Unit 20
Citizenship

Contents

Learning Objectives

After reading this unit you would be able to

- define global and dual citizenship

- outline the rights and duties as a citizen

- describe the nation of civil liberty

20.1   Introduction

Citizenship is one of the most commonly used terms in a democracy. It is used at all levels of politics; in formal legal documents, in laws, in constitutions, in party manifestoes and in speeches. But what is citizenship? Or, who is a citizen? A citizen is not anyone who lives in a nation-state. Among those who live in a nation-state, there are citizens and aliens. A citizen is not just an inhabitant. He or she does not merely live in the territory of a state. A citizen is one who participates in the process of government. In a democratic society, there must be a two-way traffic between the citizens and the government. All governments demand certain duties from the citizens. But, in return, the state must also admit some demands on itself. These are called rights. A citizen must have political rights. A person who is ruled by laws but who has no political rights is not a citizen.

It is not possible to have citizens under all types of governments. Governments, which are not democratic, cannot, strictly speaking, have citizens. They have only rulers and subjects. In governments which are not democratic, people who live in the country often have only obligations towards the state and no rights. The government expects them to perform their duties, to pay taxes, to obey laws, to do whatever else the government wants of them. But they cannot question their rulers or ask them to explain their actions. Politics in these societies is like a one-way traffic. The government tells the people what to do and what not to, but does not

listen to them. Only the rulers have rights. The ruled or the subjects have duties laid down for them by the governors. Such undemocratic governments have been much more common than democratic ones. Feudal states were terribly undemocratic. There have been thoroughly undemocratic states in modern times, too. Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy are examples of the most brutal authoritarian state. So were the most colonial states. Democratic governments are not necessarily associated with the advanced industrial societies of the West. The British were reputed for their democratic system of governance. But they maintained the worst autocratic governments in their colonies. France is a democratic country, but fought a savage colonial war in Algeria. Most colonial states practiced democracy at home but authoritarianism abroad. Industrial societies like Germany and Italy produced most brutal fascist governments during inter war period. Historically, the term citizenship was linked with the rise of democracy. The demand for democratic government came up first in the western societies like England, France, and the United States of America.

Democracy means that everybody should have political rights. When one has political rights, the right to vote, the right to participate in deciding about important questions facing one's society, one is a citizen. Universal suffrage is a recent phenomenon. The ideas of democracy made people fight for their rights. Many of the ideas which democracy is made up were accepted after the great revolutions. For instance, after the revolution France became a republic. All citizens were made equal and had the same rights. The revolutionaries published a declaration of the rights of man. This became a symbol of democratic revolutions in Europe. Initially, very few people had the right to vote, or stand for election. But people fought for the universal adult franchise. Finally, universal adult suffrage was accepted and everybody came to have the right to vote.

The word citizen was made popular by the French Revolution in 1789. Later on, this word was used whenever democratic governments were constituted. At present it is common usage to treat people in democratic societies as citizens. It means, above all, that in relation to his government, the individual is active, not simply passive. He does not only obey and listen to what the government says. The government must also listen to him in turn. He has the right to express his views freely, to be consulted and to be involved in the politics of his country. The citizen does not only enjoy rights. He also has some duties towards his country, society and fellow citizens. A citizen is a person who enjoys rights that the constitution provides; and enjoyment of rights also imposes some duties upon him. A good citizen is one who is conscious of his rights and duties.

One essential thing for a democratic state is that citizens must participate in the governing process. The quality of democracy improves if citizens from all walks of life can participate in its activities and if they take interest in the basic processes of making important decisions for their society. Democracy implies that the decisions affecting the whole society should be taken as far as possible by the whole society. Participation of ordinary citizens makes the government more responsive, and the citizens more responsible. Citizens' participation is the basis of responsible, limited and constitutional government.

> **Box 20.1: Idea of Citizenship**
>
> The idea of citizenship means that not only the government has some claims on the citizen, the citizen too has some claims on the government. A government is an association like many others in society. But it is an association of a special kind, an association that one simply cannot escape or be indifferent about. Democrats rightly feel that since the government control the people, it is good that people must have some kind of control over the government. The best government is one in which the largest number of people participates in making decisions for the whole society. This participation of ordinary people is precisely what is called citizenship. The idea of citizenship is closely linked to participation of people in government. This is how the ideas of democracy and citizenship are linked to each other.

