Citizenship as Instrument of Bio-Power:
Identifying Changes in the Functioning of Citizenship in the Netherlands in Times of Glocalization and Culturistic Discourse[1]

MSc Friso van Houdt (vanhoudt@fsw.eur.nl)[2]
Erasmus University Rotterdam

ABSTRACT
Citizenship is a concept strategically used as a solution for differing problems. For example Aristotle used citizenship as solution for the problem of ruling and to be ruled and Gaius used citizenship as a solution for the problem of the protection of the individual. As a consequence citizenship has historically developed into a multilayered and multifunctional concept. In this paper the functioning of citizenship in contemporary Dutch policy has been analyzed. This analysis has 'situated' citizenship in the period of 'glocalization' (i.e. migration) and it has been 'contextualized' in a 'culturistic' discourse (Schinkel, 2007). The analysis showed that citizenship is a useful instrument of 'bio-power' (Foucault, 1976): with citizenship it becomes possible to differentiate and regulate population(s) because it functions as social closure of the nation-state and society. It further showed that citizenship in contemporary Dutch policy is used as a solution for problems of social integration and therefore a new kind of citizenship developed: bio-political participation.

1. Introduction

The last few decades an important change took place. What happened was that the nation-state/society differentiation became problematic. The nation-state and society were, until recently, overlapping. They decoupled as a consequence of glocalization (e.g. immigration).

Glocalization refers to the unbreakable unity of processes of globalization and localization (Robertson, 1997). It was used in the 1980's by Japanese economists. In economics it is argued that a product is more likely to succeed when it is adapted to the specific local situation (i.e. McDonalds sells vegetarian burgers in India and in Holland it sells the McKroket). Glocalization became introduced in sociology by Robertson in 1995. From a sociological perspective glocalization can be understood as globalizing processes which have specific local consequences and vice versa. A good illustration of glocalization is migration.

Migration is an example of glocalization because it is a global process that has specific localized consequences. A consequence of migration is that a society becomes more ethnic heterogeneous. Migration to the Netherlands is a process that is going on

---

since the 1960's. This was, until recently, not a huge social problem and therefore migration was present only in the margins of Dutch policy (Becker, 2005). It can be argued that until 1980 the consequences of glocalization were not felt on the level of the nation-state/society differentiation.

The nation-state/society differentiation is the relation between the nation-state and society (Schinkel, 2008). Theoretically it can be argued that based on the precondition of the specific status of society (i.e. homogeneous of heterogeneous) two possible types of nation-state/society differentiation exist. When society is relatively homogeneous the nation-state and society are overlapping. When society is relatively heterogeneous the nation-state and society become separated. In the Netherlands the nation-state and society were until recently overlapping because (it was imagined that) Dutch society was relatively ethnic homogeneous.

The consequences of glocalization (more specific immigration) for the nation-state/society differentiation were felt in the 1980's. After the influx of more immigrants during 1970's and 1980's the people inhabiting the nation-state became more heterogeneous. The nation-state/society differentiation became problematic and in a sense decoupled. Within the nation-state there are now different (imagined) societies. Therefore the main question of this paper will be: 'what does the decoupling of the nation-state and society mean for the functioning of citizenship?' This question can be divided into a descriptive and an explanatory question:

1. How does citizenship function in Dutch policy?
2. Why does citizenship function in this way?

Answering these questions I will first develop a heuristic model to be able to analyze the functioning of citizenship. Thereafter I will analyze the use of citizenship in the context of glocalization.

2. Citizenship: definition and heuristic model

Citizenship is a concept used in the social spheres of the state and society and it has historically developed into a multifunctional and multilayered concept. It is multifunctional because citizenship functions as social closure meaning on the one hand that citizenship functions is a mechanism of inclusion in a social sphere and on the other hand as a mechanism of exclusion (Brubaker, 1992).

Next to this, citizenship is also multilayered because it consists of two dimensions (Schinkel, 2008). The first dimension is the formal dimension of citizenship meaning citizenship rights, hence protecting individuals from the state and other individuals. This dimension can be traced back to the Roman jurist Gaius (Pocock, 1998). From the Roman period till our times four types of formal citizenship developed, i.e. political rights, civil rights, social rights and cultural rights (Marshall, 1963). The second dimension of citizenship is the moral dimension, meaning actively participation in the political sphere, for example actively participation in the *polis* or nation-state. This moral dimension can be traced back to the ancient Greek period, for instance Aristotle. Moral citizenship was especially important for Machiavelli, Rousseau and the constitutions of France and the United States of America (Bosniak, 2006).

