

**MARKET CITIZENSHIP: THE MOST IMPORTANT DIMENSION OF COMMON
EUROPEAN UNION IDENTITY**

**EKONOMİ VATANDAŞLIĞI*: ORTAK AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ KİMLİĞİNİN EN
ÖNEMLİ DAYANAĞI**

Dr. Hakan SAMUR

D. Ü. Diyarbakır Meslek Yüksekokulu Öğretim Görevlisi

e-mail: hsamur@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

To be a fully-fledged political community, as is the ultimate aim of the European unification project launched after the Second World War, the constituent citizens need a common identity. Although the changing geo-political and economic conditions have increased the need to construct such a common identity day after day, this issue is still a challenge yet to be resolved for the European Union (EU). Since the beginning, however, a common political identity (citizenship) based on a democratic form of political culture and a market-oriented form of economic culture has been promoted as the likeliest choice for the EU to aim at. It means that common EU identity has to lean on some political (civic culture, democracy, human rights, rule of law, etc.) and economic (market orientation/culture) principles as main dimensions. Therefore, the European Community (subsequently the EU) has generated various policies to construct such a common political identity.

This article aims to show that constructing a market citizenship has invaded the core place from the beginning within the identity construction efforts of the EU. That is to say the policies to create an EU-wide economic citizenship based on the discourse of market economy has continuously taken precedence and key role on the way of constructing a common EU political identity. Market citizenship or EU citizenship should be understood in this study as a societal-normative concept that aims to equip individuals with the behavioural rules of market economy or EU political community, rather than only a legal-formal concept.

Keywords: European Union, common EU political identity, market citizenship.

ÖZET

İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında hayata geçirilen Avrupa bütünleşme projesinin nihai hedefi tam bir siyasi topluluk haline gelebilmektir. Bu hedefe ulaşılabilmesi için, kurucu unsur durumundaki vatandaşların ortak bir kimliğe ihtiyaçları vardır. Günden

* Makalenin içeriğinden de anlaşılacağı gibi, *market citizenship* kavramı, AB'de, vatandaşların normatif yönden piyasa ekonomisinin gereklerine uygun olarak donatılmalarını ifade eder. Türkçe literatürde, bunun karşılığı olarak genellikle, kavramın birebir karşılığı olan *piyasa (pazar) vatandaşlığı* ya da *piyasa ekonomisi vatandaşlığı* olduğu kadar, *ekonomi vatandaşlığı* kavramı da kullanılmaktadır.

güne değişen jeo-politik ve ekonomik koşullar böyle bir ortak kimliğin inşa edilmesi ihtiyacını artırmış olsa da, konu hala Avrupa Birliği (AB) için çözüme kavuşturulmamış sorunlardan biri durumundadır. Buna rağmen, demokratik bir siyasi kültür ve pazar ekonomisi yönelimli bir ekonomik kültüre dayanan ortak bir siyasi kimlik (vatandaşlık), başlangıçtan beri AB için amaçlanabilecek en iyi seçenek olarak destek görmüştür. Bunun anlamı; AB ortak siyasi kimliği, temel dayanak durumundaki birtakım siyasi (vatandaşlık kültürü, demokrasi, insan hakları, hukukun üstünlüğü, vb.) ve ekonomik (pazar ekonomisi kültürü) prensiplerin üzerine kurulmalıdır. Söz konusu ortak siyasi kimliği inşa edebilmek için Avrupa Topluluğu (ve devamında AB) çok çeşitli politikalar üretmektedir.

Bu makalenin amacı; bir piyasa ekonomisi vatandaşlığının inşa edilmesi yönündeki çabaların, en baştan beri, AB'nin ortak kimlik inşa çabaları içinde en önemli yeri işgal ettiğini göstermektir. Yani, AB düzleminde ve piyasa ekonomisine dayanan bir ekonomi vatandaşlığını gerçekleştirecek politikalar, ortak bir AB siyasi kimliğine ulaşma yolunda devamlı olarak önceliği ve anahtar rolü almıştır. Bu çalışmada, ekonomi vatandaşlığı veya AB vatandaşlığı sadece hukuki-resmi kavramlar olmanın ötesinde, bireyleri, piyasa ekonomisinin veya AB siyasi toplumunun davranış kuralları ile donatmayı amaçlayan sosyal-normatif kavramlar olarak anlaşılmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Avrupa Birliği, ortak AB siyasi kimliği, ekonomi vatandaşlığı

