

Structural Maldistribution of Rights as a Precursor to Economic Inequality: A Theoretical Mapping

Executive Summary

This research report presents an exhaustive mapping of academic literature designed to interrogate the hypothesis that wealth maldistribution is a downstream consequence of a more fundamental "structural maldistribution of rights." Commissioned to support the theoretical construction of a doctoral thesis, this document rigorously explores the chasm between formal citizenship (legal status) and effective citizenship (substantive ability to exercise rights). The analysis synthesizes scholarship from political philosophy, the sociology of law, development studies, and institutional economics to validate the core proposition: that the "haves" do not merely possess more wealth, but possess a superior structural relationship to the legal system, which allows them to convert rights into capital while the "have-nots" suffer from "legal estrangement" and "structural hobbling."

Key findings indicate that while T.H. Marshall's linear progression of rights (civil, political, social) provides a foundational framework, it fails to account for the "citizenship gap"—the space where formal rights exist on paper but are inaccessible in practice due to a lack of "legal capability." The report highlights that "access to justice" literature, particularly the work of Rebecca Sandefur and Marc Galanter, provides the empirical mechanism for the user's hypothesis: the unequal distribution of legal enforcement capability creates a feedback loop that stratifies wealth. Furthermore, the report identifies the "Fiduciary Theory of the State" (Fox-Decent) and the Japanese legal concept of "Quasi-Mandate" (*Jun-inin*) as potent theoretical vehicles for reframing social welfare not as charity, but as a binding legal obligation of the state to manage the "social estate" with a duty of care. Ultimately, the literature supports the view that addressing wealth inequality without addressing the antecedent inequality in rights access is theoretically insufficient.

1. Introduction: The Hypothesis of Rights as Antecedent to Wealth

1.1 The Prevailing Economic Lens and its Limitations

The prevailing discourse on inequality in the twenty-first century has been overwhelmingly dominated by economic metrics. From Thomas Piketty's exhaustive analysis of capital accumulation to the global fixation on Gini coefficient rankings, the analytical lens remains

firmly focused on the distribution of material resources. The implicit assumption in much of this literature is that wealth is the primary independent variable—the driver of social outcomes—while legal standing and rights are often treated as static constants or secondary derivatives of economic power.

However, this report investigates a more foundational layer of stratification: the distribution of rights. The core hypothesis guiding this research posits that **wealth maldistribution is merely an observable "consequence," and a structural maldistribution of rights precedes it as the root cause**. This perspective demands a radical shift in the analytical framework, moving from the *outcome* (wealth) to the *process* (rights realization). If rights are understood not merely as abstract legal declarations but as "institutional assets" that allow individuals to navigate society, secure property, and demand fair treatment, then a deficit in these assets must logically precede a deficit in economic accumulation.

1.2 Defining the Scope: Democratic Social Contracts

The scope of this inquiry is deliberately limited. It does not engage with universal or natural law arguments characteristic of broad human rights discourse. Instead, it operates strictly within the confines of democratic, capitalist, and rule-of-law societies where rights are ostensibly guaranteed by a social contract. In these systems, the "maldistribution of rights" is particularly insidious because it contradicts the foundational promise of equality before the law. The investigation focuses on the mechanisms that render these agreed-upon rights effective for some and illusory for others, thereby generating the "Hubris Factor" (excess) and "Anomie Factor" (deficiency) described in the user's theoretical context.

1.3 Theoretical Pillars of the Inquiry

To validate this hypothesis, the report synthesizes evidence from four distinct but converging academic domains:

1. **Citizenship Studies:** Examining the divergence between "formal" status and "effective" practice (Marshall, Lister, Isin).
2. **Sociology of Law:** Investigating the structural advantages of "repeat players" and the phenomenon of "legal estrangement" (Galanter, Bell, Sandefur).
3. **Institutional Economics:** Establishing the causal link where exclusionary legal institutions inhibit economic growth (Acemoglu, Robinson, Legal Origins Theory).
4. **Political Philosophy & Japanese Legal Theory:** Utilizing the Capability Approach (Sen), Limitarianism (Robeyns), and the Japanese concept of *Jun-inin* (Quasi-Mandate) to propose a framework of state fiduciary duty.

Through this mapping, we aim to construct a theoretical lineage that validates the "Service of Empowerment" framework, situating "rights maldistribution" as the primary driver of social stratification.

2. The Anatomy of Citizenship: Deconstructing the Gap (RQ1)

The first step in validating the hypothesis is to establish that "citizenship" is not a binary status (citizen vs. non-citizen) but a spectrum of effectiveness. The literature reveals a profound distinction between possessing a right *de jure* and exercising it *de facto*, a gap that serves as the breeding ground for inequality.

