

Sociology

<http://soc.sagepub.com>

Is Citizenship Gendered?

Sylvia Walby

Sociology 1994; 28; 379

DOI: 10.1177/0038038594028002002

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://soc.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/28/2/379>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



British Sociological Association

Additional services and information for *Sociology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://soc.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://soc.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 9 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://soc.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/28/2/379>

IS CITIZENSHIP GENDERED?

SYLVIA WALBY

Abstract The absence of gender from writings on citizenship, such as those of Marshall, Mann and Turner, causes problems for the understanding of citizenship. Debates as to how gender can be integrated into citizenship highlight major divergences in feminist theory over the relationship between the public and the private. The paper argues that citizenship cannot be understood without a dynamic theory of gender relations, and that political citizenship for women destabilises private patriarchy and the family. Citizenship is about a transition from private to public patriarchy, not only the civilising of capitalism.

Keywords: citizenship, gender, politics, patriarchy, state.

Introduction

Is citizenship gendered or is it beyond such particularism? Is it a concept which can be successfully universalist, or is it always affected by deeply rooted social divisions of gender, class and ethnicity? These issues relate to both a political project for which the concept of citizen serves as a unifying symbol, and an intellectual understanding of social integration. In contemporary Britain the term 'citizenship' has been used to indicate a populist notion of fairness and justice for all Britons, as in the development of 'Citizens' Charters'. The intellectual focus of British social science debate on the topic has often been concerned with the extent to which class restricts effective access to citizenship, as in the debates around T.H. Marshall's work (Mann 1987; Marshall 1950; Turner 1990), although there is also an interest in the relationship of citizenship to social cohesion (Marquand 1988; Pahl 1991; Taylor 1991; Turner 1991a, 1991b).

Gender is absent from many discussions of citizenship. Despite the fact that women do not have the same access to citizenship as men, the significance of, and reasons for, this are rarely explored (with some key exceptions e.g. Lister 1990). The inclusion of gender, even if merely to note that women have a different relationship to citizenship than men, is a necessary initial corrective. However, there is a question as to whether 'citizenship' is so imbued with gender specific assumptions related to the public sphere and the nexus of the market and state that it is necessarily only a partial rather than a universalistic project. A further question is that of the significance of citizenship in the development of contemporary forms of gender relations, and hence of social relations more broadly. This is the issue of whether the

achievement of citizenship by women has a significant impact on the form and degree of gender inequality.

Marshall's Heritage

Much of the recent social science debate on citizenship is concerned with the relationship of class to social integration and omits gender. T. H. Marshall developed a theory of citizenship which he saw as both socially progressive and politically moderate, believing in the possibility of justice and rights in a mixed capitalist economy (Marshall 1950, 1975, 1981). Most of Marshall's analysis was related to the changing structure of social classes in relation to citizenship and capitalism. While I shall adopt Marshall's definition of citizenship, I take issue with his theory of its development.

Citizenship according to Marshall, has:

three parts, or elements, civil, political and social. The civil element is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom – liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice . . . the institutions most directly associated with civil rights are the courts of justice. By the political element I mean the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body. The corresponding institutions are parliament and councils of local government. By the social element I mean the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society. The institutions most closely connected with it are the educational system and the social services (Marshall 1950: 10–11).

These rights were considered to have been steadily built up, first civil rights, then political, lastly social:

it is possible, without doing too much violence to historical accuracy, to assign the formative period in the life of each to a different century – civil rights to the eighteenth, political to the nineteenth, and social to the twentieth (Marshall 1950: 14).

Civil rights include *habeas corpus* and, in the economic field, the right to work in an occupation of one's choosing (p. 15).

Yet women in Britain before 1928 and in the US until 1920 did not have many of the features of either civil or political citizenship. They lacked 'liberty of the person' in that they did not have the right to control their own bodies in situations where they wished for abortion or contraception. Married women lacked the right to live anywhere other than where their husbands insisted. Married women, until late in the nineteenth century, did not have 'the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts', losing this right

on marriage. Married women did not have 'the right to justice' in that they did not have the right to be free from the physical coercion of their husband nor to refuse him sexual intercourse. Women certainly did not have 'political citizenship' either, since the vote was only granted to women in stages in 1918 and 1928. Women did not have the 'civil' right to work at the occupation of their choice, since there were so many restrictions on the forms of employment open to women, ranging from the marriage bar in many white collar employments to lack of access to skilled manual labour since they were denied access to apprenticeships (Banks 1981; Drake 1920; Holcombe 1983; Walby 1990).

Marshall's concept of citizenship opens the way to discuss degrees of citizenship obtained by different social groups at different times. That Marshall does not take advantage of this is no reason why we should not do so today.

