Communication   **College of Arts & Sciences**

2021

Introduction - Multiculturalism, Communication, and Critical Citizenship Studies

Hsin-I Cheng
Santa Clara University, hcheng2@scu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.scu.edu/comm

Recommended Citation

Introduction

Multiculturalism, Communication, and Critical Citizenship Studies

Since 2015, the movements of refugees and migrants have intensified discussions on citizenship in both Eastern and Western societies. The image of Aylan, a three-year-old Syrian boy lying on a beach, triggered global conversations on citizenship, borders, and nationhood. In Germany, Chancellor Merkel worked swiftly on refugees' settlement in German society and encountered much resistance. In the United States, discussions of policies to curtail immigrants, migrants, and refugees became heated after the 2016 presidential election. In Taiwan, given the country's ethnic diversity and politically controversial status as a nation-state, political economists urged the government to accept and treat refugees and immigrants as assets for the nation's future (Chou, 2015). Unlike Germany, where over one-fifth of the population is first or second generation of immigrants (Thomasson, 2017) or the United States where more than one-fourth of its population under age eighteen lives with at least one immigrant parent (Zong et al., 2019), the number of immigrants and migrants in Taiwan has recently reached 4.7 percent of the population in 2019 and continues to grow. Since the 1980s, Taiwan has become a major country to receive newcomers for jobs or family reunifications. It is estimated that in 2030, 13.5 percent of its twenty-five-year-old population will be from households with immigrant parents, predominantly from Southeast Asia (Yang et al., 2011). Occurring in one of the most vibrant regions with respect to culture, mobility, and economic activities, these rapid demographic changes brought nuanced discussions to the island's citizenship practices and their articulations, given its colonial past and ambivalent political status since the Cold War. Always a place sought by newcomers and where they settled, Taiwan has transformed itself from a formal colony subjugated by multiple cultural and political influences to a vibrant democratic,

diverse, and capitalistic society. The aim of this book is to examine the role of *relationality* in Taiwan's citizenship formations and expressions by tracing local and global influences. It further discusses the implications of focusing on relational aspects of citizenship in other societies such as the United States.

Since the late 1900s, various practices of immigration and citizenship crafting in the United States and European nations have inspired research efforts to map the effects of multiculturalism policies under current global conditions. Most of the research on transnational citizenship has explained the global South/East to North/West movements. However, various trans-Asian movements receive less attention, with a few exceptions (see Chang & Turner, 2012; Soysal, 2015). If cultural values are essential to our current human struggles, as Huntington suggested in *Clash of the Civilizations*, the ways in which memberships of each society are articulated and granted foreground the organizing logic behind these selections. For instance, in Huntington (2004), the heavy racial/ethnic tone in the hierarchical order to exclude certain groups' legitimacy is evident (see also Smith, 2007). These criteria are often categorized under "cultures" and accept particular values, which then become invisible boundaries that preserve the dominance of "Anglo-Protestant culture" in the United States (Huntington, 2004, p. 1). The twenty-first century marks a shift in citizenship-making under the market-driven ethos of neoliberalism, which promotes consumerism, individualized mobility, and privatization. One of the outcomes of this transnationalized ideology is a change in the relationship between national sovereignty and countries' interdependence with the world. Nation-states in East Asia, particularly, experienced this tension after the World War II, and many have undergone the transition from a politically and economically subjugated polity to a self-ruled autonomy (Soysal, 2015). These changes make this region a rich site for exploring the formations and expressions of citizenship, with particular attention to culturally specific temporal and spatial nexuses. This book illustrates the central role that relationality, a conspicuous aspect in citizenship studies, plays in citizenship formation. Derived from the Taiwanese society, *relational citizenship* underscores connectivity as the integral part of belonging in many societies that are ever more heterogeneous.

CITIZENSHIP, A WESTERN CONCEPT?

Citizenship, a concept often believed to have evolved in European cities (Isin & Nyers, 2014), has traditionally been approached from a legal perspective, with allusion to the process of "othering" individuals separate from those who belong to a certain political community (Joppke, 2010; Lazar, 2013;

Marshall, 1950; Plascencia, 2012). Tilly (1995) defined citizenship as exclusionary transactions between governmental units and legitimized members based on "enforceable rights and obligations" (p. 8). Indeed, citizenship is commonly viewed as a tie or contract held by individuals with the state of which they have membership (Faist, 2000; Tilly, 1995; Turner, 1997). This particular tie allows members a set of rights and obligations from which nonmembers are excluded. It controls limited powers certain members have over others in the society. As Holston (2008) explained, citizenship entails a formal sense of legal membership in a nation-state as well as "substantive citizenship" including the "array of civil, political, and social rights available to [certain] people" (p. 95).