2.1 The Marshallian Legacy and its Linear Limitations

T.H. Marshall's seminal essay *Citizenship and Social Class* (1950) remains the inevitable starting point for any discussion on the structure of rights. Marshall conceptualized citizenship as a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community, developing historically in three distinct stages:

1. **Civil Rights (18th Century):** The rights necessary for individual freedom—liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice.¹
2. **Political Rights (19th Century):** The right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body.¹
3. **Social Rights (20th Century):** The whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society.²

Marshall's framework was revolutionary in articulating that "social citizenship" was the capstone required to make the civil and political rights meaningful. He understood that a starving man cannot effectively exercise his right to free speech or property. However, modern scholarship critiques Marshall for a teleological optimism—an assumption that once these rights are inscribed in law, the progression is complete.

The literature suggests that Marshall's model is "hard on the outside but soft on the inside".³ It focuses heavily on the *granting* of rights (the formal status) rather than the *capacity* of the citizen to use them. This is where the user's hypothesis gains traction: the maldistribution is not necessarily in the *granting* of the rights (in a modern democracy, most have formal rights), but in the infrastructure required to access them.

2.2 Ruth Lister and Citizenship as "Practice"

Ruth Lister, a pivotal figure in feminist citizenship theory, challenges the "passive" nature of the Marshallian model. In her dichotomy of "rights" versus "obligation" approaches, she notes that the traditional liberal model views citizenship as a passive status where the state

guarantees formal equality.⁴ By contrast, Lister argues for a conception of citizenship as a dynamic "practice".¹

For Lister, one does not simply possess citizenship; one *acts* as a citizen. This shift from noun to verb is critical. If citizenship is a practice, then it requires resources, skills, and opportunities to be performed. Lister's work suggests that poverty acts as a barrier to this practice, effectively stripping individuals of their citizenship in the substantive sense even if they retain it in the formal sense.¹ This aligns with the user's concept of "rights maldistribution"—the resources required to "practice" citizenship (time, money, legal knowledge, social capital) are maldistributed, leading to a maldistribution of the citizenship itself.

2.3 Engin Isin and "Acts of Citizenship"

Engin Isin takes this further with the concept of "acts of citizenship." He distinguishes between "active citizenship" (following the rules, voting) and "acts of citizenship" (rupturing the given, claiming new rights).⁵

Isin's framework is vital for understanding the "have-nots." He argues that "claim-making subjects" constitute themselves as citizens through the performance of acts.⁵ When a marginalized group demands housing rights or challenges police brutality, they are enacting citizenship. However, Isin notes that "formal citizenship in Western democratic societies is presumed to confer a universal set of rights... but citizenship on the books and citizenship in action are not coterminous".⁶

This distinction identifies the "citizenship gap": the space where formal status exists but the capacity to act is suppressed. Isin and Turner (2007) argue that national governments can be "inimical to effective citizenship," actively creating barriers to these acts.⁶ This suggests that the "rights maldistribution" is not an accident but a feature of governance that suppresses the "acts" of certain populations to maintain the status quo.

2.4 Defining "Effective Citizenship"

Based on the synthesis of these scholars, "Effective Citizenship" can be defined as **the substantive capability to exercise civil, political, and social rights, to access the legal system for redress, and to participate in the shaping of the polity, independent of formal legal status.**

The academic literature consistently contrasts this with "Formal Citizenship":

- **Formal Citizenship:** A legal category (e.g., holding a passport), often used as a mechanism of closure to exclude non-members. It is necessary but insufficient for well-being.
- **Effective Citizenship:** A socio-political condition dependent on "dispositions" (habits of

mind, sense of justice)⁷, "legal capability" (knowledge and confidence)⁸, and "structural opportunity".⁶

The research confirms that "social exclusion" often renders formal citizenship void. For example, racial minorities in France or the US may possess full formal rights yet experience exclusion from housing and employment that negates their citizenship status.⁹ This "dual citizenship"—where some are citizens and others are mere "denizens" despite having the same papers—is the clearest manifestation of the structural rights maldistribution hypothesis.⁹

3. Structural Injustice and the "Haves": The Mechanisms of Inequality (RQ2)

If rights are unequally distributed, is this a result of individual failure (the "self-responsibility" narrative) or systemic design? The literature overwhelmingly points to structural causes, validating the user's focus on "structural" rather than "individual" maldistribution.

3.1 Iris Marion Young: Structural Injustice and "Hobbling"

Iris Marion Young's theory of "structural injustice" is indispensable for this theoretical mapping. Young argues that injustice is not merely the result of bad actors violating rules, but of "social-structural processes" that put large groups of persons under systematic threat of domination or deprivation.¹⁰

Young's framework aligns perfectly with the user's hypothesis. She posits that well-intentioned actions within a market system can produce unjust outcomes because of the *structure* of the system itself. Individuals acting according to accepted rules (paying rent, buying goods) collectively contribute to a structure that renders others homeless or destitute.

Structural Hobbling: Recent scholarship expanding on Young identifies "structural hobbling"—where state activity to address injustice in one sphere may contribute to injustice in another.¹⁰ For example, complex bureaucratic requirements to access welfare (ostensibly to ensure fairness) effectively "hobble" the poor, consuming their time and cognitive bandwidth, thereby stripping them of their effective right to support. This validates the "Book-off Debt" concept: the state creates a structure that is theoretically open but practically impassable, then blames the individual for failing to navigate it.

