



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Citizenship agendas in and beyond the nation-state: (en)countering framings of the good citizen

de Koning, A.; Jaffe, R.; Koster, M.

DOI

[10.1080/13621025.2015.1005940](https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1005940)

Publication date

2015

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Citizenship Studies

License

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Koning, A., Jaffe, R., & Koster, M. (2015). Citizenship agendas in and beyond the nation-state: (en)countering framings of the good citizen. *Citizenship Studies*, 19(2), 121-127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2015.1005940>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

Citizenship agendas in and beyond the nation-state: (en)countering framings of the good citizen

Anouk de Koning^{a*}, Rivke Jaffe^b and Martijn Koster^c

^a*Department of Anthropology and Development Studies, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands;* ^b*Department of Human Geography, Planning and International Development Studies, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands;* ^c*Utrecht University School of Governance, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands*

(Received 7 September 2014; accepted 7 September 2014)

This special issue analyzes the formulation, implementation, and contestation of citizenship agendas. We define citizenship agendas as normative framings of citizenship that prescribe what norms, values, and behavior are appropriate for those claiming membership of a political community. These agendas are concerned with defining the meaning of membership in explicitly normative ways that go beyond conventional, legal–formal citizenship status. Citizenship agendas prescribe relations between people and larger structures of rule and belonging, which are often but not exclusively nation-states. Such citizenship agendas invariably imply models of virtuous and deviant citizens, favoring particular subject-citizens over others, and suggesting ways to transform the latter into the former.

Some of these agendas are part and parcel of the working of the nation-state; other citizenship agendas, however, are produced *beyond* the nation-state. The articles collected here study various sites where the meaning of ‘the good citizen’ is framed and negotiated in different ways. We approach these framings as agendas that may coexist in apparent harmony, or merge, or clash. The various articles in this special issue engage with normative framings of citizenship in different contexts, ranging from security policies and social housing in Dutch cities, to state-like but extralegal organizations in Jamaica and Guatemala, and from the regulation of the Muslim call to prayer in the US Midwest, to post-conflict reconstruction in Lebanon.

In this introduction, we extend the discussion of normative framings of citizenship associated with the nation-state. Building on recent discussions in the field of citizenship studies, which emphasize that citizenship can also be conceptualized and investigated beyond the state, the first section of this introduction provides a more detailed outline of our approach to citizenship agendas in and beyond the state. In the second section, we suggest a typology of three different configurations between state and non-state actors within which citizenship agendas are produced, detailing the different mechanisms of collaboration or contestation between state and non-state/state-like actors. Drawing on the cases presented in the different contributions to this special issue, we attempt to structure the diversity in state/non-state citizenship agendas by differentiating between the

*Corresponding author. Email: a.dekoning@maw.ru.nl

regulated outsourcing, mutual formulation, and insurgent contestation of citizenship agendas. We end this introduction with some concluding remarks on the implications that the approach elaborated in this special issue might have for citizenship studies.

Shaping ‘the good citizen’ in and beyond the nation-state

Various authors working within citizenship studies have pointed to the mechanisms through which ‘the good citizen’ is framed by state actors (Pykett, Saward, and Schaefer 2010) and how this framing functions as a crucial governmental instrument through which populations are managed (Bhandar 2010). Such studies of state citizenship agendas, often invoking Foucault’s notion of governmentality as ‘the conduct of conduct,’ have explored the normative shaping of ‘good’ national citizens through the configuration of values, beliefs, and sentiments (Foucault 1991; Rose 2000). These studies demonstrate how states employ citizenship agendas as a governmental technique to inculcate responsible and virtuous behavior in citizens. They have examined, for instance, how formal forms of citizenship education such as civics curricula seek to regulate the conduct of citizens (Brooks and Holford 2009; Kennelly and Llewellyn 2011), or how immigrant integration policies promote cultural assimilation as the individual responsibility of new citizens (Schinkel and van Houdt 2010). In addition to such explicit state programs for the regulation of national political membership, citizenship agendas may also be advanced in less programmatic ways, for instance in political rhetoric or in the subtext of government policies. Having become a buzzword in popular, political, and policy-making circles, the term ‘citizenship’ itself is central to techniques of governmentality used far beyond state programs to describe and proscribe desirable behavior. Often, these agendas do not necessarily target the entire national population or territory, rather they are directed at specific subpopulations or subnational territories.

