

## Introduction

### Manufacturing citizenship – Confronting public spheres and education in contemporary worlds

*Véronique Bénéti*

Which is the best government? That which teaches us to govern ourselves.  
(Johann Wolfgang von Goethe)

Hyde Park, London, 15 February 2003. Between one and two million demonstrators gathered to express publicly their protest against the impending war on Iraq by the British–American-led alliance. At about the same time, protesters also invaded public spaces in 600 towns, cities and capitals around the world, from Tasmania to Iceland, in the US, the Middle East, Latin America, South and Southeast Asia, and Africa. All in all, up to 30 million people demonstrated worldwide that weekend, making it by far the most important public protest since the Vietnam War. All the social and political actors who took part in this large-scale event were neither thereby

complying with any electoral process; nor were they attending any formally institutionalized political event. Yet, they were acting as informed and concerned citizens, appropriating other arenas of political life for themselves. If anything, such a large-scale concern on the part of the citizenry of so many nation-states suggests a need for political analysts to rethink their conclusions about a crisis in participatory democracy.<sup>1</sup> It has become commonplace to lament a crisis in participatory democracy evidenced by falling levels of electoral participation. Such falling levels purportedly testify to a lack of citizenship awareness, which in its turn is seen as calling for remedies. Most prominent among these proposed remedies is citizenship education by means of a specially designed curriculum. Whether the sense of 'civic zeal' underpinning such a project is a long-standing sentiment, periodically renewed, or whether it is a more recent phenomenon, formal education is expected to tackle a general apathy or lack of interest in civic and political life among ordinary members of the various national publics. Interestingly, what in so-called 'established nations' is bemoaned as apathy is denounced as 'ignorance' and 'backwardness' in others, whose history of democracy is a more recent one. The contrasting experiences reflected by these different terms have significance for a comparison of nation-state formations and an understanding of experiences of citizenship, not only

within the Euro-American traditions of political philosophy, but also across the world at large.

To be sure, there is a real difficulty in identifying the various layers of meaning and the realities encompassed by the notion of citizenship in different contexts.<sup>2</sup> The nature and the scope of the rights and obligations encompassed by the concept of citizenship vary widely from country to country (Butenschon 2000). Nonetheless, the existence of over 200 nation-states in the world today, as against a mere 40 at the end of the Second World War, suggests that over the last 50 years a vocabulary of political institutions largely derived from a 'Western experience' has increasingly been shared across the globe. Yet this very notion of 'sharing' is itself problematic. First, the generalization of the nation-state model to the rest of the planet has entailed, at best, accommodation to local contexts, and, at worst, misunderstandings, misinterpretation, mistranslation, even resistance on all sides. Consequently, there may be considerable disagreement on the nature of what, if anything, is actually shared. Second, the notion of 'sharing' obscures the possible existence of indigenous notions of political organization comparable to or competing with those of citizenship 'in the West'. Third, it glosses over the multiplicity of experiences of citizenship among different sections of the population that may also be extant *within* a given country. Documenting these experiences among individuals and groups is a prerequisite for comprehending the diversity of the lived realities of citizenship. If, for some official observers and scholars, the terms 'ignorance' and 'backwardness' aptly describe citizens' understanding of and involvement in the life of the political community, they are highly contested by ordinary social actors' very ideas, representations and practices. These, indeed, suggest a much richer field, whose analysis has only recently begun and has led to a renewed discourse on citizenship. Such a discourse has engaged with the comparative paucity of studies of 'new' nation-states' political institutions as against the heavy preponderance of work produced on the earlier exemplars of nation-states. Much European and American scholarship had indeed focused on 'old Western' nations in discussing citizenship in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. By contrast, so-called 'non-Western' nations attracted far less scholarly attention. At best, they were considered as incomplete, faulty replicas of the French or German models; at worst, as national(ist) anomalies. Long-held assumptions about 'Western' categories of political understanding and their implementation have however had to be reconsidered over the last two decades in view of the international redistribution of the geopolitical world order, wherein the issues of democracy, civil society and citizenship have acquired particular salience.

### Anthropologists and the new discourse on citizenship': the public sphere contested

Studies of citizenship regained ground in the 1990s owing to the exacerbation of ethnic conflicts, the fall of communism and the development of the notion of human rights as a separate category in international law.<sup>3</sup> In contrast to earlier and more highly theoretical debates, the new discourse on citizenship draws especially on feminist (see Rubinstein 1996) and postcolonial critiques, and crucially starts 'from a recognition that citizenship is neither a pure realm of ideas nor simply an area of political advocacy' (Werbner 1998: 2). Central to these new studies has been the questioning of the claim to universalism often associated with notions of citizenship.<sup>4</sup> The moment of so-called 'universal emancipation' indeed coincided with one of female, racial and class subordination and exclusion. The idea that nationalist claims were 'primarily linked to democratization, to claims for the equality and liberty of all citizens and even to the notion of a "community of free and equal citizens" as a source of political legitimacy' (Schnapper 2002: 2) completely ignores the fact that the beginnings of citizenship in nation-states were far from egalitarian, even within European countries. As was highlighted by the recent re-evaluation (Calhoun 1997a; Eley 1997; Fraser 1997) of Habermas's discussion of the notion of civil society as public opinion and culture (largely the fact of the emerging bourgeoisie) and his extension of this to a politicized notion of it following the French Revolution, dispute and contestation were central to the 'public sphere'. It was from the very

outset an arena of contested meanings in two ways: contestation and competition from different groups within this arena, and the exclusion of others (women, subordinate nationalities, slaves, colonial subjects, the urban poor, the working class and the peasantry) altogether. As Wallerstein recently reminded us, '[c]itizenship always excluded as much as it included' (2003: 674). Membership in the national political community of many a European country was defined by a limited right granted exclusively to male members of the propertied classes.<sup>5</sup> Such a membership was also predicated upon an urban-rural divide also found in later colonial and postcolonial situations whereby a 'limbo class' belonging neither to rural areas nor to urban civil society, 'in civil society but not of it' (e.g. the working classes in Europe, migrant labour in Africa, the peasantry in South Asia) played a major part in the struggle for emancipation (from the bourgeoisie-led state and employers and colonialists respectively). It is both the need to address the conflictual dimension inherent in the public sphere and the necessity of apprehending processes of civil society formation and citizenship manufacturing in the context of a set of dialectical relations between nations, empires and their colonies that have prompted new studies of citizenship examining both the theory and practice of heretofore neglected issues. Prominent among these issues have been multiculturalism,<sup>6</sup> consumption,<sup>7</sup> religion,<sup>8</sup> gender<sup>9</sup> and transnationalism.<sup>10</sup>



Anthropologists have only recently entered this field (see in particular Butenschon *et al.* 2000; Comaroff and Comaroff 1999; Hann 1996; Joseph 2001; Werbner 1998; Yuval-Davis and Werbner 1999). Indeed, anthropologists working in 'developing nations' for a long time rightfully rejected the assumption of a universal vocabulary of political institutions. Yet this rejection was problematic on two counts. First, it had as its consequence a lasting neglect of modern nation-states and related issues, in spite of an increasingly shared vocabulary of political institutions across the globe (see also Spencer 1997). Second, such a rejection did not provide any deep understanding of how the ideas of citizenship and democracy do motivate political struggles in some of the newer nation-states as well as in the older ones. A need was gradually felt by some anthropologists to embark on an exploration of political modernity and consequently to elaborate a 'theory of citizenship that addresses the complex realities of post-colonial societies' (Werbner 1998: 3). This entails 'exoticizing' the very notion of citizenship, thanks to the 'distant gaze' so dear to anthropology's practitioners collecting first-hand accounts in the field. Postcolonial anthropology is particularly well placed to contribute to the new discourse on citizenship for several reasons. The discipline's theoretical subject-matter has long been 'difference' and 'identity', the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion, but also the particular in the universal, as much as the reverse. Political anthropology in its heyday was, notwithstanding much meandering, concerned with defining a new conceptual vocabulary for politics which would also integrate non-Euro-American

forms and practices of 'the political'. Furthermore, anthropology also seeks to reconcile the pragmatics of moral discourses (Bourdieu 1977) with a focus on the power of culture in shaping political institutions (D. Gupta 2000; Spencer 1997; Steinmetz 1999; Werbner 1998). Anthropologists are therefore well equipped to analyse the claims, representations and practices of citizenship as well as the dialogical, relational and interdependent dimensions that enter into citizenship manufacturing.