20.2   Historical Perspective

In modern times, three major issues have dominated the world. First, the place of the church and various religions within the nation-state. Second the admission of the lower strata, particularly the workers, to full political and economic 'citizenship' through universal suffrage and the right to bargain collectively. And third, the struggle for the equitable distribution of the national income among the people.

The place of the church in society was fought through and resolved in most of the nations in the 18th and 19th centuries. The citizenship issue has also been resolved in various ways. The United States and Britain gave the workers suffrage in the 19th century. In countries like Sweden, which resisted until the first part of the 20th century, the struggle for citizenship became combined with socialism as a political movement, thereby producing a revolutionary socialism. In other words, where the workers were denied both economic and political rights, their struggle for redistribution of income and status was superimposed on a revolutionary ideology. Where the economic and status struggle developed outside of this context, the ideology with which it was linked tended to be that of gradualist reform. The workers in Prussia, for example, were denied free and equal suffrage until the revolution of 1918 and thereby clung to revolutionary Marxism. In southern Germany, where full citizenship rights were granted in the late 19th century, reformist, democratic, and non-revolutionary socialism was dominant. In France, the workers won the suffrage but were refused basic economic rights until after World War II. The workers have won their fight for full citizenship in the Western nation-states.

Representatives of the lower strata are now part of the governing groups. The basic political issue of the industrial revolution, the incorporation of the workers into the legitimate body politic, has been settled. The key domestic issue today is collective bargaining over differences in the division of the total product within the framework of a welfare state.

In the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa the situation is somewhat different from the Western nation-state. In Western nations the workers were faced with the problem of winning citizenship from the dominant aristocratic and business strata. In Asia and Africa the long-term presence of colonial rulers has identified conservative ideology and the more well to do classes with subservience to colonialism, while leftist ideologies have been

identified with nationalism. The trade unions and workers' parties of Asia and Africa have been a legitimate part of the political process from the beginning of the democratic system.

20.3   Definition

Since antiquity, citizenship has been defined as the legal status of membership in a political community. Under Roman jurisprudence, citizenship came to mean someone free to act by law, free to ask and expect the law's protection. This legal status signified a special attachment between the individual and the political community. In general, it entitled the citizenship to whatever prerogatives and responsibilities that were attached to membership. With the creation of the modern state, citizenship came to signify certain equality with regard to the rights and duties of membership in the community. The modern state began to administer citizenship; it determines who gets citizenship, what the associated benefits are, and what rights and privileges it entails. As a legal status, citizenship has come to imply a unique, reciprocal, and unmediated relationship between the individual and the political community. Citizenship, in short, is nothing less than the right to have rights.

Full participating membership of a territorial state is citizenship. The term implies a universal basis: either all adults or some general category of them, for instance males or property holders, are citizens. It is a predominantly western concept, originating in Greece and Rome, current in small city-states in medieval Europe, then expanding enormously in capitalist societies of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Given a central place by the British sociologist T.H. Marshall in *Citizenship and Social Class*, an analysis of the development of class conflict in modern states, which is a combination of Marxian and Weberian insights. Capitalism increased the pervasiveness of class conflict in modern societies; citizenship in the territorial state represented not its elimination, but its institutionalisation, and the conversion of national into nation-states. In Britain this occurred in three stages. (1) In the 18th century, civil citizenship: equality before the law, personal liberty, freedom of speech, thought and religion, the right to own property and make contracts. (2) In the 19th century, political citizenship: electoral and office-holding rights. (3) In the 20th century, social citizenship: a basic level of economic and social welfare, the welfare state, and full participation in national culture. Subsequent research has supported the general applicability of the model to advanced capitalist nation-states, though with many particular qualifications. Bendix in *Nation-Building and Citizenship* attempted to apply the model to third world countries.

