

## **BRYAN STANLEY TURNER'S PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHTS: CITIZENSHIP OUTLINE ANALYSIS**

**Ahmad Dumaeri<sup>1</sup>, Samsuri<sup>2</sup>**

*Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta<sup>1,2</sup>*

Email: [Ahmaddumaeri.2022@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:Ahmaddumaeri.2022@student.uny.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

*Bryan Stanley Turner is a professor of sociology and politics who was born in Birmingham, England on January 14, 1945. Bryan S Turner is also a director of the religious committee at The City University Of New York. He is also the director of the Centre for Contemporary Islamic Studies at the University of Western Sydney. Not stopping there, Brayen is also registered as a member of the American Sociological Research Association. This study uses a literature study. Literature study research is oriented to theories relevant to research problems. In this satisfaction study, it analyzes Bryan Stanley Turner's journal of philosophical thought about the analysis of the outline of citizenship published in 1990 in the British Sociological Association and several other relevant reading sources. Turner's view of the conception of citizenship is a set of rights and obligations that give a formal legal identity to individuals. These legal and formal rights have historically been united as a set of social institutions such as the jury system, parliaments and the welfare state. Bryan Turner offered a revised model of citizenship that included legal rights (or civil rights in the Marshall model), political rights, social rights and human rights.*

**Keywords:** *Philosophical Thought, Bryan S Turner, Citizenship*

This article is licensed under [CC BY-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) 

### **INTRODUCTION**

True education is a process from childhood in goodness that imbues its recipient with a strong and passionate desire to become a perfect citizen, knowing how to use and how to submit to a righteous government. Therefore, education is used as a means to provide an understanding of how to behave well and in accordance with the rules/norms that apply in society. The existence of education provides an opportunity for all citizens to process to become a citizen who actively participates in state affairs.

Life in various countries will not be separated from the existence of the term citizenship. This conception of citizenship refers to various thoughts from scientists who are experts in their fields. Therefore, it is necessary to retrace the history of the development of citizenship. In the development of citizenship, there are many scientists who express related concepts. One of them is a concept from Bryner Stanley Turner, a professor of sociology and politics. His study departed from the development of the world economic recession and the emergence of monetary politics, the threat to the welfare state has become the main topic of social science debate in the 1980s. But the parameters of this problem are actually global. From a sociological perspective, this change in political orientation and the creation of a monetary perspective in social policy can be considered, however, a symptom of a fundamental change in the politics of industrial society, namely the collapse of corporatism and the collapse of the reformist consensus that

dominated the post-war period of social reconstruction. The rupture of the corporatism consensus can be attributed to a radical reorganization in global capitalism which some authors now consider to be an entirely new stage in the development of world capitalism, leading to the disorganization of capitalism or to the end of organized capitalism.

The institution of citizenship in the Western political cultural tradition dates back to Ancient Greece and Rome. Civil rights became significant as an aspect of modern politics only when it came to revolutionary events that applied Ancient Greek and Roman political norms such as the American War of Independence, and the French Revolution. In France, citizenship was the result of the Rational Enlightenment and was radically expressed in the writings of aristocrats such as Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794), who pioneered women's rights as citizens in his 1790 essay, "on giving women the right of citizenship" (B. S. Turner, 2002).

Critical theorists return to questions of distributive justice, individual rights and ideas of equality as the basis for social reconstruction and social reform (B. S. Turner, 1990). Although the abstract notion of Human Rights (perhaps related to some commitment to Natural Law) no longer enjoys widespread intellectual support, it is clear that the institution of definite 'rights' is an essential feature in the protection of public space as a legitimate arena of debate. Therefore, the institution of secular rights cannot be separated from the question of democracy; and the infrastructure of democracy is a fundamental, albeit limited, restraint on the use of coercive force. It is a democratic apparatus, which prevents the institutions of power, law, and knowledge from coalescing into one major organ.

In this outline of the theory of citizenship, it is argued that the present attempt to defend the principles of welfare in fact requires a much deeper sociological, historical and philosophical investigation of the character of social membership and political participation, that is, an inquiry into the breadth and character of modern social citizenship.

