COSMOPOLITICAL CITIZENSHIP

Seeing the World Through the Eyes of Others

Teresa Chataway*

National citizenship is challenged by two contrasting claims: a state's exclusivity in determining the conditions for inclusion of its own citizens, and the universal inclusiveness of everyone within and beyond national boundaries. Globalisation has increased the demand for human rights, the recognition of identity and culture, and social justice. Today, however, many persons cannot meet the conditions prescribed by national citizenship. This article considers an alternative model: cosmopolitical citizenship, which is based on Kant's *jus cosmopoliticum*. This third level of law allows all world citizens to exercise their rights and duties in multiple sites of political and legal responsibility. The article has five sections. First, Kant's cosmopolitical conception is defined. Relevant interpretations by Derrida, Bobbio and Beck expand on this definition. The subsequent analysis engages with recent writings by Benhabib, Balibar and Isin, and within that theoretical context considers the European Union's dual citizenship, regarded as a precursor of the cosmopolitical, but contested by Bigo. Notwithstanding, these authors are experimenting with cosmopolitical citizenship. Fourth, influences of Web 2.0 technologies on citizenship are discussed. Fifth, a synthesis of the conceptual and substantive developments in the citizenship debate reveals an increasing acceptance of the cosmopolitical principle, and its capacity to render citizenship more fluid and responsive as seen through the eyes of others.

Introduction

Cosmos and *polis* as a composite word, cosmopolitical, is concerned with the complexity inherent in global politics and international law in the twenty-first century. As cosmopolitics, it is a response to the need for a broader dialogue and greater collaboration globally. A cosmopolitical perspective does not pre-judge any issue of value, obligation or agency advanced by any person. It accords with recognition of the decisions one makes about everyday activity in both the private and public realms, and relates to the universal legal and political complexities of the twenty-first century. This political approach towards unravelling the diverse issues in an interdependent world requires an encompassing law, as posited by Kant in

* Adjunct Fellow, Socio-Legal Research Centre, Griffith Law School, Griffith University.

his cosmopolitical idea. Its re-emergence post-1989 reasserted the notion of a borderless humanity, and of transforming the state-centric system into a more inclusive and fluid global governance. Clearly, this is neither a proposal for a world government nor a utopian state.

An approach to cosmopolitical citizenship has the potential to encompass deep ethical encounters through the recognition of affectivity and nested polarities (us/them, self/Other, male/female, young/technogenarians) living and connecting with the world 'existing as things under laws'.¹ Bodenheimer cites Kant's statement that 'man is destined by his reason to live in society with other human beings and to cultivate, civilize, and moralize himself in this society, however great may be his animal impulse to surrender himself passively to the inducements of leisurely ease and pleasure'.²

The concept of cosmopolitical citizenship is presented along the following lines. First, there is a detailed definition of the cosmopolitical (*Weltburgerlich*), which is found in Kant's 'universal history from a cosmopolitical point of view'.³ Second, the contributions of two twentieth century European secular philosophers – Jacques Derrida and Norberto Bobbio, both of whom adopt the term cosmopolitical – are discussed. Their interpretation of the cosmopolitical principle is illustrated by Derrida with his 'right to philosophy from the cosmopolitical point of view',⁴ and for Bobbio by aspects of his conceptions of human rights and cosmopolitical democracy.⁵ Another European theorist, Ulrich Beck, provides his social scientific theory of the cosmopolitical vision, positing a rational applicability of the concept to unravel a number of global questions. Although Beck does not provide a semantic definition of either term, he generally discusses the different content and processes using the word cosmopolitan. For example, he explains that 'in Kant's sense, cosmopolitanism means something active; a task, namely, imposing order on the world. Whereas, [for Beck] cosmopolitanisation sharpens our gaze upon uncontrollable events that merely befall us',⁶ and the risks that they present.

The analysis in this article also draws on some recent insights into cosmopolitical citizenship found in the work of Seyla Benhabib, Engin Isin, and Étienne Balibar. Semantically, Balibar uses cosmopolitical,⁷ Isin uses cosmopolitan⁸ and Benhabib uses both terms.⁹ This author prefers cosmopolitical, as semantically, ontologically and socio-legally the term

¹ Bodenheimer (1971), p 653.

² Kant (1978), pp 241–42.

³ Kant (1887 ([1784])).

⁴ Derrida (1994).

⁵ Bobbio (1995, 1996).

⁶ Beck (2006), p 20.

⁷ Balibar (2004a), pp viii, 136.

⁸ Isin (2009).

⁹ Benhabib (2000), pp 37–40, but cosmopolitan in the majority of her later work.

accords with cosmopolitical right and deep ethical encounters. For Kant, this right, or law, recognises the universality of humans and the relative diversity of persons, societies, spaces and cultures on the globe. In addition, more recently there has been the significant impact of advanced communications and technologies upon humans and non-humans.

In the twenty-first century, the European Union's (EU) Dual Citizenship Project is considered a precursor of cosmopolitical governance.¹⁰ However, recent events have impacted upon and challenged this contention. Balancing border control with international and European fundamental human rights and commitments is a key complexity. The line between legal and illegal migrants, as well as the line between political, economic and environmental migrants, is blurred. With immigration controls and free movement in Europe, tensions are occurring between a legal system predicated on openness and inclusion and the 'rhetoric justifying coercive and ostracising practices against foreigners'.¹¹ To illustrate, there is increasing Islamophobia; blame shifting concerns regarding the mandate of Frontex;¹² freedom, security and justice embedded in technological advances in the Stockholm Programme;¹³ targeted discrimination and French President Sarkozy's pressure for deportation of Roma immigrants; recent protests against immigration in Germany, especially against Turkish immigrant workers; Italy's management of the island of Lampedusa to hold back Africans who come through Libya trying to enter Italy;¹⁴ the *dark number* problem;¹⁵ and the United Kingdom's border control through a philosophy of 'exporting the border'.¹⁶

This indicates that two interrelated processes are occurring in our world. Individuals are increasingly moving across boundaries set up to contain them. Authors whose expertise basically concerns citizenship are increasingly showing signs of theorising citizenship across and beyond boundaries. They are inspired by Stoic notions of cosmopolitics, by Kant and his ideal of cosmopolitical right, and by a 'more than nature' approach to humans and non-humans. While authors use different vocabularies (Isin's radicalism is different from Benhabib's left-liberalism, Balibar's spatial

¹⁰ Telò (2009). This edited volume provides a sophisticated and encompassing analysis undertaken 'from multidisciplinary approaches sharing a distinctive inside/outside perspective ... of the EU's contribution to regional and global governance': p xxi.

¹¹ Bigo (2009), p 579; Bigo and Jeandesboz (2009); Guild and Bigo (2010); Ryan and Mitsilegas (2010).

¹² Frontex (2009). Frontex is the European Union agency for external border security. It is responsible for coordinating the activities of the national border guards in ensuring the security of the EU's borders with non-member states. Frontex is headquartered in Warsaw, Poland. See COWI (2009).

¹³ Bigo and Jeandesboz (2009); European Council (2009).

¹⁴ Omolesky (2010).

¹⁵ The unknown number of a specific event – for example, an illegal migrant crossing a border undetected – is referred to as the dark number.

¹⁶ House of Lords (2008), p 38.

relevance is different from Beck's global tolerance), it can be argued that they are all independently experimenting with cosmopolitical citizenship. Bigo cautions that tensions between a legal system which is predicated on openness yet ostracises foreigners need to be resolved. These are some of the notions developed in this article, from the perspective of seeing people through 'the eyes of others'.¹⁷ The objective is not to conflate these authors' arguments by effacing their differences, but to extend their lines of inquiry. Accordingly, the article first discusses Kant's cosmopolitical idea, followed by Derrida and Bobbio's interpretations. The focus then shifts to three contemporary authors, each of whom provides a novel approach to cosmopolitical citizenship. Their themes are illustrated with recent data relating to the EU and internet developments.

Defining Cosmopolitical

Daniele Archibugi employed the term 'cosmopolitan' in his early writings.¹⁸ Subsequently, in 'Cosmopolitical Democracy', he remarked that: 'Contrary to previous work, I have been convinced that the term cosmopolitical¹⁹ should be preferred to cosmopolitan.'²⁰ In his 'The Cosmopolitan Perspective' (written after 9/11), as well as in later writings, he reverts to using the term cosmopolitan.²¹ So nomenclature issues arise. Cosmopolitical terminology in general originates in the Greek word *kosmopolite*, which describes a 'citizen of the world'. It was coined by thinkers who traced the conceptual evolution of people's mindset from that of the citizen of a city-state (polis) to that of the citizen of the entire (then Hellenic) world (cosmos). The cosmopolitical tradition continues through later-Roman Stoicism, and its emphasis on assimilation, as transmitted by Cicero and Pauline Christianity. Stoicism exerted significant influence on ethics through the work of Immanuel Kant, and was inherited by other Enlightenment figures. The tradition gained recognition as a philosophical and cultural world-view that promoted the emancipation of humans through the consideration of morals and ethics, as well as law and politics.