In political and legal theory, citizenship refers to the rights and duties of the member of a nation-state or city. In some historical contexts, a citizen was any member of a city; that is an urban collectivity, which was relatively immune from the demands of a monarch or state. In classical Greece, citizenship was limited to free men, who had a right to participate in political debate because they contributed, often through military service, to the direct support of the city-state. Historians argue that citizenship has thus expanded with democratisation to include a wider definition of the citizen regardless of sex, age, or ethnicity. The concept was revived in the context of the modern state, notably during the French and American Revolutions, and gradually identified more with rights than obligations. In modern times

citizenship refers conventionally to the various organisations which institutionalise these rights in the welfare state.

In sociology, recent theories of citizenship have drawn their inspiration from T.H. Marshall, who defined citizenship as a status, which is enjoyed by a person who is a full member of a community. Citizenship has three components: civil, political, and social. Civil rights are necessary for individual freedoms and are institutionalised in the law courts. Political citizenship guarantees the right to participate in the exercise of political power in the community, either by voting, or by holding political office. Social citizenship is the right to participate in an appropriate standard of living; this right is embodied in the welfare and educational systems of modern societies. The important feature of Marshall's theory was his view that there was a permanent tension or contradiction between the principles of citizenship and the operation of the capitalist market. Capitalism inevitably involves inequalities between social classes, while citizenship involves some redistribution of resources, because of rights, which are shared equally by all.

Marshall's theory has given rise to many disputes. Critics argue that it is a description of the English experience only, and it is not a comparative analysis of citizenship. It has an evolutionary and teleological view of the inevitable expansion of citizenship, and does not examine social processes, which undermine citizenship. It does not address gender differences in the experience of citizenship. It fails to address other types of citizenship, such as economic citizenship; and it is not clear about the causes of the expansion of citizenship. Some sociologists believe that Marshall's argument can be rescued from these criticisms if the original theory is modified.

There are very different traditions of citizenship in different societies. Active citizenship, which is based on the achievement of rights through social struggle, is very different from passive citizenship, which is handed down from above by the state. There are also very different theoretical approaches to understanding the structure of the public and private realm in conceptions of citizenship. For some sociologists, such as Talcott Parsons, the growth of citizenship is a measure of the modernisation of society because it is based on values of universalism and achievement. These different theoretical traditions are primarily the product of two opposite views of citizenship. It is either viewed as an aspect of bourgeois liberalism, in which case it involves a conservative view of social participation, or it is treated as a feature of radical democratic politics. It is either dismissed as a mere reform of capitalism, or it is regarded as a fundamental plank of democracy. Recently, sociologists have gone beyond these traditional theories of democracy, liberalism, and civil society, to ask questions about the changing relationships between individuals, communities, and states, in a world in which the nation-state is increasingly subject to influences from supranational institutions. Will globalisation replace state citizenship with a truly universal conception of human rights?

20.4 Global Citizenship

Citizenship is an obsolete concept since its cause, the nation state, itself has become obsolete. In a globalised world where technology and trade are creating transnational communities, global citizenship is the beginning of a process that will obliterate boxed identities defined by blood and soil. This

will not just expand our consciousness as citizens of the world but also help us tide over tensions that have been the product of ethnic and national histories. Nation states have the tendency to influence the course of history by imposing on it feuds and rivalries from the past. These impulses of history have been responsible for large-scale bloodshed. The holocaust was a result of the Nazi quest for a racially pure national identity. Similar state-sponsored mass murders have occurred in the Balkans and Africa in the twentieth century. The long standing wars and border disputes all over the world—Palestine, Kashmir, Rwanda, Chechnya— are all a result of our inability to traverse the faultlines of regionalism, religion and ethnicity. Citizenship has been the passport to partake in this dance macabre of violence. It does not offer one the choice of identity but imposes an identity that brings with it a history of prejudice and violence. Any measure that attempts to dilute the influence of a narrow, national identity is welcome.

