Stoker, Gerry. "Introduction." *Prospects for Citizenship*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011. 1–10. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849662444.0005>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 15:24 UTC.

Copyright © Chris Armstrong, Momoh Banya, Derek McGhee, Anthony McGrew, Andrew Mason, David Owen, Graham Smith, Clare Saunders and Gerry Stoker 2011. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Introduction

This book is written at a time when our sense of citizenship – what it is and who it can be claimed by – appears more uncertain than before. There is a great deal of public debate about citizenship, and public policy measures are aimed at promoting citizenship and clarifying our entitlements as citizens. The 2009 BBC Reith Lectures ran under the generic title of ‘A New Citizenship’ and rested on a call for a re-moralization of public life. The invited Reith lecturer and well known American philosopher Michael Sandel called for ‘a new politics of the common good’ that requires ‘a more demanding idea of what it means to be a citizen, and it requires a more robust public discourse – one that engages more directly with moral and even spiritual questions’. We hope to contribute to that debate about citizenship but in a way that downplays the moral fervour of Sandel and argues for a more nuanced understanding of the realities of citizenship in today’s complex world.

Citizenship is a multidimensional idea and practice. It captures a statement both about individuals and the social world in which they live. It can be used to describe a person’s position in a society but equally it can be something to which virtue can be attached as we are all in different ways exhorted to be good citizens. The classic distinction between liberal and republican forms of citizenship still resonates with contemporary political life as does the implied division between approaches stressing rights and responsibilities. These dynamics remain at the heart of much of the citizenship debate. However, as a group of researchers working out of the University of Southampton’s Centre for Citizenship, Globalization and Governance (C2G2), we have a shared sense that new agendas are emerging that need to be addressed both within the academic community and within the policy world. There is a need to think about how to renew our capacity for political citizenship and impassioned calls for a new politics may fall on deaf ears unless these issues are addressed. Our sense of political membership in a globalized world needs to be rethought, as we deal with a world where interdependence has increased alongside migration, population mobility, and a growing sense that we live in a shared economic system and within a collective global context of ecological constraints. So if we are to develop a new politics of the common good – as Sandel suggests – we had better be clear which of the world’s citizens are included and which, if any, are excluded. Our understanding of rights and responsibilities in this changed world leads

to complicated new challenges over the issues of multiculturalism and the emergence of an international order for the promotion of human rights. The building of a new citizenship may require the removal of many barriers and obstacles. In short, philosophical reflection needs to be accompanied by hard-headed empirical analysis.

The citizenship settlement that emerged in the aftermath of the Second World War now appears to be unravelling. This book is about the prospects for citizenship in the new century. In the introduction we lay out our arguments for why a new agenda is needed and go on to specify some of the key features of that new agenda.

A Citizenship Settlement under Challenge?

In the 1950s, T. H. Marshall (1950) published an optimistic book about citizenship which focused on British experience but was seen as having a wider relevance. His basic idea was simple: that one set of rights of citizenship leads to another. So legal or civil rights can be resilient only if combined with the right to participate in political decisions and political power which, in turn, leads to the demand for social or welfare rights of citizenship such as the right to education or good health care. The argument has authoritative status not so much for its associated perspective about a positive forward march of history as citizens gain one set of citizenship rights after another, but more because it captures the sense of a settled and clear understanding of citizenship in the post-war era. To be a citizen of a democracy, such as Britain, meant having access to basic legal rights, political entitlements to vote and make your voice heard, and social rights to basic features of a welfare state.

Marshall's assumption was that all these rights were built up and maintained in the context of a world where nation states were the prime actors and carriers of citizen rights. The state was seen as key to delivering the context for the promotion of legal, political and social rights of citizenship. Its power of taxation, its capacity to uphold the law, to govern for the common good and its capacity to deliver welfare support and economic stability were seen as key. In the 1950s, the threefold quality of citizenship was available to citizens in a relatively small club of advanced industrial western nation states – constituting no more than a third of the nation states of the world – and characterized by systems of liberal democratic governance. The political dimension of citizenship played out for Marshall in a world where the representative politics of these nation states was seen as delivering an effective democratic model in practice.

