Chapter 24

Citizenship, Multiculturalism, and the European City

Alisdair Rogers

This chapter aims to review recent theories of citizenship and attempts to relate them to the city. It focuses on the specific case of immigration and multiculturalism in the European city, mainly within the European Union. In recent years there has been much rethinking of citizenship, including the propagation of new concepts such as transnational, postnational, multicultural, and differentiated citizenship. Such debates have been generally associated with the national or state level, but some attention has also been given to the changing territorial conditions of citizenship. The European Union presents a particularly interesting situation, in which supranational cross-national and subnational territories can lay claim to political identity and cultural membership. If there is any substantial relationship between citizenship and non-national territories such as the city, then it is likely to be found within Europe.

Recent Theories of Citizenship

Citizenship is not what it used to be. Under the headline "Making a profit from portable patriotism," Mike Fritz in the *Los Angeles Times* (April 6, 1998) reports on a Denver broker who markets Belizean citizenship over the World Wide Web. Most of his clients are Russians, who are attracted to Belizean visas because they provide access to the British Commonwealth. The broker notes other advantages to possessing a second passport, including the avoidance of creditors and litigious spouses. He adds that, in Russia at least, additional citizenships have become a status symbol, one up on a Rolex or a Mercedes.

The "explosion of interest in the concept of citizenship" (Kymlicka and Norman 1994: 352) both within political theory and increasingly in other disciplines has been partly driven by the kinds of geopolitical changes suggested by this story. These include the future of the nation-state in the wake of globalization and regionalization; the role of civil society in the revolutions in former Communist-bloc countries; the weakening of the Keynesian and Fordist compacts at the heart of the welfare state; new social movements such as feminism and gay and lesbian rights; and,

perhaps above all, the increase in immigration and asylum-seeking. It is no surprise therefore, that debates on citizenship have diffused beyond the domain of political philosophy. What remains less certain is whether this diffusion also dilutes the key normative and analytical insights of citizenship theory. Beyond rhetoric, is there any theoretical gain in linking cities and citizenship?

It is increasingly difficult to pin down a clear definition of citizenship. From a focus on the relationship between individuals, states, and rights, it has broadened to include more sociological questions such as the access to resources, inequality, membership in a political community, and identity. Under the influence of new social movements, citizenship has been extended from formal matters of belonging to some nation-state to more substantive ones of civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights and obligations (Garcia 1996; Holston and Appadurai 1996). Rather than define citizenship it is more constructive to describe the kinds of debates taking place within the theory. For the most part these share a common origin in seeking to go beyond the ideas of T. H. Marshall (Beiner 1995; Delanty 1997; Turner 1997). Marshall's idea of citizenship was that it was a status conferring full membership in society beyond the economic realm, which served to mitigate inequalities and conflicts founded on class. Taking the UK as his exemplar, he described the cumulative gain of citizenship rights, from legal (seventeenth to eighteenth centuries), to political (eighteenth to nineteenth centuries) and then, with the welfare state, social rights.

The limitations of Marshall's formulation have been explored by the several philosophies within political theory. These are well summarized by Kymlicka and Norman (1994), and can be briefly described as follows. Are there rights in other spheres, such as economic rights in the workplace, cultural rights of recognition or even animal rights? To what degree should rights be matched by responsibilities and obligations (conservative theory)? Should passive protections flowing from the state be accompanied by active engagement, making participation itself the purpose of citizenship (neorepublican theory)? Are rights cumulative, evolutionary, and progressive, or are there reversals and unevenness? Soysal (1994) argues that a new postnational citizenship based on the universal discourse of human rights has trumped older national forms and provided European migrants and foreigners with almost all the social and economic rights open to full citizens. Other commentators, for example Stasiulis (1997), detect a widespread retreat from inclusive forms of citizenship towards more hierarchical situations among North American and European countries. Finally, there are a series of questions arising from the fact that Marshall assumed a high degree of cultural homogeneity in society and did not allow for the plurality of cultures. This debate pits communitarians and nationalists on the one hand against certain liberals, postmodernists, and theorists of identity politics on the other. Do the benefits of citizenship only flow from prior and committed membership of a political community, for example through naturalization? Or, as Bauböck (1992) has argued, are they universal and egalitarian and so preceding membership? Can liberal states allow group rights for national minorities (Kymlicka 1995) or further, should they extend differentiated rights and special representation to oppressed groups (Young 1990)? Aside from who has it and how, how has citizenship itself been socially constructed through gender, class, race, and sexual differences (Kofman and England 1997)?