Kant's cosmopolitical conception consists of a normative theory that regards all of humanity as the relevant moral community, unaffected by

¹⁷ Benhabib (2008b), p 7, with the term used in this essay's title to convey a complicated geographic metaphor, accommodating the concerns of ongoing tensions between a legal system predicated on openness and the rule of law, and 'security-driven rhetoric justifying coercive and ostracizing practices against foreigners': Bigo (2009), p 579. Benhabib considers 'understanding the conditions of others who may be radically different than us' as *post-national solidarity*: Benhabib (2008b), p 7.

¹⁸ Archibugi and Held (1995).

¹⁹ Chataway (1999).

²⁰ Archibugi (2000), p 143, n 7.

²¹ Archibugi (2001). He again uses cosmopolitan in Archibugi (2002) and Archibugi (2008). Subsequently, he explained that he reverted to cosmopolitan to conform to this usage in homogenised information stored in technologically governed databases (personal communication with author).

arbitrary state borders. A universal legal order represents the final phase in Kant's tripartite system of law. Beside internal public law, which regulates relations between individuals within the state, and international public law, which aims to govern relations between states, Kant posits a third level of law: *jus cosmopoliticum*. Cosmopolitical right, or law, is concerned with relations of all persons with states other than their own. Kant reveals his emphasis on humans, and acknowledges their interdependence and need for protection as 'world citizens' when he states that 'with regard to the association of peoples of the earth ... the point has been progressively reached in understanding that the violation of rights which occurs somewhere on earth, is felt everywhere'.²² That violation has become increasingly evident and in need of remedy as individuals are designated as subjects of international law.

In *Cosmogony*, Kant adds a crucial perspective for coping with creative destruction:

The inevitable tendency which every world that has been brought to completion gradually shows towards its destruction, may even be reckoned among the reasons which may establish the fact that the universe will again be fruitful of worlds in other regions to compensate for the loss which it has suffered in any one place.²³

Here Kant envisions how the destruction of existing places and systems in the world can promote the conditions of possibility for a creative response to enable both recovery and renewal of some essential elements of his cosmopolitical project. An apt metaphor is that of the phoenix rising from the ashes of its own destruction. He adds:

Can we not believe that Nature, which was capable of developing herself out of chaos into a regular order and into an arranged system, is likewise capable of re-arranging herself again as easily out of the new chaos into which the diminution of her motions has plunged her, and to renew the former combination?²⁴

When Kant states 'renew the former combination', he does not imply that we find ourselves in the same place. Rather, renewal enables us to constantly progress.

In summary, cosmopolitical right (*jus cosmopoliticum*) differs from international law in that, as Kant posits, it can properly deal with relations between individuals of one state with other states. Kant emphasises that:

National, international and cosmopolitical rights [laws] are so interconnected, that if any one of these three possible forms of the

²² Kant (1887), p 227.

²³ Hastie (1900), p 148.

²⁴ Hastie (1900), pp 152–53.

juridical relation fails to embody the essential principles that ought to regulate external freedom by law, the structure of legislation reared by the others will also be undermined, and the whole system would at last fall to pieces.²⁵

As the development of international law demonstrates, Kant's concept of cosmopolitical right, or a third jurisdiction, was far-sighted. Yet there remains a way to go to achieve that goal – that is, the ethical, legal and political conditions for all world citizens to live with dignity and in peace. Roscoe Pound's comment that 'Kant's statement of the task of the legal order as one of reconciling, harmonizing or adjusting by means of a universal rule, may be seen in the background' remains applicable.²⁶

Cosmopolitics: Jacques Derrida, Norberto Bobbio, Ulrich Beck²⁷

Derrida argues that 'a philosopher interested in ethics and/or politics must come back to the question of the law',²⁸ positing 'a right to philosophy from a cosmopolitical point of view'.²⁹ By extending his conception to the broader context of the development of the cosmopolitical, and beyond the traditional world, Derrida advances his interpretation of the concept of hospitality, of the duty (*devoir*) of hospitality, and of a right (*droit*) to hospitality.³⁰ He observes that Kant announces and prescribes a 'universal cosmopolitical state' (*Zustand*, meaning the state of things, of the situation, of the real constitution, and of the State with a capital S). For Derrida, after several revolutions and transformations, ultimately this cosmopolitics becomes a fact. That anticipation – while it remains just that – would be the highest achievement. As a conceptual universalism, such expectation is everything other than the expression of positive optimism. Thus, for Derrida, a right to philosophy, formulated as a cosmopolitical element, represents a philosophical approach to universal history not dissimilar from a type of plan of nature that aims at the political unification of humanity.

Besides thinking about justice for itself, Derrida considers that 'unconditional hospitality remains impracticable', and 'unreserved hospitality', as he terms it, is at the end of the spectrum. Notwithstanding, he is adamant that the political task must continue. This entails finding the best 'legislative' arrangement, along with the proper 'judicial' conditions to ensure that, in any given situation, the ethics of hospitality is not violated in its principle, and its practice is respected. He further contends that to achieve that end, laws, habits, phantasms and an entire 'culture' must change. During the twentieth century and continuing into the twenty-first, both the concept

²⁵ Kant (1887), p 162.

²⁶ Pound (1925), p 82.

²⁷ See Chataway (2007) on Derrida and Bobbio's cosmopolitical philosophy.

²⁸ Derrida (1998), p 1.

²⁹ Derrida (1994), np. This English title is how Derrida translates the German.

³⁰ Derrida (2001), pp 6–20.

and experience of 'refugees' have undergone a radical transformation, which reveals that current world politics and the prevailing legal system are facing seismic displacement. Hence he posits that the international legislative frame needs to be recast, and 'one has to do everything to see the laws of hospitality inscribed in positive law ... [and to] focus on what is the most concretely urgent and the most proper for the articulation of a political ethics'.³¹ He remarks that immense progress would occur if Kant's cosmopolitical right (*Weltbuergerrecht*) were implemented by existing international agencies to regulate 'universal hospitality'. But for Derrida this is far from reality: Kant's insistence on conditional hospitality was probably due to the fact that 'he knew [that] without these conditions hospitality could turn into wild war, terrible aggression'.³²

Bobbio acknowledges the persuasive force of *jus cosmopoliticum* as a *tertium genus*, which Kant introduces in *Perpetual Peace*. Bobbio addresses Kant's 'cosmopolitical right' in his *Diritto e stato*.³³ This third law stands beside the two types of traditional public law: internal or domestic law and international law, known as the traditional partition. As an innovative jurist, Bobbio explains how Kant relates the concern that underpins his theory to two interconnected facts. The first is that the earth is spherical, and Kant considers it a potential global city, or cosmopolis. The other fact is the interdependence of different humans who necessarily have to share the earth's space and its resources. Bobbio synthesises the elements of Kant's cosmopolitical conception: moral, legal and political. Subsequently, he incorporates that thinking into his theories of human rights, democracy and legal (or institutional) pacifism. He considers the juridical relation between individuals of one state and another state a comprehensive representation of the historical development of human rights, since it provides the essential means of protection. He contends that the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) established the premise for individuals, and no longer only states, to be recognised as legal subjects at international law. This was a turning point that opened a new phase in international law in that the rights of all *peoples* were transformed into rights of all *individuals*. For Bobbio, this is a significant step towards the realisation of cosmopolitical law.³⁴

Beck is another European theorist who integrates the cosmopolitical conception. He employs the term cosmopolitan consistently, but uses cosmopolitical twice.³⁵ With the latter, he explains: 'Cosmopolitical competence, everyday and social social-scientific, forces people to develop the art of translation and bridging'.³⁶ He continues:

³¹ Derrida (2001), p 7.

³² Derrida (1999), p 71. See also Bankovsky (2005).

³³ Bobbio (1957).

³⁴ Bobbio (1996), p 122; Bobbio-Zolo (1998), p 364.

³⁵ Beck (1999), p 53; Beck (2004), p 131.

³⁶ Beck (2004), p 153.

