

## Lecture Notes 8 : Citizenship and Nationalism

Lecturer: Nicholas Vrousalis

nv211@cam.ac.uk

### Four models

Aristotelian view: citizenship, or membership in a political community, comes with certain obligations of participation because such participation is *intrinsically good*.

Republican view: active citizenry prudential imperative as a bulwark against tyranny.

Liberal view: citizenship about the enjoyment of certain rights in virtue of membership in a particular community. It follows that citizenship includes certain *duties* (e.g. to respect the rights of others).

Marxian view: requires a distinction between human vs. political emancipation. Under capitalism, citizenship is a mere 'political lion's skin', a sort of halo of the profane bourgeois.

### Citizenship as an instrument of justice

All views grant that a necessary condition for the achievement of justice is the virtue of 'civility' or 'decency' in citizens. Social justice requires that individuals not be predisposed to treat one another in racist, or sexist ways, for example.

How are these 'civic virtues' to be cultivated? Democratic forms of education.

### Nationalism vs. Postnationalism

David Miller argues as follows:

- (1) Social justice requires solidarity.
  - (2) Solidarity can only be effectively mobilized through a liberal form of nationalism.
- ∴ (3) Social justice requires a liberal form of nationalism.

Habermas denies (2). According to him, the coexistence of people from different ethnic, religious and cultural groups as equals *presupposes* non-nationalism. The emphasis should be on the construction of a sustainable *constitutional patriotism*.

### Global Justice and Motivation

Top row: cosmopolitan views, i.e. views according to which justice extends beyond the ambit of states or nations. Bottom row: nationalist views, which reject cosmopolitanism.

		Motivation	
		Global	National
Purview	Global	non-statist cosmopolitanism	statist cosmopolitanism
	National	non-statist nationalism	statist nationalism

Habermas hovers somewhere between top left and top right. Kymlicka is at the top right.

## Cosmopolitanism and Citizenship

On one cosmopolitan view, borders are a morally arbitrary characteristic of the post-Westphalian world order. Here's an argument for freedom of movement due to Arash Abizadeh (2008):

- (4) Coercion raises demands for justification.
- (5) Keeping people out involves as much coercion as keeping people in.
- (6) But keeping people in is morally unjustified.

∴ (7) Keeping people out is also morally unjustified.

So either all potential immigrants to a particular country should get citizenship wherever they actively ask for it, or, at the very least, they should have a greater say on the procedure that confers it.

Another cosmopolitan argument for (almost fully) open borders:

- (8) Global justice requires redistribution from the world's rich to the world's poor.
- (9) Such redistribution can be effected either by immigration (subsequently by granting citizenship status) from poor to rich countries, or by direct redistribution from rich to poor.

∴ (10) As long as rich countries do not fully meet their duties of justice through direct redistribution, they are morally required to allow as much immigration (and create as many new citizens) as can compensate for such negligence.

The surge in immigration flows to the western world can be partly explained with reference to increasing 'north-south' inequality. It is doubtful that (global) capitalism is consistent with even and balanced (global) development.

## Study questions

What is cosmopolitan citizenship? Is it desirable?  
Should there be open borders?

## Further Reading

Kymlicka, W. (2001), *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, ch. 7.  
Leydet, D. (2011), 'Citizenship', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.