



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

HOMENAJE A ALEKSANDAR IVANOV KATRANZHEV
Y NIKOLAY POPOV

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Enero / Marzo

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Ruropa del Este

Dr. Alekzandar Ivanov Katrandhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Rumyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

*Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal*

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

**REVISTA
INCLUSIONES**
REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu
Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia
Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

**CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA
EDITORIAL**

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques
Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez
Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción

BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

Hellenic Academic Libraries Link

HEAL LINK

Σύνδεσμος Ελληνικών Ακαδημαϊκών Βιβλιοθηκών

CONTEMPORARY CITIZENSHIP - HISTORICAL PREREQUISITES AND PERSPECTIVES

Ph. D. Boris Manov

South-West University “Neofit Rilski”, Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria
bmanov@swu.bg

Fecha de Recepción: 14 de octubre de 2019 – **Fecha Revisión:** 12 de noviembre de 2019

Fecha de Aceptación: 16 de diciembre de 2019 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de enero de 2020

Abstract

The study is conducted through the philosophical-methodological approach of the unity of logical and historical. On this basis, it is argued that the concept of citizenship is a unity of discontinuity and continuity. The discontinuity is expressed in the existence of several historical stages in the concepts of citizenship: antiquity, medieval, modern, and postmodern (“relative discontinuity”). The continuity is ensured by bringing out the “invariant” essence of the concept (and phenomenon) citizenship. That is why the study starts with the presentation of the concept of citizenship in its current, “modern” form and on this basis it is tracked its “becoming” in history.

Keywords

Citizen – Citizenship – Postmodern society – Globalization – Virtualization

Para Citar este Artículo:

Manov, Boris. Contemporary citizenship - historical prerequisites and perspectives. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial Enero-Marzo (2020): 104-124.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



PH. D. BORIS MANOV

Introduction

Even the glimpse of the views of citizenship and civic education, as well as of the existing practice, shows that there are substantial differences in their theoretical coverage and realization in the life of society. This article, without neglecting the importance of a thorough study of the problem, focuses on some under-clarified aspects of citizenship, both historically and up-to-date.

The starting methodological prerequisite for the study is the assumption that it is necessary, notwithstanding the existing apparent “clarity”, to use no “default”, but to provide a theoretical and empirical reasoning for the essence and content of the notions defining “the framework” of the “citizenship” problem.

The study is conducted through the philosophical-methodological approach of the unity of logical and historical¹. On this basis, it is argued that the concept of citizenship is a unity of discontinuity and continuity. The discontinuity is expressed in the existence of several historical stages in the concepts of citizenship: antiquity, medieval, modern, and postmodern (relative “discontinuity”). The continuity is ensured by bringing out the “invariant” essence of the concept (and phenomenon) citizenship. That is why the study starts with the presentation of the concept of citizenship in its current, “modern” form and on this basis it is tracked its “becoming” in history.

Citizen and Citizenship

The concept of citizen and citizenship, which, after the time of “classical” antiquity and Western European enlightenment, at the end of the last and the beginning of this century, acquired a new and extraordinary topicality, is a complex, contradictory and “contested conception”². This fact is predetermined by cognitive - philosophical, political, legal, ethical, etc., as well as by practical - historical, political, constitutional-legal, moral, religious, ethnic, geopolitical, preconditions. This implies the existence of different, including mutually exclusive, concepts of these notions and phenomena. It can be assumed that their “invariant” characteristic, coming from antiquity, is the association with “membership in the political community”. It gives certain rights, but also gives rise to certain obligations to this community³.

Ancient citizenship

The “general” philosophical basis of the ancient understanding of citizenship is assumed by the cosmological-theological paradigm that dominated the antiquity. It is expressed in the notion that socio-political is a native-inherent component of the natural

¹ Here I would like to emphasize that the present text is an attempt to explore the problem area of citizenship through the prism of “political philosophy” not through the prism of “the political science”, “the sociology” or “the theory of education” as the dominant of the publications on this topic. Moreover, unlike the many “reps” of one or another type of existing views on citizenship, the analysis is carried out on the “empiric” basis of authentic historical texts, which implies the frequent and comparatively “long” quotes in it.

² Grazhdanstvoto – edna osporvana kontseptsiya. Under construction-7.indd, Posobie po evropeysko gragdanstvo (Sofiya: Informatsionen tsentar na Saveta na Evropa, 2003), 39-40.

³ Citizenship, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, First published Fri Oct 13, 2006; substantive revision, Mon, Jul 17, 2017, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/citizenship/>

entity. That is why the forms through which it exists, one of which is the state, are not the result of “creation” or “foundation” but are manifestations of the natural cosmic order that determines the existence of the surrounding world as a whole. The specific reason for the emergence of the state is the natural need to bring people together in a specifically organized community. This community makes it possible to meet the varied needs that every single person can not satisfy. On this basis, the concept of polis (city-state), which is considered as the highest social community, is formulated. Polis is a union that is not only different, but even the opposite of other known communities - the family and the village. This is because, while the village and the family exist because of the physical survival of individuals, the polis has a completely different purpose - to secure a life that man is fit to live for, “human life for man”. This conception of the nature of the state predetermines the perception of the ultimate goal and the meaning of politics - the attainment of the common good. A state exists not to favor “separate parts of the people” but to provide a “good” or “happy and virtuous life” to all “citizens” of the polis.

These paradigmatic-philosophical ideas are expressed as a complete conception by Plato and Aristotle. Plato's views of “citizen” and “citizenship” are set out in the “Republic”, the “Laws” and the “Stateman”, and Aristotle's in “Politics” and “Nicomachean Ethics”, as well as in other writings. Defining Antiquity, however, is the understanding of Aristotle, which is in “Politics”. Here he categorically links citizenship and the citizen with the polis (the “city-state”)⁴.

Aristotle's starting point is to consider man as a “political animal”, ie. a being whose nature is best realized in and through life in the polis. “Composed by a few villages, a community that has been completed”, writes Aristotle, “is the state which, so to speak, has already reached the limit of total self-sufficiency and has arisen because of the preservation of life, but exists to live well. From here, it becomes clear that the state is a natural thing, and that man is a social being in nature, and that who lives outside the state because of his nature, not by circumstances, or is standing below or surpassing the ordinary man... Whoever can not live in community or does not need anything because of his ability to satisfy his own needs is not part of the state, so he is either an animal or a god”⁵.

The “political” nature of man manifests, according to Stagirit, in his “existence” as a citizen. This implies a “circular” interconnection between the “city” (the polis) and the “citizen”, in which one can not speak of the primacy of one against the other - they mutually suppose and construct one another. According to him, if the state “is a community of citizens living under a state structure” it is clear “that we must first examine the citizen because the state represents a certain number of citizens. So we have to look at who we should call a citizen and what the citizen is, because about the citizen also has a disagreements - not everyone calls the citizen the same person”⁶.

The dependence of the citizen (and citizenship) on his (their) association with the polis is multi-aspect, which implies the ambiguity pointed out by Aristotle in his (their)

⁴ Here it should be pointed out the relationship between the notions of polis, politics and citizen - the latter two are “derived” from the first: polis (city-state) - politics (politeia) - citizen (polites). A relationship that determines citizenship and perceptions of citizenship not only in antiquity but also in their entire history to the nowadays.

