
Kristina Kamp • Ayhan Kaya
E. Fuat Keyman • Özge Onursal Beşgül
(Eds.)

Contemporary Turkey at a Glance

Interdisciplinary Perspectives on
Local and Translocal Dynamics

 Springer VS

- Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. 1995. »Code-switching in community, regional, and national repertoires: The myth of the discreteness of linguistic systems.« In *One speaker, two languages: Cross-Disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*, edited by Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken, 68–89. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunter, Michael. *The Kurds and the future of Turkey*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Landau, Jacob M. 1990. »Language policy and political development in Israel and Turkey.« In *Language policy and political development*, edited by Brian Weinstein, 133–149. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Somer, Murat. 2002. »Ethnic Kurds, endogenous identities, and Turkey's democratization and integration with Europe.« *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics* 1: 74–93.
- Somer, Murat. 2004. »Turkey's Kurdish conflict: changing context, and domestic regional implications.« *Middle East Journal* 58: 235–253.
- Somer, Murat. 2005. »Turkey, Kurds, and the emerging Iraq.« *Security Dialogue* 36: 109–128.
- Yeğen, Mesut. 1999. »The Kurdish Question in Turkish State Discourse.« *Journal of Contemporary History* 34: 555–568.

Market Embedded Transnationalism: Citizenship Practices of Turkish Elites¹

Özlem Altan Olcay, Evren Balta Paker

This article aims at contributing to discussions on meanings and experiences of transnational citizenship by focusing on the emerging practice among Turkish elites acquiring US citizenship. Utilizing their cases, we explore the following questions: what does the case of privileged minorities, who now have the chance to verify their claims to transnational identities by official means, tell us about the shifts that citizenship has gone through in recent decades? How do their stories contribute to emerging meanings of citizenship at the juncture of market economies and transnational pressures?

This study concerns a transnational process, whereby »natural« citizens of one country use various sources of capital at their disposal to opt to give their children citizenship in another, more industrialized one. This case speaks to the expanding literature on transnationalism and transnational citizenship in two interrelated ways. On the one hand, one line of thinking on transnational citizenship concerns itself with the disappearance of social rights at the level of the nation-state as a result of the erosion of state economic capacities. This viewpoint considers the philosophical frameworks and practical possibilities for the extension of citizenship rights beyond national borders. A second group of thinkers conceptualize transnational citizenship in response to growing numbers of immigrants. In their view, in a world of increased cross-border mobility, the institutions and experiences of citizenship are becoming pixelated and are blurring nation-state borders. Thus, while both strands of literature concern themselves with inequalities, they discuss separately the effects of market economies and migration trends.

¹ The authors would like to thank to The Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for research support. We also would like to thank Betül Baki for her research assistance.

This paper aims to help reconcile these competing literatures. It conceptualizes the case of privileged minorities, who are able to mobilize resources to acquire a second citizenship for their children, as market embedded transnationalism. It argues that we need to consider the ways in which meanings of transnationalism can become part of market performances and, therefore, contribute to existing inequalities in novel ways. The case of Turkish elite women giving birth in the United States reveals a unique trend of citizenship acquisition because this type of citizenship emerges as a result of calculations of future expectations of benefits. It is obtained as a result of successful maneuvering within market mechanisms. This citizenship, which allows transnational mobility for its owners, is a property to be utilized when needed, and as such assumes and exacerbates inequalities between those who can obtain it and those who cannot.

Methodology

The paper is based on three methodologies of data collection. First, at the conclusion of the research project, we will have conducted 40 in-depth interviews with Turkish families in which the mother has given birth in the United States for the purpose of acquiring US citizenship for the children. Snowball sampling is used to select interviewees. This is a purposive sample, which aims to achieve diversity in terms of time of birth, couples' occupations and connections to the United States. We have also achieved some variation in terms of social class. For the second means of data collection, we have conducted interviews with representatives of tourism companies that organize packages for the expectant families. Finally, we are in the process of completing textual analysis of blogs and websites on which families share their experiences with this process.

In the following sections, we first review the relevant literature on transnational citizenship, arguing for the need to bring the contributions of the two complementary trends in it together; that is, those who look at it from the perspective of the impact of economic globalization and those who approach it from within migration studies. Then we describe the process through which transnational citizenship emerges in this particular case in an attempt to make the argument that it is embedded in market mechanisms. It is market embedded transnationalism because this citizenship is physically transformed into a good, becoming part of the workings of the layers of economic transactions. Finally, we also conceptualize this citizenship as market embedded transnationalism in the words of our informants, laying out their perceptions of transnational citizenship.