Citizenship includes multiple aspects of the right to participation. The struggle for political belongingness has evolved from Marshall's (2013) "civil, political, and social citizenship" (p. 53) to demanding rights for citizens to maintain their unique cultural identity distinct from that established by the dominant group in a society (Rosaldo, 2013). The political right to partake in civic matters, the civil right to be treated justly, the social right to receive care, and the cultural right to preserve unique ways of life are the primary aspects of the well-being of an individual in a modern state. As diversity becomes a more pronounced global phenomenon, citizenship experiences are simultaneously more divergent and convergent; individuals' cultural rights to be different as equal members, with both formal and substantive forms of citizenship, remain a challenging struggle (Kivisto & Faist, 2007).

In the Western tradition, citizenship encompasses legal, civic, economic, and cultural rights, and yet the processes of membership selection and treatment are culturally and socially unique. Citizenship is, therefore, a localized moral and political struggle over legitimacy to identify who has attributes worthy of obtaining rights to participate in what Anderson (2013) referred to as "a community of value" (p. 177). At the same time, the ways in which "legitimate" citizens affect society have sparked much discussion over individual rights versus communal needs. Habermas (1995) contended that the large numbers of immigrants and refugees from the East and South seeking citizenship in the North and West after the World War II presented a challenge to modern liberal nation-states. He believed that citizens have to create and foster a political community under a unified national identity while keeping diverse ethnic or racial identities and lifestyles alive in their cultural communities. These frequent border-crossing activities have attracted researchers' attention; their study could further expand our understandings of the multifaceted nature of citizenship, as with sexual citizenship (Evans, 1993), infantile citizenship (Berlant, 1993), cultural citizenship (Ong, 2013;

Pawley, 2008; Rosaldo, 2013), flexible citizenship (Ong, 1999), postnational citizenship (Liebert, 1995), and multicultural citizenship (Kymlicka, 1996). All these facets are intended to address intersected identities and their impacts on equality and inclusion among members, pertaining to individual rights and obligations, while at the same time examine boundaries of certain citizens' privileges.

Influenced by colonial and capitalistic practices, the Greco-Roman conceptualization of citizenship has dominated academic and other public discourses (Lee, 2014). From issues concerning rights to justice, political participation, economic stability, and social benefits to cultural differences, rights-based individualistic liberalism views citizenship as a status granted to individuals who are universal, rational beings. Although advocating provisions of protections and entitlement for all individuals, the rights-based approach, which deems all individuals worthy of having universal needs and equal standing in a society, elides the unspeakably unequal treatments received by those on the margins of society. As Isin and Nyers (2014) cautioned, "the assumed all-encompassing idea of 'liberal democracy'" is often uncritically held as the "benchmark" for citizenship development in non-Western societies (p. 7), and often cultural and historical specificities, such as postcolonial legacies, are neglected (Harrington, 2014). This need to reconcile the overwhelming transnational forces and existing local practices calls for more analyses. Neoliberalism is a prime example. Neoliberals believe that "privatization and deregulation combined with competition . . . [will] eliminate bureaucratic red tape, increas[ing] efficiency and productivity" (Harvey, 2005, p. 65). The value of "individual freedom" was misguidedly used to increase the resources and dominance of the elite class and absolve the government of its responsibility to care for the disadvantaged in the society as a collective. With practices such as privatizing education and social welfare programs, individuals were turned into competing consumers and given the responsibility to make choices on behalf of their well-being through favored policies that advance the corporate sector's power. The conversations on the impacts of discourses from the West on what constitutes citizenship in different parts of the world continue to interact with local debates, such as communal good versus individual rights, public versus private decisions, and universal versus differentiated treatments. Further, many individuals maintain ties and identify with several nations, as one of the outcomes of transnational movements; this condition propels the reconceptualization of citizenship beyond national bounds (Smith, 2007). As many societies begin to recognize their heterogeneous populations with their diverse histories, citizenship matters have become inherited cultural matters (Tempelman, 1999).

The minority–majority relationship and its implications for cultural rights and citizenship articulations have become an increasingly contested issue in

many multicultural societies around the world (Kymlicka, 1996; Werbner, 2012). Tempelman (1999) classified multicultural citizenship into three types, including the "primordial, civic, and universal" construction of collective identity (pp. 17–18). Primordial multiculturalism takes a somewhat essentialist perspective toward a cultural identity shared within a community whose "authentic" lives should be recognized for their survival. Instead of viewing identity as a natural essence, as the primordial perspective does, civic multiculturalism sees culture not as something fixed but as an evolving communication process accomplished by both insiders and outsiders. It advocates for interactions and recognizes cultural differences within and across minority and majority groups. Its belief in "fuzzy and dynamic" cultural boundaries, however, raises questions about the deeply felt differences intertwined in the political economy of multicultural societies (p. 18). Last, universal multiculturalism holds that "individuals are entitled to live in a liberal societal culture" that provides "shared memories, values, and common institutions and practices" (Kymlicka, as cited in Tempelman, 1999, p. 27). This belief encourages the states to provide necessary support until minority groups fully participate in the national culture. Exceptions are granted for indigenous groups who have deeply rooted cultural connections to their land within the nation-state. As for immigrants, their ultimate integration into the national culture is assumed by the government. Such an expectation risks what Werbner (2012) advocated for as "multiculturalism in history" that illustrates the political nature of multicultural affairs pertaining to the challenging and unbridgeable differences among different cultural groups (p. 119). Werbner's call of our attention to historical development contrasts with the frequent "multiculturalism-as-usual" events in which *culture* is a neutral term referring to ethnic foods and carnivals (p. 199). This perspective depoliticizes real differences derived from historical legacy and consequently avoids political support for certain cultural communities to retain their collective memories and cultural ties. Although the multicultural nature of society has long been acknowledged, there remains a need to address uneven access to power and resources experienced by certain cultural groups of a society.