3.2 Marc Galanter: Why the "Haves" Come Out Ahead

Perhaps the most empirical validation of "rights maldistribution" leading to "wealth outcomes" is Marc Galanter's classic 1974 analysis, *Why the "Haves" Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change*.¹² This work is foundational to the sociology of law and provides

the *mechanism* for the user's hypothesis.

Galanter distinguishes between two types of actors in the legal system:

1. **One-Shotters (OS):** Individuals who interact with the legal system rarely (e.g., a divorce, a car accident, an eviction). They have high stakes in the specific outcome but low resources and little interest in the long-term state of the law.
2. **Repeat Players (RP):** Organizations (corporations, the state, insurance companies) that engage in litigation frequently. They have low stakes in any single case but vast resources and a deep interest in the *rules* of the game.

The Mechanism of Rights Maldistribution:

Galanter demonstrates that Repeat Players do not just win cases; they "play for the rules."

- **Rule Shaping:** RPs will settle cases they are likely to lose (to avoid establishing a bad precedent) and litigate cases they are likely to win (to establish a favorable precedent).¹³ Over time, this selective litigation shapes the common law and the interpretation of statutes to favor the wealthy.
- **Resource Advantage:** RPs have access to specialized legal talent, can structure their transactions to fit the law (advance intelligence), and can endure delays that starve out One-Shotters.¹⁴

This confirms that "legal inequality" is structural. The architecture of the legal system creates a "maldistribution of rights" where the "Haves" possess *effective* rights (the ability to enforce claims and shape rules) while the "Have-nots" possess only *formal* rights that are too expensive or risky to enforce.¹² The "Haves" come out ahead not just because they are rich, but because their richness buys them a superior *structural position* vis-à-vis the law, which in turn protects and expands their wealth.

3.3 Monica Bell: Legal Estrangement

Building on this, Monica Bell's theory of "Legal Estrangement" provides a modern sociological understanding of why marginalized communities are disconnected from the rights system. Bell argues that the problem is not just "distrust" (an individual psychological state) but "estrangement" (a structural condition of alienation).¹⁶

Legal estrangement posits that the law acts as a mechanism of exclusion rather than inclusion for the poor. The "criminalization of poverty" (discussed in Section 5) creates a relationship where the state is a predator (extracting fines/fees) rather than a protector. This "vicarious marginalization" ensures that the poor do not view the law as a tool for their empowerment, effectively stripping them of their "right to have rights".¹⁶

For the user's thesis, Bell's work is crucial. It argues that this estrangement is "structural".¹⁸ It is not that the poor "choose" not to exercise their rights; it is that the legal system signals to them, through every interaction, that they are *objects* of law, not *subjects* with rights. This

structural exclusion is the precursor to their economic marginalization.

4. The Causal Vector: Rights as the Precursor to Wealth (RQ3)

The central question of the user's thesis is the direction of causality. Does wealth buy rights, or do rights determine wealth? While the former is obvious and widely accepted, high-level institutional scholarship supports the latter: **the distribution of rights (institutions) is the primary determinant of economic outcomes.**

4.1 Acemoglu and Robinson: Institutional Inequality

Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson's Nobel-winning work on "Inclusive vs. Extractive Institutions" provides the strongest macroeconomic support for the user's hypothesis.¹⁹

- **Inclusive Institutions:** Secure property rights, unbiased legal systems, and public services that provide a level playing field. These allow people to participate in the economy.
- **Extractive Institutions:** Designed to extract incomes and wealth from one subset of society to benefit a different subset.

The Causal Argument: Acemoglu and Robinson argue that *political* and *legal* institutions (rights) are the fundamental cause of long-run growth and wealth distribution.²² Nations that fail to distribute rights broadly (i.e., establish inclusive institutions) fail to generate wealth for the majority.

- **Evidence:** In their "colonial origins" research, they show that where colonizers set up extractive legal systems (few rights for the many), modern inequality is high. Where they set up inclusive systems (rights for settlers), modern inequality is lower.²²
- **Conclusion:** "Institutional inequality" (rights maldistribution) *precedes and predicts* economic inequality.²⁴ The "rights" (institutions) are the independent variable; the "wealth" (GDP/Inequality) is the dependent variable.

4.2 Legal Origins Theory

The "Legal Origins Theory" (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, Vishny) argues that the *style* of a legal system (Common Law vs. Civil Law) fundamentally shapes economic outcomes.²³

- **Common Law:** Associated with stronger protection of property rights and investors, tending to produce better financial outcomes.
- **Civil Law:** More state-centered, often associated with higher regulation and formalism.

