

Citizenship, Civil Society, and Transnational Participation: Muslims in Europe

Riva Kastoryano

Since the 1980s, the question of citizenship has become a major theme in social sciences and the focus of juridical, political, social, and cultural debates in all democratic societies. In Europe, citizenship has taken different shapes and definitions in rhetoric, ideology, and practice with regard to immigrants' incorporation into nation-states and their political participation beyond boundaries relating home and host country to a broad European space. Citizenship is also an issue for European construction itself. Within nation-states, citizenship has been expressed in different domains, extending its scope from the national community to the civil society, even though only "legal" citizenship allows full participation of individuals and groups in the political community. The claim for equal recognition as citizens underlying the political strategies of immigrants remains within the framework of the legitimacy of the state of residence and of legal citizenship. At the European level, a transnational participation of immigrants has been encouraged by the very nature of the European Union and its supranational institutions, and raises the question of citizenship and its link to territoriality.

- * A shorter and slightly different version of this article appeared as "Citizenship, Nationhood and Non-Territoriality," *Political Science and Politics* 37/ 4 (2005): 693–696.

The question of citizenship is therefore at the core of negotiation of identities between states and immigrants (Kastoryano 2002). Through negotiations, the struggle for equality that citizenship entails is extended to different domains, often turning interest into identity. For states, it is a question of negotiating the means of inclusion of immigrants into the political community on the basis of a new equilibrium between community structures and national institutions. For individuals, citizenship becomes a principle of equality and a way to struggle against political, social, and cultural exclusion. It becomes a way to claim recognition as a “citizen,” through which the attachment and loyalty to both national community and to an ethnic community are expressed. Such an understanding of citizenship raises the question of the relevance of the triple link between citizenship, nationality, and identity, hence the link between political community and cultural community, the former as a source of rights and legitimacy and the latter as a source of identity. The separation of the three elements constituting the nation-state—citizenship, nationality, and identity—is reinforced by the political construction of Europe. As a matter of fact, political participation within the European Union multiplies membership and allegiances of individuals and groups and increases the ambiguity between citizenship and nationality, between rights and identity, and between politics and culture, with an emphasis on the fact that neither normatively nor empirically is there a contradiction between multilevel participation, multiple allegiances, and citizenship. At the European level, the construction of a new political space creates an opportunity for action beyond boundaries leading to transnational structures of representation and to new negotiations with states—home and host—and introduces a new understanding of membership beyond boundaries, and raises the question of territoriality with regard to the practice of citizenship and its relation to nationhood.

This article attempts to explore these complex articulations of belonging—citizenship, nationality, and identity—through different levels of political participation, within the political community and in the civil society, national and transnational, and questions the link between cultural and political belonging, between rights and identity, and the relevance of territoriality in relation to nationality and citizenship.

Citizenship, Nationality, and Identity

The concepts of citizenship and nationality, two interdependent concepts within the framework of a nation-state, are defined above all by membership in a political community (Leca 1992). This membership takes shape through rights and duties that are embodied in the very concept of citizenship. Its implementation by law implies the integration or the incorporation of the “foreigner” into the national community with which he or she is supposed to share the same moral and political values. Moreover, he or she is supposed to adopt or even to “appropriate” historical references as a proof of belonging and loyalty to the founding principles of the nation, which according to Weber, is the only community born of modernity.

Debates on citizenship and nationhood reveal precisely such expectations. They refer, therefore, to the formation of the nation-state, to the representation of its political traditions and its identity, no matter how this representation is expressed.¹ Reality, however,

1 Such perspective has contrasted French and German understanding of citizenship, considered as two republics with two different histories and each of them representing different political traditions. France is represented as the ideal type of a nation-state and perceives itself as universalistic because of its egalitarian principals based on “national assimilation” and is opposed to Germany, considered “exclusivist.” While French public discourse

is more complex. Obviously, representatives of the nation have explained, and to some extent justified, politics of citizenship in European countries. But lately, reality seems to have affected the course of history. The experience of immigration and settlement along with the claim of equality and recognition as citizens have changed both the understanding of and the laws on citizenship, by balancing the part of ancestry and birth, that is blood and soil, since almost all countries have become countries of immigration.² The legal status of citizenship based on birth or ascription crystallizes the representation of the nation-state, its founding principles, its values, and its ideology on which the national project has been built and in which the future generations and the “newcomers” are expected to believe.