Globalization has further increased multicultural interactions, which motivated Knop's (2001) development of "relational nationality" to elucidate the ramifications gender has for laws concerning nationality in international marriages (p. 89). It advocates granting married women rights to establish legal connections to the nationhood of their children without sacrificing ties to their nation of origin. As Faist (2000) explained, social spaces created by transnational movements allow for various resources for both mobile and immobile citizens, while at the same time constraining other citizens with regulations imposed by nation-states. These transnational relations cannot simply be addressed by multiculturalism as a public policy without

considering distributions of material resources because they encompass intimately lived experiences across various citizen groups who encounter "others" with unique histories. Ahmed (2007) claimed that attending to tensions sparked by multiculturalism, rather than molding homogeneous communities, would bring positive results for society. Meanwhile, differences such as gendered or classed experiences within a cultural group further complicate citizens' experiences of their daily lives in a multicultural society (Yuval-Davis, 1997). Close examinations of ways in which the intersections of racial, gender, and other identities are received, incorporated, prioritized, and politicized with localized knowledge have revealed the challenges multicultural societies face, particularly with regard to unequal power relations between citizens who are asked to tolerate the "others" and those whose cultures are "consumed" with little respect or appreciation (Iwabuchi, 2015; Werbner, 2012). Even though much of these discussions were about Western societies, the complicated formations of identities pertaining to citizenship expressions in many Confucius-influenced societies are not immune to the implications of transnational movements.

RELATIONALITY IN CITIZENSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Attempting to address the tensions accompanying multiculturalism, Pierpaolo Donati (1995), a sociologist, proposed "societal citizenship" to explain a "relational set of rights and duties of individuals *and social groups*, arranging civic life into a number of 'universalistic social autonomies' capable of reconciling collective goals and self-management practices, solidarity and identity issues" (emphasis original, p. 313). The term refers to finding a balance whereby shared solidarity and unique identities in a society can be developed. Donati (2011) viewed citizenship as "the social relations *between citizens* instead of as status attributed to the individual by the state" and stated that such a relation is "an expression and development of a series of rights that maintain significant connections with the rights of the human being as a person (individual-in-relation)" (emphasis original, p. 43). The attention to the relational aspect of citizenship was also noted by Tilly (1995), who called for locating identities *among* individuals rather than within individuals or groups.

From this perspective, membership brings "relational rights" as part of human rights, in addition to legal, civil, cultural, and social rights (Donati, 2011, p. 159). These rights, Donati opined, are interactive social relations accomplished through communication in particular contexts. Although rights-based rhetoric remains Donati's frame of reference, and the notion of societal citizenship could benefit from further explications, this perspective broadens the static view of citizenship as a fixed status. Placing valences on

human relations, Donati (2011) regarded citizens as "subjects-in-relations" (p. 43). His view of the way a civic society functions resonates with Tu's (2000) explanation of "Asian values," signified by Confucianism (p. 200). A theory that does not detail the ways in which such a social relationship is formed and views it as a right rather than a cultural facet misses an opportunity to analyze citizens in the making.

In East Asia, Confucianism has conventionally been viewed as a pillar of the organization of societies (Dirlik, 2012; Soysal, 2015). It is believed that this legacy strongly influences citizenship cultivation and expressions in which loyalty to the collective through self-sacrifice is prioritized over the Western style of personal aspiration via individual autonomy (Chang & Turner, 2012). Although identification with and dedication to a national consciousness remain central, researchers have found an increasing focus on equal rights, individual autonomy, economic development, and the rule of law in East Asia that shows convergence with Western transnational discourses on forming citizenship (Janoski, 2014; Soysal & Wong, 2015; Turner, 2012). Meanwhile, nation-states in Asian regions endeavor to reconnect with traditional values such as those the Chinese leader Xi Jinping announced during the Nineteenth National Congress of the Communist Party of China in 2017 (McDermid, 2017). The task of interweaving the local knowledge and what Canclini (2014) called the "hidden cultural effects" of globalization remains challenging (p. 44).

