

CONCLUSION

The acknowledgement of emerging plural identities; their relationship to territorial borders or political communities; the rising of new forms of belonging at different milieus; and the value on rights and duties at multiple spaces, may make possible a more meaningful debate about the normative agenda of international relations. The classic view of territoriality, sovereignty and citizenship—as it was once envisioned in the optics of a Westphalian world-order—has been subject of transformation within a context of heightened globalisation. Separateness and boundaries are also significant to IR theory, especially when the nation-state as the primary political demarcation has been centrepiece for traditionally dominant realist and neo-realist, or yet liberal or internationalist theories. But if we analyse further and discover that the spatial dimensions of exclusion, as the membership in the sovereign state, has lingered in tradition and see that new configurations of political space are emerging, we come back to the quest of resolving ethical questions on where and how political boundaries *ought* to be set up. The concept of citizenship and the transformation of its ontological priority given to territorial borders should be revisited by IR discipline; in particular when it is referred to the fictional distinction between domestic and international which has become ever more blurred.

Globalisation has had an important role in the transformations on the normative and practical concepts of citizenship. The extent on how it has influenced in such re-configurations is far from being measurable. But what we know for certain is that the re-combination of globalising forces have produced conditions of potentiality for articulating political claims on the basis other than legal citizenship. Conditions of multiple identities

and community memberships alongside the disaggregation of identity away from the state political boundaries offer new forms of potential claims for rights and duties which could generate new normative insights in IR theory. They may also help to set forth the paths for the creation (or re-configuration) of new and existing political arenas and institutions to further the goals of multiple communities. Within and in-between these milieus, citizens could possibly engage in ethical debate, interact, and discuss in an effort to construct their understanding of themselves. Equating citizenship within the confines of alleged homogenous communities attempts to undermine the value of politics for constructing identity in the public sphere. The world contains a myriad of defined and diffused meanings, and where politics has taken an important role within a globalised world context. This has made thus the quest for identity building and political practice become even more relevant today than before.

The undertaking of exploring new possibilities of new spaces for meaningful political practice, while still looking upon new forms of commonality bonds between the citizen and his or her political community in a more complex reality, is even more challenging than has hitherto been the case. Disaggregated concepts of citizenship are a valuable attempt to bring compelling perspectives on the relationship between the individual and the political community in more complex realities. But also transcending the notion of citizenship in multi-spatial but multi-layered public spheres is an important challenge by its own. The concepts of global citizenship need to re-assess these challenges in order to bring plausible but meaningful concepts of citizenship for the 21st century.

Albeit the possibility to fall into temptation of resigning to the quest of finding answers to the questions of identity-building, meaningful and legitimate politics, and

political action within as well as beyond the state borders, it is in the broad spectrum of possibilities and the plurality of theories that this could be achievable.

1. Summary of Chapters

The concept of global citizenship that I developed throughout this thesis consisted in a continuous analysis of interlocking theoretical, ethical and practical approaches. Chapter one consisted in a theoretical undertaking in reflecting the thin-thick citizenship analysis and the exposition of disaggregated citizenships. Chapter two and three have a stronger connection. Chapter two provided theoretical and ethical implications of constructing extra-territorial political boundaries for conceiving global citizenship, whereas the third chapter attempted to elucidate the practical implications of constructing such boundaries. The introduction intended to initiate the analysis regarding the link between citizenship debate and IR theory within a contextual approach, and furthered with a three-scope problematic for developing a concept of global citizenship.

Chapter one analysed some conceptual frameworks of citizenship: from the modern-liberal concept, as thin citizenship, to thick and disaggregated notions of citizenship. I contested the thin notion of modern liberal theory which primarily focuses on rational individuals as the primary unit of moral concern. By the same token, I argued that the basis of citizenship underpinned by liberalism, generally speaking as the outcome of a social contract between rational individuals who pursue their individual interest, presents some problems when we visualise citizenship in the public sphere. First, the notion of the individual endowed with reason, and a state to secure individual's private lives, derive into potential problems in the realms of identity construction, public debate for common matters, and strong bonds to the political community. I argued that thin concepts of citizenship underwrite *a priori* universal principles that are enforced in a context of rather

homogenous societies. To verify my first hypothesis, I contested that this form of citizenship within the boundaries of the nation-state is no longer applicable for the transformations seen in a context of heightened globalisation. I argue instead that other forms of (thick) citizenship challenges this unidimensional conception of citizenship, which give broader scopes for diverse and multi-layered conceptions of citizenship as core for conceiving meaningful global citizenship. In so doing, I presented republican concepts of citizenship and one deliberative model to set the pathway for the construction of a concept of citizenship in exploring other theoretical frameworks within substantial insights of the political. I also gave a short overview of how globalisation has influenced the processes of interaction and organization in the political, social and individual spheres. A brief exposition of the theoretical approaches exposed in the last sections—the post-national, agonistic pluralism and the cosmopolitan—had also the intent to explain how the porousness of borders and territoriality can be feed into new conceptions of citizenship which are not attached to the nation-state; and these in a disaggregated notion of global citizenship.

If citizenship therefore may be practiced and envisioned in different political spaces that may diverge from that of the nation-state, chapter two had the purpose of shading a little more how the boundaries of the political community are re-defined. For that purpose, first, I placed the problematic, more specifically, on the theoretical and practical problems with regard to the liberal principle of individual and collective self-determination in the construction of legitimate political boundaries. Yet, I argued that alternative notions of disaggregated citizenship face the task of defining political boundaries beyond or within the nation-state in which sovereign self-determination and membership are determined.

