

CHANGING CITIZENSHIPS

Paula Baron and Allan Ardill*

The articles in this symposium explore the unstable and contested notion of citizenship within an increasingly globalised world. The contributors chart the changing hues of citizenship that are being projected by the fractioning of sovereignty, where in some contexts it appears that the modern state is waning and in others there can be seen a violent and dominate hyper-sovereignty.

In recent years, the idea of citizenship has attracted considerable interest from the academic world. Increasingly, citizenship is viewed as a concept that is both unstable and contested as the impact of globalisation, new forms of transnational migration and the decline of state sovereignty have destabilised Enlightenment notions of citizenship.¹

The articles in this collection were written by members of the Law, Power and Identity research group at Griffith Law School between late 2008 and 2010. Each member of the group had very specific interests and specialisations. Our aim was to explore notions of citizenship from these differing perspectives.

Teresa Chataway, a specialist in the work of Bobbio, explores the concept of cosmopolitical citizenship, drawing upon Kant's *jus cosmopolitanum*. Engaging with the work of a number of theorists, Chataway examines European Union dual citizenship, often regarded as the precursor to cosmopolitical citizenship, and Web IV technologies.

Zoe Rathus, a specialist in family law, focuses upon issues of gendered citizenship, specifically the mother citizen. She plays with the concepts of 'hoods' and 'ships' – motherhood, fatherhood, mothership, fathership – to reveal both the lived identities and realities of citizens within families, and the impact of new family laws in Australia.

Michelle Edgely, whose specialisation is in criminal law, asks the provocative question: Do criminals in Australia have a second-class citizenship? She finds that the legal system imposes a number of consequences in addition to the curtailment of liberty, which impinge upon the fundamental rights of offenders. She concludes that these consequences are not justifiable, and appear to be an anachronistic remnant of attainder.

Paula Baron, who specialises in the interface between psychoanalytic theory and the law, addresses Engin Isin's concept of the neurotic citizen. Utilising a Lacanian framework, she seeks to extend and critique Isin's

* Paula Baron is Professor and Chair of the Common Law at La Trobe University. Allan Ardill is a Lecturer in the Griffith Law School.

¹ Cohen (1999) p. 245.

ideas. She provides further insights into Isin's neoliberalism, and explores the possibility that governments in state societies increasingly may respond to and address psychotic citizens and their claims, a rather more ominous development than Isin's neurotic citizen.

Reference

Cohen, Jean L (1999) 'Changing Paradigms of Citizenship and the Exclusiveness of the Demos'
14(3) *International Sociology* 245.