INTRODUCTION

The European integration process of the post-Second World War period has emerged as a different and sui generis form of organisation committed to establishing a new community with, of course, its own norms and practices. The ultimate aim of this process is the development of co-operation and interaction among European states to establish a powerful and fully-fledged political community (the ideal of ever closer union). To reach this ideal necessitates, first of all, creating a sense of belonging towards the Union and a common identity among the constituent individuals of this political community. Despite continuing debate about its context and practice, a political identity (citizenship) based on a civic-democratic form of political culture and a market-oriented form of economic culture as general dimensions, have frequently been enunciated in the documents and works of EU institutions. In other words, according to the official discourse, the EU had to be hinged upon the principles of democracy, civic statehood, rule of law, respect for human rights and market economy. Especially after mid-1980s, some symbolic innovations and figures have also been forged (common flag, common anthem, common passport and so on) to support identity formation process in the Union. Following these main political, economic and symbolic dimensions, the European Community (subsequently the EU) has generated various political, economic, social and so on strategies to create such orientation towards the EU and common identity. This essay aims to underline the core place of constructing market citizenship in the EU, as part of constructing a common identity in the Union and as part of citizen's broader role that is expected to be played within the European society. It means that the measures taken to establish a European-wide market economy and common

market orientation among Europeans have a key and precedent place among the Union policies on the way of constructing a common political identity.

Before moving to the issue, a brief explanation should be given regarding the use of the concept ‘citizenship’ in this study. Citizenship can usually be described in a legal-formal sense that denotes an individual’s membership of a polity (status-based) and in an active-practical sense that ensures ‘active involvement of individuals as deliberators, participants in common affairs and responsible for the identity and continuity of the community’ (identity based) (Kostakopoulou, 2001, 87; Oliver and Heater, 1994). Citizenship in this study is considered as this latter description that is more than a legal label that denotes an individual’s tie to a state. It is assumed, from a wider sociological perspective, as a set of practices which determines a person’s membership of a community and, in this way, constitutes as an identity rather than defines citizenship (Turner 1994, 159). For example, the concept ‘market citizenship’ implies mental and cultural grounds (orientation) of market economy.

Market Orientation as the Key Part of Identity Formation Efforts in the EU

The emergence of burghers and craftsmen (the embryo of the European middle class) who were settled in the medieval European towns and cities is frequently acknowledged as the source of the economic and, then, political and social changes of the following centuries in Europe. The bourgeois class of industrialisation followed these groups and the driving role of economic incentives and actors has always retained its place in shaping the societies. The ongoing European integration process launched after the Second World War has not remained outside this evolutionary chain. As Everson (1995, 79) noted, a direct relationship was established between Europeans and the Union by creating market citizenship and its rights through the Rome Treaty.

Indeed, the theoretical base for the strategies of the pioneers of the European Community was the neo-functionalist approach that proposed to reach unity through gradual, incremental steps in certain areas, which would cause a ‘spill over’ effect to give rise to harmonisation and further integration in other areas (Peterson and Bomberg, 1999, 14). Therefore, the Community’s initial activities were canalised and confined to economic integration and constructing market orientation. Political and social integration, as a ‘by-product’ or ‘side-effect’, would be created inevitably as a result of deepening economic integration (Shore, 2000, 18; Rosamond, 2000, 52). The logic behind this was simple as Wnuk-Lipinski (1994, 161) noted: as the most common descriptive factor of group interests, economic interests have a critical role for the growth of group identification. Even the introduction of some individual rights e.g. free movement, non-discrimination, or the right to appeal to the European Court of Justice in the Treaty of Rome was aiming, according to Welsh (1993, 26), to facilitate the completion of economic convergence. Consequently, the European integration process was tightly embedded in a market paradigm (Wiener, 1998, 152).

During the 1950s and 1960s, the strategy of the Community institutions continued to pursue this economy-oriented integration process. During the 1970s, because of some internal and external developments, the spectrum of EU activities enriched and political and social building blocks as well as economic ones came to the agenda to underpin political integration ideal. For example, the Report on European Union prepared by Tindemans in 1975 proposed that the EU had to make itself felt in education and culture, news and communications, and in leisure-time activity (CEC, 1976, 2). Furthermore, the first direct election of MEPs by the citizens of the Member States was held in June 1979. However, the very centrality of market orientation in Union policies did not change in that decade, either.

Particularly by the 1980s, while the issue of generating a common identity among the member state citizens gaining greater importance, the key role of constructing a common market citizenship increased through a deepening process. The Single European Act and the Commission's White Paper on Completing the Internal Market were adopted in 1985. The main objects of the Single Act were the free movement of persons, goods, services and capital within the EU borders. The adoption of these documents coincided with the release of the renowned Adonnino reports that also deal with freedom of movement for Community citizens and goods and propose such matters as facilitating border crossings, rights of residence, the recognition of diplomas for the exercise of the right of establishment, and freedom of movement in working life (CEC, 1985, 10). Apart from the broader economic aims of those documents, they also contributed implicitly or explicitly to the establishment of an economic dimension for a people's Europe. The creation of the Single Market and free movement rights as a core element of EU integration also aimed to promote interaction and interdependence throughout the EU.

