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For more than a decade, academics and policy-makers have pondered the consequences of globalization for national states and for the future of foundational institutions of democratic governance such as citizenship. Although globalization has been imagined in a variety of competing ways, there is general consensus that the cornerstones of modern governance, especially the symmetries forged largely in the past two centuries between national states, national territory, and national citizenship rights, have been progressively fractured by transnational networks, flows, and identities. Globalization is commonly linked to the erosion of the capacity of national states to exercise sovereignty over domestic policy and territorial boundaries or to buffer its citizens from an increasing predatory and unpredictable international political economy.

Disillusioned assessments of the future of the national state and citizenship rights are widely held among interested publics and policy networks but the degree of fatalism implied by the diagnosis is linked to different conceptions of globalization itself. At one end of the spectrum are those who maintain that there is nothing especially new about the contemporary era and that the advance of globalization ultimately depends on the power and approval of national states themselves. At the other end of the spectrum are those who understand globalization as a transformative epoch, involving the reordering of modern frameworks of human organization and action, including national citizenship and previous experience with the national state as a primary container of political power and collective action (Held et al., 1999, p. 10). Extreme versions of this latter viewpoint, sometimes termed the ‘strong globalization thesis’, represent national states as being reduced to a zombie-like presence, living yet dead (Beck, 2000, p. 27), as ‘unnatural’, even impossible units in a global economy (Ohmae, 1995, p. 5). Others, while recognizing the unbundling of the modernist links between the national state, territory, and citizens, view globalization less deterministically as a complex and multilayered process that invites us to rethink the scope and content of contemporary citizenship rights both within and beyond the national state.

The contributions to this special issue of Citizenship Studies understand globalization, although differently, as a contested term and as a set of interactions whose uncertain parameters are historically unique and still unfolding. At Janine Brodie, Canada Research Chair (Political Economy and Social Governance), Department of Political Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, T6G 2H4; e-mail: janine.brodie@ualberta.ca
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a minimum, however, contemporary globalization can be explored schematically in terms of related but distinct processes—globality and globalism. Globality refers to the amalgam of forces, many technological and irreversible, that are attributed with progressively breaking down barriers of time, space, and nation and fashioning the planet into a coherent global community. Globalism, in contrast, is a contestable political posture that promotes a transnational worldview, philosophy of governance and institutional structures (Beck, 2000, pp. 1–3, 11–5). As discussed in more detail below, the prevailing version, neoliberal globalism, is indicted for prioritizing economic growth and market logics over all other goals and institutions of governance and for enforcing on all national polities, with varying degrees of coercion, privatization, trade liberalization, deregulation, and the erosion of the public sector. The articles in this issue demonstrate the many ways in which globality and globalism impinge upon state sovereignty, the capacities of governments to legislate national policy goals and, ultimately, the relevance, scope and scale of citizenship rights in the contemporary era. These contributions also show that the impacts of globalization on citizenship are complex, uneven, and necessarily open to contestation and revision.

Globality

Modern citizenship, although also associated with participation and identity formation, is primarily understood in terms of the rights and obligations available to individuals as members of a state, that is, as a national community of fate (Held, 1999). Indeed, by definition, modern citizenship has little meaning except within the context of the consolidation and evolution of national states. Citizenship connotes membership within a bordered territory and an internationally recognized state. While the substance of citizenship has evolved with time, it defines the relationship between the individual and the state, ever increasingly in the language of rights (Brodie, 2002, p. 379). As Hindess underlines, modern citizenship is understood as an attribute of individuals who are members of a very particular kind of self-contained political unity—the modern state (2002, p. 128). The concept of globality challenges this understanding of citizenship in two important respects—first, by questioning the ongoing relevance of methodological nationalism by social scientists and political practitioners and, second, by asserting the emergence of new and unique political identities and public spaces beyond the confines of the national state.