Running through all these debates, usually unnoticed, is the question of the relationship between citizenship and territory or space. Formally at least, a citizen is always a citizen of some*where*, perhaps one state or occasionally more than one. In substantive terms, the responsibilities, obligations, practices, and denials of citizenship are intimately connected with places and with spatially mediated forms of social inclusion and exclusion. As the story of the citizenship broker indicates, the relationships assumed to exist between identity, citizenship, and territory in the Westphalian system of states can no longer be so easily taken for granted.

The Multicultural European City

Estimates of the number of non-EU nationals resident in EU countries range between 15 and 17.5 million, or over 4 percent of the EU population. The foreign population therefore outnumbers ten of the fifteen EU members, without including a similar number of second- and third-generation migrant-origin individuals. In the early 1990s there were over a million immigrants a year into the EU, double the numbers of the 1980s (*Migration News*, April 1998). The flow declined in the second half of the decade. In 1996 immigrants accounted for three-quarters of the population growth of the EU, whose countries generally possess low birth rates. Aside from the unusual case of Luxembourg, EU countries can be divided into two main groups. In the first, generally northern and western countries with long-standing guestworker programs and/or migration from former colonies, between 4 and 10 percent of the population is enumerated as foreign in some sense. The second group, of Mediterranean and some Scandinavian countries, has foreign populations of fewer than 4 percent.

Migrants and their descendants are concentrated in cities. Moreover, they are overrepresented in large metropolitan areas and national capitals. For example, 55 percent of Portugal's foreigners are in Lisbon and over 40 percent of the Netherlands' minorities are found in the four largest urban centers. As a result, a number of European cities contain "foreign" communities of between a tenth and a third of their total inhabitants (see Table 24.1). These include increasingly cosmopolitan centers such as Brussels, Amsterdam, Stockholm, and London, where both EU and non-EU nationals are found. Although each city includes sizeable communities drawn from a few countries, they are also home to smaller communities from a much wider range of origins. For instance, in the Rinkeby district of Stockholm there are 127 different nationalities (Ålund 1997).

The problems faced by migrants and their descendants in these multicultural cities include employment, housing, education, services, racism and violence, segregation, religious freedom, etc. There is a substantial body of urban research on all these issues, albeit usually focusing on one at a time and continuing to rely heavily on concepts derived mainly from studies of the USA, such as assimilation, ghetto, and underclass. There is as yet no coherent and plausible European model. Citizenship theory may be an important component of any European approach to the multicultural city. To begin with, the legal status of citizenship, or nationality, is not universally available to migrants or, in some cases, to their children. Countries differ substantially in both their rules of naturalization and their ideologies of nationhood (Soysal 1994). France's civic republicanism stresses assimilation and nationality

Table 24.1   "Foreign" residents in selected West European cities in the 1990s

City	% "Foreign"	Main Nationalities
Brussels	28.5	Moroccan, French, Italian, Spanish
Amsterdam	32.2	Moroccan, Turkish, Surinamese
London	20.1	Irish, Indian, Caribbean, Bangladeshi
Paris	13.8	Algerian, Portuguese, Moroccan
Berlin (W.)	16.6	Turkish, Kurds, ex-Yugoslav, Polish
Frankfurt	29.2	ex-Yugoslav, Moroccan, Polish
Rotterdam	25.0	Turkish, Moroccan, Cape Verdean
Stockholm	17.0	Finn, Norwegian, ex-Yugoslav
Düsseldorf	16.3	Turkish, ex-Yugoslav
Oslo	15.8	Danish, Swedish, Pakistani
Liège	18.0	Italian, Moroccan, Spanish
Copenhagen	11.0	Turkish, Bosnian, Pakistani
Milan	5.0	Egyptian, Philippine, US
Lisbon	4.5	Cape Verdean, Angolan, Brazilian
Madrid	2.4	Argentine, English, French, Peruvian