In the same vein, an important research programme, the Research on the Cost of Non-Europe (known as Cecchini Report), was launched in 1986 and completed in 1988 to analyse the costs of European market fragmentation and, thus, the potential benefits from their removal (Cecchini, 1988; CEC, 1988). First, the title of the research implied the need for a more unified Europe. Then the findings of the research showed that the removal of economic barriers would provide a base for political and social convergence.

Another significant project initiated in the 1980s was the Schengen Treaty. It was signed in 1985 among five Western states to abolish the internal border controls among themselves, and to standardise and increase the controls throughout their common external borders but initially it was not connected to the EU integration process. However, as an author underscored, since the beginning, it has been a bold attempt to deal with the anticipated problems that would result from the free movement of peoples and goods between the countries of the European Union (Tupman 1995). Therefore, in several years, other member states excluding Ireland, UK and newly accepted members from Central and Eastern Europe joined the Schengen zone. Non-EU countries of Norway and Iceland

also joined the Schengen. Consequently, by the 1st of May 1999, the Schengen Acquis became the part of EU policy following a protocol attached to the Treaty of Amsterdam.

By the Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty) signed in 1992, for the first time, a significant start was made on setting out rules that denote citizens of member states as European citizens with certain basic rights. Despite its weakness in some aspects, the concept of European citizenship embodied in the Treaty has institutionalised pre-existing and new citizenship rights and introduced them as rights with a new but more explicit, attractive and effective label (Welsh, 1993, 28). Through citizenship hinging upon certain political, economic and symbolic dimensions, the EU certainly concretised and declared its vision of common EU identity that was trying to breed until that day. The Commission's statement about the role of EU citizenship confirms what we explained at the beginning that "citizenship reinforces and renders more tangible the individual's sentiment of belonging to the Union; and that citizenship confers on the individual citizen rights which tie him to the Union." (CEC, 1996).

In spite of introducing new political rights in the Maastricht Treaty and then in the Amsterdam Treaty and other main documents, the basic characteristic of Union citizenship has still remained market-oriented. Everson (1995) points out that, by acquiring EU citizenship, nationals of the member states have been expected to fulfil 'the legal and practical realisation of the internal market'. So much so that the Directorate in the European Commission that is responsible for citizenship was located for a long time in the one that is responsible for the Internal Market, rather than the Social Affairs Directorate or anywhere else (Shore, 2000, 84) and has only been placed in DG Justice and Home Affairs since the creation of the latter in 1999. This was because, as mentioned before, Union citizenship aimed to complete previous measures to assist the free movement of people and goods between member states by extending the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member states, even to people not pursuing economic goals (Article 8e). In Article B of the Amsterdam Treaty, the right of free movement was clearly associated with political integration by incorporating into its objectives: 'to maintain and develop the Union as an area of freedom, security and justice, in which the free movement of persons is assured...'. These provisions shape part of the essential economic freedoms of the European Market by putting the 'mobility' element at the core of European citizenship (D' Oliveira, 1994, 132).

Besides all these governmental policies, the European Court of Justice has played a prominent role in the vitalisation of European citizens' rights since the 1960s and the rights pertaining to freedom of movement, and economic activities has taken an important place among the decisions of the Court (Meehan, 1991; 1993; Ruttlely, 2002).

Creating a single currency in itself can be seen as the most salient example of economic policies, defining the frontiers of the Union and carrying political purposes beyond economic ones. That is to say, at least some of the individual member states could maintain their prosperous and well-functioning economies without the need for a single European currency, but a European political

union could not be completed without its own currency (Mills, 2001). Replacing the national currencies of 12 countries by the Euro banknotes and coins on 1 January 2002 has mainly served to pursue this political aim and has taken an important role in the identity formation process.

It should be stressed that the EU and Union citizenship is still the subject of a construction process. For the time being, although there is consensus on some common objectives and on nurturing the convergence of social policies, EU citizenship has no social dimension underpinning market integration and each member state pursues its diverse path to social protection (O'Leary, 1996, 128). The contents of EU citizenship are likely to change or develop day by day; new rights and maybe duties are likely to be included. In this circumstance, from very liberal to interventionist, ideas are brought in to construct the economic contours of EU citizenship. In spite of these differences, it is evident that all the different views accept market citizenship with its core freedoms of movement and property as the starting point of their economic-social discourses. The economic perspective of the current Union citizenship is a case in point for this. The EU has various interventionist tools in the economic realm i.e. common agricultural policy, competition policy. However, this does not hide the fact that 'market orientation' within the contours of free circulation of people and other factors has, since the beginning, been the core of integration and identity formation politics.