The modernist practice of methodological nationalism advances a container theory that assumes, theoretically and politically, that the contours of society and social interests coincide with the formal boundaries of the national state and that the state controls (has sovereignty over) that space (Beck, 2000, p. 23). Society, from this perspective, is a tangible and governable space, an ‘always already’ there ‘natural-historical form of human species life’ (Burchell, 1991, p. 134). While societies are bounded and distinguished from one another, they also are conceived as being comprised of distinct and potentially conflicting collectivities whose interactions may lead either to ‘cohesion and solidarity’ or to ‘breakdown and dissolution’. The role of the national state and the goals of governance, thus,
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revolve around the promotion of social solidarity and social reproduction within
the ‘internal spaces of outwardly separable societies’ (Beck, 2000, p. 23).
Methodological nationalism, it should be underlined, is a decidedly western
perspective. Former colonies and the debt-ridden countries of the contemporary
global South never exercised the measure of autonomy and cohesion assumed by
this model.

Globality also challenges the idea that society (and citizens) is a discrete and
governable entity that is contained within the territorial boundaries of the
national state. As Beck puts it, globality ‘means that the unity of national state
and national society has become unstuck’ (p. 23). Closed national spaces and
identities no longer capture social and political life, it is argued, because the
local is now infused with transnational and transcultural networks that multiply
and often deterritorialize citizen subjectivities. Individual identity, in a globaliz-
ing era, is complicated by a complex of forces, loyalties, technologies and
movements that iterate individuals differently and at different scales of political
organization into what Held et al. call ‘overlapping communities of fate’ (1999,
p. 442). Strings of transactions and interests as well as non-territorial and pre-
and post-national solidarities run up and down through the national social fabric
such that citizens are often more directly linked to distant forces and actors than
to the national state. Local events, in turn, are shaped at a distance, thus
depriving the national state of the illusion of control. The state’s capacity to
protect is citizens, moreover, is diminished by the growing saliency of global
policy issues that are largely immune from the policy interventions of any single
state.

The concept of globality presents citizenship studies with what is, in effect, an
ontological challenge, suggesting that the world has changed. This ground-shift
has spawned new spaces for political action and new ways of conceiving of
collective rights that are neither exclusively nor appropriately the singular
domain of national citizens. Globality thus invites contemplation of inclusive
transnational public spaces and transnational citizen-subjects. This notion of the
transnational subject is clearly the object of contemporary human rights dis-
course and the human security agenda (Brodie, 2003). Both promote the idea
that the fundamental right of all individuals to non-discrimination as well as their
social, economic and political needs surpass the sovereignty of national states.
In sum, globality suggests that the world is fast becoming a coherent economic,
cultural and political unit, which is supported by, among other things, informa-
tion and communication technologies, global markets, global brands and
cultural industries, global governmental and non-governmental organizations,
global environmental awareness and global demands for human rights and
democracy. State primacy and national interests, accordingly, are considered
secondary, if not reactionary points of reference.

Globalism

Neoliberal globalism, in contrast, can be viewed as a politically contestable
experiment in transnational governance. Although diverse in application and
increasingly subject to resistance and modification, at its roots, neoliberal
globalism represents:

- the enforcement of a utopian experiment on a global scale;
- a profoundly political project that employs the levers of the national state to
  ensure the primacy of the market over other social and political rights and
  relationships;
- an uncompromising epistemic that requires social facts to be viewed, if they
  are to be seen at all, through the lens of neo-classical economics; and
- a strict and narrow conception of rationality as individual rationality, homo
  economicus, that brackets off the effects of social structures and denies the
  relevance of cultural difference (Bourdieu, 1998).

Critics argue that neoliberal globalism erodes national state competence—the
ability to realize policy goals and democratic will within a national territory—ei-
ther, de facto, through the logic and power of global capitalism or, increasingly,
de jure, through the global enforcement of international trade and investment
agreements. The unfettered globalization of production and finance, it is ad-
vanced, enables global capital to transcend national boundaries, shop among
jurisdictions for the lowest taxation regimes or the best infrastructure and just as
quickly abandon commitments to citizen rights and environmental integrity. The
ability of transnational capital to move relatively unrestricted around the globe
is also commonly understood to undermine citizenship rights, especially postwar
social citizenship rights, as national states engage in a ‘race to the bottom’ to
retain and attract capital investment. States find themselves locked into a
permanent referendum—being continuously monitored by international financial
institutions, transnational corporations and bond rating agencies as to their
desirability as sites for investment (Pierson, 1998, p. 68). The protection and
advancement of national citizenship rights are relatively insignificant factors in
this global calculus.