Mann (1987) criticises Marshall's conception of three stages of the attainment of citizenship for its evolutionism and Anglocentrism, choosing instead to emphasise the importance of military and geopolitical formations. Mann is correct to make this point, but I think he does not follow it through sufficiently in that he underestimates the significance of ethnicity and 'race', and ignores other social divisions, such as that of gender. There are occasions where a descriptive qualification is made, but it is of little analytic significance. For instance, discussing the case of the US Mann proposes:

In the US labour was eventually absorbed into the liberal regime. A broad coalition, from landowners and merchants down to small farmers and artisans, had made the Revolution. White, adult males could not be easily excluded from civil and political citizenship. By the early 1840s all of them, in all states, possessed the vote – 50 years earlier than anywhere else, 50 years before the emergence of a powerful labour movement. Thus the political demands of labour could be gradually expressed as an interest group *within* an existing federal political constitution and competitive party system. . . . As the (white) working class was civilly and politically *inside* the regime, it had little need for the great ideologies of the proletariat excluded from citizenship – socialism and anarchism (Mann 1987: 342).

In this paragraph there is an illegitimate sliding between what are quite distinct categories, especially between on the one hand 'labour' and on the other 'white, adult males'. The paragraph opens with a reference to 'labour' in the first sentence. The second sentence refers to 'a broad coalition, from landowners and merchants down to small farmers and artisans'. The third sentence refers to 'white adult males'. In the fourth 'them' refers to the 'white, adult males' of the third sentence. The fifth returns to the opening concept of 'labour'. In the next paragraph the subject shifts yet again, this time to 'the (white) working class'.

Yet 'labour' and 'white, adult males' are quite different groups since the former includes women and blacks and the latter does not. Some women are

engaged in waged and unwaged labour, so are part of 'labour' and, presumably the 'working class'. This slide is problematic, since white adult males were a minority of the population and a minority of labour. Yet Mann seeks to generalise from this minority category to the larger concept of 'labour'. While 'white, adult males' were 'inside the regime', 'labour' was not. The social base that Mann identifies as the basis for his analysis of political forces is seriously mis-described and mis-conceptualised.

It is thus inappropriate to describe the US in the 1840s as a 'liberal' society, when civil and political citizenship were granted to a minority of the adult population on the basis of ascriptive criteria of sex and 'race'. The US did not become a full 'democracy' with civil and political citizenship rights for all adults until the late 1960s, after both the struggle which won white women's suffrage and the civil rights movement of the 1960s which gained effective suffrage for Blacks. This has major implications for a theory of democracy, citizenship and political structure. While Mann explains the present US state as a result of early inclusion of 'labour', I would argue the opposite – the US state is a result of a slow inclusion of different categories of person, including 'labour', into citizenship.

Mann makes some interesting points about the significance of the military in relations of power. Yet he makes no reference to the fact that the military is a highly gendered institution (see Enloe 1983). If his thesis about the importance of the military is accepted, then so also must the significance of gender.

Turner (1990) also draws on Marshall's concept of citizenship as a valuable analytic tool, and similarly criticises it for its ethnocentrism, indeed criticising Mann for not going far enough in his criticisms of Marshall. Turner is interested in the application of Marshall's threefold notion of citizenship to the current period. In particular he is interested in the last part of the schema – that of social rights, which he considers have been guaranteed, until recently, by the 'welfare state'. Turner, using a variety of historical examples ranging from the Greek city-state to revolutionary France, suggests that a typology of forms of citizenship is more appropriate than a single entity. He uses this to discuss the specific historical social forces under which different forms of citizenship arise. Turner argues for the significance of two dimensions: firstly, whether the pressure for citizenship is from above or below; and secondly, its orientation to public/private space. He suggests that a combination of pressures from below and a positive orientation to public space gives rise to revolutionary forms of citizenship, such as that found in the French tradition. Pressure from below combined with a less positive orientation to the public gives rise to liberal pluralism, as in the American instance. When the move for citizenship comes from above and is combined with a positive evaluation of the public there is passive democracy, as in the English case. When the move above is combined with a negative evaluation of the public this is considered to give rise to fascism as in the German case.

The second issue on which Turner is critical of Mann is his neglect of 'private/public' structuring, which Turner considers to be very important. 'If we regard the historical emergence of the public as in fact the emergence of the political, then the structural relationship between the private and the public, and their cultural meanings, is an essential component in any understanding of the relationship between totalitarianism and democracy' (p. 211). This issue is discussed with reference to concepts of 'the rights of the individual' (p. 200) and 'private life' (p. 201), which are opposed to those of 'state' (p. 201) and 'totalitarianism' (p. 200). The dichotomy is set between the 'individual' and the 'state' as in 'Private life emerges as a sanctuary from state regulation' (p. 201). Turner closely links 'private' with 'family' as in 'the private space of the family' (p. 209).