Market Embedded Transnationalism

There is an impressive literature on transnational citizenship, the breadth of which is beyond the scope of this paper. We would like to engage with two of its underlying themes: first, the relationship between market forces and citizenship rights, and, second, on the relationship between cross-border mobilities and transnationalization of citizenship. Both processes are argued to challenge to citizenship regimes, which have historically evolved as a bundle of rights and obligations within the borders of nation-states. While one focuses on the erosion of social rights in an era of neoliberal globalization, the other focuses on inequalities emerging in a world of migration. Our goal in this paper is to point to a third dynamic. By explaining the mechanisms through which transnational citizenship can become a marketable good, we aim to bring together discussions of market forces and transnational citizenship.

The first set of writings focus on how market pressures erode citizenship rights. This approach to citizenship can be seen as rooted in two classical works, by T. H. Marshall and Karl Polanyi. Almost all discussions on citizenship continue to start with Marshall, who in *Citizenship and Social Class* ([1949] 1992), argued that the relationship between the state and the citizen has involved the acquisition of three kinds of rights: civil, political and social, in consecutive centuries starting from the 18th century. Inspired by this work, scholars have discussed citizenship as a bundle of rights that individuals have in return for their acceptance of nation-state frameworks.² Marshall's essay was motivated by the tension that capitalism created among different classes, conceptualizing citizenship as a mechanism through which class-based inequalities could be mollified. In this sense, we see in his work the beginnings of this literature's concern for the relationship between economic regimes and citizenship models.

Polanyi's *Great Transformation* is not directly about citizenship. Rather, in this work, he makes the argument that societies have historically always institutionalized relations of reciprocity and redistribution (2001 [1944]). However with the emergence of market economies, he argues that economic activity becomes disconnected from the rest of the social fabric. If market logics eventually prevail over all aspects of our lives, and as land, labor and money are commodified, a real dan-

2 Throughout the fifty-plus years since its publication, Marshall's conceptualization has been intensely criticized. Scholars have argued that it is impossible to understand the changes that citizenship has gone through without paying attention to social mobilizations that demanded expansion of rights and the contingency of rights acquired – that is, how they can be reversed (Turner, 1984; Roche, 1994). They have also drawn attention to persistent inequalities among different groups in society despite the universal claims of citizenship rights (Brubaker, 1992; Turner, 1990; Yuval-Davis, 1993; Lieberman, 1994).

ger for the survival of societies materializes. Today, there has been a resurgence of attention to Polanyi, given that the current context is epitomized by the emergence of market societies (Buğra and Ağartan 2007).

The literature on citizenship in a neo-liberal era brings together the discussions initiated by Marshall and Polanyi. These studies question the risks of market society and explore how responsibility for things that were once considered social rights, such as access to education and health and retirement benefits, are shifting away from governments to individuals. Accordingly, an increase in market power has disrupted the balance of power between state, market and citizens (Somers 2008: 2). The growing moral authority of the market has meant that social inclusion is no longer an inherent right, but an earned privilege (Somers 2008: 3). In fact, welfare states have at best been in stagnation, and at worst in the process of being dismantled. This has led scholars to discuss the possibilities for defining transnational standards for rights, advocated by transnational institutions of regulation, but still implemented at the level of nation-states (Faist 2009: 23). In a more general sense, these signal a move from citizenship rights to a human rights regime beyond nation-states (Falk 2000; Pogge 2002; Shafir and Brysk 2006). Overall, this scholarship is concerned with the transformation that state institutions have gone through in the age of neo-liberalism and how this compares with traditional understandings of citizenship. It draws attention to mechanisms of economic globalization that generate and reproduce increased vulnerability at the level of the nation-state. In this sense, the focus is usually on socially excluded groups, with institutions of transnational citizenship being suggested as panaceas for their problems.

A second line of literature investigates the increasingly transnational character of citizenship in an age of globalization and increased migration. As more and more people live and die in countries where they were not born, new citizenship regimes are bound to emerge because of the need to respond to new questions of political belonging. Bauböck, for instance, argues for increasing the possibilities for multiple citizenships, provided that citizens-to-be can fulfill some conditions of belonging in the social fabric (1994). His theory of transnational citizenship promotes overlapping memberships in nation-states in order to reduce inequalities between »natural« citizens, »naturalized« citizens, and denizens. Along the same lines, others have also questioned the seemingly »natural« link between nation-states and citizenship, given the history of struggles everywhere to attain and expand citizenship rights. Accordingly, similar struggles are ongoing today at the transnational level, transforming meanings and institutions of citizenship (Kaya 2011; Thelen 1999–2000). As Sassen argues, contemporary struggles at the transnational level show that citizenship is an unfinished institution. It embodies the potential for change and adaption to changing circumstances, especially as a result

of globalization (2003). These studies highlight the ways in which citizenship, as an institutional set of mechanisms, and as lived practice among immigrants, has blurred nation-state borders (Soysal 1994). Normatively, they highlight the potential for more inclusive processes of transnational belonging, which legally means pushing for states' acceptance of dual citizenship (Brondsted Sejersen 2008).