Yet the students of these processes need to practise disciplinary interaction: anthropologists must engage in a critical dialogue with other disciplines. It is by acknowledging the significance of the work achieved by other disciplines in the analysis of concepts of European political thought, and actively entering into intellectual exchange with other practitioners of the social sciences, that anthropology can both renew itself in its ancient domain of predilection (in this case, political anthropology) and make a significant contribution to the field of 'modern politics'. This volume aims to take a first step in this direction by bringing a majority of anthropologists together with scholars of sociology, political science, philosophy and history.

It focuses on the multidimensional aspects of citizenship that go beyond mere ascription. The coldly constitutional view of citizenship as only entailing a rational, contractual relationship ideally premised on rights and duties and sustained by all citizens with their nation-state has led to an overemphasizing of the study of explicitly political sites of the manufacturing of cit-



izenship such as electoral and other institutionalized processes. Furthermore, even outside of explicitly political sites, attention has often – and understandably so – been paid more to exceptional and spectacular events in the ordinary making of nationality and citizenship (see for instance Nora 1996–8; Pandey 2001; Skocpol 1979). By contrast, this volume purposefully gives pre-eminence to the ordinary and mundane by depicting instances of the ‘banality of citizenship’ (to echo Billig’s (1995) formulation of ‘banal nationalism’, itself borrowed from Arendt on the ‘banality of evil’), whether in Europe, China or South Asia. The volume focuses on the ordinary daily life processes involving cultural, historical and political memories that feed into the educational dimension of the ‘manufacturing’ of citizenship. By means of various case studies, ranging from the curricular ‘strengthening’ of citizenship in Britain, through attempts at fostering European citizenship, to Indian and Pakistani textbooks, and the implementation of Chinese state projects, to name but a few, the volume seeks to contribute to an understanding of the part played by educational institutions at various levels (from local, to regional and national). It pays special attention to the role of the Other and the importance of ethnicity and language in creating a homogeneous, dominant citizen, as well as the tensions that may arise between taught ideals of citizenship and various political, religious or ethnic affiliations, and the ways in which states and social actors negotiate them.

To be sure, such dimensions can be explored in *all* nation-states. Yet the scope of the comparison is here deliberately confined to Europe, South Asia

and China – including Taiwan. Although India and China have given rise at different periods to much Orientalist fantasizing, not least in matters political, they were the sites of two of the earliest successful nationalist movements in the ‘non-Western’ world – movements that greatly influenced subsequent independence struggles elsewhere. In spite of this, they have seldom been taken as points for comparison by ‘Western’ studies of ‘Western’ nationalism; and only rarely have they been compared with each other. Yet they offer valuable comparative perspectives on the study of the manufacturing of citizenship in relation to education and nationalism, particularly since China, unlike India, was never fully colonized. Furthermore, at first sight, the three regions appear to offer radically different conditions for the production of citizenship, conditions often hastily summarized under the rubrics of a China dominated by political parties (though different parties on the mainland and in Taiwan), an India dominated by culture(s), and a liberal individualist Europe. Yet what the present essays demonstrate is that, on closer inspection, these differences may come to appear less dominant at certain levels of analysis, and other similarities may emerge: France and both China and Taiwan, for instance, appear to have much in common in terms of the relatively high degree of centralization of their educational systems at all levels, whereas India and Britain share educational systems in which there is a considerable degree of plurality and variability particularly at the upper levels that has historically deep and

heterogeneous roots – differences that perhaps hark back to a system of state institution and control in the former case, and of state regulation and inspection of systems of mixed public/private origin in the latter. Culture, in all three regions, plays out to varying degrees depending on the period and the issue under consideration. By comparing South Asia, China and Europe, this volume therefore wants to go against the grain of the classicizing pictures of Oriental despotism and political chaos that seem so persistent in contemporary European and North American eyes. True, recent events in Central Asia and the Middle East may have done little to modify such negative views of ‘non-Western’ governance (though yet more recent events may have reinforced doubts about the allegedly greater abilities of some of the older nation-states to present convincing practical examples of their supposedly greater wisdom in governance in action either). Yet hopefully the social sciences may be able to supply some rather more vivid and contemporary representations to overlay these tired but lingering after-images.

### Manufacturing citizenship

Of course, the use of the word ‘manufacture’ is a – barely – veiled reference to Noam Chomsky’s film *Manufacturing Consent*. In this film, as is well known, the linguist-cum-social and political activist documents the various ways in which political consensus is effected in US civil society by withhold-

or distorting or otherwise concealing disturbing information from the American public. Such a kind of ‘manufacturing’ corresponds to the more recent, derogatory meaning of ‘producing by mere mechanical labour rather than by intellect or imagination’ and does not do justice to ordinary social actors’ capacity for action and ‘cunning intelligence’ (see de Certeau 1998; Détienne and Vernant 1974).<sup>11</sup> So that although Chomsky’s demonstration at first sight appears persuasive, current international events also forcefully demonstrate that the kind of consensus thus reached is far from stable, thereby confirming the much greater semantic wealth of the term and the relevance of its use in the present context. To ‘manufacture’ is also to ‘bring into a form suitable for use’, to ‘make or fabricate from material’. Here, the material thus manufactured, which may be fictitious in part, is that of



memories, imaginaries, emotions and practices of citizenship in their various dimensions – political, judicial, cultural, social, historical; all materials which are part of a continuous **bricolage** which may produce even deviant assemblages. In exploring these dimensions comparatively, the book unravels some of the ways in which national identities and modes of citizenship have been elaborated, negotiated and transmitted in different cultural and historical contexts.

### ***States and citizens***

The state has obviously played a central role in this **quotidian** manufacturing, whether in Europe or in most parts of the non-European world. National states have, until recently, penetrated down to the minutest details of everyday life in order to instil a **sense of loyalty** in their citizens.<sup>12</sup> More recently, however, **congruently** with theories of globalization emphasizing the demise of the state, the ability of the state to retain its exclusive feature of sovereignty has been questioned. States are said to

have been declining in power since the 1970s owing to economic globalization and market liberalism. A consequence of such liberalization is that the power of the national state may seem less effective and relevant owing to the state's having lost some of its earlier capacity to control the movement of capital across its own borders. Thus, according to Habermas, the globalization of information, of economic production, and of financial flows, technologies and armament, together with that of ecological and military risks, has given rise to problems that can no longer find a solution through the mediation of the nation-state (2000: 90–7).<sup>13</sup>

Yet the fact that the state may appear in some domains to no longer be a relevant entity for analysing some of the ongoing economic, financial, cultural and technological processes today should not obfuscate its **still inescapable role** in a variety of realms impacting on the lives of its citizens. Indeed, state power at times seems even more visible and encroaching (Fuller and Bénéï 2001; Trouillot 2001). The state – and its government – remains essential for the citizens living within its borders. Not



only does it still control movement of people across its borders in a majority of cases, but also the definition and production of citizens and citizenship as well as the control and production of violence, towards minorities in particular. The facts that citizens still need a passport for travelling beyond the frontiers of their own nation-states, and that asylum seekers still apply for residence to nation-states' bureaucracies, should alert us both to the wide range of other domains in which the state is still sovereign, and to the consequent need for further studying state institutions, especially schooling. As has been shown by Audrey Osler (this volume, [Chapter 8](#)), especially international agencies such as UNESCO recognize nation-states as key players for bringing about awareness, through their educational systems, of various issues such as the necessity of maintaining national and international peace and of furthering respect for equality. Hence the need felt in this volume to focus on education and citizenship *within* the context of nation-states.