CONCLUSION

In this essay, we have attempted to explain that constructing an EU-wide market orientation has taken a precedent and core place among the Union policies to reach a common identity. The official rhetoric, since the beginning, has adopted this strategy assuming that the advantages of common market and orientations of people towards this market would make it easier to realise political and social convergence and, therefore, to create a sense of togetherness and common identity among the Union citizens. As has been shown in a chronological order, this very centrality of market citizenship within the broader Union citizenship has not diminished; on the contrary, has increased.

We have not said anything about the outcome of giving such a key mission to market orientation as the part of those integration and identity formation politics because it is not within the scope of this study. However, it might be useful to say something about this point briefly in this conclusion part. The number of people using the right of free movement and settling in the territories of another member state is not proportional to expectations from the economic dimension of EU citizenship. Especially compared to the number of immigrants from non-EU countries, it is quite discouraging. In the mid-1990s, for example, among the 14.1 million resident aliens living in the European Union (EU), only 4.9 million were nationals of EU member states residing in other member states (Koslowski, 1994, 369). While analysing this issue in the mid-1970s, Aron (1974, 647) underlined the same disparity between the migrations 'into' and 'within' the Community. It proves that in spite of the Single European Act, common EU citizenship or other policies, the picture has not changed much, and psychological, sociological, cultural and other barriers to the circulation and,

therefore, the fusion of European peoples are much more inexorable than was estimated by policy-makers who put the economic dimension as pivotal to their political community project.

REFERENCES

- ARON, Raymond (1974), "Is Multinational Citizenship Possible," in **Social Research**, 4, 41, 638-56.
- CEC (1976), "Tindemans Report on European Union," reprinted in **Bulletin of the European Communities**, Supp. 1/76.
- CEC (1985). "A People's Europe: Reports from the Ad Hoc Committee," reprinted in **Bulletin of the European Communities** 7/85.
- CEC (1988), **Research on the Cost of Non-Europe: Basic Findings Volume 1**, Luxembourg, OOEPEC.
- CECCHINI, Paulo (1988), **The European Challenge 1992: The Benefits of a Single Market**, Aldershot, Wildhood House.
- D'OLIVEIRA, Hans (1994), "European Citizenship: Its Meaning, Its Potential", in Renaud Dehousse, ed., **Europe after Maastricht. An Ever Closer Union?**, Munich, Law Books in Europe, pp. 126-148.
- EVERSON, Michelle (1995), "The Legacy of the Market Citizen," in Jo Shaw and Gillian More, eds., **New Legal Dynamics of European Union**, Oxford, Oxford University Pres, pp. 73-90.
- KOSLOWSKI, Rey (1994), "Intra-EU Migration, Citizenship and Political Union," in **Journal of Common Market Studies**, 32, 3, 369-402.
- KOSTAKOPOULOU, Theodora (2001), **Citizenship, Identity and Immigration in the European Union**, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- OLIVER, Dawn and Derek Heater (1994), **The Foundations of Citizenship**, London, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- MEEHAN, Elizabeth (1991), "European Citizenship and Social Policies," in Ursula Vogel and Michael Moran, eds., **The Frontiers of Citizenship**, London, Macmillan.
- MEEHAN, Elizabeth (1993), **Citizenship and the European Union**, London, Sage.
- MILL, John (2001), "The Euro and A United states of Europe,"
in <http://www.europeansinglecurrency.com>
- O'LEARY, Siofra (1996), **The Evolving Concept of Community Citizenship**, London, Kluwer Law International.
- PETERSON, John and Elizabeth Bomberg (1999), **Decision Making in the European Union**, London, Macmillan.
- ROSAMOND, Ben (2000), **Theories of European Integration**, London, Macmillan.

- RUTTLEY, Philip (2002), "The Long Road to Unity: The Contribution of Law to the Process of European Integration since 1945," in Anthony Pagden, ed., **The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Pres, pp. 228-260.
- SHORE, Cris (2000), **Building Europe**, London, Rourledge.
- TUPMAN, William (1995), Presentation Delivered to the XVII International Course of Higher Specialisation of Police Forces. http://www.ex.ac.uk/politics/pol_data/papers/editec
- TURNER, Bryan S (1994), "Post-modern Culture/Modern Citizens," in Bart van Steenbergen, ed., **The Condition of Citizenship**, London, Sage, pp. 153-169.
- WELSH, Jennifer M (1993), "A People's Europe? European Citizenship and European identity," in **Politics** 13, 2, pp. 25-31.
- WIENER, Antje (1998). **European Citizenship Practice**, Oxford, Westview Press.
- WNUK-LIPINSKI, Edmund (1994), "Fundamentalism Versus Pragmatism: Two responses To A Radical Social Change," in Matti Alestalo et al, eds., **The Transformation of Europe: Social Conditions and Consequences**, Warsaw: Ifis Publishers, pp. 154-164.