There is a problem in Turner's concepts here in his elision of the distinction between 'individual' and 'family' via the concept of 'private'. In so doing he erases women. He treats the 'family' as if it has a unitary being and set of interests. This is incorrect because of the distinct interests of wives and husbands (see Acker 1973; Delphy 1984; Pateman 1988). 'Private' appears to have two meanings – on the one hand, the autonomy of the 'individual'; on the other hand, freedom from state interference. I would suggest that Turner conflates these meanings. Turner's attempt to extend this sense of 'private' to the 'family' is illegitimate. The 'family' is not an 'individual' – it is composed of several people, who are not 'private' from each other. Women are not free from interaction with and dominance by men. The 'family' is not 'private' for women. The 'family' may or may not be free from 'state' interference, but that is a separate issue. That is, while the dichotomies of state/individual and of state/family are legitimate, it is not appropriate to conflate the individual with the family. The phrase 'the private space of the family' is nonsensical, since it denies the social relations within the family, illegitimately conflating the woman with her husband. This conflation is further evidenced by Turner's adoption of the male viewpoint on the activities within the household when he asserts that 'in modern societies . . . the private is seen as the space of personal leisure and enhancement', thereby denying the salience of the household as a site of domestic labour by women.

The neglect of the analysis of gender and the exclusion of women from citizenship in societies which granted full citizenship to adult men is surprising in the case of Turner, given his interest in the public/private structuring of social relations, since the role of this structuring in the exclusion of women from citizenship has been subject to extensive debate. Indeed some political theorists have argued that it is precisely this public/private divide that has made women's participation in formal politics so difficult (see Eisenstein 1981; Okin 1989; Pateman 1988). Yet Turner does not describe, let alone explain, the exclusion of women from citizenship at some times and their inclusion at others.

The Marshall/Mann/Turner writings on citizenship are interesting in

grasping an important concept in political practice and debate. However, they do so at the expense of reducing it to a narrow form of class analysis. Citizenship is a broader concept than class rights. It should be retained with its modern connotations of all adults participating in a full democracy, otherwise the analysis is only relevant to the Greek city-state type of citizenship and unfitted to a gendered, ethnically diverse Europe and world of the 1990s.

I would like to suggest an alternative approach to the analysis of citizenship. In this approach the differential access of inhabitants of a given territory to civil, political and social citizenship would be a key feature. Rather than this differential participation being considered 'a complication', it should become a central issue. It is not something to be left to 'further development of the theory of citizenship' (Turner 1990: 212), but must be an integral part of its initial, central, conceptual building blocks.

There is usually no one key period of nation-formation, despite the assumptions behind the work of Mann (1987) and Turner (1990) that there is a critical period of nation-formation (or state formation or nation-state formation). This incorrect assumption is key to Mann's discussion of the societal variations in the development of the political institutions which constitute democracy. It is also a key assumption in Turner's discussion of the moments of formation of different forms of citizenship. Yet, in many countries citizenship did not arrive at one moment for all people; rather, different groups gained different aspects of this in different periods. Countries vary as to whether white men, white women, men and women of minority ethnic groups, gained citizenship at the same time or not.

In most First World countries there is a period of several decades between the granting of political citizenship to men and to women. This is quite different from the circumstances of many Third World countries where women won the franchise at the same time as men, at the moment of national independence from colonial power. The winning of civil citizenship, while completed for most First World men before political citizenship, is barely completed for women in these countries, since only recently have women won control over their own bodies, the ability to disengage from marriage and the right to engage in all forms of employment. That is, for First World women political citizenship is typically achieved before civil citizenship, the reverse of the order for men. This exists in direct contradiction of Marshall's thesis. Rather than the notion of one critical period of 'nation-formation', it is more appropriate to talk of 'rounds of restructuring' of the nation-state (*cf.* Massey 1984). It is useful in carrying the notion of change built upon foundations which remain, and that layer upon layer of change can take place, each of which leaves its sediment which significantly affects future practices.

In most Western nation-states white women won political citizenship after some considerable struggle. In the case of the UK the struggle for the vote and political citizenship was part of a wider struggle over issues which fit

Marshall's category of civil citizenship. These included: the right of access to education; to own property; to terminate a marriage; to bodily integrity, such as the right not to be beaten by a husband; to professional employment; to sit on juries; to join the police (see Banks 1981; Strachey 1928; Walby 1988). Some of these were won before suffrage, some in the decades following. For British women, political and civil citizenship were won as part of the same wave of political action, with at least as many aspects of civil citizenship being won after political citizenship as before. This contradicts Marshall's (1950) thesis that civil citizenship is won before political. In the case of British women, political citizenship was at least as often the power base from which women were able to win civil citizenship, as *vice versa*.

The structuring of the private and public spheres is of critical concern to the position and citizenship status of women (see Eisenstein 1981; Okin 1989; Pateman 1988). Citizenship, especially the political aspect of this, has historically been bound up with participation in the public sphere. European women have historically been structured out of the public by the restrictions on their paid employment, restrictions on speaking in public, threats of violence if unaccompanied in public spaces, and their confinement to domestic duties (Cockburn 1983; Hanmer and Saunders 1984; Smart 1984; Spender 1983). It has only been by leaving the private sphere of the home that women have been able to gain some aspects of citizenship.