Neoliberal globalism also is indicted for altering the form of the modern state,
as sovereignty shifts up to international trade and investment agreements that
increasingly assume binding authority over national policies, democratic institu-
tions and practices and, ultimately, fundamental citizenship rights. This ‘new
constitutionalism’, as Gill terms it, mandates ‘the insulation of key aspects of the
economy from the influence of politicians or the mass of citizens by imposing,
internally and externally, binding constraints on the conduct of fiscal, monetary,
trade and investment policies’ (1995, p. 411). In the process, market logics are
elevated both over and inside the national state. Public goods are privatized
while the public sphere embraces, as a measure of its own performance, market
discourses and rationales. As important, marginalized groups, indeed, all citizens
are constrained in their struggles for equality, security, and inclusion (Brodie,
1997). Previously, the regulation of capital and the public sector spending and
ownership were employed by national states to advance the human condition but
many of these kinds of governmental interventions are discouraged if not
disallowed by these international agreements.

Through membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO) or as signato-
ries of regional trade and investment agreements such as the North American
Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), elected officials agree to narrow the terrain of state competency by complying with externally-derived and binding rules that almost exclusively relate to the deregulation of capital within their jurisdictions. As Sassen reminds us, deregulation denationalizes national territory (1998, p. xxiv). National governmental institutions become infused with the global as policy-makers are forced to anticipate and integrate the demands of the new constitutionalism into national and local strategies of governance. In the process, a series of modernist oppositions, for example, between international and national, public and private and artificial (corporations) and actual (persons) citizens, become blurred. In summary, then, the case that neoliberal globalism is eroding the centrality of the national state and diminishing citizenship rights is represented as either necessary, as requisite of the inexorable logic of economic globalization and the uncontainable power of global capital, or as mandated by the dictates of the new constitutionalism, or as conditional upon the effectiveness of these disciplinary practices within different national settings (Hay, 1998).

Citizenship Beyond the National State

The concepts of globality and globalism invite a series of questions about the appropriateness of viewing citizenship exclusively through a nationalist and largely western lens. As many of the contributions to this issue of Citizenship Studies remind us, the contemporary lament for the erosion of national citizenship often loses sight of the historical evolution of this political institution, its strong association with western liberal political economies and its uneven application both within and across national states (Isin, 2002). Satoshi Ikeda’s lead article, for example, points out that the form and inclusiveness modern citizenship has shifted dramatically with different epochs in the global organization of capital. However, with each of the three epochs of participation/exclusion that he identifies, people at the center of the world system enjoyed a greater measure of citizenship protections than (and often at the cost of) their counterparts in the periphery. In its earliest manifestations, during the epoch of European colonialism, the designation of ‘imperial subject’ best characterized the relationship between citizens and the state. Imperial subjects at the center of European empires were subjects in a hierarchical governing structure and barred from participation in political decision-making. People in the colonized world, moreover, were subjects of a dual imperial structure, being subordinated to local rulers who were, in turn, subordinated to the European imperial structure. Imperialism denied the possibility of participation by colonial subjects in political decision-making and, instead, often subjected them to political, religious, and cultural oppression.

Ikeda notes that a different model of citizenship emerged in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with the consolidation of national models of economic development and the spread, through revolution and independence movements, of liberal democracies and citizenship rights. In the process, imperial subjects were transformed into national citizens. Although this transformation continued to be marked by sexist and racist patterns of exclusion, the promise of citizenship rights mobilized emancipatory struggles among subordinated peoples
within countries as well as among former colonies of the European imperial order. As Isabel Altamirano-Jiménez documents, members of national states only partially and selectively realized the promise of national citizenship rights. Examining the evolution of modern citizenship rights in Mexico and Canada, Altamirano-Jiménez explains how national citizenship rights were exercised primarily by the settler rather than the indigenous populations of these newly formed North American states. In Canada, for example, the vast majority of Aboriginal peoples did not achieve political rights until well after social rights were extended to the preponderant majority of Canadian citizens.