In the Confucian tradition, human beings become individuals based on the relationships existing in life. Bai (2008) explained that Mencius, an important Confucian thinker, believed that a government is responsible for providing elements essential for life such as "a full belly and warm clothes" (as cited in Bai, 2008, p. 23), as well as moral guidance for its people. Mencius appointed Hsieh as the Minister of Education to foster morality by "teach[ing] the people human relationships: love between father and son, duty between ruler and subject, distinction between husband and wife, precedence of the old over the young, and trust between friends" (as cited in Bai, 2008, p. 23). Tu (2000) stated that the Western Enlightenment mentality focused on the "market economy, democratic polity, and individualism" (p. 202), which may appear to be in diametrical opposition to Asian or Confucian values, wherein "equality rather than freedom, sympathy rather than rationality, civility rather than law, duty rather than rights, and human-relatedness rather than individualism" are stressed (p. 199). However, as much as Enlightenment ideas such as rationality, individual rights, and rule of law are deemed universal, Tu (2000) believed that Asian values including "sympathy, distributive justice, duty-consciousness, ritual, public-spiritedness, and group orientation" are also universally modern (p. 207). Values such as individual liberty and group consciousness are not mutually exclusive.

Miike (2002) explained that Asian cultural values are embodied through daily communication, which occurs in the context of multiple relationships across time and space, with the goal of seeking harmony through mutual adoption by all parties involved. Relationships serve as the nexus for the Chinese to interact with themselves, others, and the natural world (Young, 2011). One's relationships not only provide emotional and moral guidance but also function as behavioral compasses to drive ethical people. Relationships can further act as interpersonal resources to achieve personal goals (Chang & Holt, 1991). Unlike most Western philosophers who conceive of individuals as complete entities separate from the external world, Young (2011) stated that in the Chinese worldview, individuals are part of a larger entity. All member units within society are benevolently interdependent on one another to create greater social lives for all (Tu, 2000). Confucian societies aim to achieve harmonious relations by cultivating connective feelings (*qing*, 情) before imparting regulations and laws (*fa*, 法) to their members. Huang (2010) described how "qing" (feelings) has traditionally served as the foundation for Chinese moral behaviors, "*qinqing*" is communicated with one's kin, and "*renqing*" is acted on to establish connections with and encourage kindness toward nonkin friends. As the philosophers Puett and Gross-Loh (2016) explained, cultivating both the heart and the mind, according to Chinese philosophers, is essential to making good decisions. The balance between the organization of societies based on connective feelings (qing) or disciplinary laws (fa) remains a constant struggle for modern Chinese societies; many are becoming more diverse, with increasing transnational movements (Ling, 2012). The conventional epistemology of the oppositional East versus West's worldviews holds little truth in peoples' lived realities, in which the sense of belonging is discursively accomplished, viscerally experienced, and publicly performed.

CITIZENSHIP AS A COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL PROCESS

Citizenship is constantly being reconfigured through interactions and discourses. National membership and its meanings have become a struggle between imagining the self and others (Berns, 1998), whereas public discourses such as news articles simultaneously reflect and constitute the nation's images of newcomers and the nation-state itself (Chang & Aoki, 1997; Davis & Sosnovskaya, 2009). Citizenship, in this book, should be understood as the interplay between the "inward-looking" cultural values that constitute membership and the "boundary-focused" citizenship that marks the state of belonging (Bosniak, 2006, p. 123). It includes the interactive

processes whereby marginalized subjects become agents to claim their rights while negotiating the structures determining the criteria for membership (Hsia, 2016; Ong, 2013). This view reflects Isin and Nyers' (2014) explanation of "citizenship as a mediating institution between political subjects and their polities" (p. 8). In addition, it includes the multifaceted interactions in which individuals become members of a group, resonating with what Robert Asen (2004) advocated for with "a discourse theory" to understand citizenship, making it a "fluid, multimodal, and quotidian process" (p. 403). Because political subjects relate to their polities in different ways, citizenship is more than a status granted to selective members. It is communicated through complex consensus processes, full of contradictions, engaged in by multiple parties, including full members, potential members, "tolerated members" (Anderson, 2013, p. 5), and the state, all involved in people's attempts to seek membership in a nation. Citizenship is therefore accomplished, however tenuously, through interactions among citizens, nonmembers, and quasi-members, all of whom I refer to as *relational partners*. Relational partners facilitate the framing of members on the basis of affinities rooted in the history of a particular society. Although citizenship often equates to nationhood, these communicative acts of (non)citizen-making have simultaneous implications beyond the national border. Focusing on how relationality between various citizen groups is cultivated, relational citizenship calls for the examination of the relational dimension as an imperative aspect in theorizing citizenship.