Box 20.2: The Information Age

Marshall McLuhan predicted the global village in the 1960s. That is now a reality. As sociologists like Manuel Castells argue, we are in the information age. Aided by the flow of people and capital, new social networks are emerging. These seek to imagine a world without borders. Such a world is obviously too cosmopolitan to entertain constricted visions of nationalism. What is needed today is the option to explore multiple identities without creating a hierarchy of them. Global citizenship endorses this view. It allows people to be stakeholders in the future of more than one country and culture. It takes us closer to the Upanishadic vision of vasudaiva kutumbakam (entire world is a one family).

20.5   Dual Citizenship

Assimilation of a migrant community into their adoptive society is not about giving up your own ethnic or cultural identity. Assimilation is all about making your host country more comfortable with you, and you with it, to the mutual benefit of both. The concept of dual citizenship is an anachronism in today's globalised world. It is contrary to the process of assimilation of the migrant community into the host society. Those aspiring for it show a parochial mindset. Such a mindset stands in the way of merging with the mainstream and results in social and cultural ghettoisation. More importantly, it is something that is likely to be resented by the locals of the adoptive country and could lead to a backlash.

Dual citizenship is also likely to cause heartburn among the local residents, who might feel that the migrants are being rewarded for having deserted the homeland for greener pastures. In the context of India, the dual citizenship gives the emigrant Indian the unfair advantage of having his cake and eating it too. Indians who migrate should accept all that goes with migration. Especially those who left India after independence and who are the main beneficiaries of the dual citizenship scheme of the Government of India. Unlike indentured labourers, they were not forced to migrate. They were well-educated, well-off professionals who chose to go elsewhere because it was more comfortable and lucrative. Why then should they continue to seek a foothold in their country of origin? If it is the business in which they are interested in, then why can not they trade and invest like other foreigners? The truth is, dual citizenship is all about material benefit and convenience. It confers the right and ability to Non-resident Indians to travel, study, work,

and buy property anywhere in India. There is no emotional attachment to homeland in it.

20.6   State and the Citizen

The state is an important political organisation that exists within society. However, it is not the only social organisation. There are many other organisations which exist in society, e.g., family, religious, cultural economic and other organisations. All these organisations are established for the achievement of some consciously defined objectives and thus limited purposes. So, the purposes for which the state stands are not all the purposes which man seeks in society. All the organisations pursue their goals in different ways. The state pursues its objectives mainly through law and the coercive force behind it. But that is only one of the ways in which men strive to achieve their desired ends. There is no doubt, however, that the state plays a exceedingly important and increasingly decisive role in the lives of the individuals.

One of the reasons for its pervasive impact is its universality. All the people in a territorial society come under the jurisdiction of the state. In their relationship with the state, they are known as citizens. Another reason for the predominant role of the state in the lives of the citizens is the expanding scope of its activities. Still another reason is the use of coercive force, which only the state can employ in the pursuit of its objectives. The police and defence forces are coercive structures of the state. Another is bureaucracy, a well organised army of government officials who in their dealings with citizens, stand as organs of authority.

Because of its universality, the state's dealings with the citizens become peculiarly impersonal; as expressed in the bureaucracy. Since the state includes all men, its prescriptions apply to all men without the many actual distinctions of value-systems and separate interests. The same law applies to all. So, whatever policies a government may pursue, there would be many citizens and groups of citizens who would be opposed to the existing laws and policies because they believe that a particular law or a particular policy does not serve their interests but those of others.

Sometimes a law may compel a person to do what his conscience forbids him to do and vice versa. And because the law is enforced by coercive power, the citizen may carry the impression that the state or government is an external force denying them the freedom and liberty which they value. There may be issues of morality, private sentiments, high social values or interests of mankind as a whole coming in conflict with the prescriptions of the state. When the state extends its sphere of activity to hitherto excluded areas of social life, this may be regarded as an expropriating attempt by the state and, therefore, resented and opposed. Thus the issues of relationship between the state and the citizen have been matters of genuine concern and endless controversy.

Reflection and Action 20.1

Distinguish between State and Citizens. In what way is each the reflection of the other?