In this issue, several papers demonstrate how particular subjects are framed as deficient, as undesirables who must change their norms, values, and behavior in order to meet the criteria of good citizenship. However, as these contributions show, these citizenship agendas almost always emerge in complex interplays between state and non-state actors. This necessitates an approach to citizenship agendas that builds on recent work on citizenship beyond the nation-state, and attends both to the governmental role of non-state actors and to the rescaling of statehood.

Recent work in citizenship studies has emphasized the utility of ‘pushing’ the concept beyond its institutional-legal framework to include the role of non-state actors (Gordon and Stack 2007). Historically, state–subject relationships have largely gained shape through institutions other than ‘the state.’ As Lazar (2012) shows, collective civil society organizations may play an important role in the development of ‘mediated citizenship.’ Similar mediated state–subject relations may take place through informal clientelist networks (Koster 2014). In addition, others have pointed to the pluralization and hybridization of regulatory authority and political community to include non-state entities such as corporate actors, social movements, NGOs, and criminal organizations (Ong 2006; Trouillot 2001; Roitman 2007; Jaffe 2013).

What is the role of these non-state actors in delineating the parameters of citizenship? Is citizenship still tied to the nation-state, although mediated by non-state actors? Or can we also locate citizenship in non-state political communities? Lazar (2013, 2) argues that an anthropological focus on lived experience points toward an understanding of citizenship as ‘a mechanism for making claims on different political communities, of which the state is just one.’¹ Building on these approaches, this issue explores the blurred

boundaries between state and non-state, attempting to understand how citizenship can be conceptualized in relation to non-state or hybrid forms of governance.

In addition, recent scholarship on citizenship has included an extensive critique of methodological nationalism, the taken-for-granted focus on the nation-state as the standard of political community. Understanding citizenship as membership in a political community directs our attention to the various scales at which such communities take shape. Various scholars have begun to explore how the relationship between citizens and the state shifts when we take into account the rescaling of statehood to the subnational/municipal or supranational scale (Brenner 2004; Gordon and Stack 2007; Isin and Turner 2007).

Drawing on these debates in citizenship studies, we investigate how notions of national citizenship become entangled with other forms of political belonging, at different levels including the urban and the transnational. By utilizing such an approach, we hope to build on and extend existing work on citizenship agendas, which tends to concentrate on the relationship between citizens and the nation-state. Interrogations of the ways in which 'good citizens' are framed remain primarily concerned with who is a good national citizen in the eyes of the state. This special issue seeks to extend our understanding of citizenship agendas both in and beyond the nation-state, focusing on the role played by non-state actors and on the articulations between multiple, differentially scaled agendas.

Rather than a more or less unified national citizenship agenda, a plethora of competing citizenship agendas are put forward by various actors and at varying scales. National citizenship agendas are fleshed out and implemented at local, regional, or transnational scales, by institutions and actors who insert their own experiences, understandings, and interests (see, e.g., Verkaaik 2010). In addition, as political community and belonging are defined at nonnational scales such as that of the neighborhood, the city, or the world, the set of practices that 'good citizens' are expected to perform shift accordingly. The informal obligations that follow both the 'transnationalization of the political' (Balibar 2009, viii) and forms of political belonging tied to particular cities (Isin 2000; Varsanyi 2006) may coexist or become interlocked. We agree with Holston (1999, 169), who underlines 'the possibility of multiple citizenships based on the local, regional and transnational affiliations that aggregate in contemporary urban experience.' In addition, powerful non-state actors – including NGOs, corporations, and criminal organizations – also formulate citizenship agendas that affect those who dwell in the territories where these actors play a role in governing.

Citizenship agendas at these different scales or articulated by these different actors need not be mutually exclusive.

The various citizenship agendas that emerge in the center of the nation-state, at its margins and beyond, are often competing, contradictory, and ambiguous. This complexity necessitates an understanding of citizenship that goes beyond the idea of a single dominant discourse presumed in many theorizations of governmentality. The contributions to this special issue demonstrate the various articulations of multiple citizenships in different contexts.

