3. Nationhood and citizenship: from producing states to enacting rights

Flávia Rodrigues de Castro and Carolina Moulin

INTRODUCTION

Citizenship has played an ambivalent role as both a formal set of criteria of sociopolitical membership and as an ethical project. As membership, it is associated with the ability to claim rights, the obligation to perform duties and having a voice within a community. As an ethical project, it is associated with claiming and aiming for a 'good life' with others.

Modern conceptions of citizenship have historically been entangled with nationhood and state-building practices. This entanglement highlights the limits of 'community' as a central aspect of citizenship as an ethical project. The national 'territorial trap' (Agnew 1994) has provided the boundary for much of the discussion on what citizenship was and what it could do for individuals and 'their' communities. Modern conceptions of citizenship were articulated with the production of ideals of homogeneity *inside* national borders and regulation of movement *across international* borders (Torpey 2000). Exclusive ideals of community – connected to definitions of peoples as nations and their territories – created exclusionary political practices. Modern citizenship was, as such, limited by reference to national citizenship and statist frameworks of community. The entanglement between citizenship, nationhood and state-building was an extremely violent process through which the search for the 'homogenisation of peoples' (Rae 2002) legitimized a ruthless combination of political belonging, and ideas of moral communities that produced expulsions, genocide and mass killings (Arendt 1973; Rae 2002).

In the context of globalized international relations and in an effort to restore citizenship as an ethical project, an analysis of what Ong (2006) has called 'mutations in citizenship' has become crucial, to elucidate the tensions and ambivalence of forms of 'fractured' political belonging captured in conventional understandings of citizenship. A plurality of debates has focused, then, on how new forms of political participation, rights and belonging in transnational times are challenging the national dimension of citizenship. These indicate possibilities of post-national and denationalized citizenship (Sassen 2002; Tambini 2001), multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka 1995; Triadafilopoulos 1997), dual citizenship (Spiro 2019) and strategic citizenship (Harpaz and Mateos 2019; Joppke 2019), among others. In such work, we have seen the emergence of different attempts to make sense of increasingly heterogeneous, volatile and profoundly unequal attachments to diverse modalities of territorial and political belonging. Some scholars moved up the scale towards humanist, universal conceptions of cosmopolitan citizenship (Linklater 2004; Nussbaum et al. 1996) – but according to its critics, this approach did not resolve the problem of enacting rights (Walzer 1996). This in turn led to the emergence of theoretical attempts to think about citizenship as a negotiated process that requires a 'descent into the ordinary' (Das 2007) and engages with everyday life as much as with abstract principles.

Citizenship has also become a crucial point of theoretical discussions specifically in the context of critical mobility approaches to migration and its governance. If citizenship were to be rescued from its modern and statist boundaries in order to remain relevant as a political project and concept, one way of doing it is precisely to put 'citizenship in motion'. This approach focuses on the impact of transversal, mobile and circulatory systems and forms of belonging (Mezzadra 2004), in which the intricate relation between a politics of membership and a politics of movement has regained centrality (Nyers and Rygiel 2012). In these debates, citizenship can be a site of contestation and ambivalence with the potential to transform the boundaries of contemporary political communities, and the politics of movement can produce new forms of citizenship and of being political (Isin 2008; McNevin 2013; Nyers and Rygiel 2012). The displacement of citizenship, from its closed location in the state to new spaces of claims-making, especially related to mobility rights, has allowed for the possibility of imagining new forms of being political and enacting diverse and complex citizen subjectivities.

With this in mind, the chapter proceeds as follows. First, we provide a brief overview and critique of the violent entanglement between nationhood and citizenship. Next, we explore the emergence of ideas around variegated modes and models of citizenship and forms of 'fractured' political belonging in transnational times. Finally, we examine how approaches focusing on the relationship between mobility and citizenship recast the politics of belonging as a set of practices – rather than a fixed marker – and as a disputed terrain of everyday struggles. Rather than abandoning the concept of citizenship, putting citizenship 'in motion' can cast light on how contemporary forms of enacting citizenship have been connected to, and disruptive of, the boundaries shaping social justice, rights and equality.