Some turn of the century feminists believed that these changes would lead to the elimination of gender inequality. A more appropriate interpretation is that they shifted the form and degree of patriarchy without eliminating it. Contemporary Britain has moved towards a public, rather than a private form of patriarchy (see Walby 1990). Women's previous confinement to the domestic has been reduced, but structured gender inequality still exists. Social citizenship has been slower to follow. The development of the welfare state has been a significant element in this. Women played a more significant role in the struggle for this than is sometimes suggested (see Banks 1981; Middleton 1978).

Women and Citizenship

But is the relationship of women to citizenship simply one in which they have been slower than men to become 'citizens'? This implies that the citizenship project is as open to women as it is to men, if certain overt forms of discrimination are removed. It implies, further, that there is a single model of citizenship to which women can aspire alongside men, that is, a certain modernist universalism about the citizenship project.

This notion of a single model of citizenship has been brought into doubt by some recent feminist work (Bubeck 1991; Lister 1990, 1992; Nelson 1984; Pateman 1991; Ungerson 1990, 1991; Wilson 1991). The different

experiences and structural position of women are seen to militate against their full access to the rights of citizenship. This work, which draws either implicitly or explicitly on the notions of the different levels of citizenship articulated by Marshall, focuses particularly on the rights contained within the notion of social citizenship. One of the problems identified here is that social citizenship usually depends upon being a worker for full access to such rights. Significant aspects of income maintenance payments by the state, pensions, and related welfare provision are provided as a result of waged employment. Those who do not make provision via employment can fall back on only very meagre levels of support.

Pensions, for instance, are provided typically as part of a scheme with an employer. Occupational pension schemes involve payments by both employer and employee which are protected from tax. Women, with a primary orientation to the care of children, husband, and elderly relatives, do not have direct access to pensions of the same level. They may derive pension benefits via their husbands, so long as they stay married, or they may have to fall back on poverty level state benefits. Even women who do have paid employment may find that their pension is small, since part-time workers are rarely members of occupational pension schemes, and interruption of employment for a period of childcare can play havoc with such pension entitlement.

There is a question as to whether access to a decent pension is compatible with the role of carer which many women take up. Is being a carer compatible with being a full citizen? If not, then what should change? Should women only be entitled to citizenship if they behave like men and have lifetime commitment to paid employment? And if so, what are the implications for those who need caring? Or should the rules of the welfare system be changed so that paid employment is not the only or main route of access to decent support in old age? (Bubeck 1991; Lister 1990, 1992; Nelson 1984; Pateman 1991; Ungerson 1990, 1991; Wilson 1991).

The value placed upon caring becomes a key question here. The role of carer is disproportionately taken by women (Abel and Nelson 1990; Finch and Groves 1983; Glendinning 1990; Mayall 1990; Morris 1990). Yet this role as carer places women at a disadvantage in access to income (Glendinning 1990) and more broadly in relation to political and social citizenship (Lister 1990; Nelson 1984).

Lister (1990) argues that financial dependency is an obstacle to women's citizenship. She shows how the government, in its discussions of the 'problem of dependency', considers only the public form of dependency on the state, and neglects the salience of women's private dependency in the family on the arbitrary will of another. Lister discusses Hurd's notion of 'active citizen' promulgated when Home Secretary in 1988, which, while suggesting the centrality of the ideal of neighbourliness, still manages to neglect women carers, who logically ought to be exemplary representatives of this constituency. Poverty and lack of time and money curtail women's access to the

political rights of citizenship. Lister suggests that excessive calls on women's time for unpaid work limit women's effective participation in the political rights of citizenship.

Turning to social citizenship, by which Lister effectively means the welfare state, and, in particular, welfare payments, she suggests that the structure of payment of these benefits is detrimental to women because it is predicated on married women's dependence. The changes which are needed here to secure women social citizenship are threefold. Firstly, a change to individual rather than household entitlement. Secondly, a change so that the right to benefit is not dependent upon contributions, since that would be affected by labour market position where women are disadvantaged. The one example of this is the rather small and currently vulnerable child benefit. Thirdly, Lister suggests that a coherent childcare policy is needed to facilitate women's participation in the labour market.

Lister's article exemplifies the dilemmas in much current feminist analysis of social citizenship. On the one hand she argues that the solution is for women to stop being exploited at home and enter the labour market, on the other that women's position as carer should be supported. On the one hand:

Women's position as the economic dependent of a male partner; as double-shift worker juggling the responsibilities of paid employment and caring work; or as welfare benefit recipient struggling to raise children in poverty or to manage on an inadequate pension, is incompatible with the full exercise of the social and political rights of citizenship. If women are to be fully integrated into full democratic citizenship, radical changes in personal and domestic life are required (Lister 1990: 464).

Yet:

On the other, the institutions of the 'public sphere' must do more to accommodate the sexual division of labour so long as it shapes and constrains the lives of women and limits their access to the 'public' sphere (Lister 1990: 464).

and she calls for changes: 'so as to reflect the value to society as a whole of caring work, whether it be done in private or public sphere' (Lister 1990: 464).

