

# Contents

Acknowledgments .....	7
Doing Tolerance and the Question of Urban Citizenship: An Introduction .....	9
<i>Bariş Ülker and María do Mar Castro Varela</i>	
<b>I Conceptual Reflections</b>	
1 Measuring, Exhibiting, and Mobilizing Tolerance in Berlin .....	27
<i>Bariş Ülker</i>	
2 Solidarity and the City: A Complicated Story .....	53
<i>María do Mar Castro Varela and Leila Haghghat</i>	
3 The Promise and Limits of Participatory Discourses and Practices ....	72
<i>Margit Mayer</i>	
<b>II Controlling and Mapping</b>	
4 ‘Danger Zones’: How Policing Space Legitimizes Policing Race .....	95
<i>Bernd Belina and Jan Wehrheim</i>	
5 Behind the Walls of Paris: The Inhabited History of Space in the Parisian Banlieues .....	115
<i>Tania Mancheno</i>	
6 Spiriting Away the Bad Urbanite: From the Topkapı Bus Terminal to the Panorama Museum 1453 .....	136
<i>Julia Strutz</i>	
<b>III Defending the City</b>	
7 Practices of Commoning and Urban Citizenship .....	155
<i>Pelin Tan</i>	
8 Resistance and gift-giving: Gezi Park .....	171
<i>Ömer Turan</i>	
9 We Disperse to Berlin: Transnational entanglements of LGBTI+ movement(s) in Turkey .....	194
<i>Nazlı Cabadağ and Gülden Ediger</i>	
10 What do Claims for Participation Tell Us About City Planning? The experience of defenders of an environmental protected area in Bogotá, Colombia .....	211
<i>Giselle Andrea Osorio Ardila</i>	

**IV Protest and Resistance**

11 Protest in the Metropolis: Symbolism in play from the Queen's Pier conservation struggle to the Umbrella Movement in Hong Kong ..... <i>Liza Wing Man Kam</i>	233
12 What the hell has gone wrong in Egypt? ..... <i>Adham Hamed</i>	253
Authors .....	267
Index .....	271

# Doing Tolerance and the Question of Urban Citizenship: An Introduction

*Bariş Ülker and Maria do Mar Castro Varela*

Cities are complex spaces. They simultaneously enable processes of emancipation remaining exclusive and discriminatory. It is in the cities—especially the metropolis—that people make use of their right to protest in order to demand the right to vote, stand up against corruption and call for measures to curb violence (among other things). It is impossible to think of the city without considering the contested, and somehow blurry, concept of citizenship. Some scholars claim that the city and citizenship are in crisis (see Samara 2012): The present volume takes that assertion as a starting point to engage with different perspectives on the city and citizenship through a critical understanding of the relations of tolerance.

## **Tolerance Revisited**

At the twenty-eighth session of UNESCO’s General Conference in 1995, member states declared November 16 as the *International Day for Tolerance* to create public awareness about tolerance, point out the consequences of intolerance, and activate tolerance promotion and education (UNESCO 1995). As part of this declaration, four different aspects were emphasized to clarify the meaning of tolerance (Article 1). First, tolerance—as a political-legal requirement and moral duty—is understood as “harmony in difference” and the “respect, acceptance and appreciation” of the diversity of the world’s cultures, both of which provide the basis for a culture of peace. Second, tolerance—as exercised by states, groups, and individuals—is an approach that can be developed through the recognition of human rights and the fundamental freedoms of others. Third, tolerance supports the principles of democracy, the rule of law, and pluralism. Fourth, tolerance allows each person to follow their own beliefs and to accept that others follow theirs.

Within this conceptual definition of tolerance, the declaration considers both state-level adjustments (Article 2) and necessary social dimensions (Article 3). It underlines that tolerance must be backed up by legal and administrative mechanisms, and that states are required to assure that every person has the option to make use of social and economic opportunities without discrimination.

States are also expected to approve the international human rights conventions on equal treatment of individuals and groups. Last but not least, states must respect that individuals and groups have the right to be different (the multicultural character of the human family) and hence must take precautions against the exclusion of vulnerable groups from social and political participation.

In terms of the social dimension, the declaration points to the impact of the globalization of the world economy and the interconnectedness of new migration waves and urban transformations, which has resulted in the escalation of intolerance as a global phenomenon. In this sense, the promotion of tolerance must take place at different levels of social life, including the family, schools, universities, workplaces and within communication media. Particular emphasis is also placed on the support required by socio-economically disadvantaged groups in terms of housing, health, employment, education, and integration. To build up these efforts at the social level, scientific studies and networking capacities must be mobilized to undergird the policy-making processes.