The mix of legal, political and social rights entitlements identified by T. H. Marshall in 1950 no longer (albeit for different reasons) seems to be a sufficiently solid base on which to build our academic analysis of citizenship, still less our sense of what to do to meet the contemporary challenges of citizenship. That does not take away from the seminal nature of the understanding offered by Marshall, whose association with Southampton is reflected in lectures given in his honour from 1983 onwards (see Bulmer and Rees [1996] for an early collection of these). But it is important to understand just how much the world now differs from the one on which Marshall based his reflections in order to appreciate why we consider a new agenda on the prospects for citizenship is required.

Three forces have challenged the pillars of Marshall's concept of citizenship. They are globalization (which raises challenges to the effective sovereignty of nation states), a loss of faith in the capacity of the state to deliver social and economic well-being, and developments within democratic practice and experience which have led to a loss of trust in the effectiveness of the processes of representative democracy. We shall explore each further below and throughout this book.

Something fundamental is happening to our economies and the umbrella term 'globalization' is a good one to capture what is going on. There has been a strong trend towards a world of more rapid transnational communication, closer connections between peoples and organizations, and a greater sense of interconnectedness. Economies are more interdependent, patterns of migration have taken on powerful and challenging directions, environmental pressures on the world's resources seem to be both more intertwined and more pressing than in the past, and the speed and pace of communication and the sharing of ideas and practices throughout the world appear to offer new opportunities but also enable new threats. The importance, meaning and impact of globalization are a matter of dispute (Scholte 2005). Some writers suggest that the forces of globalization are so powerful that they are sweeping away all the efforts of states to protect their populations. But our view is not that globalization has removed the prospects of achieving citizenship altogether, but rather that it has fundamentally changed the context for citizenship.

We live in a world where there is a significant further development towards a global market in which patterns of production and consumption are organized by international financial institutions, transnational corporations and other related organizations, operating across national boundaries. Global finance markets and patterns of international trade in turn influence

the shape of national economies. In the industrialized countries these forces are experienced in terms of sweeping changes in the economy with old-style industrial jobs declining and new-style service and high-tech jobs emerging. Consumers in these countries observe an increasing amount of goods coming from outside their national boundaries as their economies are brought into the grip of a global market to a greater degree than before. The non-industrialized parts of the world face new economic demands and some new opportunities. But, so far at least, globalization has hardly helped to redress the disparity between richest and poorest countries; indeed it may have worsened the position of the poorest countries. So we can be clear that globalization has challenged the effective sovereignty of nation states and meant that the comfortable world view assumed by Marshall can no longer be taken for granted. This is directly related to a second key feature of today's world of citizenship: it is framed by institutions beyond the nation state. One way in which politics has responded to globalization is by regionalization. We have seen the reinforcement and development of three powerful economic blocks. The triads are: North America, Europe and South-East Asia. Developments in economy and society in these areas have met with a citizenship response, most obviously in the case of the European Union (EU). But in all these regions, the citizenship debate now leaks beyond national boundaries.

Furthermore, in today's world, the state–citizen relationship is characterized by a degree of ambiguity that would have been unthinkable during the period in which Marshall developed his thesis. For many citizens today, the state is both a necessity and a hindrance to the achievement of our empowerment. We want the state to protect us from crime but not to subject us to unnecessary surveillance. We want the state to block terrorist threats but not to usurp our freedom. Many citizens – for good reasons – are wary of the state, sceptical about its capacities and/or uncertain about its motivations and objectives. We approach the state as consumer, citizen, taxpayer, carer, user and supplicant in a jumble of ideas and emotions, not through the lens of idealized conceptions of citizenship. Indeed, we may have lost faith in the capacity of the state to support our citizenship or of citizenship to provide control of the state. Access to the law for redress remains stubbornly unequal to a significant degree; fear of crime remains high and the terrorist threat feels at best to be only in part successfully managed. The legal and court systems are an unwieldy business, lacking a cutting edge to deal with certain types of criminality, and yet at the same time they offer an unwelcoming environment in which to seek