TERRITORY, SECURITY AND CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship and nationhood can be described as two aspects of a long and ambivalent sociopolitical process: the production of the modern nation state. The transition to modern statehood is intimately related to the development of institutional capacities and the transformation of states into domains of sovereign territorial rule. In the firmly established, yet plural, political theory tradition, this process is widely described as an experience of expropriation or extraction that allowed states to control not only the 'means of violence', as in the Weberian account, but also taxation, administration, military service and the policing of society (Giddens 2008; Spruyt 2002; Thomson 1994; Tilly 1990; Weber 1974). The development of modern states and their growing capacity for resource extraction are commonly understood as a crucial to state intervention in different aspects of social life. The capacity to reach into society, through public education and conscript service, for example, is an important aspect of a process that led to ideals of homogeneity and uniformity in modern states – and to the transformation of subjects into citizens.

Nonetheless, the growing *capacity* to rule is only part of the explanation of this transformation. Another important aspect is the change in the *logic* of state organization (Spruyt 2002). The state became synonymous with *sovereign territorial rule*. Sovereignty, as a theoretical concept and as a political practice, had originated in Roman law and it is usually defined as a claim to final jurisdiction (Hinsley 1986). In this sense, the sovereign is the ultimate authority and source of law. A genealogy of sovereignty discussion is commonly perceived as dating back to the writings of Jean Bodin and Emer De Vattel, and the emergence of sovereign

territorial rule is usually ascribed to the Peace of Westphalia (1648) – although an articulation of its principles had started even before the peace treaties. Sovereign territorial rule meant that 'mutually recognized borders circumscribed the extension of political authority. Within such borders, authority would be exclusive' (Spruyt 2002: 134). A sovereign authority was conceived as a constitutive feature of modern statehood. Indeed, it has become almost impossible to conceive rule as non-territorially demarcated. In practice, this modern representation of *national citizenship* was fraught with discontinuities and heterogeneous experiences, many of which were based on mobile forms of rule-making and subject production. Modern European states were as much a product of processes within Europe as they were of the constitution of colonial spaces externally. Imperialism and coloniality have had a profound impact in imbricating ideas of nation, citizenship and race, by marking who could participate, claim rights, and exercise rule and authority, and by differentiating territories and circulations within these spaces and societies (see Mayblin in this volume, Chapter 2). Citizenship was – and to a large extent still is – born out of the intersection between national racial and imperial structures that are constitutive of a spatially differentiated territory of rights and exclusion (Schueller 2009).

Explaining the emergence of the modern state through the consolidation of sovereign authority and the growing capacities of resource extraction is described by Torpey (2000) as a 'penetrationist' approach. He promotes an alternative view, that the development of the modern territorial state is closely related to the production of citizenship and the expropriation by the state of the legitimate 'means of movement' (Torpey 2000: 4). In order to be able to penetrate societies effectively, states have, first, to embrace them. Here, to embrace society means to be able to 'grasp' it in the sense of registration or identification. With the aim of embracing societies, the development of a registration system, along with documents such as passports and identity cards, has played a crucial role in practices through which 'states hold particular persons within their grasp, while excluding others' (Torpey 2000: 12). The consolidation of the states' exclusive right to authorize and regulate movement went hand in hand with the production of a national community of citizens. This community must be more than 'imagined', as in Benedict Anderson's (1991) discussion on nationhood; it must be identified through documents (Torpey 2000). The expropriation of the legitimate means of movement, through procedures and mechanisms for identifying persons and making distinctions between citizens and aliens, is intrinsic to the construction of the modern state. Thus, ideals of homogeneity and uniformity inside the *polis* were intimately related to the regulation of movement across inter*national* borders (see also El Qadim in this volume, Chapter 19).

