



Citizenship in historical perspective / edited by Steven G. Ellis, Guðmundur Hálfðanarson and Ann Katherine Isaacs
(Transversal theme ; 1)



323.6 (21.)

1. Cittadinanza 2. Individuo e società I. Ellis, Steven II. Hálfðanarson, Guðmundur III. Isaacs, Ann Katherine

CIP a cura del Sistema bibliotecario dell'Università di Pisa

This volume is published thanks to the support of the Directorate General for Research of the European Commission, by the Sixth Framework Network of Excellence CLIOHRES.net under the contract CIT3-CT-2005-006164. The volume is solely the responsibility of the Network and the authors; the European Community cannot be held responsible for its contents or for any use which may be made of it.

Volumes published (2006)

I. Thematic Work Groups

- I. Public Power in Europe: Studies in Historical Transformations
- II. Power and Culture: Hegemony, Interaction and Dissent
- III. Religion, Ritual and Mythology. Aspects of Identity Formation in Europe
- IV. Professions and Social Identity. New European Historical Research on Work, Gender and Society
- V. Frontiers and Identities: Exploring the Research Area
- VI. Europe and the World in European Historiography

II. Transversal Theme

- I. Citizenship in Historical Perspective

III. Doctoral Dissertations

- I. F. Peyrou, La Comunidad de Ciudadanos. El Discurso Democrático-Republicano en España, 1840-1868

Cover: Ambrogio Lorenzetti (1285-1348 ca.), *The Effects of Good Government in the City and the Countryside*, fresco (central part), Palazzo Pubblico, Siena. © 1990. Photo Scala, Florence.



© Copyright 2006 by Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press

Lungarno Pacinotti, 43

56126 Pisa

Tel. 050 2212056 – Fax 050 2212945

info-plus@edizioniplus.it

www.edizioniplus.it - Section "Biblioteca"

ISBN 88-8492-406-5

Manager

Claudia Napolitano

Editing

Francesca Petrucci

Informatic assistance

Michele Gasparello

Multiple Paths to Citizenship

T.H. Marshall's Theory and the Greek Case

ANTONIS LIAKOS

University of Athens

Η ιδιότητα του πολίτη στην Ελλάδα εξετάζεται μέσα από τέσσερις οπτικές γωνίες, οι οποίες έχουν ως αφετηρία τη θεωρία του T.H. Marshall. Η πρώτη περίπτωση εξετάζει την αναφορά στο «γένος» ή στο «δήμο»; Υπερισχύουν τα εθνο-πολιτισμικά χαρακτηριστικά, ή τα εδαφικά κριτήρια, με ανάλογες επιπτώσεις στις πολιτικές ένταξης ή αποκλεισμού. Η δεύτερη περίπτωση εξετάζει την ιστορική σειρά απόκτησης δικαιωμάτων υποστηρίζοντας ότι στην Ελλάδα δεν αποκτήθηκαν πρώτα τα αστικά (civil rights) και μετά τα πολιτικά δικαιώματα, αλλά τα δεύτερα στάθηκαν προϋπόθεση των πρώτων, εξαιτίας του τρόπου με τον οποίο συγκροτήθηκε το ελληνικό κράτος. Η τρίτη περίπτωση προβάλλει το επιχειρήμα ότι σε αγροτικές κοινωνίες, όπως ήταν η Ελλάδα έως το 1950, η έννοια των κοινωνικών δικαιωμάτων αφορούσε την αγροτική μεταρρύθμιση και τη δημιουργία ενός σώματος μικροϊδιοκτητών αγροτών-πολιτών. Η τέταρτη περίπτωση εξετάζει τους αποκλεισμούς από την ιδιότητα του πολίτη, σε σχέση με το φύλο, τις μειονότητες, τον εμφύλιο πόλεμο και την κατηγορία των εθνικοφρόνων, και τέλος τους μετανάστες της δεκαετίας του 1990.

During the 1990s, the term citizenship was included among the new key-words in historical and social sciences. But this term was hardly new. It has re-emerged several decades after its elaboration by the British sociologist T.H. Marshall in post-war Britain¹. The new preoccupation with citizenship was not unrelated to social and international realities at the end of the 20th century: mass immigration, European Unification, the fall of the Communist regimes and rising nationalisms, new social movements (especially Feminism), the restriction of state interference in economy and the re-orientation of welfare politics.