From a broader perspective, the UNESCO declaration was one of the first efforts to promote tolerance through participatory citizenship in the post-1989 world. Although in the following years, this declaration would have a large impact on how the role of urban settings in encouraging the participation of citizens for the promotion of tolerance was understood, the relationship between cities and tolerance was not *terra incognita*. In classical and contemporary studies (Simmel 1997, Wirth 1938, Fischer 1971, Abrahamson and Carter 1986, Zukin 1995, Wessel 2009, Bannister and Kearns 2012, Huggins and Debies-Carl 2014), cities had already been labeled as the most productive spaces to encounter strangers, engage with difference, and to provide in return the foundation for the creation and development of tolerant behaviors.

## **Participatory Citizenship: A Genealogy**

These efforts to promote tolerance through participatory citizenship must, however, be analyzed critically in order to uncover the power relations embedded in the concept of tolerance in regards to various urban settings. What are the necessary conditions for the emergence and development of tolerance in different urban spaces? How can one interact with others through tolerance? How is tolerance reflected in urban space? Which urban actors are involved in the practices and narratives of tolerance? What are the limits of tolerance?

This edited volume provides answers to these questions by considering different forms of urban in/exclusion and participatory citizenship. By drawing together disparate yet critical writings, it examines the production of space, urban struggles and tactics of power from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Illustrating the paradoxes within diverse interactions, the volume focuses on conflict and solidarity between heterogeneous groups of the governed and the governing in urban spaces. Above all, it explores the divergences and convergences of participatory citizenship, as they are revealed in urban space through political, socio-economic and cultural conditions and the entanglements of social mobilities.

Before considering these critical assessments more closely, it is necessary to briefly contextualize the idea of citizenship and the debates surrounding it, which historically relied on the emergence and development of cities. This overview is particularly crucial for both a deeper understanding of the power relations embedded in the concept of tolerance promoted through the divergences and convergences of participatory citizenship and a reflection of these relations in urban spaces. Additionally, it provides a conceptual background for the twelve chapters in this volume by highlighting the relationships between cities and citizens and thus the argument, from a methodological perspective, for urban space as the main unit of analysis.

Generally speaking, the idea of citizenship has evolved from a traditional form of communal membership to a rational understanding of social order. In this understanding of social order, populations are organized within the boundaries of nation-states by the content of social rights and obligations, by the form or type of such obligations and rights, by the social forces that produce such practices, and by the various social arrangements through which such benefits are distributed to different sectors of society (Turner 1993: 3). Put differently, citizenship has been defined as a set of political, economic, cultural and symbolic practices and an amalgamation of rights and duties that forms an individual's membership in a polity (Isin and Wood 1999: 4). In this sense, the relationship between the state and citizens is not regulated through the domination of one over the other. Although the nation-state as a dominant polity identifies individuals through criteria such as birth, blood, and nationality, registers them with identity cards, and regulates the process of naturalization and the rights of immigrants, citizens are not only political objects that can be manipulated by the nation-states (*ibid.*: 4). They are also active participants in the formation of political, economic, cultural and symbolic practices, and can potentially develop strategies against or through the nation-state.

According to Castles and Davidson, three dynamics affected this developing conceptualization of citizenship (2000: 6–9). First, globalization questions the relative autonomy of the nation-state upon which a particular national citizenship is based. This can be considered a result of the relationship between economy and bounded national territories. Since economic activities transcend national borders and become uncontrollable for national governments, national industrial society cannot be seen as an economic and social system based on

rational principles within a bounded territory. In that sense, the autonomy of the nation-state as the main regulatory unit over a specific territory becomes questionable, since it cannot ignore the pressures of global markets.

Second, globalization has destabilized the ideology of distinct and autonomous national cultures. Though homogenization is one of the aims of the nationalist project, developments in transportation and communication have paved the way for the interchange of cultures. This, in turn, has increased the interaction between global and local cultures and weakened the ostensibly homogenous character of national cultures. Moreover, this trend has paved the way for an emphasis on ethnic groups within the nation-state and inevitably created the re-ethnicization of culture and identity.

Third, not only the temporary and permanent movements of highly skilled specialists, manual workers, tourists and young people for education or training but also labor migrations, and refugee exoduses have increased the mobility of people across national boundaries. This amplified mobility of people has also resulted in the emergence of new ethnic cultures and minorities, which have forced policymakers to reorganize national laws and practices concerning integration and citizenship. Additionally, the ethnocultural characteristics of migrants—in particular, solidarity mechanisms—enable them to further develop social linkages between the country of origin and the country of settlement, through which the rapid movement of capital, goods, people, culture, image, and symbol become possible, and transnational networks are formed. To have a better understanding of this recent development in the conceptualization of citizenship, it is helpful to look briefly at its historical dimensions.

