strategic choices made by states in response to the world economy and that strong states are still ‘able to work the system to their advantage’ (Waltz 1999: 7). Marxists are also sceptical on the grounds that global interconnections have always been an initial and essential part of the capitalist mode of production (Harvey 1997: 421).

The third account of globalisation is the 'transformationalist' perspective that seeks to define globalisation as a spatial process and has become the predominate explanation of globalisation. The transformationalist position conceives globalisation as being a process whereby various forms of human activity are increasingly traversing the world and connecting people in differing parts of the world more densely and more quickly than in previous times (Held et al. 1999; Scholte 2000). This spatial interconnectedness is largely due to developments in transportation and communications technology that enable trans-continental social relations. Anthony Giddens (1990: 64) exemplifies this account when he defines globalisation as ‘the intensification of world wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa’. As such, globalisation implies that political, economic and social activity is becoming increasingly inter-regional or intercontinental in scope and that there has been intensification in the
levels of interaction and interconnectedness between states and societies. In this process, national borders are transcended on a regular basis by various flows of resources, people and ideas. It is important to emphasise that this account contends that globalisation is multifaceted in that it is not restricted to the economic realm alone, as people are increasingly affected by various forms of economic, cultural and political activity. Equally important, the transformationalist position argues that globalisation is not novel to the late twentieth century, as global connections have been interconnecting individuals and polities for at least 500 years, with some dynamics of globalisation evident even earlier (Held et al. 1999). Indeed, the spread of the nation-state as the predominant form of polity across the world over the course of the last two centuries is an early example of globalisation.

There are a series of significant political implications of this spatial process. While nation-states remain as important and powerful actors in world politics, global connections and the development of communications technology have empowered a new range of actors to operate in politically significant ways (Held et al. 1999: ch. 1). Clearly, globalisation has made it easier for NGOs and social movements to promote a certain set of political values transnationally, as well as provided opportunities for terrorist groups and organised crime to transfer people and resources across national borders. Transnational corporations have also been greatly empowered – if not enabled – by these accelerated forms of global linkage. In addition, globalisation leads to various forms of connections and ramifications that are more authentically transnational and global. Indeed, David Held claims that:

political communities and civilisations can no longer be characterized simply as ‘discrete worlds’: they are enmeshed and entrenched in complex structures of overlapping forces, relations and movements. . . . But even the most powerful among them – including the most powerful nation-states – do not remain unaffected by the changing conditions and processes of regional and global entrenchment.

(Held et al. 1999: 77–80)

Clearly, these overlapping transnational processes are often drastically uneven and have greater local or regional implications for some people or states. They also open up particular locations to ‘outside’ influences that may disturb local cultural and social traditions that are profoundly meaningful to particular groups of people. The rising magnitude of cultural and ‘civilisational’ interaction is a notable component of contemporary globalisation.

There is also indication that the lines between foreign and domestic policy have blurred due to the intense and widespread forms of global integration and connection. Thus, globalisation creates a series of
‘disjunctures’ that cut across states and ‘indicate the different ways in which globalisation can be said to constitute constraints or limits on political agency in a number of key domains; and to what extent the possibility of a democratic polity has been transformed and altered’ (Held 1995: 99). According to Held, these disjunctures clearly limit the freedom of democratic states to act in the manner they desire and ultimately sever the relationship between democratic governors and their respective citizens. Held maintains that democracy must come to terms with:

these developments and their implications for national and international power centres. If it fails to do so, it is likely to become ever less effective in determining the shape and limits of political activity. Accordingly, the international form and structure of politics and civil society has to be built into the foundations of democratic thought and practice.

(Held 1995: 136)

At a practical level, these disjunctures also exist in the form of issues such as terrorism, organised crime and transborder pollution that intersect national borders and thereby can only be addressed by elaborate international cooperation.