Nonetheless, the idea of political belonging as a relationship between state, citizen and territory (McNevin 2006) cannot be reduced to a formal or bureaucratic status of passport-holding (Tambini 2001), only affecting human mobility. Another relevant dimension, with important non-formal effects, is the development of a politics of recognition through formal membership allowing the achievement of the 'allocative function' (Turner 1997: 6) of citizenship entitlements. As a national status, citizenship has been linked to the idea of being part of a nation as 'the main determinant of access to resources, rights and to the institutions of political participation' (Tambini 2001: 196). The formal membership of a nation was established, then, as key to practices of allocating rights and resources. According to Turner (1997), citizenship can be conceived as a form of controlling the access of individuals and groups to scarce resources in society, such as social security, retirement packages, healthcare assistance, education and individual freedoms. Thus, citizenship membership indicates not only the prevailing formal

criteria for practices of inclusion and exclusion inside the *polis*, but also the access to rights which impact the everyday lives of citizens and non-citizens (Turner 1997).

The institutionalization of nationhood in state bureaucracies and its connection with citizenship rights was an extremely violent process. The search for the homogenization of peoples, in Rae's (2002) terms, legitimized virulent combinations of political belonging and ideas of moral communities that produced expulsions, genocide and mass killings. Historical examples of such violence abound: the exchange of peoples between Greece and Turkey in the 1920s (a central moment to the formation of these 'modern' states), the denationalization of Jews in the mid 1930s as a fundamental mechanism in their expulsion of the space of rights in Nazi Germany, as well as more contemporary experiences in much of the world, such as Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda and ongoing minority issues in several countries. Although citizenship is supposed to capture how people of different races, sexualities and classes belong to the state (Weber 2008), its practices of formation and everyday reinforcement indicate a sociopolitical process of differentiated inclusion. This presupposes a fundamental 'exclusionary dimension' (Chauvin and Garcés-Mascarenãs 2012: 241). Thus, different scholars (Brubaker 1992; Isin 2002; McNevin 2006) have emphasized the practices of exclusion that constitute the foundation of citizenship with the 'subordination of those categorized as nonmembers, noncitizens, minors or foreigners' (Chauvin and Garcés-Mascarenãs 2012: 241).

Isin (2002) extends this argument, conceptualizing citizenship as an enactment of political privilege and marginalization. Traditional narratives of citizenship as expanding over time, to gradually include former slaves, the working class, colonial subjects, women and indigenous populations, tend to erase how political membership is also responsible for exclusionary practices. Rather than a linear and expansive set of practices, for Isin, citizenship has always enacted an unequal double movement, within and outside national state boundaries. Political communities have been premised on differentiated access to citizenship rights, either conceived in formal terms (for example, in the right to vote or stand for election, which has historically excluded numerous groups) or in more substantive terms (access to social and cultural policies, right to political and social organization and mobilization). These exclusionary dimensions of citizenship enactment have produced forms of lumpen citizenry both *within* and *across* national communities (Linklater 2004). Across national borders, citizenship produced its Others as aliens, strangers – those that inhabit the exterior borders of the community. Such spatial striation of citizenship has been accompanied by moral conceptions on the nature of non-citizens, subsumed into ideas of uncivility. Those deemed uncivil presented as not following and abiding to rules of engagement, of putting at risk the balance between individual and collective forms of life and, frequently, as threatening the core values that constitute moral ideals of community (ideals taken to be constitutive of the very notion of being a citizen).

Established as the very condition for the production of the modern nation state, the homogeneity of populations functioned as an ideal involved in the violent 'treatment of those deemed "political misfits"' (Rae 2002: 14). This permitted the targeting of minority groups for expulsion, assimilation or extermination (Arendt 1973; Rae 2002). With the conquest of the state by the nation, to use Arendt's terms, practices of 'pathological homogenization' have played an important role in the constitution of a system based on the distinctions between insiders and outsiders. These practices of demarcation and containment of difference (Inayatullah and Blaney 2004), are often marked by the most violent forms of mistreatment and exclusionary practices (Rae 2002). Beyond the borders of the political community, the difference is constituted as the Other who is left on his own, who is denied entry or who is colonized within the

state, the difference is governed by a plurality of practices of eradication, assimilation, expulsion, tolerance and marginalization/hierarchy (Inayatullah and Blaney 2004). Differentiation depends on the construction of national identities crafted out of bureaucratic practices of state-building (census, registration and documentation, for example) and ongoing management of social and cultural markers of belonging (based, more often than not, on race and ethnicity and on knowledge of historic and contemporary forms of 'civility', exemplified perhaps more crudely nowadays in national citizenship exams). Sameness is the ideal; violence is the means.

