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Abstract:

As the state incorporates all functions as sites of control and legitimacy, this paper questions the role that shifting economic and social realities play on the security of the state. Specifically, how the construction of democratic security communities builds upon structures of identity and belonging with ideas of liberty, equality and freedom within with the national and international arena while maintaining the ideals of statist authority. This paper will also look into what are agents of emerging power and the processes of temporal and spatial emerging power structures, how each is specified and the ways they are put into relation with the political. This paper will begin with the assertion that since the practices and locations of sovereignty are constantly shifting, it is important to understand how the prominent articulations of democracy and economic dominance, in the face of new realities, are continually used to enhance statist authority. This paper explores the relationship between historical articulations of democracy and contemporary enactments of the technological, cultural, and discursive boundaries that promote diffusion within pluralizing rationalities, temporalities and political subjectivity. Emerging economies and social realities disrupt the centrality of the political, and thus raise questions for state security.

Paper:

On a recent trip to Barcelona, Spain, to do specific research on Cataluña Independence movements, this author went with the intention of seeking to recast traditional conversations about identity, peace, regional governance and international security upon temporal movements of global politics. The research was designed to argue that the pressing political question becomes not whether to move, but, on the contrary, given that everything is already moving, how can movements be repoliticized? In order to accomplish this, the research started with the assertion that since the practices and locations of sovereignty are on the move, it was important to understand how the prominent articulations of sovereignty changed in different historical and geographic contexts. The use of the Cataluña and País Vasco political movements towards ―independence‖ was thought to be a springboard to provide the primary mechanisms to explore what factors facilitated the movements’ progression on one side to political practices and on the other side towards violence. The author hoped to develop an understanding of the factors that played a role in the choice between peaceful political integration and violence amongst two Spanish independence movements.

While researching various aspects and speaking with a variety of people, the author underwent a transformation as the first few days in May 2013, saw a flurry of activity based on the Catalan parliament’s January 23, 2013’s decision to hold a referendum on Independence. The flurry of activity culminated on May 8, 2013, with the Spanish Constitutional Court revoking and suspending the Declaration of Sovereignty of Catalonia approved by the Catalonia Parliament on the grounds that the one and only national sovereignty belongs to Spain. Embedded in concepts of civilizations are notions of sovereignty, statehood and citizenship. What became evident in discussions with pro-independence Catalonians was this overarching acknowledgement that terror and fear were not components they were interested in pursuing, and
more importantly, not interested in supporting. What was even more shocking was that there was a unique recognition that that independence was an economic issue. When pressed further, it was also astonishing that traditional notions of statecraft and statehood, notions surrounding the unliterary state, were in fact not constituents of the push towards independence. This lack of unitary constituencies flew in the face of preconceived notions of Catalonian independence which harked back to the defeat of the Cataluñaon September 11, 1714, by Philip V of Spain after a 13-month siege of Barcelona – an emotional loss of identity that has been the basis of mass protest and demonstrations that aimed to revive their secessionary fervor after huge pro-independence marches of 2012. In response to such fervor, Catalan President, Artur Mas promised to hold a referendum on independence in 2014. Thus, this paper will begin with the assertion that since the practices and locations of sovereignty are on the move, it is important to understand how the prominent articulations of sovereignty and citizenship have changed in different historical and geographic contexts. Specifically, this paper explores the relationship between historical articulations of sovereignty and contemporary enactments of the technological, cultural and discursive boundaries of sovereignty. This research intersects with key issues in international relations surrounding civilizations, state formations, citizenship, governance, identity and resistance by continuing to explore the following questions: what is the future of sovereignty and statehood? What is the relationship between politics, time and movement? And How do complex transversal environments constitute new political subjects/citizens?

In general, the traditional concepts of statehood/country, concepts based on the Westphalian perceptions of singular territory, singular peoples, singular language and singular religion, are on the move and shifting at least since the late 19th century. This shift and movement is consistently battling the generally accepted idea that the state is a tangible entity with specific effects that has authority and sovereignty. The state under the generally accepted ideas of the citizenry exercises control over peoples, ideas, and territories. This accepted perception was constituted through the rise of the modern state, involving territorialization, and place-based/space-based imaginations. The state assumed a material presence through the development of statist imagination that enacted institutions and agencies to formulate practices and effects. The formation of state effects facilitated the acceptance of practices of a ruling authority. Public discourse was transformed by the intersections of national, economic and interpersonal insecurities with contemporary citizenship. Whereas the social contract in liberal discourse was always a response to fear, the contract is always also in flux with changing relations of production and consumption as well as changing relations of raced, classed, gendered and other bodies. In effect new dimensions of fear continue to appear and there always seems to be someone capable of profiting from our most basic emotion.