To be sure, taking the role of international agencies into consideration remains crucial. But this role has to be envisaged in

relation to the Gellnerian perspective (1983) premised on a universalist sociological model of modernization, so oft-encountered at the levels of *both* international aid agencies and state apparatuses. Such a perspective, as is well known, associates modernization with industrialization and secular nationalism. In such a context, industrial division of labour is required, as well as a shared culture of nationalism that would hold together a society rendered atomized by the very processes associated with industrialization. This homogeneous culture is aimed at being produced through schooling, especially at the primary level. In keeping with such a theoretical premise, all nation-states, whether 'older' or 'newer', have developed and implemented policies and programmes of 'universalisation of elementary education' to varying extents (Lê Thành Khôi 2001).

Such developments have raised the question of the impact of uniform education practices on diverse national populations. In most 'newer' states (although not exclusively), this has often been accompanied by international aid programmes, thus generating questioning of the presence and objectives of these



international aid agencies (see Caddell, [Chapter 3](#)). In this respect, the role of agendas of citizenship development vis-à-vis those of producing a 'global', uniformly literate labour force have been matters of acrimonious contention in education agendas, *both* in older and newer nation-states. Whether in Britain or in India, to take but these two examples, the issue of racial and ethnic diversity has occupied many public debates about schooling in recent years. If, in the first instance, these have revolved around the recomposition of British society in regards to the more recent flows of migration, in the latter, they have focused on the implications of religious affiliation (particularly Hindu and Muslim) for defining citizenship.

Regardless of their specificities, these succinct examples confirm the need for comparatively engaging with the all too often taken-for-granted Gellnerian perspective mentioned above. Not only is this perspective highly problematic in view of its ethnocentrism inasmuch as it precludes any alternative model of modernity (see for instance Van der Veer 2001). It also leaves out *ordinary* social agency. The perception of citizenship and

education (schooling in particular) as **state-centred** strategies of social control and **state-led** projects serving the hierarchical structures of social reproduction (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990) and of capitalist inequality does not do justice to the crucial role played by ordinary citizens. Indeed, if citizenship comprises the modern nation-state's range of attempts to define and produce 'ideal, loyal and dutiful citizens', no less does it also comprehend social actors' negotiated responses to these. The view that states manufacture identities and citizenship at will (Bourdieu 1999) is far too monolithic: it obfuscates **social actors' intervention** in the public sphere at different levels of mediation – whether state institutions, voluntary organizations or even communalist outfits. Civic movements such as that of the **sans papiers** in France (Balibar 1998, 2001; Fassin 2001), conscientious objection in Israel (Helman 2000), Chinese 'passively resistant' movements such as that of the Falungong sect, secularist mobilizations of Indian citizens protesting against recent upsurges of communal violence in Gujarat (or even the Hindu right-wing activism instrumental in the latter); all are evidence of



ordinary social actors' active contribution to the (un-)making of citizenship, whether premised on universalist values, secularism or religious principles. Such processes are constitutive of citizenship, contributing to its **continuous redefinition and reshaping**, and thus denote congruence with yet another meaning – often neglected today – of 'manufacture': to 'produce by natural *agency*'. And thus it also means how, by 'manufacturing citizenship', one becomes a citizen. In other words, rather than a nation-state project aimed at producing a culturally and nationally homogeneous labour force, education may also be seen as a means for **promoting active democracy** premised on the building of **autonomous, critical citizens**, much in congruence with American philosopher and educationalist John Dewey's project.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Educational processes***

Although T. H. Marshall's (1950) path-breaking discussion of the evolution of citizenship in modern nation-states (from the formation and democratization of civil citizenship to political citizenship followed by social citizenship) has been criticized as teleological rather than contingent, its undeniable interest is to present a historical process, a movement, rather than a mere status, as in the liberal tradition. Instead of furthering a complacent picture of citizenship as the indication of an unquestioned status **bestowal**, Marshall stressed that citizenship is **nowhere a given**, whether at the level of the wider national community or at that of an individual. Rather, citizenship is **a process** in two different ways. At the national level, it is the ongoing product of a **historical process**. At an individual one, it involves a Foucauldian notion of **subjectification of individuals** – principally by means of '**surveillance mechanisms**' such as schooling – as well as the naturalization of a civil identification with the national political community over time (see Helman 2000). This secondary identity transcends primary identities in what becomes a **banal citizenship**.

Education obviously plays a crucial role in this naturalization of a civil identification. To be sure, the notion of education



encompasses a wide range of processes, from informal learning taking place in a variety of contexts (family, media, cultural activities or events and so on) and at many levels of society through to formal schooling – the systematic instruction and training of children and young people, and by extension, of adults. The term may also refer to the development of mental or physical powers, the moulding of (some aspect of) character, in addition to the public policy of providing formal instruction. Owing to the wide definitional scope of the term ‘education’, some scholars have aptly interrogated the nature of the relationship between citizenship and education. Schuller (2001), for instance, has questioned the oft-assumed crucial role played by expansive formal education, including that of a specially designed ‘civics’ curriculum. Indeed, citizenship education is often part of a wider body of cultural knowledge encompassing history, art and the humanities. It is also relayed by cultural and social institutions that lie beyond the scope of formal education.

Yet however differently education is defined, educational institutions are key organizations associated with the promotion

of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (Marshall 1950). School in particular, has often been a privileged site for testing, even implementing projects – however utopian – of citizenship. Today, education often connotes the naturalization of a civil identification that is deemed the mark of an indisputable ‘modernity’. Pedagogical missions lay at the very core of modernity projects both in ‘Western’ and ‘non-Western’ situations. Educational projects have since the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries been sites for the expression of competing and conflicting visions of modernity. These were promoted by either colonial administrators and missionaries, or by indigenous educationalists and political and social leaders, at the level of public fora, newspapers or other media participating in the construction of a public sphere.<sup>15</sup> Governments, too, particularly envisaged pedagogical missions as crucial tools for safeguarding the viability of the state by producing ‘responsible citizens’. Hence the formal educational projects concocted in the nineteenth century by state officials and administrators, whether in Australia, with the establishment of school systems for the



'preparation of the young for their future responsibilities as citizens' (Macintyre 1996: 229), or in India, with the creation of separate schools for separate communities in order to secure the latter's allegiance to the colonial state (Bear, this volume, [Chapter 10](#)).

Because the state undeniably plays a major part in the manufacturing of citizenship, many of the contributors have chosen to focus on examples of formal schooling. Schools are indeed privileged sites of observation for the manufacturing of what followers of a communitarian perspective call 'the kinds of social bonds, commitment, and education, maybe even molding, necessary to create and maintain [. . .] a national community' (Shafir 1998: 11) and of the educational initiatives promoting particular visions of citizenship. Yet, in order to highlight the multiplicity of levels at which citizenship is manufactured, most authors in this volume have adopted varied perspectives and levels of analysis; not only top-down views of state projects, but also bottom-up views of social actors' engagement and negotiation with the institutions of their nation-state (from

schools to parents or associations involved in educational processes). In so doing, they provide **heuristic** elements for a contribution to a comparison between 'new' and 'old' nation-states

## ***'New' and 'old' nation-states: towards a comparison***

### ***Western modernity and colonial experiences***

Many debates have centred on the specificity of (Christian) Western modernity and the issue of its reproducibility in 'non-Western' contexts, that is, whether modernity entails universal adoption of Western forms of political institutions such as democracy, civil society and citizenship.<sup>16</sup> If, such ideas embody the epic of Western modernity, the question is also whether the historical experience of Western politics is meaningful to other societies that have different cultural and historical logics, yet that have historically been affected by the Western model (Khilnani