## **METHOD**

This study uses a literature study. Literature study research is oriented to theories relevant to research problems. In this satisfaction study, it analyzes Bryan Stanley Turner's journal of philosophical thought about the analysis of the outline of citizenship published in 1990 in the British Sociological Association and several other relevant reading sources. In addition, library research is research that is carried out by collecting data or scientific papers that are in harmony with the object of research.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

According to Turner (1990), sociologists are concerned with understanding how civic institutions protect individuals and groups (citizens) from the negative effects and aimless actions of the market in a capitalist society. The focus on the redistributive potential of civic institutions (allocative functions) provides the basis for a sociological approach to questions of justice and equality. Thus, citizenship controls the access of individuals and groups to the scarcity of resources in society. To borrow Marshall's term, legal rights and obligations after being institutionalized as a formal status position in turn give the people a formal designation for limited resources, especially economic resources such as social security, health care, housing subsidies, pension packages or tax concessions. Resources include access to resources or goods, which are culturally desirable, such as within the traditional liberal framework of the right to

speaking one's language in the public arena or rights related to religious freedom. These resources include not only traditional economic resources such as housing, jobs, but also cultural resources can be conceptualized in the cultural capital paradigm through the theories of sociologist Bourdieu.

Citizenship is a set of practices or actions that include judicial, political, economic and cultural that can determine a person as a competent member of society, as a consequence of forming the flow of resources to people and social groups (B. S. Turner, 1990). What Turner said is that the concept of citizenship is actually not solely a set of passive rights granted by the state to its citizens. But according to him, citizenship is a set of actions both legally, politically, and economically; i.e., and culture, which can be done by residents as members of the community. Turner defines citizenship as a set of rights and obligations that give an individual a formal legal identity (B. S. Turner, 2002). These legal and formal rights have historically been united as a set of social institutions such as the jury system, parliaments and the welfare state. In his discussion, Turner included the issue of protection for individuals and groups from the negative impact of the market in a capitalist society.

Turner also touched on social exclusion (fear of diversity), which is inclusion and exclusion from formal criteria in a political community. For Turner, the human community faces two contradictory principles. This principle is closely related to the scarcity that results in the structure of elimination, such as gender division, social class and status group, but at the same time they must secure social solidarity. Tracing the model of citizenship proposed by T.H. Marshall, Bryan Turner offers a model of citizenship revision that includes legal rights (or civil rights in the Marshall model), political rights, social rights and human rights. Check the table below. Citizenship emerged with city-states and the idea of citizens (denizen), where the nation-state created the primitive concept of citizenship (citizenship). This form was then followed by a welfare state based on political rights. Next, Turner asks the question: what would happen in this historical model?. One of the answers is capitalism with the rise of the concept of human rights. As the world economy becomes more globalized, more and more workers will travel between economic centers in search of work, so there will be conflicts in the labor market over access to global resources. The sovereignty of the nation-state is eroded by the global market where the national economy is increasingly owned by international companies. Traditional forms of citizenship may not be able to express the idea of an increasingly global market. For Turner, despite historical changes, the idea of citizenship is a central aspect of the modern struggle for democracy and an essential concept for analyzing international conflicts over the limited resources of the world economy.

The analysis of citizenship proposed by Turner is much more advanced, because it does not use the concept of the subject of citizenship, but rather the concept of public and private dichotomy and active and passive. However, Turner's approach still has weaknesses. According to Nara Yuval-Davis (1997), a pair of Turner's concepts of citizenship that tend to be claimed to be universal are actually Euro-centric. Turner did not pay enough attention to 'gender differences'; control and negotiation that takes place in the territory of government in different social lives. Top-down approaches, such as those in Germany and postcolonial countries, have not been adequately discussed. In contrast to the political definitions proposed by thinkers such as Rousseau (the social contract) and Fichte (the science of rights) which emphasize political, state and individual rights, Marshall and Turner's definition of citizenship is a sociological

definition, which focuses on the institutions of citizenship, social identity, the nature of justice and access to socio-economic resources.

