

Theories of Citizenship Sociology

Farrokh Ghorbani Namvar¹, Isa Abedini^{2*}, Mohammad Reza Hassani³

¹Lecturer Executive Management in Farhngyan University (Pardis Allameh of Tabriz), Tabriz, Iran

²Lecturer in Farhngyan University (Pardis Allameh of Tabriz) and Education zone 1, Tabriz, Iran

³PhD in Sociology at the University of Mazandaran, Iran

*Corresponding Author Email: esaabedini@gmail.com

Abstract: Citizenship is one of the most important social concepts that work in understanding the relationship between individual and society. The citizen is defined as a member of the political community who enjoys all the rights and accepts all responsibilities dedicated to membership. In fact, civil rights include the rights of citizens in relation to public institutions, such as political rights, the right to employment, the right to choose and be chosen, the right of the authorities, the right to be a judge. Therefore, the word is too general than political rights. So we can say that civil rights are considered when the human rights are applied within a civil society under a special rule for certain people in certain territories, legislation. In this article, the concept of citizenship, civil rights, concepts of citizenship, civic culture, history and theories of citizenship and citizenship views, including citizenship, liberal, communitarian, republican, feminist and ecological citizen are studied.

Keywords: Citizenship Culture, Citizenship Perspective, Feminism, Ecological Citizenship.

Introduction

Citizen composed of two words "City" which means the humane society and "zen" as the member of the community. Clearly, the mere gathering of people in a particular place and forming the human society, city, the citizenship cannot be formed. In other words, human society is a prerequisite for citizenship, but not a sufficient condition. People are called citizenship when they take the rights and responsibilities and fulfill them. Citizenship is a two-way relationship between the individual and society. From one hand, it implies guarantees the faithfulness of people in the society and on the other hand involves government support for the individual. It can be described as membership in the society and political institutions (Enayati et al., 2013).

Citizenship is a complex word with multiple meanings. Its political success in the past does not mean that the current status rests on the resolution or unity in the context of the election, political leaders or intellectuals. Different meanings represent different applications. First, citizenship is a moral judgment. The so-called good or true citizenship is a positive judgment about the morality of the person. This concept implicitly implies that the person is interested in the collective interest and well-being. Second, citizenship is an objective, empirical and descriptive expression. In this sense, Citizenship is a particular set of duties and rights given to qualified individuals in a particular nation-state. Even though there were periods in which citizenship was related to a city government, in the present era, citizenship is linked solely to the nation state. Thirdly, citizenship can be regarded as an analytical interpretation. That is, citizenship includes a) maintaining a state and its leading members, b) government

opportunities in creating the main members for political participation, or c) a combination of A and B (Morris, 1980).

Citizenship Culture

Along with several definitions of culture, different divisions of the concept (such as civic culture, organizational culture, rural culture, etc.) are presented. One of the divisions is citizenship, culture. Citizenship culture is a set of values, attitudes and fundamental common law that contains a sense of belonging, commitment and respect for common heritage and also recognize the rights and obligations of citizens. It is a vast concept that is close to the collective soul. This concept not only refers to learning the collective life, it also includes the acquisition of values, attitudes, skills and loyalty to the obligations of citizenship which sometimes called as "Democratic Citizenship". A key issue in the citizenship culture is to attain social capital. Social capital is the capacity and capability to interact with people and institutions and achieve the collective goodness. Among the features of citizenship, trust and hope for future, self-esteem, humility, general partnership, open vision and the unity of tradition and modernity can be mentioned (Fatemi Nia, 2007).

Citizenship culture is the intersection of good governance, efficient organizations and active citizens. Citizenship culture is not created unless the government, organizations and citizens to be responsible and committed. There are two basic common elements in different levels; collective goodness and the citizens. The most important common goal in this arena is an attempt to get the collective goodness. It is a concept that unlike liberalism, there are greater consensus over its meaning and evidences. In comparison to other concepts, it was less stressful and disputable.

Citizenship Approaches

Liberal Citizenship

Liberal theory, whether of citizenship or of anything else, begins with the individual; Liberalism's view of the individual shapes its views of all other social aggregations, including the state. Yet its (and our) understanding of the nature of individuals is both dynamic and woefully incomplete. In particular, new advances in the fields of psychology, evolutionary biology, human genetics and social science constantly unsettle received understandings about how individuals apprehend the world, about their motivations, rationality, spirituality, and behavior, and about the causal relationships that determine how these factors operate, and with what effects, in the real world. Partly for this reason, liberal theory has had to take individuals much as it finds them on the surface, while the scientists proceed with deeper investigations. This inability of liberal theory to advance an authoritative and convincing account of the individual poses a fundamental challenge to its coherence, one that I discuss below. The most influential early expositors of systematic liberal theory were John Locke and John Stuart Mill. Locke ([1690] 1960) viewed individuals as endowed with and animated by reason, characterized as the 'Voice of God,' through which they can discern and act upon the dictates of divinely given natural law (Isin & Turner, 2002).

According to Luck, the state is a collection of people which has been formed just to maintain, protect and advance the interests of civil society. He defines the civic interests in life with items like liberty, health, the welfare of persons and possessing some objects such as money, land, housing, furniture and appliances. This is the civil ruler's duty to fairly defend the right of all people and specifically each individual under its lordship and protect their legitimate ownership of what belongs to the earthly life. If a person thinks about violation of the law relating to social justice and equality for ensuring the protection of life, the state prevents him by threatening to punish and deny of benefits and the blessings of civil life.

John Stuart Mill is mainly thinking in the context of the liberal discourse and seeks to defend individual rights and prevent violations of them. Mill is always concerned with the total domination of the society and government on individual and afraid of this fact that it may limit the sphere of thought and action of the people. Locke and Mill intersection is in their defense of the individual and the right of the individual against society. The systems of "liberal democracy" that govern modern societies can be considered as a bridge. If we consider two poles for this bridge, one pole includes John Locke, Jean Jacques Rousseau and other thinkers who designed the bridge of liberal democracy and the other pole includes Mill (Stolley, 2005).

Republicanism

Citizenship is a key concept in the ideas and policies of the Republicans or the tradition of civic republicanism. Citizens are considered as the equal and definite members of a political community. Their identity is defined along with their responsibilities and tasks in the political community. In Republicanism, citizenship is an action and a

person who is not involved in the action, is not considered as a citizen; that is, the full membership in the political community is only possible through performing the citizenship duties and responsibilities. Doing public service is necessary for citizens by whom the political community will be able to define, explain and fix the equal citizens (Nowruzi & Gul Parvar, 2011).

The republican standards embedded in the ethical dimension of citizenship thus provide an ideal of what a citizen should be. Like other ideals, however, republican citizenship can take more or less stringent forms. At its most stringent, the republican conception seems to demand unquestioning loyalty and total sacrifice from the citizen. The Spartan mother who supposedly told her son to come back a hero from the war or to come back on his shield gave voice to this view. In its less stringent forms, the republican conception acknowledges that even good citizens should not forsake self-interest. Tocqueville articulated this position when he praised the doctrine of 'self-interest properly understood'. Paying taxes, serving on juries, obeying the law, and attending to public affairs require the sacrifice of time, attention, and treasure, but such sacrifices are necessary if we are to preserve republican government and continue to enjoy the rights of the citizen (Isin & Turner, 2002).

Environmental Citizenship

The resurgence of citizenship as a fashionable idea in the last decade of the twentieth century has been well documented. One side effect of this renewed interest has been the emergence of a long list of adjectival citizenships. For example, MacGregor and Szerszynski identify 'cyber citizenship, scientific citizenship, corporate citizenship, consumer citizenship, and global citizenship' as just a few of the pairings that have made an appearance in the literature'. In the environmental literature, at least 'environmental citizenship', 'ecological citizenship', 'sustainability citizenship' and 'green citizenship' have been seen.² One problem with all of these adjectival citizenships is that it is not clear what the adjective does to the idea of citizenship. It is common knowledge what 'British citizenship' means – a British citizen is a member of a particular political community with a particular set of institutions and defined territorial borders. 'British' is a qualifier that can be understood because it clearly relates to the core idea of citizenship as membership of a political community. But what does 'environmental citizenship' mean? (Bell, 2005).

At a basic level, ecological citizenship is concerned with the status, entitlements, and processes of participation that citizens enjoy in relation to the natural environment. However, as we shall see, the various terminologies of environmental citizenship embrace a wide spectrum of opinion on the shape and relative importance of these features. In this article, we therefore want to explore these different perspectives and examine their specific implications for our understanding of corporations.

The recognition and development of a form of citizenship appropriate for environmental issues and politics has spurred a growing stream of academic literature across the politics, philosophy, ecology, law, and sociology disciplines. Although some authors seek to make conceptual distinctions between alternative labels here—for instance, Dobson (2003) distinguished between *environmental citizenship* and *ecological citizenship*—for the sake of simplicity we will use ecological citizenship as a catch-all umbrella term in this article. This stream of literature has been characterized by a considerable degree of heterogeneity, and often a fair degree of imprecision, about what exactly ecological citizenship might constitute. In general, though, it is possible to discern three main strands, each of which characterizes ecological citizenship rather differently. First, there is the notion grounded in pre-modern ideas of identity and status being intimately tied to a certain physical territory or ecological environment rather than to a nation state and/or government (Curtin, 1999). Second, there is the notion of citizenship being grounded in the modern apparatus of liberal or republican citizenship and focusing predominantly on environmental rights (Shelton, 1991) or the common good (Sagoff, 1988), respectively. Third, there is a notion predicated on non-territoriality that seeks to establish an entirely new basis for citizenship (Crane et al., 2008).

Environmentally sensitive citizens must be world citizens. Ecological processes disregard the artificial and contrived borders of nation-states. Now this model of citizenship is nothing more than an environmental movement. That is why the question that what will eventually be the nature of environmental citizenship has not yet got a definitive answer. However, there are some comments in this regard that how the environmentalists should go beyond the Marshall's model of citizenship and create a global environmental citizenship. The first issue relates to civil rights and this problem that who should be considered as citizens. Civic rights expanded by the social movements and now the environmentalists argue that it needs to be expanded more than before. Firstly, the future generations must benefit from civil rights. In some respects, this proposal does not seem as controversial as in the first glance. The rights of citizens, who are children now, are somehow considered. For example, the education and welfare services can be named. In addition, it is expected that citizenship is also granted to those who are not yet born and it is expected that the current situation leads to this direction. It seems that Norway's constitution has met

the expectation related to the environment in an amendment article. This article says that everyone has the right to benefit from an environment which provides health and preserves the forces of production and the diversity of natural environments. Natural resources should be exploited based on long-term and comprehensive considerations so that future generations also have the right to be protected (Nash, 2008).

The second issue is that global environmental citizenship is often seen as a liability in the nature. It is sometimes called environmental monitoring. Emphasis on responsibilities rather than rights has made a profound difference and conflict among the environmental movements and other social movements. The notion of responsibility is not a new idea, and in fact, it has been an inherent and permanent element of citizenship. However, social movements are mainly fighting to expand the rights of the citizens not to expand the duties and obligations. Therefore, there may be a conflict on this issue between environmental movements and other social movements because the expansion of welfare rights depends on the development of the capitalist economy. While some members of the green movement believe that the concerns of environment are compatible with the reproduction of capitalism, others argue that economic growth in the long run is not beneficial to the environment.

Thirdly, responsible citizens towards the environment are often linked to wider participation in political life. There are various proposals to increase the rate of participation. Eastward suggests that citizens should participate with experts in assessing the environmental risks that affect them and find solutions for dealing with it. Christopher offered some issues in transnational and international levels and argues that regional parliaments (such as a democratic European Parliament) should be established in areas with ecological importance so that they can tie the national boundaries together. He says that a referendum should be held on environmental issues (Nash, 2008).

Conclusion

We can say that women are half of the human being population and have been disregarded during the evolution of science, history and politics. Women perpetuated their historical role in the traditional system of division of labor in capitalism's history. Along with continuation of the patriarchal roles and functions in the society, the gender dimension has traditionally been absent in the social and political issues, including the theories of citizenship. They are absolutely contradictory were deprived of full citizenship rights. That is, when women must have had such legal rights as men, they have been discriminated as opposite gender.

Second, when only the distinct behaviors could create full equality, women were considered as men. In such cases, physical and historical differences are neglected and it stopped women from the actual participation in the institutions and actions prepared for men, although they enjoy the rights associated with such participation. Third, some civil rights, especially social rights, are differently allotted to women and men. In these situations women are treated as inferior citizens. According to feminists, the women contradictions and inconsistencies dates back to this fact that their citizenship is subordinate to men's one. Historically, until recently, men were considered as heads of households and the women's rights emerged in a framework which was based on the masculine rights (Nash, 2008).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Bell DR, 2005. Liberal Environmental Citizenship. *Environmental Politics*. 14(2):179 – 194.
- Enayati T, Arasteh H, Zameni F, Nezafati Payaneh Y, 2013. Relationship between Students' Knowledge of Civil Rights and their Social Behavior. *Journal of Ethics in Science and Technology*. 7(2).
- Fatemi Nia S, 2007. The culture of citizenship: the product of good governance. efficient organization and active citizen. *Journal of Social Welfare*. 7(26).
- Inis EF, Turner BS, 2002. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. Sage Publications Inc. Thousand Oaks. California.
- Morris J, 1980. Observations on the Sociology of Citizenship: Obligations and Rights. *Social Forces*. 59(1): 1-24.
- Nash K, 2008. *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power*. translated by Mohammad Taghi Delfrouz. Tehran. Kavir press. Iran.
- Nowruzi FU, Gul Parvar M, 2011. Evaluation of the sense of women from the citizenship rights and the related factors. *strategy quarterly*. 20TH year: 167-190.
- Stolley KS, 2005. *The Basics of Sociology*. United States of America. Zibaklam, Sadegh (2009) *Five Words about the government*. Tehran. Rouzaneh press. Iran.