The rights and duties of citizens in Europe are mostly a development of the last three centuries. According to Marshall, citizenship “is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status endowed” (1992: 18). In Marshall’s conceptualization, citizenship, as a problem of democracy and capitalism, is related to the question of

how to reconcile the formal framework of political democracy with the social consequence of capitalism as an economic system, that is, how to reconcile formal equality with the continuity of social class divisions (Turner 1993: 6).

In other words, citizenship, in his formulation, is utilized by the ruling elites in order to tackle conflicts arising as a consequence of the division of social, political and economic resources among different classes. In this respect, citizenship is an ideological apparatus akin to nationalism or racism (Kaya 2003: 152–153). Citizenship is thus seen as a political institution that legitimizes inequalities

within the structure of capitalist society. This tension between citizenship and capitalism can only be resolved through the arbitration of the welfare state (Delanty 2000: 16). With the institution of citizenship, the welfare state may usurp the role of class conflict by removing conflict from the social domain.

In analyzing the emergence of a modern conceptualization of citizenship, Marshall formulates an evolutionary understanding of citizenship which is dependent upon the acquisition of rights. These rights evolved from civic rights to political rights and then to social rights in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries respectively. In the medieval period, these rights were inseparable, and citizenship could be seen in cities, where it reflected a right to the city and its institutions (Isin and Wood 1999: 26). While uniform rights and duties did not exist, status was the mark of class and the measure of inequality. Classes in early modern societies included patricians, plebeians, serfs, and slaves, which necessarily contradicted the understanding of equality implicit in citizenship (*ibid.*: 28). In the seventeenth century, the struggle against absolutist monarchies resulted in the freedom of the individual with respect to freedom of conscience, worship, speech, the right to enter into a contract and the ownership of private property. These rights subsequently gave rise to a civil form of citizenship. Moreover, these achievements led to the institutionalization of law courts and individual rights for open trials. The equality of all citizens before the law was foundational to these developments (Delanty 2000: 15).

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, political rights became the main focus of a modern conceptualization of citizenship. The emergence of political citizenship was mostly associated with the growth of modern parliamentary democracy. Within this context, political rights were composed of the right to vote, the right to be selected, the right of association and the right to participate in the organs of government. Although political rights existed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they were not universal. Franchise remained as a group monopoly until the twentieth century, and political rights were exercised by those who had made economic gains and purchased property using their newfound civil rights (Isin and Wood 1999: 27). Both civic and political rights were necessary for capitalism and its class system. Thus, citizenship did not and does not contradict with the existing type of class structure (*ibid.*: 28). Rather they became unavoidable for the maintenance of particular forms of inequality. Status as a reflection of order, rank and family as in early modern societies was not destroyed but replaced with the institution of citizenship, founded upon the equality of opportunity, which provided the legal atmosphere to struggle for the things one would like to possess but without a guarantee of their eventual possession (*ibid.*).

Although social rights were incorporated into the status of citizenship with the introduction of public elementary education at the end of the nineteenth

century, it was not until the twentieth century that the link between social rights—the right to education, health, unemployment benefits, pensions, and social security—and citizenship became readily apparent (Delanty 2000: 16). In that sense, the rise of social services, especially housing and education, as indicators of social rights has made citizenship the architect of a new class of inequality (Isin and Wood 1999: 29). Within the relation between education and occupation, for example, the demand for various degrees, certificates, and diplomas has become a substantial qualification for employment, as demand classifies individuals into certain groups and fosters a system of class differentiation via profession and occupation.

Furthermore, as examined by Isin and Wood, Marshall underlines three reasons for the incorporation of social rights into the conceptualization of citizenship (*ibid.*: 29): the rise of egalitarian principles, in which the notion of equality was expressed through the principle of justice; the rise of real incomes and the narrowing of the gap between classes; and the increase of mass production and the incorporation of the working class into mass consumption. Yet, these social rights had an overwhelming effect on class inequality. Although the rise of social rights was expected to diminish class conflicts, advocates did not concentrate on the lowest ranks of society but rather on the whole pattern of social inequality. According to Marshall, social rights created “a universal right to real income which is not proportionate to the market value of the claimant” (1992: 28). Thus, Marshall understands social citizenship as a model that will bring equality to social opportunity. That is to say, “equalization is not so much between classes as between individuals within a population, which is now treated for this purpose as though it were one class. Equality of status is more important than equality of income” (*ibid.*: 33).

Marshall’s theory of citizenship has nonetheless been criticized from various perspectives. Isin and Wood outline three main arguments (1999: 30): First, they argue that Marshall privileges the question of how citizenship rearranged class-conflicts over the question of how citizenship rights were gained as a result of class struggle. That is to say, not only the impact of citizenship on class but also the impact of class on citizenship must be studied. Second, his formulation of a linear development of rights within the emergence of citizenship, over the possibility of a more circuitous pattern, leaves something to be desired, ignoring the possibility that the sequence of rights does not necessarily have to move from civic to political and to social rights. Third, it relates in particular to patterns of inequality, Marshall does not consider inequalities such as gender and ethnicity but presumes class as the only form of inequality.