Thus I argued that the notion of global citizenship is directly entrenched in how political boundaries are defined responding in the process to conflicting notions of the good and, therefore, the legitimacy of delimiting these boundaries. I presented that moral and democratic cosmopolitanism—like in the predominating literature on global citizenship—entails some practical and democratic deficiencies when democracy and meaningful political practice are addressed to validate the notion of a universal (thin) citizenship at a global scale. I thus presented the problems regarding the constitutive dilemma between sovereign self-determination and democratic legitimacy in the process of re-defining the border. The second part of this chapter attempted to provide the theoretical grounds to prove my second hypothesis that *global citizenship in the form of political activity is possible whereby individuals can develop multiple identities while enhancing political practice through the interaction in-between different political arenas considering at a time strong and weak polities where citizenship can be performed*. For this purpose, I showed that Benhabib’s concept of “democratic iterations” is fruitful to give a multi-layered meaning of global citizenship. In so doing, I argued that cosmopolitan norms can take the form of global human rights as the moral justification but whose norms can be subject of re-assessment and debate in diverse political communities. On one hand, popular sovereignty would derive from the interlocking networks from multi-level spheres in the form of global civil society. On the other, democratic practice in the form of democratic iterations bring plausible mechanisms for legitimating the political boundaries within which ‘global’ citizens can discuss common concerns and, at the same time, they are re-evaluating, transforming and re-constituting the concept, value, and application of cosmopolitan norms.

Chapter two showed the theoretical grounds for the concept of global citizenship I attempted to form. The term ‘global’ I gave to citizenship corresponds to the practice of citizenship in diverse and multiple public spaces. Chapter three therefore elucidated the public spheres where this view of ‘global’ citizenship can be performed in practice. I displayed the cosmopolitan view of global citizenship in practice both in the form of a ‘global public’ and cosmopolitan democracy. Within this separation, I divided the analysis in two parts: the way cosmopolitans view human rights in line with the concept of ‘society of peoples’ and the ‘constitutionalization of cosmopolitan law;’ and the way discourses on global governance reform and global democracy promotes cosmopolitan (global) citizenship. I brought possible scenarios of imagining a ‘global public’ through the constitutionalization of cosmopolitan law, for example for the justification of humanitarian interventions like the OTAN’s intervention in Kosovo. I also gave some examples of how global governance discourses – as exposed in Charter 99 and the report of the UN Commission on Global Governance – surmount the meaning of politics needed in the process of imagining global citizenship. I argued that both approaches suggest the ‘making’ of a global public sphere in which public morality and human rights are debated within a context of an international society of states but where a cosmopolitan law should be enforced by global institutions. I contested both assumptions by giving a democratic critique where I emphasised that the cosmopolitan conception of global citizenship, in practice, do not regard political participation in multi-layered democratic publics; and which at the same time considers a kind of moral justification that gives ‘inclusive’ membership to individuals to participate in multi-level public discourses.

The second section of chapter three attempted to confirm my second hypothesis referring that *spaces-in-between* can exist in multi-spatial arenas where the practice of

citizenship can be attained in the creation of political communities within a more substantive and thicker dimension demonstrating political meaning and democratic practice. In such an attempt, the task was to provide a deeper scope of global citizenship by identifying where the sites for potential democratic deliberation are, on one hand; and to give a more fully political and ontological scope for meaningful democratic deliberation on cosmopolitan norms, such as human rights. Section three supported my second sub-hypothesis that *some aspects on political action, democratic deliberation, and normative principles are necessary to give an image of a plausible and meaningful concept of global citizenship in multi-spatial public spheres*. I here showed that ‘global’ civil society in strong and weak polities, for example reflected on transnational political activity of migrant NGOs, could bring the milieus where a meaningful ‘global’ civil citizenship can be practiced.

2. General Conclusions

I hope to have shed some little light on the theoretical, ethical and practical implications that constructing a notion of global citizenship as an alternative view of citizenship for the 21st century demands. The central aim of this thesis was to bring alternative theoretical frameworks to cosmopolitan or internationalist discourses that have driven the predominating discourse of global citizenship. However, the task for overcoming the theoretical, ethical and practical challenges of bringing a concept of citizenship beyond the theoretical (and even psychological) confines of the nation-state has not been straightforward.

This thesis intended to help in capturing some of the conditions between the individual and broader notions of political space, especially regarding the concepts of the spatial outlines that IR discipline traces. For example, the view of IR mainstream of

international system as a whole – a world society of states under the scheme of the UN members – has established global discourses and inter-national practices to cope with global problems so as to reduce poverty, spread of democracy, mitigate carbon footprint, foster economic equity and so forth. But this is one of the multiple normative views for political participation. In practice, as in reality, for example, civil society has shown alternative spaces for political participation which are not exclusively attached in the political arena of a territory but which also addresses the globalising effects on their communities.

The territorial state has served as a container for our understanding of citizenship within IR theory. This thesis attempted to address the kinds of normative change that need to be dealt with in IR discipline. The task was set up at the beginning of this exciting journey in order to contribute to the debate on citizenship, and more precisely, global citizenship. I hope this thesis has contributed to the continuous journey within the realm of normative international political theory. But more specifically, on generating questions about how our theoretical understandings of the operation of international politics generate ideas for further discussions on global citizenship.