Politics and rights of citizenship obviously have an influence on the strategies of the participation of immigrants. But the practice of citizenship goes beyond its legal definition. It stems from the political engagement of the individual and is applied to different domains and in different terms. It is expressed in terms of participation in the public space. Citizenship can therefore be practiced within a cultural, ethnic, or religious community as well as within the national community. Such multiple identifications and allegiances resulting from political participation raise the question of the belonging and

emphasizes the elective and political understanding of the nation, the German nation is defined as a cultural and ethnic unity based on common descent as a sign of belonging. Such representations have found a basis on the laws of access to citizenship that have privileged *jus solis* in France and *jus sanguinis* in Germany. See Dumont 1991; Brubaker 1992.

- 2 Again, in reference to France and Germany, according to recent citizenship laws in France, a child born to foreign parents can become French at the age of 16, whereas in Germany, starting in January 2000, a child born in Germany is automatically German if one of the parents was born in Germany or has resided uninterruptedly for the last eight years.

loyalty of the individual to the national community. It becomes a source of “suspicion” for nation-states, a feeling that emerges in every discussion or public debate on citizenship and nationhood. As a matter of fact, since the 1980s, the scope of the debates on citizenship related to immigration has undoubtedly transmitted the apprehension of the political class and of public opinion to see citizenship depreciated or “desacralized,” based on the argument that the “immigrant” or “foreigner” expresses his or her attachment to the country of origin, and therefore to “primordial ties” with a transposed cultural and/or religious community instead of with the political community of the country of settlement. Based on such fears, immigration has been perceived as a challenge to nation-states and to the pair citizenship/nationality. But what is truly at stake are the limits of laws and their links with social reality. To what extent does legal citizenship constitute a solution to inclusion and equality?

Thus, citizenship, in practice and as discourse, is linked to the phenomenon of exclusion, to ways to counter social exclusion, and to the fostering of political inclusion. In the nineteenth century, citizenship was extended to different domains such as education, health, and welfare. Right after World War II, the British sociologist T. H. Marshall reconsidered citizenship in terms of social class, adding to its political and legal content a social approach to the concept of right and equality (Marshall 1964). According to Marshall, citizenship as social rights follows political rights. As far as immigrant populations in Europe are concerned their social rights precede their political rights.³ As a matter of fact, immigrants are settled into a “social citizenship” upon their arrival, at the same time as their integration into the labor market, with equal access to social rights

3 Y. Soysal (1994) notices the reverse phenomenon between social and political rights of immigrants in Western Europe.

and equal protection stemming from the Constitution with regard to Human Rights.

A normative approach to citizenship therefore extends its understanding and its expression in social and cultural domains to include them in the political. According to Kymlicka (2002, 328), the extension of citizenship to ethnic communities today is a way to integrate these communities into a common national community as was the case with the reconsideration of citizenship with regard to the participation of social class analyzed by Marshall. Conversely, actors devise strategies for participation according to legal citizenship applied in nation-states.

The concept of citizenship embodies values and action, “responsibility and civic virtues,” according to Kymlicka and Norman (1994). It cannot therefore be limited to a political status and rights related to a national identity. Citizenship is also an identity that is developed through direct or indirect participation, in the name of shared interests for individuals and groups, immigrants or not. It is expressed through the engagement of the individual for the common good.⁴ Such an involvement can take place within a voluntary association recognized by public authorities, through community activities (local, or broader cultural, ethnic, religious), in short, through an engagement with civil society as well as with the political community. Citizenship is therefore participation in the public space, defined as a space of communication, of shared power, as well as a space of political socialization where the rules of the game are internalized and a political culture assimilated at the same time that solidarity is defined along the lines of various identities. Through politization, they assert themselves toward the state so as to

4 On citizenship as a subjective feeling of membership and citizenship as engagement, see Leca (1986).

gain recognition and negotiate an identity with the state in order to gain legitimacy and be represented within national institutions.

Since the 1980s, in many European countries the immigrant associations, supported by the European countries' governments—as long as their activities come within the framework of the so-called “integration policies”—have become loci of political socialization for immigrant populations. Within these associations, individuals of the same national, regional, ethnic or religious origin form a collective identity, distinguish frontiers, create new bonds, and finally learn the political behavior that positions them vis-à-vis the state.