Turner elaborates these last two points by criticizing the teleological character of Marshall’s evolutionary view of citizenship (1993: 7–8). On the one hand, it can be claimed that the universal church during the medieval



period provided a more universalistic degree of participation than was the case within the boundaries of the nation-state. In this line of thought, national citizenship can be seen as a particularistic type of secular social membership. Within this context, the institution of citizenship does not have to evolve in a straight line from the ancient city-states, to through the church, to the absolute monarchies—it can also exist in a different chronological order. Social rights do not inherently have to come after civil and political rights in every society, and Marshall does not give a causal explanation of how citizenship expands. Additionally, civil, political and social rights are not equally significant in Marshall's cosmology. For example, it can be argued that bourgeois rights of civil and political membership may not contradict or challenge capitalist property rights at all; indeed, they may be necessary for the support of capitalist relations. By contrast, social welfare rights appear to bite into the dominance of capitalist property, because they indicate or require some redistribution of wealth and property in society. Civil and political rights do not require any social hierarchy, whereas welfare rights, because they involve principles of redistribution may promote an egalitarian transformation of social hierarchies (Turner 1993: 7). Furthermore, Turner asserts that Marshall also neglects the idea of economic rights. Economic rights differ from social rights, insofar as the latter concerns citizens and provides various support mechanisms, and the former is related to those who are excluded from society (Kaya 2003: 154–155). With the increasing effect of global capitalism, these excluded people are identified as an under-class. They do not have the means to benefit from education, health, unemployment support, pensions, and social security since they are not permanently employed. On this point, according to Turner, Marshall's theory is unclear (1993: 8): Citizenship is not only a means of incorporating social classes into a society working through principles of capitalism but also a practice that conflicts with capitalism since it requires the redistribution of social wealth. Thus, even though these two principles seem to oppose each other, they in fact simultaneously enforce and constitute each other.

Like Turner, Delanty stresses other kinds of exclusion that lead to different forms of inequality in society (2000: 18). Given that a model based on social rights cannot accommodate these inequalities, a functional conceptualization of citizenship requires the recognition of group rights (e.g. cultural, sexual or gender rights). However, due to differing practices and interpretations of modernity, it is impossible to assume a single rational path for the development of rights. Considering the challenges of globalization and the effects of multiple modernities, the relationship between the state and the nation cannot be taken for granted (*ibid.*: 19). The sovereignty of the nation-state is challenged both with sub-national units and transnational agencies or groups. These challenges have influenced the relationship between nationality and citizenship

and damaged the ostensibly perfect correspondence between them. As such, any conceptualization of citizenship must consider non-citizens, immigrants, dual citizens, denizens and refugees. Finally, Delanty points out the difference between industrial society and post-industrial society (ibid.: 20–21). In post-industrial society, the neoliberal discourse, in which citizen is replaced by consumer, dominates: The increased consumption of goods creates new kinds of rights that have nothing to do with notions of inequality. In other words, the shift from an industrial society to a post-industrial society is also a transformation from the liberties of citizenship to the liberties of market forces.

Although this brief account of the various conceptualizations of citizenship covers issues related to rights, obligations, legal status (the relationship between individuals and the state), it is also necessary to take into consideration the dimension of belonging, more specifically identity, in order to adequately examine the idea of participatory citizenship as it functions through tolerance in urban settings. While citizenship is more a concept of status than one of identity and is expressed in legal norms that define the rights of the members of a polity, identity is a concept that presupposes a dialogical recognition of the other (Isin and Wood 1999: 19). Whereas the concept of citizenship allows or disallows rights and obligations, identity is produced and reproduced by individuals in an ongoing process of dialogical recognition. However, as Isin and Wood have underlined, both citizenship and identity are group markers (ibid.: 20).

