Eric Mutabazi
Nathanaël Wallenhorst *Editors*

Second-Class Citizenship

Sociological Analyses and Educational Remedies

Springer

Second-Class Citizenship

Eric Mutabazi · Nathanaël Wallenhorst
Editors

Second-Class Citizenship

Sociological Analyses and Educational Remedies

Springer

Editors
Eric Mutabazi
Faculty of Education
Catholic University of the West
Angers, France

Nathanaël Wallenhorst
Dean of the Faculty of Education
Catholic University of the West
Angers, France

ISBN 978-3-031-82843-0 ISBN 978-3-031-82844-7 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-82844-7

The original submitted manuscript has been translated into English. The translation was done using artificial intelligence. A subsequent revision was performed by the author(s) to further refine the work and to ensure that the translation is appropriate concerning content and scientific correctness. It may, however, read stylistically different from a conventional translation.

Second-Class Citizens in the Pink Ghetto: Gender Bias in Legal Writing, Civil Servants and Second-Class Citizens, Online Staffers: Superstars or Second-Class Citizens

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Contents

Part I Thinking About Citizenship in Terms of the Difficulties Involed in Exercising It

1 The Challenges of Citizenship in Education When Vulnerable Citizens Define Themselves as "Second-Class Citizens" 3
Eric Mutabazi and Nathanaël Wallenhorst

2 Thinking About Citizenship from the Perspective of the Forgotten 15
Fred Poche

3 Homeless People: Citizens in a Situation of Sub-citizenship? 25
Marianne Trainoir and Bertrand Bergier

4 The Challenges of Citizenship for Unaccompanied Minor Migrants in France 39
Éric Mutabazi and Pierre-Antoine Joly

5 Illiteracy and Citizenship: A Depiction of the State of Play Through Three Portraits of Adults Experiencing Great Difficulty in Relation to Writing 57
Christelle Chevallier-Gaté and Jean-Pierre Gaté

6 Responsible Citizens or Led Leaders? the Case of Bosses in France 75
Jean-Yves Robin

7 Citizenship Challenged by Social Classes in Brazil and France 89
Constantin Xypas and Eric Mutabazi

Part II Elements of Political Education

8 Citizenship Facing Difficulties in Rwanda: How Has Ethnicity Prevented the Formation of a Community of Citizens? 111
Eric Mutabazi

9 Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Education 129
Jean-Marc Lamarre

10 Childhood: A Time Sheltered from Citizenship? 145
Renaud Hétier

11 From Downgrading in the Juvenile Experience to an Education in Politics 157
Nathanaël Wallenhorst

12 Citizenship and Adult Education: The Place of Experience 169
Gilles Pinte

13 Teaching and Raising Awareness Among Students About the Challenges of Social Justice: An Educational Device Promoting Exchanges Between French and Swedish Students 181
Eric Mutabazi and Stellan Sundh

14 Participation of the Most Disadvantaged. Epistemic Justice and Capabilities to Act 193
Fred Poché

15 Digital: A Tool for More Citizen Participation in Election Campaign? Between Display and Fluctuation Around the Concept of Citizen Participation During the French Presidential Election of 2012 205
Anaïs Theviot

Part III Some Thoughts on the Challenge of Contemporary Citizenship

16 The Civic Efficacy of Civic Service, Put to the Test by Social Inequalities 219
Gérald Houdeville, Romain Perrier, and Charles Suaud

17 Let's Get Civilized! from Citizenship as Power to Citizenship as Potency 233
Sébastien Claeys and Florent Trocquenet-Lopez

18 A Critique of Citizenship Through Practice 249
Daphnée Valbrun

19 The Individual in the City: Reflection on Citizenship According to Paul Ricœur 261
François Prouteau

20 Transculturality 281
Christoph Wulf

21 The Time of Citizenship: A Time to Come? 293
Jean-Pierre Boutinet

22 Towards Citizenship for Animals? 309
Bruno Villalba

Part I
Thinking About Citizenship in Terms of the Difficulties Involed in Exercising It

Chapter 1
The Challenges of Citizenship in Education When Vulnerable Citizens Define Themselves as "Second-Class Citizens"

Eric Mutabazi and Nathanaël Wallenhorst

Abstract In our liberal democracies, everyone has equal rights and equal weight in terms of participating in the exercise of power. Gone are the days of census suffrage when, in France and other European countries, the right to vote was granted only to citizens who paid tax above a certain threshold, and women did not have the right to vote. Is this truly the case, though? The provocative expression "second-class citizenship" would suggest otherwise! Indeed, while officially, or from a legal point of view, we cannot talk about second-class citizenship, or secondary or sub-citizenship, what ought we to do when the actors themselves speak in such terms? What should we do with the conceptual tools created by social actors? By analyzing different contexts, we will show in this work that the implementation of the rights and duties of citizens, and the fundamental values of modern citizenship, appear to be in question. We use the expression "second-class citizenship" not only to refer to the power of the internalization of a hierarchy among citizens (accompanied by the experience of contempt), but also to forcefully reveal this inequality between citizens who are supposed to be equal before the law. Would it be possible to prevent this hierarchy and these inequalities? Other modalities can be considered in this liberation of the conditions of exercise of second-class citizenship, such as legal work, deepening of international relations, social work of proximity facilitating the integration of ethnic minorities, etc. However, in our view, education is a particularly powerful political means to give substance to citizenship.

Keywords Second-class citizenship · Impeded citizenship · Vulnerable people · Social and cultural inequalities

Most elements of this chapter have also been published in another book: *Citoyennetés de seconde classe"D'une citoyenneté empêchée à une education citoyenne* (From Restricted Citizenship to Civic Education", edited by Eric Mutabazi and Nathanaël Wallenhorst, Le Bord de l'eau, 2021.

E. Mutabazi (✉) · N. Wallenhorst
Catholic University of the West (UCO), Angers, France
e-mail: eric.mutabazi@uco.fr

E. Mutabazi and N. Wallenhorst (eds.), *Second-Class Citizenship*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-82844-7_1

1 Introduction

At the SNCF (French national railway operator), it is common to talk about "first class" and "second class". On airlines as well, we speak of "economy class" or "business class"! The terms "first-" and "second class" have entered common commercial language. They are used to differentiate levels corresponding to two categories of people. On board the plane, first class is reserved for VIPs—people entitled to a *certain respect* and a little more living space…! In second class, passengers must make do with minimal service and recognition, corresponding to their category.

When buying a car, the list of classes is countless. You have the choice between a 1995 "used Clio", a 2013 Picasso, a new Tesla… or the supreme domination of a Hummer—not forgetting that many people cannot afford to buy and maintain a "small used Clio" and will settle for a scooter. As for buying or renting an apartment, a house or a small castle, the example requires no explanation. However, these different examples come from the economic sphere and do not refer to the exercise of civic rights and duties. In our liberal democracies, everyone has equal rights and equal weight in terms of participating in the exercise of power. Gone are the days of suffrage census when, in France and other European countries, the right to vote was granted only to citizens who paid tax above a certain threshold and, women did not have the right to vote. Is this truly the case, though? The provocative expression "second-class citizenship" would seem to suggest otherwise!

While officially, or from a legal point of view, we cannot talk about second-class citizenship, or secondary or sub-citizenship, what ought we to do when the actors themselves speak in such terms? What should we do with the conceptual tools created by social actors?