Discourse alternates with action, and these community-oriented organizations appear increasingly as a refuge and at times even a sanctuary where culture, religion, the nation, and ethnic origins are interpreted and solidified in order to face the state and negotiate each of these elements with those in power. Such a “politicization” of identities finds legitimacy in an identity consciousness that is largely fueled by public debates and reinforced by local or national politicians and targeted government practices. This simple consciousness-raising of cultural differences is quickly transformed into political action when it is accompanied by demands that the state recognize these differences. Consequently, their creation is based on an obvious dual objective because it aims to develop a collective conscience and at the same time integrate the immigrant populations into state structures. Political participation therefore becomes the extension of community action; participation places the very concept of citizenship at the antipodes of exclusion, which highlights its social aspect while maintaining its political and legal aspects.

A citizenship that expresses itself in both community and national institutions runs against the traditional analysis of republican citizenship that blends political involvement and national sentiment, because citizenship is systematically attached to its structure, the

nation-state, where its identity-based and political aspects are confused. But actually, whether citizenship be political, judicial, social, or economic and its content identity-based, cultural, or legal, this combination boils down to a sense of loyalty directed at once toward the group, the community, civil society, and the state. It is through their interpenetration that the actors' strategies emerge.

Yet, citizenship as civic participation does not always theoretically preclude the expression of collective identities. All the more so since migrants who arrived in different European countries in the 1960s, and their descendants, publicly express their attachments to the country of origin, a linguistic, ethnic, or religious community, or a local community, as well as to a transnational community and the European Union. Their participation combines both the interests of an ethno-religious or cultural community and the political community. The principle of new ethnic identifications defined in religious or national terms from local to transnational becomes one of the stakes of citizenship open to negotiation.

Such an evolution brings to the fore a multiplicity of allegiances that all pluralistic democratic societies face. These have been crystallized around debates on dual citizenship, mainly in Germany. For the group, dual citizenship is founded on a logic that has two consequences: It transforms nationality into an identity rooted in the country of origin and it makes of citizenship an entitlement within the country of residence—identity vs. rights. In such a view, citizenship becomes simply a legal status, and nationality is merely defined along the religious, ethnic, or cultural lines that constitute the identity of the home country. In Germany for example, by demanding dual citizenship, Turks define citizenship as a judicial tool that gives them political representation and nationality as an ethnic identity. Dual citizenship flows, therefore, from a duality that appears, *a priori*, contradictory but is in fact complementary: the construction of a

minority status and the creation of a citizen's identity. Both emerge within the country of residence's institutions. How, then, can the relationship between citizenship and nationhood be defined? Is this a citizenship linked to the nation of the home country, thereby de-territorialized, or is it a citizenship related to an ethnic community seeking recognition not only within the national political community but on a European and international level, therefore de-nationalized and de-territorialized? Such a question suggests that ethnic communities become "transnational nations" deriving from the interaction between home and host countries and with a broader space of transnational participation.

Citizenship and Recognition

The question of citizenship is even more important since it is intertwined with the issue of recognition (cf. Taylor 1992). The demand for recognition allows groups that claim a specific identity to emerge from the political sidelines and fully integrate the structures of the state. In this perspective, being recognized is seen as a battle for emancipation. But contrary to the emancipation of the Enlightenment, which separates religion from public life and the individual from his community so as to ensure that he or she identifies with the national community, the demand for recognition in this case is born of a desire to be part of a community with equal rights within the framework of the State.

Recognition policies are related somehow to differentiated group rights that are at the core of a "multicultural citizenship" elaborated by Kymlicka (1995) and confirm the separation of citizenship from identity. They reveal the multiplicity of belonging and the contradictions between the social reality that filters through the demand to be recognized and the political traditions imagined as the

founding principles of a unified nation-state. Recognition focuses, however, on a legitimate identity with regard to existing institutions. It becomes a basis for equal treatment of differences and their integration into the state structure. In France, as in many European countries, the recognition of difference specifically concerns Islam. Since the 1990s, the actions by local authorities toward Muslim populations in Europe have been guided by the “fear of Islam.” At the same time, debates over the issue of citizenship that seek to prove an “incompatibility” between a “republican citizenship” and a “differentiated citizenship,” put Islam, the religion of post-colonial immigrants in Europe, at the center of demands for its recognition in their country of settlement. The assertion of an Islamic identity, as well as the emergence of an ethnicity that crystallizes around certain means of political participation, is pitted against the doctrine of a single nation characterized by its cultural identity and the common identity of its citizens. This principle of unity claims to mask all cultural, regional, linguistic, and other differences in the public domain and responds to a legitimate recognition before the state.

