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• Social citizenship: a post-1945 notion that generated a range of citizenship regimes:
  o rights,
  o access,
  o belonging
  o responsibility mix.

• The composition of social citizenship has changed over time in all citizenship regimes

• Some challenges of new practices embedded in citizenship regimes for social citizenship at work.
SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP: A POST-1945 NOTION THAT GENERATED SEVERAL CONFIGURATIONS
Social citizenship in three welfare regimes

• The concept is usually and usefully associated with the perspective of T.H. Marshall (1949), then taken up by Gøsta Esping-Andersen (1990).
• Marshall was a social liberal and so his social citizenship was:
  • “the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security”
  • “the right to live the life of a civilized being”
• Marshall’s metaphor: “class abatement” is like “smoke abatement”

C-à-d: on modère les effets de classe comme on modère les effets de la pollution industrielle.
Three configurations of welfare regimes


- Liberal
- Social Democratic
- Conservative-Corporatist (Bismarckian)

- Nonetheless, in a VERY stylised way, it is possible to generalise.
Social rights

• In the social liberal, social democratic and corporatist versions of post-1945 welfare regimes, the relationship to the labour force (or not) was definitive for the rights set down in the citizenship regime:
  o Employment was the responsibility of all (male) citizens & employment provided a wide range of rights – the main source of income was market income.
  o Social care was primarily a private responsibility and performed by women; motherhood was protected.
  o Gaps and inequalities were addressed by social benefits – unemployment insurance; pensions; family allowances; social assistance; health care; etc.
Access (governance)

• Universal suffrage, with political parties usually ranged across the Left-Right spectrum.

• But also intermediary organisations, to represent workers (and their families) in politics and in the workplace – claimed social rights and/or social wages, depending on the configuration of the citizenship regime.

• Thus social rights were themselves the outcome of these forms of access and belonging was a – more or less strong – class or status identity.
THE COMPOSITION OF SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP HAS CHANGED OVER TIME IN ALL CITIZENSHIP REGIMES
These citizenship regimes are no more …

- The neo-liberal moment:
  - Shrink the state (and therefore social citizenship)
  - Dislodge the power of “organised interests” (aka unions)
  - Thrust responsibility back on the family
  - Use the community sector for the poor.

- Shift in discourse from equality or status-maintenance to poverty, social exclusion, social cohesion and so on.
But neoliberalism *pur et dur* ALSO displaced by the social investment perspective

- Move towards the social investment perspective:
- A quasi-concept which succeeds by being “under-defined”
- Nonetheless identifiable by three characteristics:
  - Child-centred, via emphasis on human capital
  - Activation-centred, via emphasis on employment for all
  - Anti-poverty focus, especially child poverty
- In other words, a redefinition of the content of social rights to focus on children and the future – from social protection to preventive social policy.
## Rights and duties in three citizenship regimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keynesian Perspective</th>
<th>Neoliberal Perspective</th>
<th>Social Investment Perspective - SIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social goals</strong></td>
<td>Provide social protection</td>
<td>Avoid policy instruments that foster dependency; promote autonomy</td>
<td>Invest in prevention and human and social capital, in order to ensure growth and prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision of equality</strong></td>
<td>Equality of condition and equal opportunities</td>
<td>Inequality is inherent in markets and is necessary to motivate economic actors</td>
<td>Equality of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risks to covered by social and labour market policies</strong></td>
<td>Unemployment, disability and sickness, extra costs of children, loss of income due to retirement or absence of a male breadwinner</td>
<td>Disability, sickness, threat of crime and social disorder, ageing</td>
<td>Family breakdown, low-wage work or unstable work, challenge of balancing earning with social care, demography</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A citizenship regime inspired by the SIP also implies shifts in access and governance

• Political parties difficult to position vis à vis left-right axis
• Shift in centre of gravity of decision-making about social citizenship:
  o From social and labour ministries to finance (Treasury): tax-based delivery as well as targeting.
  o As the economic institutions displace the social, they undermine the political influence of intermediary bodies representing labour (and other groups).
CHALLENGES OF NEW PRACTICES EMBEDDED IN CITIZENSHIP REGIMES FOR CITIZENSHIP AT WORK
The challenges that are real for actors concerned with citizenship at work

1. Governance – gaining access to the institutional locales and networks in which decisions about social citizenship are now being made.

2. Successfully and innovatively taking up the issues that are the focus of social citizenship now:
   I. Precarious work, etc.
   II. Social care – Whose responsibility? Who does it? How is it remunerated?
   III. Shifting from “poverty” to “equality”