Note: The figures in this table are taken from the city templates for the UNESCO MOST programme "Modes of Citizenship and Multicultural Policies in European Cities," available at www.unesco.org/most/p97city.htm. Different countries use different definitions of foreign, immigrant, and ethnic status. The table uses local definitions under the single description "foreign," which may therefore include individuals born or naturalized in the country in question.

based on residence in contrast to Germany's ethno-nationalistic ideology. The Netherlands retains some of the institutional structure of pillarization, the organization of social and political life around groupings founded on Catholicism, Protestantism, and secularism. Sweden practices a corporate form of multiculturalism, while the UK's citizenship and nationality laws remain a bewildering, if pragmatic, mess. Many countries are favorably inclined to dual citizenship but some, notoriously Germany, are not. There are up to 7.5 million resident noncitizens in Germany, including second and third generation individuals. The consequences of the liberalization of these laws by the new Schröder government in 1999 remain to be seen. Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway grant local voting rights to noncitizens, as do some local states within Germany and Switzerland. EU nationals enjoy virtually full rights in whichever EU country they are resident. In Brussels for example, although the 135,000 EU expatriates working temporarily in the city will be able to vote, many of the 350,000 non-EU nationals making their lives there will not (*Reuters wire* March 21, 1998). Even given these hierarchies of formal citizenship, it is still an open question as to whether the possession of citizenship does in fact produce improved lives, more political participation, a greater sense of belonging and more social acceptance for migrants and their families.

   Although, as Soysal has argued, noncitizens often enjoy many of the social and economic rights of citizens, these are mainly the property of guestworkers long resident in Europe. Since the 1980s, however, there has been a drastic increase in the number of marginalized migrants, seasonal and contract workers, street

hawkers, women forced into the sex industry, female domestic workers, refugees, illegal immigrants and, at the other end of the spectrum, transient professionals and their families. What many of them share is that their lack of citizenship is functional in their exploitation. Moreover, even if residence were to become more widely accepted as the basis for formal citizenship, many marginal and transnational migrants are not, and may not intend being, permanently resident in any one country.

Since the Maastricht Treaty EU countries have moved towards a common citizenship (if only a residual one contingent upon prior citizenship in a member country) and a common immigration and asylum policy under the Schengen agreement (albeit unevenly applied in practice). These moves take place against a background of high unemployment, pressure on welfare services and the rise of new and strident nationalisms and racist politics. The spaces of citizenship across Europe are opening up, with both supranational and nationalistic/exclusionary alternatives already on the table. Is there also space for an inclusionary, tolerant, and just multicultural citizenship? Will it begin in the cities?

City and Citizenship

Holland is a country with some multicultural cities, rather than a multiethnic society.

<div align="right">Veenman 1995: 609</div>

There has recently been an increasing connection made between the city and citizenship (for example in thematic special issues of *Public Culture*, *Urban Studies* and the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, see Holston and Appadurai 1996; Garcia 1996; Imrie et al. 1996). There are five main reasons for the association. To begin with, revival of philosophical interest in citizenship often returns to its antecedents in Athens, Rome, the medieval borough and the many local sites of citizenship swept away by the emergence of the nation-state. Within some quarters there seems to be a nostalgia for the premodern European independent city-state and the leagues of mercantile cities (Castells 1994). The millet system governing the relations between religious groups under the Ottoman Empire and the Jewish ghetto provide alternative antecedents for the modern multicultural city.