In France, the mobilization of the political class around the controversy over students wearing the Islamic veil to school (first in 1989 and then in 1994) in the name of *laïcité*—French secularism—considered to be the pillar of social cohesion, led to making the Islamic religion the key to the collective identification of North African immigrants’ descent. The separation between Church and State grants institutional judicial status to the Catholic clergy, to the Protestants of the National Federation of Protestant Churches of France, as well as to Jews governed by the Consistory created by Napoleon. Such “recognition” is based on the argument of respect for the freedom of religion and the neutrality of the secular state. The place that should be given to Islam in France causes the old duality between religion and the State to resurface in public debate and poses

the question of the recognition of Islam on the same basis as the other religions, only a century later. Today, the recognition of Islam leads to a repositioning of the different religions in the public space that challenges the concept of republican secularism and its practices and at the same time the link between the State and religion in France.

In April 2003, the French Council for Muslim Worship (CFCM) was established to give institutional legitimacy to French Muslims. The establishment of the CFCM is also viewed by Muslims as a form of religious legitimacy (Sevaiste 2004). The process has been denounced as authoritarian, and the artificial and pragmatic nature of the procedure for choosing the official representative of Islam in France has been subject to criticism. Nevertheless the most important aspect is that such a structure now situates Islam, institutionally, on an equal footing with other religions in France as well as other countries in Europe such as Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Belgium. Its creation is a way of orchestrating a shift from Islam in France to Islam of France, from a simple presence of Muslims and their practices visible in France to an Islam that is expressed and developed within national institutions, assuming its freedom from “foreign” influences, especially those of the homeland. In effect, the CFCM has brought into the open the tensions and power struggles among Muslims seeking representation, as well as the external influences that weighed on the choice of representatives.

The institutionalization of Islam is a response to a demand for recognition by the Muslim population. In this perspective, it leads to equal treatment of Islam with other religions before state institutions. Of course, this development raises a number of normative questions. In particular, there is the question of whether recognition can be limited to institutional representation when other institutions, such as schools, are not fulfilling their function of “assimilation” and the promotion of social, cultural, and religious equality. At the same time,

if religion appears as the main cleavage in European countries today, then perhaps its recognition can be seen as a path toward integration. This kind of “institutional assimilation” may be the only form of assimilation possible in countries that are, *de facto*, multicultural.

Thus, often, the claim for equality and justice for Muslims stems from the exclusion of religious associations from the process of resource distribution, while at the same time allowing religion to exist and to mobilize in civil society. The question of recognition of differences yields, therefore, an “institutional assimilation” of religious diversity. The objective is to give the same institutional basis to Islam, the same representative communal body as for other religions, for the purpose of integrating Islam into state institutions on the basis of equal representation along with other religions, to create a more genuinely inclusive public sphere by promoting common civic culture that all can have a sense of belonging to because they are indeed institutionally integrated, like the voluntary associations’ activities that combine community traditions and interest and the integration into the civil society. And it could encourage Muslims to identify with national institutions and thus help them break free of external political forces—their countries of origin and international Islamic organizations seeking to promote Islam in Europe. These forces weigh on the choices of individuals, families, and local communities in France as in other European countries.

Transnational Participation and Territoriality

Even though the search for recognition relates the group to the state, the increasing fluidity of borders has led immigrants to develop transnational networks linking the country of origin to the country of residence and to participate actively in both spaces. In this view, dual citizenship stems from their political participation in both

political communities, which brings to light multiple membership and to some extent multiple loyalties: to the home country, to the country of residence, and to the transnational community itself. Dual citizenship becomes the institutional expression of and the basis for transnationalism.