Lister both demands the entry of women into the public sphere as the only way that their second class status can be ended, and she insists that women's presence in the private realm of caring be accommodated. Perhaps she is deliberately asking for both, but these are quite different strategic responses. Indeed they underlie many of the issues in the feminist debate on gender and citizenship. Should women seek support for their existing roles in the family as carers, or should they be seeking to leave such roles behind and enter paid employment? Women's greater commitment to caring is simultaneously positively valued and a source of disadvantage to women. The suggestion that women should become more like men in order to obtain economic and social rights is contentious within the debate on gender and citizenship.

This issue of whether women are intrinsically different from men and should value this difference, or are basically the same and should claim the same rights on the basis of this similarity, is a key philosophical, theoretical and political division in feminist analysis and practice (Eisenstein 1984; Meehan and Sevenhuijsen 1991). It underlies the debates on the issue of citizenship and caring and it has fuelled discussions on the analysis of the effectiveness of divergent feminist strategies since the turn of the century (Banks 1981; Hewlett 1986; Littleton 1987; Segal 1987; Sklar 1973; Weitzman 1985). On the one hand, there is the desire to claim the same rights and privileges as men – for instance, equal pay and pensions, the vote and political representation. On the other, there is the wish to protect things women hold – for instance, protective legislation at work, abstention from military conscription.

How Important is Citizenship for Gender?

The question of the relationship of citizenship to gender can be asked in the reverse direction. What is the place of citizenship in the analysis of gender relations? How important is it for patterns of gender relations? This can be considered, following Marshall, in three arenas: civil, political and social.

Civil Citizenship:

Marshall described civil citizenship as being related to individual freedom – including liberty of the person, freedom of speech, the right to own property, and the right to justice (Marshall 1950: 10). Yet these are rights which most women did not obtain until after political citizenship, and some, such as the right to justice from male violence, are still not fully secured (see Adler 1987; Edwards 1989). Many of the first wave feminists who struggled for the rights Marshall would consider the marks of civil citizenship came to argue that they could not win them without political citizenship. That is, they reversed the order that Marshall suggested was general, but is in fact merely typical for white men, in which civil rights preceded political rights. Most aspects of civil citizenship were won after suffrage was obtained. They are important, but in the case of women, are largely contingent upon success in obtaining political citizenship, the struggle for which is therefore even more significant.

Political citizenship:

Interpretation of the significance of political citizenship depends upon the theory of the state and politics within a theory of gender relations. Much feminist theory in the 1970s argued that the realm of the political was much

wider than was usually considered, and that the state did not play as large a role as conventional theories suggested (Millett 1977). However, there is currently some reassessment of this position within feminist theory, partly as a result of the success of some feminist movements to win changes they desire (Sawer 1990; Watson 1990).

Political citizenship is more important than has often been considered in analyses of changes in gender relations (Walby 1988, 1990). The successes of turn of the century feminism are rarely noted in accounts of changes in gender relations, despite the impact of the movement on women's formal political rights, access to education and employment, civil rights, such as that to sit on juries, and to leave unwanted marriages (compare Strachey (1928) with Bergmann (1986)). Political citizenship was the basis of the transformation from private to public patriarchy (Walby 1990). Without these political victories neither civil nor social citizenship would have occurred.

Social Citizenship:

There is a tension between social citizenship for women and their location as carers in the family, as discussed above. The concept of citizenship depends upon the public; the term has no significant meaning in the private. So what can be the relationship between that private realm of the family and citizenship? Is the family intrinsically an obstacle to the inclusion of all people as citizens? Or can it be accommodated, or, even, embraced? The answer to this depends upon the theorisation of the family, in particular the relationship between gender inequality and the family. This depends on the theorisation of women's interests. Some of the dilemmas these issues raise in feminist theory have already been explored above.

For most social theorists social citizenship is bound up with the provision of welfare, with the provision of an infrastructure which enables people to be guaranteed a minimum of provision of necessities. Hewlett (1986) compares the welfare position of women in the US and Europe and suggests that European women have higher levels of provision than those in the US. European women have been more successful in issues such as publicly funded childcare and legal entitlements to hold onto a job through pregnancy. This is not due to the greater strength of European feminism, which it does not have, but due to the different strategy they have followed on behalf of women. Hewlett argues that European feminists have adopted a 'difference' position to a greater extent than feminists in the US, who adopted more of a 'sameness' strategy, and have done better by women because of that.

However, there are problems in the analysis of the history of European feminism. For instance, European feminists are currently eagerly participating in the 'sameness' strategy through the utilisation of sex discrimination legislation emanating from the EC (*CREW Reports, passim*). European

feminists were less enthusiastic, or perhaps simply less strongly divided, than their US counterparts about protective legislation. Hewlett misconstrues European feminism by viewing it through the lens of the US sameness/difference debate. Rather, the explanation of the different achievements of US and European feminism lies more in the nature of the alliances which feminists have made in Europe. UK feminists have long engaged with the labour movement and won, in alliance, those welfare demands that Hewlett sees as a consequence of the 'difference' strategy. This is part of a collective strategy of the working class, from which women not only benefited, but in which they took a leading role. In alliance with some middle class feminist organisations as well, they demanded social provision such as health care, child and maternity welfare schemes, free school milk. These demands were steadily implemented from the turn of the century onwards (see for instance, Mark-Lawson, Savage and Warde 1985; Middleton 1978). This alliance was absent from the US because there was no lasting labour movement of any size. The US and UK history of social citizenship thus is based on a different political context, with its distinctive dilemmas, which are the subject of European debates.