While controversial, this theory supports the idea that the "architecture of rights" (the legal

software of a society) determines its "wealth hardware".²⁵ The report notes that legal inequality traps are "constructed out of the socio-economic inequality" but also serve to *entrench* and *reproduce* it.²⁷ The legal origin determines the "security of property rights," which in turn determines the "financial development".²³

4.3 The "Legal Inequality Trap" and Development

The World Bank's work on "Legal Empowerment of the Poor" suggests a "legal inequality trap." When the poor are excluded from the rule of law (cannot register property, enforce contracts, or access labor protections), they cannot accumulate capital.²⁸

- **De Soto's Influence:** Hernando de Soto (co-chair of the Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor - CLEP) famously argued that the poor possess vast assets but cannot convert them into capital because they lack formal property rights.³⁰
- **Mechanism:** The lack of *legal rights* (to property, to business formalization) prevents the accumulation of *wealth*. Thus, rights maldistribution is the bottleneck.²⁹
- **Four Billion Excluded:** The CLEP report estimated that 4 billion people are excluded from the rule of law. This exclusion "robs them of economic opportunities".³⁰

Synthesis for User: The literature confirms that "exclusion from the rule of law" (rights deficit) is the primary engine of poverty. As the CLEP report states: "The rules of the game are unfair," denying the poor the chance to participate.³⁰ This is "rights maldistribution" in action.

5. The Justice Gap as an Extraction Mechanism (RQ4)

The abstract maldistribution of rights manifests concretely in the "Access to Justice" crisis. This section details how the inability to enforce rights directly leads to wealth extraction from the poor to the rich.

5.1 Rebecca Sandefur and the Justice Gap

Rebecca Sandefur's research on the "Justice Gap" reveals that the vast majority of civil legal problems faced by the poor (eviction, debt, family law) go without legal assistance.³¹

- **The Statistic:** 92% of civil legal needs of low-income Americans receive no or inadequate help.³³
- **The Consequence:** These are not just "legal" problems; they are life problems. An unresolved legal issue (e.g., a wrongful denial of benefits, an illegal eviction, a predatory loan) creates a "poverty trap." The *inability to exercise a right* leads to a direct *loss of wealth*.³²
- **Health and Income Impact:** Sandefur's work connects these legal failures to adverse impacts on health and income.³² If a person cannot legally contest a wrongful

termination, they lose their income. The "rights failure" precedes the "income failure."

5.2 Matthew Desmond: Eviction and Exploitation

Matthew Desmond's *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City* provides a harrowing case study of rights maldistribution driving wealth maldistribution.

- **The Mechanism:** In housing court, landlords (Repeat Players) have counsel; tenants (One-Shotters) do not. The result is mass eviction, which destroys credit, loses possessions, and forces families into worse housing.³⁴
- **Exploitation:** Desmond argues that "exploitation" is a structural feature of the housing market where the poor pay *more* for housing because they lack the legal rights (or power to enforce them) to demand fair conditions.²
- **Conclusion:** The legal system facilitates the transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich because the poor lack the "effective citizenship" to stop it.³⁴ The "law actually works against their favor".³⁴

5.3 The Criminalization of Poverty (Fines and Fees)

A direct mechanism of "rights maldistribution" causing "wealth maldistribution" is the system of fines and fees (Legal Financial Obligations - LFOs).

- **Regressive Penalties:** The justice system funds itself by extracting wealth from its poorest subjects through non-scaled fines.³⁷
- **The Cycle:** Failure to pay leads to warrants, incarceration, and job loss—a "vicious cycle that traps people in poverty".³⁹
- **Rights Analysis:** This occurs because the poor lack the *effective right* to a defense that would challenge these unconstitutional practices. As noted in *Harvard Law Review*, "Fourth Amendment protections vary based on wealth".⁴⁰ The "taint of poverty" lessens the constitutional protection, allowing the state to extract wealth.

5.4 Equality of Arms

The concept of "equality of arms" (a fair balance between parties in litigation) is central to European human rights law but often absent in civil litigation elsewhere.⁴¹

- **Cost Capping:** The literature discusses "cost capping" and "litigation funding" as attempts to restore equality of arms, but these are imperfect fixes.⁴²
- **Insight:** Without equality of arms, the legal system becomes a weapon of the wealthy. The "market" for legal representation ensures that those with wealth have "super-rights" while those without have "sub-rights".⁴⁴

6. Theoretical Frameworks for Remediation (RQ5 &

Beyond)

To address the "rights maldistribution," the report explores four theoretical frameworks identified in the user's context, evaluating their potential to support the "Service of Empowerment."

6.1 The Capability Approach: Sen and Nussbaum

Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum shift the focus from "resources" (wealth) to "capabilities" (what one can actually do).⁴⁶ This is critical for the user's thesis because it provides a metric for "rights" that goes beyond the "formal."

- **Relevance to Citizenship:** A "Capability-based Citizenship" focuses on the *effective freedom* to participate in political choices and hold property.⁴⁸
- **Conversion Factors:** Sen argues that individuals differ in their ability to "convert" resources into well-being. A disabled person needs more resources to achieve the same capability.⁴⁶
- **Legal Capability:** Recent scholarship extends this to "legal capability"—the knowledge, skills, and confidence to use the law.⁸ This connects directly to the user's need for "Service of Empowerment"—empowering the "conversion" of formal rights into effective ones. The "Service of Empowerment" can be theoretically defined as the provision of "conversion factors" required to realize rights.