justice. The fight against terrorism appears to lead to measures that curtail traditional freedoms, whether they are stop-and-search practices by the police, 'star chamber' legal practices or practices of extended detention without charge. These measures may or may not be seen as justified but it is difficult to deny that they have an oppressive quality that could make any citizen at least wary of what the state is doing in our name. Yet the state has also become the actor that we look to for providing services that meet basic and more advanced needs in our lives. It is not just our protector; it is our saviour in providing health, social care, education and in some instances housing and income support. Sometimes this is experienced as organized beneficence as recipients obtain the benefits of the investment made by themselves and others through a redistributive tax system. At their most positive, institutions such as the National Health Service (NHS) in the UK express communal values of solidarity. But the state in this arena of meeting needs also rations and redistributes in a way that citizens find difficult to fathom. And gather any group of citizens in a social setting and ask them for examples about waste in the provision of public services and the examples pour out.

Perhaps there is evidence of spiralling expectations as we citizens have got used to our welfare rights but equally we, as citizens, are hearing that the state is no longer simply there to provide. Rather it has expectations of your help. It wants you to eat more healthily, to be a better parent, to take exercise regularly, to reduce your carbon footprint and to save for your retirement. The state has the character of both a generous relative and a nagging teacher. Again citizens are left in a position where they are far from sure which of the two faces of the state they are going to experience at any given exchange. Ambiguity and contradiction are inherent in our experience of the state. Whereas Marshall saw the state as delivering our citizenship in terms that are broadly fair to all, today there are many who believe that the state has been captured by special interests.

The idea that the state could be captured by inside interests has a long history in progressive thought – witness the arguments in different circumstances of G. D. H. Cole and George Orwell – so it is not some trumped-up charge of the New Right. But the public-choice critiques that inspired Margaret Thatcher and Keith Joseph are overblown with their emphasis on how public servants are narrowly bent on the pursuit of power and money, under the guise of public service. We can disagree with the view that all public servants are on the make without falling into the trap of assuming that all who work in the public service are other-regarding

champions of the public. As most empirical studies have shown, public servants are neither entirely knavish nor wholly knightly in their behaviour and moreover cannot be said to have captured the state. Yet it would be difficult now for anyone to assume the easy virtue of state action that underlay much of Marshall's thinking.

This brings us to the third major change in the context for citizenship. The environment of British civil society was more benign in the period of the great expansion of the welfare state after the Second World War than it is now. Large-scale projects and programmes were put together with a minimum of public consultation and pushed through. It was only in the 1960s and 1970s that people's protests about, for example, massive slum clearance programmes began to be heard. Public projects and programmes had been carried along on a sea of deference. No more. There is a wider loss of the legitimacy of authority in society. The police, judges, teachers and many others in positions of authority report a loss of respect and a greater willingness for their decisions to be challenged. Again there are reasons for thinking that the rise of critical citizens might be a good thing and healthy for our democratic creed. The difficulty is that the evidence points to the emergence of a culture of hopeless fatalism and deeply ingrained cynicism towards public institutions and politics, despite the fact that the ideal of democracy retains widespread support. Indeed, democratization presents the other great force for change in our world. Whereas in late 1974 fewer than three in ten nations in the world could be classified as democratic, twenty years later in 1994 that number had grown to six in ten and at the beginning of the twenty-first century most of these newly established democracies have survived and been joined by a few more recruits (Diamond 2003). But it is not just the spread of the basic institutions of liberal democracy that is historically unique about the current period; it is that the idea of democracy has gained a certain universal appeal. Democracy has gone global and is no longer the exclusive preserve of the few nation states that Marshall had in mind when depicting his view of citizenship.

Our view of citizenship remains sympathetic to the understanding offered by Marshall of the connection between societal changes and the development of citizenship. In line with Marshall's argument, we suggest that because society has changed dramatically since the 1950s, we need to rethink our understanding of citizenship as an idea and practice. We sustain his interest in a multi-dimensional approach to the issue of citizenship, embedding our conception of it within legal, political and social dimensions. Our challenge is to produce a new analysis of citizenship for a new era and

we propose to approach that challenge using, like Marshall, a mixture of theoretical and empirical analysis.