Indeed, it happened in France that young people from an immigrant background, sparked into mobilizing by the urban violence of 2005 (where 1300 cars were set on fire), pointed to their French identity card in front of television cameras, stating that they felt they were considered "second-class citizens" compared to young French people of European origin (Xypas 2006, p. 224). The urban riots of 2005 and 2023 have highlighted how a group of young French people no longer believe in the rules, values and principles supposed to structure a "neutral" space allowing peaceful coexistence between French citizens from diverse cultural backgrounds. These riots demonstrated that the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity have failed among young people who claim to be discriminated against and despised. The French model of republican assimilationism, which had allowed the integration of migrants until 1939, is currently failing. These young people are aware of the gap between the promises of integration into our republican democracy and their day-to-day experience of relegation (regularly marked by failure at school and difficulty in accessing employment). The ideal of citizenship that has developed during modernity is marked by equal access to rights, respect for fundamental dignity, freedom of expression and movement, as well as national, supranational and global solidarity among individuals. However, the gradual emergence of this ideal does not necessarily come with

the harmonious and serene exercise of citizens' rights and duties. Often the exercise of citizenship appears to be hindered. This is a problematic and worrying situation.

Let us take the "time" to examine citizenship to understand the reasons for this "hindrance", and then identify some paths by which the situation could be remedied. Usually, in relation to citizenship, we think more of space than of "time"! Indeed, the Ancients associated territory with public life, and the concept of citizenship originated from belonging to the Athenian city-state. An individual, depending on their status, could participate in public life as long as they lived there. A citizen belonged to a local, defined, legal entity. Citizens were those who had in common their unique city-state (Del Pup 2003). In particular, citizenship embodied two essential dimensions: political and legal (Schnapper 2000; Xypas 2003). The political dimension was characterized by participation in the exercise of power: a citizen of a city-state was one who participated in power. Citizenship was understood in a participatory and active sense in a city-state. As for the legal dimension, it referred to a man belonging to a given society: the inhabitant of the city-state had to respect the laws, the rules, and fulfill a set of duties that bound him to his state. The state, in turn, guaranteed him the rights of a citizen.

2 The Ideal of Contemporary Citizenship

2.1 Between an abstract citizen and the recognition of unique community features

Gradually, modern citizenship, while drawing inspiration from the Ancient model, produced the idea of a citizen without its being directly the result of membership of a territorial community but as access to universal rights. The homeland, land of fathers, grandfathers, and great-grandfathers, gave way to the nation, which surpassed and marginalized identity affiliations. The land inhabited by ancestors that was the homeland opened up to other fellow citizens with whom a community of interests is shared (Del Pup 2003). The nation was built, not as a territory of individuals from the same ethnic groups, but a set of citizens living in the same geographical space, having experienced common events—such as glories, sacrifices, or trials (Renan 1992). This is the case of France which, since the time of the Third Republic, has associated within a single nation different peoples living in the territory. In order to constitute one, and only one, "community of citizens", regional languages have been reduced to the rank of dialects; immigrants (as well as other minorities) have had to assimilate to the values of the Republic and speak the French language (Schnapper 1994). French has been invested as the overcoming of all social affiliations. What a citizen is has been apprehended in an increasingly abstract way, outside of his peculiarities (tribe, city, ethnicity). The nation has participated in the creation of other institutions and cultural characteristics than those of the individuals constituting it, which have had

the function of exercising coercion and cohesion among all its groups. Citizens were then defined by his ability to break with the determinations that would confine him in a culture and a destiny imposed by his birth (Schnapper 1994, p. 92).

Thus, in France, the conception of citizenship (with its attendant rights and duties) has gradually been built around the idea of an abstract individual (McIntyre 1993; Taylor 1994). The specificity of citizenship in Britain, unlike France, is that it has managed to maintain a respect for cultural diversity. Indeed, political engagement is apprehended on the basis of family and its uniqueness—the idea being that an individual insensitive to family ties cannot make a good citizen (Schnapper 2000: p. 43). This recognition of communitarianism within the nation currently marks the Anglo-Saxon model of citizenship. Here, then, citizenship is not the fact of sharing the same national language, the same culture, or common values, but it brings together individuals from different ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious groups.[1] The conceptual sedimentation of citizenship in Anglo-Saxon countries is organized around belonging to a community, which then defines the citizen as a subject of rights. Citizenship is not organized around the idea of an abstract individual, without ethnicity, religion, region or cultural practice. The Canadian philosopher Will Kymlicka (1995), in his work on citizenship and multiculturalism, espouses the idea that it will be necessary to take account of the specificity of each community in the management of the State to respond to cultural claims that are expressed today in modern nations. Indeed, each group has specific needs and interests, and it is thus necessary to offer what Kymlicka calls "ethnocultural justice" with the proposal of a consideration of community membership based on law. Within European countries (apart from in Great Britain, perhaps), the relationship to citizenship is rather unfavorable to the consideration of local situations or particular interests (Fenet 2016, p. 118).

Within this tension between the emergence of an abstract citizen figure and the recognition of community particularities, an ideal of contemporary citizenship granting rights to all citizens, based on a principle of distributive justice, has gradually been established. Here, what determines contemporary citizenship is not ethnic belonging, nor the fact of speaking the same language, living in the same territory, sharing the same beliefs, or having the same ancestors (as was the case with the Ancients), but the desire to live together despite, or thanks to, our differences, and to achieve things together (Renan 1992).

[1] This situation in the English-speaking world has evolved gradually. From civil citizenship to social citizenship through political citizenship, English-speaking citizens have gradually acquired the rights to expression, information, voting, the right to stand for election, and rights relating to the satisfaction of basic needs, such as the rights to housing, education, social protection, work, health, and human rights (Marshall, 1964).

2.2 National, supranational and global citizenship

The ideal of contemporary citizenship, in its integrative aim, projects common achievements with the citizens of other nations. Such is the case with supranational citizenship—the possibility of moving outside of one's nation while benefiting from a set of rights.[2] The European project, for example, brings together the citizens of the European Union countries into a single citizenship, as it creates upward relations of individuals to the European Union that allow them to be actors, rather than merely to be governed by the supranational directives (Lamblin-Gourdin 2014, p. 278). Thus, the treaties of the European Union recognize the political and legal dimensions of each citizen from the countries concerned by the agreements: through voting, citizens participate in power, and they can appeal to European jurisdictions in case of non-respect of their rights. The basic principles of citizenship are laid down within the European Union, even though there is still some way to go for the citizens of the Union to master their rights and duties (Leclerc 2014). Indeed, the duties of the citizen towards the European Union are not defined sufficiently precisely in the different treaties (Lamblin-Gourdin 2014), and we are currently experiencing a period of depoliticization of the European Union and disenchantment with the European dream (Jeannesson 2016). This, of course, does not help deepen the construction of the European community—the unfinished unification of Europe (Mouric 2016).

The expansion of the idea of citizenship to a continental and global scale is not unique to European citizenship. The same movement of expansion and universalization is perceptible in the project of African union or federation of countries speaking the same language (such as Francophonie or the Commonwealth). It is also a dynamic that is perceptible through globalization and the development, in some individuals only, of a feeling of belonging to the same global community—sometimes called "our global village"—facilitated by the digital revolution and the development of tourist stays (Brougère and Fabbiano 2014). Within this fundamental movement of modernity, with the economic globalization it brings, the relationship to space is reconfigured. Moreover, in recent decades, the perception of the ecological limits of the earth has cast doubt over citizenship—sometimes thought of as world citizenship or environmental citizenship. The notion of world citizenship, for example, is often understood as human hospitality based on a questioning of humanity, which broadens and questions the notion of citizenship. Cooperation, mutual respect, and equal dignity of all men and women are the watchwords of world citizenship. Territoriality fades in the attribution of universal rights and responsibility to world citizens. The same is true for environmental or ecological citizenship, expanding the idea of relationship with others inherent in citizenship to the relationship with nature, animals, and the supportive fabric that is the living world (Pelluchon 2015; Wallenhorst 2016; Weber 2017; Flahault 2018). The awareness of shared responsibility

[2] Moreover, dual nationality has been enacted in several countries around the world. This allows citizens to have citizenship of more than one State, and guarantees the same rights and responsibility to citizens of foreign origin without forcing them to renounce their nationalities of birth. A citizen can therefore have rights and duties – including the right to vote – in several countries.

for the Earth is at the heart of this idea of environmental or ecological citizenship. The ideas of world citizenship, environmental and ecological citizenship carry the same preference for collective and universal interests over individual interests (Xypas 2003, pp. 285–286).