6.2 Limitarianism: Ingrid Robeyns

Ingrid Robeyns argues for a "limit" on extreme wealth (Limitarianism). The user's query specifically asks if Robeyns addresses the "rights" dimension.

- **Political Equality Argument:** Yes. Robeyns explicitly justifies limitarianism on the grounds of "political equality".⁵⁰ She argues that excessive wealth inevitably spills over into the political sphere, allowing the rich to buy influence, shape laws, and thus undermine the *rights* of others.⁵⁰
- **Limitarianism as Rights Protection:** Robeyns argues that limiting wealth is necessary to protect democracy against the "disproportionate political influence of the super-rich".⁵⁰ This supports the user's hypothesis: Wealth maldistribution causes Rights maldistribution (feedback loop), so limiting wealth is a mechanism to restore Rights equality.
- **Surplus Money:** Robeyns argues that surplus money should be used to meet "unmet urgent needs" (which can be framed as rights-fulfillment).⁵²

6.3 Fiduciary Theory of the State: Evan Fox-Decent

Evan Fox-Decent's *Sovereignty's Promise* reframes the state-citizen relationship not as a contract between equals, but as a **fiduciary relationship**.⁵³

- **The Logic:** The state possesses irresistible power over the subject (like a parent or

trustee). Therefore, it owes a **fiduciary duty** (a duty of loyalty and care) to use that power only for the benefit of the subject.⁵³

- **Social Rights:** This theory grounds "social rights" (welfare, environment) not in the generosity of the state, but in its *legal obligation* to manage the "public trust" for the beneficiaries (citizens).⁵⁵
 - **Connection to User:** This aligns with the user's concept of "Service of Empowerment" and "Quasi-Mandate." It frames the failure to provide effective rights as a *breach of fiduciary duty*. If the state allows "rights maldistribution," it is violating its fiduciary obligation.
-

7. The Japanese Context and Yuji's Theoretical Innovation

The user's specific interest in "Quasi-Mandate" (*Jun-inin*) requires a dedicated analysis of Japanese legal theory regarding social welfare services, linking it to the global theories above.

7.1 From *Sochi* (Placement) to *Keiyaku* (Contract)

The Japanese social welfare system underwent a paradigm shift with the "Basic Structural Reform of Social Welfare" (circa 2000). The system moved from **Sochi** (administrative placement, where the state decides who gets what) to **Keiyaku** (contract, where the user selects services).⁵⁷

- **The Goal:** To respect the "dignity" and "self-determination" of the user, treating them as an equal subject rather than an object of state charity.⁵⁸
- **The Problem:** While this empowers the user in theory, it presupposes that the user has the capacity to contract. In reality, many vulnerable users (elderly, disabled) lack this capacity, leading to "contractual failure" or exploitation.

7.2 The Legal Nature of Welfare Services: *Jun-inin*

In Japanese civil law, the contract for welfare services (e.g., nursing care, home help) is often interpreted not as a *Ukeoi* (Contract for Work/Result) but as a **Quasi-Mandate (*Jun-inin*)**.⁵⁹

- **Definition:** *Jun-inin* (Article 656 of the Civil Code) applies to the entrustment of acts that are not "juridical acts" (like signing contracts) but "business" (like providing care).⁶⁰
- **Duty of Care:** The defining feature of a *Jun-inin* is the **Duty of Care of a Prudent Manager (*Zenkan Chui Gimu*)** (Article 644/400). The provider must act with the care expected of a professional, regardless of the specific outcome.⁵⁹

7.3 Integrating "Service of Empowerment"

The user's theoretical innovation lies in framing "social welfare" not just as the provision of

goods, but as a *Jun-inin* contract for the **Service of Empowerment**.

- **Theoretical Link:** If the state (or its outsourced providers) acts as a *Jun-inin* trustee, they have a *Zenkan Chui Gimu* to ensure the user can effectively exercise their citizenship.
 - **Book-off Debt:** The user's concept of "Book-off Debt" describes the state "booking off" this fiduciary duty. By shifting to a pure market contract model without ensuring "legal capability," the state dumps the "duty of care" onto the individual as "self-responsibility." This is a breach of the *Jun-inin* nature of the social contract.
 - **Validation:** The *Jun-inin* framework provides the *legal mechanism* (Duty of Care) to operationalize the *philosophical goal* (Capability Approach) within the *political structure* (Fiduciary State).
-

8. Synthesis: Mapping the Theoretical Landscape

8.1 The Causal Chain Table

The research gathered allows us to construct a causal chain that validates the user's hypothesis:

Stage	Concept	Key Author/Theory	Yuji's Terminology
1. The Root Cause	Institutional/Right s Maldistribution	Acemoglu/Robinso n, Galanter	Structural Rights Maldistribution
2. The Mechanism	Exclusion/Estrang ement	Bell (Estrangement), Isin (Acts)	Citizenship Gap
3. The Failure	Lack of Capability/Conver sion	Sen (Conversion), Sandefur (Justice Gap)	Failure of Empowerment
4. The Consequence	Wealth Extraction/Accum ulation	Desmond (Eviction), Piketty	Wealth Maldistribution
5. The Feedback	Political Capture	Robeyns (Limitarianism),	Hubris Factor

		Galanter	
--	--	----------	--

8.2 Theoretical Gaps Identified

While the components exist, the report identifies specific gaps where the user's thesis can contribute:

1. **The *Jun-inin* Gap:** There is little English-language literature linking the specific Japanese legal concept of *Jun-inin* (and its high duty of care) to the global "Capability Approach." The user can argue that *Jun-inin* is the legal vehicle for delivering "Capabilities."
2. **The "Book-off Debt" Concept:** While Young talks about "responsibility," the financial metaphor of "booking off" a state liability (rights protection) and hiding it as a private debt (self-responsibility) is a novel and powerful framing not explicitly found in the literature.
3. **Unified Causality:** Most authors focus on one link (e.g., Rights \rightarrow Growth, or Poverty \rightarrow Legal Problems). Few explicitly frame "Rights Maldistribution" as the antecedent to "Wealth Maldistribution" in a unified normative theory of citizenship.

9. Key Findings per Research Question (Summary)

RQ1: What is "effective citizenship"?

- **Authors:** Marshall, Lister, Isin.
- **Finding:** It is the "practice" and "act" of citizenship, distinct from the static "status." It requires "dispositions" and "capabilities." The "citizenship gap" is the distance between formal rights and effective practice.

RQ2: Is the gap structural?

- **Authors:** Young, Galanter, Bell.
- **Finding:** Yes. "Structural Injustice" and "Legal Estrangement" define the gap as systemic. The legal system is structurally biased toward "Repeat Players."

RQ3: Does rights maldistribution precede wealth maldistribution?

- **Authors:** Acemoglu & Robinson, La Porta, De Soto.
- **Finding:** Yes. "Extractive Institutions" (rights deficits) are the primary cause of poverty. The "Legal Inequality Trap" prevents wealth accumulation.

RQ4: How does "access to justice" frame the issue?

- **Authors:** Sandefur, Desmond.

- **Finding:** The "Justice Gap" is a poverty trap. Unresolved legal issues lead to income loss and health decline. The legal system extracts wealth (fines, eviction) from those unable to defend their rights.

RQ5: Relationship between Capability and Citizenship?

- **Authors:** Sen, Nussbaum.
- **Finding:** Citizenship should be measured by "capabilities" (effective freedoms). "Legal Capability" is a crucial conversion factor.

10. Suggested Search Queries for Next Phase

- "legal capability" AND "citizenship" AND "conversion factors"
- "fiduciary theory of the state" AND "social welfare" AND "duty of care"
- "limitarianism" AND "political equality" AND "legal influence"
- "jun-inin" contract social welfare Japan academic (Japanese: 社会福祉 準委任契約 善管注意義務)
- "social impact of legal aid" empirical studies

11. Key Authors to Follow

- **Ingrid Robeyns:** For the intersection of Limitarianism and political equality.
- **Rebecca Sandefur:** For empirical data on the "Justice Gap" and civil legal needs.
- **Evan Fox-Decent:** For the "Fiduciary State" theory.
- **Monica Bell:** For "Legal Estrangement" and structural exclusion.
- **Daron Acemoglu:** For the macro-causality of institutions (rights) and wealth.
- **Ruth Lister:** For "Citizenship as Practice."

This report confirms that the "rights-first" hypothesis is not only viable but supported by a convergence of high-level interdisciplinary scholarship. The "Haves" come out ahead because they are "Repeat Players" in the game of rights. A "Service of Empowerment" that restores the "Fiduciary Duty" of the state and treats social support as a "Quasi-Mandate" offers a theoretically robust path toward "Effective Citizenship."

引用文献

1. Untitled - ResearchGate, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ruth_Lister2/publication/248945862_Citizenship_on_the_margins_Citizenship_social_work_and_social_action/links/546f345e0cf24af340c07a1d/Citizenship-on-the-margins-Citizenship-social-work-and-social-action.pdf
2. Poverty in America: New Directions and Debates - Annual Reviews, 12月 21, 2025