Citizenship agendas and configurations of state/non-state actors

In the various contributions to this special issue, we can differentiate between three broad types of configurations of state and non-state actors in which citizenship agendas are articulated. While this typology of configurations is not exhaustive, and the three types are not necessarily mutually exclusive, we suggest that it covers many contemporary instances. A first configuration involves the *regulated outsourcing of citizenship agendas*.

In contexts across the globe, states have been ‘rolling back’ their direct role in the realization of citizenship rights to their subjects. Recent decades have shown many cases of outsourcing service provision to non-state entities, whether corporate or voluntary actors. Increasingly, governance assemblages, in which state and non-state institutions are entangled, are responsible for the management of populations and territories, as is illustrated by the contributions to this issue by de Koning (2015) and Koster (2015). Against the background of neoliberal modes of governing, national citizenship agendas come to be formulated and implemented by non-state actors within such assemblages. Although citizens can still make claims on the nation-state for the right to certain amenities (e.g., housing, security, social assistance, basic infrastructure, health care), service provision is taken on by voluntary or corporate actors. Non-state actors are responsabilized with guaranteeing citizenship rights, with the blessing and cooperation of the state, and in so doing take on the state-like moral role of ensuring that subjects display appropriate norms, values, and behavior. As de Koning shows for the domain of youth and security, and Koster for that of housing, the regulated outsourcing of citizenship agendas involves the cooperation of state and non-state actors, with non-state actors financially dependent or juridically attached to the state. This outsourcing of agendas is necessarily a fractured process in which different public and private interests may clash and compete. Although tensions may arise between state and non-state actors in their collaboration, they jointly articulate particular citizenship agendas. Neveu (2015) argues that such state citizenship agendas may be subverted and appropriated in the process of implementation. In her discussion of a participatory scheme and a social movement in France, she demonstrates how the seemingly apolitical ‘ordinary’ can become a site for politicization and contestation.

A second configuration involves the *mutual formulation of citizenship agendas*, with non-state actors taking on a more proactive, complementary role in negotiating the normative framing of citizenship with the state. This entails forms of collaboration (or collusion) in which political communities beyond the state develop framing of citizenships that intersect with state citizenship agendas. Here, non-state actors engage with the nation-state’s citizenship agenda, while claiming a place within the state or pursuing specific economic interests. In the contribution by Perkins (2015), we see how groups of citizens in the US city of Hamtramck, Michigan, engage with municipal regulations on rights to religious manifestations in public space. Focusing on the public and juridical debates around the Muslim call for prayer in Hamtramck, Perkins shows how different actors contested the material and spatial conception of shared civic culture and existing assumptions about political and religious differences. In so doing, through creating a distinct citizenship agenda, these actors set out to claim a place within the city for the Muslim religious community. Referencing both religious obligations and national rights, religious organizations actively shaped debates on good citizenship and, eventually, effected a broadening of City Hall’s framing of citizenship. Focusing on the electoral process in Jamaica, the contribution by Jaffe (2015) describes the entanglement of trade unions and criminal organizations with political parties, relationships that have tended to be collaborative rather than antagonistic. Approaching elections as sites for negotiations of political community and citizenship agendas both in and beyond the state, Jaffe shows how citizens engage with and are engaged by these different, entangled actors. She demonstrates that ideas about appropriate voting behavior have been framed not only by the formal institutions but also by unionists and gang members, enabling a particular citizenship agenda that blurs the boundaries of the nation-state.

A third configuration can be glossed as *insurgent contestations of citizenship agendas*. This involves a more contentious relationship between different political communities, with non-state actors developing citizenship agendas that may diametrically oppose those of the state. Here, we see non-state political communities that counter the state's authority and notions of belonging. Non-state actors tend to turn to different strategies in advancing their ideas about citizenship, often attempting to usurp or appropriate the authority of the state in order to legitimize their governmental role of subjects. They tend to mimic the state in imposing particular moralities about good behavior and social justice. The contribution by Sharp (2015) shows how, in Guatemala, political communities below the state may usurp rights to define good citizenship and to impose severe sanctions for those who transgress their common law. However, this formulation of rights, obligations, and sanctions proposed by the older men in the community is contested by younger men, who draw on contrasting citizenship agendas that foreground individual rights within the framework of the national constitution. Hourani's (2015) contribution on post-conflict urban planning in Beirut shows how Hizballah utilizes both legal and extra-legal power to pursue particular citizenship agendas. Referencing both national and ethno-religious structures of rule and belonging, Hizballah has developed a morally loaded urbanism that attempts to displace that of the neoliberal Lebanese state.