2001: 14). In this respect, it is important to remember that whether in Europe or elsewhere, citizenship is hardly the product of consistent, homogeneous cultural influences. Just like ideas about the nation-state (Anderson 1991) and 'civil society' (Kaviraj and Khilnani 2001), 'Western' ideas about citizenship are not a new thing linked to a form of unprecedented (political) globalization.<sup>17</sup> On the contrary, they have been circulating around the world since the nineteenth century. European discourses of 'civil society' made their historical entry into non-Western political discourse through entering the political literature of European colonies as early as the nineteenth century (Kaviraj and Khilnani 2001). The ideas of 'civil society' and 'citizenship' are therefore not as recent for new nation-states as they are often purported to be. Yet, if the cross-circulation of models and borrowings for the construction of nationalism (Anderson 1991; Hobsbawm 1997; Thiesse 1999) and civil society (Castro Leiva and Pagden 2001; Goody 2001; Metzger 2001), both across Europe and elsewhere, has been largely documented, this task remains to be fulfilled in the field of citizenship. Such a

task requires an appraisal of the problems posed by the debates about political modernity in relation to colonial experiences.

To begin with, these debates have been dominated by a particularly elitist conception of modernity in non-Western and postcolonial contexts: such as in Europe until the mid-twentieth century, only members of *the elite* are seen as possessing an understanding of democracy and of the workings of the state. By contrast, ordinary social actors are deemed powerless agents disconnected from the world of bureaucratic and rational modernity. This position has been challenged over the last decade, especially with regard to notions of the state (see for instance A. Gupta 1995; Fuller and Bénéï 2001; and Hansen and Stepputat 2001). As regards civil society, however, a disjunction is still felt between the reaching out of the state's legal bureaucratic apparatus to virtually the entire population inhabiting its territory on the one hand, and the still restricted access of 'citizens' to civil social institutions on the other (Chatterjee 2001: 172), with the result that the overwhelming majority of ordinary social actors is **still untouched** by ideas and



notions of civil society. In sum, the theoretical hiatus deemed to exist between members of the *elite* and the rest of the population regarding matters of the state has been reproduced in the domain of civil society. Such a hiatus, Chatterjee argues, is 'the mark of non-Western modernity as an always incomplete project of "modernization"' (ibid.).

There are several difficulties with such a statement. First, there is the suggestion that modernity, whether 'Western' or 'non-Western', can ever be anything other than an 'incomplete project of modernization'. The point here is that the West is also engaged in a project of modernization that by its very nature is incomplete and ever beyond reach: in fact, this incompleteness is itself the very *telos* of modernity. Second, the terms of the comparison between the (ever so arbitrary) categories of 'Western' and 'Eastern' forms of modernity are grossly and unfairly flawed: what is actually compared is a Western theoretical position stemming from a specific historical and political philosophy (political forms of governance as they should be) with an empirical observation pertaining to 'Eastern' political and civil life

(political forms of governance as they actually are). As was said above, such incomplete and ineffective modernity is by no means characteristic of 'Eastern' societies: surveys of citizenship conducted in so-called 'Western' nation-states (see for instance Crick 2001a; Macintyre 1996: 239) have highlighted that – even in these exemplary sites of modernity – most ordinary social actors have little understanding of and connection with issues pertaining to civil society. Furthermore, the incompleteness of civil society and citizenship in 'the West' is also highly debated (see for instance Pandey and Geschiere 2003: 11), not least in this volume (see Balibar, [Chapter 1](#) and Schneider and Schneider, [Chapter 7](#) in particular). Therefore, to argue that the hiatus between members of the *elite* and ordinary people is a feature of *non-Western* modernity as an always incomplete project of modernization is a gross exaggeration. The sites of 'non-Western' modernity are not the only ones where the existence of an *elite* political culture has neither done away with 'lower, mass political cultures' nor gained any legitimacy because it has failed to provide a framework of intelligibility for popular expectations



and has been unable to live up to them. Theorists of modernity need to allow for the existence of other trajectories than those recognized and charted by Western political theory. And, as Hann argues, '[t]he narrow, western liberal-individualist idea of civil society has long been in need of [. . .] **ethnographic investigation**' (1996: 22). Especially so that, to paraphrase Comaroff and Comaroff, this idea 'has proven impossibly difficult to pin down' (1999: 5).

Furthermore, if the notion of civility, understood as the development of restraint and 'manners' accompanying the Enlightenment and rationality, became central to the development of civil society and citizenship, it is however not specific to Western Europe. The problem with this kind of 'moral evaluation' attached to the concepts of 'civility', 'rationality' and 'enlightenment' is that these are seen as a Western preserve (Goody 2001: 153). So in order to understand these trajectories – especially in relation to civil society, democracy and citizenship – the colonial experiences of non-European histories need to be explored, along with the individual legal, conceptual and political languages that each society has developed; and then also they need to be compared and contrasted with those shaped by the European historical experience. In this respect, it should be emphasized that because there was never any uniform or homogeneous colonial situation (see for instance Cooper and Stoler 1997; Stocking 1991; Thomas 1994), the variety of experiences of political modernity brought about by the colonial encounter in non-European societies is **profoundly diverse**. Consequently, colonial sovereignty gave rise to some early ideas of 'civil society' and 'citizenship' in a variety of ways. Whether '[a]ctual processes in the Third World are mostly very different from political life in the West' or not (Kaviraj and Khilnani 2001: 4) requires, at the very least, investigation.

### ***Nationality, ethnicity and nationalism***

At stake in the notion of citizenship in modern nation-states is the production of individual citizens who will not only enjoy civil, social and political (or even, lately, cultural) *rights*, but also abide



by the law and fulfil a number of *duties* related to the pursuit of the common good and **coterminous** with full granting of membership in the nation-state's political community. Primary among these duties is loyalty to the national community. This places citizenship, nationality and nationalism on extremely intimate terms, to the extent that studies of European nationalism have long assumed a **close (even if variable) overlap of these categories**. The relationship of nationality and citizenship is a blurred one. A quasi-equation between citizenship (belonging in a political sense, the entitlement to civic, political and social rights and duties) and nationality (belonging to a national historic community) has existed in many languages and institutions of modern states. In English-speaking countries, the two are often seen as synonymous. Yet this equation should not be taken for granted. At least as regards Europe, it was made possible thanks to a 'powerful element of **internal democracy**, a productive tension between the idea of "people" as community (*ein Volk*) and the idea of "people" as a principle of equality and social justice (*das Volk*)', which was violently shaken by both

class struggles throughout the nineteenth century and the two World Wars that tore the continent apart in the twentieth century (Balibar 1998: 104).

If the idea of a fit between citizenship and nationality cuts across the diversity of nation-states, it has also acquired renewed salience in postcolonial times, even if in contrast to studies of European citizenship, those of 'non-Western' nationalism have stressed both the **contingency and the extreme variability** of such a fit. That such contingency and variability appear salient in the postnational project of European citizenship today has rendered the comparison with the ways in which the categories of nationality and citizenship operate elsewhere more compelling than ever. Yet, such a comparison can only be achieved both by decentring the usual 'Western' centred perspective and by analysing the ways in which local and idiosyncratic formats and models of citizenship have developed since the beginning of the postcolonial era.