This [competence] includes both the location of one's own lifestyle within the horizon of other possibilities, and the ability to see oneself from the viewpoint of those who are culturally other – as well as to practise this within one's own experiential space through the imaginative crossing of boundaries.³⁷

Beck's notions of space and the crossing of boundaries can be linked with Derrida's notion of hospitality and Bobbio's extension of Kant's cosmopolitical principle to his democratic theory and human rights, domestically and internationally: In the international community 'we are moving towards an international law whose subjects are no longer just the states, but also, and especially, individuals'.³⁸

Beck's recent contributions to *The Guardian*, which attracted a considerable public response in the electronic newspaper site, illustrate how hospitality and the rights of others beyond the state are considered critical to 'the relativity of one's own social position and culture in the global area'.³⁹ He extends the themes in his earlier writings on cosmopolitan Europe and beyond to cosmopolitics. This entails a transnational mindset capable of confronting the visionary claim that the threats of economic globalization, terrorism and climate change demand.⁴⁰ He emphasises that we need to: (a) free ourselves from the straitjacket of the nation-based approach; (b) recognise that economic globalisation is generating new forms of inequality that increasingly will need to be considered transnationally; and (c) realise that it is untenable to argue that the social and political consequences of climate change can be addressed by unilateral effort; and that the politics of climate change is necessarily inclusive and global. To accommodate these multiple contingencies, and realise his vision of a cosmopolitical future, Beck underscores the importance of access to networks across all types of boundaries. For him, such a vision combines the concern for national and global justice with an interest in the survival of all persons in the world.

In an article published in *The Guardian*, 'Nation-State Politics Can Only Fail the Problems of the Modern World',⁴¹ Beck reasserts and extends his argument for a European community based on the principles of cosmopolitical tolerance, and as a possible template for a new global order. The breadth of this tolerance, which is central in both Derrida and Bobbio's conceptions, requires a shift from state-based prescriptions. To illustrate, Beck refers to developments in international humanitarian law, such as the recognition of crimes against humanity and the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC, 1999). Another example is the evolving

³⁷ Beck (2004), p 153.

³⁸ Bobbio-Zolo (1998), p 167.

³⁹ Beck (2004), p 131.

⁴⁰ Beck (2007).

⁴¹ Beck (2008).

international norm of responsibility to protect (R2P, 2001).⁴² Its crystallisation as a norm of customary international law or its articulation in an international instrument would render it efficacious for the protection of all citizens' rights, both within and beyond state boundaries. These new advances in international law, Beck asserts, 'took the idea of recognition of the humanity of the Other and made it the foundation of a historically new counter-logic'.⁴³

In another article published in *The Guardian* during the global financial crisis, Beck discusses some of the associated problems, which clearly extended well beyond nation boundaries:

[F]aced with the menacing aggregation of global problems that resist national solutions, nation-states left to their own devices are powerless, incapable of exercising sovereignty.⁴⁴

He considers that 'the unit of political action in the cosmopolitan era is no longer the nation but the region'. One might add that regions are interdependent globally and, in the Kantian sense, the acts of individuals in one region potentially impact on others elsewhere. Beck concludes that:

In the interconnected world, the circular maxim of national *realpolitik* ... must be replaced by the maxim of cosmopolitan *realpolitik*: the more European, the more cosmopolitan our politics becomes, the more nationally successful it will be.⁴⁵

In these articles, Beck outlines the basis for his cosmopolitical vision, which he considers rational and realistic, and capable of dealing with contemporary transnational issues.

The arguments presented thus far for cosmopolitical citizenship draw on facets of Derrida, Bobbio and Beck's cosmopolitical interpretations. The following contributions by Benhabib, Balibar and Isin add another dimension to this global analysis. In particular, they identify different ways of responding to the exigencies of seeing the world through the eyes of others, thereby illustrating the cosmopolitical applicability.

Elements for Understanding Cosmopolitical Citizenship

The concept of citizenship has always been considered important yet problematical. Almost a century ago, a US commentator on citizenship observed:

The *old ways* of fitting for citizenship are not sufficient for the modern world. The citizen of a twentieth century democracy has

⁴² Chataway (2007).

⁴³ Beck (2008), p 2.

⁴⁴ Beck (2009), np.

⁴⁵ Beck (2009), np.

responsibilities that are both greater and different from those borne by his forefathers ... [W]ith the development of new necessities and new demands, we find ourselves obliged to scrap much of that long useful machinery [social control] the motive power of which was authority.⁴⁶

Citizenship is about inclusion and exclusion. With the failure of historical communism in 1989, the creation of new states and the European Union enlargement, rethinking citizenship in such a fragmented and yet generative environment re-emerged as a global issue.⁴⁷ Immigration and residency are still considered critical features of state sovereignty, and citizenship remains the process by which belonging is recognised and enacted.

Yet citizenship 'is an incompletely theorised contract between the state and its subjects'.⁴⁸ Isin contends that questions such as what it means to be a citizen, who can act as a citizen and what obligations derive from citizenship are at the forefront of much political discourse. At the same time, the state seeks to maintain its status within regional spaces; it integrates or fails to integrate new social groups, and is pressurised by supra-national entities. Ultimately, the issue of citizenship lies at the heart of the legitimacy of rule and political subjectivity.

A century later, Benhabib, Balibar and Isin are facing that challenge about 'old ways'. Their work reveals some of the ways in which citizenship can be reconstituted in forms that move 'towards a *citizenship of residency* that strengthens the multiple ties to locality, to the region, and to transnational institutions'.⁴⁹ Their different approaches illustrate how citizenship is changing from social control to a fluid, contested, globally encompassing institution. Such attitudinal shifts, refracted in an uneven implementation, are generating a significant and diverse body of literature.⁵⁰

As with the cosmopolitical conception of democracy, cosmopolitical citizenship is considered a work in progress. In this section, the analysis draws on the relevant contributions of Benhabib, Balibar and Isin, who address different elements of cosmopolitical citizenship and its evolution. Their comprehensive and suggestive narratives reveal how cosmopolitical citizenship utilises internal and external differences, rather than suppressing them. In so doing, it works towards a 'differential integration' of its constituent citizens to fulfil positively its transnational obligations and connections.

⁴⁶ Snedden (1919), pp 1–2, emphasis added.

⁴⁷ Benhabib (2007a) mutely refers to 'volatile times'.

⁴⁸ Sassen (2007), p 439.

⁴⁹ Benhabib (2008a), p 23, original emphasis.

⁵⁰ A representative range consulted includes: Archibugi (2008); Beck (2006); Beck and Grande (2004); Benhabib (2004a); Cheah and Robbins (1998); Hutchings and Dannreuther (1999); McDonough and Feinberg (2007); Delanty (2009); and Rumford (2009).

Benhabib's personal experience and public engagement appear to support her self-description as a cosmopolitan citizen.⁵¹ Of interest for this essay is her approach to cosmopolitical citizenship. In her contribution to the 2004 Tanner Lectures, Benhabib posits that cosmopolitan norms of justice accrue to individuals as moral and legal persons in a worldwide civil society.⁵² She observes that since World War II, the range of human rights agreements demonstrates a progressive transition from treaty-based international law to cosmopolitan law, understood as a public law that binds and bends the will of sovereign states. She perceives cosmopolitanism as a normative philosophy that carries universalistic norms of discourse ethics beyond state boundaries. By extending Kant's cosmopolitical right, Benhabib contends that the norms of hospitality currently covering the status of alienage are now protected by both civil and international laws. The guest is no longer a guest but a resident alien. Particularly in Europe, the rights of third-country nationals are increasingly being protected, and citizenship has now been disaggregated into its constitutive elements. These institutional developments represent the three dimensions of citizenship: collective identity, political membership and entitlement to social rights and other benefits. This shift, in turn, has led to contestations over the boundaries of the demos.

Benhabib introduces her notion of 'democratic iterations', defined as linguistic, legal and cultural, as political repetitions-in-transformation, and as invocations that are also revocations. They not only change established understandings but also transform what passes as the valid or established view of an authoritative precedent. She illustrates with two examples: the 'scarf affair' in 1990s France; and the changing of qualifications for participating in local municipal and district-wide elections in Germany. In the first example, wearing the scarf is re-signified as expressing an act of conscience and moral freedom. It highlights that a consequence of a transformed citizenship is the long- and short-term coexistence of individuals and groups of distinct, and often quite contradictory, cultures, mores and norms in the same public space. In the second example, the eventual outcome reveals that the democratic legislator has the prerogative to transform the meaning of citizenship and the rules of democratic belonging. Were this to occur, it would cause nationhood ideology to collapse, leading to the acknowledgement of the desirability of immigration. This is consistent with Benhabib's post-national solidarity. Hence the need to naturalise second- and third-generation children of immigrants was recognised, and the German citizenship law was passed (in January 2000). These case studies elucidate the processes of democratic iteration that validate the dialectic of rights and identities. In this way, the identities involved and the substance of rights claims are reappropriated, resignified and imbued with a new and different meaning. According to Benhabib, these occurrences reveal that outsiders are found within the polity as well as at the

⁵¹ Benhabib (2008b).

⁵² Benhabib (2004b).

borders. Recognition of such fluidity and dynamism enables the reconciliation of the cosmopolitical with the collectivist, so that people are respected and encouraged to participate in the multiple processes of democratic iteration, which lead to an increase in democratic reflexivity. Benhabib observes that the more widespread acceptance of cosmopolitan norms has yielded a new political condition in that 'the local, the national, and the global are all imbricated in one another'.⁵³

Benhabib expands on her conception of 'democratic iterations' to illustrate how commitments to context-transcending constitutional and international norms can be mediated through the will of democratic majorities.⁵⁴ Negotiations for political membership and democratic iterations occur in the context of the international community. Consequently, policies regarding access to citizenship ought to be viewed not as unilateral acts of self-determination, but rather as decisions with multilateral consequences that influence other entities in the world.