⁵ Aristotel, Politika (Sofiya: Otvoreno obshtestvo, 1995), 5-6.

⁶ Aristotel, Politika... 63.

understanding. Both in historical and theoretical terms, two main strands can be drawn in this connection:

- a.- From the position of “the law” who is (who has the right to be) a “citizen” of the polis;
- b.- From the position of “participation” in the life of the polis, ie. in political aspect - the realization of the individual as “zoon politikon”⁷.

Citizenship from the position of “the law”

As stated in the literature⁸, from the standpoint of the “law of ancient citizenship it is characteristic that it is “exclusive” - not every person who is living in the state is its “citizen”. In “Politics’s” “Third Book”, Aristotle elaborates on this aspect of citizenship. He states that citizenship can be acquired in two ways. At the first one “defines as a citizen one to whom both parents are citizens, not just one”. There are also policies that have more requirements – “for two, three or more ancestors citizens”. The other way to acquire citizenship is to “obtain citizenship”. In this case, a non-citizen must become a citizen. This can be done differently. One of the most common is “as a result of a change of state government” or through recognition of “conditional” citizenship. Such cases existed with respect to the so-called “metics”. Although Aristotle himself was a “metic” in Athens, this second method is, according to him, quite controversial, and therefore it can be accepted with serious doubt as to its lawfulness⁹.

Citizenship as “unconditional” or “political” citizenship

That is why Stagirth sees as his main task finding “unconditional” citizenship. Only legal grounds are not available here, whether citizenship is inherited or “granted”. This is because “the citizen is a citizen, not because he lives in one place (both the metics and the slaves have the same residence)”. Citizens are not in the full sense and “the women, the children who, because of their age, have not yet been enrolled in civic lists, and the elderly people who are released from civic obligations”¹⁰. The legal status of citizenship is the “first degree” of true citizenship. This is because those who hold it acquire a new social status. They are the subjects of the whole life of the polis. Economic life - for example, they are “users” of municipal property, including municipal land. Religious life - the priests are recruited from them, they can participate fully in religious rituals. But participation in political life is crucial. It is in this plan that Aristotle brings out as a defining characteristic of citizenship the opportunity to participate in “power” in the polis. Citizens are citizens in terms of their involvement in the affairs of the state (to participate in decision-making and control their compliance) - ie. in government and court. „This makes it clear who the citizen is” he points out. This is the citizen “who has the right to participate in the council and the courts”. We “call him a citizen of the country”. And by “state” we call “the multitude of these citizens enough for independent life”. The conclusion he draws is: “Such is the concept of “citizen” that is appropriate for all, called citizens”¹¹.

⁷ This “division” remains lasting in history, passing through various manifestations and interpretations. I will try to show in the article that, despite its ambiguous interpretation, it preserves its lawfulness today. This position is particularly strong in relation to “education” in citizenship. On the issue of “education” in citizenship See. B. Manov, “Gragdanskata obrazovanost – tsel na obrazovaniето v aktivno gragdanstvo”, *Filosofia*, num 1 (2019): 50-75.

⁸ I. B. Fan, “Antichnaye modeli grazhdanstva”, www.ifp.uran.ru/files/publ/eshegodnik/2002/6.pdf

⁹ Aristotel, *Politika*... 65-66.

¹⁰ Aristotel, *Politika*... 64.

¹¹ Aristotel, *Politika*... 64.

However, according to Aristotle, it is the citizen who is actively involved in public affairs and in state affairs. This is because the “right” to be a citizen and the “opportunity” to participate in power are not enough. The “right” gives rise to obligations. They require the “opportunity” to become “reality”. This can be done by involving citizens in the political as well as in the whole life of the polis (the city-state).

This position is predetermined by the philosophical conception of the supreme purpose and the meaning of politics - the attainment of the common good. A state exists to benefit not “individual sections of the people” but to provide a “good” or “happy and virtuous life” to the “all citizens” of the polis. This is because it is “clear” that “the best polity must be that in which everyone is well and lives most blissfully”¹². The virtuous life of the citizen is achieved through observance of moral values and norms. Citizenship presupposes and requires a certain moral appearance. It has as a leading feature the preservation of the honor of being a citizen of the polis. This must be achieved by all actions in political life - when participating in government, in court, in other social activities. Of particular importance is the inclusion in the troops and in hostilities. Loss of honor (“dishonor”) is tantamount to losing “citizenship”. It means depriving yourself of the “right” and “status” of being a “citizen”. Therefore, following his “teacher” Plato¹³, Aristotle builds his own model of the “ideal state”. In this model, one of the main characteristics is the presence of “virtuous” citizens. This is because “the best way of life - both individually and in general for the states - is one that is associated with virtue in such a way as to enable virtuous actions”¹⁴. Aristotle views “virtue” as the unity of knowledge and action of the citizen for the sake of the good of the community of citizens in the polis. The following points are important here: a) the essence of virtue “in general” is “the simultaneous synthesis of high moral qualities”, it is the “criterion and norm of human behavior” and also the “ideal of a person's vital position”¹⁵; b) civic virtue is a specific manifestation of the “ideal”. It is a transformation of the “moral position” into an „act” that is realized in the life of the political community. This act is “beneficial” not only to the „citizen” but to the whole community; c) civic virtue is “variable” in nature as well as historically. Aristotle says “Since there are several types of state apparatus, the virtue of a good citizen is not a single one, and he does not have the virtue of a good man at all, which is one and only perfect. Everyone must have the virtue of a good citizen, but not everyone can have that of the good man... The virtue of a good citizen is to be able to govern and obey”¹⁶. The outlined features in Plato and Aristotle's views express the essence of the ancient conception of citizen and citizenship, including of “Roman” antiquity. And here, despite the existence of many, some of which - significant, historical differences and specifics, citizenship is associated with the city (state)¹⁷. It manifests itself in two plans - the legal (the right to be a citizen of Rome - *jus civitatis Romanus*) and the political - the actual participation in the

¹² Aristotel, Politika... 197.

¹³ Plato has consistently defended the position that a true citizen of an “ideal” state can only be a “virtuous” member of the state. This is especially true of the “guards” - the most important ingredient of the citizens of an ideal state. They “must be careful masters of the freedom of the state; they have to start from childhood in order to become masculine, sensible, pious, free and with all such qualities”. Platon, Darzhavata (Sofiya: Nauka i izkustvo, 1981).

¹⁴ Aristotel, Politika... 197.

¹⁵ R. Valcheva, “Dobrodetelta – izraz na moralno savarshenstvo”, Kultura (2006) <https://valtcheva.com>

¹⁶ Aristotel, Politika... 70.

¹⁷ For more on the nature and specifics of citizenship in ancient Rome, M. Weber, Citizenship in Ancient and Medieval Cities. The Citizenship Debates, Gershon Shafir (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

rule of the city-state (*civitas*). Participation is done as a “*res publica*” - a matter for the common good. It requires respect for the high moral standards of a valiant citizen - freedom, equality, personal honor and dignity. The readiness to protect society and the state from external threats, including by joining the army, which for many years is a privilege only for the citizens of Rome, is particularly emphasized (*civis Romanus*)¹⁸.