Economic citizenship?

Much of the writing on women and social citizenship has taken a focus which concentrates on women's welfare needs, rather than women's social and economic contributions. However, the concept of social citizenship has also been used to illuminate the notion of social integration, of the ability to take part in the full range of societal activities. This has been developed by Marquand (1988) in his account of the need for full social and political citizenship in order to secure economic participation and economic efficiency and success. Marquand has interestingly inverted the old dilemma of efficiency or equity into an argument that greater participation is needed for economic efficiency. His argument could have been made more strongly if he had included a gender dimension. The cessation of exclusion of women from effective participation in paid work, or their full economic citizenship, is a contributor to a country's economic success. A focus on social integration and social cohesion as concerns of citizenship might then include women's economic participation.

Conclusions

Not only should we ask how gendered is citizenship, but also the symmetrical question: how important is citizenship for gender? I would answer this question unequivocally – politically citizenship has been central in the transformation of the forms of gender relations over the last century.

Today, citizenship means universalistic democratic rights of social and political participation. In popular political discourse it entails the full integration of all adults regardless of 'race', ethnicity, sex, or creed. In this way it is a modernist, universalistic concept. However, it is also a national project, a location which places limitations on its universalism. Nevertheless, the new meaning of the term citizen, with its attempt at a democratic and universalistic project, rather than the limited notion utilised in ancient Greek city-states from which women and slaves and aliens were excluded, is useful for social science. Access to citizenship is a highly gendered and ethnically structured process. Yet the concept is potentially suited to the conceptualisation, investigation and theorisation of the varying degrees of social integration and participation in contemporary society.

The development of social citizenship for women is linked to, but different from, that for men. Similarly, the social citizenship of men has been affected by women's demands for welfare. Access to welfare benefits is so significantly structured by employment that women and men typically have a very different relationship to them. Women's caring work in the family is a major barrier to women's full social citizenship.

The question of citizenship belongs not only to the classic debates about the balancing of liberal freedom with the demands of a capitalist economy, of the relationship between the labour market and the state, of efficiency and equity, that is, of class and capitalism; it is also about the major structuring principles of gender. When half the population might be denied effective citizenship because of gender, then gender matters to citizenship. The question of the relationship of the public and private is not incidental.

The male-dominated family-household is incompatible with full citizenship. Social citizenship for women is incompatible with, and unobtainable under, women's confinement to the family and the vagaries of a dependency relationship upon a private patriarch. Political citizenship for women has had a destabilising effect on private forms of patriarchy and thus traditional forms of the family. Citizenship is about gender and the transformation of the form of patriarchy as much as it is about class, nation/ethnicity and capitalism.

The introduction of the different levels of citizenship is not only about the development of capitalism, but about the transformation of patriarchy. The civil and political rights and the development of the possibility of social citizenship through the welfare state are essential foundations of the transformation from private to public patriarchy. The welfare state acts as a mechanism of welfare payments from which women disproportionately benefit, in that they receive more in benefits than they pay out in taxes (LeGrand 1992), and, despite all the many problems of poverty levels of income support, it does constitute an alternative to the private patriarchy, albeit a public one (Hernes 1987; Borchorst and Siim 1987). This financial alternative to dependence on an arbitrary individual patriarchy is important in the transformation of the form of gender relations, even if it does not lift

women out of poverty. The welfare state has socialised some forms of previously privatised domestic labour, through schools, nurseries, hospitals, and other forms of publicly provided care, albeit at levels which do not satisfy women's demands. It is the socialised provision as much as the welfare transfers, which is crucial in socialising women's domestic role. Given the significance of these transformations for gender relations it is not surprising that women played an active role in struggling for these changes.

Thus the development of social citizenship is constituted at least as much by changing gender relations as it is by changing class relations. Citizenship is about a transition from private to public patriarchy, not only the civilising of capitalism.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank those who commented on the paper, including: the seminar series of the LSE Gender Group; the ESRC/CNRS seminar and ESRC seminar series on citizenship; the 1992 BSA/PSA gender conference; and the Sociology Department at Leeds University.