Combining the insights that citizenship is social closure (inclusion and exclusion) on two dimensions of citizenship (formal and moral) it becomes possible to create a heuristic model for analyzing the functioning of citizenship in contemporary Dutch policy. Four positions can be distinguished. Citizenship can function as formal inclusion (A) and formal exclusion (B) and citizenship can function as moral inclusion (C) and moral exclusion (D).[3]

Table 1
Citizenship dimensions and closure

	Rights (formal)	Obligations (moral)
Inclusion	A	C
Exclusion	B	D

3. Citizenship in the context of glocalization

In the preceding paragraphs both the consequence of immigration (a feature of glocalization) for the nation-state/society differentiation was described (a decoupling of the nation-state and society took place) as well as a heuristic model for analyzing citizenship. In the following paragraphs the functioning of citizenship in contemporary Dutch situation will be analyzed. It will be argued that the functioning of citizenship underwent two changes. The first is a tightening of the formal dimension with an emphasis on its exclusionary function. Secondly a moralization of citizenship takes place, both in a traditional and in a new way referring nowadays to political participation in the nation-state and bio-political participation (active participation in society: this will be explained later).

3.1 First change: from formal inclusion to formal exclusion

Following the analysis of T.H. Marshall (1963), Bosniak (2006) and Schinkel (2008) in the post-war period of the Netherlands the formal dimension of citizenship was emphasized. Marshall (1963) signaled the progressive development of the formal dimension of citizenship and he chronologically distinguishes between three types of citizenship rights. The first bundle of rights is called civil rights (developed in the 18th century and important for individual freedom), the second bundle of rights is political rights (guaranteed political participation) and the third bundle of rights is social rights (right to live a civilized life and to take part in the collective arrangements of the welfare state). This can be completed with a fourth bundle of rights namely cultural rights (Bosniak, 2006)

---

[3] In the literature a distinction is made between formal and moral citizenship (Schinkel, 2008). As a methodological critique it can be argued that a two-by-two model has to be created with opposing elements: in opposition to formal citizenship it would be expected to get informal citizenship and vice versa in opposition to moral citizenship one would expect amoral citizenship. It is therefore better to speak of rights and obligations. The author likes to thank Ladislav Rabusic for this comment.

After WOII the inclusionary formal function of citizenship was articulated in the Netherlands. The nation-state took as her task the inclusion of many 'new' groups living on its territory as a vehicle of 'emancipation', for example women (Becker, 2005, p.63). This was still the situation in the 1980's. Then a change took place in the general functioning of the state, described as the process from inclusionary state to exclusionary state (cf. Young, 1999, p.6; Bauman, 2004). This is also reflected in the functioning of citizenship. Until 1980 citizenship was used as a mechanism of formal inclusion, yet after the 1980's citizenship has functioned as a mechanism of formal exclusion (Broeders, 2004).

These developments can be explained by the changing political and economic situation in the Netherlands in the 80's as a consequence of the crisis of the welfare state and the consequences of immigration (Broeders, 2004, p. 44). The welfare state and its arrangements expanded in the period after WOII. It is very important to keep in mind the intrinsic relation between the welfare state and the nation-state because the welfare state is only accessible for citizens (Entzinger & Engbersen, 2004). Because formal citizenship was used inclusionary many people were granted social rights and access to welfare arrangements. This situation became problematic in economical difficult times.

During the late 1970's and 1980's the number of unemployed citizens increased and this led to a situation in 1984 were 11% (about 822.000) of the professional population were unemployed and depending on social welfare (Engbersen, 2006, p.21 n.2). Because too many people were depending on the welfare state and the welfare state arrangements seemed to make people lethargic[4] it was argued that sustaining the situation of formal inclusion was practically impossible and therefore the entrance to welfare state had to be secured. Closely linked to this is the second aspect: in the 1980's migration became seen a social problem, migrants came be seen as 'free riders' (Schinkel, 2008) and the undocumented or illegal migrants were 'discovered' (Engbersen et al., 2002).