Since the early 1990s, scholars have researched citizenship in the fields of anthropology, feminism, history, political science, and sociology. Since the 2000s, communication scholars have written extensively on borders and immigration, with a primary focus on the U.S. context from two viewpoints. One collection of work has documented immigrants' voices in relation to sociocultural contexts (e.g., Amaya, 2007; Cheng, 2008; Kinefuchi, 2010). Another line of inquiry has included rhetorical criticism on the construction and performance of the legality sought by undocumented or asylum seekers as well as border patrollers, such as minutemen on the U.S.–Mexico border (e.g., Dechaine, 2009; Flores, 2003; McKinnon, 2009). Many scholars have provided critiques of the ways immigrants are discursively positioned in the media, conditioned by material structures such as the political economy (e.g., Amaya, 2010; Demo, 2005; Fay, 2016; Greenberg & Miazhevich, 2012; Kim & Wanta, 2018; Ono & Sloop, 2012). Sowards and Pineda (2013) argued that the mainstream media simplified representations of immigrants from Latin American countries for U.S. audiences to consume without providing a substantial understanding of their actual experiences as immigrants. Metaphors used to construct immigrants' subjectivity include pathology (Cisneros, 2008), parasites (Inda, 2000), excess (Amaya, 2013), criminals (Romero,

2008), victims (Strauss, 2012), and job takers (Chavez, 2001). Overall, there is a sense of "invasion" by immigrants who threaten "the [social and economic] stability of the nation" (Chavez, 2001, p. 213; van Dijk, 1997), while immigrants' experiences are far from such a representation.

More recently, research has been conducted on the rhetorical framing of citizens and citizenship in various political arenas, including public discourse (Councilor, 2017; Rowe, 2004), presidential speeches and government statements and ceremonies (Bishop, 2013, 2017; Cisneros, 2015; Soto-Vásquez, 2018; van Dijk, 1997), or the impacts of resources such as social capital on political influence (de Zúñiga et al., 2017). Another area of research involves unpacking online and offline engagements of participatory citizenship or immigrant identity (e.g., Bishop, 2019; Dalisay & Liu, 2015; Hickerson & Gustafson, 2016; Hinck, 2016; López-Sala, 2019; Mossberger et al., 2017; Pande & Drzewiecka, 2017; Reedy, 2015; Yu & Oh, 2018). Immigrants as newcomers differentiated by policies assume various positions including showing resistance against or incorporation into dominant ideologies with regard to the economic conditions and symbolic meanings promoted by the national community (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2012; Enck-Wanzer, 2011; Flores, 2003). Some studies have also addressed how immigrants are viewed by the native citizens within a society to articulate the meaning of citizenship (Beyer & Matthes, 2015; Flores-Yeffal et al., 2019; Mudambi, 2015; Rumble, 2017). Finally, a few authors have explored the role of communication infrastructure in active citizenship participation (Golding, 2017; Grabe & Myrick, 2016). Most of the research has been centered on U.S. and European experiences, with a few exceptions, in recent years. For example, Chirindo (2018) argued that the Western-based concept of citizenship does not apply to postcolonial African nations, whose national boundaries were arbitrarily drawn under a European-centered ideology, disregarding citizens' actual lived experiences. Drawing from Asen's (2004) concept of viewing citizenship as a discursive process, Livio (2017) presented communication as an analytical lens to examine Israeli citizenship in the context of its status as a non-Western country.

Although mainly working within the U.S. context, communication scholars have examined various texts in which citizenship is constructed and practiced. This rich body of research provides a great foundation for understanding the dynamic social creation of "ideal" citizenry, simultaneously influenced by and influencing multiple cultural forces. At the same time, most research focused on a single cultural group's experiences and its framing, an epistemological convention that values individual units as entities separated from their interlocutors. While the individual group has a unique history that informs particular knowledge, relational citizenship further asks how these specific experiences are arrived at through interactions with various other societal members and institutions. It asks the question of how our understanding of

citizenship formations may be different when relationality becomes the focus of analysis. As several East Asian nation-states become receiving societies for newcomers, Taiwan is one of those in the "Global South"[1] facing discussions on the meanings and methods of "becoming a Taiwanese" (Chen & Yu, 2005, p. 99).

The Chinese were traditionally depicted as civilized people in ancient literature, as popularized by Confucianism (Chuang, 2011; Dikötter, 1992). This image created a binary that divided people into "*Hua*" (the civilized Chinese people, 華) and "*Yi*" (the barbarians outside the Middle Kingdom, 夷). Chuang (2011) argued that these writings solidified the hierarchical relationship between the Chinese as "the virtuous saints" as opposed to the non-Chinese as "the evil barbarians" (p. 33). Dikötter (1992) explained how some influential Chinese elites in the early twentieth century incorporated Western constructions of races into the "civilized Hua" versus the "barbaric Yi" mentality, popularizing the existing racialized cultural views that would describe "the Burmese as lazy, the Thai as cowards and the Vietnamese as frivolous and dishonest" (p. 148). One of the results of this ideology is its promotion of a nationalistic cultural singularity derived from the belief in superior Confucian moral codes and diminishing pluralism in a diverse nation. The need to "*Huahua*" (civilize the non-Chinese, 華化) those "*Yi*" (the barbarians from outside, 夷) who are capable of converting to Chinese conduct became a noble mission under Confucianism. The boundaries between the majority insiders and the minority outsiders relied on managing the intricate relational processes of be(com)ing Chinese, guided by Confucianism. Constructions of recent immigrants' citizenship in Taiwan, a predominantly Confucian society that practices democracy and capitalism, provide an excellent context for examining these practices of forming relational citizenship. The current work furthers the existing literature and provides an account, from a communication perspective, of citizenship cultivations and expressions in Taiwan, a multicultural society (Cheng & Fell, 2008; Wang, 2005/2006). Moreover, it proposes a theoretical perspective embedded in Taiwan's local knowledge to illustrate an alternative way to understand citizenship beyond the East (community good) versus West (individual rights) binary.

