

Defining Citizenship

A person who is intrigued by the topics upheld in one's community and feels urged (not necessarily forced) to contribute to various issues that affect one's own identity physically or morally. This was the original thought that I had written out when you first asked us to compose our own definition of citizenship. I've been contemplating this analysis of citizenship and struggled to capitalize on the declaration. Although I will include portions of the concrete definition within the piece, I would like to think abstractly. Through this desire, I will introduce a point of time in my life, and how my comprehension of citizenship was altered.

I came to the conclusion that my original definition was idealistic in nature and would be nearly impossible to replicate in reality. After facing the harshness implanted in actuality, I realized that most rhetoric, along with the definition of citizenship, is constructed and sustained by those in power. This was introduced to me through the deportation of my good friend Miguel Cortes. Although his story is just one of many, it showed me that regardless of all of these comprised definitions of citizenship, our government, the source of power, can redefine it at any given moment.

At numerous points in time, Miguel has complied with various of these rhetoricians' denotations. However, when it comes down to it, a rhetorician's definition of citizenship is meaningless. This is because rhetoricians don't appoint citizenship, government does. Therefore, Everett Lord can hypothesize that maybe we are just different types of citizens. However, just like their definitions, it is utterly pointless when each rhetorician is simply contributing to a concept that will never be applied. Maybe if we successfully developed an immigration act pertain-

ing to this generation we wouldn't have to debate the actual definition of citizenship because it would be provided to us.

With frustration aside I commend some and reject other rhetoricians and their contributions in attempting to understand the complicated topic of citizenship. Kenneth Rulfo and Jarrod Atchinson record that citizens are never associated with government and state agents. In this description, they don't necessarily declare that government officials and state agents are not citizens, but decide that the type of citizens we are, differ from those that occupy power within the government. I find this topic intriguing and considered it an entry point for my understanding of citizenship. On the opposing hand, Robert Putnam states that citizenship is on the wane when in reality, it is more present then ever. Obama's and Trump's campaigns have deported nearly 3 million undocumented immigrants with various tactics like ICE raids and the presentation of documentation proof during common traffic violations. Through this it is apparent that obtaining the label of a citizen is more essential now than ever.

Does citizenship really only apply to those who don't have citizenship?

References

Asen, Robert. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Routledge*, vol. 45, no. 09, May 2004, pp. 189–211. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*.

Chavez, Karma R. "Beyond Inclusion: Rethinking Rhetoric's Historical Narrative." *Beyond Inclusion*, Feb. 2015, pp. 162–172. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, doi: 10.1057/9781137385420.0003.