As a consequence several policies and laws were introduced to exclude people from entering the Netherlands, from access to the welfare state and to exclude illegal immigrants from Dutch *soil*.[5] Thus the formal dimension of citizenship became of use for the state as an instrument of exclusion. This change of policy from formal inclusion to formal exclusion has continued. For example on the topic of illegal immigrants in 2004 a memorandum on undocumented migrants ('Illegalennota') was introduced. In this memorandum two forms of exclusion are operating. The first is exclusion of undocumented persons present at Dutch *soil* and the second can be described as keeping persons, who try to enter, outside the Netherlands. The given rationales for this are the risks they present like crime and poverty (Albrecht, 2002; Tweede Kamer, 2004).

In short, the first change in the functioning of citizenship is a shift in emphasis from formal inclusion to formal exclusion. In a glocalizing world citizenship is used by the nation-state to exclude people whereas citizenship before the 1980's was used as a mechanism of inclusion.

---

[4] According to Engbersen this can be called a fatalistic culture (Engbersen, 2006)

[5] In 1994 both the 'Wet op de Identificatieplicht' and the 'Wet Voorkoming Schijnhuwelijken' were introduced and in 1998 the 'Koppelingswet' to exclude illegal immigrants from entering welfare state arrangements (Engbersen et al., 2002, p.5).

3.2 Second change: moralization of citizenship in a classical and new manner

The other change can be described as the moralization of citizenship. Both Bosniak (2006) and Schinkel (2008) argue there is a renewed interest in the moral dimension of citizenship manifesting itself in literature, public policy and rhetoric. In the classical notion of Aristotle the moral dimension of citizenship means political participation or active citizenship in the *polis* (Pocock, 1998). This can be translated to our days as the participation in the nation-state, for example being a member of a political party and voting. From the late 1980's the moralization of citizenship in this classical interpretation has occurred. As an illustration, it is expected of new citizens that they are politically active (see further Van Bochove, 2008).

Next to this classical interpretation it is also possible to signal a new type of moral citizenship namely 'actively participating in society'. Although it can be agreed with Bosniak and Schinkel that a moralization of citizenship takes place, this is not the whole story. Within this process of moralization an internal differentiation takes place and moral citizenship nowadays means on the one hand active participation in the nation-state and on the other hand active participation in society. This new type of moral citizenship can be called 'bio-political' participation (explained later).

3.2.1 Internal differentiation of moral citizenship

As a consequence of glocalization citizenship is now constructed at the local level what can be understood as a localization of citizenship (Schinkel, 2007). This can be illustrated with the case of the city of Rotterdam. In this city more than 150 nationalities are present and from the 1990's an urge is felt to solve problems of 'social integration' (Engbersen, Snel & Weltevreden, 2005). In 2005 the so called 'Islam and Integration Debates' were held in which the people of Rotterdam could participate. This culminated into the *Rotterdam Citizen's Code* (Rotterdam City Council, 2006)[6] in which 'good' or 'active' citizenship is seen as the key-solution for the problems of social cohesion and social integration (Uitermark & Duyvendak, 2006). It is important to notice the 'vocabulary' that is used: 'social cohesion' and 'social integration'. These terms are referring to something like a 'social body' for which citizenship will become of use because this 'social body' is in trouble.

3.2.2 The Rotterdam Citizen's Code

The *Rotterdam Citizen's Code* begins with asking the question '*When is an Urban Society a real* (sic) *society?*' and this becomes directly answered '*When citizens take responsibility for themselves and their city*'. The idea of the *Rotterdam Citizen's Code* is that '*we* [citizens, FvH] *take active part in society*' (Rotterdam City Council, 2006, p2).

---

[6] To be precise, this is symbolic policy and cannot be enforced formally. It is a discursive practice functioning in society.

It further states that "*We Citizens of Rotterdam:*

1. *assume responsibility for our city and for each other and do not discriminate*
2. *use Dutch as our common language*
3. *do not accept radicalization and extremism*
4. *raise our children to be full citizens*
5. *treat women equally to men and with respect*
6. *treat homosexuals equally to heterosexuals and with respect*
7. *treat people of (different) religious conviction and people without conviction equally and with respect*"

This code can be summarized as follows: a real society consists of moral citizens and moral citizens '*take active part in **society***' (Rotterdam City Council, 2006, p.2; articulation FvH). What is interesting is the distinction made between a 'real society' and an 'unreal society'. This real society consists of active citizens (moral dimension of citizenship) and society is therefore a moral space which is separated from the unreal society consisting of amoral and inactive citizens.

