'Citizenship'. Pp. 497-500 in *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by George Ritzer. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Jack Barbalet

Citizenship refers to membership in political community organized as a territorial or national state. The nature and content of citizenship varies with the form of state. Citizenship in the classic Greek *polis*, for instance, provided membership to a political elite, whereas modern liberal democratic citizenship provides opportunity to vote once every 3 or 4 years in a political election cycle. Sociological theories, however, recognize that citizenship has more than a mere political dimension.

Types of citizenship can be characterized in terms of two distinct axes or dimensions, one being access to citizenship status and the other being the quality of the rights and duties that attach to citizenship. Rules of access to citizenship separate citizens from non-citizens. Two alternative legal possibilities include jus sanguinis or citizenship by descent and jus soli or citizenship by birthplace. Which of these operates can have large consequences for persons who have moved across national boundaries either through the internationalization of economic activity and labour markets or the transformation of political units, both of which have relocated significant numbers of people trans-nationally over the last century.

Under conditions of jus sanguinis it is not sufficient to be born in a country to have access to its citizenship. To be a German or a Japanese citizen, for instance, it is not sufficient to be born in Germany or Japan. In these cases citizenship is based on descent or appropriate ethnic-cultural qualities and birth in its territory has no bearing on access to citizenship, even for second- and third-generation settlers. The range of possibilities under jus soli arrangements, on the other hand, is broader. American and Australian citizenship, for instance, can be acquired by virtue of being born in those countries. French citizenship, on the other hand, is attributed to a person born in France if at least one parent was also born in France (or a French colony or territory prior to independence). The legal requirements of acquisition of citizenship by naturalization are also quite variable between nation states.

The second axis of citizenship, which is that of quality, refers to what is provided by formal membership of a political community once it is attained. The quality of citizenship comprises the rights and duties that are available to persons as citizens. The rights and duties of citizenship include not only those of political participation but also those that relate to legal and social capacities. Marshall (1950), for instance, distinguishes civil, political and social citizenship.

The civil component of citizenship, according to Marshall, consists of those rights and duties that derive from legal institutions and especially courts of law. Civil rights include equal treatment before the law, rights of contract and property, and freedom from constraint by the state. Political rights are typically understood as rights of participation in the nation's political processes and especially the right to vote and stand for election. The social rights of citizenship are described by Marshall as rights to a basic level of material well-being through state provision independently of a person's market capacities. Other writers have added to these three sets of rights as when Janoski (1998), for instance, includes participation rights along with civil,

political and social rights. Accounts of the quality of citizenship have also been supplemented by reflection on recent social movements, which lead to consideration of rights associated with gender, ethnic and green citizenship, to which we shall return.

The analytic distinction between different rights of citizenship in Marshall's account is also an historical narrative of the development of citizenship and, within that development, of the relationship between citizenship and social class. Also, this historic developmental account of citizenship says something important about its institutional basis.

Marshall's distinction between civil, political and social rights operates in the context of an account of the incremental development of citizenship in England from the 18th century. At this time legal innovations functioned to oppose and undermine the remnants of feudal privilege that had persisted in English law. In that sense the advent of civil rights of citizenship was progressive. At the same time civil rights encouraged market relations that gained strength during the 18th century, and they therefore harmonised economic and social inequalities characteristic of the class system. By the mid-19th century the industrialization that grew out of the market economy produced a working-class movement that, among other things, laid claim to political membership in the states within which they lived and worked. The resulting parliamentary reform led to political rights becoming rights of citizenship rather than an adjunct to the privilege of property ownership. Here arises an element of antagonism between citizenship and the class system because, through political citizenship, organized electors without economic power can potentially influence market forces through the political process. This antagonism become more pronounced in the 20th century according to Marshall because through social citizenship, won by working-class voters, there arises participation as a right in a material culture that was previously the preserve of those who enjoyed class advantage.

Unlike a number of philosophical accounts of rights and citizenship that operate in terms of moral or ethical categories, Marshall's sociological account underscores rights institutionally. This therefore avoids the problem of inappropriate historical judgements that are based on the values the writer takes to the situation they treat rather than those that emerge out of it directly. Marshall understands citizenship rights to exist in terms of the institutions that are pertinent to them. Civil rights are based on the courts of law, political rights on representative institutions and social rights on the social services of the welfare state, including public education. Without the appropriate institutions, the corresponding rights have no basis. This approach does not deny aspirations for particular rights. In fact, such aspirations to as yet unachieved or denied rights in reality have the practical task of institution building to secure and sustain those rights. The virtue of this approach, then, is that it encourages an understanding of the history and practice of citizenship through a grasp of the development and role of institutions.