References

- ABEL, EMILY and NELSON, MARGARET (eds.) 1990. *Circles of Care: Work and Identity in Women's Lives*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- ACKER, JOAN. 1973. 'Women and Stratification: A Case of Intellectual Sexism' in Joan Huber (ed.) *Changing Women in a Changing Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ADLER, ZSUZSANNA. 1987. *Rape on Trial*. London: Routledge.
- AFSHAR, HALEH. 1981. 'The Position of Women in an Iranian Village'. *Feminist Review* 9, Autumn 76-86.
- AFSHAR, HALEH. 1989. 'Women and Reproduction in Iran' in Nira Yuval-Davis and Floya Anthias (eds.) *Woman-Nation-State*. London: Macmillan.
- BANKS, OLIVE. 1981. *Faces of Feminism: A Study of Feminism as a Social Movement*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- BARRETT, MICHELE and PHILLIPS, ANNE (eds.) 1992. *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- BEGUM, NASA. 1992. 'Disabled Women and the Feminist Agenda' in Hilary Hinds, Ann Phoenix and Jackie Stacey (eds.) *Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- BERGMANN, BARBARA. 1986. *The Economic Emergence of Women*. New York: Basic Books.
- BORCHORST, ANETTE and BIRTE SIIM. 1987. 'Women and the Advanced Welfare State - a New Kind of Patriarchal Power' in Anne Showstack Sassoon (ed.) *Women and the State: The Shifting Boundaries of Public and Private*. London: Hutchinson.
- BRAH, AVTAR. 1991. 'Questions of Difference and International Feminism' in Jane Aaron and Sylvia Walby (eds.) 1991. *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
- BUBECK, DIEMUT. 1991. 'Do women care too much? Care, gender and justice'. Paper presented to LSE Gender Group seminar, London.
- COCKBURN, CYNTHIA 1983. *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto Press.

- CREW Reports*. Published since 1980 by Centre for Research on European Women, Brussels.
- DALY, MARY. 1978. *Gyn/Ecology*. London: Women's Press.
- DELPHY, C. 1984. *Close to Home*. London: Hutchinson.
- DRAKE, BARBARA. 1920. *Women in Trade Unions*. London: Labour Research Department and Allen and Unwin (reprinted by Virago, 1984).
- EDWARDS, SUSAN S. M. 1989. *Policing 'Domestic' Violence: Women, the Law and the State*. London: Sage.
- EISENSTEIN, ZILLAH. 1981. *The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism*. New York: Longman.
- EISENSTEIN, ZILLAH. 1984. *Feminism and Sexual Equality: Crisis in Liberal America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- ENLOE, CYNTHIA. 1983. *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarisation of Women's Lives*. London: Pluto Press.
- ESPING-ANDERSEN, GOSTA. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- FINCH, JANET and GROVES, DULCIE (eds.) 1983. *A Labour of Love: Women, Work and Caring*. London: Routledge.
- GLENDINNING, CAROLINE. 1990. 'Dependency and interdependency: the incomes of informal carers and the impact of social security' in *Journal of Social Policy* 19, 4: 469-97.
- HANMER, JALNA and SAUNDERS, SHEILA. 1984. *Well Founded Fear: A Community Study of Violence Toward Women*. London: Hutchinson.
- HERNES, HOLGA MARIA. 1987. 'Women and the welfare state: the transition from private to public dependence' in Anne Showstack Sassoon (ed.) *Women and the State: The Shifting Boundaries of Public and Private*. London: Hutchinson.
- HEWLETT, SYLVIA. 1986. *A Lesser Life: The Myth of Women's Liberation in America*. New York: Morrow.
- HOLCOMBE, LEE. 1983. *Wives and Property: Reform of the Married Women's Property Law in Nineteenth Century England*. Oxford: Martin, Robertson.
- LeGRAND, JULIAN *et al* 1992. 'Findings from the Welfare State Programme'. Paper presented to Welfare State Programme Seminar, STICERD, London School of Economics.
- LISTER, RUTH. 1990. 'Women, economic dependency and citizenship' *Journal of Social Policy* 19, 4: 445-68.
- LISTER, RUTH. 1992. 'Tracing the contours of women's citizenship - a social policy perspective'. Paper presented to LSE Gender Group seminar, London.
- LITTLETON, CHRISTINE A. 1987. 'Equality and feminist legal theory'. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review* 48, 4: 1043-1059.
- MANN, MICHAEL. 1987. 'Ruling class strategies and citizenship' *Sociology* 21; 3: 339-54.
- MARK-LAWSON, JANE, SAVAGE, MIKE and WARDE, ALAN. 1985. 'Gender and local politics: struggles over welfare policies' in Linda Murgatroyd, Mike Savage, Dan Shapiro, John Urry, Sylvia Walby, Alan Warde and Jane Mark-Lawson *Localities, Class and Gender*. London: Pion.
- MARQUAND, DAVID. 1988. *The Unprincipled Society: New Demands and Old Politics*. London: Fontana.
- MARSHALL, T. H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARSHALL, T. H. 1975 *Social Policy in the Twentieth Century*. (Fourth Edition, original edition 1965) London: Hutchinson.
- MARSHALL, T. H. 1981. *The Right to Welfare*. London: Heinemann.