But why should we start with Marshall's theory? Because he does not define what the citizenship is or is not, but how it works. He said that citizenship is constructed as a sequence of three types of rights: civil, political and social. He localized them in historical periods of the British society, which corresponded to the transformation of European society. In addition to this historical perspective, the analytical categories which this theory uses avoid the formal definitions of legal citizenship. Instead of asking who is entitled to be citizen, Marshall asks what effective actual rights are required for being a citizen and how these rights have been developed in the course of the making of European society. But this theory has also a normative dimension. By the end of the Second World War in Britain, Marshall was questioning the effectiveness of citizenship. His proposal was that full citizenship requires social rights to complement civil and political rights in order for the inequalities produced by capitalism to be counterbalanced. As a consequence, this

theory paved the path of reconciliation between capitalism and democracy in the Welfare State, and provided the language for justifying the inner connection between democracy and the Welfare State. As a consequence, Welfare politics could be demonstrated to be the heir of liberal traditions and a distinctive European path to democracy. In this chapter I wish to argue that Marshall's theory has potential for societies beyond that whence it emerged, and that it can be used in understanding statecraft in countries which have followed different historical paths. The history of Modern Greece is a useful case for illustrating similarities and differences, in intentions and realities, in constructing social belongings in different circumstances.

WHO IS ENTITLED TO BECOME A CITIZEN? *GENOS* OR *DEMOS*?

Although citizenship in Greek city states is at the origin of the history of the concept, Modern Greek citizenship has to be traced to the Ottoman Empire. Greece was established as an independent state in 1830 after a secessionist revolt and an eight year war against the Ottoman Empire. In the Empire, subjects were organized in *millet*, that is on a religious-ethnic basis. The subject belonged first of all to the *millet*, and through the *millet* to the Ottoman Empire. The *millet* were made up of organized communities on extra-territorial basis². People dispersed in the territories of the Empire belonged to the same millet, although they were living mixed with peoples belonging to different millets in the same territory. What does this mean for our discussion? The organization of the Ottoman Empire determined the participation in political communities on the basis not of territorial but of cultural criteria, and culture in this case was over-determined exclusively by faith. Even the Greek speaking populations of the Aegean Islands did not participate in the Rum-Orthodox millet because they belonged to the Roman Catholic Church. As a consequence, the Ottoman Empire, instead of homogenizing its subjects, was pushing them to be associated with a pre-eminently exclusive criterion of religion. The result was compartmentalization and national cleavage in the region even before independence. Balkanization preceded independence in the Balkans.

This legacy produced a tight linkage between ethnicity and citizenship when nationalism transformed the religious bonds to ethnic allegiance. This route was opposite to the path taken in western European, where citizenship was characterized mainly by territorial and only secondarily by ethno-cultural criteria, and where ethnicity was disengaged from religion. The Ottoman tradition determined the exclusive ethno-religious character of belonging. In this way, *genos* (population on an ethno-cultural basis) and not *demos* (population on a territorial basis, originally the people of ancient city-states) was established as the criterion of belonging. The ethno-cultural sense of belonging was the presupposition of citizenship.

WHICH FIRST? CIVIL OR POLITICAL RIGHTS?

Despite the historical bonds, the construction of a modern state was not bound exclusively to the historical traditions, but it was also a matter of choice. As a consequence the conceptualisation of Citizenship in Greece was not exclusively determined by the Otto-

man legacy. Concepts like citizenship were elaborated under the impact of the French Revolution and the diffusion of Enlightenment ideas through Greek intellectuals. One of the most prominent of these radical intellectuals was Rigas Feraios. In his writings, civil rights depended on the political rights of the citizen. According to his republican view of the polity, the rights of the citizens (civil and political) derived from their sovereignty. Rigas was influenced by Rousseau's ideas on citizenship but the idea that civil rights were dependent on political rights was also widespread in Greek political theory in pre-revolutionary times.

A closer examination of the translation of these terms in Greek reveals the way these ideas were understood. The contemporary Greek word for 'Rights' is *Dikaiomata*, which derives from the root *Dikaion* (Justice/Droit). In the French Revolutionary Declaration [of the rights of man] the word used was, in the plural, *Droits*. Thus Greek intellectuals of 18th century, who relied on the French texts as their model, translated the plural form *Droits* as *Dikaia* and not *Dikaiomata*. This translation is not without significance. In Greek, *Dikaiomata* (rights) has a subjective meaning. 'Rights' belong to the subject. But *Dikaia* (*Droits* in the plural), has an objective meaning. It is the allocation of Justice to each individual. It is not the individual's natural condition by birth. The idea is that if citizens live under the sovereignty of Justice and the Law and if they participate in the polity, they possess *Dikaia* (*Droits*). So if rights were individual, the meaning of *Dikaia* was a collective condition. Where rights refer to a negative Freedom (free from the bondage of power) the *Dikaia* refer to the positive meaning of Freedom (as the right to participate in the polity)³. In the Greek political theory, civil rights were understood as deriving from and depending on political rights.

SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP IN AN AGRARIAN SOCIETY

In T. H. Marshall's theoretical time-table of citizenship, social rights were institutionalised in the industrial era and considered necessary to counterbalance political rights and the anxiety that the general franchise might provoke an overturn of the social order. In industrial societies, as in Western and Northern Europe, this strategy implied the need for social reform and the welfare state. But what happened in agrarian societies like Greece? Social rights would remain meaningless if they were not related to the majority of the population, the peasantry, and not translated into agrarian reform.

In the period of Ottoman domination, land in Greece belonged to the Ottoman sovereign or to religious foundations. During the National Revolution (1821-1830) all of this land was deemed national land and there were demands for its redistribution. It is worth noting that the land was not sold. If the land had been sold, the local notables would have taken advantage of the situation and would have strengthened their position even more. On the other hand, the selling of land would have conflicted with the general expectations of the Revolution. According to the national rhetoric of this period, since all had participated in the sacrifices, why should some benefit more than others? For all these reasons, the land was distributed over a period of seven years after the establishment of general male franchise (1864, 1871)⁴. From this viewpoint, the establishment of general male franchise, the institution of public education for males and females and the distri-

bution of the national land to families occurred during the same historical period, and constituted the outcome of the way in which the national state was formed in Greece. But this distribution of rights was unequal. Although all were entitled to the social rights, political rights were allocated only to the male population.

When Greece doubled its territory in the period of the Balkan Wars (1912-13), and received a great wave of Greek refugees from Turkey (1922-23), which equalled about one-fifth of the Greek population, there was a new distribution of land to landless peasants. The justification of the reform originated again from the arsenal of the national ideology: “the resettling of the refugees and their integration into the national community”. Nonetheless, another reason was offered which brings us closer to Marshall’s logic on social rights. It was held that the distribution of land and the creation of small landholders would spare Greece from the danger of revolution and communism. In this way a social mechanism was established, connecting the allocation of the land and the creation of small landholders with social security. Despite the creation of the Social Insurance Foundation (IKA) in the 1930s, under the auspice of and pressure from the International Labour Office, social rights were understood as the creation of small landholders and easy access to land ownership⁵.

This attitude continued to hold sway after the Second World War and the subsequent Civil War, when the balance between the agrarian and the urban population overturned during a mass wave of internal migration in the 1950s and 60s, and the right to vote for the parliament was extended to women (1952)⁶. The politics of the post-war social engineering was not based on social welfare, as in Western Europe, during the same period. It was based on the distribution of super-valued urban real estate in the expanding urban areas. Anybody with a little money from his/her savings was able (or encouraged) to acquire a small portion of landed property, or to share this property with others and use it as an investment to be liquidated during difficult times, as a compensation for the lack of social insurance. This policy, with its visible consequences for the urban landscape in Greece, came to an end after the fall of the Dictatorship (1974), and a new welfare policy was implemented during the Socialist government in the 1980s. The problem this time was that the expansion of the welfare did not coincide with the expansion of the economy as in the 1950s and 1960s, but with a period of stagnation, reduction of public economy and severe criticism of state intervention.

The conclusion is that social citizenship was

- interconnected with the national state and the national ideology;
- understood mainly as the creation of small land owners/small property? holders;
- established not later than political citizenship, although the latter was restricted to the male population till the middle of the 20th century.

CITIZENSHIP AND EXCLUSION

What remained outside of this process of incorporation were the ethnic and religious minorities. During the War of Independence and at the beginning of the foundation of the new state (1821-1830), the non-Christian population (Muslim Turks and Jews) were out-