Transnationalism relates importantly to European integration. Citizens of the European Union as well as residents participate in the European Union's politics through transnational networks combining identity—be it national, religious, or both—and interest. This is also due to the very nature of the European Union, where the logic of supranationality has given shape to a transnational civil society within which networks of solidarity (national, regional, religious, or professional) compete and interact, and cover the European space. The politicization of each of these networks has led to the formation of transnational, de-nationalized public space: where, thanks to the density of communications between actors from different traditions, the groups and individuals who are active in bringing about networks transcending boundaries and transnational communities can socialize politically, and where the same actors learn the trade of a new political culture that takes shape outside the nations and their institutions, creating a new political identification that is transnational.

Within the context of the European Union, a “transnational community” transcends the borders of the member states. Some networks arise from local initiatives in countries of immigration, others from the country of origin, and still others are encouraged by supranational institutions such as the European Parliament or the European Commission. The intervention by supranational institutions situates the transnational communities such as lobby groups that operate directly at the European level and define their activities as transnational (Smith, Chatfield, and Pagnucco 1997).

Whether these networks emanate from local initiatives or whether they are encouraged by the countries of origin, international organizations, or supranational institutions, mainly the European Parliament, together they create a transnational space, where new solidarities and new forms of political participation are created, and the transnational community, characterized by its internal diversity—national, ethnic and linguistic—emerges. This diversity is “recentered” around norms and values diffused by European supranational institutions and through the process by which these same institutions give the diversity a legitimacy on the international stage, especially through an inclusive discourse developed by transnational activists founded on human rights, the fight against racism, or any other form of social, political, or cultural exclusion.⁵ Therefore, the identity of a transnational citizenship is expressed through the fight of transnational actors for equality and human rights, seeking at the same time a unified identity in search of legitimacy before supranational institutions.

The same diversity finds itself “recentered” around a common identity element, such as religion, particularly Islam, the religion of the majority of post-colonial immigration that has become the minority religion in Europe. Religion has always been the origin of the most

5 The fight against racism and exclusion was originally the official motivation of the European Parliament which, in 1986, had formed the Immigrants’ Forum. Dissolved in 2001, the Forum sought out “a place of expression for the non-community populations established in Europe, through which they could establish their claims and disseminate information from European authorities” (“Exception and Complimentarity in Europe,” 1994). According to the Forum’s attaché to the Commission of the European Community, the goal was to provide third-world country nationals “the same opportunities and the same rights as natives, thereby compensating for the absence of democracy.”

elaborate and institutionalized transnational networks For Steven Vertovec, religion is better adapted to the problem of transnationalism, since it acquires the indices of transformation in modes of religiosity, enabling it to follow the evolution of the importance of religion in the country of origin. Above all, a transnational community founded on religion is in essence a multiethnic community (Vertovec 2002), and is nonetheless the identity of the non-European minority in Europe. Moreover, religious communities have always been stimulated by secularization to organize themselves in pressure groups and take action in the domain of international relations, as demonstrated in treaties governing minorities from the 1648 treaties of Westphalia until the 1878 Berlin Conference, partially resumed by the League of Nations in the aftermath of World War I (cf. Preece 1998).

However, it is primarily with the case of Islam as a minority religion that communities are formed in Europe to legitimate their demands for recognition and to spawn pluralist politics (cf. Rudolf 1997, see introduction). In some cases, it is the countries of origin or international organizations that reactivate the religious loyalty of Muslim populations residing in different European countries. Their strategies seem contradictory, and at times even completely in conflict, insofar as the countries of origin aspire to a supranational recognition, and the international organizations seek to rise above the national cleavages of Muslims in Europe so as to create a single identification, that of being Muslim in Europe, and from there, the recognition of Islam by European institutions.

Such a “recentralized” transnational community in the European Union has been formulated by the activists as the 13th nation, or as the “13th population,” or the 13th state, in 1992, at the signing of the

Maastricht treaty, when the European Union counted 12 member-states.⁶ Such a formulation suggests a feeling of collective belonging through transnationality and a will to consolidate their solidarity as a political community that transcends member-states. But the idea of the “13th” also points to the emergence of a “transnational community” on a European level, that is a community structured by individuals or groups settled in different national societies, sharing some common references—national, ethnic, religious, linguistic—and defining common identity and interest beyond boundaries.