These two lines of inquiry share a concern for existing and increasing inequalities. They both turn to various conceptualizations of transnational citizenship at the nation-state level as a way to ease tensions, respectively, between markets and social rights or migrants and citizenship rights. We argue, however, that there is another dynamic to be explored if we bring together discussions of markets and migration. For this purpose, we approach the concept of »transnational citizenship« as a property (Shachar 2009) for which market forces can be mobilized in order to disaggregate the bundle of rights and obligations (Benhabib 2005). Shachar (2007, 2009) compares birthright citizenship to an inherited property, arguing that both contribute to the reproduction and exacerbation of existing inequalities. In the case of birthright citizenship, these inequalities are between nations. We propose to use this conceptualization to discuss the case of elites with multiple passports. Ong refers to this situation as »flexible citizenship,« (1999), a practice among the transnationalized business classes, whose multiple passports and residency permits allow them to unbundle the spaces where they live, work, go to school, pay taxes, inter alia (2005). Our focus, too, is on the socially privileged; more specifically, on those who can utilize market mechanisms to broaden their citizenship rights. This group benefits from the marketisation of citizenship and the transnational processes that exert pressures on nation-states. Citizenship, for these groups, is still an exclusionary right, which requires membership in a particular political and/or social body – usually conceived of as a nation state. However, their membership is now a strategic one. In this study, we approach the ability to acquire multiple passports, become transnational, and unbundle rights and obligations as an exit strategy, unavailable to the majority of people. We also further our argument by conceptualizing transnational citizenship as a status symbol (Bali 2002) and a luxury good (Grewal, 2005), which signifies the privileges of local elites. Thus, discussing the ways in which transnational citizenship is embedded within market mechanisms allows us to shed light on a complex dynamic, less easily captured when the discussion separates out the two. We call this process »market embedded transnationalism«. The focus on market embeddedness not only underlines how transnational processes are rooted in market mechanisms, but also highlights how transnational citizenship can stem from and exacerbate already-existing inequalities.

Markets, Babies, Dreams

Citizenship tourism has now become a viable possibility, first and foremost, due to the increased legal acceptance of dual citizenship by nation states. This is in contrast to the early twentieth century international consensus, which generally sought to disallow dual nationality. This earlier view was enshrined in international law, specifically in the Hague Convention of 1930, which signaled its chief aim as »the abolition of all cases both of statelessness and of double nationality.«³ Subsequently, the citizenship regimes of the majority of nation states reflected this early twentieth century consensus (Martin 2000: 27). However, this hostility toward dual nationality began to change in the last quarter of the twentieth century so that by the 1980s a handful of states allowed dual citizenship. By 1998 the number was 55, and by 2001, 93 (Brondsted Sejersen 2008: 542). Today, more than 100 states accept or tolerate dual nationality, and the trend towards allowing this status has accelerated significantly.

Historically, both the Turkish and US citizenship regimes reflected the »one nation, one person« principle. However, in 1981, the Turkish Nationality Act was amended to remove obstacles to dual citizenship for Turkish citizens as long as the person acquiring a second citizenship informed the government (Keyman and İçduygu 2003).⁴ On 29 May 2009, a new citizenship law was enacted that clearly acknowledged Turkish citizens' right to have multiple nationalities.⁵ In the case of the United States, several Supreme Court rulings make loss of US citizenship vir-

- 3 *Convention On Certain Questions Relating To The Conflict Of Nationality Laws The Hague* – 12 Nisan 1930. <http://eudocitizenship.eu/InternationalDB/docs/Convention%20on%20certain%20questions%20relating%20to%20the%20conflict%20of%20nationality%20laws%20FULL%20TEXT.pdf>, (accesses July 15, 2012). In the cases of dual citizenship, Article 4 of Hague Convention advocates what is known as the *Master Nationality Rule*, which gives states the right to treat that person as if he or she were *solely* a citizen or national of that country. This includes the right to impose military service obligations or to require an exit permit to leave.
- 4 Article 22/III of the 1964 Citizenship Law. This amendment was basically a response to the growing numbers of Turkish guest workers in Germany acquiring German citizenship. The amendment also made it possible to reacquire Turkish citizenship immediately after renouncing it. This was a »practical/pragmatic??« solution, since German citizenship prohibited dual citizenship and required the person to renounce his/her former citizenship (Kadirbeyoğlu, 2010: 4).
- 5 The Turkish Citizenship Act, No.5901. Article 44-(1) states that: »With regard to the persons who acquire the citizenship of a foreign state for any reason, in case they submit documents showing their status and following the inquiry to be launched, in case it is determined that the individual is the same individual as contained in the records, an explanatory note shall be attached to the birth (civil) registry book stating that the relevant individual has multiple citizenship.« *Turkish Citizenship Law*, Law No. 5901, 29 May 2009, available at: [http://www.](http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4a9d204d2.html)

tually impossible without the consent of the citizen (Aleinikoff 2000: 120). This greater flexibility of national citizenship regimes towards allowing multiple citizenships has allowed actors with means to seek a second citizenship for their children without having to worry about losing important rights in the parents' country of origin, such as property ownership and inheritance.