In this real society the moral citizens take responsibility and do not discriminate whereas in the unreal society people lack responsibility and do discriminate. In the real society the moral citizens speak Dutch and in the unreal society people speak a foreign language. The unreal society consists of people who are extremist or tolerant to extremism while the moral citizens of the real society are intolerant to extremism and radicalism and the moral citizen is the 'norm'. In the real society women, homosexuals are equally to men and heterosexuals and all of them are respected whereas in the unreal society a distinction in treatment is made between women and men and homosexuals and heterosexuals and in addition the former are also disrespected. In the unreal society people with different religious conviction and people without a religious conviction are disrespected and treated unequally whereas in the real society citizens with a different and without religious conviction are treated equally and with respect.

It is interesting to notice that citizenship is this way is functioning as social closure of society. Included in society are the moral citizens who take responsibility for society and as a consequence excluded are people who are not taking actively part in society. As a consequence 'society' is defining itself as a moral space and its norms become articulated, for example: in this moral space Dutch is the common language. As a consequence: if you are not speaking Dutch you do not belong to the moral space because you are not participating and therefore you are not a real citizen.

To take a further look at this new functioning of citizenship a relevant question is: 'who are the people standing/placed outside the real society because they are lacking moral citizenship, in other words who are the people not allocated with moral citizenship?' These people are the inactive citizens; these are the people outside the real society. On a more abstract level and in common terms it can be argued that people who are not integrated are outside the real society. This is especially the case for immigrants.

The explicit link between integration and citizenship was made in 1994 by Van der Zwan & Entzinger. Since then citizenship became incorporated in Dutch policies concerning integration and therefore citizenship came to be functioning as a mechanism

of inclusion/exclusion of immigrants in society. What needs an explanation though is the question why the Rotterdam Citizen's Code is written in this way. To explain this we need to look at the changing political situation in the Netherlands which affected policies on integration and citizenship.

In the 1990's the political climate in the Netherlands changed rapidly. Baukje Prins (2004) calls this the period of 'new realism' and of 'naming things'. Important contributors are for example: the Dutch politician Bolkestein; two essays on multiculturalism of Schnabel (1999) 'Multiculturele Illusie' (Multicultural Illusion) and Scheffer (2000) 'Multiculturele Drama' (Multicultural Drama); the rise of Leefbaar Nederland (2001) and Pim Fortuyn. More recently this 'new realism' is carried out by politicians like Wilders and Verdonk. This political climate also influenced social policy.

Van Meeteren (2005) and Schinkel (2008, p.4-5) distinguish three phases of immigrant integration policy. First a phase which focuses on cultural plurality and integration is not seen as desirable; second a phase which focuses on underdevelopment, in which integration denoted preservation of identity, and; third is the present phase which can be called 'culturistic'[7] in which immigrants have to assimilate (e.g. Schinkel, 2008).

The 'culturistic' discourse has culture at the centre of its focus and can be described by the following characteristics: it distinguishes between a 'dominant culture' and 'another culture'; it consists of an essentialist way of thinking, framing culture as a stable and determining set of norms and values; it focuses on problems whereby the problems are allocated the 'other culture' which is seen as incompatible with the 'dominant culture' (Schinkel, 2007, p.148).

It is possible to argue that underlying the Rotterdam Citizen's Code is this 'culturistic' perspective. The norms of the real society (dominant culture) are clearly described resembling Dutch norms and values (for example speaking Dutch). Immigrants are seen as the 'other' having a backward and problematic culture. Therefore they are not real citizens because they are not participating in the real society. The only way an immigrant can become a citizen is when he/she integrates (assimilates), meaning actively participating in the real society (for example by speaking Dutch). Thus citizenship (as active participation in society) became to function as a mechanism of social closure of society, including Dutch and assimilated immigrants and excluding 'others'.