The need for decentring the Western perspective is especially pressing given that citizenship in the 'newer' nation-states has so



far been largely overlooked by scholars and political analysts, owing to the doubts held about their ability to build truly democratic regimes. More often than not, these nation-states have been used as counter-examples to the problematic notion of 'good governance' that has acquired dominance in the discursive modes extant among international organizations; in these discourses, the models for 'good governance' have so far been generally European or North American. At issue here are many political observers' expectations that the advent of independence would usher in a democratic regime. Independence was expected to effect more than just a transfer of power from foreign hands to native ones; it was meant to achieve a transformation of the whole pattern of political life. In addition to the creation of a public sphere in which various segments of civil society could express themselves and interact with the state, new nation-states were expected to metamorphose subjects into citizens (Geertz 1973, 2000). Thus, contrary to a theoretical perspective wherein the people as community must be both sovereign and subject (the citizen, by submitting to the law, ultimately submits to

himself only), the distinction between subject and citizen has been at the heart of many debates about citizenship in new nation-states today. If, in the political science inherited from French post-revolutionary public law, the logical dichotomy refers to the opposition 'subjection'/'autonomy', it has more recently come to integrate the opposition between 'primordial ties' and 'civic ties'. Whereas subjects were deemed to have been held back by their 'primordial ties', citizens would be freed from such ethnic, cultural or religious bonds, at last bound together by a common sense of universal civic virtue.

Such conceptions are unsatisfactory on many counts. To begin with, the citizen/subject distinction is largely the product of colonial history, although its relevance for the constitution of a political, sovereign community – whether in formerly colonized countries or not – is debatable.<sup>18</sup> True, in many of the cases presented here, the distinction between citizen and subject is often a tenuous one. Yet the fact that, for instance, in India citizens' associations have also been demonstrating against the invasion of the public sphere by Hindu nationalist propaganda



suggests alert and reactive practices of citizenship. Education has been in the eye of the storm following recent attempts by the then central Hindu nationalist government to instil their invidious propaganda by redesigning curricula, syllabuses and textbooks to fit their purposes. In this battle over contended meanings of nationality and citizenship, public protest – as well as public support on the other side – does indeed testify to a ‘live and kicking practice of citizenship’. Furthermore, these conceptions obliterate an essential interrogation about citizenship, namely whether citizenship does and should represent the deepest layers of cultural identity or only ‘proclaim the surface layers of political life’ (Shafir 1998: 17–19). To what extent individuals’ social and national identities are fixed, and what degree of agency ordinary social actors have in the manufacturing of citizenship, are central questions.

The notions of ‘citizenship’, ‘civic ties’ and ‘ethnic ties’ are not devoid of difficulties either. They need to be both historically and culturally situated rather than hastily posited as universal categories abstracted from their original milieu. To be sure, the

fact that very different histories and contexts across the globe have led to nation-state models of political organization suggests the relevance of such a model for peoples recently achieving political sovereignty (Savidan 2001: 19), quite apart from international pressure (Burghart 1996; Butenschon 2000). Yet, rather than the nation-state’s enabling the social integration that the old hierarchical relations supposedly no longer undergirded, more often than not these old hierarchical relations did not simply vanish but became redeployed and transformed, playing a part in the new political process (see for instance S. Bayly 1999; Dirks 2001). Drawing attention to the persistence of old ties – whether religious, ethnic or other – both within ‘Euro-American’ and ‘non-Euro-American’ contexts enables one to pinpoint heretofore ignored similarities between these contexts.

Indeed, much has been said about a universalist conception of citizenship as a product of the transcendence of ethnic particularisms at the supra-level of the nation (Schnapper 1994). Such a conception is often presented as the brainchild of philosophers such as Rousseau, seen as the promoter of the



inalienability of sovereignty and the ethnocultural neutrality of the nation-state. Yet even at the heart of the Rousseauist conception of the nation is an intricate nexus between politics and an ethnically defined nation: in his *Considérations sur le gouvernement de Pologne*, for instance, the philosopher envisaged political freedom as mediated by the preservation of national character, with education playing a crucial role in promoting citizenship **consubstantially** to nationality (Savidan 2001: 15). The thesis of the political decline of the nation-state internally torn by too many nationalities is thus untenable: the salience of these nationalities and their claims for recognition highlights the mythical and ideological character of the thesis of **'State ethnocultural neutrality'**.<sup>19</sup> In other words, the nation is always an ethnocultural one. Even Rousseau defended the idea that, rather than an obstacle to political freedom, **culture can be a vehicle** enabling the exercise of citizenship (Savidan 2001: 12). This obviously has capital implications for a comparison between older and newer nation-states today, and calls for a more extensive reflection on the statuses of 'subject' and 'citizen', and particularly on their oft-presented mutual exclusivity. It also re-opens the debate regarding the existence (especially in precolonial times) of **'native' socio-political modes** of organization competing with European or American models of **'good governance'**.

Furthermore, if nationalism is an important feature in any discussion of the legacy of European colonial political structures, the immense power of postcolonial nation-states nevertheless does not lie in their being inherited from colonialism but from their **nationalist mobilization** (Kaviraj 2001: 314). In societies formerly under colonial rule, the emergence of nationalist consciousness and mobilization against colonial rulers were concomitant processes. There, citizenship and nationalism were closely associated, inasmuch as the struggle for independence was intricately linked to fighting for basic rights. The consciousness of being a free national was thus forged in relation to the establishment of citizens' rights (and duties). This raises the question of the extent to which nationality today can be disentangled from citizenship. The question obtains as much in



mainland China or in Taiwan, where the implementation of 'Three Principles Education' systematically engendered a **nationalist vision of citizenship and personhood** (Chun, this volume, [Chapter 2](#)), as in South Asia, or in Europe, both in its old and its newer nation-states (see Bryant, this volume, [Chapter 4](#) for the British colonial context of Cyprus, where citizens' rights were closely tied up either with Greek or with Turkish nationalist claims). In this respect, the attempts currently being made by some South Asian nation-states at making nationality and citizenship fit (in an unprecedented way based on an essentialist religious definition) offer a vivid contrast to the European postnational construction: the latter is currently groping in search of a new model reconsidering the relationship between citizenship and nationality (Balibar 1996, and this volume, [Chapter 1](#)).

Lastly, far from non-European models being the products of passive colonial legacies, the volume also highlights the multiple influences that have been at work in the elaboration of different modes of citizenship at one given moment and within one given

society.<sup>20</sup> Rana Mitter and Naran Bilik on the one hand and Allen Chun on the other provide instances from mainland China and Taiwan, respectively: in mainland China, Western and Japanese features of political thought have been redeployed in an interesting triangular relationship with Han and Mongolian perspectives. The notion of Western civil society has also led to conflicting visions – some of them as counter-reactions to Western notions – among minorities and majority Chinese citizens. In Taiwan, European and American borrowings occurred together with the inherited Japanese and Chinese ethical ideals of early Republican China (the nationalist ideology of Sun Yat Sen). Interestingly, the international ideology of communism, which was later and until quite recently to reign supreme, is not so much relevant to the manufacturing of interactive citizenship in the Chinese context as it is in places where such an ideology was never implemented, for instance in the Sicily of the 1960s: Schneider and Schneider show that this ideology, together with the 'universalizing rational culture of the French Enlightenment', has been a major influence in the redefinition of citizens'



involvement in the life of the *polis*. Furthermore, colonial legacies and international ideologies do not exhaust the potential for borrowing. As is documented by Mohammad-Arif, not only has the British legacy been an enduring one in the formation of India and Pakistan, but also, since their creation, mutual cross-borrowings have occurred between these two rival nation-states in South Asia (for example, the notion of a ‘Hindu *umma*’). So the political processes and features of citizenship that are documented in the volume are the products of complex, multi-layered and multi-sited circulatory developments that have taken place over at least two centuries.

## ***Contents of this volume***

Because education is not limited to schooling, although schooling accounts for an increasingly large part of it today, the contributors have chosen to vary their sites of observation as well as their perspectives and levels of analysis: from museums (Mitter) to schools (Caddell, Chun and Schneider and Schneider)

and textbooks (Mohammad-Arif and Schneider and Schneider); some have more specifically addressed the relationship of schools to public space (Bryant) and society at large (Balibar and Bilik), as well as the community in relation to the nation (Bear), or even to national and international governments (Osler); and contributions vary from top-down views of state projects, to bottom-up views of various levels of social actors’ engagement and negotiation with the institutions of their nation-state (from schools to parents to associations involved in educational processes).