Roger Brubaker emphasizes two citizenship categories deriving from different constructions of nationhood (1992: 1–17): The French (civic) understanding of nationhood—assimilationist, state-centered and universal, wherein a political community rather than a shared culture constructs the nation. Inclusion into the political community and cultural integration are understood as the constitutive elements that lead to the formation of an expansionist understanding of citizenship. Citizenship is granted to all immigrants through cultural assimilation. Rather than emphasizing common ancestry, language, and cultural background, this citizenship rests on residence within a particular territory, functioning on the principle of *jus soli* (Castles and Miller 1993: 225–226). The alternative—the (pre-2000) German (ethnic) understanding of nationhood—is differentialist, polycentric and ethnocultural. Nationhood is constructed upon genealogical rather than territorial lines, restricting German citizenship. Although it was liberalized after 2000, the genealogical understanding of nationhood and belonging remains. It is thus not possible to lose one's citizenship if one was born German, but one can be expelled from the German nation if one acquires this citizenship later and subsequently does not fulfill the prescribed norms. That is to say, common ancestry, language, and culture remain the basic criteria for belonging to the nation and granting citizenship

to children, based on the legal criterion of *jus sanguinis* (Castles 1994: 21). In this model, nationhood defines a constant form of culture that allows zero possibility for change and remains closed to non-nationals. This creates an unwillingness to grant citizenship to immigrants and even to their descendants born in the country to which their parents and grandparents immigrated.

In contrast to Brubaker, Yasemin Soysal tries to clarify the post-war changes within the institution of citizenship (Soysal 1996: 18). For Soysal, the predominant conceptualization of modern citizenship implies that populations are organized within the boundaries of the nation-state via rules claiming national belonging as the basis of membership. As a result of this, national citizenship is defined according to national belonging, as a source of identity, rights, duties, and correspondence between territorial state and national community. However, rights and identity as constitutive elements of citizenship have in fact been decoupled as a consequence of the post-war changes in the conceptualization of citizenship. In the process, rights that were associated with belonging in a national community have instead become international and legitimated at the transnational level, while identities are still considered territorially bounded and particularized. In other words, the sphere of rights predominantly highlights the universal rules and individual norms deriving from different organizations, institutions, laws, declarations or codes like UNESCO, the Council of Europe, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Conventions of International Labor Office and so forth. Conversely, understandings of identity emphasize locality, particularity, distinctiveness, uniqueness, authenticity or self-determination. By pursuing this goal, however, citizen and non-citizen immigrants do not exclusively establish their claims on these group narratives. Rather, they refer to universalistic discourses of human rights and individuality. In a way, they seek to legitimize the emphasis on particularity by referencing definitions of global norms, institutions, laws, declarations, and codes.

To define this process, Soysal argues in favor of Roland Robertson's conceptualization of the "universalization of particularism and particularization of universalism" (Soysal 1994: 160). On the one hand, particularistic characteristics of collectivities are verbalized as part of universal norms of humanness at the global level; on the other hand, these discourses of human rights and universality are largely utilized and practiced within the narratives of immigrant groups. Although this leads to a re-definition of identities, the idea of nation loses its force since it becomes embedded in a universalistic discourse of human rights (ibid.: 161–162). In a similar way, themes, activities, and references, which underline the uniqueness of national identities, create a normalizing trend and thus nationhood becomes more and more discredited. As a result of these two vectors, national citizenship turns into a rather irrelevant conceptualization.

In order to clarify these developments, Soysal underlines four developments that have affected the expansion of membership beyond the boundaries of national collectivities (Soysal 1996: 18–19). Initially, the internationalization of the labor market led to massive migratory flows into Europe, affecting the existing ethnic and national composition of European countries. Moreover, de-colonization at the international level and the celebration of rights within universalistic parameters encouraged the emergence of social movements that focus on notions of citizenship in European politics, and the incorporation of identities into the social domain and institutions of citizenship. Additionally, the emergence of multi-level politics (as in the case of the European Union) produces different opportunities for social movements and new demands within and beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. Lastly, the intensification of the global discourse surrounding individual rights and its resulting instruments has encouraged the development of a discourse of human rights independent of nation-state institutions. According to Soysal, these global changes shifted the institutional and normative basis of citizenship from the territorial entity of the nation-state to a transnational level, extending rights beyond national territories, while also noticeably changing the dynamics of membership and belonging in Europe (*ibid.*: 21).

Thus, post-national membership becomes an intrinsic part of the agenda, as three differences have emerged between post-national and national citizenship (*ibid.*: 22–23). First, in the post-national model, individuals do not belong to specific nations with formal national boundaries and membership is more fluid than previously. Second, membership in this model does not assume a single status. Post-national membership implies a multiplicity of memberships, although rights are not distributed evenly among these citizens. Legal permanent residents, political refugees, dual citizens, nationals of common market countries, temporary residents and illegal residents are likely to have very different rights. Third, in this new model of membership, the legitimation level has shifted from national rights to human rights as a result of global challenges to the sovereignty of the nation-state.