Secondly, in the recomposition of territory and politics which Europe in particular is undergoing, some authors hold that neither the nation-state nor the supranational quasi-state are sufficient to exhaust the possibilities of citizenship or meet its challenges (Holston and Appadurai 1996). Into this democratic gap enters the city (Borja and Castells 1997). Forging new contracts with its residents, asserting political autonomy from its national and/or regional state and networking globally and locally, in this vision the city becomes a new political agent, capable of mediating between global and local processes, generating economic growth, securing the redistribution of resources and building a sustainable environment. Barcelona, Amsterdam, Berlin, Stockholm, and other cities have sought to produce their own strategic visions going beyond local economic development, often couched in the language of citizenship (see Vertovec 1996, on Berlin for example). Quite how meaningful or radical these strategies are remains to be seen. The evidence suggests that Western European cities are less autonomous from the state than their North

American counterparts (Harding 1997). An important line of inquiry will be how the transition from the stable and hierarchical structures of the Fordist local state to the more horizontal, project-specific and networked structure of the post-Fordist state will affect new migrants. In the US model, ethnic groups succeeded one another in a set of local political institutions. But what happens if this institutional structure itself changes?

Thirdly, insofar as current debates on citizenship raise questions about the relationship between membership in some form of community and the formal aspects of citizenship, cities are the sites of the most profound questions of belonging and identity. The assumption of shared community and culture as the basis for citizenship becomes most problematic in the city. Liberal and universalistic formulations face their strongest challenge from communitarian, neorepublican and identity politics formulations of citizenship. It is in the city that the contradictions between universal and differentiated conceptions of citizenship become most evident.

Cities are also the most productive sites of alternative citizenships, challenges from below (Holston and Appadurai 1996). Although the era of urban social movements has passed in Europe at least, there are signs of migrants and others negotiating new forms of citizenship. In some cases, these appear to have close connections with urban conditions. Perhaps the most notable is the Franco- Maghrebian struggle for citizenship in the French *banlieues* (Wihtol de Wenden 1995). Starting from a geographical and institutional base in the suburban trades unions and left-wing organizations, second-generation Maghrebians asserted *le droit à la différence* in the early 1980s and moved on to demand citizenship by participation independently of naturalization as French nationals. Cities can also be the site and medium of exclusionary discourses of citizenship, as found among the neo-Nazi campaigns for "foreigner-free" zones in former East Germany which began in the 1990s. The so-called liberation of bars, clubs, cafes, then streets and whole city quarters through violence and intimidation is described by neo-Nazis in terms of a counter-power, creating a space in which the state "remains outside" (*Guardian*, December 12, 1997).

Lastly, the focus upon the substance rather than the form of citizenship reveals significant local variations, both between states and within them. This is confirmed by the kinds of analyses provided by the European Commission COST program of Multiculturalism and Political Integration in European Cities. For example, Rex and Samad (1996) note significant differences between Bradford and Birmingham in their management of the needs and demands of visible minorities. It is also the assumption underlying the UNESCO-MOST program Modes of Citizenship and Multicultural Policies in European Cities. According to Soysal (1994) there are strong grounds for anticipating that different national "incorporation regimes" will encourage different degrees of local variation. Compared with corporatist or statist and centralized regimes such as Sweden or France, liberal and decentralized regimes such as Switzerland or the UK are likely to exhibit a more local level of incorporation. The absence of a central state organization of foreigners and migrants into groups for the purposes of representation, coupled with an adherence to liberal individualism, should allow more scope for the negotiation of substantial citizenship at the urban level. Whether or not there are such local differences and whether they

are meaningful is a matter of empirical study. For example, in a comparison of Moroccan political mobilization in Lille and Utrecht, Bousetta (1997) discovered the anticipated contrast between nonethnic- and ethnic-based collective politics, but concluded that neither strategy was more successful than the other.

Holston and Appadurai (1996, p. 189) conclude that "cities are challenging, diverging from, and even replacing nations as the important space of citizenship – as the lived space not only of its uncertainties but also of its emergent forms." There is clearly sufficient ground for associating cities and citizenship, although it should be noted that the nation-state is far from finished and that national, supranational, and even transnational scales of analysis remain important. One can make two general observations about this association, especially as it concerns immigration. Firstly, European studies – perhaps in contrast with US writings – generally feature a division of labor between research on immigration and ethnicity on the one hand and on the city and urbanization on the other. Few scholars or research programs do anything other than hold one of these two terms constant while subjecting the other to scrutiny. Secondly, the city has usually (but not exclusively) appeared in the literature on citizenship as a taken-for-granted material space, not informed by the growing retheorization of space within political economy and interpretive approaches.