If the increasing acceptance of dual citizenship is one important factor in explaining birth tourism, then the other is the state's choice of means for acquiring citizenship. Currently, the vast majority of individuals acquire citizenship through three primary means: by birth on the soil of the sovereign territory (*jus soli*), by descent (*jus sanguinis*) and by naturalization through formalized legal procedures (Klusmeyer 2000: 5). What makes the practice of United States citizenship acquisition possible is the granting of citizenship in the United States in accordance with the *jus soli* principle. The United States enshrined *jus soli* in its Constitution as part of the 14th amendment, meaning that anyone born on American soil is an American citizen. Thus, the interplay of US rules on the acquisition of citizenship and a growing acceptance of multiple nationalities has created the legal background for birth tourism.

The explanations for such historical shifts in legal regimes are usually discussed in terms of the aforementioned activism of migrant populations. There is also emphasis on the motivation of states. First, migrant sending states aim to maintain cultural, and political connections with emigrants (İçduygu, Çolak and Soyarik 1999; Kaya and Kentel 2005). From this perspective, economic concerns are not unimportant – if for no other reason than remittances, states have an economic incentive for maintaining citizenship ties with those living outside state borders (Walton-Roberts 2004). As for the receiving states, several states have mechanisms in place that offer residency and/or citizenship in return for large cash investments (Joppke 2010). That is, in a sense, states are motivated by the goal of flexible accumulation (Ong 1999: 130). Therefore, the first point of entry into this process, legal opportunity, is already interwoven with market logics on the part of states. The marketization of transnational citizenship continues from this point onwards.

The data obtained from the Turkish Population Registry Office show that the number of Turkish citizens has increased from around 1 000 to around 1 500 (see Table 1).⁶ These numbers include people who gave birth while they were residing in the United States and who also registered their children as Turkish citizens.

[unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4a9d204d2.html](http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4a9d204d2.html) [accessed 12 September 2012]. Another interesting point of the new Act is the flexibility of its approach to those who try to avoid military service.

6 Electronic data was not available before 2000.

They exclude those who opted to suffice with American citizenship alone. One way of extrapolating the figure for birth tourism is to deduct from this number those with dual citizenship who are currently living in the United States. This total increased from around 500 at the beginning of the decade to over 600 today. While it is hard to ascertain the exact numbers, both the mushrooming of companies who service couples wishing to travel to the US for the purposes of giving birth, in combination with the numerous blogs where parents exchange information about the logistics of such trips, all testify to a visible tendency among Turkey's upper classes, who are attempting to add to their cultural connections with the United States, to opt for the tie of US citizenship for their children.

One such company's package includes a choice between nine different states, several hospitals, and residences in each of them. The costs range from a minimum of \$22,000 US dollars (which includes hospital birth and accommodation) to \$60,000 US dollars. It is not only the detailing of the costs of the »birth package«, as these offers describe it, that interweave the act of giving birth in the United States into a market process (had it only been that, all births in private health care systems would be described no differently). In the promotional package, it is the US passport that becomes the marketable good: »With *Yeni Bir Hayat* you can give birth to your child in the United States easily and safely. You give your child the gift of US citizenship, through which they will have access to privileges that last a lifetime.«⁷ The gift of US citizenship becomes, accordingly, something couples can purchase, inserting themselves into overlapping networks of health tourism, health care facilities and specialists, concierge services, and real estate.

There appear to be three categories of people who strive for US citizenship for their children. The first, and the largest, is composed of those couples, one or both of who have lived in the United States for some time, mostly for the purpose of higher or post-graduate education, or because of their work. In this group, either both or one of the spouses are high-end professionals with degrees from international schools. They have sufficient financial means to underwrite the costs; and most also have networks of friends and acquaintances, who can offer them logistical assistance and emotional support during their stay in the United States. However, even if a pre-existing network does not exist, the couples are often sufficiently well informed to navigate this process themselves. This group sees citizenship as an extension of their connections with the United States, in a sense, aspiring for their children to not go through some of the institutional hurdles they endured, if and when the children go and live there.