ed, and their rights as citizens were not recognized. On the other hand linguistic minorities of Orthodox faith (Albanian and Vlach speaking population) were identified as Greek citizens without any distinction from the Greek speaking citizens. The minorities became a political question after the Balkan Wars, the First World War and the Greek invasion of Asia Minor (1912-1922) when agreements for the mutual exchange of populations were made between Greece and Bulgaria, on the basis of the 'consciousness' of national belonging on the one hand, and between Greece and Turkey, on the basis of religion on the other. Minority groups, such as the Muslim community in Thrace and Slav-Macedonians, after mutual agreements, were left inside Greece under the protection of the League of Nations⁷ Formally, these minorities had the rights of Greek citizens, although we should introduce here a distinction between formal or legal rights and the actual exercise of these rights. The discrepancy between the formal and the actual practice of political rights is another serious issue in Greek history concerning political and minority issues. In the inter-war period, just as in the period from the end of the Civil War until the dictatorship of 1967, political rights were guaranteed. Nevertheless, a percentage of the population was excluded from them by laws known as 'para-constitutional' (or 'shadow-state'), which were appended to and supplemented the Constitution. Thus during this period citizens who were considered to belong to the Left were arrested, exiled and impeded in the free exercise of their political rights. Those who were in exile abroad, as political refugees, were deprived their legal citizenship. This exclusion from political citizenship created and was justified by the concept of *ethnikofrosyni* (national mindedness). Those excluded from political rights were considered to be outside the national community. In the post civil war period, the concept of *ethnikofrosyni* was connected to the right to citizenship. The non lawful to the nation was considered as non citizen. The divided citizenship was mirrored in a divided identity. On the one hand, there was the officially promoted identity, on the other, the excluded identity⁸. Only after the fall of the dictatorship and the setting up of the Republic in 1974, the concept of the citizen had forced in Greece a unified national identity with the inclusion of political excluded identities into the citizenship⁹.

During the 1990s the entry of new immigrants from Eastern Europe, the Middle East and other Asian and African countries, counting circa 10% of the population of the country, has challenged the concept of citizenship once more. Access to the right of citizenship was allocated only to a minority of the newcomers, those who could demonstrate their ethnic allegiance to the Greeks, the *omogeneis*¹⁰. Once more the old dilemma between *genos* and *demos* came out in favour of the former.

CONCLUSION

The four cases of Modern Greek history of citizenship show first the tension between two principles of belonging to the 'city', the principle of *genos*, connected to kinship and defined by culture, religion and history, and the principle of *demos* linked to the intellectual tradition of republicanism. Second, we have seen the reversal of the sequence between civil and political rights. Civil rights depended on and derived from political rights and not vice versa. This was the consequence of the making of the nation-state. The construction of citizenship was not a gradual and linear procedure but the result of a rupture in the

history of society. The polity was constructed out of secession with Empires and without state and legal continuity as implied by the Marshallian model of citizenship. Third, social rights were indispensable for the social cohesion of new formed national communities. The majority of the population imposed the need for agrarian reform, and, at the same time, the reform was justified with the national and citizenship discourse. Despite the differences with respect to the social legislation and the welfare policies developed for urban working people, the politics of social cohesion was used as a vehicle of attaining full citizenship, in a way similar to the theoretical proposals of T.H. Marshall.

NOTES

- ¹ T.H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*, Cambridge 1950.
- ² B. Braude - B. Lewis, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire*, New York 1982; I. Ortayli, *The Ottoman millet system and its social dimensions* and U. Kocabasoglu, *The Millet System: A Bird's Eye View*, in R. Larson (ed.), *Boundaries of Europe?*, Uppsala 1998, pp. 120-138.
- ³ A. Manitakis, *Ta Dikaia tou Anthropou*, "Politis", 61, 1999, pp. 14-19 (in Greek).
- ⁴ W. McGrew, *Land and Revolution in Modern Greece, 1800-1881*, Kent State 1985.
- ⁵ A. Liakos, *Welfare policy in Greece (1909-1940). From the private needs to the social question*, MIRE, *Comparing Social Welfare Systems in Southern Europe*, Paris 1997, pp. 93-108.
- ⁶ E. Avdela, *Between duties and rights, Gender and citizenship in Greece, 1864-1952*, in F. Birtek - T. Dragonas, *Citizenship and the Nation-State in Greece and Turkey*, London 2003, pp. 117-143.
- ⁷ L. Divani, *Greece and Minorities*, Athens 1995 (in Greek).
- ⁸ N. Alivizatos, *Les Institutions Politiques de la Grece a travers les crises 1922-1974*, Paris 1979.
- ⁹ N. Alivizatos (ed.), *Greek Constitutional Law and Practice*, Special Issue of Modern Greek Studies, 17, 1, 1999, pp. 1-84.
- ¹⁰ "Omogeneis" (= belonging to the same *genos*): Immigrants belonging to the Greek minority of Albania, and people from Southern Russia and Georgia speaking a Greek dialect of the southern part of Black Sea (Pontus).