Benhabib underscores the importance of European and other global experiences. These herald a new process that defies the pressure of borders and national identities by pursuing the goals of universal inclusion and equality. In recent times, that process is being aided by a broader range of media influences, especially the internet, through which:

We extend the boundaries of our sympathy by understanding the conditions of others who may be radically different than [sic] us. At its best, journalism does this; it extends your vision of the world by making you see the world through the eyes of others.⁵⁵

Such a perspective is also reasserted in 'Toward a Converging Cosmopolitan Project?'⁵⁶ Benhabib restates her argument for the basic right of freedom of movement, and for democracies to consider porous borders. In a polity, 'learning to mediate' is essential, and democratic will simultaneously becomes generative, by responding to society's needs, and reflexive, by imposing constraints upon itself. She advocates an approach to resolving issues by operating at two levels: through cultural community claims, and by securing transnational guarantees and institutions. We need to rethink the combination of newly devised institutions and more appropriate rules and norms that can deal with interdependence. It becomes evident that the Kantian proposal of cosmopolitical right can accommodate such reasoning. Today, there is the increased realisation that the cosmopolitical project does not depend merely on states as the units of action, and individuals as subjects of international law, but also on political institutions that reflect the substantial developments in international law. In the aftermath of the global financial crisis, the critical effects experienced by

⁵³ Benhabib (2004a), pp 163–64.

⁵⁴ Benhabib (2004b).

⁵⁵ Benhabib (2008b), p 7.

⁵⁶ Benhabib et al (2010).

states and the public as a whole are eminently visible. This raises the possibility, or necessity, of extending the reach of human rights protection to include proper financial stewardship and management integrity. This could help prevent scores of citizens across the world from future suffering, or ongoing exposure to such dire consequences. This question, however, remains in the realm of the political will of world leaders, who are reluctant to acknowledge the cosmopolitical reality. Thus, what is required is a new range of global institutions capable of responding to the complex needs of a borderless world.

Balibar applies his notion of borders to concerns over the rights of immigrant workers and undocumented residents.⁵⁷ He contends that borders are places where confrontations and problems occur due to the convergence and concentration of all kinds of differences, such as differences in world-view, religion, identity, culture, customs, wealth and politics. He considers the symbolic aspect of borders (those who can cross over and return) and the contradictory aspect (those who are not readmitted). Borders can be geographical, cultural, ethnic, economic and political. They are external as well as internal. They are scattered everywhere – wherever the movement of information, people and things occurs and is controlled.⁵⁸

Balibar challenges us to rethink the border by discarding the outdated framework of the nation-state, where borders were employed to clearly demarcate the territory of a supposedly linguistically and culturally homogenous population or nation. This was a sovereign state that held absolute authority, and promised security and material welfare to its citizens. Balibar raises the notions of triple points and overlapping zones of contradictory civilizations – or, as he illustrates, ‘Europe is multiple’. Moreover, borders and related areas are places where the differences and problems encountered are collectively resolved, revealing that ‘a project of active European citizenship’ can be implemented. He suggests that, rather than building Europe from within – that is, on the basis of common traits and similarities in different states – it should be rebuilt from the outside, by acting on the unresolved conflicts and confrontations present at its borders or peripheral areas.

Balibar develops a concept of the political whose space is defined by the relations between individuals and illustrated by the outcomes experienced by those subjects. Rethinking the discourse of citizenship continually fragments or displaces it from any linear unfolding. In this way, the discourse reclaims a division or discrepancy between the absolute contingency of citizenship in a global context and the purported universality of human rights. This process creates a tension from which the citizenship discourse draws much of its conceptual force and contemporary political pertinence. Balibar acknowledges the existing uncertainty about both the relevance and future of the modern conception of citizenship in the twenty-first century. This is due to several factors: its conditions are now informed

⁵⁷ Balibar (2004b).

⁵⁸ Balibar (2004a).

by globalisation, the plight of refugees and non-citizens, and the global and local migrations of labour determined by contemporary capitalism. Thus citizenship does not unfold as a coherent or linear discourse. Instead, he argues that recent debates concerning the continued viability of the original concept of citizenship are underpinned by a range of definitions emerging from multidisciplinary angles. A challenging aspect in Balibar's rethinking of citizenship relates to *aporia*.⁵⁹ He links his notion of border with the aporia of the stranger. This enables him to consider and analyse citizens through the prism of different relations with the state, the political space and the 'territory'. This approach raises the question of openings to new modes of civility (humanitarian treatment of abject aliens, refugees and boat people), in contrast to modes of incivility (terrorism, suicide bombers or the Darfur hecatomb). The Kantian realisation that all humans live 'unavoidably side by side' is apposite.⁶⁰

One of the most pressing contemporary problems is that of permanent 'access' rather than 'entitlement' to citizenship. Balibar argues that this distinction implies an 'active and collective civil process' rather than a simple legal status. But he hastens to add that a 'collective political practice' is always 'in the making'.⁶¹ In this sense, citizenship remains a site of continuous struggle and conflict, where the desire for permanent access to it is continually exposed to the necessity of engaging in a civil 'process' that precludes permanence and juridical legitimacy.

Isin's innovative approach highlights the emergence of new rights. He describes both spontaneous and organised protests as new 'acts of citizenship', and considers new media and social networks as sites of struggle. These new rights and 'acts of citizenship' reveal how certain actors become citizens or claim citizenship. Isin and Turner observe that:

Over the last decade we have witnessed the emergence of citizenship as a vital political, social and cultural issue of our time ... and this is because citizenship is a vital democratic or democratizing institution.⁶²

'Citizenship in flux'⁶³ encapsulates Isin's conception. He begins by observing that, in order to engage in meaningful discussion about emergent concepts of citizenship, it is necessary to establish a new vocabulary rather than recycling former categories. He identifies the symbolic figure (the foreigner, migrant, illegal alien, wanderer, refugee, nomad and others), and explores its implications for new 'sites', 'scales' and 'acts' used by 'actors'

⁵⁹ Balibar (2006). In this article, Balibar addresses the question 'What is cosmopolitics' and associates the term with a transnational, rather than a post-national, perspective. He associates the Kantian *weltpürger* (citizen of the world) with the notion of community.

⁶⁰ Kant (1965), §42.

⁶¹ Balibar (2004), p 132.

⁶² Isin and Turner (2007), p 16.

⁶³ Isin (2009).

to express a claim, and thus transform themselves (and others) from subjects to citizens, as claimants of rights.⁶⁴ Isin contends that a fluid and dynamic conception of citizenship, which is historically grounded and geographically responsive, must address the question: 'What is *called* citizenship?' (original emphasis) rather than 'What is citizenship?'⁶⁵ He notes the prevailing binary interpretations of citizenship (status vs practice; domination vs empowerment; formal vs substantive; national vs transnational), and posits that the new actors, sites and scales complicate the ways in which citizenship is enacted, not only as membership but also as claims. Moreover, these new objects of investigation are influencing our conception of the political as well as citizenship. The challenge, he argues, is to theorise citizenship as an institution in flux embedded in the current social and political struggles that constitute it. This is where Isin's new vocabulary is critical. The conventional conception of citizenship needs to incorporate a new vision of such terms as actors, sites, scales and acts. Isin explains that 'sites' of citizenship are fields of contestation concerned with particular issues, interests and stakes as well as themes, concepts and objects. 'Scales' are scopes of applicability considered appropriate in those fields of contestation. Both entities are fluid and dynamic, arising from contests and struggles and having empirically determined boundaries. However, they are connected by specific 'acts of citizenship'.

Citizenship instituted as a subject-position can be enacted by various categories of subjects, including aliens, migrants, refugees, states, the courts, and so on. Citizenship as subjectivity fulfils the conception of the political. And the actors of citizenship cannot be defined in advance of a given site or scale, since these depend on other categories that are central to citizenship.

'Acts of citizenship' are underpinned by four considerations. First, the actors' status need not be pre-determined. Quite often, subjects who are not citizens act as citizens in that they constitute themselves as entities, as Hannah Arendt argues, with the right to claim rights. Second, acts that produce claims create new sites of contestation, belonging, identification and struggle. Much more than the right to vote, eligibility for social security or obligation for military service, institutions, courts, streets, media, networks and borders create sites of contestation for citizenship. Third, acts of citizenship cross boundaries, frontiers and territories, and involve multiple and overlapping scales of contestation, belonging, identification and struggle. From many perspectives, they are loosely coupled and highlight the evolution of citizenship in our age of migration and movement.⁶⁶ Fourth, identification of acts shifts the focus from what people *say* (opinion,

⁶⁴ A similar view is expressed in Bobbio (1996), p 7: 'democracy is a society of citizens, and subjects become citizens when they are recognized as having certain fundamental rights', emphasis added.