EAST? WEST? NORTH? SOUTH: BLURRED GEOGRAPHIC AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL BOUNDARIES

At the turn of the century, Wang and Shen (2000) questioned the possibility of an "authentic" Asian-focused theory to explain human interactions and warned of the risk of neglecting the dynamic nature of culture, which

continuously shifts and changes, and is heightened by the high volume of transnationalism (Cheng, 2008). Wang and Shen were concerned that any theory that claims to be authentically "Asian-focused" runs the risk of essentializing the complexity of culture and consequently becoming fixated on the binary notion of "Asian" versus "non-Asian" experience. Indeed, Isin (2002) stated that

> globalization has recast modern patterns of inclusion and exclusion between nation-states by forging new hierarchies, which cut across and penetrate all regions of the world . . . North and South, First World and Third World, are no longer "out there" but nestled together within different nodes of capital, labour, and commodities. (p. 11)

Understanding the constructions and expressions of citizenship requires viewing national borders as both contained and expanded, sovereignty is intersected and overlapping, and members are disciplined and empowered. When communication with local and global audiences can arrive at one's fingertips within seconds, geographic locations no longer determine one's belongingness to a land or people. Instead, it is the opportunities, forces, processes, and directions under which human beings are relating to one another that warrants analyses. Dissanayake (1990) asserted that "as a reaction to the pervasive impersonality generated in the postindustrial society, a quest for fundamental meaning in life is likely to surface" (p. 93). In calling for a critical examination of community research and theories, Wasserman (2018) called for ethical attention to the "universal being of 'humans-in-relation'" (p. 447). Relational citizenship is anchored in the belief that members of *Homo sapiens* are relational beings whose individuality is inevitably accomplished through relationship building. Such a universality, however, is complicated by the nexuses of the global and local power relations within which memberships are negotiated, conferred, recognized, and celebrated. As Werbner and Yuval-Davis (1999) wrote, "citizenship is always already becoming" (p. 3).

Given the force of transnational movements, citizenship is no longer a parochial matter, as Isin (2002) cogently pointed out. At the same time, much of the sense of belongingness is constructed discursively through (re)articulations with local values embedded within communities. Miike (2002) argued that Asian cultures, albeit diverse, are distinctive compared to European and American cultures, and these cultural values are intertwined with peoples' behaviors. He warned of the danger of "intellectual dislocation," wherein the Euro-centered perspective toward human interactions remains unchallenged, and pointed to a need to provide alternative views toward communication rooted in Asian traditions and unique experiences (2008, p. 57). This call to produce localized knowledge for context-specific understandings of human

interactions in the "Global South" continues to be relevant (Wasserman, 2018). Furthermore, the meanings and productions of knowledge about any bounded region have continued to be interrogated since Said's (1978) groundbreaking work in *Orientalism*. As Hall (1992b) contended, the idea of "the West" and "the Rest" is constructed in discourses of "mis-recognizing differences" based on "fixated superiority/inferiority hierarchy" (p. 325). These (mis)representations are often absorbed by both "the West" and "the Rest" in the processes of knowledge, production, and dissemination. Therefore, the meaning of "localized values and knowledge" is viewed not as an issue of authenticity; rather, it pertains to issues of how certain values became "localized" and accepted as commonly representative knowledge and what goals this common knowledge serves.

For example, Isin (2002) argued that, influenced by Orientalism, citizenship has been viewed as an occidental concept that did not exist in the East; and with the new wave of orientalist perspectives, the East is ironically reproduced as abundant with "fundamentalism," which bonds members collectively. These discursive practices affect how the West behaves with the rest when it comes to understanding citizenship formations. The self-perceptions of people in the East are further complicated by their relationship to the West. After "Asian-ness" was first used by the Singaporean Senior Minister Lee Kaun Yew as a distinct and quintessential set of cultural values in Asia, it was used by Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad of Malaysia to propagate his "Look East" policy, in which Asia is situated in opposition to the "West" (Leheny, 2015, p. 62). "Asian values" are constructed simultaneously with the imaginations of Western values. Castles and Davidson (2000) explained that the challenge in developing the notions of democratic citizenship in Asia is that "many Asian countries experienced the hypocrisy of Western ideals during the colonial period" and "civilizing missions" served as "a cloak for domination and exploitation" (p. 206). As an ideology, this "localized Asianness" in practices such as the "Look East" policy is articulated primarily to foster support for economic development and nationalism. It serves the pragmatic goal of "speaking back" to the dominant Western powers through economic advancement. Easily accessible local values such as Confucianism become powerful vehicles ready to mobilize citizens' behaviors and sense of identification, which simultaneously help build a strong front against those who are outsiders—the Westerners. Local expressions are implicated in the "West versus Rest" hierarchical construct that was created to dominate and exploit.