Consequently, there are increasingly elaborate forms of international and transnational cooperation that have become referred to as ‘global governance’. It is now the case that international organisations such as the UN, regional organisations like the EU and non-official bodies like TNCs, business councils or NGOs are increasingly important to the political process in most states. Jan Aart Scholte (2000: 138-39) indicates that these public and private bodies are ‘supraterritorial constituencies’ that are external and largely unaccountable influences over the operation of state policy making. As such, it has become commonplace to refer to the term ‘democratic deficit’ to the gap between the significant power and authority of international organisations and the capacity of citizens to influence these bodies. This leads to claims that the structure of world politics is moving towards a ‘post national’ context (Habermas 2001) or a ‘cosmocracy’ (Keane 2003).

It is important to emphasise that some scholars are sceptical of the incidence or significance of the spatial implications of globalisation. Furthermore, there are also scholars who believe that while the supposed spatial implications of contemporary global integration may be largely correct, they ignore the importance of neo-liberal and free market capitalist ideologies and policies in shaping the way that globalisation has developed since the 1970s (Cox 1997; Gill 1998). Neo-liberalism is a strand of liberal thought that advances a range of policies ushered in many Western – especially Anglo-Saxon – countries and the international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. These policies attempt to ‘roll back’ the state and the role of government, and
leave decisions about allocation, production and distribution in the economy to the global market, thereby excluding or limiting measures that restrict or redistribute the wealth of individuals (Gill 1998). These 'market friendly' policies are evident in the policies of deregulation, privatisation and the liberalisation of restrictions on the movements of capital or trade. The consequences of these policies are manifold but the central implication of the policies is the development of a minimum state that both privileges investors over resident citizens and opens their respective societies to the vicissitudes of the global markets. The significance and consequences of neo-liberalism for the direction of political life and citizenship are not always sufficiently examined in the globalisation literature.

Aspects of citizenship

It is widely agreed that processes of globalisation have significant implications for the practice and theory of citizenship. However, there is a considerable range of theoretical debates that are attempting to determine the importance and impact of globalisation on the role of the individual in political practice. Even more fundamentally, the term citizenship, like globalisation, is a contested one that encompasses various political, economic, legal and cultural features (see Delanty, Chapter 1 in the current volume). Importantly, citizenship includes the idea of 'citizenship-as-status' – as the right to be a member of a political community and have rights within that community (Kymlicka and Norman 1994: 354). Indeed, citizenship comprises the 'set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which, as a consequence, shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups' (Turner 1993: 2). The exact range of entitlement varies from one polity to another. Citizenship also involves an aspect of 'citizenship-as-activity' which entails the socially fashioned expectation that people will engage productively in civic life in general, and participate in the composition and operation of government in particular (Kymlicka and Norman 1994: 354). It has to be emphasised that citizenship is always a purposive activity. As Alastair Davidson indicated, by referring to the works of Norberto Bobbio; 'the starting point of citizenship is the attempt by ordinary people to impose order on chaos' (UNRISD 1997: 14). In an era of accelerating globalisation, the focus on securing order has a significant array of international and transnational implications which emphasise the importance of rethinking citizenship. As such, there are aspects of citizenship that rest in realm of political theory, where citizenship is an ideal that guides the formation and operation of new forms of political community in the face of novel challenges or new ideas.

This book starts from the position that these various features of citizenship are all significant. Hence, we focus on three major aspects of citizenship. First, we examine the status and practice of citizenship as the socially
legitimised membership of a particular nation-state. Second, we examine the normative conception of citizenship as a prescription for the role of the individual in a theoretical model of political community. Third, we examine the actual role of citizenship as being an active participant in civic life within or across the boundaries of state. Each of these differing conceptions of citizenship has different key dynamics and issues relating to contemporary processes of globalisation.