にアクセス、

<https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053411>

3. Constructing Citizenship, "Legality," and "Illegality" in Comparative Perspectives | Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://oxfordre.com/criminology/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.001.001/acrefore-9780190264079-e-634?d=%2F10.1093%2Facrefore%2F9780190264079.001.0001%2Facrefore-9780190264079-e-634&p=emailA%2F8sJIRtHmlKU>
4. STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE: Exploring the Impact of the 2004 Nationality Law Reform Campaign on Gender Equality in Egypt - AWS, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://haqqi.s3.eu-north-1.amazonaws.com/2015-03/HRIDER0328_ImpactNationalityGenderE.pdf
5. Full article: Making sense of non-belonging and statelessness resulting from citizenship testing: the voices of stateless Kurds - Taylor & Francis Online, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369183X.2025.2545430>
6. Corporations and Citizenship - select college library, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://library.select.edu.et/index.php?p=fstream-pdf&fid=1050&bid=1337>
7. Learning Citizenship.pdf - Agora, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.agora-parl.org/sites/default/files/agora-documents/Learning%20Citizenship.pdf>
8. Legal Needs, Legal Capability and the Role of Public Legal Education - Advice Services Alliance, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://asauk.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Legal-needs-Legal-capability-and-the-role-of-Public-Legal-Education.pdf>
9. Citizenship and Racial Exclusion in West European Nation-States - Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk2/ftp01/MQ52361.pdf>
10. Structural Hobbling: Regressive Harm, Diffuse Responsibility, and Structural Injustice | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/structural-hobbling-regressive-harm-diffuse-responsibility-and-structural-injustice/61466BCA2A4370F0B22A28581545AEA9>
11. Structural Harm, Structural Injustice, Structural Repair | What is Structural Injustice? | Oxford Academic, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://academic.oup.com/book/58181/chapter/480370223>
12. Common Knowledge and Ideological Critique: The Significance of Knowing That the "Haves" Come Out Ahead - MIT, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<http://web.mit.edu/~ssilbey/www/pdf/haves.pdf>
13. The Two Motifs of "Why the 'Haves' Come Out Ahead" and Its Heirs | Law & Society Review, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/law-and-society-review/article/two-motifs-of-why-the-haves-come-out-ahead-and-its-heirs/B78F74D87B01F9B53F0874105BE0C6EE>
14. Foreword: Why Marc Galanter's 'Haves' Article is One of the Most Influential

Pieces of Legal Scholarship Ever Written - UCI Law, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.law.uci.edu/faculty/full-time/talesh/TaleshForewordGalanterarticle.pdf>

15. Why the “Haves” Come Out Ahead: Speculations on the Limits of Legal Change, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Why-the-%E2%80%9CHaves%E2%80%9D-Come-Out-Ahead%3A-Speculations-on-the-Galanter-Umubyeyi/1d39ca4646700e7705c39d83a835d41e81ac00ed>
16. Addressing Legal Estrangement - Criminal Law - Jotwell, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、 <https://crim.jotwell.com/addressing-legal-estrangement/>
17. Police Reform and the Dismantling of Legal Estrangement | Yale Law Journal, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://yalelawjournal.org/essay/police-reform-and-the-dismantling-of-legal-estrangement>
18. Police Reform and the Dismantling of Legal Estrangement - Yale Law School, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/area/center/liman/document/b.2054.bell.2150_rbbnaxd9.pdf
19. What is the effect of the institutional qualities of state unions on the income distribution of member states? - DiVA portal, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1677670/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
20. Institutional Persistence and Economic Performance in the long-run, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.tdx.cat/bitstream/handle/10803/98399/fjlv1de1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
21. Daron Acemoglu - Wikipedia, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daron_Acemoglu
22. A Nobel for Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson: Institutions and Prosperity, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://conversableeconomist.com/2024/10/14/a-nobel-for-acemoglu-johnson-and-robinson-institutions-and-prosperity/>
23. The Economic Consequences of Legal Origins, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w13608/w13608.pdf
24. Role of Institutions in the Macroeconomics of Climate Change, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、 <http://www.isid.ac.in/~aceqd/aceqd2025/papers/ManujJha.pdf>
25. Examining the Relationship Between Legal Origin and Levels of Economic Globalization - The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1966&context=student_scholarship
26. LEGAL ORIGINS, POLITICS, AND MODERN STOCK MARKETS - Harvard Law Review, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/11/roe.pdf>
27. Inequality and Human Rights - Texas Law, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://law.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2016/09/inequality_bibliograph

