Gün Güley, PhD Fellow (Political Theory) at Hamburg University

**The Voluntariness Assumption and the Enfranchisement of Non-Citizen Residents**

Bauböck, Miller and other prominent political scholars argue that the disenfranchisement of permanent, non-citizen residents, so-called denizens, is only a problem of justice, if naturalization laws are underinclusive. If this circumstance were remedied and naturalization laws were sufficiently inclusive, so the argument goes, denizens’ decision to abstain from naturalizing would simply amount to the voluntary decision not to vote (Bauböck 2008, Miller 2008). This paper rejects this assumption by, firstly, showing that commonly used rights-based conceptions of voluntariness, such as Nozick’s (Nozick 1974), are inadequate for the purpose of assessing whether a given institutional framework of inclusion is just or not. It argues, secondly, that under non-moralizing accounts of voluntariness such as Olsaretti’s (Olsaretti 1998), denizens’ decision not to naturalize could more plausibly be categorized as involuntary acts. Thirdly, the paper shows that the decision between a) remaining a citizen of one’s polity of origin while also remaining disenfranchised in one’s polity of residence or b) becoming a citizen of one’s polity of residence and thus gaining the right to vote there, while thereby entering a citizenship status that does not accurately reflect one’s real political identifications, is a choice between two fundamental interests. Policies and practices that set up such fundamental interests as mutually exclusive, however, compromise the decision-maker’s autonomy and flourishing and are therefore problematic vis-à-vis core liberal-democratic norms of justice. Thus, the paper concludes that we have good reasons to reject the voluntariness assumption. It suggests that instead of holding on to arbitrarily exclusionary citizenship-focused membership units that disenfranchise millions of permanent residents on the basis of this problematic voluntariness assumption, we ought to invest in principles and institutions of inclusion that more adequately reflect the multilayered fundamental political interests of immigrants and citizens within the nested, multinational polities of today.