## ***Disciplining citizens***

In an introductory chapter, drawing on his experience as a French academic and intellectual, Etienne Balibar reflects on the conditions for the possibility of the democratization of the schooling process (involving the effective participation of the *demos*) in relation to the construction of European citizenship. Balibar sees a general ‘exercise in education’ (*effort d’éducation*)



as a prerequisite for even thinking about the possibility of creating any form of European citizenship. Such an exercise is required at every level of each national community within Europe. In order to attain a postnational citizenship, a European system of education would also have to be put into place, rather than nation-states separately devising their own citizenship education studies and having special European citizenship studies programmes concocted for them by Brussels bureaucrats, as in the late 1990s (Shore 2001).

There are ideological tensions at play in the construction of citizenship through educational processes generally: between individual and collective education; between ideals of (post)national construction and the dangers of an essentialist identity; and between primary and secondary identities. Through the examination of these various dialectical relationships, Balibar poses the question of the ideological correlation between various types of educational projects and different modes of citizenship: is education to be conceived of as a liberating, emancipating force conducive to the advent of 'enlightened' (European) citizens

living on a territory relatively open to the world lying beyond its sovereignty, or is it rather to become a conditioning force put at the service of manufacturing docile inward-looking citizens living within the closed frontiers of their sovereign space, whether national or postnational? Obviously, there is no straightforward answer to such a crucial question: there exists a vast continuum of possibilities ranging across these two extremes, as is testified by the next three examples discussed in this section.

In his school ethnography of the highly centralized Taiwanese educational system, Allen Chun documents hardly any space to manoeuvre left for negotiation. Education in Taiwan is 'less an autonomous process of knowledge dissemination' and more an 'integral part of the state project of nation-building'. The state's organizational structures and bureaucratic features are replicated within schools, ensuring effective state supervision, control and surveillance in each institution, by means of discipline and militarization. The curriculum is an important framework for the dissemination of social values, cultural identity and political notions of citizenship. Of special import is the



influence of the early Republican Chinese ideals of Sun Yat-Sen's philosophy and the political ideology of 'Three Principles Education', encompassing the teaching of etiquette and health, ethics and morality, and citizenship and political thought. Principles of morality and citizenship are intricately linked, and both are rooted in a blend of Confucian ethics and modern political values.<sup>21</sup> Hence a fully-fledged citizenship is expected to mature into the proper ethical behaviour of a proper citizen acting as a 'proper person' (*zuoren*).

Through the daily routine, Chun also emphasizes the materiality of the manufacturing of citizenship, in which bodily procedures inscribe the first stages of citizenship on to the future citizens' bodies, and the spatial representation of hierarchies of state power is effected within the school. Schools are also part of a wider network of social, cultural and political life, mirrored not only by the schools' internal administrative structure, but also by the conduct of extracurricular activities, which promote spiritual education and 'cultural enlightenment' through civic service for the local community. In this citizenship geared towards serving

both the Taiwanese state and Taiwanese society, little leeway seems to be left for negotiation, whether on the part of the teachers or the parents, let alone the children.

By contrast, Martha Caddell provides an example of how citizenship is negotiated and expressed in Nepal today by different social agents and groups – in particular aid agencies and Maoist organizations – and their engaging with the state's projects. Interestingly, the modern 'Western' concept of the nation-state has been gradually indigenized over the last two and a half centuries (Burghart 1996). By the same token, today's national project of education is formulated in native terms, whilst also being foreign oriented, owing to international funding. The agencies promoting development (*bikas*) are central to the processes of Nepali nation-building and manufacturing of citizenship inasmuch as citizens are ideally conceived of as agents of development (although the term *bikas* does not have any connotation of personal development similar to that comprised in the Greek notion of *paideia*; see below). The Nepali case is also a brilliant example of indigenous modernity, whose narrative is



associated with official national Hinduism and against which alternative, Christian-inspired visions are being proffered by some development agencies. To be sure, this alternative Christian vision of modernity is a powerful one in the international world order today. Yet this case not only underscores the contingency of Christian modernity, but also the need for generally reassessing the relationship between modernity and religion.

Caddell further highlights the possibility of 'deviance', 'undiscipline' or non-conformity with the proposed national and international models of citizenship and participation. (Interestingly, the Maoists engage with their 'enemies' in the latter's terms of debate, i.e. 'development'.) This is partly due to the fact that schools remain *loci* of the promotion of inequality, even when this is undertaken in the name of development and inclusion, and even when notions of the 'good citizen' are not determined by locality or ethnicity.

If ethnicity does not appear to play all that crucial a part in the definition of citizenship in Nepal, it does play a determinative

role in the conflict opposing Greek Orthodox Cypriots and Turkish Muslim Cypriots. As debates are still raging about whether the inhabitants of Cyprus should be (re)united in a common citizenship within a single, unified nation-state accommodating ethnic and religious differences, Rebecca Bryant goes back to earlier phases of the conflict and analyses the value placed in colonial times upon education and educated persons in Cyprus, and how this articulates with notions of nationality conditioning the possibility of any project of citizenship on the island.

By looking at both communities, Bryant demonstrates that the problem in Cyprus has been the inextricability of citizenship from ethnonationalisms. In the Greek case, citizenship was premised on a 'Humanity' defined in the archetypal Ancient Greek sense. *Paideia*, as the foundational pedagogy of the Ancient Greek citizen, encompassed as its ultimate goal the achieving of mastery in personal development, and formed the basis for a citizen's persona. Eloquence, in particular, was deemed conducive to proper thinking and proper living, in accordance with a



nationalist self whose development also relied in part on emotions, a fact testified to by teachers' and leaders' impassioned speeches about fulfilling one's duty towards the fatherland and its sacred flag. By contrast with the classic European vision of a universality enabling the creation of a citizenship and a nation in which ethnic particularisms would be transcended, this case reveals a culturally defined notion of universality, which hence becomes a matter of acrimonious contention between competing ethnic communities. In contradistinction, Bryant argues, Turkish Muslim Cypriots were weighed down by a sense of the impossibility of creating a true citizenship, in spite of an already existing conception of rights and duties among the Muslim leaders.

### ***National history and memory***

Citizenship is always manufactured locally, and the main material that is drawn on in the process is national history and memory, which feature largely in educational programmes. The next three

chapters explore the prominent place history and social memory occupy in the elaboration of national curricula and the ways in which nation-states and citizens appropriate and negotiate them.<sup>22</sup>

Rana Mitter first examines the transformations that have occurred in the meaning of citizenship in China over the last century. The changing nature of these debates is reflected in attempts to reform education, particularly that part of it that inculcates civics. As was said above, Mitter highlights the circulation and borrowings of models across vast geographic and cultural spaces. The result of such cross-borrowings is that today the Chinese political idiom has embedded in it the Western concepts of 'citizen' and 'nation', to some extent as these were revisited in Japan.

In China today, as in many other nation-states, the inculcation of patriotism is an essential element in the construction of citizenship. This is effected through the construction of a 'national' memory in a variety of forms, the most spectacular among which are historical museums. These museums are among



the impressive educational tools that have been promoted in the reform era. Diorama historical reconstructions of battles and other memorable events have occupied the centre stage of many museums in recent decades, and are meant to facilitate public identification. These technologies also lend themselves particularly well to the reinterpretation of national history that takes place in the course of attempts to create a consensual national memory. In some ways, the historical dioramas are a means for ‘visually re-writing national history’.