The second group is also made up of high-level professionals who, again, have enough resources. However, this group's ties to the United States are limited to

7 E-mail correspondence with an interviewee, who consulted the company. July 1, 2012

visits for business and tourism purposes. Some have gone to internationally oriented schools, but have lived in Turkey for their entire lives. They aspire to acquire American citizenship for their children as an opportunity that they themselves lacked. The third group, the smallest of the three, may have traveled to the States, but the extent of their travels, as well as their financial means, are much more limited than the first two groups. Citizenship for them represents, among other things, a chance for upward mobility and a way out for their children. They usually have to take risks in covering the costs of the travel, making very tight calculations as to where they can go and how long they can stay.

In most cases, there are strong cultural affinities with the United States, which stimulates the imagination of future lives there. The rise of educational networks and business connections has, in turn, made these cultural affinities possible. In the last decade, Turkey has consistently been in the list of top ten countries sending students to the United States.⁸ It has also become a hub for multinational business, as a result of the last two decades of government induced financial liberalization and foreign business friendly policies. This has meant, at the level of the individuals working in these companies, not only more frequent international business trips, but also, for a lucky minority, economic mobility. As a result, people have begun to observe and become slowly acculturated to different life possibilities and associated citizenship regimes without having to make final decisions about where to live and work.

Typically, the process begins in one of two ways. Either one or both of the spouses have long made up their minds up about having their children in the United States, or there is a third influential person, a family member or a close friend residing in the United States, who introduces the idea. There is usually a short window of opportunity for deliberations over the costs and benefits because of travel restrictions for pregnant women (after the thirty-second week, airlines do not accept pregnant passengers without a medical report from a doctor). The decision making process goes hand in hand with research regarding hospitals, doctors, and places to stay for the duration leading up to and immediately after the birth. For those with previous experience in the country, the choice is usually to go to the states with which they are familiar. Barring that, they usually end up in places where there are friends or family who can, at the very least, help out in difficult circumstances or, at most, can provide accommodation. Doctors and hospitals are arranged in multiple ways. Some couples do extensive internet research, both about the hospitals in the states and cities they are considering and the doc-

8 For annual figures and rankings, see <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Leading-Places-of-Origin> (last accessed September 7, 2012).

tors. This research also involves reading about the experiences of other women who have given birth to their children in the United States. There is considerable cyber-word-of-mouth: we have encountered several women, whose ob-gyn were the same person, even though the women did not know each other personally. This is also partly due to the companies offering extensive concierge services, whose lists of hospitals, doctors, and services become widespread knowledge. The owner of a concierge services company in the United States explained that her work consisted of visiting as many hospitals as possible and contacting doctors, both of which she adds to her portfolio if they reach an agreement. In addition, she maintains working relationships with a network of real estate agents, residence complexes, cleaning companies, car services, and translators. The combination of services utilized depends on the demands and the qualifications of the clients. Thus, transnational citizenship is not only connected to market mechanisms because it is transformed into a property; it is also at the center of various markets, connecting them to one another.

The length of stay in the United States varies according to whether the woman is employed, and the extent of the family's financial means. Most mothers-to-be travel around the thirty-second week of their pregnancy, but many also travel after that, with notes from doctors confirming that they can do so safely. They all have prior visas so obtaining a new visa is not a problem. As stated, the destination cities are typically determined as a result of calculations regarding prior experience, proximity to family and friends, climate and expenses. Miami, Los Angeles, Boston, New Jersey and New York outrank other places. At this stage, depending on their arrangements, some settle in with acquaintances, some go directly to places they have subleased, and others stay in hotels until they find more suitable accommodation. Next, hospital and doctor visitations are organized. Experience with the health care system varies dramatically from patient to patient. While some cannot speak more highly of their doctors and hospitals, many others are shocked by standards lower than the level of private health care in Turkey they are accustomed to. After the birth, the passport for the baby is arranged quickly (this in itself means additional fees), and the couple travels back to Turkey. Once they are back, they also apply for Turkish citizenship for the child, with many also registering their child with the US Consulate in Turkey.

After all of the legal procedures are completed, the family's life returns to normal, although many now talk about taking their children to the United States on a regular basis and sending them to international private schools in Turkey. Their plans revolve around raising children who will be able to live and work anywhere in the world, while retaining cultural and emotional ties to Turkey. The expectation is to combine creatively the rights and obligations of both citizenship regimes in order to offer most opportunities as possible to their children.

Market Rationalities of Transnational Citizenship

In the previous section, we focused on the mechanisms that people mobilize, using their market power, to acquire new citizenships for their children. In this section, we focus on the stories of our interviewees to show how they conceive of the dual citizenship as a resource to be utilized when needed. Almost all our interviewees considered their children's dual citizenship status as a resource that they owned, which they expected to give them advantage over others, and something that could be disposed of when not needed. Many of these families worked with lawyers to thoroughly examine their rights and obligations in an effort to gain maximal benefit from each respective citizenship. In other words, these stories reveal the workings of market rationalities where the actors aim to maximize individual benefits and minimize individual costs.