The violent and antagonistic underpinnings of the history of modern citizenship have produced, in the context of the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, and of an increasingly interdependent and mobile world, efforts to conceptualize alternative forms of citizenship and belonging. The last decades have witnessed an effort to resignify citizenship and, in some cases, rescue it from its nationalist and statist original foundations. Whether in the form of an adjectival modulation of citizenship (for example, cosmopolitan or post-national citizenship) or in a stronger critique of the project of citizenship, embracing its heterogeneous and ambivalent traces, these debates remain a central part of contemporary reflections on the future(s) and possibilities of political belonging and becoming.

CITIZENSHIP IN TRANSNATIONAL TIMES

Rethinking citizenship as a critical (and progressive) sociopolitical project requires divesting its national character and downplaying dogmatic and formulaic conceptions of what constitutes political membership. This task assumes great relevance in a context shaped by global flows of markets, technologies and populations that challenge the entanglement between citizenship and nation state (Ong 2006). In increasingly transnational contexts, what Ong (2006) has called 'mutations in citizenship' can be perceived as the growing disarticulation between elements or dimensions of citizenship, such as rights, entitlements, state and territoriality, and its rearticulation with diversified and universalizing forces defined by markets, neoliberal values or human rights. The territorial limits of a nation state cannot be conceived as the exclusive domain for political mobilizations and claims made by diverse actors who invoke de/re/territorialized notions of citizenship as a new ground for resources, entitlements and protection (Ong 2006).

The challenges to national conceptions of citizenship and the possibilities for multiple dimensions of political belonging emerge in the context of globalized international relations. Saskia Sassen (2002: 277) contends that 'it is becoming evident today that far from being unitary, the institution of citizenship has multiple dimensions, only some of which might be inextricably linked to the national state'. She attributes to the transformation of the concept of citizenship two major conditions: the globalization process, with dynamics such as economic privatization and the consolidation of the international human rights regime, and the emergence of a plurality of actors and groups unwilling to identify automatically with the nation state. For Sassen, the formation of cross-borders networks helped to conceive alternative forms of political belonging and membership, giving rise to post-national and denationalized notions of citizenship. These alternative political imaginations indicate new possibilities for citizenship outside the confines of the modern nation state (Sassen 2002).

One might argue that part of the literature on citizenship studies has attempted to guide our contemporary political imagination towards a more humanist, universal conception of

citizenship. Ideals of *cosmopolitan* citizenship presuppose an ambitious project of detaching citizenship from the sovereign state in order to reinforce a strong sense of moral commitments to the whole of humanity (Linklater 2004; Nussbaum et al. 1996; compare, on the influence and limits of humanitarianism, Hart in this volume, Chapter 8). This entanglement between cosmopolitanism and citizenship acknowledges that states are not the only moral agents in global politics and individuals have crucial moral obligations to the rest of humanity (Linklater 2004). Conceptions of cosmopolitan citizenship entail a sense of moral obligation that surpasses the borders of the national political community in order to allow a just and equal treatment for humanity.

Eloquent challenges to the idea of cosmopolitan citizenship have been proposed. According to Richard Falk (1996: 57), cosmopolitanism risks 'indulging a contemporary form of fuzzy innocence'. He stresses the danger of conflating neoliberal globalism with cosmopolitan expectations, which then promotes a pernicious and ethically deficient market-driven globalism, fostered by actors such as transnational corporations and banks. Others, like Himmelfarb (1996: 76), called attention to the fact that some specific principles and policies associated with cosmopolitanism, such as social programmes, religious liberty and tolerance, or the prohibition of racial and sexual discrimination, 'depend not on a nebulous cosmopolitan order but on a vigorous administrative and legal order deriving its authority from the state'.