The issue of history-writing is also addressed by Aminah Mohammad-Arif, although this time in relation to ‘communalization’ on the South Asian subcontinent. This term is predicated on that of ‘communalism’, and denotes the process whereby religion becomes the main component in the definition both of social and political communities, and of nationhood. In such a context, the numerically dominant community seeks to impose its own ethnic or religious identity on the very definition of nationhood and citizenship. Other comparable instances have been documented whereby citizenship – defined as membership

in the national political community – was gradually defined in an exclusivist fashion, and in which the implication for citizenship is the exclusion from access to the fully-fledged status of citizen of residents who do not comply with the majoritarian ethnic or religious definition of citizenship (see for instance Pandey and Geschiere 2003 for illustrations in Africa, Asia and Latin America).<sup>23</sup>

Looking at the continuous process that has been taking place since Partition in 1947 and the subsequent creation of the nation-states of India and Pakistan (and later, in 1971, that of Bangladesh), Mohammad-Arif explores how education systems of both countries have turned history textbooks into vital ideological instruments, according a central place to the traumatic events related to Partition. Furthermore, if communalization was a distinctive mark of Pakistani nationality and citizenship as reflected in the emphasis put on Islamic definitions, knowledge and practices in the official curriculum since that nation-state’s inception, the continuing implementation of a Hindu nationalist policy over recent years



(and until May 2004) in India has now blurred the distinctions between these two rival nation-states' political agendas: in both countries, secular forces have increasingly been marginalized.<sup>24</sup> This has called into question the viability of the notion of citizenship enshrined in the Constitutions and theoretically granted to all residents within the territorial limits of both nation-states, regardless of the painful and traumatic social and historical memories shared by the citizens of both since their creation.

Jane Schneider and Peter Schneider mobilize an altogether different kind of history and social memory in their discussion of the antimafia movement in Sicily: one that is negatively connoted and targeted in a project geared towards educating for legality and citizenship. Interestingly, a conception akin to those often used in non-European contexts is to be found in the common rhetoric applied to southern Italy (and particularly Sicily): a conception akin to 'Mediterranean Orientalism'. Whereas northern Italy is deemed heir to a 'civic tradition' related to city-states dating back to the Middle Ages, the south passes off as steeped in 'feudal, bureaucratic, and absolutist rule'. Schneider and Schneider seek to invalidate such a commonplace opposition by exploring citizens' initiatives in Sicily since the 1980s.

Following major outbursts of *mafia* violence, members of the Leftist sections of society engaged in initiatives that were largely educational and primarily focused on 'middle schools' (the teenage group). Middle schools have thus become the major *loci* for civic action integrated within civic life at large. In contrast to Allen Chun's Taiwanese case, where participation in civic life through schools also occurs, but as the result of the state's designs rather than as the outcome of more autonomous grassroots-level citizens' initiatives, here the emphasis is no more on fulfilling one's duties (observance of the law and collaboration with justice) than on claiming one's rights (to the vote and to fair educational assessment rather than educational opportunities conferred as a matter of personal favour), as exemplified by new didactic materials and antimafia events conflicting with the dominant cultural codes (*omertà* in particular). In accounting for the conflicting views of middle-class (initiators) and working-



class Sicilians (dependent on the mafia's economic activities), this case vividly exemplifies how citizenship is not a given but a process involving the negotiation of different social memories and political and cultural allegiances.

### ***Ethnic frontiers and cultural diversity***

The issue of the activity of a multiplicity of social actors and interests in the manufacturing of citizenship in relation to minorities is the object of further study in this section. How states and citizens negotiate cultural diversity and members of ethnic minorities themselves envisage their place within the nation-state are among the central questions addressed by the next three contributors.

Discussing the recent strengthening of educational policy on citizenship studies in Britain, Audrey Osler offers a testimony to how the paradox of the crisis in democracy is dealt with in the British context: at a time when ordinary social actors increasingly feel that their views matter little to their elected representatives,

citizenship education is further introduced in schools to counter a lack of participatory democracy manifested by electoral absenteeism. The notion of a frontier, both physically and metaphorically, underlies Osler's chapter in two ways. By documenting how a specific nation-state's concerns articulate with international ones in the field of education, Osler shows how nation-states' ideological frontiers are permeable, especially in terms of matters of international security. Since the 1990s and, more recently, the terrorist attacks of 2001, the issues of peace and human rights have attracted renewed attention on the part of international agencies. UNESCO, for one, has devised a framework promoting 'education for greater democracy and human rights internationally', thus bringing pressure to bear upon *every* nation-state to include these issues in its educational agenda.

In addition to external ideological frontiers, states also negotiate their own internal ones. Notwithstanding their oft-made claims to neutrality, they devise all sorts of boundaries between various communities and categories of citizens living



within their administrative boundaries.<sup>25</sup> It is to tackle one of these frontiers, following the publication of a report in 1999 in Britain that identified institutional racism as a major cause of social exclusion, that citizenship education has recently been introduced with renewed vigour in schools by the Government. Through citizenship education, schools are expected to help prevent racism from developing by encouraging young people to value cultural diversity.

In a converse movement, cultural diversity has become officially devalued in China since the Cultural Revolution, as is shown by Naran Bilik's discussion of Chinese educational policies with regard to minorities. Bilik reconsiders the notion of the frontier in the light of the issue of ethnicity and citizenship in China, and offers a different reading of its metaphorical and physical dimensions as these are usually imposed by a centralized state. The history of the coming about of ethnic and cultural (Han) dominance in China until the early twentieth century reveals how the state did not initially attempt to trace frontiers; rather, the margins tended to dominate the centre, and

enforced geophysical frontiers. Furthermore, following the 1911 revolution, the redistribution of the balance of ethnic power gave preponderance to and shaped discourses of ethnicity. In keeping with this awareness of the issue of ethnicity, the state that resulted from the communist takeover in 1949 paid great attention to ethno-national identities, encouraging 'ethno-national education' for the next few decades. So that, far from transcending ethnic particularisms, national unity and citizenship were to be premised on the cultivation of ethnic pluralism.

The period that followed the Cultural Revolution nevertheless saw a radical change in views about ethnicity and educational policies, with a renewal of Han dominance in national matters. Citizenship and nationality were consequently constructed on the basis of Han ethnicity, relegating other ethnicities beyond the acceptable realm of Chinese citizenship. A metaphorical frontier was thus created by the Chinese nation-state through the rhetoric of (non-Han, other) ethnic backwardness.<sup>26</sup> By looking at the Inner Mongolian and the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous



Regions, Bilik documents how such a metaphorical frontier has been internalized by some minority communities, but also how some members – including teachers – negotiate the state's imposed version of their own ethnic identities and sense of citizenship.

It is also to the negotiation of ethnic identities and senses of membership in the national community that Laura Bear devotes her attention in the last chapter. Yet, rather than concentrating on the links between projects of mass education and citizenship through the study of schools, textbooks or pedagogy, she focuses on the aftermath of schooling through school histories. Narratives of schooling and education provide a way for social actors to discuss how as citizens they negotiate a sense of belonging to various communities, whether their ethnic community or the nation. Bear looks at the specific case of the Anglo-Indians in India. Here, the notion of frontier does not only capture 'the hierarchies of degrees of belonging to the national community', it also 'conveys a sense of nationalism as an existential project at the level of the individual citizen'. Bear

argues that 'the existential project of being a citizen-subject is often framed in relation to people's experience of schooling'.

A historical overview of educational projects directed at Anglo-Indians first highlights how the funding of education was intimately connected with the idea of securing loyalty to the state by means of personal and moral transformations. Despite the claims to secularity made by many British administrators and historians alike, the moral reform underlying imperial educational policies – particularly in India – was largely premised on Christian religious ethics – mostly Protestant.<sup>27</sup> A second section is devoted to contemporary school stories as told by Anglo-Indian adults today. These stories enable members of this community to reappropriate both colonial and postcolonial projects of education and to recover a sense of autonomy and agency in the very process of schooling. Bear reveals how the colonial creation of separate schools for Anglo-Indians initially conceived as a state project has today become a community right conducive to producing the internalized frontiers of this 'minority community'.