20.7 Nation-State and the Citizenship

Of late, assertion of ethno-religious identities has emerged as a dominant global reality. This has, in turn, questioned the basic premises of the nation-state, which was conceived as the most authentic expression of group life and all encompassing political community. The strong faith reposed in the idea of nation-state and citizenship as means of striking equality, protecting liberty and promoting fraternity among the people of diverse social-economic groups stands shattered. The neutrality of the state and disjunction between ethnicity and state is under question. The basic assumptions of the hyphenated concept of nation-state are contested by the emergent global reality of ethno-national movements, assertion of minorities for their identity and rights, and a strong politics of identity and politics of representation. Now minority and disadvantaged groups are demanding their space in the structure of governance. Autonomy and self-governing rights are major agenda of the new social movement across the world. This has resulted into compounding ethnic conflicts in different parts of the world.

Nation-state is Euro-centric construct, and in many situations and conditions state has been conflated with nation in their conceptualisation. The conflation of state and nation has given rise to many wrong policies of the state towards its ethnic groups and minorities. The occurrences of ethnic violence are not unconnected with the approach of the state towards different ethnic groups. This is not confined only to the case of the developing world which have attempted to emulate the model of the West for building their own structure of state and society but also in the developed world of the West which have been regarded as the citadels of the idea of nation-state. The politics of identity and ethnicity has emerged very forceful. The concept of nation and state has been the part of the grand narratives of modernity. Consequently, the project of nation and state building in third world countries has not been congruent with the European experience, for the societies in these countries have been traditional and diverse. Multiple allegiances have not been co-terminus with the loyalties to the nation-state of the western construct.

Language and territory are main basis of nation formation. There are strong tendencies to conflate state to nation and state building as the nation building. This conflation has given rise to multiple and compounded problem of programmes and policies of the state towards the ethnic groups. Religion cannot provide authentic basis of nation formation and national identity. Therefore, any effort to espouse nationalism by invoking religious exclusivity is not only alienating but also exclusionary. Any such effort in the past has not succeeded and it is bound to fail in the future also.

20.8 Rights and Duties of the Citizenship

Harold J. Laski asserts that every state is known by the rights that it maintains. The state is not merely a sovereign organisation which is entitled to the citizen's allegiance and which has the power to get its will obeyed. The citizen owes, and normally renders allegiance to the state and carries out its commands. However, the citizen does not render allegiance and obedience to the state merely for their own sake. On the contrary, he does so because of his conviction that the state exists and functions for the achievement of common welfare, which includes his own welfare. The citizen has his obligations to the state. At the same time, the state has an obligation

towards citizen, namely, the obligation to provide and maintain those conditions and opportunities, which facilitate the fullest development of his physical, mental and moral faculties. The citizen is entitled to these conditions and opportunities. In other words, they are his rights.

Rights are closely related to duties. Rights imply duties. Rights and duties are two aspects of the same coin. Rights represent a man's 'claims' on society while duties indicate what he owes to society so as to be able to enjoy his rights. Thus, while society guarantees security and well being to the citizen, the citizen owes to society the duty to make his contribution to the security and well being of the community as a whole. In other words, the citizen owes to society as much as he claims from it. His rights are not independent of society. He cannot act unsocially.

There is a twofold relationship between rights and duties. In the first place, every right implies a corresponding duty. A right belonging to one individual imposes on others the duty to respect his right. His right, therefore, is their duty. In the second place, a right is not only a means to the individual's self-development, it is also a means to the promotion of general welfare. Every right of a citizen is accompanied by the duty that he should use it for the common good. Rights, valuable and indispensable as they are, are not absolute or unlimited. Rights and duties are correlative. As a citizen, man owes some obligations and duties to his fellow citizens and to society is universally recognised. As in the case of rights, the obligations of citizenship are also equally applicable to all alike.