Transnationalism and Europe raise the question of territoriality with regard to participation and citizenship (Berezin 2004; see introduction). First of all, transnational organizations create a space for political participation that goes beyond national territories. They re-map a “political community” that is Europe, albeit transnational and therefore de-territorialized and/or re-territorialized. From this perspective, territory becomes a broader, unbounded space, where nation-states and supranational institutions interact, and where transnational networks build bridges between national societies and Europe (Kastoryano 2004). As for citizenship, it implies, in the view

6 In the early 1990s, more than 13 million “foreigners” (non-Europeans) were living legally in the 12 countries of the European Community. Sixty percent of the foreigners in France and 70% in Germany and in the Netherlands are citizens of countries outside the European Community. Of this group, France has absorbed most of the North Africans (820,000 Algerians, 516,000 Moroccans, 200,000 Tunisians), and Germany has taken the largest number of Turks (almost 2 million). In the Netherlands, the Turks (160,000) and the Moroccans (123,000) constitute most of the non-European immigrants, while Great Britain is characterized by the preponderance of groups from India (689,000), the West Indies (547,000), and Pakistan (406,000) (SOPEMI-OCDE); Eurostat 1999; INED 1997.

of the activists involved in building such a network, a part of the responsibility in the construction of a new “community of fate”⁷ that is supposed to represent the European Union and is expressed by the “will to live together.”⁸ Just as it was with the formation of a national political community, this implies the expression of their “will to live together” in a de facto multicultural (including residents with legal status) and democratic space (Kastoryano 1998).

The emergence of European space is linked to multiple and complex interactions between states and the collective identities expressed by immigrants or any other kind of interest group which strives to imprint its independence on the state. Transnational actors, such as leaders of volunteer associations, business persons, or activists, develop strategies beyond nation-states by expressing their solidarity through transnational networks based on a common identity or interest, and often both.

Political engagement on the European level leads to a citizenship that derives through action and mobilization beyond state boundaries. The question of European citizenship has led indeed to the elaboration of concepts such as post-national, cosmopolitan and/or transnational membership, and constitutional patriotism, all concepts that came along with the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992 that transformed the European Economic Community into a European Union. These concepts remain, however, normative. In legal terms, the Maastricht Treaty defined the status of citizenship as “citizenship of the Union.” According to article 8 of the treaty, “Citizen of the Union” is whoever holds the nationality of one of the member states. In principle, the “citizenship of the Union” requires the national citizenship of one of the member states.

7 In reference to Otto Bauer.

8 Inspired by E. Renan’s famous phrase in “Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?” (What is a nation?).

Thus the treaty maintains the link between citizenship and nationality as is the case of nation-states. But the practice of citizenship of the Union brings an extra-territorial aspect into play with regard to nation-states: again article 8 (8a–8d) of the Treaty of Maastricht gives the citizen of the Union the right to move, reside, and work freely in the territory of a member-state as well as the right to vote and run for office in local elections and in European Parliamentary elections based on residency, i.e., in the territory of a member-state of which he or she is not a citizen, but just resident. The extra-territoriality of the concept of citizenship is expressed by its practice, that is, political participation beyond territorially limited nation-states, therefore de-territorializing the national community or re-territorializing the European space. As Preuss (1998) has pointed out, territoriality becomes the basic means of citizenship in the Union.

Extra-territoriality is precisely what gives transnationalism its strength. Like dual citizenship, it institutionalizes multiple allegiances and dissociates citizenship from nationhood and territoriality. Within the European Union, this multiplicity of allegiances and spaces for political participation include the home country in the repertoire of citizenship. In fact, European citizenship, as a more global concept of membership than nation-states, introduces the allegiance of immigrants to their home country into the bargaining process in the same way that they express their allegiance to their state of residence and to the transnational community in which they are involved. The countries of origin participate in building a transnational community and encourage extra-territorial citizenship. For example, countries like Turkey, Morocco, and Pakistan, in relation to their émigrés settled in Europe, have changed their citizenship laws, introducing dual citizenship in their constitution in order to maintain emigrant loyalty by inducing them to maintain their original citizenship. Even though such processes can be sources of tensions between home and

host countries for countries that reject dual citizenship, the home country contributes openly to the construction of a “diaspora” and invests in designing a “diasporic identity” that would be expressed by the attachment of its citizens—former or current—to the homeland. Such an extra-territoriality is at the core of transnationalism. It keeps the legality of the citizenship of the country of origin, but only on its territory, its de-territorialization abroad becomes a resource for identity and mobilization for individuals and/or groups of immigrant descent. From this point of view, the nation is linked with the citizenry of the home country. At stake is the integration of the state (both states) into a global space (Ong 1999, more specifically chapter 8).