Michael Walzer's (1996: 125) critique argues that national citizens usually have not only a sense of belonging to a political community, but also precise rights and duties which are constitutive of their formal membership. Thus, the national domain provides real meaning and significance to the idea of citizenship, while aspirations to cosmopolitanism risk having no obvious implications for our everyday life. Importantly, Walzer stresses the importance of enacting rights, arguing, for example, that refugees should become citizens with the same rights as members of the moral and political community. Walzer's criticism casts light on what Veena Das (2007) has observed as a necessary 'descent into the ordinary' – the engagement with daily life as a fundamental condition to deal with violent practices. Citizenship, as a negotiated process, is concerned with the tensions and ambivalences of different forms of political belonging. And this presupposes an immersion into the recesses of everyday life. In light of contemporary challenges to political belonging, both in theory and in practice, we are all embedded, simultaneously, in fragmented and incongruous enactments of citizenship, in multiple and overlapping forms of membership.

Rather than dispensing with national citizenship altogether, some scholars have defined this shift towards a reconfigured politics of belonging as strategic citizenship (Harpaz and Mateos 2019; Joppke 2019). This trend can be understood as 'the worldwide rise of instrumental practices pertaining to the acquisition and use of citizenship, along with a concomitant instrumental-strategic attitude to nationality' (Harpaz and Mateos 2019: 843). Groups and individuals enact citizenship possibilities as a tactical way of making sense of their lives and to appropriate formal and bureaucratic rules relating to claiming and accessing rights. According to Harpaz and Mateos, strategic approaches to citizenship are modulated by acquisition strategies (how one becomes a citizen); instrumental uses (how one accesses the rights and duties pertaining to citizenship); and perceptions (how one becomes seen as a member of a community). The authors use, for example, the idea of citizenship as a premium, where, based on familial lines or economic resources, citizenship is obtained as a way of acquiring a certain status before an original community (dual citizenship as a highly valued social trait in certain societies, for example) or as enabling mobility (through access to passports and resi-

dency permits, usually in developed countries). What these cases have in common is a context marked by a global hierarchy of nationalities within which individuals search for another membership as a way to have access to economic advantages, global mobility or an improved social status. Thus, national citizenship is experiencing a sociopolitical process of becoming a market commodity by carrying strategic values independently of national ties (Harpaz and Mateos 2019; Joppke 2019). Epistemologically, the strategic citizenship perspective sheds light on the pragmatic, 'bottom-up' dimension of citizenship, highlighting how individuals and groups appropriate ideas of belonging and negotiate its terms in relation to their needs, dreams and projects (Das 2007).

What Harpaz and Mateos (2019) have called 'the commodification of citizenship' helps to elucidate the previous arguments on post-national (Sassen 2002; Tambini 2001), denationalized (Sassen 2002) and dual citizenship (Spiro 2019). It emphasizes the desacralization of membership and the growing acceptance of multiple and complex rights through instrumental attitudes towards citizenship. It is important to note here that strategic citizenship has not been valued for the possibilities of gaining access to political rights or even social welfare, but especially for the benefits in terms of global mobility, reinforcing the relevance of mobility rights and the centrality of passports in the current dynamics of membership (Harpaz and Mateos 2019). Although the idea of expanding mobility rights could be seen as a reason to celebrate, the 'instrumental turn' in citizenship (Joppke 2019) also elucidates the likelihood of deepening inequalities in non-Western countries and contributing to the consolidation of a global elite (Harpaz and Mateos 2019).

A plurality of debates on citizenship has focused, then, on how new forms of political participation, rights and belonging in transnational times are challenging the national dimension of citizenship, indicating possibilities of post-national and denationalized citizenship (Sassen 2002; Tambini 2001), multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka 1995; Triadafilopoulos 1997), dual citizenship (Spiro 2019), and so on (see also Fischer in this volume, Chapter 4, on transnationalism). Although each one of these approaches has its own particularities, they all have in common the impossibility of a return to ideals of national citizenship under contemporary conditions. Different sociopolitical processes, such as economic globalization, cultural denationalization, new migrations, and the consolidation of transnational institutions, indicate that national citizenship, as conventionally established, is experiencing a decline in terms of its ability to provide rights, participation and belonging in a world beyond the exclusive domain of the nation state (Tambini 2001). Rather than seeing citizenship as a sacred national and statist doxa or, conversely, as a cosmopolitan moral ground for a borderless human community, a growing debate on the citizenship has been more attentive to the experienced, lived constitution of political communities and the multiple and variegated ways in which it is enacted. Thus, theorists of new conceptions of citizenship can help elucidate the tensions and ambivalences of forms of 'fractured' political membership, making sense of increasingly heterogeneous, volatile and profoundly unequal attachments to modalities of belonging.