Although Mexico formally recognized indigenous peoples as citizens in its founding documents of the early nineteenth century, the almost exclusive focus of successive Mexican governments on the formation of a homogeneous national identity excluded aboriginal peoples and denied their unique and different ties to land and nature. Altamirano-Jiménez’s discussion of the struggles of contemporary indigenous groups in Canada and Mexico reveals that governments in both countries have bypassed aboriginal demands for formal recognition of organic constructions of citizenship in favor of integration through a market-based definition of citizenship. This definition promotes the integration and inclusion of Aboriginal peoples into the national community of citizens by separating economic development of aboriginal lands from either aboriginal culture or the struggle for aboriginal self-government. According to this new model of citizenship, indigenous populations are integrated and empowered within national communities, not as first peoples with distinct cultures, but, instead, as entrepreneurs, consumers and producers of global capitalism.

This idea of market citizenship coincides with what Ikeda identifies as the current phase of modern citizenship, which, he argues, has transformed national citizens into corporate subjects. The growth and reach of transnational corporations (TNCs) and the ascendancy of neoliberal governance throughout the world has rendered citizens dependent on TNCs both for their livelihoods and increasingly for their identity. Although the subordination of corporate subjects is more direct and unforgiving in the South than in the North, contemporary ‘free enterprise imperialism’, Ikeda argues, is the driving force behind the tendency for people to locate themselves and define their subjectivity in terms of consumption patterns instead of national identities and political struggles. This new global cycle of the corporate subject, as Ikeda points out, is rife with contradictions and inherently unstable.

Janet Conway’s article identifies one such contradiction as the explosion of demands for democratization and citizenship rights occurring outside the boundaries of the national state and traditional institutions of national citizenship participation such as political parties. Conway uses the example of the World Social Forum (WSF) to argue that the conditions of globality have generated the growth of a new public space, one that is ‘placed but transnational’, where new visions of global citizenship are being imagined, contested and elaborated. Conway notes that traditional notions of national citizenship have fallen into disarray as national boundaries become ever more porous, loyalties and identities multiply, the promises of political and social citizenship whither away and the goals of decolonization and national self-determination in the South are sub-
verted by the realities of neoliberal globalism and debt bondage. Global economic and cultural flows as well as the growing currency of the idea of international human rights betray dominant constructions of citizenship as irredeemably western and national in definition and scope. This does not mean, however, that the emancipatory impulses that framed the evolution of modern citizenship rights have diminished. Instead, Conway emphasizes that new transnational sites, underpinned by social movements rather than national states, give voice to a broad spectrum of marginalized peoples and call into being new kinds of sovereignty and new conceptions of unbounded citizenship rights and practices. Rather than being bestowed from above, which arguably was the case with national citizenship rights, this new form of transnational citizenship is claimed from below.

Juan José Palacios also examines the contemporary proliferation of new forms of, and claims to, citizenship outside the territorial boundaries of national states and the formal institutions of the public sphere. Palacios traces the development of self-proclaimed non-territorial nations such as ‘cyber-nations’ and the flourishing population of virtual citizens on the World Wide Web. He argues, however, that the spread and power of TNCs in the global economy invites a closer interrogation of these organizations as paradigmatic examples of the global citizen as well as the potentially positive meanings of corporate citizenship under contemporary conditions. TNCs now organize and operate as horizontal networks of services and production and as flows of transaction that evade and transcend territorial boundaries and the regulatory capacities of national states. A significant body of ‘caring capitalism’ literature, however, now advances the case that corporations can be held accountable for citizen well-being and environmental sustainability without the constraints of state regulation and democratic practice. Corporations, according this social responsibility thesis, can be held accountable to a wide range of stakeholders, including the employees, communities, and national governments because caring capitalism is good for business. Palacios, however, rejects the idea that TNCs, as artificial persons/citizens, can ever profess the moral and ethical values pursued by individuals or democratic collectivities. When ethics and profits come in conflict, TNCs, by definition, will always act to enhance the bottom line. Alternatively, Palacios suggests that TNCs could be held in check if the growing anti-globalization movement were to regroup as a network of ‘civic regulators’. Although not yet sufficiently united, these non-state transnational actors could monitor the activities of TNCs across the globe and hold them accountable for their social and environmental footprints.