Citizenship as membership of a nation-state

While the idea of citizenship gained its first expression as membership in the polis of ancient Athens, in recent centuries it is the nation-state that has been the main forum for democracy and citizen involvement in public decisions. Citizenship in this sense of political membership is an organising principle of political authority that bestows certain rights and obligations as well as the competency to be engaged in political affairs on the adult populace granted with this status (Davidson 1997: 5). Importantly, this competency bestows certain rights and cultural membership within a context which is socially legitimised and is considerably determined by prevailing forms of culture and identity. As such, the status of citizenship is not 'automatic' in that most nation-states have, at various times, excluded women, migrants and indigenous peoples from having full entitlements of citizenship. Furthermore, at the same time that democracy has started to spread around the world, accelerating globalisation has undermined the effective practice of citizenship in key respects. In terms of democratic participation in public policy and political outcomes, there are a series of 'disjunctures' in a globalising age between the public and outcomes, because so many global influences cut across the territory of the state, as mentioned previously. These disjunctures are magnified by the rationale of neo-liberalism. The influence of global market forces and the states need to maintain credibility in the face of these forces places significant restrictions over the ideal of a vibrant democratic sphere determined by citizens' deliberation. Not only is there an ideological convergence of political parties in many nation-states around neo-liberal policies, but also the promotion of market forces and economic growth removes many political alternatives and control over aspects of economic policy from democratic consideration. The contemporary neo-liberal state is increasingly tightly wound into global financial markets and international financial institutions, and is considered by many to be less responsive to the electorate or to voices and interests of national citizens (UNRISD 1997). Ultimately, the integrity of democratic processes and notions of citizenship cannot be assumed when the policy orientation of the state has been shifted away from its territorial constituencies.

Consequently, the actual exercise of citizenship has been curtailed in those countries where democracy is exercised. While liberalism has long
emphasised representative democracy and taken the view of citizenship as being limited to rights and status (Kymlicka and Norman 1994), both globalisation and neo-liberalism restrict active participative citizenship and the rights that citizens can expect to enjoy. In many ways it overturns the gradual development of the ideal types of citizenship rights seen since the seventeenth century, as outlined by T. H. Marshall (1963), by restricting political and social rights in particular. The generally distanced nature of the citizen from an increasing array of international agreements and institutions that are often aimed at economic goals, restricts political participation by privileging capitalism in law and in public policy (Gill 1998: 32). Social rights are limited by the rationalised nature of the welfare state, the persistence of an underclass of people without ‘full citizenship’, and the general austerity and priorities of the competitiveness stimulated by neo-liberal policies (Dahrendorf 1987). Indeed, the aspiration of state citizenship as evident in Marshall’s theory of citizenship ‘assumed some form of nation-state autonomy in which governments were relatively immune from pressures within the world-system of capitalist nations’ (Turner 1990: 195). However, the practices of contemporary globalisation and neo-liberalism devastate this assumption as neo-liberal policies open up society to the pressures of increased competition and decrease the autonomy of society from global pressures. This dismantles the rights and processes of citizenship and democratisation that have ‘involved centuries of struggle for representation’ (Gill 1998: 38), as well as challenging the integrity of historically formed notions of identity and community. There are real questions as to whether citizens, even in the most powerful states, can control their domestic affairs in the face of globalised structures and influences.

Citizenship as a normative prescription

As a result of the questions facing state-based citizenship, there has been a considerable growth in efforts to envisage forms of citizenship that transcend the state. Clearly, some scholars have focused on enhancing the development of regional democracy – a project spurred on by the actual but delimited development of European citizenship (Bellamy and Warleigh 1998). Other scholars are seeking to augment existing international institutions or the developing networks of NGOs as an impulse for new forms of global citizenship. Consequently, in political theory and international relations literature, the idea of ‘cosmopolitan democracy’ has become a significant conjectural alternative to contemporary globalisation (Falk 1995; Held 1995). Contemporary scholars such as Richard Falk, Anthony McGrew and David Held have argued that we need to institutionalise the idea that people are ‘citizens of the world’. While cosmopolitanism in its most modest sense implies a set of moral principles that should be extended to all people, in recent times, cosmopolitans are more forthright in their support for global political institutions and a single global democratic
sphere because they have made the case that the various processes of glo­
balisation have fundamentally delimited the sovereign capacity of the
nation-state. Held (1998: 21) claims that 'the idea of a political community
of fate – of a self-determining collectivity which forms its own agenda and
life conditions – can no longer meaningfully be located within the bound­
daries of a single nation-state alone'. People are now so routinely affected by
decisions made beyond their state that cosmopolitans assert that the only
way to have effective participation and citizenship is to make the appro­
priate site for democracy a global one. In pursuing this alternative and
globally extending democracy across states' borders, the state and other
actors such as transnational corporations will be increasingly bound by
global laws and standards (Held 1995: 234-35), and individuals – not
states – will be the primary moral agents in world politics.