Although Soysal's arguments challenge the idea of national identity and the national form of citizenship and depend upon the development of human rights and the spread of universal norms of individuality, these have certain limitations. First, as Castles puts it, empirically, it would be an overestimation to claim that immigrants have acquired most citizenship rights despite lacking formal membership in the nation-state (1998: 234). Second, Soysal admits that in a post-national membership paradigm, rights are not distributed evenly among immigrants. In this respect, post-national membership does not provide something different from the national form of citizenship, as discussed in reference to Marshall and Brubaker. Third, within the political dynamics of

globalization, relations between individuals and nation-states have not reached a level globally at which authority has been transferred to supranational and transnational spheres—where it could generate a serious challenge to the prerogatives of nation-states (Koopmans and Statham 1999: 656). Even the common policies in the European Union are exclusionary toward foreigners and still fail to transcend the model of nation-state citizenship (Castles 1998: 235; Faist 2000). Last but not least, the practical implications of international human rights and civil rights conventions are highly questionable since they reflect various restrictions upon non-nationals and leave all discretionary decision power to local authorities (Koopmans and Statham 1999: 657).

Considering Brubaker's emphasis on national forms of citizenship and Soysal's post-national membership model, Christian Joppke attempts to set up a third model, arguing that national citizenship and post-national membership models coexist and simultaneously condition each other (1999: 186–187). In response to citizenship traditionalists, Joppke argues that different countries are moving from an ethnic to a civic-territorial model of citizenship for two reasons (*ibid.*: 203): One, the elimination of state discretion and cultural assimilation as preconditions for citizenship has decoupled the state and the nation. Two, membership in a nation is not required as a condition for membership in a state. He also claims that although it might have changed form from an ethnic to civic model, citizenship still matters, as post-national membership retains four major fallacies (1998: 25–29). First, post-national membership mostly considers immigrants, despite the fact that the majority of the global population, national citizenship remains a relevant choice. In this sense, only a small elite of global academics are post-national members of the global world, a title that—for our purposes here—can also be expanded to include entrepreneurs. Even the so-called 'guest workers' constitute only a small percentage of these post-national members in Europe since they are not as mobile as the upper-classes of the same immigrant group in terms of access to work and residence permits. Second, in a post-national membership model, there is a dualism between the nation-state and individual rights, since individual rights are inherent features of nation-states. Third, although post-national membership does not have a spatial marker, it mainly references Western Europe, thereby contradicting their attempt at being global. Fourth, this model also lacks a temporal marker. Although it has a clear beginning, it is conceived of as having no end. While 'guest workers' have challenged the nation-state in post-war Europe, their existence does not necessarily open the door for a post-national model nor is it an alternative to national citizenship emergence, unless a supra-national or world polity becomes a real possibility. All in all, Joppke's analysis underlines not only the inevitable influence of the national citizenship model, especially in relation to its transformation from

*jus sanguinis* to *jus soli* but also the pressure of a post-national model on the evolution of nation-states.

## **Urban and Participatory Citizenship: Resistance and Solidarity**

In his article “Reinventing Urban Citizenship,” Rainer Bauböck uses “sociological insights about major trends in contemporary urban development, such as growing internal segregation within and transnational connectivity between cities, as starting points for asking how these changes should be reflected in norms and rules of citizenship” (2003: 141). This is also a good way to frame our intentions with this volume—namely to show, on one hand, the “growing internal segregation” of the city and, on the other hand, describe different forms of “transnational connectivity between cities,” such as between Istanbul and Berlin, which formed the starting point of our ‘thinking about the city.’ For that reason, a short genealogy on citizenship and the relevant debates on the “changing shape of citizenship” (Smith/McQuarrie 2012: 3) is vital to providing a deeper understanding of the different citizenship models that frame the contributions to this volume, namely, “participatory” and “urban” citizenship.

As Mohanty and Tandon point out, it is important to depict the complex challenges of modern societies that a more mainstream perspective on citizenship is unable to grasp—neither in the Global North nor in the Global South. In their volume on “Participatory Citizenship” (2006), they, therefore, shift to a citizenship model that takes the perspective of those whose belonging to the nation is constantly under threat into account. But participatory citizenship and urban citizenship somehow still depend and are entangled with more classical ideas about citizenship that rely on a formal and legal belonging to the nation-state. Hence, even when the focus is on participatory citizenship, authors too easily fall back into the trap of methodological nationalism. Having said that, the fact that urban citizenship is a very blurred concept with little analytical power is a theoretical—and also political—problem. Meanwhile, it is surely important to transcend national citizenship as it often appears too easy to call for “a right to the city” without analyzing the challenges produced by such a call.