In the sense that Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau conceptualized social contract, they made it clear that individual liberty is in the balance. Contemporary ideas of social contract reflect this same sense of balance as citizens are perpetually persuaded, by news media and popular political discourse that their freedom is in constant jeopardy from multivariate threats. More importantly, in order to balance individual liberties with statist control, legitimacy and authority, states developed communities/national identities that assumed sites on which practices of statecraft were actualized. As a state-effect, a national community was developed as an image over time
and space. An image of lived practices that existed before us and would exist after us (Paul, Ikenbury, and Hall, 2003; Anderson, 1983).

The state, as currently perceived, constitutes institutions and practices that legitimize its existence and are instrumental in the creation of a national core. The national core is a set of imaginations that manufacture statist culture. Based on this statist culture, the national core constructed a perceived majority and enhanced a specific identity to be processed and implemented. To witness the effects of a national core, incorporating historical narratives, one can turn to developments in almost any country. Histories and historical imaginations can be investigated to elucidate the formation of a national core that manage and coordinate public space via set rules and laws that delimit rights and situate networks of intelligibility.

The networks of intelligibility that constitute a national core are also at the heart of practices of citizenship and identity formation. All too often, citizenship is primarily seen as a social, cultural, legal and emotional commitment that facilitates identity formation and belonging. The national core and historical narratives, coupled with citizenship, constructs a specialized juxtaposition of power, legitimacy and authority with identity and belonging. This juxtaposition intensifies the fact that citizenship and identity are not based on specific legal status, but more provocatively, are actually based on control and access to social and economic resources. If we accept this argument, then a whole host of questions in regards to identity, belonging and solidarity are called into specific frames and made an essential component of greater social and statist problems tied to social and economic access and unequal distribution of resources. Some of these questions are as simple as “what does it mean to be a citizen of a state in a global environment?” and “how do concepts of citizenship get enacted within statist formation that are multivariate and constantly in motion?”; to questions as complex as “should there be concepts of citizenship within geo-political obligations that are counter to statist interest?” and “if citizenship is based on control and access to social and economic resources what does that mean to the overarching belief of the social contract within democratic principles?” This second complex question is most revealing, especially when taken in the context of democracy, challenging preconceived notions of citizenship, statehood and identity. Citizenship, when conjoined with inequality, poverty and disenfranchisement, excludes groups and individuals – very much a statist, social and civic complex. The statist system is consistently enacting effects of inclusion and exclusion of citizenship. Thus, the state faces an increasing contradiction in its development of maintaining the social contract, identity, belonging, citizenship, and sovereignty in an environment where the very questions of sovereignty and citizenship “of various forms of inclusion and exclusion, are no longer adequately answered in the territorial terms we have inherited” (Walker, 1993: 21–2). As we recognize that these questions are no longer adequately answered, we can engage in a construction of citizenship in a comprehensive and effective way – a reliance on the qualified life.

The language used within statist realities of citizenship creates a foundation, a constituted truth, through which power and desire interact and perform their various functions. In its very articulation, statist systems codify specific meanings and ideals valued in the exercise of authority in order to ensure adherence to specific formulations of identity and belonging that constitute statist imaginations of citizenship. If we take the Foucauldian assumption that power and knowledge are directly related, coupled with statist desires, then the relationship between power and knowledge is one where power is able to produce knowledge enhanced with desire (Foucault, 1979). This is the multifaceted, Janus-faced aspect of the political whereby power and knowledge intersect at points and is everywhere present. In this sense a specific dialogue
serves a function: it brings objects into being by identifying them, delimiting their field, and specifying them (Foucault, 1972). This is especially important in the conceptualization of citizenship as the subject/object dyad.