Finally, the contributions to this special issue highlight the territorial dimensions of citizenship agendas. Although in the classic understanding the focus of citizenship is the state and its locus is the national territory, the different contributions to this issue show how alternative socio-spatial parameters of citizenship may gain shape. Often, citizenship agendas are not imposed on the population of the national territory, but focus on people in specific sites, such as a particular municipality (Sharp and Perkins), 'ordinary' public space (Neveu), or particular neighborhoods (de Koning, Hourani, Jaffe, and Koster). Citizenship agendas often include territorial negotiations about who has the right to live where, and what particular norms and obligations pertain to various categories of people in that territory. Non-state actors involved in producing citizenship agendas also actively claim particular territories, in another act of state mimicry, as becomes clear in the cases presented by Jaffe and Sharp.

Concluding thoughts

This special issue makes a contribution to citizenship studies in two ways. First, by focusing on agendas, it calls for specific attention to the variety of normative articulations of citizenship. By emphasizing the distinctions between good and bad citizens that underlie such agendas, the issue builds on theorizations of how 'differentiated' (Holston 2008) or 'variegated' citizenship (Inda 2005) is produced, expanding our understanding of how framings of citizenship may construct inequality rather than equality. Second, by emphasizing the possible involvement of non-state actors, we show how such differentiations are by no means produced by the state alone. This approach, building on recent explorations of citizenship beyond the state, allows an understanding of the production of inequality through more complex and sometimes conflicting forms of governance. As many states increasingly outsource service provision to, and care for, subjects to non-state actors, the role of the state in shaping the contours of citizenship is progressively appropriated by public-private assemblages of governance or even extra-legal organizations. The papers in this issue provide insights into the alternative forms of political community that may emerge in such contexts.

Rather than always taking the state as the point of departure in citizenship studies, in this special issue, we propose an analysis that starts by asking by whom and at what levels of scale subjects are governed and from which sites and within which configurations of states and state-like actors citizenship agendas are produced and negotiated. Whereas many of the contributions to this special issue foreground the governmental sides of citizenship agendas, Hansen's (2015) afterword highlights the aspirational side of citizenship agendas. As Hansen points out, citizenship has become a dominant form of claim-making for people around the world. Citizenship agendas are not only forms of control; they also provide people with important horizons of aspiration and action, with full citizenship remaining an aspiration that fuels struggles against exclusion and inequality. However, citizenship agendas may equally be taken up in pursuit of more conservative and exclusionary futures. With the perspective on citizenship in and beyond the nation-state that we develop in this special issue, we hope to contribute to a sophisticated analysis of citizenship as both a form of control and a horizon for collective struggles.

Acknowledgments

This special issue developed out of a Society for Urban, National, and Transnational Anthropology (SUNTA) invited session on 'Citizenship against the Grain' at the American Anthropological Association's annual meeting in San Francisco, 14–18 November 2012. We are grateful to the participants in the session and to the discussants Thomas Blom Hansen and Deborah Thomas for their valuable input into our discussion of citizenship in and beyond the nation-state.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Note

1. This stretching of citizenship has been met with some critique. Stack (2013), for instance, proposes the term 'civil sociality' to refer to understandings of obligations and good behavior that are grounded in 'society' rather than in (state) authority and law. Nuijten (2013) views citizenship as but one, although very dominant, 'language of the political,' and argues that marginalized groups in particular may draw on other languages, such as patronage.

References

- Balibar, Etienne. 2009. *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bhandar, D. 2010. "Cultural Politics: Disciplining Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 14 (3): 331–343. doi:10.1080/13621021003731963
- Brenner, Neil. 2004. *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brooks, Rachel and John Holford, eds. 2009. *Citizenship, Learning and Education*, special issue of *Citizenship Studies* 13 (2): 85–200.
- de Koning, Anouk. 2015. "Citizenship Agendas for the Abject: The Production of Distrust in Amsterdam's Youth and Security Domain." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 155–168.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, 87–104. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, Andrew, and Trevor Stack. 2007. *Citizenship beyond the State*, special issue of *Citizenship Studies* 11 (2): 117–228.
- Hansen, Thomas Blom. 2015. "Citizenship as Horizon." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 228–231.