The claim that belonging to the city is more important—although legally more complicated—than belonging to the nation-state in mobilizing people and, as Smith and McQuarrie rightfully remark, cities “tend to privilege multiple modes of belonging beyond legal citizenship and place of birth—such as work, residence, and civic responsibility—as the basis of claim to rights and citizenship.” (ibid.) As an analytical tool, it helps researchers to look at

everyday practices of marginalized groups who are denied membership in the nation-state or are perceived as a threat to the nation-state. We might focus on the organizational and structural level to describe how the concept of citizenship has expanded through migration, to analyze how urban citizenship sparks new practices or to understand how a claim to the right to the city becomes a power which describes as a right through the city. Here, we might also point out to a pertinent ethical question—namely, how can the city protect citizens against the violence of the state, instead of working with the state against vulnerable citizens (see Fainstein 2010)? Or, more concretely, “how are cities strategic spaces through which immigrants struggle for general rights?” (Nicholls/Vermeulen 2012: 79). “It is tempting”, like Bauböck writes,

to regard the global city as a new political space within which the meaning of citizenship can be fundamentally redefined. We could hold up this hope against the prophets of globalization who proclaim the end of citizenship and democracy. Maybe a new conception of urban citizenship can offer a more attractive alternative (Bauböck 2003: 156).

The contributions in this volume endeavor to delineate the fraught line between tolerance and “freedom” offered by the city, between spaces of hope that are created within and the continuous “violence” exerted by the city as new conceptions of citizenship are contested. The authors show how negotiations, networks, conflicts, resistance, and rebellions push the borders of citizenship and thereby broaden the space of citizenship and create new models of belonging, but also curtail how alternative models of citizenship are contested by shrinking the opportunities the city might offer vis-à-vis violent global and local politics.

## Contributions

The first part of the edited volume is composed of three chapters presenting conceptual reflections. Barış Ülker (chapter 1) examines how public and private institutions, as well as civil society organizations in Berlin, take part in the definition and implementation of a specific form of tolerance toward certain groups of people through particular narratives and practices of measuring, exhibiting and networking for tolerance. This promotion of tolerance continuously asserts the superior position of the tolerant over those to be guided toward certain ends. In a complimentary manner, María do Mar Castro Varela and Leila Haghighat (chapter 2) introduce a new concept of solidarity—“de-solidarity”—which tries to tackle the shortcomings of previous conceptualizations of solidarity,



which replicate a caritative blueprint where the well-off reach a hand to the have-nots without questioning their own privileged position. It, therefore, shows how inequalities persist even when citizens try to turn the violent city into a just city. Furthermore, Margit Mayer (chapter 3) unfolds the concept of participatory citizenship and illuminates the contradictory phenomenon of a nearly endemic rise in inequality and disenfranchisement in the city just as models of inclusive planning and concepts of participatory citizenship have multiplied and have opened up new possibilities of survival in the city through the lens of a neo-liberalization framework.

Part two illuminates how cities are controlled and surveilled. Bernd Belina and Jan Wehrheim (chapter 4) expose the violent side of the city and how municipalities make use of the monopoly on violence to regulate and structure their cities. The production of “danger zones” in cities like Hamburg parallels the production of dangerous subjects who are constantly under suspicion and surveillance. Tania Mancheno (chapter 5) illustrates the relationship between space and violence through an analysis of Paris’s urban history, with an emphasis on the urban planning of the *banlieues* as a central component of French colonial and national history. While Julia Strutz (chapter 6) sheds light on the relationship between the city and citizenship by looking at the production of marginalized spaces, in particular through the history and architecture of the Topkapı bus terminal in Istanbul.

In part three practices of defending the city are presented. While Pelin Tan (chapter 7) unfurls practices of commoning and how they bloomed in spaces of resistance like the Gezi protests in Istanbul, Ömer Turan (chapter 8) argues that gift-giving relations were a major component of the Gezi Park protests and generosity and altruism could not be separated from this process. Moreover, Nazlı Cabadağ and Gülden Ediger (chapter 9) focus on the contributions of LGBTIQ movements to the Gezi Park protests and the emergence of a new wave of migration between Istanbul and Berlin deriving from the violence against the LGBTIQ communities. Last but not least, Giselle Andrea Osorio Ardila (chapter 10) complicates the claim of participatory city planning by showing how planners and government officials in Bogotá unilaterally present their projects and decisions to citizens, despite the fact that citizen participation in the making of public policies is a right protected by the Colombian Political Constitution (1991).

In part four, the authors consider examples from Hong Kong and Cairo to shed light on global protest movements. Liza Wing Man Kam (chapter 11) analyzes the Hong Kong Umbrella Movement through the lens of postcolonial theory, in order to show the historical predicament of redefining the postcolonial city. Meanwhile, through the lens of Elicitive Conflict Mapping (ECM), Adham Hamed (chapter 12) attempts to understand how violence may have been a



central ingredient in the alleged failure to achieve deep societal transformation in Egypt after the rebellion associated with Cairo's Tahrir square.