### **Geopolitics of Citizenship**

Historically, the presence of a successful bourgeois revolution in the development of the modern political system has been an important element in building parliamentary democracy and related civil rights. The revolutionary conflict against aristocratic privilege in the Great Revolution of 1688 and the French Revolution of 1789 has been important in the formation of the ideas of sovereignty and citizenship, representation and social contract, and in the development of the concept of public opinion significant in shaping political life (Baker, 1987). If the successful revolutionary conflict against aristocratic power is at least one aspect of the historical emergence of democratic citizenship, then the failure of the liberal bourgeois struggle (as in Germany in 1848) is one aspect of the bureaucratic and authoritarian character typical of political life in Germany under the domination of Junker's aristocracy (Baker, 1987).

While Moore's main orientation on the issue of the origins of democracy involves the historical relationship between lords and peasants in the development of modern society, recent approaches to democracy (and thus citizenship as well) have paid more attention to the geo-political implications for long-term constitutional change. Thus, contemporary democratic politics owes much to the military victories of the Anglo-Saxon countries, but in the future, because of nuclear weaponry, "war-aided patterns of change" (Mann 1987:352) will not be an option.

However, if we examine the longer periods in Western history, we can also see that at the beginning of the modern century the pattern of constitutionalism (parliamentary assembly, city-state immunity, village councils, and so on) was an important foundation for later democratic movements. However, societies threatened by massive international military attacks often turn from constitutionalism to military-bureaucratic absolutism. (Downing, 1988) has shown how different military histories in Brandenburg-Prussia, Britain, Sweden, and the Netherlands played an important role in the survival or destruction of early forms of constitutionalism.

Thus, Downing can criticize Moore for two reasons: his failure to acknowledge the early developments in democratic participation and the role of warfare in creating authoritarian conditions of government. However, Downing's thesis asserts the importance of gradualism in the history of British democracy (combined with the role of common law, demilitarization, and island isolation) as the basis of citizenship (passive). This historical record of the geo-politics of citizenship fits the typology that has been developed in this argument, since the idea of democracy from above or from the bottom is only one version of Moore's perspective on the rise of modern democracy. In addition, mass war, in the modern period, has created conditions in which there is political mobilization to demand rights or seek the satisfaction of rights through state mediation (B. S. Turner, 2002).

The argument that the ways in which public space is culturally organized (in relation to the ideas of individualism, privatization, and ethical status of the household) also has important implications for whether private space is seen as an area of appropriation or as an arena of moral fulfillment. In classical society, the private space is clearly a space of need and privacy, whereas in modern society with an emphasis on achievement-oriented in public competition for material success, the private space is seen as a space of personal recreation and improvement. If we

consider the historical emergence of the public as the emergence of politics, then the structural relationship between the private and the public, and its cultural meaning, is an important component in the understanding of the relationship between totalitarianism and democracy (Lefort & Haworth, 1979; Prager, 1997). The transfer of sovereignty from the king's body to the political body of citizens is thus a major turning point in the history of western democracy, as it indicates the expansion of political space, even the creation of political space. Revolutionary conflicts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries gave rise to expanded ideas about political participation and membership. The development of the concept of political citizenship is an important addition to the historical development of the nation-state as the main political unit in contemporary political life. The failure of absolutism and the persistence of constitutionalism created space for the gradual development of parliamentary rights and political participation. Therefore, Marshall's work is crucial in providing a theoretical perspective on the broader and deeper conception of social membership as expressed through the idea of the welfare state which is the embodiment of certain social rights and claims. Citizenship becomes a form of rights (Bell, 1976).

Although the idea of citizenship continues to provide a normative basis for maintaining a welfare state, some important changes in the organization of the global system have made some aspects of the idea of citizenship redundant and obsolete. The contemporary world is composed of two conflicting social processes. On the one hand, there is a strong pressure on autonomy and localism and, on the other hand, there is a stronger idea of globalism and global political responsibility. Therefore, the concept of citizenship is still in the process of change and development. We do not have a conceptual device to express the idea of global membership, and in this context, national identity in particular appears anachronistic. The uncertainty of the global context can produce strong political reactions that assert local and national normative authority over the global and international (G. P. Robertson, 1987; M. D. Robertson, 1986).