20.9 Civil Society

The term 'civil society' was used by writers such as Locke and Rousseau to describe civil government as differentiated from natural society or the state of nature. The Marxist concept derives from Hegel. In Hegel, civil or bourgeois society, as the realm of individuals who have left the unity of the family to enter into economic competition, is contrasted with the state, or political society. For Hegel it is only through the state that the universal interest can prevail, since he disagrees with Locke, Rousseau or Adam Smith that there is any innate rationality in civil society, which will lead to the general good. Marx uses the concept of civil society in his critique of Hegel. Marx uses civil society in his early writing as a yardstick of the change from feudal to bourgeois society. Civil society arose, Marx insists, from the destruction of medieval society. Previously individuals were part of many different societies, such as guilds or estates each of which had a political role, so that there was no separate civil realm. As these partial societies broke down, civil society arose in which the individual became all-important. The old bonds of privilege were replaced by the selfish needs of atomistic individuals separated from each other and from the community. The only links between them are provided by the law, which is not the product of their will and does not conform to their nature but dominates human relationships because of the threat of punishment. The fragmented, conflictual nature of civil society with its property relations necessitates a type of politics, which does not reflect this conflict but is abstracted and removed from it. The modern state is made necessary and at the same time limited by the characteristics of civil society. The fragmentation and misery of civil society escape the control of the state, which is limited to formal, negative activities and is rendered impotent by the conflict, which is the essence of economic life. The political identity of individuals as citizens in modern society is severed from their

civil identity and from their function in the productive sphere as tradesman, day-labourer, or landowner.

Box 20.3: Ideal of the State

In Marx's analysis two divisions grow up simultaneously, between individuals enclosed in their privacy, and between the public and private domains, or between state and society. Marx contrasts the idealism of universal interests as represented by the modern state and the abstractness of the concept of a citizen who is moral because he goes beyond his narrow interest, with the materialism of real, sensuous man in civil society. The irony according to Marx is that in modern society the most universal, moral, social purposes as embodied in the ideal of the state are at the service of human beings in a partial, depraved state of individual egotistical desires, of economic necessity. It is in this sense that the essence of the modern state is to be found in the characteristics of civil society, in economic relations. For the conflict of civil society to be truly superseded and for the full potential of human beings to be realised, both civil society and its product, political society, must be abolished, necessitating a social as well as a political revolution to liberate mankind.

Although Gramsci continues to use the term to refer to the private or non-state sphere, including the economy, his picture of civil society is very different from that of Marx. It is not simply a sphere of individual needs but of organisations, and has the potential of rational self-regulation and freedom. Gramsci insists on its complex organisation, as the 'ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private' where 'hegemony' and 'spontaneous consent' are organised. He argues that any distinction between civil society and the state is only methodological, since even a policy of non-intervention like laissez-faire is established by the state itself. The metaphors he uses to describe the precise relationship between the state and civil society vary. A fully developed civil society is presented as a trench system able to resist the incursions of economic crises and to protect the state. Whereas Marx insists on the separation between the state and civil society, Gramsci emphasises the inter-relationship between the two. The state narrowly conceived as government is protected by hegemony organised in civil society while the coercive state apparatus fortifies the hegemony of the dominant class. Yet the state also has an ethical function as it tries to educate public opinion and to influence the economic sphere. In turn, the very concept of law must be extended, Gramsci suggests, since elements of custom and habit can exert a collective pressure to conform in civil society without coercion or sanctions.

In any actual society the lines of demarcation between civil society and the state may be blurred, but Gramsci argues against any attempt to equate or identify the two. And while he accepts a role for the state in developing civil society, he warns against perpetuating statolatry or state worship. Gramsci redefines the withering away of the state in terms of a full development of the self-regulating attributes of civil society. In Marx's writings civil society is portrayed as the terrain of individual egotism. Gramsci refers to Hegel's discussion of the estates and corporations as organising elements, which represent corporate interests in a collective way in civil society, and the role of the bureaucracy and the legal system in regulating civil society and connecting it to the state.

A reading of the concept of civil society in both Marxist and non-Marxist thinkers leads to an examination of the concept of politics itself. It involves the relationship between individuals, and between individuals and the community, a view of society as organised or not, the delineation of public and private.

Reflection and Action 20.2

Distinguish between multiculturalism and pluralism in social culture.