4. Explaining the functioning of citizenship as a mechanism of Bio-Power

What has been argued so far is that citizenship can be used strategically by different types of power, for example the nation-state (as a power) or society (as a power) in different types of situations. In the situation of the crisis of the welfare-state and migration the nation-state reacts by using formal citizenship to exclude people from its soil or from entrance to the welfare state whereas citizenship was used before as a mechanism of inclusion. In the situation of the decoupling of the nation/state and society as a consequence of immigration, 'society' uses citizenship as social closure, first to define itself as a moral space and second for purposes of integration and homogenization. With

---

[7] It is interesting to note that according to Ladislav Rabusic in Czech 'culturistic' means 'bodybuilding'. This is exactly what society is doing with 'citizenship' and the Rotterdam Citizen's Code: society is (discursively) building itself a (powerful) body.

this in mind it can be argued citizenship is a mechanism to regulate a population, something Foucault has called 'bio-power' (Foucault, 1976).

Bio-power has developed from the 18th century onwards and can be described as the situation in which the control of the 'social body' becomes the end of political power. Political power means for Foucault not only the power of the state, he therefore goes beyond Marx and Weber because the state is merely one manifestation of political power: 'power constitutes and expresses itself through multiple sources, of which the state is merely one' (Cohen, 2006, p.252-253). Next to the state for example also society 'has' power. Bio-power works both on a micro-level were it tries to influence the individual body (anatomic-politics) as well as on a meso/macro-level were it influences the 'social body' (bio-politics).

Foucault argues it is sexuality which is positioned at the crossroad of both anatomic- and bio-politic. It is interesting to notice that maybe citizenship too holds this position. Next to sexuality also citizenship holds a junction point of the two politics of bio-power (anatomic- and bio-politics). Next to sexuality citizenship too is a mechanism of regulating the social body. In this paper it has been showed that citizenship is an instrument with which it becomes possible to manage a population for example by differentiating them (c.f. Hindess, 2000). This paper also showed that bio-power is not only working in the nation-state but it can also be working in society.

Bio-power of the state in relation to citizenship was illustrated by the use of formal citizenship by the nation-state. After a period in which the formal dimension of citizenship was used to include people and as a consequence of the crisis of the welfare state and immigration as a social problem, formal citizenship is used to exclude people. Consequently a differentiation of persons has taken place. Based on citizenship it has become possible to differentiate between: citizens (full formal citizenship); denizens (bounded citizenship); aliens (full citizenship in other nation-states) (Hammar, 1990) and; illegals (Entzinger & Engbersen, 2004). In a glocalizing world the nation-state tries to operate and make itself useful by transforming the functioning of citizenship and regulating the population on its *soil*.

Bio-power of society in relation to citizenship was illustrated by the use of moral citizenship. In a period society has trouble defining itself it uses citizenship to create a moral space and to differentiate between real citizens and unreal citizens. Moral citizenship of society means active participation in society, to contribute to the health of society (social cohesion). Next to (moral) citizenship as political participation in the nation-state stands bio-political participation in society.

5. Conclusion

In this paper the functioning of citizenship in the Netherlands has been questioned, analyzed and explained. Traditionally citizenship is used as a solution for differing problems. It has been argued that citizenship nowadays is a mechanism of bio-power meaning that it makes it possible to control and regulate a population. As Foucault argued bio-power is functioning via different canals and this has been showed in the case of citizenship because both the nation-state and society are using citizenship as a mechanism to control populations. It has been showed that citizenship can be used strategically because it historically developed into a multilayered and multifunctional concept. In

contemporary Dutch situation a new meaning has been added: citizenship as active participation in society what is called bio-political participation.

In this paper a distinction has been made between a formal dimension of citizenship and a moral dimension of citizenship. It has been argued that next to the already existing formal dimension of citizenship (meaning political, civic, cultural and social rights) and moral dimension (meaning active participation in politics) a new version of citizenship has developed. An internal differentiation took place of the moral dimension and it nowadays means, next to active participation in the politics of the nation-state, active participation in society. This was possible because society and the nation-state were not overlapping anymore.

The first change in the functioning of citizenship was the shift from formal inclusion to formal exclusion. Citizenship in the formal sense is of use to the nation-state because it differentiates the population. As a consequence and based on the formal dimension of citizenship a distinction can be made between citizens, denizens, aliens and illegal persons. In the Netherlands two periods were distinguished: a period in which formal citizenship was used to include as many people as possible and a period in which the exclusionary function of formal citizenship was emphasized in guarding the soil and the welfare-state.