In the processes of constituted reality, knowledge and power need to be understood as an interlinked social process through which discourse intensifies the relationship between the state issue and the desired perception. Citizenship becomes the enactment of the tension between state issues and desired perceptions. Foucault’s understanding of the power-knowledge relationship is one where power produces knowledge and it is “the processes and struggles that traverse it and of which it is made up, that determines the forms and possible domains of knowledge” (Foucault, 1979: 28). Language, especially the language of citizenship, identity and belonging, is the mechanism through which the power/knowledge dyad is enacted and we can further this line of thinking and suggest that it is actually a triad enacted of power/knowledge/desire.

The language employed by statist systems implicates meaning and values as it constitutes the embodied citizen, which is then transmitted as a desire of the state, or at least a vocal minority that purports to speak for the state. It is through “reality-making scripts” and language practices that discourse interprets, produces, and reproduces the world around “US” (Der Derian & Shapiro, 1989).

The enactment of statecraft on citizenship via the qualified life enhances the role of citizenship within the confines of a political community vis-à-vis establishment of specific obligation and rights. Thus, the notion of citizenship “represents a relationship between the individual and the state, in which the two are bound together by reciprocal rights and obligations” (Heywood 1994:155). What is interesting here is that conceptualizations of citizenship recognize the dual nature of legal rights and obligations coupled with identity and belonging. The question for statist control, legitimacy and sovereignty is the objectification and subjectification of citizenship. When is citizenship a subject and object of statist control? It is important to understand that this discussion falls within the concept of the political subject – however, this paper argues that within the conceptualization of the political subject/citizen there is a specific tension between the citizen as both a contributing/participating member of society via the classical notions of the social contract (the subject “doer”) and as a member through which statist power is enacted on (the object). Statist systems continually prorogue the historical imagination and identity of citizenship subjects that enact power and authority and lend legitimacy to statist system through the long held concepts of the social contract. The problem for statist systems is that all too often citizenship takes on the object realm through which states enacts specific, rights, obligations and identities on the citizenry.

This duality of the subject/object citizen is particularly important in light of the fact that the practices and locations of sovereignty are on the move. Thus, it is important to understand how the prominent articulations of sovereignty and citizenship have changed in different historical and geographic contexts, or at least to acknowledge if the statist system has maintained the historical imagination of articulated sovereignty and citizenship. The dual specificity of citizenship – subject and object and the association with ideology and identity – encourages the state to manufacture specific conceptualizations of sovereignty and citizenship that are always flexible and malleable, always changeable, to fit within specific articulations of statist identity. Through citizenship as object, there is an interesting dynamic that is played out as there exist conditions of possibility when citizenship is conceived by the state as an object that must be managed based on the malleability and possibility of its description in its challenges to the state. Given the concept of the state’s historical foundations, it is not difficult to envision how modern
perceptions of the state project an entity that becomes part-in-parcel of the everyday life of the citizen.

What is provocative in this construction is that contradictions arise between the role of the conventional state and its existence within the processes of the global environment. Once it is recognized that the state is not a single tangible entity, but rather a series of institutions and agencies that manage thought, space, place and time through the creation and implementation of practices, then interrogation of the processes of statecraft becomes possible. The state is then problematized with economic processes, international treaties and organizations, and power concepts. Based on the proposition that the state is not a tangible entity but produces tangible effects, it may be useful to view the idea of citizenship through the metaphor of story. In this vein, a story normally has a beginning, middle, and ending. In addition, a story has an author as well as a reader. The citizenry, as reader, helps derive a story from a specific text that is the subject of state practices. The citizen as reader also becomes the key component to deciphering the story of the state and takes its role in solidifying and providing sites for the enactment of statecraft practices. Without the citizenry, the total story of statecraft does not exist. Thus, the state needs the citizenry to decipher the purpose for which it was created. The citizenry as the object of statecraft becomes the enacted entity on which the story influences control and authority. The story metaphor also helps establish the way in which the state composes multiple faces, legible to the citizenry through variations on the plot and the existence of multiple streams of plot development. In addition, the state also produces sub-narratives which are illegible to the citizenry. Finally, the story metaphor illuminates the possibility that the state, like a story, is not a tangible entity but is, rather, an idea/thought/conception of reality comprised of words and beliefs that in turn constitute and construct its own story, a self-perpetuating mythical structure.

We can also use the metaphor of the story to unpack the ways in which the state confronts transversal forces in the production of “spatial practices” (de Certeau, 1988: 114). Michel de Certeau suggests that stories organize places and link them together in spatial trajectories (1988). The plot of the story of the state is constructed through a linking of spaces that recognize the sites of “practiced places” (1988: 117). The state lives within these sites of “practiced places.” In the enactment of practices of statecraft, the state constitutes and constructs public sites for the spatial state as it “opens a legitimate theater for practical actions” (1988: 125). Thus, citizenship is the ultimate practiced place that incorporates temporal and spatial realities. The forces of globalization compress the time-space relation between states and diminish the absolute sovereignty and authority of the state and thus that of citizenship. The ideology, internality and externality of citizenship, can at times make the enactment of citizenship volatile for the state within place-based and space-based imaginations. Citizenship, especially within the confines of the qualified life, has the potentiality to be extremely fluid and unpredictable. This idea of the fluidity and unpredictability of citizenship is echoed by Benedict Anderson’s (1991) suggestion that the project of the nation-state was to adhere cultural and social interaction, identity and attachment to political participation and practices. Anderson goes on to suggest that the nation-state project is being dismantled by aspects of transversality and contemporary modes of communication. This fluidity and unpredictable nature of citizenship fosters the state’s ability to respond and control a variety of events as it makes them part of the sovereignty, legitimacy and identity of statecraft – all in an attempt to maintain classical notions of citizenship and statehood through specific effects. These effects are often perceived by the citizenry as a symbol of an actual entity used to prescribe a perceived entity that continually struggles to find its own identity and relevance in an increasingly global and transversal world.
The fluidity and unpredictability of statist sovereignty and citizenship, especially in the face of fear and crisis, creates an environment ripe for the contestation of traditional concepts of citizenship and sovereignty. Fear and crisis open a site through which these contestations can be voiced and queried. The issue for contemporary statist systems is that fear and crisis are not just the product of the outside other. Utilizing ideas of the other from security studies, whereby the internal security of identifying the other is revealed in the idea that through the inscription of the other’s foreignness, it is state-controlled ―foreign policy [which] helps produce and reproduce the political identity of the doer supposedly behind the deed‖ (Campbell, 1992: X). Campbell’s scrutiny of the state’s production of the other is developed further in Simon Dalby’s representation of the state as “a political entity that needs investigation in terms of its supposed provision of security, rather than having its provision of security taken for granted as a starting point for analysis” (Dalby in Krause and Williams, 1997: 24). Fear and crisis is as much an internal phenomena. If we are ourselves the source of our fears, following Nietzsche, we captivate and capture ourselves as bodies that fear. Writing on security, David Campbell states that,

just as the source of danger has never been fixed, neither has the identity that it was said to threaten. The contours of this identity have been the subject of constant (re)writing: not rewriting in the sense of changing the meaning, but rewriting in the sense of inscribing something so that that which is contingent and subject to flux is rendered permanent” (Campbell 1988, 31)

The production of fears, with a particular focus on the construction of bodies, more specifically the construction of bodies as citizens, it is then possible to open up sites of inquiry that challenge preconceived notions.  

As a site of challenge for, embodied citizens return us to the concepts of the qualified life.  In looking at the qualified life we must recognize the fallacy of an essential, unified, and autonomous subject/object and promote the multitude of perspectives that reside in the in citizen. In this way, the qualified life of the citizen incorporates the different conceptualizations of citizenship that are capable of expressing their own discontent and dissatisfaction. The qualified life in this paper falls in line with Gorgio Agamben’s (1998) treatment of the bios/zoe dyad. Agamben notes that statist lawshave the power of defining what zoe – bare life (Homo Sacer) is, as opposed to bios – qualified life. This definition between the bare and qualified life is the exclusive operation of the state, and more specifically the sovereign. It is important to note that while the definition of bare and qualified is the exclusive role of the state, the state must also ensure that it addresses the subject/object dyad of citizenship. The state must exercise power over the citizen by making it the object of political control, while at the same time projecting the image that the citizen is the subject of citizenship and can exercise its own power – this becomes a concept of citizencing.\(^1\) Citizen as political entities and thus the bios – qualified life, is separated from zoe – bare life through the notions of embodied individuals within the political system. This expands on Aristotle’s constituted political life that has simultaneous inclusion and exclusion of bare life. In this way, the citizen life is originally an animal born to life, but truly only exists as a being in regards to the good/qualified life which can only be achieved through politics and participation. Bare life, in the classical political sense, is transformed by statist systems into the good/qualified. Here the inclusion/exclusion dyad reigns supreme as bare life, that which is excluded from politics, is included specifically so that it may be transformed into

\(^1\)Citizencing is the action of participating within the statist system as a citizen within the notion of citizenship.
qualified life. Sovereignty is thus conceived as the power to determine what/who is incorporated into the political body and what is to remain outside of the political body. Here, bio-politics is the qualified life of citizens into its political systems.

Within the qualified life of citizenship there is a definite recognition of the state as a corpus entity that is fully constituted and is consistently re-identifying and re-defining itself in order to be a constant aspect of the consciousness of the citizenry. The state, through its effects, steadily interacts with the citizenry and is dependent on the citizenry for the creation of a specific environment, through which the conceptualization of the citizen is utilized to ensure relevance and maintenance of a statist constituted reality. In this way, citizenship is regarded as a bio-political component of the state in that it is used to create a sense of the other – the non-citizen – while at the same time separating life of the state via citizenship from the classical assumptions of sovereignty that defined society and citizenship narrowly to the discursive articulations identity, belonging, residency, inclusion and exclusion. What is emerging out of this change in perspectives, coupled with the tension of the subject/object citizen, is a specific interactive model of citizenship that both enhances the state but also strengthens the ideas of citizenship as a unitary entity that can mode and change the existing parameters of identity and belonging. This is occurring as states attempt to organize individuals into groups based on their skills, knowledge and power as it distributes rights and benefits (Ong 2006). In this shift of distribution of rights and benefits from traditional membership within states to skills, power and knowledge is actually an extremely dangerous proposition and puts the state in a tenuous position – a tenuous position based on the fact that if citizenship is now based on skills, knowledge and power rather than identity, membership and belonging to a state, the state may in fact be sowing the seeds of its own discussion as states may no longer be the locus of citizenship. It is also tenuous in the sense that this shift also opens a site to interrogate the connections between sovereignty, authority and citizenship.

This site, that interrogates the connections between sovereignty, authority and citizenship, also develops a space to discuss self-sufficiency and independence. For if citizenship is based on access to, and utilization of social and economic resources, rather than identity and belonging, then sub units of the constituted body can seek for fully constitution within the global environment. Turning back to the Cataluña independence that started this paper, we can see that Cataluña independence is the effect of these very specific developments in the conceptualization of citizenship. Citizenship, in the Cataluña experience, is consistently being contested as the traditional/classical conceptualizations of citizenship based on identity and belonging clashes with modern concepts of citizenship based on economic and social relevance. The clash symptomatic of citizenry that is preconditioned to view citizenship along the classical formation and the state, that at the same time it is promoting the sense of belonging it is also manipulating citizenship as the economic and social relevance. This clash is witnessed by the most recent September 11, 2013, demonstrations in Barcelona where supporter of Cataluña independence joined to form a 400km (250-mile) human chain, estimated at hundreds of thousands of peoples, across the region in support of their cause (http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24052713 accessed 9/13/2013). The fact this demonstration took place on the Cataluña’s regional “national” holiday, harkens to the classical sentiment of identity and belonging as these people strive for a “nation” that go back to the conquest of Cataluña by Philip V in 1714 and intensified through the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s and Franco’s dictatorship. It is imperative to recognize the struggle of classical concepts with modern environment and as
Carme Forcadell, president of the Catalan National Assembly which organised the human chain, called the event "historic". "The Catalan people have reaffirmed their determination to be a free state," he said. The BBC's Tom Burridge in Barcelona said the human chain was another strong show of popular support in Catalonia for the idea of a vote on independence. Speaking to reporters before the action, Mr Mas said the drive for independence was entering a "decisive phase". He later told the BBC that if Madrid continues to block a referendum he will turn regional elections - due in 2016 - into a vote on independence (http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24052713 accessed 9/13/2013).

The issue for statist structures, as evidenced by the Cataluña experience, is how does the state deal with reconciliation of classical notions of citizenship with modern developments of economic and social relevance. Cataluña is one of Spain's most developed regions, and already has a wide degree of autonomy, but the economic crisis is at the heart of nationalism. The dramatic surge in secessionist sentiment in Catalonia is closely related to the Eurozone crisis.
— (1992), *Reading the Postmodern Polity: Political Theory as Textual Practice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).