Medieval citizenship

In late Rome, a number of changes took place that formed the basis for a gradual transition to a new type of citizenship - the citizenship of the Middle Ages¹⁹. It is mainly the result of two interrelated fundamental factors: first, the transformation of Rome into a world empire. It determines the complete concentration and centralization of power in the emperor; the second was the imposition of Christianity as the only official religion in the empire. The overall result is a change in status for the Romans: they became subjects of the empire instead of its citizens. Historically, this process has three relatively separate stages. The first covers the period of the late empire and is mainly related to the establishment of supreme authority of the emperor. In the second, the “whole building” of the medieval political model, including the medieval “citizenship” (“subjection”), was built. The third is the period of the late Middle Ages, in which, though with many difficulties, a new model of “citizenship” was established - the citizenship of the medieval city. It has the hallmarks of a “classic” medieval model, but it lays the foundations for the emergence of a new model - the model of the citizen of “Modern times”.

The process of asserting centralized imperial authority began as early as Octavian. It was strengthened after the adoption of the Constitution of Antonin (Edict of Caracalla) in 212 AD. It acknowledged, with few exceptions, the right of citizenship of all free members of the empire. The centralization of power reached its totality during the reign of Diocletian and Constantine the Great. Antonin's “extension” of citizenship and the completion of the new structure of the “vertical” of power by Diocletian²⁰, led to a new legal status for the inhabitants of the Roman Empire - they became “subjects” (*subiectus*)²¹ of the empire and the emperor. The change is that, both legally and especially politically, „citizens” are

¹⁸ Virtue, the preservation of honor is a fundamental characteristic of a Roman citizen. Their loss is related to the partial or total loss of citizenship. Chr. Krastev, points out that the loss of Roman citizenship happens with the loss of freedom (*capitis deminutio maxima*). The reason for losing a citizen's freedom is his captivity by an enemy. Roman citizenship is also lost by the imposition of deportation (*deportation in insulam*, *relegation in insulam*). Decreasing the civil rights of a Roman citizen can be done by imposing the punishment *infamia*, the word means “bad fame, shame”. Krastev, Hr., *Grazhdanstvoto – tvorenie na darzhavata*, Praven pregled, 1/ 2007, s. 206-245,

¹⁹ The study defends the thesis that “citizenship” also exists in the Middle Ages, initially at least in its “juridical” manifestation and later in political manifestation - in the Western European medieval city. In the literature, the prevailing view is that “citizenship” has existed in antiquity and since the Enlightenment, or even only during modernity, because it is the „birth” of the “modern times” of liberal democracies that emerged after the 17th century, See: Pocock, J., *The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times*. H. Krastev, “*Grazhdanstvoto – tvorenie na darzhavata*”, Praven pregled, num 1 (2007): 206-245. <https://law.nbu.bg/download/departamenti/law/Publikacii/praven-pregled-2007.pdf>

²⁰ J. Pocock, *The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times*. *The Citizenship Debates*, Gershon Shafir (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

²¹ The etymology of the word comes from the Latin - *subiectus* - which is subordinate to the sovereign authority of the state, i.e., to the law and justice. H. Krastev, “*Grazhdanstvoto – tvorenie na darzhavata*”, Praven pregled, num 1 (2007): 206-245

gradually losing their rights and opportunities to participate in political life (their civic independence and pride - "Noli me tangere: civis romanus sum!"). The only "right" they "acquire" is the "right" to be "subordinate" to the series of "superiors" of the imperial bureaucracy, and ultimately to the "supreme" ruler and governor - the Roman emperor.

The centralization of power and the transformation of citizens into subjects takes on a new look with the adoption of Christianity in the empire by Constantine the Great. With the establishment of Christianity as the only official religion, the need arises for the formation of a new political doctrine. It should formulate the Christian doctrine's approach to politics and political authority in society. This is the doctrine of the divine origin of the state. It combines Greco-Roman and Biblical perceptions of the origin and tasks of the state. Also important are the views of the Church Fathers, especially those of Eusebius of Caesarea in the East and Blessed Augustine in the West.

The basic ideas of the doctrine of the divine origin of the state follow from the monotheism of the Christian doctrine of God as the creator of the world, man, society and political authority. According to this teaching, Christ is the "emperor" of both the heavenly and the earthly states, and emperors are his "representatives" on earth. This general view finds conflicting theological development and practical realization in the specific conditions of the Eastern and Western Churches.

The Eastern Model

In Eastern Orthodox Christianity, the idea of the divine nature of earthly power, the deification of Roman emperors, and the monotheistic-monarchical tradition coming from Judaism, which formulated the view of "one God - one people - one king", are united. This is how the notion (later called „Caesar-Papism“) is justified and developed, which presents the empire as "divine monarchy" and the emperor as "divine monarch". This conception presents the Christian emperor as an image of the reigning Christ, as the mediator between him and the people, as the bearer and expression of divine truth and divine law on earth. This leads to the formulation of the thesis "one God, one emperor, one empire". The emperor gains all political and spiritual authority. He became a supreme statesman and a high priest in the empire²². It unites the sacred and the secular, the moral and the political.

The Eastern Christian (Byzantine) political-theological ideal is formulated as a concept by Eusebius of Caesarea. It is most concentrated in the famous "Sixth Novel" by Emperor Justinian I the Great (527 - 565): "Two are the highest gifts" he writes, "that God has bestowed upon us in his love for man: the priesthood and imperial dignity. The first serves divine things, and the second directs and manages human affairs. ... If emperors rule their country rightly and wisely, there will be universal harmony and all good will be given to the human race"²³. Therefore, the emperor not only governs earthly affairs, but is also a guardian of the faith and a conduit of God's mercy to men, his "purpose" is "to do good". Imperial governance is not simply rule, but the "charismatic service of predestination" by the earthly viceroy chosen by God and the state (empire) is the image and "millennial" realization of the heavenly Kingdom of God on earth.

²² Zh. Dragon, *Imperatorat i sveshtenikat. Etyud varhu vizantiyskiya „tsezaropapizam“* (Sofiya: AGATA-A, 2006), 62.

²³ Y. Mayendorf, *Vizantiysko bogoslovie. Istoricheski nasoki i dogmaticheski temi* (Sofiya: Gal-Iko, 1995), 267-268.

This ideal underpinned the construction of the Second and later the Third Rome (Constantinople and Moscow, respectively). It is realized by giving priority to the state and power of the emperor. This trend is exacerbated after the Russian rulers proclaim themselves emperors (tsars) of all Orthodox Christians and affirm the autocracy and full subordination of the church to monarchical rule.

The Model of the Western Church

In the West, after the destruction of the Roman Empire, a contrarian concept of the relationship of the authorities (spiritual and secular) in the Christian world was created. The highlights of this concept are found in "The City of God". Aurelius Augustine formulates the concept of the two cities - earthly and God's. These two cities are based on fundamentally opposite values. The earthly city is "created out of love for oneself, reaching for contempt for God". The city of God exists "out of love for God, reaching for contempt for oneself". Therefore, "in the first the lust of power dominates, in the second - mutual love"²⁴.

This understanding predetermines Augustine's view of the real earth state. He identifies this country mainly with the Roman Empire, to which he has a markedly negative attitude. According to him, the only possible saving way for the existence of the real state is to promote the values of the Christian religion and to build the state as a Christian state. "If the earthly rulers and all their subjects" he points out, "if all the princes and earthly judges, if men and women, young and old, overseers and soldiers, people of all ages, if all those to whom the words sound of John the Baptist, together listening to and following the messages of the Christian religion for a dignified and virtuous life, then the human state would decorate the earthly world with harmony and achieve the eternal apogee of its glory."²⁵ A country can only become a new "earthly Jerusalem" if it goes this way. Her emperor must follow the path of the "new and eternal" King Christ²⁶. In this way, he will not be subject to the aspirations and values that govern the kings who are "worshippers of demons" and will achieve true happiness and success in building and managing the state.

This position of the Church Master leads to the idea of dividing the earthly communities and authorities - secular and sacred. It predetermines the primacy of the Church of Christ over the Christian state, the ecclesiastical (spiritual) authority over the secular. According to him, the overriding purpose of both the state and the ruler is to serve Jesus Christ and His church, in which the only path to their rule and salvation lies²⁷. Therefore, faithful service to God and ensuring the victorious progress of His church is the first and foremost duty of Christian rulers. This idea is the basis for the formulation of the concept of "Papal Caesarism", according to which the Pope is "Vicar of Jesus Christ, successor of St. Peter, the highest head of the Universal Church", in which he must focus both the supreme spiritual and and supreme secular authority. The main point is that the Christian rulers must submit to the authority of the Church and seek and obtain legitimacy of their authority from the Pope or his deputies.

²⁴ Avgustin Blazheni, Za Bozhiya grad, T. 1, XIV, 28 (Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Zahariy Stoyanov“, (2005). The quotations from Book Eleven, Chapter One, and the Next Books of "The City of God" are translated from Russian language by I. Iv. Manova. The Russian translation used is on the site of „Russian Humanitarian Internet University" at: http://www.i-u.ru/biblio/archive/avgustin_o/, - XIV, 28.

²⁵ Avgustin Blazheni, Za Bozhiya grad, T. 1, II, 21 (Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Zahariy Stoyanov“, 2005).

²⁶ Avgustin Blazheni, Za Bozhiya grad, T. 1, XVII, 3 (Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Zahariy Stoyanov“, 2005).

²⁷ Avgustin Blazheni, Za Bozhiya grad, T. 1, IV, 21 (Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Zahariy Stoyanov“, 2005).

This concept is only realized in Western Europe after the destruction of the Western Roman Empire. It was imposed through centuries of confrontation between the papal and secular authorities and determined the history of the Catholic world throughout the Middle Ages and many centuries after.

It should be noted, however, that both Eastern and Western political models condition, albeit in different ways and with different historical and temporal lengths, for the establishment of a “subjectional” model of citizenship in them. There are two defining points in it. First, it is the complete personal subordination of the individual to the “personality” of the ruler. From the local feudal lord, the boyar or “superior” to the “viceroy” of Christ on Earth - the emperor or the pope. The second point is the “doctrinal” rejection of “activity” in “this world” and the eschatological expectation of the Second Coming and “salvation” of life in the “Heavenly City” of the righteous.

The “citizenship” of the medieval city

In Western Europe, as early as the late Middle Ages, the overcoming of the “subjectional” model began. This is happening in a Western European city.

Cities in Western Europe began to emerge in the IX-X centuries mainly through the “revival” of already existing Roman cities. The main reason, as Max Weber points out, is economic²⁸. It became from a mostly political and administrative center into an economic center - initially a commercial one, and later a manufacturing one. Although it retains its connection with the dominant feudal system, the city gradually becomes separated from it - initially economically, and later culturally and politically. After the 12th century, it began to become more and more noticeable and intensely opposed to it. The main prerequisite for this process is the “independence” of the city's inhabitants. They are “free” “entrepreneurs” who, though difficult, are beginning to impose a new “behavioral” model. The model is not the passive expectation of salvation in the “beyond” world, but the reliance on one's own forces, the belief that one is able in this “world” to build a worthy life for himself and his fellow citizens.

The most important aspects of this process can be summarized in the following several: a) the medieval city, through the establishment of the workshop organization, becomes a strictly systematic and hierarchical “common workshop”, that ensures the economic and financial existence of its inhabitants; b) on this basis, it is possible to “transfer” education from monasteries to cities and to establish schools and universities; c) new “business” and “political” institutes are being set up - professional guilds, city councils, independent troops and law enforcement authorities, as well as city administration²⁹.

On this basis, the medieval man gradually began to turn from a “subject” to a “citizen”. He acquires the opportunity, the obligation and the habit to participate freely and actively in the overall life of the urban community. In the self-government of the city by

²⁸ Veber, M., “This means that in the Middle Ages, the bearers of “democracy” were entrepreneurs from the very beginning ... Medieval citizens were interested in income through peace trade and industry ... The political situation of the medieval citizen made him a *homo oeconomicus*, while in the Antiquity polis of its heyday has maintained its character of a highly developed technical military defense alliance. The ancient citizen was a *homo politicus*.” Antichnaya i srednevekovaya demokratiya. M. Veber, Antichnaya i srednevekovaya demokratiya, Gorod, gmarket.ru) Gumanitarnaya biblioteka.

²⁹ M. Weber, Citizenship in Ancient and Medieval Cities... 44-45.

participating in the elections of the city government and the judiciary. In decision-making by participating in workshops or city councils. In the defense and preservation of social order through the obligation, but also the “privilege”³⁰ to “self-arm” and join the army and to protect the independence of the city, the property and freedom of his family and his fellow citizens. In education, he creates, finances and defines the content of education and upbringing of the younger generation. The overall result of this process is the construction of a kind of “dignity” and “honor” of being a citizen as an independent and „equal” to the feudal “masters” a free, complete personality. This person is no longer subject to the “monarch” but to the laws and institutions he created and protected. Thus, though slow and contradictory, the preconditions are created and the transition to the citizenship of the Renaissance and Modernity takes place.

Modern citizenship

The philosophical and ideological underpinnings of the formation of a new understanding of citizenship are found in the socio-humanist paradigm that was established in the XV-XVII centuries. The socio-humanist paradigm in spatial terms emerges in a limited area of Europe. Initially in “Renaissance” Italy and “Protestant” Northwest. Later it covered the whole of Western Europe. It reaches total worldwide dominance in the age of the twentieth-century globalizing society. In establishing the new paradigm, there is a comprehensive transition in the development of European society. It affirms new social organization, way of life, social practice, thinking style and worldview of reality.

The major transformations associated with the formation of a new model of citizenship can be reduced to the following more important ones:

First, though a contradictory but radical rejection of the basic ideas at the previous stage in the socio-political and spiritual development of society. This rejection initially begins as a “revival” of ancient values, but results in the “overthrow” of the center of natural and human existence “from heaven to earth”. The thesis is formulated and affirmed that social structure and history are the result not of “cosmic” or “divine” predestination, but of the characteristics and mechanisms of existence and development inherent in human society.

Secondly, on this basis the position of “secularization” of European society is imposed. This position substantiates the theory and practice of distinguishing the “truths” of faith from the “truths” of reason, the “sacred” from the “secular”. It claims that there are “two” worlds - the “religious-spiritual” and socio-political worlds. The first is the world of a person's spiritual choice, the second - his community affiliation.

The third essential point is the placing of man in the “center of the universe”, the raising the idea of the “humane” nature of the existing. Man is no longer just an “image and likeness”, he is both the center and the pinnacle of the world. He, through his reason and action, spiritualizes being, creates that being.

Fourth, the socio-humanist paradigm substantiates the idea that the socio-political structure of society is an expression and result of a person's rational free willpower. One can and should build a political system that ensures the freedom and equality of people. It

³⁰ M. Weber, *Citizenship in Ancient and Medieval Cities...* 46.

must safeguard the tolerance, justice and security of each individual member of society and of society at large. Thus, politics and its most important manifestation - the state, like everything else in reality - becomes the result of human decisions. The extent to which one has created a “scientific” picture of the political and has mastered the secrets of the “art” of political government depends on the veracity and success of these decisions. This creates the conditions for the hegemony of man as a sovereign subject, as a “demiurge” of his own, individual and collective destiny, as well as the fate of the whole - inanimate and alive, terrestrial and cosmic - reality.

This paradigmatic and philosophical basis leads to the construction of a new model of citizenship, distinguished by two fundamental characteristics.

Nations in the modern state

The first characteristic relates to the affirmation of the nation as a socio-political substrate and a “collective entity” of the modern state. Belonging to a nation is an ontological fact for every individual. It determines his life path, place and role in ongoing social processes. This affiliation - a) is manifested in the formation of a specific national consciousness that affirms the „uniqueness” of one's own nation and state; - b) requires the full unity of the members of the nation; - c) leads to opposition to other nations and to the prevention of the inclusion of their representatives in the nation and the state. Thus, in its “pure”, “ideal” variant, citizenship in the modern “nation-state” is understood and realized as a contradictory unity of striving to impose a full “integration” of “natives” into the functioning of the state and to the fullest possible “isolation” of “foreigners”, where “citizens” are only “natives” and “foreigners” are not!

On this basis, a specific legal “framework” is created which defines the boundaries of the realization of citizenship in public life. Two fundamental alternative legal-political ideas are formulated. On the one hand, the idea of inalienable human rights and equality before the law of the citizens of the nation-state. On the other, the statement of the need to create a hierarchical legal system that includes a “written” universal law (constitution) and subsequent specific sectoral “codes” in the nation state that determine the political system and the public and private status of collective subjects and individuals in a state.

The more complete or partial implementation of these ideas in the practical life of society for about two centuries in Western Europe, and later in the United States, consolidates the system of liberal democracies. It requires the unity of the constitutional-legal regulation of the power relations in the state (rule of law, independence and mutual restraint of the authorities, decentralization and deployment of local self-government, etc.) and creation of conditions for democratic participation in the political processes in the state (consideration of the people (nation) as the supreme sovereign, the affirmation of the principles of “representative” participation in the legislature, the emergence of political parties and “civil” society, etc.). Thus, this system leads to the complete overcoming of the institute of “subjection” and the statute of the “subject” and to the formation of the institute of “modern” citizenship and the status of „modern” citizen. In this way, citizenship institutionalizes the place and role of individuals in the nation-state, dividing them into “citizens” and “non-citizens”. Citizens, as J. Habermas points out,³¹ are those who live in the state who “participate in the exercise of political domination”. This means that the

³¹ Yu. Habermas, *Grazhdanstvo i natsionalnaya identichnosty. Demokratiya. Razum. Nravstvennosty: Moskovskie lektsii i intervyyu* (Moskva: 1995), 211-213.

citizen in the nation-state is that member for whom the relevant legal framework is created, which enables him to be involved in political life, to participate directly or indirectly (through his representatives) in political decision-making and their realization in the life of society.

Freedom and activity in the modern state

The second basic characteristic of modern citizenship is manifested in the output of foregrounding of the “freedom” and “activity” of the citizen, his ability to create „himself” the social structures, institutions and mechanisms that enable him to realize himself as the “subject” of his being in history. The starting point for this is the formulation of new political ideologies that contain both “visionary” models for the future “best” political order and programs for specific political actions for the implementation of these models in the real life of society. Despite the apparent “diversity”, it can be assumed that two „basic” ideological concepts are emerging - liberalism and socialism. The theory and practice of liberalism substantiate and implement the concept of building a political system that guarantees the individual freedom of the citizen of the state - the political views of John Locke, Thomas Jefferson and the “founding” of the United States of America. Socialism (more broadly and with a number of specifics – communitarianism), raised the idea of equality and the priority of the “common good” - the political teachings of Karl Marx, Vladimir Lenin and the “historically” destined and inevitable “victory” of the socialist revolution in the Soviet Union.

This second, “activist” aspect of modern citizenship focuses on socio-political commitment and motivation (“internally” or “externally” determined) to be involved in society, to participate in the formulation and implementation of political programs for the development of the nation and the state. Citizenship is manifested in the affirmation of the understanding that the true citizen must build up (through education received mainly in the family and school, but also through self-education) virtues within himself. These virtues must be based on the requirements of the prevailing national moral traditions and norms and the established constitutional and legal provisions. They must build trust and loyalty to the existing political system and pride in belonging to their own nation. In doing so, they will motivate the citizen to actively participate in political processes and to build and function the state, its institutions at local, regional and national level, including, as Hegel specifically points out in “Philosophy of Law”³², for the implementation of the “higher” moral and patriotic (“altruistic”) debt - enlisting in the army and participating in hostilities to “protect” the nation and the state. The main forms and mechanisms for realizing the activist position of citizenship of the citizen are the emerged during the “mature” modernity civil society, “involvement” in mass political actions - rallies, demonstrations, protests, membership in political parties and NGOs, conscious participation in local elections and national bodies of political power and representation, protection, including through media appearances, the public interest, and the “common good” of citizens and the nation at large.

Postmodern citizenship

In the second half of the twentieth century, the transition from “modernity” to “postmodernity” gradually began to take place, and the concept of citizen and citizenship of the postmodern era was built. Its philosophical and political basis is the ideas embedded in the emerging cosmological-humanistic paradigm. The process of building this paradigm began in the first half of the twentieth century. At the beginning of the 21st century, without

³² G. V. F. Hegel, *Filosofiya na pravoto* (Sofiya: Gal-Iko, 2001).

its complete construction, its basic ideas were outlined. These ideas, viewed in the light of their action as the basis of “postmodern” citizenship, can be summarized as follows:

First, the cosmological-humanistic political paradigm is the result of a complete turning point in the development of humanity that began at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The main characteristic of this turn is the realization that human development has reached its limit in its quest to “impose itself upon nature”, that Man is already “equal” to God in its capacity: both as „creator” and as „the destroyer”. As a creator: modern science and technology not only create a “second” nature, but also a new “life”, they can even „inspire” him a new “mind”. As a destroyer: Man, as history of the twentieth century shows, is capable of destroying the world - from the self-destruction (in wars or through various artificially induced pandemics) of humans, through the threat to the ecological balance and biosphere on Earth, until the possibility of using the achievements of subatomic physics, for example, to destroy the existing at all. This is the main reason that necessitates a “paradigm shift” and finding new avenues for human development.

Second, the paradigm is “revolutionizing” the fundamental principles of explaining the human world. It formulates a qualitatively different purpose for humanity: the goal of overcoming the desire for unlimited domination of man over the surrounding world, to form a new approach that finds ways to establish „equal” and „harmonious” interaction between society and nature. “The new type of thinking”, writes E. Fromm, must express “a new humanistic philosophy - the philosophy of the love of life and its manifestations in human relations, in economy and in politics”, in the relation to the natural and social reality in general. The formation of this “new philosophy” would be possible through the “synthesis of the spiritual aspirations of the late Middle Ages and the achievements of post-Renaissance rationalist thought and modern science.” This synthesis should translate man from the “Earth City of Progress” to the future harmonious and humanistic “City of Being”³³.

The new paradigm is formulated in a number of philosophical, theological, cultural, natural-scientific, economic, sociological and political concepts. Among the authors who create the “building” of this paradigm are the names of V. Vernadsky and P. Teilhard de Chardin, as well as to a greater or lesser extent E. Frome, D. Bell, A. Tofler and representatives of the “Roman Club”. A. Pechei and E. Pestel. What unites these concepts is the emphasis on the need to formulate a new way of thinking, a new approach in explaining and managing the functioning of modern society, that the basis for the progress and future of the modern world is humanistic-ecological development and application of science to the whole existence and activity of mankind.

The affirmation of the new paradigm is carried out in the conditions of a radical change in the existence of the society and the realization of the political processes in it. This change leads to the “expansion” of the “political” (except in the state - in the “global” society / state, in NGOs, etc. and in the “virtual” society) and to its “synoptization”. Politics pervades, through so-called “global” (demographic, environmental, food, religious, etc.) problems and virtualization of public reality in all spheres and turns social into political.

Determining this change are two interconnected processes: globalization and virtualization of the contemporary world.

³³ E. From, *Revolutsiya na nadezhdata* (Sofiya, Izdatelstvo “Zahariy Stoyanov”, 2005).

Globalization

Globalization is a complex, comprehensive and contradictory process that began in the economy but later covered all spheres of society. It is manifested above all in the “emergence of a single global market dominated by multinational companies since the 1980s, leading to a reduction in the capacity of nation states to control their economies”³⁴. Politically, globalization has two main results: “effective erasure of national borders” and “easy or uncontrolled migration”³⁵.

National borders

Globalization is a neoliberal project whose main purpose is to limit and even eliminate any state interference that takes place outside of “property protection, treaties and national security”³⁶. In the context of globalization, according to one of the most prominent representatives of the neoliberal idea - W. Beck, the nation and its associated national state are losing their role in the modern world. “The nationalist perspective that equates society with the nation-state blinds us to the essence of the world we live in” he writes, „The common terminological denominator of our densely populated world is “cosmopolitanization”, which means blurring the clear boundaries that divide markets, civilizations, cultures, and last but not least, the lifeworlds of different peoples.” The globalization process is changing the conditions under which social identity is shaped. It is not expressed in the alternative of “we” and “they”, but in the affirmation of a new “cosmopolitan” model of constructing the self-consciousness of the contemporary man³⁷.

The main results of the implementation of the neo-liberal globalization model as a universal model for the development of the world economy, which focuses on unrestricted economic growth and consumption, are: First, the widening gap between rich and poor countries. The rich became many times richer and the poor poorer. In the last decade of the 20th century, only 15% of the world's population living in rich countries had 85% of the world's wealth. The second, equally important aspect of this process is the emergence of a “transmutation” situation in the development of human society, in which it, and the whole biosphere, is threatened with destruction³⁸.

Many modern theories are opposed to the neoliberal globalist model. Two of the most influential and most politically supported concepts that express the essence of the cosmological-humanist paradigm in the late XX and early XXI centuries are the concepts of “sustainable development” (E. Pestel, Gru H. Bruntland) and “modern Eurasianism” (A. Dugin). There are significant theoretical and political differences between them, but their main ideas unite them. These ideas are expressed in the view that the dominant universal model for the development of the world economy in the age of globalization leads to the self-destruction of human civilization. Therefore, a “qualitatively new civilization model” is needed, which, unlike neoliberalism, which imposes monetarism, fundamental marketing and abdication of the nation-state, is based on investment activity in the development of

³⁴ Collins English Dictionary: Complete and Unabridged (Harper Collins Publishers, 2003), 692.

³⁵ H. Daly, “Globalization and Its Discontents”, *Philosophy & Public Policy Quarterly*. Vol :21 num 2/3 (2001): 17.

³⁶ Douglas F. Down, *Capitalism and Its Economics: A Critical History* (London and Sterling, Pluto Press, 2000), 166.

³⁷ U. Bek, *Noviyat kosmopolitizam na savremennostta*, *Liberalen pregled*. 2007.

³⁸ L. Braun, *Sastoyaniето na planetata*. *Doklad na instituta Worldwotch za napredaka kam ustoitichivo obchestvo Kolektiv* (Sofiya: Knigen tigar, 2001).

the real economy, social commitment, reasonable regulatory intervention by the state, including on environmental issues, and respect for national traditions in politics and culture. The main objective is “to protect human health and to ensure a fulfilling life in harmony with nature”³⁹.

Migration

The second major aspect of globalization is the possibility that the contemporary man can move almost indefinitely in the global world. The man of the global world is a “citizen of the world”, “homo mobilis”, possessing „mobility - social and geographical”. The desire to move into the social space is central to this system. The tendency is „not to change the individual atom by motion: it gradually gains the right to retain its characteristics“. The culmination of this process, in the words of I. Dichev, is the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 (UN 1948), which which “guarantees to this atom a minimum of identity” and, wherever it goes, it “exists beyond this place”⁴⁰.

In both personal and demographic terms, the contemporary world, and Europe in particular, is moving towards the creation of a new and inevitable ethno-racial model of existence and development. It can be chaotic-destructive, with the spontaneous invasion of mainly African and Asian migrants. This is because of the demographic explosion in Africa and South Asia and the aging and depopulation of the North.

The result of this process is that the living space is changing and multicultural coexistence is increasingly observed. This, on the one hand, is “related to the effort to transcend yourself, to make a step towards the alien” and to attempt to move „beyond the unshakable boundaries of history, geography or culture”. On the other hand, it is expressed in the fact that we continue to “protect ourselves with the various techniques of racism”⁴¹. Thus, the problem of otherness, of coexistence with foreignness, comes to the fore.

In philosophical, social and political-civic terms, as Zimel points out, the problem of “foreignness” is that “Our foreigner is close to us as we feel related to him because of a national or social, professional or universal community. But he is far from us, insofar as this community extends beyond him and us, and connects us only because it brings many people together”⁴². Solving “own – alien” problem is of paramount importance for modern humanity and Europe in particular in the face of increasing migration flows. It is related to overcoming the dominant “thinking-as-usual” based on the ignorance to the other. The one who “comes” or the one “who you go to”. This generally puts the alien in a situation of “isolation, alienation and failure”⁴³.

The formation of a new type of thinking and a new type of identity are linked to the resolution of the complex dilemma between ethnocentrism and national nihilism.

³⁹ B. Manov, *EvrAziystkiyat proekt kato model za ustoychivo razvitie i negovata interpretatsiya v Balgariya*. V: *Inovatsionno povedenie, predpriemachestvo i ustoychivo razvitie* (Sofiya: Izdatelstvo “Znanie”, 2014).

⁴⁰ I. Dichev, *Grazhdani otvad mestata? Novi mobilnosti, novi granitsi, novi formi na obitavane* (Sofiya: Prosveta, 2009), 10.

⁴¹ I. Dichev, *Grazhdani otvad mestata?... 27*.

⁴² G. Zimel, *Chuzhdenetsat*, V: *Sotsiologiya na lichnostta*. Sast.: Nikolov, L. L. Deyanova (Sofiya: Nauka i izkustvo, 1990).

⁴³ A. Shyutts, *Chuzhdenetsat* (Sofiya: LIK, 1999), 9.

Ethnocentrism creates and maintains the denial of other people's values and practices. National nihilism is based on the underestimation of “own's” traditions and values and the worship of the “foreign”. The “decision” leads to finding a balance between the “alien” and the “own”. It requires both the avoidance of the homogenization of the modern world and the hyperbolization of its differences and superiorities. This world is a world of polycentrism, of equality between the “local” and the “universal”, between “national” and “cosmopolitan”. It is based on the existence of modern “common sense”, the understanding that “for most human beings, the world is becoming a place where minimum universal norms could be defined”. Norms that lead to the rejection and overcoming of the extreme positions of nationalism and chauvinism, of universalism and cosmopolitanism⁴⁴.

It is important for contemporary citizenship to come to the conclusion that polycentrism, as one of the creators of the Eurasian concept N.S. Trubetskoy emphasizes, is to understand that the social world is multipolar. Understand that “neither “I” nor anyone else is the navel of the earth, that all peoples and cultures are equal, that there are no higher and lower races” and ethnicities. Any other position is an expression of the “self-centeredness” of people and cultures. Therefore, the world must be seen as a mosaic of multiple equivalents. Each center has its own history, landscape, ethnicity and ethnic dominant, religion, national culture, economic and political (state) system and organization⁴⁵. This understanding does not represent the modern world as unipolar or through the prism of the West-East relationship as bipolar. It views the world as an aggregate of many regional political-economic, religious and cultural centers with different civilizational and value orientations. Accordingly, the process of globalization should not be understood as possible in a single variant, but as globalization, expressing and preserving the specificity and identity of the main civilization nuclei in the modern world. This “regional” globalization would allow not only to strike a reasonable balance between the world's “super” powers, but also to develop industries, technics, technologies and interactions with nature that reflect regional characteristics and contribute to the creation of a true “noosphere”.

Virtualization

Virtualization is a major feature of the world at the end of XX and the beginning of XXI century. It turns society into a communication one. It is a society based on digital technology and computers in the production, storage and dissemination of information, as well as the use of the Internet, as a worldwide information exchange network. In less than twenty years the “network” has become the most influential “subject” of modernity.

Virtual “multi-subjectivism”

The result of these processes is the “expansion” of the members of society who “make” history. The main reason for this is the “nature” of the network - its accessibility - technical and technological, financial and linguistic. This is why the internet is “multi-subjective”. Anyone who has “logged in” to the network can create information. It is also “multipolar”. The dissemination of information is not one-way (from the top down, from the center to the “many”), but multidirectional (from many to many, even from all to all). Internet is also “anonymous”. Subjectivity can be hidden. It is usually hidden behind some code, password, virtual image. This extends the “readiness” to actively engage in the “life”

⁴⁴ U. Beck y C. Cronin, *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Polity Press (Cambridge: 2006), 49.

⁴⁵ N. S. Trubetskoy, *Ob istinnom i lozhnom natsionalizme, Ishod k Vostoku* (Sofiya: 1921).

of the network. On this basis, the “inhabitants” of cyberspace have no “boundaries” of their “freedom” to express themselves in it, in the formulation and dissemination of ideas and information in all possible aspects of the existence of both the real and the virtual world.

The revolution in the development of digital technologies and the Internet has led to the fact that, like globalization processes, borders between countries are increasingly breaking down, becoming more “permeable”. This is because cyberspace covers all the people on the planet who have access to the Internet. The modern world is becoming a truly “global” world, building a unified “geosocial universe”⁴⁶.

Virtual activism

The virtual society is characterized by a new type –“virtual-real” - activism. The citizens' mobilization center moves from the various institutions and organizations that exist “real” (state, parties, NGOs) to virtual “social” networks and other “power” centers of cyberspace. In this way, the subjects and the nature of the course of social processes are changed qualitatively, as well as the mechanisms of managing political and social life both internally and interstate. This leads to the pluralisation of sovereignty, which from the state power (head of state, parliament, government) partially “surrenders” to or “appropriated” by new entities (“net”communities, “net”demos, “net”cracy). This limits the ability of the state to control the public space uncontrollably and to determine the “agenda” of society.

The “activism” of the modern communication society is one of the most effective mechanisms leading to the formation of the new type of “citizen” and “citizenship” of postmodernity. It has many manifestations that can be grouped into two large groups: activism that takes place “inside” in cyberspace, and activism going beyond that space. The first type covers the activities of both qualified and ordinary users of the network. These activities are related to specific political actions of “responsible” political entities - governments, parliaments, political leaders. In these activities, information about unreported or intentionally concealed intentions, prepared violations, etc. is disseminated on the Internet, discussions on the topics raised and evaluations of the published information are conducted. In this way, a “public” opinion is formed that supports or rejects the actions of the political institutions as well as the users of the network involved in the virtual debate. Such shares are often accompanied by so-called “hacktivism” that attacks, penetrates, disrupts or restricts their functioning in the virtual space, organizes “virtual” forces to counter the “dictatorship” of political power on and off the network.

The second major form of activism in the communication society is realized through the unification through the social networks of the virtual with the real political actions in the modern virtual-real world.

Social networks are arguably the most influential “product” of the Web 2.0 platform, which unifies the virtual and the real, and pluralizes the political space. Although there is no commonly accepted definition, it can be assumed that social networks are communities “in which computer-mediated communication plays a leading role in their organization and functioning”. In addition, they are spatially, temporally, and subjectively non-localized and variable.⁴⁷ From the point of view of their influence on citizenship, the most important

⁴⁶ M. Georgieva, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram i geosotsialnata vselena <http://newtrend.bg/social-media/twitter-facebook-instagram-i-geosotsialnata-vselen>

⁴⁷ H. Prodanov, Digitalnata politika (Sofiya: Faber, 2012), 146.

characteristics of social networks are the speed of formation, and often the short duration of their existence, anonymity of participation, affirmation of “horizontal” relationships and interactions, the absence of “leadership”, spontaneity of emergence and self-organization of participants.

One of the most striking manifestations of network citizenship is the “flash mob” communities, which emerge almost “lightning-fast” and bring together strangers in a particular place to respond and pressure to resolve a political problem or protect their rights and interests, even to individuals and (or) marginalized groups who could not achieve this in the modern political space under the rules of traditional political practice. That's why, social networks are distinguished by their marked ability to mobilize for active involvement in real political life, including participation in street protests and other anti-government actions by otherwise “inactive” individuals and social groups.