The second change has been described as the moralization of citizenship. This has occurred in the classical way and in a new modern way. Citizenship in the new moral sense was of use to society. As a consequence of migration society became too heterogeneous to handle and decoupled from the nation-state; 'society' had difficulties defining itself, and; the 'social cohesion' of the 'social body' became problematic. To solve these problems of 'society' citizenship was put forward as a solution. Therefore the concept and functioning of citizenship had to be transformed. To be of use for society, citizenship was defined as active participation in society or to say 'bio-political citizenship'. As a consequence citizenship is functioning as social closure of society differentiating the active from the inactive and defining society as a homogenous and moral space.

Literature

Albrecht, H.J. (2002). Fortress Europe? Controlling illegal migration. In: *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 10(1): pp. 1-22.

Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bochove, M. van (2008). *Ethnic Voting*. Paper presented at the Dubrovnik conference on inclusion and exclusion in European Societies (14-21 April 2008).

Bosniak, L. (2006). *The Citizen and the Alien. Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Broeders, D. (2004). Immigratie in Nederland: Normaliseren door Differentiëren. In H. Entzinger & J. van der Meer (red). *Grenzeloze Solidariteit*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij De Balie (p.43-56).

Becker, J. (2005). Het Burgerschap in de Troonredes, 1945-2005. In P. Dekker & J. de Hart (red.) *De Goede Burger: Tien Beschouwingen over een Morele Categorie*. Den Haag: Sociaal Cultureel Planbureau.

Cohen, A.F. (2006). Governmentality. In B.S. Turner (ed) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Engbersen, G., Snel, E. & Weltevrede, A. (2005). *Sociale herovering in Amsterdam en Rotterdam: één verhaal over twee wijken*. Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam.

Engbersen G. & J. Van der Leun (2002). Illegale migratie en de praktische wijsheid van gedogen. In: G. van Oenen (red), *Ongeregelde orde; gedogen en de omgang met wilde praktijken*. Meppel: Boom

Entzinger, H. & G. Engbersen (2004). Integratie en Solidariteit. In W. Arts, H. Entzinger & R. Muffels (red). *Verzorgingsstaat… vaar wel*. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.

Foucault, M. (1976). Recht over de Dood en Macht over het Leven. In M. Foucault *De Wil tot Weten: Geschiedenis van de seksualiteit*. Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Sun.

Foucault, M. (1994) Governmentality. In J. D. Faubion (ed.). Power: essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 (transl. Robert Hurley et al.). London: Penguin Books.

Hammar, T. (1990). *Democracy and the Nation-State. Aliens, Denizens and Citiznes in a World of International Migration*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Hindess, B, (2000). Citizenship in the International Management of Populations. In *American Behavioral Scientist,* 2000; 43: 1486-1497

Marshall, T.H. (1963). Citizenship and Social Class. In Shafir, G. (1998). *The Citizenship Debates. A Reader.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Meeteren, M. van (2005). Discoursen van Integratie. De omslag in het publieke debat over integratie in Nederland. Master Thesis Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Pocock, J.G.A. (1998). The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times. In Shafir, G. (1998). *The Citizenship Debates*. A Reader. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Prins, B. (2004). *Voorbij de Onschuld. Het Debat over Integratie in Nederland.* Amsterdam: Van Gennip.

Rotterdam City Council (2006). *Rotterdamse Burgerschapscode* (Rotterdam Citizen's Code). Rotterdam.

Schinkel, W. (2008). *The Virtualization of Citizenship*. Forthcoming.

Schinkel, W. (2007). *Denken in een tijd van sociale hypochondrie. Aanzet tot een Theorie voorbij de Maatschappij.* Kampen: Klement.

Tweede Kamer (2003-2004). *Illegalennota.*

Uitermark, J. & J.W. Duyvendak (2006). *Ruimte Maken voor Straatburgerschap. Sociale Integratie… Straataanpak in de Praktijk.* Essay Mensen Maken de Stad. Rotterdam: Project Sociale Integratie.

Young, J. (1999). *The Exclusive Society*. London: Sage Publications.

Zwan, A. van der & H. Entzinger (1994). *Beleidsopvolging Minderhedendebat: Advies in opdracht van de Minister van Binnenlandse Zaken.* Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken.