Nation-states were different from earlier political organizations in three main ways. First, the nation-state's political authority came to be organized as separate from and supreme to that of other social actors, including the Church. This provided the nation-state with its high level of authority and legitimacy. Second, nation-states developed a significant degree of self-identification and state loyalty among populations that led to the rise of modern nationalism. Third, nation-states developed concurrently with the rise of the merchant class in Europe. As a result, intricate class structures, which extended beyond elite-peasant systems, created opportunities for pluralistic government and nondiscriminatory legal systems, and hence, the eventual rise of democracy.

THE MODERN NATION-STATE

The nationalism of nation-states contributed to both the scramble for empires and the great wars of the twentieth century. Nation-states that had high degrees of homogeneity at home nonetheless developed multiethnic empires that failed to develop the same degrees of loyalty and attachment to the home state. That nation-states were at their core ethnic entities contributed to ongoing ethnic conflicts, especially as the consequences of imperialism were manifested by the redrawing of ethnic boundaries and the dislocation of populations. After World War I (1914–1918), the empires of Germany, Russia, Turkey, and Austria-Hungary were dismantled by the victorious allies, and their former territories were either granted independence or came under new colonial mandates by the remaining imperial powers, France, Britain, and Japan.

In the post–World War II (1939–1945) era, the nation-state came under increasing competition in the global system. The empires of Western Europe disintegrated due to a combination of self-determination movements, nationalism, cold war politics, and empire fatigue occasioned by the increased costs in terms of lives and resources of combating resistance movements. The break-up of colonial empires and the subsequent demise of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war caused the number of independent countries to increase from 75 in 1945 to more than 200 by 2000.

International organizations such as the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) altered traditional notions of sovereignty and established competing centers of authority over political, economic, and security matters. For instance, in the early twenty-first century, the EU has taken over many of the functions formerly the domain of the nation-states, including monetary policy. The attractiveness of organizations such as the EU is that they allow small- to medium-sized nation-states to pool resources and magnify economic and security power. Nonetheless, this trend also undermines the nation-state's traditional role. In addition, the growth of multinational corporations (MNCs) has eroded the economic and political control of individual governments and offered new challenges to nation-states.

Contemporary scholarship remains divided on the role of the nation-state in the international system. Neorealists continue to assert that the nation-state is the main actor in global politics and that these entities are rational actors that seek to maximize power through cost-benefit analysis. Such scholars contend that international bodies are merely the reflection of the political preferences for the great powers and serve as a means to augment, rather than lessen, the power of the nation-state. Neoliberal-institutionalists counter that the nation-state is on the decline as global organizations and MNCs increasingly gain economic and political power. In addition, the growing interdependence among states has not only reduced nationalism and increased economic ties but fostered a nascent global culture that transcends traditional notions of self and ethnicities. Such manifestations of globalization are criticized by scholars who contend that the erosion of national norms and values undermines indigenous cultures and is a form of cultural imperialism.

See also *Nation; Nationalism; State, The.*

TOM LANSFORD

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Hay, Colin, Michael Lister, and David Marsh, eds. *The State: Theories and Issues.* New York: Palgrave, 2006.

Kennedy, Paul. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict From 1500–2000.* New York: Random House, 1987.

Keohane, Robert O., ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

Naturalization

Naturalization is a person's acquisition of the citizenship of a state whose citizenship he or she did not acquire at birth. Most individuals acquire citizenship automatically at birth through some combination of *jus soli* (citizenship based on place of birth) and *jus sanguinis* (citizenship based on parentage), the two elements present to varying degrees in every state's citizenship laws. By contrast, naturalization happens at some later point in time and involves an administrative decision or procedure.

Conditions for naturalization commonly include a minimum age, demonstrated time of residence, knowledge of the society as demonstrated by a test, language requirements, evidence of good character, and other evidence of integration such as family ties. Such conditions for individual naturalization are often relaxed or waived when state interests are invoked, and most states include provisions for accelerated naturalization in particular circumstances.

States extend or restrict citizenship for many reasons and alter their naturalization requirements accordingly. Most notably, naturalization policies tend to reflect the changing goals of immigration policy. In the United States, for example, naturalization was considerably easier until the 1920s, when both immigration and naturalization were restricted. Making citizenship harder to acquire is one way in which states can attempt to discourage immigration.

VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY NATURALIZATION

Many definitions of naturalization describe it solely in terms of the intentional choice of individuals to acquire a new citizenship, but naturalization can be involuntary as well as voluntary and can involve groups as well as individuals. Historically, some states imposed citizenship on noncitizens in order to enforce civic duties, such as military service. Territorial and border changes such as annexation often included large-scale naturalizations of the resident populations, such as the forced naturalization of residents east of the Curzon line, who became Soviet citizens following annexation of their territory by the USSR after World War II (1939–1945). (Many Polish residents instead left or were deported, often resettling in Poland's "recovered territories," which had been vacated by departing Germans). Such mass naturalizations usually include provisions for individuals to opt out. State breakdown or mass migrations caused by war provide other triggers for large-scale naturalizations.

The opposite of naturalization is denaturalization, the loss of citizenship resulting from an administrative decision or procedure. An infamous example of denaturalization is the Reich Citizenship Law of 1935, which stripped Jews and others not "of German or kindred blood" of their German citizenship. In response to this and other denaturalizations, Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights provides both that everyone is entitled to a nationality and that no one may be arbitrarily stripped of his or her nationality. This does not prevent denaturalization: The laws of many states continue to provide for denaturalization, such as when a citizen acquires another citizenship through naturalization. Most citizenship laws also allow the voluntary renunciation of one's citizenship under certain conditions. Other states refuse to recognize naturalization of their citizens in another state.

There remains a gender component to naturalization flowing from the distinctions of citizenship law. Historically, it was commonplace for women (but not men) to automatically lose their citizenship when marrying a noncitizen. In their citizenship laws, many states continue to deny equality between women and men, although this is now uncommon in liberal democracies. Children are likewise a special category, including the question of the age at which a child becomes an adult capable of voluntary naturalization. The citizenship laws of many states provide for automatic naturalization through adoption or the recognition of paternity.

The distinction between supposedly natural citizenship acquisition at birth and non-birth-based naturalization becomes ambiguous as *jus sanguinis* is extended. For example, many states provide for repatriation or a right of return to coethnics abroad. Israel's Law of Return, which offers instantaneous naturalized citizenship to any Jew wishing to settle in Israel, was amended in 1970 to extend this right to "the child and the grandchild of a Jew, the spouse of a Jew, the spouse of a child of a Jew, and the spouse of a grandchild of a Jew." Other states similarly extend preferential access to naturalization on the basis of ethnic grounds (e.g., Italy's or Spain's privileging of emigrants and their descendants; Germany's policies favoring *aussiedler,* and Greece's policies favoring ethnic Greeks), linguistic grounds (e.g., Portugal's facilitating naturalization for people who speak Portuguese), or other grounds.

CROSS-NATIONAL VARIATION

Explanations for differences in naturalization rates include the costs and benefits of acquiring citizenship, the resources and networks of individuals, the bureaucratic procedures for acquiring citizenship, and the degree of political mobilization to encourage and facilitate naturalization.

The costs of acquiring citizenship often include the obligation to renounce one's previous citizenship. For example, when Germany eased its citizenship law in 2000 to allow dual citizenship, naturalization rates increased. Benefits of acquiring citizenship include the right to vote and access to more rights than noncitizens have. When the United States in 1996 restricted certain social benefits to citizens (previously, permanent residents also had access to many such benefits), applications for naturalization increased dramatically.

Declining mobilization by political parties and grassroots groups can be linked to falling naturalization levels, but institutional factors, such as differences in state intervention, also play a role. One case study comparing differential naturalization rates among Portuguese immigrants in Canada and the United States found that in Toronto, government bureaucrats and federal policy encouraged citizenship through symbolic support and instrumental aid to ethnic organizations and community leaders, while Boston area grassroots groups were expected to mobilize and aid their constituents without direct state support, resulting in lower naturalization rates.

The introduction of a supranational European Union (EU) citizenship does not constitute naturalization, because EU citizenship is acquired automatically upon acquiring the citizenship of an EU member state and is not a separate legal status. Some have proposed that EU citizenship should be granted based on residence rather than nationality of a member state, but this proposal has not been adopted. Nevertheless, the European Commission has promoted naturalization as a strategy for facilitating integration, arguing that immigrants should be helped to settle successfully into society through the acquisition of rights and citizenship of the member states.

Naturalized citizens generally enjoy the same rights as citizens who acquired citizenship at birth, though naturalized citizens are sometimes subject to denaturalization more easily than native-born citizens. The aim of policies favoring naturalization is generally to avoid the growth of large populations of long-term residents who do not possess citizenship.

See also *Citizenship; Dual Citizenship and Dual Nationality; Immigration, Politics of; Immigration Policy; Mass Immigration; Nationality.*

WILLEM MAAS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloemraad, Irene. "The North American Naturalization Gap: An Institutional Approach to Citizenship Acquisition in the United States and Canada." *International Migration Review* 36, no. 1 (2002): 193–228.

Brubaker, Rogers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Maas, Willem. "Migrants, States, and EU Citizenship's Unfulfilled Promise." *Citizenship Studies* 12, no. 6 (December 2008): 583–596.
Safran, William. "Citizenship and Nationality in Democratic Systems: Approaches to Defining and Acquiring Membership in the Political Community." *International Political Science Review* 18, no. 3 (1997): 313–335.