In the first instance, cities are the sites of research or the living laboratories of analysis. The complex processes of urbanization in the late twentieth century are generally contingent to the analysis. Research projects simply select from the range of European cities a series of naively given spaces. This can and does generate good research, for example Patrick Ireland's comparative study of four cities in two countries, France and Switzerland (Ireland 1994). For the most part it neglects many of the stock questions of political geography. These might include the impact of consolidated metropolitan government on minorities, as for example in Rotterdam, or the decentralization of public services in cities such as Stockholm. It could include the effect of the emergence of horizontal forms of governance within polynucleated city-regions such as Randstad, Lombardy, or the Lake Geneva cities. Whether representation is by citywide and group-specific consultative structures or by intraurban districts might also be expected to influence the political participation of migrants and minority ethnic groups.

The majority of studies hitherto remain wedded to conceptualizing the city in terms of absolute space, and have yet to fully engage with the range of theories which conceive of the urban in more relative or relational terms (Harvey 1996). They remain within what Agnew (1994) calls "a territorial trap," failing to examine the historical, geographical, and socially and politically constructed aspects of space and scale. A connection between approaches from a revived political economy and interpretive thinking and citizenship has yet to be made. There are some indications of what this might involve, for example in the call made by Painter and Philo (1995) to consider both material and immaterial spaces of citizenship through a closer attention to alternative or underground geographies that include interaction, organization, representation, and imagination. Recent work from North America has also hinted in this direction (for example D. Mitchell 1995; K. Mitchell 1997; Ruddick 1996; Staeheli and Thompson 1997). These studies combine a focus on the social and political construction of public space with a view that both identities and

social boundaries are actively made through public spaces. A different tack is taken by Robinson (1997) in her use of Foucault's ideas on biopower, surveillance, and discipline to explore the spatial construction of differentiated citizenship in South Africa during and after apartheid.

What these and other studies share is a grounding of the questions of citizenship, particularly the dimensions of identity, community, and exclusion, in spaces, sites, and networks which are themselves part of the constitution of citizenship. Few of the current philosophies of citizenship have attempted such grounding to an adequate degree (with the exception of Young 1990). This reinforces the gap between theoretical speculations and empirical research and leaves many of the newer concepts of citizenship "floating" in an abstract realm. Thus the agora and the forum can remain unquestioned historical referents of citizenship, while "public space" often stays detached from any material basis in the lived experiences of cities. Amin and Graham have coined the term "the multiplex city" to describe the urban as "the co-presence of multiple spaces, multiple times and multiple webs of relations, tying local sites, subjects and fragments into globalizing networks of economic, social and cultural change" (Amin and Graham 1997: 417–18). Migrants and foreigners above all are implicated in this multiplex city and citizenship theory can be extended to address its many overlapping and intertwined features.

Conclusion

What can citizenship theory and urban theory do for one another? Based on an analysis of French politics between 1981 and 1995, Favell (1997) argues that there are times in which philosophical speculation can and does make a difference to policy outcomes. Even so, for the most part the abstract discussion is weak on translating terms into public policy. The time is certainly ripe for a reassessment of citizenship in Europe, both in its formal or legal status and in its broader substance. Citizenship theory provides urban analysts with a set of analytical and normative questions backed up by an increasingly rich philosophical debate. It can make links across the territorial scales of European governance, membership, and identity. For instance, are closed or exclusionary national borders a precondition for open or inclusive cities, as is often supposed by national politicians? By the same token, placing the city within citizenship theory loosens its connection with the nation and state and makes explicit its spatial or territorial foundations. Through good empirical and ethnographic studies of public spaces, of the kind referenced above, urban study can ground citizenship debate in the lived, material, and representational practices of migrants and foreigners in the multicultural European city.

REFERENCES

Agnew, J. 1994: The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of International Relations Theory. *Review of International Political Economy*, 1 (1), 53–80.