Conclusion

The outlined characteristics of the postmodern, global and virtual-communication society lead to the formation of a new essence of citizen and citizenship in it. Their most important manifestations are “synopticism” - inclusiveness, dynamism, mobility, freedom, and the “activist” role of the citizen at all levels and in all spheres of society. These manifestations are expressed both in the “public” and “personal” terms.

Within the political organization of the postmodern world (“community plan”), it is possible to have the following “borderline” “models” of citizenship:

- liberal - based on individual responsibility, legality and human rights;
- republican - participation-based citizenship;
- communitarian - based on equality and fair citizenship;
- cosmopolitan – based on “global” values citizenship - ecological citizenship, environmental citizenship⁴⁸, “virtual” citizenship.

In a “personal” plan, the citizen of the postmodern global world must have the following features:

First, to know the basic characteristics of contemporary society as:

Liberal values - liberties and human rights; international standards for their nature and realization; institutions and procedures for the protection of liberties and rights.

Modern democracy - institutions, procedures and democratic freedoms; the principles of democracy - the rule of law, pluralism, equality, protection of minorities, etc.

Civil society - the essence and powers of the civil sector; relations with the state.

Globalization and the problems it poses, the ways and ways to solve them.

The virtualization of modern society - the Internet, social media and their role in the political and social life of the 21st century man.

⁴⁸ Cost Action CA16229, European Network for Environmental Citizenship (ENEC); <http://eneccost.eu/>

Second, to be built as a socially responsible person with civic virtue. Civic virtue is manifested in:

Ability to think critically and evaluate social reality, to make intellectually and morally grounded and responsible decisions for practical action for both the present and the future of society.

Developing personal attitudes based on contemporary legal norms and universal values.

Willingness and ability to participate in social processes - at school and in the whole life of society. P. Pachkova was right when she wrote that “civil activists are only a part of people”, but that more and more citizens are realizing that “without their activity in defense of their own rights and opportunities for development, their future is threatened”, which is a strong motivating factor for increasing their political activity.⁴⁹

It should be noted, however, that the contemporary citizen and the contemporary citizenship are not only an expression of the postmodern, but that they “carry” in themselves their “invariant” essence, which was formed in antiquity and is passing and rising to new levels in the historical development of human society. Considered through the lens of political philosophy, as has been shown, the citizen represents a unity of two opposing characteristics: “static” - the legal status and “dynamic” - socio-political activity. The emphasis on one or the other of these characteristics defines not only the “model” of citizenship but also the “educational” model by which society “intentionally” “creates” the “image” of the citizen who seeks to build. From this perspective, it can be assumed that civic education consists of two relatively independent “levels”. The first level is bound with the „citizenship“ in the juridical sense. The second is bound up with the realization of the social-political activity and identity of the citizen and that is why this second level should be built upon the first one. It also should be the ultimate goal of the process of civic education – education in active citizenship.

References

Avgustin Blazheni. Za Bozhiya grad, T. 1. Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Zahariy Stoyanov“. 2005.

Aristotel. Politika. Sofiya: Otvoreno obshtestvo. 1995.

Beck, U. y Cronin, C. Cosmopolitan Vision. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2006.

Beck, U. “Noviyat kosmopolitizam na savremennostta”. Liberalen pregled. (2007): <http://www.librev.com/index.php/2013-03-30-08-56-39/prospects/world/131-2009-06-17-08-26-08>

Braun, L. Sastoyanieto na planetata. Doklad na instituta Worldwotch za napredaka kam ustoitchivo obchestvo, Kolektiv. Sofiya: Knigen tiger. 2001.

Collins English Dictionary: Complete and Unabridged, Harper Collins Publishers. 2003.

⁴⁹ P. Pachkova, “Economic welfare and civic activity”, Revista Inclusiones Vol: 6 num Esp (2019): 194.

Cost Action CA16229 European Network for Environmental Citizenship (ENEC). <http://enec-cost.eu/>.

Daly, H. "Globalization and Its Discontents". *Philosophy & Public Policy Quarterly*. Vol: 21 num 2/3 (2001): 17-21.

Dichev, I. *Grazhdani otvad mestata? Novi mobilnosti, novi granitsi, novi formi na obitavane*. Sofiya: Prosveta. 2009.

Dowd, D. *Capitalism and Its Economics: A Critical History*. London and Sterling: Pluto Press. 2000.

Dragon, Zh. *Imperatorat i sveshtenikat. Etyud varhu vizantiyskiya „tsezaropapizam“*. Sofiya: AGATA-A. 2006.

Fan, I. B. *Antichnaye modeli grazhdanstva*. www.ifp.uran.ru/files/publ/eshegodnik/2002/6.pdf.

From, E. *Revolyutsiya na nadezhdata*. Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Zahariy Stoyanov“. 2005.

Georgieva, M. *Twitter, Facebooc, Instagram i geosotsialnata vselena*. <http://newtrend.bg/social-media/twitter-facebook-instagram-i-geosotsialnata-vselena>.

Grazhdanstvoto – edna osporvana kontseptsiya. Under construction-7.indd, *Posobie po evropeysko gragdanstvo*. Sofiya: Informatsionen tsentar na Saveta na Evropa. 2003.

Krastev, H. "Grazhdanstvoto – tvorenie na darzhavata". *Praven pregled*, num 1 (2007): 206-245.

Mayendorf, Y. *Vizantiysko bogoslovie. Istoricheski nasoki i dogmaticheski temi*. Sofiya: 1995.

Manov, B. *Evraziystkiyat proekt kato model za ustoychivo razvitie i negovata interpretatsiya v Bulgariya. Inovatsionno povedenie, predpriemachestvo i ustoychivo razvitie*. Sofiya: Izdatelstvo „Znanie“. 2014.

Manov, B. "Gragdanskata obrazovanost – tsel na obrazovaniето v aktivno gragdanstvo", *Filosofia*, num 1 (2019): 50-75.

Habermas, Yu. *Grazhdanstvo i natsionalnaya identichnosty. Demokratiya. Razum. Nravstvennosty: Moskovskie lektzii i intervyyu*. Moskva: 1995.

Hegel, G. V. F. *Filosofiya na pravoto*. Sofiya: Gal-Iko. 2001.

Pachkova, P. *Economic welfare and civic activity*. *Revista Inclusiones* Vol: 6 num Especial (2019): 186-195.

Platon. *Darzhavata*. Sofiya: Nauka i izkustvo. 1981.

Pocock, J. *The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times. The Citizenship Debates*, Gershon Shafir (ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1998.

Prodanov, H. Digitalnata politika. Sofiya: Faber. 2012.

Shyutts, A. Chuzhdenetsat. Sofiya: LIK. 1999.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, First published Fri Oct 13, 2006; substantive revision Mon Jul 17, (2017) <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/citizenship/>

Trubetskoy, N.S. Ob istinnom i lozhnom natsionalizme, Ishod k Vostoku. Sofiya: 1921.

Valcheva, R. “Dobrodetelta – izraz na moralno savarshenstvo”, <https://valtcheva.com> ›

Weber, M. Citizenship in Ancient and Medieval Cities. The Citizenship Debates, Gershon Shafir. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1998.

Zimel, G. Chuzhdenetsat. Sotsiologiya na lichnostta. Sast.: Nikolov, L., Deyanova, L. Sofiya: Nauka i izkustvo. 1990.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de la **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.