Natural Law

Natural law is both a moral and legal theory that posits the existence of a law whose content is set by nature and therefore has validity everywhere. As a moral theory, natural law claims moral standards that govern human behavior are in some part objectively derived from the nature of human beings and the world; as a legal theory, natural law asserts that the authority of legal standards is in some sense derived from the considerations of the moral merit of those standards. While being logically independent of each other, the two theories do intersect with each other: Both claim that some laws depend for their authority on the relationship they have not to preexisting convention but to moral standards.

GREEK AND MEDIEVAL ORIGINS

Greek philosophers, particularly Plato and Aristotle, emphasized the distinction between nature (*physis*) and conventional law (*nomos*). While the content of law varies from place to place, the content of nature is the same everywhere. Natural law therefore not only functions as a standard by which to criticize the content of conventional law but also determines what the law said in the first place. As a result, the state is bound by natural law and becomes the institution directed at bringing its subject happiness, whether temporal or through other-worldly salvation. This classical conception of natural law was promulgated by the Roman Catholic Church as set forth by philosopher and priest Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274).

According to Aquinas, humans are social and political animals as well as naturally religious. The natural law applies to humans alone as conscious, rational, moral, and social creatures, teaching them to avoid ignorance and not to give offense to others. Through reason, all humans can naturally and equally know the one standard of truth in the natural law. But when it comes to particular conclusions drawn from the eternal moral principles of natural law, although the standard of truth remains fixed (primary precepts), the specific circumstances of its applications vary (secondary precepts). As history changes, the secondary precepts also change in particular cases, but the natural law is not altered but added to.

This concept of natural law had entered mainstream Western culture through the writings of medieval Islamic scholars like Averroes, whose Aristotelian commentaries influenced Aquinas's understanding of natural law. Averroes wrote that the human mind alone could know the higher intents of Islamic *sharia,* like the protection of religion and life, as well as the unlawfulness of certain offenses such as theft and murder. The concept of *istislah* in Islamic law also bears some similarities to Aquinas's natural law: Whereas Aquinas's natural law deems good that which is self-evidently known as it tends toward the fulfillment of the person, *istislah* calls good whatever is connected to the five basic goods of Islam. The largest Islamic school of thought that posits the existence of natural law is the Maturidi school, which teaches that the human mind can know the existence of God and the major forms of good and evil without the help of revelation.

MODERN NATURAL LAW AND LEGAL POSITIVISM

Aquinas's conception of natural law spread to the school of Salamanca, where, in the sixteenth century, scholars like Francisco Suárez (1548–1617) and Francisco de Vitoria (ca. 1483–1546) further developed a philosophy of natural law in the Catholic tradition. The Protestants Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) and Samuel von Pufendorf (1632–1694) also made significant contributions to natural law theory. Grotius based his philosophy of international law on natural law and insisted on the universal validity of the natural law even if God were not to exist. Likewise, Pufendorf based his theory of natural law not on God but on the sociability of humans and held that every person, on the basis of human dignity, had a right to equality and freedom.

In England, theologian and preacher Richard Hooker (1554–1600) adapted features of Aquinas's natural law theory into Anglicanism, and legal scholar and judge William Blackstone (1723–1780) used natural law in determining the contents of common law, although it was not identical with the laws of England. But it was English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) who had the greatest influence on natural law by seeking to replace it with legal positivism. According to Hobbes, law is not an expression of higher principles or morality but simply the articulation of the will of the authority that created it. Natural law therefore is subordinate to positive law: The natural law—how a rational human being could survive and prosper—could exist only if humans first submitted themselves to the authority that had created the law. For Hobbes, natural law was discovered by considering natural rights first, whereas previously it could be said that natural rights were discovered by considering the natural law first. The supremacy of legal positivism over natural law would be continued and advocated by such subsequent thinkers as Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), Hans Kelsen (1881–1973), and H. L. A. Hart (1907–1992).

There is considerable debate about whether John Locke's (1632–1704) conception of natural law was more akin to Aquinas's as filtered through Hooker or to a revision of Hobbes's interpretation. According to Locke, God's natural law provided that no one ought to harm another in life, liberty, or possessions, and it therefore gave each person a natural right to his or her life, liberty, and property. If the sovereign went against the natural law, people could justifiably overthrow the existing state and create a new one. The notions of equality under the law, limited government, and the state's purpose to protect life, liberty, and property would influence subsequent liberal thinkers and seminal documents, such as the U.S. Declaration of Independence.

CONTEMPORARY NATURAL LAW

Contemporary natural law jurisprudence has been undergoing a period of reformulation with John Finnis, Germain