⁶⁵ Isin (2009), p 369.

⁶⁶ Castles and Davidson (2000).

perception and expressions in attitudinal surveys) to what people *do*. It is 'what a person *does* rather than what they *get* [that] makes them a citizen'.⁶⁷

Isin synthesises the above content into a specific definition of citizenship (political, legal, social and cultural, but perhaps also sexual, aesthetic and ethical) as a dynamic institution of domination and empowerment. As such, it determines who will be citizens (insiders), subjects (strangers, outsiders) and objects (aliens), and how these actors should behave and manage their relation with others in a given society. He does not regard citizenship as membership. Rather, citizenship is about conduct across social groups, which together constitute a body politic. Generally, being a citizen means one is more than an insider. It also denotes someone who has mastered modalities and forms of conduct that are appropriate to that status. An insider is an actor both in the sense of a person (law) and a persona (norm).

In the case of subjects and objects, Isin contends that for them to become citizens, they must adopt the modalities and forms of an insider – namely, assimilation, integration and incorporation – or challenge these expectations and instead transform them into identification, differentiation and recognition. These modalities and the combination of rights and obligations that define citizenship are exercised differently in diverse sites, and hence produce a variety of actors. Because sites and scales are not discrete or mutually exclusive, when investigating an act it is important to consider the overlapping and connected aspects of sites and scales through which different actions become performative acts.

Isin's theorisation of the 'citizen in flux' is different from that in many twentieth century citizenship writings. His perspective identifies and then explicates the components of a more inclusive, responsive and responsible citizenship. In particular, his analysis of acts of citizenship illustrates both the coincidence of his conception with, and its relevance to, the multi-level global reality. Those acts translate forms of being political – namely, orientations, strategies, technologies and processes – in the guise of citizens, strangers, outsiders and aliens, and thus empower new actors as activist citizens. By creating or transforming sites and expanding scales, these new actors become claimants of rights. Viewing citizenship through acts signifies one's implicit acceptance that being a citizen allows one to make claims to justice. It means to break *habitus* and act in a way that disrupts already defined orders, practices and statuses.⁶⁸ The emerging figure of the activist citizen who advances claims to justice and disrupts traditions is the defining figure of contemporary global politics. Isin contends that the entrenched basis of citizenship within territories in status and practice (masculinity, militarism and property) is no longer appropriate for the societal flux of the twenty-first century. The activist citizen is questioning those conventional

⁶⁷ Davidson (1997), p 248.

⁶⁸ *Habitus* is a set of acquired patterns of thought, behaviour and taste that link social structures and social practice (or social action).

structures and opening those persisting boundaries, and seeking to exercise her/his rights to see the world through the eyes of others.

Stockholm Programme: Open Europe Serving and Protecting Citizens

European citizenship is generally regarded as a precursor for cosmopolitical citizenship. According to Ferry: 'In the EU, cosmopolitan law is positively demonstrated by the transversal rights granted to European citizens as such.'⁶⁹ Essentially, EU citizenship is based upon the existing national membership of citizens of the different states that constitute the EU. The cosmopolitical dimension of citizenship seeks to go beyond those conditions since all persons are considered 'citizens of the world'. This status allows all persons to exercise their rights and duties, whereas currently states are the initial grantors of citizenship, and only to their nationals. The European Council (EC) has prioritised the challenge to ensure respect for fundamental rights and freedoms, and integrity, while guaranteeing security in Europe. The EC recently concluded:

It is of paramount importance that law enforcement measures and measures to safeguard individual rights, the rule of law and international protection rules are coherent and mutually reinforcing. The Stockholm programme focuses on: promoting citizenship and fundamental rights (para 27); a Europe of law and justice (para 28); a Europe that protects (para 29); a Europe of responsibility, solidarity and partnership in migration and asylum matters (para 31); and the role of Europe in a globalised world – the external dimension ... [thus] providing greater opportunities for EU citizens to work and do business with countries across the world. The external dimension of Freedom, Security and Justice is crucial to the successful implementation of the objectives of this programme and should in particular be taken into account in, and be fully coherent with, all other aspects of EU foreign policy (para 32).⁷⁰

Thinking cosmopolitically would be an enabling process to meet those EC priorities. As indicated earlier, the larger legal-political aspects of humanity arguably have become a phenomenon of the twenty-first century. The issue of extraterritorial immigration controls and free movement in Europe, combined with institutional developments such as Frontex, and emerging issues such as the Roma row and anti-gypsyism throughout Europe, or Islamophobia, are creating distinct tensions between the open access approach of EU member states, and the more restrictive approach of bordering non-member states and citizens.

There are instances of EU member states employing different approaches, but they all require continuous political negotiation, and most importantly the preparedness of states to adapt their constitutional

⁶⁹ In Telò (2009), p 332.

⁷⁰ European Council (2009), pp 9–11, paras 26–32.

requirements to EU laws. As a recent study on electoral rights granted to EU citizens reveals, there are inevitable ‘tensions between national constitutional models and the models of democratic inclusion required by the goal of European citizenship’.⁷¹ Currently, the EU’s trajectory reveals an ambitious aim: building a society with fluid political boundaries, and an intellectual preparedness to resolve many of the problems that threaten the dynamic character of EU citizenship by employing a global or cosmopolitical perspective.⁷²

Border management issues and cooperation with countries outside the EU are now firmly on the agenda. However, some third countries acting as transit countries for illegal immigrants to Europe, such as Libya and Tunisia, have not signed working arrangements with Frontex. Thinking cosmopolitically has the potential to find solutions to these tensions, which – to employ Isabelle Stengers’ comments in another context – ‘can be collectively affirmed in a “cosmopolitical” space where the hopes and doubts and fears and dreams they engender collide and cause them to exist. This is why, through the exploration of knowledge, what I would like to convey to the reader is also a form of ethical experimentation.’⁷³ Those collisions, that ethical experimentation, are intrinsic to thinking cosmopolitically, as expressed here.

This dual dimension creates a common space of free movement in which citizens do not lose their rights when crossing internal borders.⁷⁴ Thus dual citizenship incorporates two important features: derivation and reciprocity of free access among EU member states.

Nevertheless, many problems still exist when citizens of non-member states attempt to cross EU borders. They include ensuring that the systematic safeguards established by protection-sensitive entry systems do not become insurmountable obstacles to individuals’ rights with respect to: non-penalisation of entry of asylum seekers; extra-territorial application of the non-*refoulement* principle; and obligations by states and private actors (such as carriers being prevented from transporting irregular non-nationals).⁷⁵ A coping strategy of first thinking cosmopolitically and addressing such problems from that mindset, will recognise that collisions between practices occur, and subsequent tensions can be resolved through a cosmopolitical sensibility – one invested deeply in the affective politics of living in and connecting with a globalised world.

⁷¹ Lansbergen and Shaw (2010), p 62.

⁷² Killion (2010).

⁷³ Stengers (2010), p viii.

⁷⁴ This idea has deep roots, and is found in Kant’s *Inaugural Dissertation*: ‘The question of the *principle of the form of the intelligible world* turns, therefore, upon making apparent in what manner it is possible *for several substances to be in mutual commerce*, and for this reason to pertain to the same whole, which is called world.’ (1770), pp 69–70, emphasis in original.

⁷⁵ UNHCR (2008) debated these issues.

Web 2.0: Democratic Iterations, Acts of Citizenship, Beyond Borders

Data on Web 2.0 illustrate the influence of the internet on citizens and institutions through a diverse range of communicative channels and strategies that are being used in support of both the theory and practice of citizenship, within and beyond national boundaries. The social roles of technological artefacts are difficult to ignore. In this context, four interrelated questions arise: Is cosmopolitical citizenship assisted by the web's influence upon networked citizens? Does the web affect the political decision-making of networked citizens as international democratization advances? What is the role of communities in a web-based discourse in the constitution of the public sphere? Does digital democracy reflect European cosmopolitics (Derrida, Bobbio and Beck), notions of democratic iteration (Benhabib), acts of citizenship (Isin) and the beyond borders notion (Balibar)? Can Web 2.0 inform 'citizens of the world' about 'post-national solidarity' (Benhabib), and the legal challenges facing extraterritorial immigration control (Bigo)?

Such questions are situated within a democratic and participatory context. Bobbio contends that what reveals the development towards greater democracy is not only that individuals have the right to vote, but also '*in the number of contexts or spaces in which they can exercise this right*'.⁷⁶ Web 2.0 is one such space.