The first advantage that these families emphasized was their ability to give up either of these citizenships when or if necessary. The possibility of an exit option appears to have motivated almost everyone we have interviewed. The importance of an exit option is directly related to their fearful perceptions about the future of Turkey. Almost unanimously, they stated their fear of Turkey's becoming a more »Islamic«, more »oriental« and »less civilized« country. Their fear was sometimes exacerbated because of their children's gender, arguing that the life chances for educated and »liberated« women in Turkey were gradually decreasing. One of the interviewees stated this clearly when we asked whether she recommends the practice of giving birth in the US to the other expecting couples, she said: »Gosh, they should definitely do it, especially if they are expecting a baby girl. In four or five years, their daughter's freedom may be taken away; maybe she will be banned from the streets; maybe she will be harassed by the public police. They should definitely go.« In some other cases, their fear was closely connected to their minority status. In those cases, their community's memories of violence against minorities in Turkey and future anxieties shaped their decision. These families saw dual citizenship as a risk management tool and tried to make sure that their child had an exit option, in case the social and political climate deteriorated, as it frequently had in the past.

Fears over the future of Turkish politics are probably not, however, always related to the current political situation, or the fact that a conservative political party is in power. In fact, the figures for dual citizenship applications have not shown any sharp increase since the Justice and Development Party (AKP) came to power in 2002; instead, they have remained more or less stable throughout the 2000s (see Table I). One of the travel company managers also stated that viewing the motivation of these families only as a reaction to the rise of conservatism in Turkey would be wrong. He argued that the Turkish elites have always had anxieties for

the future, albeit the reasons for their anxiety have shifted over time. He claimed that the real factor is actually the instability and unpredictability of the Turkish political regime. The excerpt below aptly encapsulates such feelings voiced by our interviewees:

This country is always full of unknowns. You cannot simply say this is how things are. You cannot make a plan for the future. You know the situation in education; the college entrance exams are changing everyday. The same is true for military service. We, even adults, fear for our lives, for our tomorrows. Our children have a long life ahead of them, so our worries about them are much more intense. We don't know what they will encounter in the future. US citizenship is a security. In this country, we have injustice everywhere. Nobody gets what they deserve. It is not like we are living in a country where there is rule of law. ... We have given them the chance to escape if they want to. This is a huge opportunity.

The second cluster of factors that explain the decision to acquire American citizenship is related to the future benefits that this provides for the children. These benefits include cross-border mobility, educational and work opportunities in the United States, and sometimes evading military service. In other words, for companies selling the process, this is a gift that parents can buy for their children; for parents-to-be, this is a gift token, which the children are expected to cash in when they feel like it. On the one hand, this enables their children to avoid the unwanted obligations of Turkish citizenship, while on the other hand it gives them the desirable advantages of American citizenship. In other words, the owner of dual citizenship has the chance to disaggregate the various rights and responsibilities in order to use whichever suits their interests.

Among these advantages, cross-border mobility was the most frequently mentioned. The majority of these families were frequent travelers – either for work or for recreational purposes. They had complaints about what they viewed as the unpleasant, bureaucratic, drawn-out and expensive visa procedures that are applied to Turkish citizens, and the unjust and unequal treatment of Turkish citizens at border crossings. Although they are privileged citizens of Turkey, they do not feel that privilege in their travels abroad. On the contrary, they feel that they are undeservedly treated as low-class citizens. The hurdles of visa acquisition, and their encounters at international borders, prevent them from being the citizens of the world that they feel they are, and aggravate their class anxieties. All of them longed for the freedom to move around internationally without hassles and restrictions, and they believe that American citizenship will give their children this mobility without these restrictions. As one of the interviewees put it,

This passport gives them global mobility. I did not get US citizenship for my children; they became citizens of the world. Wherever they go, doors will be wide open for them. You are opening the first door. The rest is up to them.

Another one stated a similar view:

Let's say she turns out to be a child who is deeply devoted to her country, traditions. If she wants to live in Turkey, at least she will be able to travel internationally easily. Let's say she becomes a businesswoman. I have American friends and I know how easily they travel internationally. It is my hope that there are no such unnecessary procedures, paperwork like visas in the future. But this possibility does not seem to be in the foreseeable future. At least my daughter will travel comfortably.