3 Contemporary Citizenship and the Difficulties It Faces

3.1 The exercise of citizenship sometimes hindered by religious affiliation

Religious affiliation is a hindrance to citizenship in many cases. Thus, in Britain, for example, an atmosphere of mistrust reigns between Catholics and the State, the latter sometimes being viewed as an oppressor by the former. It is therefore important for Catholics to resist against a State that marginalizes them (Vanderpelen and Weis 2014). In Germany, as in several other European countries, belonging to Judaism or Islam poses a set of difficulties in the fulfillment of citizen rights and duties, and in the quest for emancipation (Olivier and Roudaut 2014). In a number of countries, nationality is correlated with official affiliation with a religion. Such is the case, for example, in Israel, Afghanistan, Mauritania, Iran, and Pakistan, where religion is a structuring presence pervading all public life, and thus affecting citizenship and the ways in which it is exercised, which run counter to the description of the universal dimension of the ideal of citizenship (Bakhrouri and Lunel 2014). As an illustration, this is what we can observe in Egypt, with Islam dominating in social organization, which turns out to be "a global system": "[Islam] encompasses all aspects of life. It is the state and homeland or government and nation (*umma*). It is morality and force or mercy and justice. It is culture and law or science and justice. It is material and wealth" (Elias 2014, p. 55). Religious affiliation can also be a source of differentiation between men and women, compromising the ideal of equal access to citizens' rights and duties—this is particularly the case with the controversial issue of the Islamic veil (Moya 2014).

3.2 The exercise of citizenship sometimes hindered by cultural and ethnic affiliation

In addition to this dialectic between the State and religious affiliation that hampers citizenship, we see a dialectic between the State and cultural and ethnic affiliation[3] (Mutabazi 2011, 2012, 2013, 2020, 2021). Indeed, many countries in the world,

[3] Ethnic belonging refers to a relatively closed group sharing the same origin (the members of an ethnic group descend from a common ancestor) and a name of their own. These members

particularly in Africa, are currently torn apart by wars, massacres, racism, tribalism, and interethnic violence of all kinds. We can cite the recent conflicts in the Ivory Coast, the Central African Republic, Sudan, Burundi, Chad, and the Tutsi genocide in Rwanda that marked the end of the last century.

However, this dialectic problem between the State and cultural and ethnic belonging has not spared so-called democratic countries, as we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter: young people from an immigrant background feel themselves to be "second-class citizens". Let us mention, in closing, the situation of the Roma in Europe, which represents another particularly problematic situation of integration of an ethnic minority encountering difficulties in exercising their citizenship. These 10–12 million individuals represent one of the most discriminated-against ethnic minorities in Europe (Mäkinen 2013); in relation to the Roma, the EU Member States face are profoundly embarrassed, and are unable to develop a common integration strategy. Thus, in 2009 and 2010, France expelled thousands of Roma to Romania and Bulgaria (which attracted fierce criticism within the European Parliament; then in 2010, Sweden followed suit). Are there, then, different types of European citizens? Some would be allowed to move freely and stay in the different countries of the European Union, while others would be deprived of these rights. For this reason, Claire Saas wonders whether there is "second-class citizenship" linked to the ethnic categorization of citizens deemed undesirable within the European Union (2016, p. 153).

3.3 Hindered citizenship—one of the characteristics of the present time?

Continuing in the vein of cultural, ethnic or religious affiliations preventing the exercise of citizenship, we can identify a set of social characteristics of the contemporary period that are not neutral from the point of view of citizenship. We can thus raise the question of the threefold acceleration (technical, social change, and pace of life) highlighted by the German sociologist Hartmut Rosa (2010, 2012); the "Great Acceleration" of the mid-twentieth century worked on by the American geochemist Will Steffen (which has become another name for the Anthropocene) with the permanent alteration of planet Earth's habitability (Steffen et al. 2004; Wallenhorst 2019, 2020, 2021a, b, 2022a, b, 2023; Hétier and Wallenhorst 2023; Testot and Wallenhorst 2023; Wallenhorst and Wulf 2023; Wallenhorst et al. 2023; Renouard et al. 2023); the contemporary digital and technoscientific revolution, with the convergence of NBIC (Hottois et al. 2015; Wallenhorst et al. 2018); a rise in religious and political radicalization where, in various places around the world, citizens, by voting, affirm

share cultural and religious practices, live in the same geographical space and tend to experience strengthened solidarity (Amselle, 2002, p. 887).

their desire to leave democracy behind[4]; or the burgeoning mass of social inequalities (Fitoussi and Rosanvallon 1998)—to mention here only a few of the markers of the present time. Moreover, as Hannah Arendt, the German political scientist who emigrated to the United States, highlighted in *The Human Condition*, published in the United States in 1958, modernity is characterized by the growth of private spaces at the expense of public spaces. The economic logic of the *animal laborans* she describes has become hegemonic, at the expense of the political logic of concerted action typical of the *zoon politikon.* The domination of economic logics of maximization of individual interests hinders the exercise of citizenship, the conditions for which are, themselves, political. Sixty years after the publication of *The Human Condition*, we perceive how much the logics of limitless maximization of individual interests of *homo oeconomicus* have continued to gather strength (Les convivialistes 2013; Les économistes atterrés 2015).

These characteristics pose a set of difficulties for the exercise of citizenship. For many individuals, citizenship appears to be *hindered*. Can we go so far, today, as to apprehend the present time as being characterized by hindered citizenship? Could the difficulties of exercising citizenship be considered one of the fundamental issues of the present time? This question was the starting point of this book. In dealing with this question, a number of choices, which are necessarily partial, have been made. With the contributors to this research, we wished to explore the means of exercise of different types of citizenship, which differ greatly from one another.

4 Steps Towards Citizenship Education: Education as a Political Tool

Faced with this observation of the exercise of citizenship regularly being hindered, what means of action do we have to enable citizens to fully exercise their rights and duties? Here, the contributors to this book propose to design a movement based on the conviction that education is dependent on the power of participation in preparing for the future. In this book, the act of education is apprehended as the capacity to act on the world and human existences. Other modalities could have been considered in this liberation of the conditions for exercise of hindered citizenships, such as legal work, tightening of international relations, local social work facilitating the integration of ethnic minorities, etc. However, education appeared to us to be a particularly powerful political means of action to give substance to citizenship.

The founding fathers of the Third French Republic aimed to educate future citizens through school programs that used object lessons to instill scientific rationality, history and geography to express the spatio-temporal framework of citizen action, French language and arithmetic in the field of practical knowledge, and of course, the weekly moral lesson… (Del Pup 2003, p. 71). In fact, it is the entire organization

[4] Examples of this include the election of Donald Trump in the United States, Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil, the vote for Brexit in Great Britain, and the election of a coalition with the far right in Austria.

of school life in primary school which, up until the 1960s, focused on learning the law and the primacy of community interest over individual interests, aimed to instill republican values, to shape honest people, good parents and good citizens. Today, the schooling system must devise new forms of citizenship education. Citizenship education is not apprehended in this book as the presentation of values and convictions which all citizens should share, but as the creation of pedagogical situations allowing students to develop the skills required to live together (Xypas 2003; Jutras 2010). How can we learn to build a common world together and overcome that which impedes us from reaching that goal? How can we facilitate citizenship education in a nation where collective memories are made of interlacing alliances and separations, and painful conflicts with the humiliation and shame that they bring? What could be some of the foundations of an education in politics in the contemporary period?

Nearly 60 years after the publication of "The Crisis in Education" by Hannah Arendt in 1958, and 40 years after the publication of "*Éducation et politique* " by French educator Jacques Ardoino (1977), it seemed important to us to address these notional relations between education and politics anew. This is one of the objectives of this work on citizenship, which is at the junction between politics and education, both of which have the purpose of laying the groundwork for the future. Western lifestyles of individual consumption, based on industrial production, are often apprehended as being marked by economic *hybris* that has taken precedence over an organizationally reasoned politics. However, if it is possible to apprehend capitalism as cultural practices based on the sacralization of individual freedom from which it is possible to depart, these must be able to be tested by democratic political experiments allowing for the production of new social norms (Arnsperger 2005, p. 480).