As with previous eras, in the digital age democracy also attracts both a plurality and a polarity of views. One strand argues that the information available to networked citizens educates them to be able to contribute through their social contract within communities. There is, however, a caveat: access to the web is not global for many under-privileged communities. Another view is that individuals who can access information use it only for personal empowerment. Nevertheless, there is empirical research that Web 2.0 is providing conditions for cosmopolitical citizenship (and democracy) through access to twitter, Facebook, YouTube and construction of the blogo/public sphere.⁷⁷

Web 2.0 provides users with such contexts or spaces, loosely termed 'digital democracy'.⁷⁸ This virtual renewal of 'the social contract' is enabling individuals to contribute through 'acts of citizenship, which are considered ruptures from social-historical patterns'.⁷⁹ In such a context, the democratic values of openness, inclusion, participation, empowerment and a common

⁷⁶ Bobbio (1987), p 32, emphasis added.

⁷⁷ Aspen Institute (2009); Geiger (2009); Geiger and Ribes (2010); Margetts et al (2009).

⁷⁸ Waisman (2009) seeks ways to employ Web 2.0 innovations in the service of local participation and civic life. See also Smith et al (2009) and Allard and Blondeau (2009). Hindman (2008) argues that while the internet has increased some forms of political participation and transformed the way interest groups and candidates organise, mobilise and raise funds, elites still strongly shape how political material on the web is presented and accessed.

⁷⁹ Isin and Nielsen (2008), p 11.

pursuit of truth in the public interest can be exercised. The ideal is to make relevant and credible information available to global citizens and their communities,⁸⁰ and reveal a new cognitive space.⁸¹ This extends the capacity of individuals to engage with information and, as Chadwick argues, their behaviour 'has real value in online consultation and public policymaking'.⁸² Improved information availability, increased citizen capacity and public contribution promote individual engagement with information and the public life of the community. Communities are emerging based on the need to coordinate, solve problems, establish systems of public accountability and develop a sense of connectedness.⁸³

Information flows across borders, in Balibar's sense, represent a process towards the democratisation of borders.⁸⁴ Those flows do not abolish frontiers but renegotiate the conditions for crossing them, thus breaking away from unilateral political decisions attached to heightened security ideologies and practices. The identifiable growth in the influence and use of Web 2.0 can feasibly be regarded as an example of Benhabib's democratic iterations in that users solely or collectively contribute through acts of citizenship, as theorised by Isin. Indeed, the information needs of communities in a democracy have become a critical policy issue in the development of broadband, real-time analysability of information, instant media availability (one need only recall the 2001 terrorist attack on the Twin Towers in New York, or the 2009 Mumbai bombings), online newspapers, journals and e-books, open access, free software and semantic webs (both private and public).⁸⁵

The major source of content on the web is user-generated, including blogging⁸⁶ and profiles on social-networking websites. This content aggregates all varieties – personal, political and cultural. It can be seen as 'expressive content ... governed by expressive rationality':⁸⁷ individuals appropriating the media's agenda (a specific political event), a range of cultural forms (TV series, advertising and games) and differentiated sources

⁸⁰ The Google Corporate Information heading 'Our Philosophy' notes among its core principles that 'Democracy on the web works', and that 'the need for information crosses all borders'.

⁸¹ Hayles (2009).

⁸² Chadwick (2009), p 10.

⁸³ Aspen Institute (2009).

⁸⁴ Balibar (2004a), pp 176–77.

⁸⁵ NEXA (Latin for 'connected things') is a research centre within the Politecnico University, Turin whose work focuses on the internet and society, employing a multidisciplinary and quantitative approach to ascertain what the force of the internet consists of, and how it can be used for individual and common good. See www.nexa.polito.it.

⁸⁶ Most creators of content are simply bloggers or users of social networking sites, sharing photos, links, videos, etc. – not forgetting the increasing number of people who create their own blogs and upload their data on to information-sharing platforms.

⁸⁷ Svensson (2009), p 6.

of information (newspaper articles, online encyclopedias, blog posts, academic research). Moreover, individuals contribute either by expressing their opinions on the same topic (in a written text, a video remix, by transposing an advertising photo in a different context); or by re-using internet interventions in various procedures or processes (embedding, republishing a link, sharing content deemed interesting) in their own content – a note, a tweet, a comment, a hash tag (micro-formats that add an additional layer on to information technology languages such as html), for example, in relation to the Mumbai terrorist attack *#mumbai*, or the riots in Greece *#griots*. Such user-generated content is yet another kind of Isin's acts of citizenship, which accord with the so-called 'semiotic democracy'. This concerns the decentralisation of the power to create cultural meaning – namely, peer-to-peer (P2P) file-sharing, digital music, blogging and other personal publishing, network filtering and censorship.⁸⁸ In this expressive age, 'the two processes: publicization of the private and privatization of the public are not incompatible and, in fact, interpenetrate each other'.⁸⁹ This synthesis can be achieved by sharing self-expression content through the media, and by participating in online public debates (hackers defacing Facebook sites that express respect for a tragic event, which evokes public disgust and highlights the sense of community and shared democratic values; and, for example, the reactions to Beck's *The Guardian* pieces published online, referred to above). Text ethnography is emerging as a new competence to trace these trends.

At stake here is the emergence of a new relationship between public debate, citizenship and democracy; as Galey points out, 'information theory and textual scholarship are converging on the same intellectual questions'.⁹⁰ These types of tele-technologies can be regarded as special-purpose laboratories that allow us to observe and experiment with new procedures and forms, new supports and tools designed to inform citizens and public debate. They highlight the paramountcy of intermediary groups for democratic stability.⁹¹ When considered together – the cosmopolitical concept and its genealogy, the derived form of citizenship shaped by the flux and fluidity of recent ideas on citizenship advanced by Benhabib, Isin and Balibar, and the Web 2.0 discussion – they evince an aggregative paradigm. The notion of new vocabulary developed by Isin is equally attributable to digital citizenship⁹² and digital democracy. Today, it is possible to express our political subjectivity, which has been formed by a plurality of sources of information and knowledge across diverse formats and applications, or beyond borders.⁹³ These technological processes enable citizens to

⁸⁸ Fiske (1987).

⁸⁹ Bobbio (1989), p 17.

⁹⁰ Galey (2007), p 23.

⁹¹ Graber (2004).

⁹² Mossberger et al (2008).

⁹³ Aspen Institute (2009).

participate in public debate in a variety of ways. The social dynamics of sharing and exchanging, currently possible through the dynamics of Web 2.0 and xml format of user-generated content, provide the information ecology for cosmopolitical citizenship (and cosmopolitical democracy).

In this context, the notion of the public becoming a 'co-creator of ideas' is apposite. Governments are learning to use such technical terms (mashup, data, contests, crowd-sourcing, cloud computing, user-generated content) in their standard lexicon. They are reconfiguring their approaches, turning to strategies and forms of dialogue that characterise the internet. They are using these new modes of expression to generate debate and mobilise civil society. Such an approach aims to invigorate the democratic linkage, as Balibar expresses it, 'from above' and 'from below',⁹⁴ and from meso-levels.⁹⁵ Fischer highlights emergent public infrastructure and social demands arising from thinking cosmopolitically:

cosmopolitical marshalling of ingenuity tracked by ... [innovations] ... in science and technology productively complicate and make more realistic the demand for attention to the reconstruction of public spheres, civil society, and politics in *the technoscientific worlds we are constructing within and around ourselves*.⁹⁶

These scientific and technological innovations, combined with the practice of recognition, solidarity and co-responsibility, gradually can achieve the goal of effective integration. To be sure, recent events within the EU (EU Commissioners' reactions to Gypsy expulsions by France); developments at the borders (legal challenges to extraterritorial immigration control); and developments within non-member states (treatment of migrants in both Libya and Tunisia) are given real-time global exposure via Web 2.0. Bigo demonstrates how 'this insecurity continuum is propagated in the media and how it is implicitly echoed even by pro-migrant communications'.⁹⁷

The Stockholm programme approach outlined earlier, for instance, could be enhanced through greater awareness of the pervasiveness of Web 2.0 developments, and their impact on democratic processes and citizenship rights. The web's aggregative paradigm reflects the convergence of the theoretical premises and practical implications discussed here. But until thinking cosmopolitically and cosmopolitical citizenship are recognised, the tension between openness and free movement and the rhetoric of justifying gaffe-laden practices of ostracising extraterritorial immigrants will remain.

⁹⁴ Balibar (2004), p 114.

⁹⁵ Fischer (2009).

⁹⁶ Fischer (2007), p 580, emphasis added.

⁹⁷ Bigo (2009), p 586.

Conclusion

Cosmopolitical citizenship is one of the oldest and arguably one of the most farsighted conceptions of citizenship. The cosmopolitical idea straddles citizenship that can be operational both inside and outside the state. It can provide reasoned awareness, and open new channels of communication that will minimise disagreements in many spheres (cultural, political and legal). Cosmopolitical reasoning provides an additional parameter to enable everyone to form their judgements based on a more complete picture of the basic needs of all world citizens.