Obviously, there are many critics of cosmopolitan proposals. After all,
the idea of global democracy seems a far-fetched and utopian attempt at
world government. Indeed, Falk (1995: 139-40) is aware that if the idea of
world citizenship is imposed on the current world order it looks like a
'purely sentimental, and slightly absurd, notion', but that the real purpose
of global citizenship is as an aspirational ‘political project’ which forwards
a human-wide community, rather than an actual account of legal rights
and obligations. While the proponents of cosmopolitan democracy claim
that we need to think creatively for a more just form of global order, the
communitarian critics of cosmopolitanism claim that cosmopolitans
understate the power and utility of national forms of identity and loyalty
(Miller 1999). Michael Walzer (1996: 126) likewise suggests that it is
incongruous that our political loyalties should originate from the ‘outer­
most circle’ and claims that 'my allegiances, like my relationships, start at
the centre'. Also, critics of a communitarian and republican cast claim that
a global democracy is neither necessary nor sufficient for effective global
cooperation. Rather, the focus of an alternate conception of citizenship
should instead rest on encouraging and developing citizens of democratic
states to be politically aware and involved so as to direct their states to be
more principled and cooperative with respect to their foreign policies and
efforts at creating responsive international institutions in a globalising
context (Slaughter 2005). Even those critical of the cosmopolitan project
appreciate the importance of rethinking the prevailing forms of governance
and citizenship within the context of globalisation. In this sense, cosmo­
politans are asking the crucial questions.

**Citizenship as a participant in transnational civic life**

Citizenship also entails the active role of the individual in relation to public
affairs beyond the formal channels of government. Involvement in civic
affairs has taken on a new cast with the notion of what is actually 'public'
taking on transnational dimensions with the acceleration of globalisation –
both in terms of the transnational cast of many political issues, and the faster and cheaper global communications that have made it easier to organise like-minded groups around the world. The increasing transnational profile of individuals and NGOs has given rise to the idea that a global or transnational civil society is emerging. While it is important to note that NGOs are not completely novel – the Red Cross was involved in international humanitarian law in the late 1800s for example – the number of NGOs has increased dramatically in recent decades and the interaction between NGOs and states, international organisations and transnational corporations have become a routine part of global politics. Networks of NGOs and social movements mobilised by transnational activists can be seen as ‘moral entrepreneurs’ in the sense that they disseminate norms and ideas (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998: 896–97; Keck and Sikkink 1998; O’Brien et al. 2000). This is a significant shift from the pure Westphalian idea of world politics being about state-to-state interaction.

It is important to distinguish between citizenship as a normative disposition and an actual political practice. Scholars such as Richard Falk and Mary Kaldor (1999: 195) take global citizenship and the idea of global civil society as being an aspiration and an unfolding reality. The problem here is that not all NGOs are shaped by cosmopolitan values – some NGOs are quite narrow interest groups with little cosmopolitan inflection, and there is also a geographical bias invested in the notion of global citizenship (Keck and Sikkink 1998: 32–34). Significant numbers of people around the world do not have access to a telephone, let alone the internet. In this sense, the globality (and diversity) of global civil society is frustrated by the existence of a significant ‘digital divide’ and the predominance of English as the global internet language. Furthermore, the often politically sensitive activity of transnational activists demonstrates that their activity is often very agonistic, in that governments are often resistant to the efforts of human rights and environmental NGOs. Consequently, there is an increasing tendency to use the term ‘transnational citizenship’ and ‘transnational civil society’ to emphasise that while people are engaged in transnational political practice, they are not necessarily cosmopolitan and may indeed be focused on quite specific political interests. Rather than there being a monolithic global civil society, it is important to look at transnational activism on a case-by-case basis, with each network having different actors, dynamics and consequences for global politics.