CITIZENSHIP IN MOTION

Citizenship as a focal point of theoretical discussions has become crucial in the context of *mobility critical* approaches to migration and its governance. Different scholars have emphasized how citizenship can be a site of contestation and ambivalence that has the potential

to push and transform the boundaries of contemporary political communities, and how the politics of movement can produce new forms of citizenship and of being political (Isin 2008; McNevin 2013; Nyers and Rygiel 2012). For Nyers and Rygiel (2012: 3), 'the governing of mobility is directly connected to constructions of citizenship, not only as a legal and political institution and status, but also related to practices, daily living and subjectivities related to and constitutive of being political'. As such, citizenship is constituted through (im)mobility in an ontological and biopolitical way: citizenship rights and their articulation with membership in particular states presuppose the condition of immobility and the biopolitical investment in governing desirable and undesirable populations through the politics of movement (Moulin 2012; Nyers and Rygiel 2012). With this in mind, it becomes possible to rethink citizenship through mobility – putting citizenship as a concept 'in motion' (Nyers and Rygiel 2012).

The displacement of citizenship, from its closed location in the state to new spaces of claims-making, allows for the possibility of imagining new forms of being political – many examples could be found in refugee protests and campaigns of activism initiated by migrants that enact a form of citizenship grounded in active participation in community and demands for access to 'the commons' (compare, on political mobilization, Ataç and Schwenken in this volume, Chapter 30). Nyers and Rygiel (2012) point to these new forms in their analysis of migrant activism and the enactment of citizenship 'from below'. By being political and making rights claims from a position not defined by the state, non-citizen migrants are creating new forms of citizen subjectivities. By the same token, they are blurring boundaries as the binary citizen/non-citizen has become less important, in relation to daily living practices (Nyers and Rygiel 2012). This theoretical effort can help illuminate new ways of being political that are not subsumed under traditional national and statist modes of belonging, useful for thinking and enacting other forms of solidarity in relation to issues such as social justice, rights and equality.

Isin (2008) highlights new possibilities of reimagining what citizenship is about, by focusing on its performative dimensions, and claims-making practices, especially related to one's ability to move within and across spaces (compare, on rights-based legal forms of migrant mobilization, Kawar in this volume, Chapter 31). He develops the conceptual tool of 'acts of citizenship' and 'activist citizenship' to grasp emerging citizen subjectivities as potentially disruptive acts that are not limited to traditional citizenship roles, such as voting and paying taxes. Isin highlights the importance of the rupture with the politics of modern liberal citizenship, developing an approach focused on 'those moments when, regardless of status and substance, subjects constitute themselves as citizens – or, better still, as those to whom the right to have rights is due' (Isin 2008: 18). From this perspective, an 'act of citizenship' concerns assertions to be (considered as) political subjects, seen through production of (activist) citizens and their others. Thus, subject positions – such as citizens, strangers, outsiders and aliens – are always in flux or in motion instead of being conceived as immobile identities.

Similarly Nyers (2015) develops the concept of 'migrant citizenships'. Instead of adopting a formal and legalistic approach to the relationship between mobility and citizenship (traditionally antagonistic – migrant vs. citizen), Nyers foregrounds the practices and political struggles of migrants and the impact of their claims in terms of membership and political belonging. He recognizes a disruptive potential, intrinsic to a critical concept of citizenship. He emphasizes the possibility of rethinking political subjectivity and community from the standpoint of everyday struggles and the claims of individuals and groups for recognition, regardless of their formal status. Thus, for Nyers (2015: 34), the notion of 'migrant citizenships' challenges

our conventional wisdom that citizenship is but a "technology of governance, exclusion, and differentiation"'. To think citizenship from the point of view of the 'migrant' forces us to blur commonplace distinctions of citizen/non-citizen. Viewing these categories as mutually constitutive illuminates a viable alternative to nationhood as a determinant and necessary dimension of political belonging. By analysing complex processes and dynamics that produce irregular subjects, Nyers (2011) also explores how citizens and non-citizens 'take rights' and transform the boundaries of political belonging through irregular paths. He refers to this as 'irregular citizenship'. Here, irregularity is understood as a condition produced by complex and multiple 'political struggles over status, rights and belonging' (Nyers 2011: 189). This mobility-critical approach shows how citizens are being made irregular, deprived of membership rights through (often racialized) politics of exclusion. But it also highlights how citizens and non-citizens embody the experience of irregularity through political contestations over 'the right to have rights'.