Apart from global mobility, another advantage parents foresaw is the global protection extended to American citizens through US Embassies. One of them indicated, »I don't know whether you have had a US passport issued or not but in it there is really a statement saying that the state will support their citizens everywhere. In other words, if you are in a country other than the United States and register yourself with the embassy, the US state is behind you in any potential problem, health related issues to theft.« As these words signify, our interviewees were apprehensive about the support they could get, as Turkish citizens, if anything happened to them in a foreign country. They believed that, through the acquisition of American citizenship, their children could become thoroughly transnational citizens, whose rights would be protected everywhere by the US Consulates.

Our interviewees also mentioned educational opportunities frequently. They thought that American citizenship would give their children an advantage when or if their children wanted to attend university in the United States. Although all of them were aware that US colleges accepted international students, their real concern, however, was financing the education. While some were under the mistaken impression that colleges were free for American citizens, the majority of interviewees associated American citizenship with the wider availability of education loans and tuition cuts not offered to international students.

In the event that the children decided to stay in Turkey for their university education, some imagined that they could give up their Turkish citizenship in order to take the separate university entrance exam designed for foreign residents. This alternative exam is considered to be easier than the exam Turkish citizens take, and most of the universities have special quotas for foreign residents. For these families, having their children abandon Turkish citizenship would not be a serious

concern, since recent revisions to the Turkish citizenship law have made it easier to reacquire Turkish citizenship after renouncing it.

A less frequently mentioned advantage was employment opportunities. Usually the families, who stated this concern were those that had already worked in the US, and had experienced difficulties obtaining work visas. For these individuals, the ability to seamlessly live and work anywhere was a primary motivation for getting their children second (and third) passports. Most of our interviewees talked about being and raising global citizens, and about the flexibility this involved. For some, the ideology of flexibility was almost a defining personality trait.

There is also the work permit issue. They can work wherever in the world. Actually US citizenship opens the doors to the world. It will allow our child flexibility in making decisions. I guess flexibility and options were key motivators for us. It is up to her how she uses this.

Initially, my thinking was this: this can provide for my daughter more educational opportunities. When the time for university comes, she can study in her birth state, free of charge, etc. etc. But, of course, she may never really want to go to the States. Even then I just wanted to give her a life where she can be mobile, live without restrictions.

Finally, the opportunity to evade military service seemed to be an important concern for some of the families. Currently, every male citizen of the Republic of Turkey is obliged to perform military service – alternative service outside the army is not possible. Military service applies to any male of Turkish nationality, irrespective of his background or place of residence. In contrast, the US military is a voluntary and professionalized institution. Citizens are not required to complete compulsory military service. As in education, the majority of our families saw American citizenship as providing an exit option for their sons if conditions in Turkey became dangerous. In that event, they stated that their children could forfeit Turkish citizenship. In the past, male Turkish citizens were not allowed to renounce their citizenship without completing their military service. However, in 2003, Article 20 of the Turkish Citizenship Law No. 4866 was changed, and completing military service was no longer a precondition for the renunciation of the Turkish citizenship. In 2009, a new Citizenship Law (5901) was enacted which is more lenient towards those who try to avoid military service. In this new law, military service is not a precondition for the renunciation of the citizenship. Furthermore, failing to respond to regular procedural summons to perform military service is not considered a reason for loss of citizenship. Article 28/1 also states that Turkish citizens who renounce their citizenship can reacquire it back at any time.

These amendments in the law can enable dual citizens to renounce Turkish citizenship at the age of military service and then reacquire when they are old enough for lawful exemption from it.

In sum, several concerns related to the unpredictability of the Turkish context, as well as various opportunities associated with American citizenship were motivating factors for these families to strive towards obtaining the latter for their children. They wanted their children to become transnational citizens to assuage their apprehensions about only possessing Turkish citizenship, as well as to provide their children with the privileges, as they saw them, associated with the American citizenship. For them, transnationality signified opportunities at both the local and global level – perhaps even a guarantee for protecting their existing privileges everywhere.

Conclusion

Usually modern citizenship is defined as a personal status consisting of legal rights (i. e. legal claims on the state) and duties held equally by all members of the nation-state. Beginning with Marshall, modern citizenship has been seen as based on equalizing principles that are expected to mitigate the economic inequalities of social class positions. Discussions of transnational citizenship, which build on this premise, have considered the addition of the term ›transnational‹ as a way to further the promise of citizenship by responding to the contemporary realities of globalization. This means that transnational citizenship can come to mean international human rights and/or the right to hold multiple citizenships for the growing number of people living beyond a singular, one nation-state framework.