The "time of citizenship" thus means that it is possible to learn to disengage from the hegemony of the logics of maximization of individual interests on which capitalism is founded. The work of education and training can thus contribute to the "*political reflection* on the *democratic construction* of *social norms*", allowing us to discover "the kind of human beings we are able to be" (Arnsperger 2005, pp. 486–487).[5]This cultural component of capitalism highlighted by Arnsperger is important to take into consideration, particularly from an educational perspective. It means that, even if the economic logics of the contemporary period appear incredibly powerful in the face of politics, educators can invest this political power in devising other ways of living together.

We identify three functions at the articulation of which to think of education for citizenship against the complex backdrop of the contemporary period. The first is the development of the function of critique. It is a matter of being able to distance oneself from the modalities of citizenship, having knowledge of legal provisions, being able

[5] The contemporary Franco-German economist Christian Arnsperger identifies capitalism as a historically determinate "culture" from which it is possible to extricate ourselves without necessarily plunging into a totalitarian approach (Arnsperger, 2005, p. 481). Hartmut Rosa's analysis, which is in line with the Critical Theory advanced by the Frankfurt School, is fully in agreement with Arnsperger's: he reminds us that there have been non-capitalist civilizations and that "Capitalism is not a given of nature!" (Rosa and Wallenhorst, 2017, p. 5).

to master conceptual tools in order to apprehend the complexity of the contemporary world. The second is the function of resistance. It is about learning to resist, to say no, to situate oneself in the City. For this purpose, it is necessary to have a set of resources—social, cultural or cognitive. The function of resistance is an important mode of participation in the exercise of power, in accordance with the fundaments of democracy. It is about learning to oppose without massacring or dominating others (Les convivialistes 2013). Finally, a third function is absolutely necessary: that of utopia. It is important to learn to dream, to hope in the possibility of the emergence of another world in which cooperation and solidarity are truly experienced, and are at the heart of a common world.

References

Amselle, J.- L., «Ethnie in *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, Corpus 8, France S.A., 2002, pp. 886–887.
Ardoino, J., *Education et politique*, Paris, Anthropos, 1999 (ed. or. 1977).
Arnsperger, C., «La "moralisation du capitalisme": une approche du problème. L'expérimentalisme démocratique et la coévolution des normes», *Revue internationale des sciences sociales*, 2005, n°185, pp. 477–488.
Bakhrouri, M. et Lunel, F., «De la judéité en contexte minoritaire à la citoyenneté israélienne: de Mendelssohn aux juges de l'affaire Rufeisen», in D. Avon (dir.), *Sujet, fidèle, citoyen*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2014, pp. 179–208.
Brougère, G., Fabbiano, G. (dir.), *Apprentissages en situation touristique*, Villeneuve-d'Asq, Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 2014.
Del Pup, H., «Les citoyennetés politiques: entre participation et représentation», in C. Xypas (dir.), *Les citoyennetés scolaires*, Paris, PUF, 2003, pp. 11–71.
Elias, A., «L'islam comme contre-proposition au modèle européen laïque. Étude de cas: Hassan al-Bannâ fondateur des Frères musulmans (1906–1949)», in A. Elias, A. Jomier, A-T. Khatchadourian (dir.), Bern, Peter Lang, 2014, pp. 45–60.
Fenet, A., «Union européenne et droits des minorités: la permanence d'une ambiguïté», in M. Catala S. Jeannesson, A.-S. Lamblin-Gourdin (dir.), Bern, Peter Lang, 2016, pp. 107–130.
Fitoussi, J.-P., Rosanvallon, P., *Le nouvel âge des inégalités*, Paris, Seuil, 1998.
Flahault, F., *L'homme une espèce déboussolée*, Paris, Fayard, 2018.
Hétier, R. & Wallenhorst, N. (2023). *Penser l'éducation à l'époque de l'Anthropocène*. Le Bord de l'eau.
Hottois, G., Missa, J.-N., Perbal, L. (dir.), *L'humain et ses préfixes – Une encyclopédie du transhumanisme et du posthumanisme*, Paris, Vrin, 2015.
Humphrey Marshall, T., *Class, Citizenship, and social development*, The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
Jeannesson, S., «Nation et citoyenneté dans la pensée européiste de l'entre-deux-guerres», in M. Catala S. Jeannesson, A.-S. Lamblin-Gourdin (dir.), Bern, Peter Lang, 2016, pp. 19–34.
Jutras, F., *L'éducation à la citoyenneté : enjeux socioéducatifs et pédagogiques*, Québec, PUQ, 2010.
Kymlicka, W. *Multicultural Citizenship*, London, Oxford University Press, 1995.
Lamblin-Gourdin, A-S., «La condition juridique des individus au sein de l'Union européenne: sujet ou citoyens?», in D. Avon (dir.), *Sujet, fidèle, citoyen*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2014, pp. 275–298.
Leclerc, A., «La citoyenneté européenne en question: de la méconnaissance des droits à la reconnaissance des principes constitutifs», in D. Avon (dir.) *Sujet, fidèle, citoyen*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2014, pp. 299–326.

Lenoir, Y., «Citoyenneté et multiculturalisme, les termes du débat», in Y., Lenoir, C. Xypas, C. Jamet (dir.), *École et citoyenneté : un défi multiculturel*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2016a, pp. 7–24.
Lenoir, Y., «Confrontation des modèles éducatifs français et nord-américain», in Y., Lenoir, C. Xypas, C. Jamet (dir.), *École et citoyenneté : un défi multiculturel*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2016b, pp. 42–60.
Les convivialistes, *Manifeste convivialiste*, Lormont, Le Bord de l'eau, 2013.
Les économistes atterrés, *Nouveau manifeste des économistes atterrés*, Paris, Les liens qui libèrent, 2015.
Mäkinen, V., Are there fundamental rights for Roma beggars in Europe? *Political Theology: The Journal of Christian Socialism*, 2013, 14(2), 201–218
MacIntyre A. C., Quelle justice ? Quelle rationalité? Paris, P.U.F, 1993, (Trad. de l'anglais par Michèle Vignaux d'Hollande)
Mouric, J., Une citoyenneté européenne est-elle possible? Raymond Aron face à la construction européenne (1948–1983). Dans M. Catala & A.-S. Lamblin-Gourdin (eds.), L'Europe des citoyens et la citoyenneté européenne, Bruxelles, Peter Lang, 2016, pp. 35–50.
Moya, M., «Une laïcité disputée: le féminin et l'islam dans l'espace public», in A. Elias, A. Jomier & A-T. Khatchadourian (éds.), Bernes, Peter Land SA, éditions scientifiques internationales, 2014, pp. 125–142.
Mutabazi E., « En quoi l'enseignement de l'histoire avant le génocide aurait-il contribué à la souffrance à l'école au Rwanda?», in C. Meyor (dir.), *La souffrance à l'école*, Université du Québec à Montréal, Cercle interdisciplinaire de recherches phénoménologiques (Cirp), 2011, Vol 2, pp. 103–116, //www.cirp.uqam.ca/documents%20pdf/collectifs/11_MutabaziE.pdf.
Mutabazi E., «Échec du vivre-ensemble au Rwanda: Quelle est la responsabilité des manuels scolaires d'histoire?», in N. Bouchard et R. W. Morris (dir.), *Éduquer au vivre ensemble. Fondements, pratiques et politiques d'une éducation en quête d'éthique*. McGill Journal of education. Revue des sciences de l'éducation de McGill, n°48(1), pp. 131–154.
Mutabazi, E., «Éducation à la citoyenneté et formation au vivre ensemble», in N. Bouchard, *Éduquer et former au vivre ensemble dans l'espace francophone et ailleurs. Analyse de conceptions théoriques, de politiques et de pratiques éducatives.* Les Dossiers du GREE, Montréal, série1, N°1, 2012, pp. 38–42.
Mutabazi, E., Ethnicity and Second-Class Citizenship in Rwanda. *Bildungsforschung*, 2020, 1, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.25539/bildungsforschun.v1i17.290
Mutabazi, E., Identity and Citizenship in Rwanda. Analysis of History Textbooks. *Bildungsforschung*, 2021, 2, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.25656/01:23917
Olivier, A. P. et Roudaut, M., «Aufklärung et Révolution: sur les conditions d'émancipation de l'homme et du citoyen», in D. Avon (dir.), *Sujet, fidèle, citoyen*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2014, pp. 123–140.
Pelluchon, C., *Les nourritures*, Paris, Seuil, 2015.
Renan, E., *Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation*, Paris, Presses Pocket, 1992.
Renouard, C., Brossard Børhaug, F., Le Cornec, R. Dawson, J., Federau, A., Ries, D., Vandecastele, P., Wallenhorst, N. (2023). *Pedagogy of the Anthropocene Epoch for a Great Transition*, Springer-Nature.
Rosa, H., *Accélération. Une critique sociale du temps*, Paris, La découverte, 2013 (ed. orig. 2010), trad. fr.
Rosa, H., *Aliénation et accélération – Vers une théorie critique de la modernité tardive*, Paris, La Découverte, 2014 (orig. 2010, trad. fr.)
Rosa, H., Wallenhorst, N. (entretien avec), «Apprendre ensemble dans la société de l'accélération», *Bildungsforschung*, 2017, n°1, pp. 1–7, tr. fr.
Saas, C., «Les «Roms», des citoyens européens aux droits contestés», In A. Elias, A. Jomier & A-T. Khatchadouirian (éds), *Laïcités et musulmans, débats et expériences (XIXe-XXe siècle)*, Bernes, Peter Land SA, éditions scientifiques internationales, 2016, pp. 131–153.
Schnapper, D., La communauté des citoyens – Sur l'idée moderne de la nation, Paris, Gallimard, 1994.

Schnapper, D., *Qu'est-ce que la citoyenneté*, Paris, Gallimard, 2000.
Steffen, W., Sanderson, R. A., Tyson, P. D., Jäger, J., Matson, P. A., Moore III, B., Oldfield, F., Richardson, K., Schellnhuber, H.-J., Turner, B. L., Wasson, R. J., *Global Change and the Earth System. A Planet Under Pressure*, The IGBP Book Series, New York, Springer, 2004.
Taylor, CH., *Multiculturalisme, Différence et Démocratie*, Paris, Flammarion, 1994.
Testot, L. & Wallenhorst, N. (2023). *Vortex. Face à l'Anthropocène*. Payot.
Vanderpelen, C., Weis, M., « Fidèles et sujets, fidèles et citoyens: les catholiques anglais (XVIe et XXe siècle)», in D. Avon (dir.), *Sujet, fidèle, citoyen*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2014, pp. 103–122.
Wallenhorst, N. & Wulf, C. (2023) (Eds.). *Handbook of the Anthropocene – Humans Between Heritage and Future*. Springer.
Wallenhorst, N. (2020). *La vérité sur l'Anthropocène*. Le Pommier.
Wallenhorst, N. (2021). La datation de l'entrée dans l'Anthropocène – Synthèse d'un débat à destination des enseignants. *Recherches et éducation*, 23.
Wallenhorst, N. (2021). *Mutation. L'aventure humaine ne fait que commencer*. Le Pommier.
Wallenhorst, N. (2022a). *Qui sauvera la planète? Les technocrates, les autocrates ou les démocrates…* Arles: Actes Sud.
Wallenhorst, N. (2022b). What does the Anthropocene hold for citizenship? *Vierteljahrsschrift für Wissenschaftliche Pädagogik*, 98(4), pp. 434-446.
Wallenhorst, N. (2023). *A Critical Theory for the Anthropocene*. Springer. doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37738-9.
Wallenhorst, N., «Citoyenneté existentielle et reconfiguration du politique – Les pratiques écologiques de deux jeunes professionnels», *Revue des Sciences Sociales*, n°55, 2016, pp. 116-123.
Wallenhorst, N., Hétier, R., Pierron, J.-P. & Wulf, C. (dir.) (2023). *Political Education for the Anthropocene*. Springer.
Wallenhorst, N., *L'Anthropocène décodé pour les humains*, Paris, Le Pommier, 2019.
Wallenhorst, N., Prouteau, F., Coatanéa, D. (dir.), *Éduquer l'homme augmenté – Vers une société postprométhéenne*, Lormont, Le Bord de l'eau, 2018.
Weber, A., *Sein und Teilen*, Bielefeld, Transcript, 2017.
Xypas, C. (dir.), *Les citoyennetés scolaires*, Paris, PUF, 2003.
Xypas, C., «La fonction politique de l'École au défi des jeunes issus de l'immigration», in Y., Lenoir, C. Xypas, C. Jamet (dir.), *École et citoyenneté : un défi multiculturel*, Paris, Armand Colin, 2006, pp. 223–235.

Eric Mutabazi Eric Mutabazi is a senior lecturer, vice-dean, and member of the LIRFE research team at the Western Catholic University. He holds a doctorate in Educational Sciences and serves as an associate researcher at the University of Haute-Alsace (LISEC EA 2310) as well as an international collaborator at the University of Quebec in Montreal (GREE). He has edited several issues of scientific journals, with a particular focus on the topic of citizenship, and is the author of seven books.

Nathanaël Wallenhorst is a Professor at the Catholic University of the West (UCO). He holds a dual Doctorate in Educational Sciences and Philosophy (first international co-supervised Ph.D.), and a dual Doctorate in Environmental Sciences and Political Science (second international co-supervised Ph.D.). He is the author of twenty-five books on politics, education, and anthropology in the Anthropocene. Together with Christoph Wulf, he is editor of the "Anthropocene—Humanities and Social Sciences" series at Springer-Nature and editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Anthropocene—Pluriversal perspectives* at Springer-Nature (Major Reference Work). He is a member of the Anthropocene Working Group (AWG) and he ran an IRN (International Research Network) "Education in the Anthropocene" for WERA (World Education Research Association).

Chapter 2
Thinking About Citizenship from the Perspective of the Forgotten

Fred Poche

Abstract This article proposes to think about citizenship from the perspective of the forgotten. By drawing on the tradition of *subaltern studies* and the notion of *empowerment*, it immediately situates citizenship in a political sense. Thinking in terms of the forgotten means thinking politically about the ways in which human existence is shared within a public space that necessarily constrains the private space of individual interests.

Keywords Second-class citizenship · Feeling of powerlessness · Subaltern studies

1 Introduction

Faced with the low level of citizen participation in public affairs, and the discreditation of politicians, institutions and, generally, authorities, many educators, who are social actors, find themselves particularly helpless. What benchmarks ought we to pass on to the younger generations, and what kind of society should we aim to establish? As Bernard Stiegler points out, the task is particularly demanding, today, because the "service" offered by cultural industries robs individuals of their time and takes care of children's education. This situation tends to produce disoriented, gregarious, impulsive youth—in other words, instinctual. Indeed, more than ever, young people in today's world find themselves over-informed and finally de-formed by cognitive and affective saturation (Stiegler 2006, p. 57). In view of this situation, it seems essential to teach young people—especially budding citizens—to pay attention to others, starting with the most disadvantaged; in other words, all those who are too often excluded from the *decision-making processes* directly concerning them. It is also necessary to provide tools to question the *context* and the *structures* that produce

This text was originally published in the book "*D'une citoyenneté empêchée à une éducation citoyenne*" edited by Nathanaël Wallenhorst and Eric Mutabazi, Lormont, Le Bord de l'eau, 2021.

F. Poche (✉)
Catholic University of the West (UCO), Angers, France
e-mail: fred.poche@wanadoo.fr

E. Mutabazi and N. Wallenhorst (eds.), *Second-Class Citizenship*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-82844-7_2

this reality. Taking account of the *marginalized*, the *subalterns* and the *minorities*, we believe, offers the opportunity to revivify our democracy.

I. Mistrust, Fear and Feeling of Powerlessness

Restoring the shine to citizenship requires working on the *imaginaries* that, today, get in the way of concern for the common good and of actively participating in the organization of society. On the contrary, the current modes of representation, which are driven les by *reason* than by *negative passions* (fear, despair, envy, regret or nostalgia, etc.), crystallize three types of phenomena which are mutually correlated: (1) *generalized mistrust*, (2) the *fear* of anything "other", and (3) the feeling of *powerlessness*.

In addressing the crisis facing *representative democracy*, it would be tempting to focus attention on the problem of mistrust solely on politicians. However, beyond the political field, we are witnessing a much broader phenomenon, corresponding to a generalized crisis of trust. Thus, we are suspicious, of *athletes*' performance, suspecting him of using performance-enhancing drugs. We also doubt that the *media* are telling us the truth, the word fading before the weight of the image whose reception oscillates between emotion and disbelief; the phenomenon of rumors spread widely "thanks" to new technologies is testament to this issue. Moreover, against a background of concern about purchasing power, *merchants* are accused of making profit on the backs of their customers. In *education*, at the first hint of disagreement between a teacher and a student, parents rush to defend their offspring and vociferously disagree with the teacher's methods; in some cases, the student themselves will attend a disciplinary hearing with an attorney in attendance. In the same sense, nursery managers receive requests from parents for the structure caring for their child to install cameras allowing them, during their lunch break at the workplace, to check whether "everything is going well". Retirement homes receive similar requests. Thus, the social and societal body is affected by the metastases of mistrust, radically extending the movement of de-institutionalization which has long been described by sociologists and social philosophers (Dubet and Martuccelli 1998, pp. 147–171). Let us also underline that the general crisis of trust also concerns individuals' relationship to themselves. Indeed, we have never talked so much about *lack of self-confidence.*

The logic of mistrust has been intensifying for several decades, in parallel with the death of *absolutes*, intangible truths, both scientifically and ideologically, and the growing mistrust of traditional authorities. In counterpoint, at the same time, we see the appearance of equally worrying forms of scientism or ideological dogmatism. Moreover, screens (televisions, computers, smartphones) have become the window through which citizens perceive the world. In this context, the most vulnerable express deep concerns: "*with all that we see and all that we hear*". However, what is seen and heard does not necessarily refer to the territory where people live, but to the images that constantly scroll before our eyes. Our contemporary condition becomes that of a practice that is half-voluntary and half-subjected: the *digital deterritorialization* (Poché 2014, pp. 83–87). It is *this* phenomenon which leads to a distortion between *space* (a modality of the mind) and *place* (a modality of corporeal existence).

In this context, we see the emergence of a culture of *passivity* that blocks the desire to participate—to take part in the life of the City. Such an inclination seems to correlate with two phenomena: (1) Firstly, society, permeated by neo-liberal logics, is tending to transform into a vast supermarket; each citizen is reduced to the role of *consumer of social life*. (2) Secondly, now more than ever, against the backdrop of globalization, we see the emergence of a feeling of *social impotence* that paralyzes the desire to act. On what basis is this generalized crisis of confidence developing? Why do citizens feel such a sense of social paralysis? Far from forming two parallel questions, the two phenomena are interlinked, against the backdrop of globalization.

Firstly, in terms of geopolitics, the fall of the Berlin Wall, for the peoples of the West, changed the way they perceive themselves and others. Indeed, real communism functioned as a scarecrow, enabling rulers to say: "It is undoubtedly difficult within our democracies, but when we look at the other side of the wall, we can only be satisfied with our situation". At the same time, mistrust of the East referred to the figure of the *enemy*. According to some political philosophers, opposition to an enemy is a condition for structuring, or federating, a people. The post-1989 period has significantly reshuffled the cards. The theory of the "clash of civilizations"[1] then replaced the old model by producing two things in the collective imaginaries: on the one hand, the *substantialization of cultural identities*, and on the other, a stronger mistrust of people from immigrant backgrounds. Let us also recall that, formerly, the danger, capable of generating fear, was clearly circumscribed in a particular territory (the communist countries). It was beyond our borders. However, the Gulf War, the attacks of September 11, 2001, in the United States, and, more recently, terrorism in various countries, including France, have reinforced the idea that the threat is ubiquitous. The enemy is no longer elsewhere, far away, but very close, and likely to manifest itself anywhere and at any time. Thus, at least in terms of social representations, the threat is disseminated within society, even going so far as to deconstruct the dichotomy of war and peace (Derrida and Habermas 2001, p. 133–196), which had previously been attached to matters of territoriality.

In this context, we are witnessing what could be called the *de-corporealization of society*, on at least two levels. On the one hand, we note the deterioration of the sense of belonging to a *community of destiny*, and of its correlate: concern for the common good. On the other hand, we note the difficulty, for adults, to *form a body* and to constitute a real educational community; while, at the same time, the cultural industry marks a real offensive on the level of "landmarks" and "values". Moreover, in this context, some people talk about the commodification of existence, or *reification* of life, or even a war against parents (West and Hewlett 1999). However, it is indeed the ability to feel a (social) body, to form a body, that allows for various forms of solidarity.

These various metamorphoses contribute to a feeling of collective impotence and, at the same time, allow the following contradiction to emerge. On the one hand, the State seems to exercise too much power in relation to citizens; or to put it differently, citizens have become too passive in relation to their own political system. They have

[1] For a critical approach to the question, see Poché, 2013.

lost the means to truly influence it and no longer think that voting will change their existence. Many, then, choose the path of abstention. Those who do cast a ballot do so mostly to avoid a candidate, or express anger, rather than out of conviction for a particular program. On the other hand, today we see the emergence of a State that is somewhat powerless in the face of the global economy. The normally sovereign people then become, in turn, unable to influence their government, their ministers, or, more broadly, their political representation, which itself no longer has much power over the course of events (Balibar 1998). Étienne Balibar warns us that such a situation brings us closer to fascism. For citizens who feel powerless and who, at the same time, fear the impotence of the state ask it to "take visible *security measures*, to institute something like *apartheid*, in whatever form and under whatever name it presents itself (national preference is one) in order to ensure that they are always "on the right side"—that the victims, the poor (…) is not them, it is *the others*. They implicitly ask a question of the kind: *who* does the state prefer? *To whom does the state belong?* and *Who* has influence over its decisions, who can get a response from it that is precisely a preference? Who are the chosen ones, and who are the damned" (Balibar 1998, p. 112–123).

II. **Trust, Courage and Power to Act**

Our society marked by discomfort (Ehrenberg 2012), summed up in three terms—*mistrust*, *fear* and *feeling of powerlessness*—thus allows the emergence of social pathologies capable of jamming the democratic machine. What should be done?

If the societal body proves to be sick, perhaps it would be beneficial to look at how certain care practices can shed light on a new *ethos* of citizenship. Such is, in any case, the author's hypothesis. In this sense, we would probably benefit from learning the lessons of certain intuitions developed, in the past, by the methods of institutional psychotherapy. In the view of psychiatric thinkers, indeed, it is the hospital that heals the patient, rather than the individual doctor. In line with this thinking, it is ridiculous to try to treat hospitalized patients if the *institution* itself is unwell. It is therefore appropriate to constantly question the power relations and structures that lead to pathological relationships. As the institution heals the patient, it is in its power relations that the therapeutic function lies.

Politically this time, the return of a culture of *trust*, of *overcoming fear* and of the capacity (cf. François Prouteau, in this present volume) to *take control of one's existence* calls for the constant search for human relationships inhabited by the concern for cooperation and carried by a *genuine atmosphere* constantly reinvented. Recall, in this regard, that the prefix *amb-* does not mean "what surrounds", but rather: "on both sides" (right and left). The verb *ambire* carries the idea of the movement of both arms during a warm embrace (Thibaud 2012, p. 157). This notion of protection and benevolence aligns with the desire to create positive and humanizing connections. Promoting a genuine atmosphere in all interactional spaces would contribute to restoring the taste for participation in the construction of our society.

In the same vein, empowering the marginalized, the subalterns, the minorities, is not only about allowing them to take their place, but also about being attentive to their perspective on our society and creating a climate of trust, an atmosphere conducive

to the valorization of everyone's talents. As the psychiatrist Lucien Bonnafé once pointed out, the way a society treats the mad is a measure of its degree of civilization, and this deserves to be extended to many categories: *the elderly, children, immigrants, those living in working-class neighborhoods, the psychologically fragile,* etc.

Regaining self-confidence and trust in others, which is a necessary path for an active and joyful citizen's life, requires experimenting with one's abilities to engage in a dynamic of participation and action. However, such an approach, which is referred to in the literature as *empowerment*, requires taking the question of power seriously (Tilman and Grootaers, 2014). The first facet of this, understood as having "*power over*", corresponds to the control that an individual or a group has over areas of reality; such as having control over one's own existence. We then move from a state of subordination, dependence and submission to a position of greater mastery of a particular context. This is about the effective exercise of power. The second facet, perceived as "*power to*", refers to the ability for a person, or a group, to make decisions, "to set off, to solve problems or to take actions. This is about the ability to act in which the intellectual and motivational dimensions occupy an essential place" (*Ibid*.). The third refers to "*inner power*"—in other words, to self-image, and more specifically to self-esteem. "This is about the 'capital' of self-confidence that allows the individual to dare to dream of changes for himself and for others and to imagine himself capable of influencing his life" (*Ibid*.). Finally, we can talk about the "*power with*", which "refers to the implementation of values of solidarity and their translation into the life of a collective. This is about the ability to create a 'we' that perceives itself as a full-fledged social actor" (*Ibid*.).

Of course, this work on the valorization of citizens' *abilities* and *power*—especially those who are usually the furthest removed from decision-making spaces—requires attention to the type of society that we wish to promote. However, for years, many social actors regret that policies no longer propose a societal project. It is true that in the era of global space–time, it seems totally impossible to think of a country as a closed-off and autonomous reality. The *processes of dematerialization of the economy*, *international tensions*, *migrations*, and *pollution* demonstrate clearly that different nations are interdependent. Nevertheless, the way of designing coexistence at the scale of France, and at a European level, requires a certain idea of the *society* we want to build and the types of *connections* we wish to promote. Then, the question arises of which model to choose. Let us consider four, only the last of which meets the criteria of a decent democracy: the *individualistic* society, the *authoritarian* society, the *communitarian* society, and the society of *mutual attention*.[2]

In the first model, individuals are encouraged to develop personal initiatives and to *take responsibility*: each person being—for better or worse—responsible for their own fate. Any attempt to understand the difficulty or the deviations of this or that group of citizens is then qualified as a "culture of excuse" and thus considered as relieving individuals of responsibility for their actions. Incidentally, this dismissal overlooks the fact that the family, the social context, through which the individual

[2] Here, I draw inspiration from Généreux, while developing my own ideas (Généreux, 2009, p. 280 *et seq.*).

discovers society and takes their place in it, also constitute the humus in which the limits of the possible, the desirable and the thinkable are rooted (Lahire 2016, p. 106). The limit of this model lies in the fact of thinking about the connection between citizens as being a simple juxtaposition of sensible citizens, each one being solely and uniquely responsible for their own existence.

The second model gives an important place to authority, both at different levels of the State and within various institutions. However, this authority representing the community of destiny implies the necessity, for individuals, to renounce their particular affiliations in order to manifest that of the societal "great family": the homeland. Thus, in the name of necessary national solidarity, citizens are asked to faithfully follow the decisions of an expert authority considered to be concerned with the general interest and security. At this level, citizenship consists of reproducing, repeating or maintaining the modes of operation decreed by a pyramidal power. The main danger of this model is to think of connection as a form of *massification of citizens*, with each and to confine all individuals to imaginaries of reproduction which are never questioned. At this level, the individual no longer stands at a distance from himself. He merges into a whole. He adheres, without critical thinking, to the values, representations and ways of life of his society. Thus, citizens become an impersonal passive mass, without openness to otherness.

The third model strongly values intracommunity relations: religious, ethnic, etc. The idea is that integration into society and the structuring of individuals necessarily require the existence of particular communities. For economic and/or political reasons, contacts exist with other communities, but the relations remain only instrumental or functional. In this model, the type of "being with" risks confining individuals in certain modes of representation, ways of living or thinking in total fusion with their group. We then conceive of the connection within the framework of *identity closure* which causes genuine *societal fragmentation.*

Finally, the last model aims to orient *coexistence* in an approach that values attention to others—especially to those most in difficulty. The aim of such a posture is not to advance the community of destiny through *generalized competition* but through *cooperation*, understood in the form of the *complementarity*, *reciprocity* and *mutuality*. This approach holds that we should value the abilities of citizens, and pay *attention* to the need for care. It thus encourages *responsibility* (valuing and not blaming) by highlighting individual and collective abilities, irrigates micro-politics that, without evading conflict, values *kindness* in human relationships. Finally, it encourages all forms of attention to the perspective that the most disadvantaged have on society. The *society of mutual attention* strives, moreover, to maintain and encourage *links* between individuals within groups and communities, but also outside of their groups. This promotes the questioning of what is taken for granted, and the emergence of imaginaries capable not only of maintaining the very substance of society, but also of inventing new ways of producing *meaning* together. Sensitive to *environmental*, *social* and *subjective* ecology (Guattari 1989), this dynamic strives to attach value to "sociodiversity" as much as to produce free, attentive and imaginative subjects.

To move towards a *society of attention*, it is important to value and encourage practices of *popular education* in different social spaces. Thinking about citizenship from the perspective of the forgotten thus leads to developing another way of *producing the commons* and of "making society".[3] Such an approach is not just a simple utopian ideal, but is posed as a practical requirement—an experience that needs to be developed within the different strata of society.

2 The Lesson of the *Subaltern Studies* for Politics of the Forgotten

A few decades ago, in India, a critical current of nationalist and anti-colonial historiography developed, aiming to highlight the voices and historical capacity of those on the losing side decolonization; in this case, peasants, women, the caste of untouchables, the marginalized, the subalterns. This attention given to the "voiceless" and the "powerless" could enrich our own perspective to rethink citizenship, in France, with the forgotten finally included. The analysis of the researchers of the Subaltern Studies Group was, indeed, part of a broad reflection that took shape at the end of the 1960s, gained structure in the 1970s, and then, especially, came into its own in the following decade. It was, precisely, about shifting intellectual attention from the ruling classes and high culture to the ways in which *popular cultures* adjust and reinvent themselves in situations of exploitation and repression. This way of approaching the question was marked by the works of Edward Palmer Thompson on the English working class which aimed to approach "history from below" (Diouf 1999, p. 21; Thompson 2012). *Subaltern studies* sought to produce historical analyses that take account of subaltern groups as subjects of history. Historians involved in this approach preferred the term *subaltern*, used by the Italian philosopher Antonio Gramsci (1891–1939), to "class". This is because, in their work, they spoke of people who, of course, are part of economically disadvantaged classes, but who, in their daily lives as well, find themselves subject to direct relationships of domination and subordination. Moreover, these researchers opposed nationalist historians who portrayed nationalist leaders as "modern" and described the peasant mentality as "backward". On the contrary, for subaltern historians, the "peasant" was not a pre-political individual, but a subject who has always been political (Chakrabarty 2006, p. 34).

It is in his *Prison Notebooks*—a text written under the fascist government of Mussolini—that Gramsci uses the term "subaltern". He then aims to account for non-hegemonic groups or classes. The philosopher uses this term in particular to refer to unorganized groups of peasants located in the south of Italy. These peasants

[3] The quotation marks highlight the ambiguous nature of the phrase "making society", because while citizens are called upon to contribute to the development of society, it always pre-exists them. In other words, it is probably less about "making society" – a phrase relevant to the (liberal) theory of the social contract – than about agreeing to contribute to a history that has already begun. This remark is in keeping with Labbé's symbol theory (1998).

had no social or political consciousness, but were found to have potential for action. The category of *subaltern*[4] was intended to shed light on practices of domination and resistance outside of the framework of class struggle, but without ignoring the notion of class itself. It was meant to avoid the pitfalls of economic reductionism in which some Marxists were trapped, while continuing to take account of the notions of domination and exploitation. Thus, Gramsci used the word *subaltern* to question the Marxist emphasis on the economy and the urban proletariat. It was then a matter of taking the problems of *culture* and *self-awareness* seriously (Gopal 2006, p. 232).

In a context of globalization in which the most disadvantaged citizens seek spaces in which they are given attention and respect, an interpretation focused solely on the economic issue would be unsatisfactory. Indeed, the various realities that make up the digital revolution, the emergence of cybercitizenship, the intersection of cultures, migrations, the issue of the raw memories of colonization and also the emergence of individuals experiencing a certain "fatigue of being oneself" (Ehrenberg 2000) mean a multifactorial reading becomes absolutely essential.[5] Such an approach proves particularly fundamental in the field of education. Moreover, when we fear that solidarity, civility and respect for others are losing ground, or when we wish to get citizens out to the polling stations, we invoke civic education. Thus, with this approach, it is a matter of instilling basic rules of life in society and teaching future citizens their rights, as well as their duties.

However, in such a logic, shaping citizens constitutes a separate activity; with a subject, a program, and a schedule that are removed from activities leading to integration into professional, associative or family life. However, as John Dewey shows, it seems important, not to focus on specialized education at the level of public legislation, national history, morality or civics, but to promote education instituting that students must participate, through experience, in the development of their schooling, in order to train them to *live in society.* The challenges of the civic participation of the forgotten, then, require a *consideration of the complexity of reality*, a *change of perspective* and the development of *new imaginaries* specific to re-establishing the desire for a joint production of harmony. They also require a concern for concrete education in the effective practice of solidarity. While the task may prove demanding, it appears, however, to carry a full range of possibilities.

References

Balibar, E., *Droit de cité, Culture et politique en démocratie,* La Tour-d'Aigues, L'Aube, 1998.
Chakrabarty, D., « Quelle histoire pour les dominés ? » *Sciences humaines*, n°175, octobre 2006.
Derrida, J, Habermas, J., *Le «concept» du 11 septembre* : Dialogues à New York (octobre-décembre 2001), présentés et commentés par Giovanna Borradori, Paris, Galilée, 2001.

[4] The Italian term *subalterno*, as used by Gramsci, can be translated as "subordinate" or "dependent".

[5] Obviously, such a statement does not aim to minimize the importance of the economic system and its impact on human relations, but to articulate it with all the other dimensions mentioned and to think about it anew from a rehumanized perspective. On this question, see Passet, 2010.

Diouf, A., « Entre l'Afrique et l'Inde : sur les questions coloniales et nationales. Ecriture de l'histoire et recherches historiques », in A. Diouf (dir.), *L'historiographie indienne en débat. Colonialisme, nationalisme et sociétés postcoloniales,* (Sous la direction de Mamadou Diouf), Paris, Karthala/ Amsterdam, Sephis, 1999, p. 18–28.
Dubet, F., Martuccelli, D., *Dans quelle société vivons-nous ?*, Paris, Seuil, 1998.
Ehrenberg, A., La fatigue d'être soi. Dépression et société, Paris, Odile Jacob, 2000.
Ehrenberg, A., *La société du malaise*, Paris, Odile Jacob, 2012.
Gopal, P., « Lire l'histoire subalterne », in N. Lazarus (dir.), *Penser le postcolonial. Une introduction critique*, Paris, Amsterdam, 2006, p. 229–258.
Guattari, F., *Les trois écologies*, Paris, Galilée, 1989.
Lahire, B., *Éloge de la sociologie. Pour en finir avec une prétendue « culture de l'excuse*, Paris, La Découverte, 2016.
Passet, R, *Les grandes représentations du monde et de l'économie à travers l'histoire*, Paris, Les liens qui libèrent, 2010.
Poché, F., « Deterritorialization, globalization and citizenship », *Concordia. Internationale Zeitschrift für Philosophie*, n°66, 2014, p. 83–87.
Stiegler B, & Ars Industialis, *Réenchanter le monde. La valeur esprit contre le populisme industriel,* Paris, Flammarion, 2006.
Tilman, F., Grootaers, D., «L'empowerment ! De quoi s'agit-il ?», *Le grain, atelier de pédagogie sociale*, https://www.legrainasbl.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=461:l-empowerment-de-quoi-s-agit-il&catid=9&Itemid=103.
Thibaud, J.-P., «Petite archéologie de la notion d'ambiance», *Communications*, n°90, 2012, p. 155–174.
Thompson, E. P., *La formation de la classe ouvrière anglaise*, Paris, Seuil, 2012, tr. fr.
West, C., Hewlett, S. A., *The War Against Parents : What We Can Do for America's Beleaguered Moms and Dads*, Mariner Books, 1999.

Fred Poche is a Professor of contemporary philosophy at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of UCO, a full member of RPpsy, "Research in Psychopathology and Psychoanalysis", EA 4050. Latest publications: *The Condition of the* "*Nomads*". *From internment to the question of hospitality* (with C. Leblanc and J.-F. Petit, Strasbourg, PUS, 2020); *The Crossed Failure* (with V. Margron, Paris, Albin Michel, 2020); *The Discontent* (Lyon, Social Chronicle, 2019); *An ethic of living together. The social philosophy of Cornel West* (Lyon, Social Chronicle, 2017); *The Culture of the Other. A postcolonial reading of Emmanuel Levinas* (Lyon, Social Chronicle, 2015); *The Time of the Forgotten. Remaking Democracy* (Lyon, Social Chronicle, 2014).

Chapter 3
Homeless People: Citizens in a Situation of Sub-citizenship?

Marianne Trainoir and Bertrand Bergier

Abstract This article presents several ways of analyzing the question of the political and social citizenship of homeless people. Although homelessness and citizenship have historically been considered mirror twins (Two sides of the same coin), legislators are gradually working to address this issue. However, this legal metamorphosis does not put an end to the correlations between the concrete conditions that homeless people experience and a hindered experience of political and social citizenship. There are many sheltering and supporting organizations, all of which have a differing view of homeless people's citizenship, and implement very different practices when it comes to supporting their civic life. Thus, while the "participation of the people" is at the center of the concerns, this form of supervised citizenship can paradoxically contribute to confinement in a "diminished world". Street people are then confined to "second-class citizenship situations", although the law affirms that they are full citizens.

Keywords Street people · Sub-citizenship

1 Introduction

The aim of this article is to explore the repercussions—on the political and social citizenship—of the concrete conditions in which homeless people exist, and the responses provided by the various structures available, particularly from the perspective of user participation and the consideration of their individual and collective

This text was originally published in the journal *Bildungsforschung,* No. 3, released in 2020, edited by Eric Mutabazi and Nathanaël Wallenhorst.

M. Trainoir (✉)
Rennes 2 University, Rennes, France
e-mail: marianne.trainoir@univ-rennes2.fr

B. Bergier
Catholic University of the West, Angers, France

E. Mutabazi and N. Wallenhorst (eds.), *Second-Class Citizenship*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-82844-7_3