Citizenship analysis in recent years has become an urgent theoretical issue, given the problems facing the welfare state in periods of economic recession. However, the issue of citizenship is actually not limited to the question of the normative basis of the provision of welfare; The territory is global. On the one hand, it includes the international consequences of perestroika and glasnost in the Soviet Union, and on the other hand, the implications of medical technology on the definition of what constitutes a subject/citizen. Although Marshall's aim in formulating the theory of citizenship was rather modest in its focus (to understand the tension in Britain between capitalism and social rights), his statements on such issues have proved to be very useful in sociology and political science.

However, the limitations of Marshall's approach are also clearly visible. Its framework is now widely regarded as evolutionary, analytically obscure, and ethnocentric. Mann's treatment of citizenship in a comparative and historical context as a ruling class's strategy indicates a number of important directions that can be used to expand, elaborate, and ultimately go beyond Marshall's framework. Therefore, the type of citizenship can be considered in accordance with the spirit of Mann's criticism in the sense that only the historical sociology of citizenship can take us out of the orbit of the Anglophile Maraslian view. It has also been argued that Mann's thesis fails to deal with the revolutionary conception of citizenship, with cultural variations in the definition of public space, and with the problem of status as opposed to class in the formation of citizenship.

For example, Mann seems to consider gender, age, and race as irrelevant variables in the historical emergence of citizenship. Since Mann (1986:222) has stated that status is 'the most hollow sociological term', this absence is not surprising, but it can be argued that status is an important concept for the analysis of modern citizenship problems (J. H. Turner, 1988). Two dimensions were lost in Mann's attempt to surpass Marshall: the private-public division of western culture, and the issue of a passive and active version of citizenship. However, further development of the theory of citizenship should be more fundamental in societies where the struggle over citizenship should involve issues of national identity and state formation in the context of multiculturalism and ethnic pluralism.

## **CONCLUSION**

Citizenship according to Bryan Stanley Turner is a series of rights and obligations that give an individual a formal legal identity. These legal and formal rights have historically been united as a set of social institutions such as the jury system, parliaments and the welfare state. Bryan Turner offered a revised model of citizenship that included legal rights (or civil rights in the Marshall model), political rights, social rights and human rights. Bryan Stanley Turner also revealed that the concept of citizenship is not solely a set of passive rights granted by the state to its citizens. But citizenship is a set of actions both legally, politically, economically, and culturally, that citizens can do as members of the community. Turner defined citizenship as a set of rights and obligations that give an individual a formal legal identity.

## **REFERENCES**

- Baker, K. M. (1987). Politics and public opinion under the old regime: Some reflections. *Press and Politics in Pre-Revolutionary France*, 204–246.
- Bell, D. (1976). Welcome to the post-industrial society. *Physics Today*, 29(2), 46–49.
- Downing, B. M. (1988). Constitutionalism, warfare, and political change in early modern Europe. *Theory and Society*, 7–56.
- Lefort, J.-P., & Haworth, R. T. (1979). The age and origin of the deepest correlative structures recognized off Canada and Europe. *Tectonophysics*, 59(1–4), 139–150.
- Prager, K. J. (1997). *The psychology of intimacy*. Guilford Press.
- Robertson, G. P. (1987). Geostatistics in ecology: interpolating with known variance. *Ecology*, 68(3), 744–748.
- Robertson, M. D. (1986). Northern Rebel: The Journal of Nellie Kinzie Gordon, Savannah, 1862. *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, 70(3), 477–517.
- Turner, B. S. (1990). Outline of a Theory of Citizenship. *Sociology*, 24(2), 189–217.
- Turner, B. S. (2002). Religion and politics: The elementary forms of citizenship. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, 259–275.
- Turner, J. H. (1988). *A theory of social interaction*. Stanford University Press.