Our case introduces a qualifier to these discussions. The popularity in Turkey of the practice of acquiring American citizenship for Turkish children by traveling to the United States solely for purposes of giving birth complicates assumptions about (transnational) citizenship's equalizing power. This practice of transnationalism involves intricate relationships between national laws, economic incentives and various market mechanisms that extend across borders. We call it ›market embedded transnationalism‹ to emphasize how transnational practices of citizenship can also result in new kinds of inequalities at the intersection of global and local hierarchies. This elite group aims to expand the range of their children's legal rights, and plans to disaggregate them to maximize their benefits. However, not everyone has the necessary capital and connections to make use of this possibility. Thus, in addition to solidifying inequalities among different populations, the institution of citizenship, in this case, also exacerbates local inequalities within developing countries between those who have the means to acquire a second citizen-

ship through market mechanisms and those who do not. Thus, although we agree that thinking of transnational citizenship as a possible remedy to contemporary issues of economic inequality and/or immigrant rights is a valid stance, we suggest that it is also important to bring together discussions of markets and citizenship rights in order to better understand unexpected side-effects such as the one discussed here.

Appendix

Table 1

Turkish Citizens whose places of birth are listed as the USA

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
1151	1218	1388	1449	1512	1444	1568	1614	1636	1550	1613	1368	212

Turkish citizens whose places of birth are listed as the USA and who reside in Turkey

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
515	553	617	625	616	559	587	657	661	588	646	568	99

Note: These statistics were received on 21.05.2012 from the Turkish General Directorate of Population and Citizenship via correspondence.

References

- Brondsted Sejersen, Tanja. 2008. »I Vow to Thee My Countries« – The Expansion of Dual Citizenship in the 21st Century. « *International Migration Review*. 42,3: 523–549.
- Brubaker, W.R. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Falk, Richard, 2000. »The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization.« *Citizenship Studies*. 4,1: 5–17
- Grewal, Inderpal. *Transnational America: Feminisms, Diasporas, Neoliberalisms*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.
- İçduygu, Ahmet, Çolak, Yılmaz and Soyarık, Nalan. 1999. »What is the Matter with Citizenship? A Turkish Debate.« *Middle Eastern Studies*. 35,4: 187–208.
- Joppke, Christian. 2010. »The Inevitable Lightning of Citizenship.« *European Journal of Sociology*. 51,1: 9–32.
- Kadirbeyoğlu, Zeynep. 2010. »Country Report: Turkey« *EUDO Citizenship Observatory*. May. <http://eudo-citizenship.eu> (accessed 10 July 2012).

- Kaya, Ayhan, Kentel, Ferhat. *Euro-Turks: A Bridge, or a Breach, Between Turkey and the European Union?* Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies Publication, 2005.
- Kaya, Ayhan. 2012. »Transnational Citizenship: German-Turks and Liberalizing Citizenship Regimes.« *Citizenship Studies*. 16,2: 153–172.
- Keyman, Fuat E., İçduygu, Ahmet. 2003. »Globalisation, Immigration and Citizenship: The Case of Turkey« In *Globalisation: Theory and Practice*, edited by E. Kofman ve G. Young, 193–206. London: Continuum.
- Klusmeyer, Douglas. 2000. »Introduction« In *From Migrants to Citizens* edited by T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer. Washington D. C.: Carnegie Endowment Publications.
- Lieberman, R. C. *Shifting the Color Line: Race and the American Welfare State*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Marshall, T. H. *Citizenship and Social Class* London: Pluto Press, 1992.
- Mann, Michael. 1987. »Ruling Class Strategies and Citizenship.« *Sociology*. 21, 3: 339–254
- Martin, David. 2000. »Introduction to Part One« In *From Migrants to Citizens*, edited by T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer. Washington D. C.: Carnegie Endowment Publications.
- Ong, Aihwa. *Flexible Citizenship*. London, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Ong, Aihwa. 2005. «(Re)Articulations of Citizenship.« *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 38,49: 698–699.
- Pogge, Thomas. *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.
- Roche, Maurice. *Rethinking Citizenship: Ideology, Welfare and Change in Modern Society*. Polity Press: Cambridge, 1992.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2003. »Citizenship Destabilized.« *Liberal Education*. 14: 21.
- Shafir, Gershon, Brysk, Alison. 2006. »The Globalization of Rights: From Citizenship to Human Rights.« *Citizenship Studies*. 10,3: 275–287.
- Soysal, Yasemin. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Thelen, David. 1999. »How Natural are National and Transnational Citizenship? A Historical Perspective.« *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*. 7: 549–565.
- Turner, Brian. *Citizenship and Capitalism*. London: Allen Unwin, 1986.
- Turner, B. 1990. »Outline of a Theory of Citizenship.« *Sociology*. 24: 189–217.
- Walton-Roberts, Margaret. 2004. »Globalization, National Autonomy and Non-Resident Indians.« *Contemporary South Asia*. 13: 53–69.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 1999 »The Multi-Layered Citizen: Citizenship in the Age of Globalization«, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1,1: 119–136.

Open Access. This chapter is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License, which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.