The contributions

These conceptions of citizenship point to an examination of the fundamental question of political agency. These debates point to the questions of how people actually act or should act in order to be a decisive influence over the direction of political life. Citizenship as political agency at a minimum means being recognised or having a voice in the prevailing political system,
while in a more robust sense it means being able to alter public policies or transform the political system itself. Globalisation challenges this question of agency in dramatic and indeterminate ways. This book seeks to advance the debate over the impact of globalisation on citizenship by focusing on this crucial and often overlooked question of agency from multiple perspectives. The following contributions demonstrate the struggles to maintain basic recognition in the face of globalisation's impacts on the nation-state, attempts to rethink governance in the face of globalisation's challenge to existing forms of authority, and attempts by groups to modify or exploit globalisation to promote transnational political change.

The first part of this volume focuses on how globalisation challenges traditional conceptions of citizenship. In Chapter 1, Gerard Delanty argues that a broader conception of cosmopolitanism is needed to understand the challenge of globalisation to national citizenship today. The chapter further contends that cosmopolitan citizenship is expressive of new cultural discourses and is not reducible to globalisation. In Chapters 2 and 3, in the contexts of Japan and China respectively, John Clammer and Michael Keane examine the country-specific dynamics of national citizenship. The second part of this volume examines the prospects for the development of global citizenship and democracy and the challenges facing these proposals. In Chapter 4, John Keane examines the relationship between speculative cosmopolitan political forms and the existing practices of global media systems and journalists. Danilo Zolo offers a contrary view in Chapter 5. Zolo advances a realist critique of global citizenship and argues that such conceptions of citizenship cannot adequately respond to the political realities of hegemonic powers or to global terrorism. In Chapter 6, Steven Slaughter argues that neo-roman republicanism is a middle way between moral cosmopolitanism, which advances universal principles, and political cosmopolitanism, which advocates the creation of universal political institutions at a global level. Haig Patapan argues in Chapter 7 that it may be possible under conditions of globalisation to return to an older and potentially more productive conception of citizenship based on friendship, rather than the prevailing modern conceptions of social contract, consent and 'rights'. In Chapter 8, Andrew Vincent argues against critiques of universal human rights and examines the problems of particularism in light of the claims of universalism.

Part III of the volume examines the development of new transnational citizenships and new civil society spaces in light of the impact of globalisation and neo-liberalism. April Carter explores the potential and limits of transnational direct action (understood as essentially non-violent popular protest) in Chapter 9. Such action is increasingly a response to democratic deficits in global politics, which include attempts to ensure accountability of international bodies to national governments and their respective publics. In Chapter 10, Andrew Vandenberg examines the ways that unions have embraced the transnational strategy of social movement
unionism, and have increasingly interacted with other NGOs and social movements to attempt to promote worker friendly social change, especially in relation to neo-liberal globalisation. In Chapter 11, Jeremy Moon, Andrew Crane and Dirk Matten examine the significance of corporate citizenship. While corporate citizenship is pursued in different ways, from short-term corporate philanthropy to more holistic, long-term strategies for changing business organisations, it represents a new civic tendency that challenges the traditional criteria for performance of firms. This chapter examines corporate citizenship as a global phenomenon and assesses its potential for being a legitimate actor in the public sphere. In Chapter 12, Ravi de Costa evaluates the global trends in Australian indigenous politics from the 1960s, and their consequences for natural citizenship. Last, in Chapter 13, Wayne Hudson concludes the volume by arguing that globalisation impacts on citizenship in ways that require new institutional responses informed by cosmopolitanism, but that cosmopolitanism alone is not strong enough to meet all the demands placed upon it.
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