Relational citizenship focuses on relationality between citizens of intersected identities and allows for articulating, molding, and remolding diverse ideas, peoples, and practices in these times of transnational movements. As Mercer (2014) noted,

> People do not merely associate with groups, they can become those groups through shared culture, interaction, contagion, and common group interest. The social emotion of group identity cannot be reduced to biological bodies. Instead, emotion goes with identity: group-level emotion can be stronger than, and different from, emotion experienced as an individual; group members share, validate, and police each other's feelings; and these feelings structure relations within and between groups. (p. 530)

Focusing on dynamic interactive processes rather than fixed legal status, relational citizenship attends to the culturally significant ways relationships are formed, and as a result, it serves as a central framing mechanism for membership. Such mechanisms tap into "social emotion," as Mercer described (2014) it, and communicate *relational distance* to its audiences: whom we feel close to or distant from. Relational citizenship does not evoke the sense of "thick" identification in which marginalized citizens assimilate completely into the dominant culture of a society (Ehrentraut, 2011; Kymlicka, 1996); instead, it recognizes differences and differential power within a society (Young, 2011; Yuval-Davis, 1997). Similarly, relational citizenship does not advocate a return to the traditional trope of the homogenous family based on a shared bloodline in constructing citizenship (Yam, 2018). It seeks ways to create a sense of *political kinship* through collaboration among multicultural groups across ethnic, racial, gender, class, linguistic, and legal, as well as geographic boundaries. It examines various relational distances created and deeply felt within the society and beyond. These relational distances are affected by complex histories in the past and in the present. Relational citizenship is a path for the government and other stakeholders to take while drawing from local values to strategize intentional ways to frame and publicize relationality of those marginalized citizens and foster connections with their various relational partners in society. As mentioned, citizenship is both an inclusionary and exclusionary selection from the binary of "self-citizen/other-non-citizen [sic]" (Baines & Sharma, 2002, p. 76). Brandzel (2016), in *Against Citizenship*, pointed out how citizenship as a social policy is anti-intersectional because it inevitably creates insiders who are "iconic citizens" and outsiders who are not. Recognizing this incommensurability, relational citizenship, although it emphasizes shared connections, should be treated as a communicative strategy that functions as both a disciplinary and a resisting mechanism. It encompasses contradictions to be negotiated.

The concept of relational citizenship facilitates current discussions on citizenship beyond civic, political, social, and cultural belonging. Focusing on dynamic interactive processes rather than fixed legal status, relational citizenship refers to the culturally logical ways in which relationships are formed to serve as central framing mechanisms in a society. Such mechanisms help

explain membership that *makes* an individual a citizen. It involves naming practices, engaging in performativity, and invoking local cultural knowledge, all with the purpose of normalizing or demonizing "different" identities. These actions generate an effect that serves as leverage for membership-relatedness. Relational citizenship as a strategy in a multicultural society allows for interruptions, realignments, or enhancements of the national ideal of loyalty. It interweaves both the public and the private domains, in which citizenship is embodied differently by gender, culture, and class (Abraham et al., 2010). In summary, relational citizenship encompasses the following characteristics:

- It focuses on the relationality of members and how relational distance is manifested with reference to multiple relational partners with whom certain emotions are created.
- It is not a status to be possessed but rather a value-laden communicative process in which connectivity is gradually and collaboratively established through continuous interactions in both private and public spaces.
- It attends to local histories and global trajectories embedded within uneven power relations.
- It is not bound to nation-state geographic boundaries. Relationality bleeds through national borders.
- While it has the potential to include as well as exclude certain members, with discernment of the beneficiaries of both material and symbolic interests, it could serve as a strategy to decrease relational distance between groups, particularly those marginalized in a society.

Throughout the book, these characteristics will be delineated with material collected from particular sites. The following chapters will unpack various contexts in which relational citizenship has been cultivated and embodied.

Chapter 1 will foreground Taiwan's experiences in citizenship development by discussing its multiple colonial pasts and current unique geopolitical positions. This chapter delineates both the subjectivity of Taiwan as controlled by outside powers and its resistance in becoming its own subject. In doing so, ideas of "citizenship" will be historicized through the current constructions and promotions of a multicultural Taiwanese society. Relational citizenship adopts methods rooted in the "third-world" experience (Chen, 2010) to attest to previous Western-based perspectives on citizen-making and helps bridge the gap between citizenship studies and intercultural and international communication. The "third-world approach" is not intended to further the perceived dichotomy between the West and the rest of the world (Chen, 2010, p. xiii). On the contrary, it is derived from the strong belief in the interplay between historical experiences and their connections to the current

development of group relationships. This chapter lays out the parameters that enable what Chen (2010) described as "decolonialization" (p. 65), "deimperialization" (p. 208), and "de-cold war" (p. 120) methods. By incorporating such methodologies in communication research, particularly on citizenship formations and expressions, Taiwan's experiences are therefore treated as an ontological and epistemological center. Its unique hybridized culture from a complex colonial past and current geopolitical position makes for a rich research site for a future trajectory in our understanding of how citizenship is communicated.