Citizenship is generally treated in terms of the rights that are available to citizens and denied to non-citizens, but there are also duties of citizenship and the relationship between rights and duties in citizenship has drawn interest from sociological writers (Janoski 1998; Janowitz 1980). The role of citizenship duties or obligations arguably have a role in the maintenance of social order and integration, but for most writers this

aspect of citizenship remains secondary to the importance of citizenship in providing otherwise unobtainable capacities to persons through the rights of citizenship. One difficulty with the notion of obligation is that it is not coterminous with the concept and practice of rights: it is erroneous to assume that to each right there is a corresponding obligation. This is because, as we have seen, citizenship rights are institutionally bounded and the relevant institutions require an organizational form; obligations or duties, on the other hand, operate as imperatives for citizens and as exhortations for compliance are morally, politically and ideologically bounded. The disarticulation of rights and obligations is further evident in the fact that many obligations exacted by the nation state are not confined to citizens but also embrace non-citizens, including the obligations of taxation, conformity to the law, exercise of social tolerance and so on.

Marshall's influential account of citizenship has a social, political and intellectual context that no longer obtains, and the changes that have occurred since the time his account was written lead to necessary modifications in the understanding of citizenship it provided. The full-employment policies of the immediate post-World War II period in all Western societies meant that social citizenship could be fiscally supported by a large and growing workforce. Structural economic and demographic changes since that time has meant that the financial basis of the social services required for social citizenship are no longer as secure as they were. When unemployment was typically "frictional" – associated with moving from one job to another – then high levels of unemployment benefits did not impose a strain on state financial support for social citizenship. When unemployment becomes "structural" and long term, and the non-working sector of the population is extended further through increasing numbers of aged persons coupled with a declining birth rate, then the social services can draw on only a diminishing tax basis and funding for social rights of citizenship can no longer be taken for granted.

Marshall's assumption of a full-employment economy is coupled with another, namely that the basic social unit is the family, comprising a male bread-winner and a dependent female spouse and children. This assumption too can no longer be assumed, which also has consequences for consideration of citizenship. Since the 1970s in all Western economies erosion of the share of real national income going to wage and salary earners has been so severe that earnings of male breadwinners are insufficient to maintain a traditional family. At the same time there has been a massive increase in the workforce of women with dependent children. The economic decomposition of the traditional family means that the individual and not the family is the basic social unit. Marshall's citizen was sexually neutral because uniformly male. The labour force significance of economically independent females means that the citizen is now undeniably sexed. Sexually distinct perspectives on citizenship rights are now unavoidable.

There are a number of issues of "green" citizenship that Marshall and his generation did not face associated with a now unacceptable assumption of unlimited resources. Once it is accepted that natural resources are inherently limited two tenets of green citizenship arise. First, in a world of non-renewable resources the community of citizens must include an intergenerational membership such that the rights of as yet unborn citizens feature in present calculations of distributive well-being. Second, as some writers have argued (Turner 1986), an ecological perspective on citizenship

means that natural objects, such as land, trees and animals, must be accorded citizenship rights. Given the difficulties of claiming and enforcing such rights this concern might be translated to issues concerning new duties or responsibilities of citizenship. In any event it has to be acknowledged that the environment upon which national well being depends is not confined to national boundaries. The radioactivity released by the Chernobyl disaster in 1986 spread across Western Europe. Green citizenship raises questions of trans-national citizenship.

A further development that has affected issues of citizenship is the changing composition of national communities, through migration, from culturally homogeneous populations to mosaics of national, ethnic, religious and racial diversity. These changes pose problems of integration and social segmentation. From the migrant's point of view this is the issue of access to the rights of citizenship, a problem classically treated by Parsons (1965) in his discussion of the citizenship consequences of internal migration and racial diversity in the USA. Today the question of access to rights by outsiders is associated with the broader questions of the increasing internationalization of national economies and displacement of persons through war and national decomposition and the consequent movement of large numbers of peoples across national boundaries. This raises questions concerning the impact of international organizations on national citizenship rights. Indeed, in Western Europe today there are in effect different levels of citizenship participation insofar as non-national residents may have civil and social rights and even certain political rights by virtue of the laws of their host counties that operate in terms of EU sponsored human rights protocols and other trans-national directives.

REFERENCES AND READINGS.
Barbalet, J.M. (1989). *Citizenship: Rights, Struggle and Class Inequality*. Indianapolis: University of Minnesota Press
Brubaker, Rogers. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Janoski, Thomas. (1998). *Citizenship and Civil Society: A Framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional and Social Democratic Regimes*. New York: Cambridge University Press
Janowitz, M. (1980). "Observations on the Sociology of Citizenship: Obligations and Rights". *Social Forces*. 59(1): 1-24
Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Parsons, Talcott. (1969). "Full Citizenship for the American Negro?" Pp. 252-91 in his *Politics and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press.
Turner, Bryan S. (1986). *Citizenship and Capitalism: The Debate over Reformism*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Vogel, Ursula and Michael Moran. (1991). *The Frontiers of Citizenship*. New York: St Martin's Press