- Holston, James. 1999. "Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship." In *Cities and Citizenship*, edited by James Holston, 155–173. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Holston, James. 2008. *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hourani, Najib. 2015. "Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Citizenship Agendas: Lessons from Beirut." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 183–198.
- Inda, Jonathan X. 2005. "Analytics of the Modern: An Introduction." In *Anthropologies of Modernity*, edited by Jonathan X. Inda, 1–20. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Isin, Engin F., ed. 2000. *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. London: Routledge.
- Isin, Engin F., and B. S. Turner. 2007. "Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies." *Citizenship Studies* 11 (1): 5–17. doi:10.1080/13621020601099773
- Jaffe, Rivke. 2013. "The Hybrid State: Crime and Citizenship in Urban Jamaica." *American Ethnologist* 40 (4): 734–748. doi:10.1111/amet.12051
- Jaffe, Rivke. 2015. "Between Ballots and Bullets: Elections and Citizenship in and beyond the Nation-State." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 128–140.
- Kennelly, Jacqueline, and Kristina R. Llewellyn. 2011. "Educating for Active Compliance: Discursive Constructions in Citizenship Education." *Citizenship Studies* 15 (6–7): 897–914.
- Koster, Martijn. 2014. "Fear and Intimacy: Citizenship in a Recife Slum, Brazil." *Ethnos* 79 (2): 215–237. doi:10.1080/00141844.2012.732955
- Koster, Martijn. 2015. "Citizenship Agendas, Urban Governance and Social Housing in the Netherlands." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 213–227.
- Lazar, Sian. 2012. "Disjunctive Comparison: Citizenship and Trade Unionism in Bolivia and Argentina." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 18 (2): 349–368. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9655.2012.01747.x
- Lazar, Sian, ed. 2013. "Introduction." In *The Anthropology of Citizenship: A Reader*, 1–22. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Neveu, Catherine. 2015. "Of Ordinarity and Citizenship Processes." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 141–154.
- Nuijten, Monique. 2013. "The Perversity of the 'Citizenship Game': Slum-Upgrading in the Urban Periphery of Recife, Brazil." *Critique of Anthropology* 33 (1): 8–25. doi:10.1177/0308275X12466683
- Ong, Aihwa. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Perkins, Alisa. 2015. "Muslim Sound, Public Space, and Citizenship Agendas in an American City." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 169–182.
- Pykett, Jessica, Michael Saward, and Anja Schaefer. 2010. "Framing the Good Citizen." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 12 (4): 523–538. doi:10.1111/j.1467-856X.2010.00424.x
- Roitman, Janet. 2007. "The Right to Tax: Economic Citizenship in the Chad Basin." *Citizenship Studies* 11(2): 187–209.
- Rose, Nikolas. 2000. "Community, Citizenship, and the Third Way." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (9): 1395–1411. doi:10.1177/00027640021955955
- Schinkel, Willem, and Friso van Houdt. 2010. "The Double Helix of Cultural Assimilationism and Neo-Liberalism: Citizenship in Contemporary Governmentality." *British Journal of Sociology* 61 (4): 696–715. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01337.x
- Sharp, Ellen. 2015. "Vigilantes, Gangsters and Alcohol: Clashing Citizenship Regimes in Postwar Guatemala." *Citizenship Studies* 19 (2): 199–212.
- Stack, Trevor. 2013. "In the Eyes of the Law, in the Eyes of Society: A Citizenship Tradition in West Mexico." *Critique of Anthropology* 33 (1): 66–90. doi:10.1177/0308275X12466680
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2001. "The Anthropology of the State in the Age of Globalization: Close Encounters of the Deceptive Kind." *Current Anthropology* 42 (1): 125–138. doi:10.1086/318437
- Varsanyi, Monica W. 2006. "Interrogating Urban Citizenship vis-à-vis Undocumented Migration." *Citizenship Studies* 10 (2): 229–249. doi:10.1080/13621020600633168
- Verkaaik, Oskar. 2010. "The Cachet Dilemma: Ritual and Agency in New Dutch Nationalism." *American Ethnologist* 37 (1): 69–82. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1425.2010.01242.x