20.10 Multiculturalism and the Citizenship

The problem of multicultural accommodation is high on the global political agenda. Accommodation refers to a wide range of state measures designed to facilitate identity groups' practices and norms. Due to the anti-ancient regime legacy of standard conceptions of citizenship, individual rights generally are prioritized over assertions of legal entitlements based on sub-national group affiliation. Thus liberal, civic-republican, and ethno-cultural models of membership all share in common a basic mistrust of 'identity groups' as a relevant component of citizenship theory. The term 'identity groups' here refers to a range of cultural, religious, or ethnic groups that are recognisable by virtue of their nomos. 'Identity groups' are distinguishable by a unique history and collective memory; a distinct culture or set of social norms, customs, and traditions; or perhaps an experience of maltreatment by mainstream society.

Proponents of a multicultural understanding of citizenship are concerned with the power of the state and dominant social groups to erode identity groups. This concern derives from a philosophical position that stresses the role of culture in constituting a person's understanding of who they are, of their fundamental defining characteristics as a human being. Charles Taylor in his famous essay *The Politics of Recognition,* argues that we form our identities and our conceptions of ourselves as free and equal agents through a dialogical process, using certain given cultural scripts. Culture, under this view, is not just something that we use to understand and evaluate the world; it also is a fundamental part of us.

Membership in an identity group combined with active participation in its cultural expressions as distinct from mere blood ties can provide individuals with an intelligible context of choice and a secure sense of identity and belonging. This emphasis on the links among culture, identity, and group membership stands at the core of the quest for a new multicultural understanding of citizenship. Under this new understanding, persons stand forth with their differences acknowledged and respected, and they participate in the public sphere without shedding their distinct identities. This approach departs from blindness to difference ideal and aims to carve out a philosophical and legal rationale for recognising identity groups as deserving of special or differentiated rights. The multicultural understanding of citizenship therefore departs from the perception of all citizens as individuals who are merely members of a larger political community. Instead it views them as having equal rights as individuals while simultaneously meriting differentiated rights as members of identity groups. Hence in legal terms, the move toward a multicultural citizenship model raises potential conflicts among three components: the identity group, the state, and the individual.

20.11 Conclusion

In this unit, we have discussed the various aspect of citizenship. The concept of citizenship has been defined in the legal and historical perspectives. Its evolution has been delineated from Greek city-states to modern nation-state. Earlier it was a rare privilege of few, now it is the legal political rights of every human being residing in a territory called state. Citizenship refers to the relationship between individuals and the state. Citizenship confers certain legal and political rights and it is the duty of state to enforce and protect these rights. Not only states, citizens also have certain duties towards their fellow being, society, and the state. The concept of citizenship is closely linked to the concept of democracy. In non-democratic societies we have subjects but no citizens. Citizenship means active participation of the people in the decision-making, and the process of governance.

With the emergence of globalisation, the concept of nation-state has become obsolete and with it the concept of citizenship has also lost its sheen. Now, in place of state citizenship, there is talk of global citizenship. Upnishidic vision of vasudhaiv kutumbkam is on the verge of realisation. There is also greater demand for dual citizenship in view of large-scale migration of population from one country to another. India has recently granted dual citizenship to people of Indian origin living in some countries.

Modern society has been described civil or bourgeois society by Marxist and non-Marxist thinkers. Civil society refers to the realm of private sphere of an individual. The economic competition and the independence of the individual characterise civil society. Unity of the family and other medieval associations is absent in the civil society. Civil society has emerged from the destruction of medieval society. For non-Marxist thinkers, it is a rational system, which ensures the social welfare. Marxist thinkers, however, don't agree with this thesis.

Contemporary society is a multicultural society characterised by the diverse cultural, ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups. Multiculturalism aims at accommodating diverse identity groups into a homogeneous society, without eroding their distinct identity. Multiculturalism promotes unity in diversity and is opposed to assimilation of distinct identity groups. There exists a links among culture, identity, and group membership. This is at the core of the quest for a new multicultural understanding of citizenship.

20.12 Further Reading

T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class* (1950)

R. Bendix, *Nation-Building and Citizenship* (1964)

Jack Barbalet, *Citizenship* (1988)

Bryan S. Turner (ed.), *Citizenship and Social Theory* (1993)

M. Bulmer and A.M. Rees (eds.), *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H. Marshall* (1996)

Charles Taylor, "The Politics of Recognition", in Amy Gutmann ed., *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (1994)