The conceptual intertwining of citizenship and mobility, as proposed by Isin and Nyers, enables a transformative reading of the practice of community building and reorients our conception of political belonging. Two moves are central to this endeavour. Firstly, that claims to citizenship are produced, disputed, and negotiated in the ongoing circulations of individuals and groups and in their encounters with governance structures (be they national governments, cities, international organizations and so on). Secondly, that citizenship is constituted as a normative and material framework through which individuals and groups become subjects or, in other words, rights-claiming and rights-bearing members of political communities. Belonging is a continuous and disruptive process of becoming that has profound consequences not only for individuals but for ideas of political membership writ large.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has articulated three arguments that have been central to the constitution of modern citizenship and its contemporary reconfiguration. Firstly, modern citizenship was indelibly connected to the rise of the modern nation state and to its spatial conception of political life. Historically, this has meant that citizenship was imbricated in statecraft practices devoted to producing a homogeneous population and to regulating and managing those deemed different both inside and outside national territories. For those included, at least in theory, citizenship enabled the possibility for accessing rights and duties, for having a voice within a bounded community, for envisioning the potential of a just, orderly and good life. Secondly, the production of modern citizens has justified practices of violence that have themselves structured much of our social and political life. Genocide, expulsions, wars, but also revolutions and liberation struggles, have been based on different claims on, and projects of, citizenship. Citizenship has functioned historically both as an ideal and as a set of practices that has modulated the possibilities of our being in the world, in relation to others and to structures of power. Thirdly, citizenship can be best understood as a site of ambivalence and as a permanently incomplete and contested project and conceptual tool.

Although the sociopolitical construction and reinforcement of citizenship is strongly marked by violent exclusions and technologies of governance, engaging with critical perspectives casts light on the possibilities of imagining other forms of 'being political' and of enacting citizen subjectivities. Therefore, and building on an analysis focused on putting citizenship

'in motion', this chapter has shown how different authors understand what it means to think about political belonging in contemporary times and what lies on the horizon of citizenship as a negotiated terrain of constitutive inequalities.

Rather than an either/or set of historically situated practices, citizenship helps us understand the fragmented and variegated ways in which individuals and groups fight for belonging and articulate the possibilities of living in and across communities. By focusing on those on the move, particularly in contexts of exclusion and of unequal access to rights, citizenship studies has been able to incorporate the centrality of its own outside (that is, non-citizens) to reconfigure what it means to belong today. Migrant citizens have routinely disrupted the boundaries of nations, states and political communities by tactically claiming rights, by autonomously enacting their own mobile projects and, more often than not, by forcing citizens to bear witness to their own exclusions and violence. Stateless peoples, displaced persons and 'non-status' communities all over the world attest, sometimes in the most dire and inhumane conditions, to what excluding notions of citizenship can produce. Assuming that citizenship is not limited by a fixed and state-centric nature, but it is still connected to racialized identities and modes of political belonging, opens up a potentially complex and creative fissure for grasping multiple transformations both historical and contemporary (Nyers 2015). This chapter has shown some of the lenses through which we can start to make sense of such a politics of belonging – as well as why we need to do so.

REFERENCES

Agnew, J. (1994), 'The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory', *Review of International Political Economy*, 1 (1), 53–80, doi:10.1080/09692299408434268.

Anderson, Benedict (1991), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London and New York: Verso.

Arendt, Hannah (1973), *1906–1975: The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Brubaker, Rogers (1992), *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chauvin, Sébastien and Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas (2012), 'Beyond informal citizenship: the new moral economy of migrant illegality', *International Political Sociology*, 6 (3), 241–59.