- MASSEY D. 1984. *Spatial Divisions of Labour*. London: Macmillan.
- MAYALL, BERRY. 1990. 'The division of labour in early child care – mothers and others'. *Journal of Social Policy* 19, 4: 299–330.
- MEEHAN, ELIZABETH and SEVENHUIJSEN, SELMA (eds.) 1991. *Equality, Politics and Gender*. London: Sage.
- MIDDLETON, LUCY (ed.) 1978. *Women in the British Labour Movement*. London: Croom Helm.
- MILLETT, K. 1977. *Sexual Politics*. London: Virago.
- MORRIS, LYDIA. 1990. *The Workings of the Household: A US-UK Comparison*. Cambridge: Polity.
- NELSON, BARBARA J. 1984. 'Women's Poverty and Women's Citizenship: Some Political Consequences of Economic Marginality'. *Signs*, 10, 21: 209–231.
- OKIN, SUSAN MOLLER. 1989. *Justice, Gender, and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- PATEMAN, CAROLE 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- PATEMAN, CAROLE 1991. 'Women and Citizenship'. Paper presented to LSE Gender Group Seminar, London.
- RHODE, DEBORAH L. 1989. *Justice and Gender: Sex Discrimination and the Law*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- RUDDICK, SARA. 1989. *Maternal Thinking*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- SAWER, MARIAN. 1990. *Sisters in Suits: Women and Public Policy in Australia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- SEGAL, LYNNE. 1987. *Is the Future Female? Troubled Thoughts on Contemporary Feminism*. London: Virago.
- SHIVA, VANDANA. 1989. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development*. London: Zed Press.
- SKLAR, KATHRYN KISH 1973. *Catherine Beecher: A Study in American Domesticity*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- SMART, CAROL. 1984. *The Ties that Bind: Law, Marriage and the Reproduction of Patriarchal Relations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- SPELLMAN, ELIZABETH. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- SPENDER, DALE. 1983. *Women of Ideas (and what men have done to them)*. London: Ark.
- STRACHEY, RAY. 1928. *The Cause: A Short History of the Women's Movement in Great Britain*. London: G. Bell (reprinted by Virago, London, 1978).
- TAYLOR, HARRIET. 1851. *The Enfranchisement of Women*. Republished in 1983 by Virago: London.
- TAYLOR, IAN. 1991. 'The experience of order and disorder in free market societies: New York and Manchester: A Reply to Bryan Turner' in Bryan Turner (ed.) (1991a) *Citizenship, Civil Society and Social Cohesion*. Swindon: ESRC.
- TURNER, BRYAN. 1990. 'Outline of a Theory of Citizenship'. *Sociology* 24; 2: 189–217.
- TURNER, BRYAN (ed.) 1991a. *Citizenship, Civil Society and Social Cohesion*. Swindon: ESRC.
- TURNER, BRYAN. 1991b. 'Prolegomena to a general theory of social order' in Bryan Turner (ed.) *Citizenship, Civil Society and Social Cohesion*. Swindon: ESRC.
- UNGERSON, CLAIRE. 1990. 'Conclusion' to Claire Ungerson (ed.) *Gender and Caring: Work and Welfare in Britain and Scandinavia*. London: Harvester.
- UNGERSON, CLAIRE. 1991. 'Citizenship and Caring – the routes to "carers' citizenship"'. Paper presented to LSE Gender Group Seminar, LSE.

- TAYLOR-GOOPY, PETER. 1991. 'Welfare State Regimes and Welfare Citizenship'. *Journal of European Social Policy* 1, 2: 93-105.
- WALBY, SYLVIA. 1988. 'Gender Politics and Social Theory'. *Sociology* 22, 2: 215-32.
- WALBY, SYLVIA. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- WATSON, SOPHIE (ed.) 1990. *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions*. London: Verso.
- WATT, SHANTU and COOK, JULIET. 1991. 'Racism: Whose Liberation? Implications for Women's Studies' in Jane Aaron and Sylvia Walby (eds.) *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties*. Basingstoke: Falmer.
- WEITZMAN, LENORE. 1985. *The Divorce Revolution: The Unexpected Social and Economic Consequences for Women and Children in America*. New York: Free Press.
- WILSON, GAIL. 1991. 'Liberty, Caring and Coercion: The Case of Elder Abuse'. Paper presented to LSE Gender Group Seminar, London.

Biographical note: SYLVIA WALBY is Professor of Sociology at Bristol University. She has previously been Reader in Sociology at the LSE and Lecturer in Sociology at Lancaster University. She is author of *Patriarchy at Work* (1986), *Theorising Patriarchy* (1990), joint author of *Localities Class and Gender* (1985), *Contemporary British Society* (1988), *Restructuring: Place Class and Gender* (1990), and *Sex Crime in the News* (1991), editor of *Gender Segregation at Work* (1988) and co-editor of *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the 90s* (1991).

Address: Department of Sociology, University of Bristol, 12 Woodland Road, Bristol BS8 1UQ.

Sociology Update

by Martyn Denscombe

1994 Edition

- * latest data on social trends
- * discussion of current social issues
- * clear diagrams and charts
- * fact files with new social statistics
- * international comparisons

published by:
Olympus Books
32 Shirley Road
Stoneygate
Leicester LE2 3LJ

£2.50 (inc p & p)

ISBN 1 872585 04 3