In 1991, when Walzer was asked for his opinion on the Kantian concept of 'cosmopolitical citizenship' as advanced by Bobbio, he replied as follows:

This type of cosmopolitical citizenship does not really exist. It may come into being at some future time ... [I]t does not exist [because] people do not have the notions [e.g. global solidarity] that this idea requires. And one cannot bring them into existence by promulgating theories. They will become real when the world becomes smaller, communications more intense and close, and mobility among its people more frequent.⁹⁸

Two decades later, and in Walzer's lifetime, that vision of a smaller world has become more evident. This is demonstrated by the rapid technological advances in communication, networked citizens across the globe, and the inevitable flow of persons from both the advanced and developing regions of the world. As well, the principle of cosmopolitical right (law) is illustrated by new 'acts of citizenship' and the daily reality of 'citizens without community', or Others 'beyond borders'. These are undeniable features of this first decade of the twenty-first century, which are redefining the debate and, as Balibar contends, contributing to 'a project of active European citizenship'.⁹⁹ Because those same differences are occurring across the world: 'borders are dispersed a little everywhere, wherever the movement of information, people and things, is happening and is controlled'.¹⁰⁰ In that respect, the notion of cosmopolitical citizenship is both encapsulating and rational. The evidence of such diversity globally reveals the constitution of a trans-national public sphere where citizens act beyond, and sometimes even against, the narrow confines of the state. Cosmopolitical principles are changing the formerly highly bureaucratised Europe by operating transversally between different religions in secular and non-secular states. A proper understanding of cosmopolitical principles can be persuasive in promoting attitudinal change and transformation of lifestyles. Today, those principles are more essential than ever to uphold respect for human dignity, and all kinds of life: human and non-human.¹⁰¹ In this regard, there is a growing

⁹⁸ Walzer (1991), p 161, author's translation.

⁹⁹ Balibar (2004a), p 3

¹⁰⁰ Balibar (2004a), p 3.

¹⁰¹ Aspen Institute (2009).

debate on technoscience, technonatures and a 'more than nature' approach by Isabelle Stengers, which provides a host of critical insights, narratives and provocative depictions for a well-inhabited cosmos.¹⁰²

The integrative global linkages generated by the web both illustrate and support the argument for cosmopolitical citizenship. This conception, with its openness to different cultures, values and civic principles, can better accommodate the reality and life flux of the twenty-first century.¹⁰³ Thinking cosmopolitically along Kantian lines can help us to comprehend and promote citizenship as a model that provides all citizens of the world with access to law and justice, and where protection, responsibility and solidarity are considered through the eyes of others.

References

Secondary Sources

- Laurence Allard and Olivier Blondeau (2009) *E-Democracy vs Open Democracy: The cathedral and the bazaar*, Fondapol, www.fondapol.org/home/research/all-publications/publication/titre/e-democracy-vs-open-democracy.html.
- Aspen Institute (2009) 'Informing Communities: Sustaining Democracy in the Digital Age', *The Report of the Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy*.
- Daniele Archibugi (2000) 'Cosmopolitical Democracy' 4 *New Left Review* 137.
- Daniele Archibugi (2001) *Terrorism and Cosmopolitanism*, Social Science Research Council, 21 November.
- Daniele Archibugi (2002) *A Critical Analysis of the Self-determination of Peoples*, paper presented before the Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict Research Group discussion on Transnational Democracy: Lessons from the Nation-State?, University of Western Ontario, 15–17 March.
- Daniele Archibugi (2008) *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy*, Princeton University Press.
- Daniele Archibugi and David Held (eds) (1995) *Cosmopolitan Democracy. An Agenda for a New World Order*, Polity Press.
- Philip Armstrong (2009) 'From Paradox to Partage: On Citizenship and Teletechnologies', in Philip Armstrong, *Reticulations: Jean-Luc Nancy and the Networks of the Political*, University of Minnesota Press.
- Étienne Balibar (2004a) *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, trans James Swenson, Princeton University Press.
- Étienne Balibar (2004b) 'Europe as Borderland', The Alexander von Humboldt Lecture in Human Geography, Institute for Human Geography, Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Étienne Balibar (2006) 'Strangers as Enemies: Further Reflections on the Aporias of Transnational Citizenship', *Globalization Working Papers Series* (Institute on Globalization

¹⁰² Stengers (2010). Her *Cosmopolitics II* will be published by the University of Minnesota Press in Spring, 2011.

¹⁰³ Armstrong (2009); Benhabib (2010).

- and the Human Condition, McMaster University),
<http://globalization.mcmaster.ca/wps/balibar.pdf>.
- Étienne Balibar (2009) 'Biopolitics: The New Behemoth', lecture presented at the Urbana-Champaign campus, University of Illinois, 13 October.
- Miriam Bankovsky (2005) 'Derrida Brings Levinas to Kant: The Welcome, Ethics and Cosmopolitical Law' 49 *Philosophy Today* 2.
- Ulrich Beck (1999) 'Democracy Beyond the State: A Cosmopolitical Manifesto', 46(1) *Dissent* 53.
- Ulrich Beck (2004) 'Cosmopolitical Realism: On the Distinction Between Cosmopolitanism in Philosophy and the Social Sciences' 4(2) *Global Networks* 131.
- Ulrich Beck (2006) *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, trans Ciaran Cronin, Polity Press.
- Ulrich Beck (2007) 'In the New, Anxious World, Leaders Must Learn to Think Beyond Borders', *The Guardian*, 13 July.
- Ulrich Beck (2008) 'Nation-state Politics can Only Fail the Problems of the Modern World', *The Guardian*, 15 January.
- Ulrich Beck (2009) 'This Economic Crisis Cries Out to Be Transformed into the Founding of a New Europe', *The Guardian*, 13 April.
- Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande (2004) *Cosmopolitan Europe*, trans Ciaran Cronin, Polity Press.
- Seyla Benhabib (2000) 'Transformation of Citizenship: Dilemmas of the Nation-State in an Era of Globalization', *The Spinoza Lectures*, University of Amsterdam, May–June.
- Seyla Benhabib (2004a) *The Rights of Others. Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*, Cambridge University Press.
- Seyla Benhabib (2004b) 'Reclaiming Universalism: Negotiating Republican Self-Determination and Cosmopolitan Norms', *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, University of California at Berkeley, 15–19 March.
- Seyla Benhabib with Jeremy Waldron, Bonnie Honig, Will Kymlicka and Robert Post (eds) (2006) *Another Cosmopolitanism: Hospitality, Sovereignty, and Democratic Iterations*, Oxford University Press.
- Seyla Benhabib (2007a) 'Twilight of Sovereignty or the Emergence of Cosmopolitan Norms? Rethinking Citizenship in Volatile Times' 11 *Citizenship Studies*.
- Seyla Benhabib (2007b) 'Democratic Exclusions and Democratic Iterations: Dilemmas of "Just Membership" and Prospects of Cosmopolitan Federalism' 6 *European Journal of Political Theory* 445.
- Seyla Benhabib (2008a) 'Democracy, Demography, and Sovereignty' 2 *Law & Ethics of Human Rights* 1.
- Seyla Benhabib (2008b) 'On the Public Sphere, Deliberation, Journalism and Dignity', interview with Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, 9(6) *Journalism Studies* 962, republished (2010) *Reset Dialogues on Civilizations*.
- Seyla Benhabib, Daniele Archibugi and Mariano Croce (2010) 'Toward a Converging Cosmopolitan Project?' *Open Democracy*, 28 January.
- Seyla Benhabib, Ian Shapiro and Danilo Petranović (eds) (2007c) *Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances*, Cambridge University Press.
- Didier Bigo (2009) 'Immigration Controls and Free movement in Europe' 91 *International Review of the Red Cross* 875.
- Didier Bigo and Julien Jeandesboz (2009) 'Border Security, Technology and the Stockholm Programme', *INEX Policy Brief* 3, November.
- Norberto Bobbio (1957) *Diritto e Stato nel pensiero di Emanuele Kant* [Law and the state in E Kant], Giappichelli.