Anna Yeatman’s thought-provoking article critiques streams of analyses that displace the centrality of the idea of the state in the promotion and protection of human rights and security in the contemporary era. She argues that the very idea of the state has been discredited by civil society movements (both the supporters and opponents of neoliberal globalism) and by states themselves that have failed to live up to ethical demands, especially the hallmark principle that all humans be accorded the constitutional status of person. Similarly, the idea of right has been distorted by state-sponsored nationalism that uses national identity to displace fundamental principles of non-discrimination, personhood and the
universality of right. Yeatman draws on Hegel’s insights regarding the dialectical relationship between the subjective and objective to argue for renewed and reinvigorated ideas of the state and of constitutionalism that are sensitive to changing historical circumstances and embedded both in national institutions and in our daily subjective experience.

The final article in this issue of *Citizenship Studies* also advocates a reinvigorated national state to regulate global capital and to recover the policy processes and policy options that have been denied citizens of democratic polities through the implementation of constitution-like international treaties. David Schneiderman argues that the protection of investor rights, secured within contemporary international investment treaties such as NAFTA and the WTO, have effectively diminished the capacity of national governments to regulate economic relations as well as their capacity to reflect the will of democratic polities. Drawing on the recent work of Jurgen Habermas, Schneiderman argues that such investment rights are worth discarding precisely because of the constraints they impose on states and democratic practices. Like Habermas, this discussion invites citizens to distinguish between colonizing discourses and convincing ones and to challenge mechanisms, constitution-like or otherwise, that uphold private power in the face of growing economic inequalities and debilitating constraints on democratic practice. From this perspective, national states have the room to deviate, if not reject the configuration of economic rights advanced and enforced through international investment treaties.

**Conclusion**

Although examining a diversity of cases, the articles in this issue demonstrate that the projects of citizenship within and beyond the national state are more complex and indeterminate than those envisioned by schematic accounts of globality and globalism. As Doreen Massey cautions, too often references to unbounded space and free flows, so common in the literature on globalization, are less an accurate description of how the world is than an image in which the world is being made. Moreover, it is a partial, if not inaccurate, imagination (1999, pp. 35, 36). Rather than decline, the early twenty-first century has witnessed national states flexing their growing powers of surveillance and coercion. Territorial borders have been reinforced and new ones constructed, through the regulation of citizenship, visas and migration, to close the doors of the North to migrants and refugees from the South. Moreover, the marginalized are more effectively confined to local spaces through such other technologies of power and exclusion as fingerprinting, identity cards and biometric surveillance. As Massey notes, globalization is increasingly characterized by a double movement—one that opens space for the free flow of global capital and, at the same time, reinforces the defensible places, the fortresses of the North, from the vast majority of the planet who have their rights, dignity, and personhood denied on a daily basis (1999, p. 39).

It would be mistaken, however, to interpret the emergence of the security state in the contemporary era as evidence of a revival of the national state of the modern epoch. As Hardt and Negri argue, the qualitative changes, which have
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blurred the economic and political landscapes of the present period, are ‘structural and irreversible’, ‘superceding the effectiveness of national juridical structures’ (2000, p. 36). As such, we are compelled to conclude, on both moral and empirical grounds, that the so-called ‘security state’ is less a solution to the challenges of a globalizing era than evidence of the intensifying crisis in global governance. This crisis calls ever more loudly for the provision of human security and elaboration of human rights both within and beyond the national state.
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