Prospects for a New Analysis of Citizenship

We construct our new agenda for citizenship around three themes. These are not intended to exhaust the territory of thinking about citizenship in theory and practice, and there are other issues that might have been included for discussion in this volume. One example would be the relationship between gender and citizenship, an issue that has inspired a great deal of discussion across a wide range of dimensions. The omission of such issues should not be taken to reflect a view that they are not important. Rather, it reflects our focus on the core theme of the changing nature of political membership in the contemporary world. Although this is not, from the perspective of citizenship, *all* that matters, it is an extremely important issue and moreover one which unites the research interests of the various contributors to this book. Within this focus on the changing nature of political membership, we focus on three major issues. The first major issue is the future of political citizenship, and this is addressed in the opening three chapters. Something fundamental seems to be happening to what in the middle of the twentieth century in the eyes of Marshall and others seemed to be one of the most settled parts of the citizenship debate. Political citizenship is under threat and it is not clear how it might be revived, though some of the chapters of this book discuss ways in which it might conceivably be revitalized. The middle chapters of the book address the issue of rights and responsibilities but through new lenses, including the issue of multiculturalism and the emergence of demands for human rights legislation. In both cases the focus is on the nature of political membership, and the relationship between citizen and state. In the former case the issue of multiculturalism has brought to the fore questions about the value of integration, whereas in the latter case we examine a tension that has opened up in recent political debates about citizenship between the rights of citizens and human rights. The final core area for further analysis is the emergence of the idea of transnational and even global citizenship, and the pressing need for citizenship debates to take into account a world of globalization and transnational migration.

Chapter One looks at the issue of the decline of political citizenship. The discussion opens with a consideration of what level of activism and passivity is appropriate for the citizen of a democracy today. It argues that in established and new democracies, there is a danger that many – even a majority of – citizens have no positive sense of political citizenship and that

this in turn provides the base for a potential undermining of a commitment to democratic principles and practices. Evidence about a malaise within politics is offered from Europe and the United States. The analysis then turns to examine, in greater depth, explanations for that malaise and finally it asks what if anything could be done to restore a stronger sense of political citizenship. The discussion then closes with a plea for more research into how citizens understand politics.

Recent years have witnessed growing experimentation by public authorities with democratic innovations: institutions specifically designed to engage citizens in the political decision-making process. Chapter Two focuses on this institutional strategy to 'revive' political citizenship. Initially, the chapter lays out a series of significant challenges to effective citizen engagement: differential rates of participation across social groups; competence of citizens; capacity to influence decision making; costs to citizens and authorities; and scale. The chapter highlights how four very different democratic designs – participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre; the British Columbia Citizens' Assembly; 21st Century Town Meetings; and Womenspeak – respond in different ways to these challenges. The chapter ends with a call for more systematic comparative analysis of the democratic contributions of such innovations and the conditions under which they emerge and thrive.

Chapter Three considers the prospects for citizenship 'from below' in the form of protest movements. Evidence is presented which suggests that, contrary to what is implied by much social movement scholarship, protest is not dramatically rising. In fact, in Britain in 2005 only around 2 per cent of the British population participated in a legal demonstration (European Social Survey). Why is it that protest is such a minority activity in Britain? An attempt is made to answer this question using insights from social movement theory, particularly political process theory, the new middle class thesis and the concept of 'waves' of protest. The analysis shows that these aspects of social movement theory do not – alone – satisfactorily answer our questions. We therefore suggest that more research should be carried out in order for us to understand how the confluence of factors from each of the theories impacts upon the shape and form of protest, and therefore its contribution to citizenship. Furthermore, we suggest the need to develop analysis and understanding of the interactions between protest and 'top-down' democratic innovations.

