

Practices of citizenship and the politics of (in)security

Co-Directors: Xavier Guillaume (University of Geneva, Switzerland) & Jef Huysmans (The Open University, UK)

Keywords: Citizenship, Security, Democracy, Identity, Resistance, World Politics

Context and aims

Citizenship and security are not only two words that are pervading contemporary discussions around the globe but two central concepts in political science. More particularly, central fields within political theory and international relations have made each of these concepts the heart of their reflections. In that regard, it is interesting to note that both citizenship studies and security studies are actually constantly touching upon one another's concepts as both have come to bear on the other in their analysis of the political and of contemporary political processes. Yet, while touching upon one another, they often fail to question and engage the other's central concept – i.e. “security” or “citizenship”. As a result, the interplays between citizenship and the politics of (in)security, which have become an extremely central question in contemporary politics, are not well understood.

The aim of this workshop is to provide for a discussion and an analysis of these interplays and their potential or concrete effects in modern polities and world politics. It seeks to address important and contemporary empirical, theoretical and normative issues that emerge at the nexus between security and citizenship in areas such as immigration, cultural and ethnic minorities rights, civil rights and liberties, terrorism and counter-terrorism, and global mobility.

Invited papers:

The workshop invites papers discussing the heuristics and limits of the security/citizenship nexus whether from an empirical, theoretical or normative point of view.

Among the areas of research where this nexus can be productively unpacked and questioned, the following are of particular interest to this workshop:

- ❖ *Democracy and its different articulations.* What are the links between democracies' practices toward their citizens and security? Taken primarily as ways to protect their citizens, are security practices undertaken by liberal democratic regimes really doing what they are supposed to? State practices might, to the contrary, as well constitute particular forms of citizens by delineating good citizens from bad citizens. Indeed, behind securitization moves lay the idea that it is necessary to anchor and protect a specific collective political identity that is perceived to be in danger. But it begs the question of the effects of these moves for the normative foundations of liberal democratic societies as well as of the impact of the technologies employed upon their citizens.
- ❖ *Multiculturalism and the culturalising of politics.* As several scholars have pointed out, within liberal democratic societies, members of cultural minorities can be disadvantaged, marginalized or suffer from a lack of social and political integration *despite* their formal citizenship rights. To which extent, then, are practices of security aimed at specific populations – defined by their difference to an imagined political collective identity whether in terms of religion, migratory origins, and so on – redrawing the boundaries of citizenship? What are the effects of these security practices on these differentiated groups? How can groups perform acts of citizenship, i.e. enact the claim of the right to hold rights, when they are denied political inclusion? How do acts of citizenship rearticulate conceptions of insecurity? How does the

domestic and international culturalising of politics – i.e. conceptualising political and societal cohesion in terms of value integration and international politics as a clash of civilisations – and the securitising of multiculturalism – i.e. defining cultural difference as a source of disorder and political radicalisation – affect conceptions of citizenship? And, how do procedures to acquire citizenship impact on perceptions of insecurity?

- ❖ *Political loyalty.* While the state is extending its protection to its citizens by the sheer fact of recognizing them as such, it also expects them to grant it their loyalties. Contemporary issues, such as home-grown terrorists or soldiers refusing to obey certain military orders that they deem in contradiction with other forms of loyalties they hold (religious or else), are putting this rather unquestioned dimension of the nexus between citizenship and security into a different light. Is the fragmentation of loyalties among citizens putting the state in an insecure position? What impact does this fragmentation have on definitions of citizenship?
- ❖ *Mobility and circulation.* The right of mobility within a territorial space is often a taken for granted but sometimes also explicitly politicised aspect of citizenship. But mobility is also a practice transforming citizenship as can be seen in concepts like post-national and accidental citizenship. At the same time, the mobility of people and the circulation of knowledge and capital are currently heavily securitised. Security technologies and practices are widely deployed to govern various aspects of mobility, ranging from migration, over various financial transactions, to the intensive surveillance of nuclear and biological knowledge. How do these two developments relate? Is it simply a matter of the liberal tension between economic mobility and social citizenship on the one hand and securing territorial integrity and political citizenship on the other? How have nexuses between security and citizenship been constituted around questions of mobility and circulation? Is mobility simultaneously transforming notions of citizenship and security?