Das, Veena (2007), *Life and Words: Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Falk, Richard (1996), 'Revisioning cosmopolitanism', in Martha C. Nussbaum, Joshua Cohen and Immanuel M. Wallerstein (eds), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 53–60.

Giddens, Anthony (2008), *O Estado-Nação e a Violência. Segundo Volume de uma Crítica Contemporânea ao Materialismo Histórico*, São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.

Harpaz, Yossi and Pablo Mateos (2019), 'Strategic citizenship: negotiating membership in the age of dual nationality', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (6), 843–57.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude (1996), 'The illusions of cosmopolitanism', in Martha C. Nussbaum, Joshua Cohen and Immanuel M. Wallerstein (eds), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 72–7.

Hinsley, Francis Harry (1986), *Sovereignty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inayatullah, Naem and David Blaney (2004), *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, New York: Routledge.

Isin, Engin (2002), *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*, Minneapolis, MN and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Isin, Engin (2008), 'Theorizing acts of citizenship', in Isin Engin and Greg Nielsen (eds), *Acts of Citizenship*, New York: Zed Books, pp. 15–43.
Joppke, Christian (2019), 'The instrumental turn of citizenship', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (6), 858–78.
Kymlicka, Will (1995), *Multicultural Citizenship*, New York: Oxford University Press.
Linklater, Andrew (2004), *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
McNevin, Anne (2006), 'Political belonging in a neoliberal era: the struggle of the sans-papier', *Citizenship Studies*, 10 (2), 135–51.
McNevin, Anne (2013), 'Ambivalence and citizenship: theorising the political claims of irregular migrants', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 41 (2), 182–200.
Mezzadra, Sandro (2004), 'Citizenship in motion', *MakeWorlds*, 22 February, http://makeworlds.net/node/83.
Moulin, Carolina (2012), 'Ungrateful subjects? Refugee protests and the logic of gratitude', in Peter Nyers and Kim Rygiel (eds), *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*, London and New York: Routledge.
Nussbaum, Martha C., Joshua Cohen and Immanuel M. Wallerstein (eds) (1996), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Nyers, Peter (2011), 'Forms of irregular citizenship', in V. Squire (ed.), *The Contested Politics of Mobility*, London: Routledge, pp. 184–98.
Nyers, Peter (2015), 'Migrant citizenships and autonomous mobilities', *Migration, Mobility, & Displacement*, 1 (1): 23–39.
Nyers, Peter and Kim Rygiel (2012), *Citizenship, Migrant Activism and the Politics of Movement*, London and New York: Routledge.
Ong, Aihwa (2006), 'Mutations in citizenship', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23 (2–3), 499–505.
Rae, Heather (2002), *State Identities and the Homogenisation of Peoples*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sassen, Saskia (2002), 'Towards post-national and denationalized citizenship', in E. F. Isin and B. S. Turner (eds), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London: Sage, pp. 277–91.
Schueller, M. J. (2009), *Locating Race: Global Sites of Post-Colonial Citizenship*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
Spiro, Peter J. (2019), 'The equality paradox of dual citizenship', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45 (6), 879–96.
Spruyt, Hendrik (2002), 'The origins, development and possible decline of the modern state', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5, 127–49.
Tambini, Damian (2001), 'Post-national citizenship', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (2), 195–217.
Thomson, Janice (1994), *Mercenaries, Pirates, and Sovereigns*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Tilly, Charles (1990), *Coercion, Capital and European States*, *AD 990–1990*, Cambridge: Blackwell.
Torpey, John (2000), *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship, and the State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos (1997), 'Culture vs. citizenship? A review and critique of Will Kymlicka's *Multicultural Citizenship*', *Citizenship Studies*, 1 (2), 267–77.
Turner, Bryan (1997), 'Citizenship studies: a general theory', *Citizenship Studies*, 1 (1), 5–18.
Walzer, Michael (1996), 'Spheres of affection', in Martha C. Nussbaum, Joshua Cohen and Immanuel M. Wallerstein (eds), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 125–30.
Weber, Cynthia (2008), 'Designing safe citizens', *Citizenship Studies*, 12 (2), 125–42.
Weber, Max (1974), *Ensaios de Sociologia*, Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.