Chapter Four reflects on the fact that traditional notions of citizenship are facing a number of challenges. Ideas of cosmopolitan and environmental citizenship have emerged in the light of concerns about global inequality

and climate change, whilst new models of transnational and multicultural citizenship have been developed in response to the dilemmas raised by migration and the cultural diversity it creates within state boundaries. At the same time, more particular debates rage about the demands citizenship places upon us. Different normative theories of citizenship will address these issues in different ways and provide different perspectives on them. In this chapter, two such theories will be distinguished and brought to bear on a crucial question which has engaged both political theorists and policymakers in a number of countries, namely: Do immigrants have a duty to integrate when they join a state?

Chapter Five explores the tension between 'civic rights' (or the rights of citizenship) and human rights in the context of domestic politics. It is suggested that the debates and proposals for a Bill of Rights in the UK are the site for the emergence of a clash between two types of politics – 'a politics of citizenship' and a 'politics of human rights' – in which the dual commitments of liberal democracies (i.e. to international human rights and collective self-determination) are in tension. In this chapter the tension between 'civic rights' and 'human rights' is examined by analysing government and opposition discourses about the potential Bill of Rights with regards to the relationship between: (a) human rights and 'public safety'; (b) rights and responsibilities; and (c) the need to bolster and shape what is perceived to be a weak sense of citizenship in contemporary Britain through a Bill of Rights and Statement of Shared Values.

Chapter Six focuses on the proliferation of forms of transpolitical (i.e. transnational and supranational) citizenship in recent years in terms of both explanatory and normative agendas. Outlining distinct 'nested' and 'non-nested' forms of transpolitical citizenship, its initial examination is primarily directed at explanations for the development of the 'non-nested' forms, namely transnational citizenship, attending to the breakdown of the norm of single nationality and consequent emergence of forms of dual or plural nationality, the spread of expatriate voting rights and the development of resident non-citizen voting rights. This survey and explanatory discussion is followed by a consideration of the major normative issues raised by the transformation of membership regimes in terms of three potential principles: the all subjected principle, the all affected principle and the stakeholder principle. The chapter concludes by noting a central issue raised by these considerations for the primary example of 'nested' transpolitical citizenship, EU citizenship, concerning national voting rights for EU citizens who are not resident in their country of nationality.

Chapter Seven analyses the nature of citizenship in the context of globalization. In short, it examines the challenges which globalization presents to the conditions, practices and the institution of citizenship. Much of the literature on the relationship between globalization and citizenship contends that the process has diminished the significance or essence of citizenship, this chapter explores this 'declinist' thesis by identifying some of the key contributions and primary arguments in order to understand why globalization is considered to undermine the conditions of citizenship. It also considers the connections between globalization and securitization and the implications for citizenship – particularly in terms of why and how the global movement of people and ideas, for example, has contributed to expanded restrictions on the practices of citizenship. In other words, it highlights the complex ways in which modern citizenship is being reconfigured by the related processes of globalization and securitization. The chapter then goes on to examine the prospects for the institution of citizenship under conditions of contemporary globalization. It argues that globalization is neither the principal culprit in the purported demise of citizenship nor the harbinger of the progressive transformation of citizenship.

Chapter Eight examines the major recent arguments for 'cosmopolitan' citizenship. It is sometimes claimed that we are living in more 'cosmopolitan' times, and that citizens today – or at least younger generations of citizens – have a more cosmopolitan orientation. But the precise nature of arguments for cosmopolitan *citizenship*, and the relationship between cosmopolitanism more generally and arguments for cosmopolitan citizenship in particular, need careful exploration. The chapter examines cosmopolitan arguments for the universal scope of democracy, distributive justice and individual ethical obligations, and assesses in each case the relationship between those commitments and any commitment to global or cosmopolitan citizenship. Though the connection between cosmopolitanism and global citizenship is tightest in the case of arguments for cosmopolitan democracy, that position does face significant challenges which question both the feasibility and desirability of global citizenship.

The reflections offered in this volume thus mark out what we take to be central questions for the contemporary theory and practice of citizenship. In our view, citizenship remains a central organizing concept for political life, but if it is to play that role, we need to be clearer about the forms and contexts of citizenship in a globalizing world and the demands on, and of, citizenship in these contexts.