hy_august_2016.pdf

28. Is 'legal empowerment of the poor' relevant to people with disabilities in developing countries? An empirical and normative review - PubMed Central, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3831029/>
29. Legal empowerment of the poor - the United Nations, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/reports/Legal%20empowerment%20of%20the%20poor.pdf>
30. Legal Empowerment, Justice and Inclusion | Center on International Cooperation, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://cic.nyu.edu/resources/legal-empowerment-justice-and-inclusion/>
31. What Is Access To Justice | Daedalus - American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://www.amacad.org/daedalus/access-to-justice>
32. ACCESSING JUSTICE IN THE CONTEMPORARY USA: - Self-Represented Litigation Network, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、https://www.srln.org/system/files/attachments/sandefur_accessing_justice_in_the_contemporary_usa._aug._2014.pdf
33. Research Brief: Analysis of the Social and Economic Impact of the Alaska Community Justice Worker Program (2021-2025) | American Bar Foundation, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://www.americanbarfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/ABF-Alaska-Community-Justice-Brief-FIN.pdf>
34. Evicted: Poverty and Profit in America - Prezi, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://prezi.com/hwuyko26rp92/evicted-poverty-and-profit-in-america/>
35. "What Shall I Give My Children?": Installment Land Contracts, Homeownership, and the Unexamined Costs of the American Dream | The University of Chicago Law Review, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://lawreview.uchicago.edu/print-archive/what-shall-i-give-my-children-installment-land-contracts-homeownership-and-unexamined>
36. Tenants Without Rights: Situating the Experiences of New Immigrants in the U.S. Low-Income Housing Market - Georgetown Law, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://www.law.georgetown.edu/poverty-journal/wp-content/uploads/sites/25/2021/07/159-Ayano-Tenants-Without-Rights.pdf>
37. Criminalizing Poverty: The Consequences of Court Fees in a Randomized Experiment - Columbia Justice Lab, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://justicelab.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/content/Criminalizing%20Poverty.pdf?outputType=chromeless>
38. Poverty Penalties as Human Rights Problems | American Journal of International Law, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law/article/poverty-penalties-as-human-rights-problems/2C4FFED59EFF533F6CD0CF97CB708E41>
39. Poverty and wealth | Prison Policy Initiative, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、https://www.prisonpolicy.org/research/poverty_and_wealth/
40. (Attenuating) the Taint of Poverty: How Fourteenth Amendment Jurisprudence and the Attenuated Doctrine Lead to Lesser Fourth Amendment Rights for the

- Poor - Harvard Law Review, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://harvardlawreview.org/print/vol-138/attenuating-the-taint-of-poverty-how-fourteenth-amendment-jurisprudence-and-the-attenuated-doctrine-lead-to-less-fourth-amendment-rights-for-the-poor/>
41. EQUALITY OF ARMS IN ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW - Melbourne Law School, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://law.unimelb.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/4808817/04-Groves-726.pdf
42. Review of Litigation Funding - Final Report - Courts and Tribunals Judiciary, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/CJC-Review-of-Litigation-Funding-Final-Report.pdf>
43. COVENTRY v. THE UNITED KINGDOM - HUDOC, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-219645>
44. Justice and the Market (Chapter 5) - The Cambridge Handbook of Privatization, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-privatization/justice-and-the-market/398F094F3D1B38BA055B8E66A24CF576>
45. What Price Are We Willing to Pay for the Dream of Equal Justice? - Oxford Academic, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://academic.oup.com/ojs/article/42/1/325/6373528>
46. Sen's Capability Approach | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、<https://iep.utm.edu/sen-cap/>
47. Full article: Activating citizens: the contribution of the Capability Approach to critical citizenship studies and to understanding the enablers of engaged citizenship - Taylor & Francis Online, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13621025.2025.2493672>
48. Capability approach - Wikipedia, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capability_approach
49. Full article: Legal Capabilities - Taylor & Francis Online, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19452829.2022.2082392>
50. Having Too Much: Philosophical Essays on Limitarianism - Open Book Publishers, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://books.openbookpublishers.com/10.11647/obp.0338.pdf>
51. Rejecting Ingrid Robeyns' Defense of Limitarianism - University of Pennsylvania, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://repository.upenn.edu/bitstreams/eca15e08-81a3-42c8-a4f3-8a083fbda63f/download>
52. What, if Anything, is Wrong with Extreme Wealth? - Taylor & Francis Online, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19452829.2019.1633734>
53. The Private Law State - McGill Law Journal, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://lawjournal.mcgill.ca/article/the-private-law-state/>
54. Fiduciary Government - Cambridge University Press, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/fiduciary-government/614E67B52ED4216>

7B46CE5A496F590A4

55. A Fiduciary Perspective on the State's Duty to Protect the Environment - New Zealand Legal Information Institute (NZLII), 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.nzlii.org/nz/journals/AukULRev/2014/6.pdf>
56. the legal meaning of state custodianship in the context of the mineral and petroleum resources develop - University of Cape Town, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://open.uct.ac.za/bitstream/11427/38540/1/thesis_law_2023_schmidt%20hendrik.pdf
57. 社会福祉基礎構造改革 – 非営利用語辞典 - 全国公益法人協会, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、 https://www.koueki.jp/dic/hieiri_450/
58. 新自由主義改革と社会福祉 - 天理大学, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
<https://www.tenri-u.ac.jp/wp/wp-content/uploads/GT279-4.pdf>
59. 介護付き有料老人ホームにおける入居契約等の法的性質と顛末報告義務, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/jares/29/4/29_196/_pdf/-char/ja
60. Japanese labour law - Wikipedia, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Japanese_labour_law
61. 準委任契約に契約不適合責任は当てはまる？トラブルへの対応や防止策を解説, 12月 21, 2025にアクセス、 <https://biz.moneyforward.com/contract/basic/16980/>