- Norberto Bobbio (1979[1965]) *Il Problema della Guerra e le vie della pace* [The problem of war and the paths to peace], Il Mulino.
- Norberto Bobbio (1987) *The Future of Democracy*, Polity Press.
- Norberto Bobbio (1989) *Democracy and Dictatorship*, Polity Press.
- Norberto Bobbio (1989) 'Introduzione' [Towards perpetual peace: a philosophical project] in N Merker (ed), *Immanuel Kant, Per La Pace Perpetua*, Editori Riuniti.
- Norberto Bobbio (1989) 'Educare al rispetto' [Education for respect], 15 *Duemilauno* 13.
- Norberto Bobbio (1992) 'Democrazia e Educazione' [Democracy and education] 1 *News Educazione*.
- Norberto Bobbio (1994) 'Il futuro della democrazia. Ci vuole un mondo che superi gli Stati' [The future of democracy. There is a need for a world beyond States], *La Stampa*, 16 November.
- Norberto Bobbio (1995) 'Democracy and the International System' in Daniele Archibugi and David Held (eds), *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*, Polity Press.
- Norberto Bobbio (1996) *The Age of Rights*, Polity Press.
- Norberto Bobbio (2000) *In Praise of Meekness*, Polity Press.
- Norberto Bobbio (2002) *A Political Life*, Polity Press.
- Norberto Bobbio-Danilo Zolo (1998) 'The Theory of Law and the International System: A Talk' 9 *European Journal of International Law* 2.
- Edgar Bodenheimer (1971) 'Philosophical Anthropology and the Law' 59 *California Law Review* 653.
- Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*, Routledge.
- Andrew Chadwick (2009) 'Web 2.0: New Challenges for the Study of E-Democracy in an Era of Informational Exuberance' 5 *I/S: A Journal of Law and Policy* 1.
- Teresa Chataway (1999) *The Relationship Between International Law and Democracy*, unpublished ms, University of Melbourne.
- Teresa Chataway (2007) 'Towards Normative Consensus on Responsibility to Protect' 16 *Griffith Law Review* 193.
- Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins (eds) (1998) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, University of Minnesota Press.
- Alastair Davidson (1997) *From Subject to Citizen: Australian Citizenship in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge University Press.
- Gerard Delanty (2009) *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory*, Cambridge University Press.
- Jacques Derrida (1994) 'The Right to Philosophy from a Cosmopolitical Point of View' 4 *Surfaces* np, available at http://Derrida_on_cosmopolitical_files/derrida.htm.
- Jacques Derrida (1998) An Interview with Derrida Jacques, *Cardozo Life*, Fall, available at www.egs.edu/faculty/Jacques-derrida/articles/an-interview-with-jacques-derrida.
- Jacques Derrida (1999) 'Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility', in R Kearney and M Dooley (eds), *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, Routledge.
- Jacques Derrida (2001) *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, Routledge.
- Michael MJ Fischer (2007) 'Four Genealogies for a Recombinant Anthropology of Science and Technology' 22(4) *Cultural Anthropology* 539.
- Michael MJ Fischer (2009) *Anthropological Futures*, Duke University Press.
- John Fiske (1987) *Television Culture*, Methuen.

- Alan Galey (2007) 'Introduction: Digital Humanities and the Networked Citizen' 1 *TEXT Technology* 11.
- R Stuart Geiger (2009) 'Does Habermas Understand the Internet? The Algorithmic Construction of the Blog/Public Sphere' 10 *Technology & Society* 1.
- R Stuart Geiger and David Ribes (2010) 'The Work of Sustaining Order in Wikipedia: The Banning of a Vandal', *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, ACM.
- Doris Graber (2004) 'Mediated Politics and Citizenship in the Twenty-First Century' 55 *Annual Review of Psychology* 545.
- Elspeth Guild and Didier Bigo (2010) 'The Transformation of European Border Controls', in Bernard Ryan and Valsamis Mitsilegas (eds), *Extraterritorial Immigration Control: Legal Challenges*, Brill.
- William Hastie (ed and trans) (1900 [1755]) *Kant's Cosmogony as in His Essay on the Retardation of the Rotation of the Earth and His Natural History and Theory of the Heavens*, James Maclehose and Sons.
- N Katherine Hayles (2009) 'How We Think: The Transforming Power of Digital Technologies', eCommons@Cornell, 4 March.
- Matthew Hindman (2008) *The Myth of Digital Democracy*, Princeton University Press.
- Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther (eds) (1999) *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, Macmillan.
- Engin F Isin (2009) 'Citizenship in Flux: The Figure of the Activist Citizen' 29 *Subjectivity* 367.
- Engin F Isin and Greg M Nielsen (eds) (2008) *Acts of Citizenship*, Zed Books.
- Engin F Isin and Bryan S Turner (2007) 'Investigating Citizenship: An Agenda for Citizenship Studies' 11 *Citizenship Studies* 1.
- Immanuel Kant (1798) *Essays and Treatises on Moral, Political, and Various Philosophical Subjects*, trans William Richardson, Vol II, London.
- Immanuel Kant (1887) *Philosophy of Law*, trans W Hastie, T & T Clark.
- Immanuel Kant (1891) *Principles of Politics*, trans W Hastie, T & T Clark.
- Immanuel Kant (1894 [1770]) 'Kant's Inaugural Dissertation of 1770', trans/introduction/discussion by WJ Eckoff, 1 *Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education* 1.
- Immanuel Kant (1939 [1795]) *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, trans NM Butler, Columbia University Press.
- Immanuel Kant (1965 [1797]) *Metaphysical Elements of Justice* trans J Ladd, Macmillan.
- Immanuel Kant (1978 [1798]) *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, trans VL Dowdell, Southern Illinois University Press.
- Immanuel Kant (2006) 'Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View' trans. Robert Louden, in K Ameriks and D Clarke (eds), *Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press.
- M Ulric Killion (2010) 'The Function of Law in Habermas' Modern Society' 10 *Global Jurist*, 2, Article 1, www.bepress.com/gj/vol10/iss2/art1.
- Pauline Kleingeld (1998) 'Kant's Cosmopolitan Law: World Citizenship for a Global Order' 2 *Kantian Review* 72.
- Anja Lansbergen and Jo Shaw (2010) 'National Membership Models in a Multilevel Europe' 8 *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 50.

- Helen Margetts, Peter John, Tobias Escher and Stephane Reissfelder (2009) 'Experiments for Web Science: Examining the Effect of the Internet on Collective Action', paper presented to the first Web Science Conference, Athens, 18–20 March.
- Kevin McDonough and Walter Feinberg (eds) (2007) *Citizenship and Education in Liberal-Democratic Societies: Teaching for Cosmopolitan Values and Collective Identities*, Oxford University Press.
- Karen Mossberger, Caroline J Tolbert and Ramona S McNeal (2008) *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*, MIT Press.
- Matthew Omolesky (2010) 'Irregular Crossings', *American Spectator* (Special Report), 12 August.
- Roscoe Pound (1925) 'Law', in EC Wilm (ed), *Immanuel Kant 1724–1924*, Yale University Press.
- Chris Rumford (2009) *Cosmopolitan Spaces: Europe, Globalization, Theory*, Routledge.
- Bernard Ryan and Valsamis Mitsilegas (eds) (2010) *Extraterritorial Immigration Control: Legal Challenges*, Brill.
- Saskia Sassen (2007) 'Response [to Benhabib]' 6 *European Journal of Political Theory* 431.
- A Smith, K Lehman Scholzman, S Verba and H Brady (2009) 'The Internet and Civic Engagement', *Pew Internet and American Life Project*, [www.pewinternet.org/-/media/Files/Reports/2009/The Internet and Civic Engagement.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/-/media/Files/Reports/2009/The%20Internet%20and%20Civic%20Engagement.pdf).
- David Snedden (1919) 'Some New Problems in Education for Citizenship' 30 *International Journal of Ethics* 1.
- Isabelle Stengers (2005) 'A Cosmopolitical Proposal', in B Latour and P Weibel (eds), *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, MIT Press.
- Isabelle Stengers (2010) *Cosmopolitics I*, University of Minnesota Press.
- Jakob Svensson (2009) 'E-participation and iCitizens. The Expressive Turn of Political Participation and Citizenship in Convergence Culture', paper presented at the Conference of the ECREA Political Communication Section, Leeds, 17–18 September.
- Mario Telò (ed) (2009) *The European Union and Global Governance*, Routledge.
- Sebastian Waisman (2009) 'The True Face of Digital Democracy', *The New Atlantis*, Spring.
- Michael Walzer (1991) 'La democrazia: entrare e uscire dall'impegno politico' [Democracy: entering and exiting political commitment], in Giancarlo Bosetti, *Il Legno Storto* [The crooked timber], Marsilio.
- Michael Walzer (1996) 'Democracy: Entering and Exiting Political Commitment' 1(2) *Political Expressions* 151, original in Giancarlo Bosetti (1991) *Il Legno Storto* (The Crooked Timber), Marsilio.

Reports

- COWI (2009) *Frontex: External Evaluation of the European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External Borders of the Member States of the European Union – Final Report*, COWI, January.
- European Council (2009) *Conclusions*, Brussels, 10–11 December.
- Frontex (2009). *The Impact of the Global Economic Crisis on Illegal Migration to the EU*, Risk Analysis Unit, Warsaw, August.
- House of Lords, European Union Committee (2008) *FRONTEx: The EU External Borders Agency – Report with Evidence*, 9th Report of Session 2007–08.
- UNHCR (2008) *10-Point Plan Expert Roundtable No 1: Controlling Borders while Ensuring Protection*, 20–21 November, Geneva, Summary Report.