Conclusion

Transnational communities are constructed around shared references and bring to the fore a feeling of belonging to a “deterritorialized political community,” with identity claims that are nourished by new expressions of nationalism. Together, they lead to a redefinition of the link between territory, nation, and political space, challenging the nation-state as well as a territorially defined political structure.

But transnationalism and an extra-territorial citizenship generate negotiations between transnational actors and states. For transnational actors, a transnational action becomes a political tool leading them to act from “outside.” For states, transnationalism is a way to include identity issues developed in a minority situation into their political strategy and “re-territorialize” them or themselves as “de-territorialized” actors so as to maintain the loyalty of transnational actors and of any nationalist expression beyond their political border. It becomes a way for states to integrate into the process of globalization.

Thus the paradox: Even if transnational logic and its expression of nationalism try to circumvent national politics and weaken the state, the state remains the driving force of the process of globalization. Despite its limited autonomy owing to normative pressures of supranational institutions, despite an increasing interdependence between the internal and external in political decisions, the state remains the main actor for negotiations defending its interests and its sovereignty within and outside of its borders. It remains the legal source for citizenship despite dual citizenship. But transnational communities and their “nationalization” have become an important source of identification, resistance, and mobilization, a source of power stemming from the mobility of individuals and groups in opposition to the immobility of states. Therefore, might not the de-territorialization of citizenship generate new tensions between states and communities, and more generally, new tensions in the international system?

References

- Berezin, Mabel. 2004. “Introduction.” In: Mabel Berezin and Martin Schain, eds. *Europe Without Borders. Remapping Territory, Citizenship, and Identity in a Transnational Age*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1–33.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dumont, Louis. 1991. *L'idéologie allemande. France-Allemagne et retour*. Paris: Ed. Gallimard.
- Kastoryano, Riva. 2002. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2004. “Transnational Networks and Political Participation: The Place of Immigrants in the European Union.” In: Mabel Berezin and Martin Schain, eds. *Europe Without Borders. Remapping Territory, Citizenship, and Identity in a Transnational Age*, 64–89.
- Kastoryano, Riva. ed. 1998. *Quelle identité pour l'Europe? Le multiculturalisme à l'épreuve*. Paris: Presses de Sciences-po, second edition, 2005.

- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2002. *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will, and Wayne Norman. 1994. "Return of the Citizen: A Survey on Recent Work on Citizenship Theory," *Ethics* 104/2: 352–381.
- Leca, Jean. 1986. "Individualisme et citoyenneté." in: Pierre Birnbaum and Jean Leca (eds.), *Sur l'individualisme*. Paris: Presses de la FNSP, 159–213.
- . 1992. "Nationalité et citoyenneté dans l'Europe des immigrations." In: Jacqueline Costa-Lascoux and P. Weil, eds. *Logiques d'Etat et immigration en Europe*. Paris: Kimé.
- Marshall, T. H. 1964. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Neveu, Catherine. 1994. "Citoyenneté et racisme en Europe: exception et complémentarité britanniques." *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 10/1: 95–107.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Preece, Jennifer Jackson. 1998. *National Minorities and the European Nation-State System*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Preuss, Ulrich K. 1998. "Citizenship in the European Union." In: Daniele Archibugi, David Held, and Martin Köhler, eds. *Re-imagining the Political Community*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 138–151.
- Rudolf, Susanne H. 1997. "Religion, State and Transnational Civil Society." In: Susanne H. Rudolf and James Piscatori, eds. *Transnational Religion and Fading States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sevaiste, Vianney. 2004. "L'islam dans la République: le CFCM," *Regards sur l'actualité*, no. 298, 33–48.
- Smith, Jackie, Charles Chatfield, and Ron Pagnucco, eds. 1997. *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoğlu. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 1992. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vertovec, Steven. 2002. *Religion in Migration, Diasporas and Transnationalism, Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis*. Vancouver: Vancouver Center of Excellence (Working Paper Series, no. 02-07).