## Bibliography

- Abrahamson, Mark/ Carter, Valerie J. (1986): Tolerance, urbanism and region. In: *American Sociological Review*, 51, pp. 287–294.
- Bannister, Jon/ Kearns, Ade (2012): The Function and Foundations of Urban Tolerance: Encountering and Engaging with Difference in the City. In: *Urban Studies*, 50, 13, pp. 2700–2717.
- Bauböck, Rainer (2003): Reinventing Urban Citizenship. In: *Citizenship Studies*, 7, 2, pp. 139–160.
- Brubaker, Roger (1992): *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press.
- Castles, Stephen/Davidson, Alastair (2000): *Citizenship and Migration*. London. MacMillan Press.
- Castles, Stephen (1998): Globalization and the Ambiguities of National Citizenship. In: Rainer Bauböck, and John Rundell, (eds.): *Blurred Boundaries: Migration, Ethnicity, Citizenship*, England. Ashgate Publishing Company, 223–244.
- Castles, Stephen (1994): Democracy and Multicultural Citizenship: Australian Debates and their Relevance for Western Europe. In: Rainer Bauböck (ed.): *From Aliens to Citizens: Redefining the Status of Immigrants in Europe*. Brookfield. Avebury.
- Castles Stephen/Miller, Mark J. (1993): *The Age of Migration*. London. MacMillan Press.
- Delanty, Gerard (2000): *Citizenship in a Global Age*. Buckingham. Open University Press.
- Fainstein, Susan (2010): *The Just City*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Faist, Thomas (2000): *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fischer, Claude S. (1971): A research note on urbanism and tolerance. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 7, pp. 847–856.
- Huggins, Christopher M./ Debies-Carl, Jeffrey S. (2014): Tolerance in the City: The Multilevel Effects of Urban Environments on Permissive Attitudes. In: *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 37, 3, pp. 255–269.
- Inin, Engin/Wood, Patricia K. (1999). *Citizenship and Identity*. London. Sage Publications.
- Joppke, Christian (1999): *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany and Great Britain*, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Joppke, Christian (1998): “Immigrant Challenges the Nation-State”. In: Christian Joppke (ed.), *Challenge to the Nation-State: Immigration in Western Europe and United States*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kaya, Ayhan (2003): “Ulusal Yurttaşlıktan Çoğul Yurttaşlığa? Yurttaşlık Kuramlarına Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım”. In: Ayhan Kaya and Günay Göksoy Özdoğan (eds.) *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Sınır Tanımayan Sorunlar: Göç, Yurttaşlık, İnsan Hakları, Toplumsal Cinsiyet, Küresel Adalet ve Güvenlik*. İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları, 149–190.
- Koopmans, Ruud/Statham, Paul (1999): “Challenging in the Liberal Nation-State? Postnationalism, Multiculturalism, and the Collective Claims Making of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities in Britain and Germany”. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 105, Number 3, 652–696.
- Marshall, Thomas H. (1992[1950]): *Citizenship and Social Class*. London. Pluto.
- Mohanty, Ranjita/Tandon, Rajesh (eds.) (2006): *Participatory Citizenship. Identity, Exclusion, Inclusion*. New Delhi/London: Sage.
- Simmel, Georg (1997): “The Metropolis and Mental Life”. In: David Frisby and Mike P. Featherstone (eds.): *Simmel on Culture: Selected Writings (Original work published 1903)*. London. Sage, pp. 174–185.
- Smith, Michael Peter /McQuarrie, Michael (2012): “Remaking Urban Citizenship”. In: Michael Peter Smith and Michael McQuarrie (eds): *Remaking Urban Citizenship. Organizations, Institutions, and the Right to the City*. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 3–11.
- Samara, Tony Roshan (2012): “Citizens in Search of a City: Towards a New Infrastructure of Political Belonging”. In: Michael Peter Smith and Michael McQuarrie (eds): *Remaking Urban Citizenship. Organizations, Institutions, and the Right to the City*. New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers, pp. 39–56.
- Soysal, Yasemin (1996): “Changing Citizenship in Europe: Remarks on post-national membership in the National State”. In: David Cesarani and Mary Fulbrook (eds.): *Citizenship, Nationality, and Migration in Europe*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 17–29.
- Soysal, Yasemin (1994): *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, Bryan S. (1993): *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications.
- UNESCO (1995): *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*. Available at [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.phpURL\\_ID=13175andURL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPICandURL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.phpURL_ID=13175andURL_DO=DO_TOPICandURL_SECTION=201.html) [accessed 15 Jun 2019].

- Wessel, Terje (2009): "Does diversity in urban space enhance intergroup contact and tolerance". In: *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 91, 1, pp. 5–17.
- Wirth, Louis (1938): "Urbanism as a Way of Life". In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 44, 1, pp. 1–24.
- Zukin, Sharon (1995): *The Culture of Cities*. Cambridge, MA. Blackwell.