Ålund, A. 1997: Co-operation for multi-ethnic inclusion: a project on local citizenship, participation and community integration in metropolitan Stockholm, Department of Sociology, University of Umeå.

Amin, A. and Graham, S. 1997: The ordinary city. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, NS 22 (4), 411–29.

Bauböck, R. 1992: *Immigration and the Boundaries of Citizenship*. Monographs in Ethnic Relations no. 4, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, Coventry.

Beiner, R. 1995: Why citizenship constitutes a theoretical problem in the last decade of the twentieth century. In R. Beiner (ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1–28.

Borja, J. and Castells, M. 1997: *Local and Global: Management of Cities in the Information Age*. London: Earthscan.

Bousetta, H. 1997: Citizenship and political participation in France and the Netherlands: reflections on two local cases. *New Community*, 23 (2), 215–31.

Castells, M. 1994: European cities, the informational society, and the global economy. *New Left Review*, 204, 18–32.

Delanty, G. 1997: Models of citizenship: defining european identity. Paper presented at the 2nd Convention of The European Association for the Advancement of Sciences, Europe: "Conflict and Cooperation," University of Nicosia, Cyprus, March.

Favell, A. 1997: Citizenship and immigration: pathologies of a progressive philosophy. *New Community*, 23 (2), 173–95.

Garcia, S. 1996: Cities and citizenship. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 20 (1), 7–21.

Harding, A. 1997: Urban regimes in a Europe of the cities? *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 4 (4), 291–314.

Harvey, D. 1996: *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Holston, J. and Appadurai, A. 1996: Cities and citizenship. *Public Culture*, 8, 187–204.

Imrie, R., Pinch, S., and Boyle, M. 1996: Identities, citizenship and power in the cities. *Urban Studies*, 33 (8), 1255–61.

Ireland, P. 1994: *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity: Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kofman, E. and England, K. 1997: Citizenship and international migration: taking account of gender, sexuality and "race." *Environment and Planning A*, 29 (2), 191–3.

Kymlicka, W. 1995: *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. and Norman, W. 1994: The return of the citizen: a survey of recent work in citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104 (2), 352–81.

Mitchell, D. 1995: "The end of public space?": People's Park, definitions of the public and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 85, 108–33.

Mitchell, K. 1997: Transnational subjects: constituting the cultural citizen in an era of Pacific Rim capital. In A. Ong and D. Nonini (eds.), *Ungrounded Empires: The Cultural Politics of Modern Chinese Transnationalism*. London: Routledge, 228–56.

Painter, J. and Philo, C. 1995: Spaces of citizenship: an introduction. *Political Geography*, 14 (2), 107–20.

Rex, J. and Samad, Y. 1996: Multiculturalism and political integration in Birmingham and Bradford. *Innovation*, 9 (1), 11–31.

Robinson, J. 1997: The geopolitics of South African cities: states, citizens and territory. *Political Geography*, 16 (5), 365–86.

Ruddick, S. 1996: Constructing difference in public spaces: race, class and gender as interlocking systems. *Urban Geography*, 17 (2), 132–51.

Soysal, Y. N. 1994: *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Staeheli, L. and Thompson, A. 1997: Citizenship, community and struggles for public space. *Professional Geographer*, 49 (1), 28–38.

Stasiulis, D. K. 1997: International migration, rights, and the decline of "actually existing liberal democracy." *New Community*, 23 (2), 197–214.

Turner, B. S. 1997: Citizenship studies: a general theory. *Citizenship Studies*, 1 (1), 5–18.

Veenman, J. 1995: Ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. In K. McFate, R. Lawson, and W. J. Wilson (eds.), *Poverty, Inequality and the Future of Social Policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 607–28.

Vertovec, S. 1996: Berlin Multikulti: Germany, "foreigners" and "world-openness." *New Community*, 22 (3), 381–400.

Wihtol de Wenden, C. 1995: Generational change and political participation in French suburbs. *New Community*, 21 (1), 69–78.

Young, I. M. 1990: *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.