Chapter 2 discusses the connections between relationality and space, unpacking how Taiwan uses relational citizenship fostered in the society to navigate its complicated position in the global community. This chapter illustrates how relational citizenship facilitates Taiwan's solidification of its national identity, particularly through the discourses of multiculturalism, a learning society, national competitiveness, and the New Southbound Policy. However, it simultaneously establishes boundaries for certain groups in the names of border control. Relational citizenship, consequently, serves as a border management strategy. Combined with rhetoric of the future, relationality is used to create a space in the nexus of unequal power relations while projecting a promising destiny for Taiwan's citizens. It offers a possibility for breaking away from Taiwan's many experiences as a nation under subjugation to further assert a path that addresses the legacies of (neo)colonialism and imperialism it has experienced or participated in.

Chapter 3 offers an analysis of discourses including news articles, governmental publications, and interviews with new immigrants and those who work closely with them. Castells stated that "the main issue for the political players is not the shaping of opinion through explicit messages in the media, but the absence of a certain contents [sic] in the media" (as cited in Agirre et al., 2015). These various materials are juxtaposed to trace both the pronounced and silent elements on citizenship-making. As Norman Fairclough (2012) noted, interrelated elements such as social relations, power, institutions, and cultural values are all part of discursive construction. Critical discourse analysis is therefore utilized to discern the ways in which newcomers' subjectivities are constructed as well as the circumstances in which these subjectivities flourish. These newcomers are framed within the cultural logic in which humane connections (*qing*, 情), reasons (*li*, 理), and laws (*fa*, 法) are prioritized in different ways. Citizenship is communicated in the context of these relationships in various modes, depending on how each of these components is weighed and sequenced. Moreover, their subjectivities are accomplished through the discursive framing of their relational partners—other members in the society. Under global and historical influences, these relationships are inevitably racialized, gendered, and classed in the Taiwanese

context. They serve as a social script that guides appropriate interactions with various groups in society.

Viewing relational citizenship as consisting of everyday embodiments bound up with emotions, chapter 4 adopts ethnographic approaches to examine public spaces such as transit stations, religious sites, celebrative festivals, and television series. These physical and online public spaces are analyzed from the perspective of critical geography to unpack the mundane and performative nature of relational citizenship, which conjures particular affect in responding to the bodies in these spaces. Relational citizenship is an embodied process, in which recent members act in visible ways that signify their degree of belonging. By expressing identification, resistance, integration, and motivation, new members of society in Taiwan take on active roles in demonstrating their agency. At the same time, these public performances require collaborations from multiple parties in the society to be recognized. Through various forms of communication at multiple sites, newcomers' relational citizenship is gradually materialized.

As Margery Wolf (1972) pointed out, Taiwan's history is not unlike that of the United States, in that waves of immigrants have arrived throughout the years to build homes. Chapter 5 applies the concept of relational citizenship to examine the role of relationality in crafting citizenship in the United States. Specifically, it does so through examining debates over family-based unification in public discourses such as news reports, as well as President Trump's Twitter feeds on chain migration. In addition to the analysis of current discourses, this chapter features an analysis of the 1938–1939 radio show *Americans All—Immigrants All* to trace the role of relationality during the post-Depression era, when anti-immigration feeling was heightened. In so doing, this chapter shows how various sectors of society affect the formation of relational citizenship for certain members and that the strategy that I term *relational amnesia* is used to craft U.S. citizenship.

Humans are relational beings. Relationalities therefore exist in all communities, expressed in locally meaningful ways, conjuring up particular emotions toward various members. The concluding chapter is a discussion of how relationality serves both as a disciplinary tool to draw out "ideal" citizen behaviors and as a resistant strategy with which members can build alliances across boundaries. Finally, this chapter describes how the concept of relational citizenship helps tease out the processes of localization and globalization of citizenship constructions beyond a unidirectional flow or bifocal logic centered around Western traditions. In the current world, citizenship expressions are accomplished in the transnational communication flows beyond the East/South versus West/North divide. Through the analytical lens of relationality, conversations about citizenship are furthered beyond the common discourse imbued with the grammar of individualized legality.

NOTE

1. The term "Global South" here is to be viewed as a theoretical concept rather than an economic reference. I understand that Taiwan was not part of the Organization of Solidarity with the People of Africa, Asia, and Latin America established in 1966, aiming to fight against imperialism. According to Mahler (2015), this movement later morphed into the concept of the Global South, "a political consciousness resulting from the recognition by diverse peoples of their shared experience of the negative effects of globalization" (p. 95). The phrase is based on Chen's work (2010) to examine experiences as part of the Global South, which is intimately connected to its (post) colonial histories under Taiwan's multiple imperialistic powers. My employment of this term is aimed at underscoring Taiwan's struggles over subjectivity-making as an entity under numerous subjugations.