## *Epilogue*

In sum, far from an analysis built upon measured levels of electoral participation, the purpose of these essays is threefold; first, in contrast to the commonplace according to which the role of nation-states has been reduced to a minimum owing to economic and financial globalization, these chapters aim to highlight the still powerful role that nation-states play, especially in conveying ideas about citizenship and manufacturing citizens. Such a view is also congruent with the more recent works that have underscored the role of agent of the state played by civil society, especially in times of globalization (see in particular Aretxaga 2003; Hardt and Negri 2000; Trouillot 2001; Bayart 2004 also refers to this aspect, although without making it central to his argument). Of course, the definition of 'civil society' as primarily consisting of NGOs working at the interface of private and public corporate partnership does not do justice to the variability of the notion across both time and space (see

Comaroff and Comaroff 1999; Hann 1996; Harris 2004).

Yet second, regardless of the definitional difficulty posed by the notion, by focusing on 'civil society', these recent works have sometimes left out of their purview the heuristic potential of the notion of citizenship, evidenced by the significant political part played by ordinary social actors, including teachers and parents, be it in Europe, South Asia or China (mainland and other). Some of the present essays indeed suggest a way out of the conundrum of 'civil society' in postcolonial times by attracting more attention towards the heterogeneity of actors as well as the multiplicity of forms of organization of, and participation in, and expression of belonging to a national political community (what Callon *et al.* 2001 call 'hybrid fora') that citizens experience and manufacture in their educational environment. The critical inventory resting on these case studies brings into relief the high variability of the definition, discourse and practices of citizenship, in the process highlighting the contingency of citizenship as much as its arbitrariness and exclusive character, thus inviting analysts to think of 'citizenship' together with 'non-citizenship', or the denial



thereof to some individuals and groups, whether in ‘the East’ or in ‘the West’.

Third, and consequently, this critical inventory also forcefully confirms the need for a dialogical exercise of democracy (*démocratie dialogique*, see Callon *et al.* 2001) to be combined with the more classical forms of delegatory democracy. No less importantly, these essays demonstrate that such a dialogical exercise, involving the participation of social actors of all categories, does not require them to shed their ‘cluttered’ social and cultural selves and break out from the shackles of their bonds – ethnic, religious or other – prior to entering the political arena of rational debate, as a Habermasian, an Arendtian or even a Rawlsian view of formal democracy would have it. Rather, the educational processes that take place at a variety of levels within a given society are themselves imbued with these particularisms and feed on the emotions and memories – individual and social – entailed by them. Yet, rather than these very particularities and bonds being a hindrance to an active exercise of democracy, what an anthropological approach demonstrates is that it is with them,

as they are both shaped through the very manufacturing of citizenship, and contribute to it, that social actors can best actively participate in and enrich the political life not only of their own nation-states, but also of the ‘global civil society’, as shown by the anti-war demonstrations with which we opened this chapter, as well as by the further events deriving therefrom that have continued to mobilize the citizens of many nation-states. Nevertheless, the present contributions also suggest how long and arduous the path towards the realization and materialization of this thesis still is, both everywhere in general, and in China, South Asia *and* Europe in particular.

At any rate, salvaging the notion of citizenship from what is often conceived as its prerequisite, namely civil society, reveals the dynamic quality and potentiality of political participation by various fora of actors in both ‘Western’ and ‘non-Western’ contexts, thereby highlighting heretofore unsuspected similarities, not least in matters of ethnic particularisms and nationalist construction. In the process, citizenship, whether in ‘the West’ or in ‘the East’, emerges as a feature of an ever-



evolving and incomplete modernity, yet also as one of its elective affinities, real or imagined.

## **Notes**

<sup>1</sup> If we accept – granted, in a somewhat Schmittian conception – that mass manifestations can be considered as part of participatory democracy. Thanks are due to Jackie Assayag, John Charvet, Leo Coleman, Stephan Feuchtwang, Chris Fuller, Thomas Hansen, Deborah James and Jean Leca for their worthwhile criticisms and comments on several stages of this Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed and informative account of the various traditions of citizenship that have existed from Greek to Roman to medieval to modern and contemporary times and the debates they have generated, see Shafir (1998). On the various notions of civil, political, and more recently cultural, global and even ecological citizenship, see Butenschon (2000).

<sup>3</sup> See Jelin and Hershberg (1996) on human rights and

citizenship with particular reference to Latin America; also on the issue of democratizing institutions as the condition for the advent of a citizenship premised on the recognition of the rights of social actors (both individual and collective). On the latter topic and the relationship of national models of citizenship to new conceptions of human rights, see also Delanty (2000).

<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, this claim to universalization raises the question of the 'location' of the scholarship relating to this topic (see Assayag and Bénéï 2003, and Prakash 2003 for a problematization of this notion).

<sup>5</sup> From this perspective, citizenship certainly represents an 'aspirational politics', a 'politics of desire' oriented towards the future (Werbner 1998: 2). Yet, unlike Werbner, I argue that this aspirational politics does not stand in stark contrast with nationalism: nationalism may be grounded in a mythical past, but it also looks towards an ideal. Both political projects are grounded in specific traditions, whether of a mythical national past or of a political philosophy. By the same token, both projects look towards the future and are animated by a sense of loss and



desire at the same time, a *telos*.

**6** On discussions of citizenship in relation to the issue of multiculturalism and the necessity of a theory of minority rights as distinct from human rights, see Kymlicka (1996 [1995]) and Kymlicka and Norman (2000). On the critique of the notion of 'multicultural citizenship', see Joppke (2001).

**7** Daunton and Hilton (2001) look at consumption and analyse the triadic relationship between consumer, citizenship and the state, discussing whether consumption has been conducive to the production of an integrated nation or has subverted social order. Not only do they study how states have anchored types of consumption in notions of citizenship, but also the ways in which shoppers may extend their economic purchasing decisions into political acts or moral statements.

**8** On the issues of citizenship, discrimination and religious schooling, see Callan (2000) and Spinner-Halev (2000) with reference to Canada and the USA, respectively.

**9** See for instance Yuval-Davis and Werbner (1999) and Rajan (2003) on a theoretical perspective, and Joseph (2001) on the

Middle East, where she discusses the ways in which the linkage woman/mother to nation and man to the state has reinforced the reproduction of a gendered hierarchy conducive to the institutionalization of gendered citizenship in state-building projects.

**10** On transnationalism and social actors' accommodation to different notions of citizenship according to varying contexts, as well as their embeddedness in networks of relationships that connect them simultaneously to two or more nation-states, see Ong (1999) on the Chinese diaspora and Basch *et al.* (1997) on the Caribbean and the USA. These works emphasize the fluidity involved in simultaneously belonging to several nation-states, and reflect on the problematic notion of a nation-state exclusively encapsulating forms of territorial allegiance even in a so-called postmodern world.

**11** On other types of opinion manufacturing, see Loïc Blondiaux (1998).

**12** See also an illustration of this in contemporary France and Germany with respect to state teachings on the subject of taste in



furniture (Auslander 2001).

<sup>13</sup> To Habermas, the solution lies in the acceptance of a 'postnational society', that is, a political society whose limits are no longer determined by the nation. Ironically, however, the very model upon which he predicates the construction of a postnational society is still that of the nation-state. (This broadly corresponds to the concept and political project of the European union [Ferry 2000]. See also Delanty [2000] on European postnational and cosmopolitan citizenship and global civil society.)

<sup>14</sup> See Zask (2001). Note that such a project was in tune with its own times, the early twentieth century, since Dewey looked at educational methods and the growth of democracy in connection with the then prevalent development of experimental methods in the sciences, evolutionary ideas in biological sciences and industrial reorganization.

<sup>15</sup> See Bayly (1997) for an account of the transformation of what he identifies as an 'indigenous public sphere' in India prior to the advent of British colonial powers. In contrast, see

Chatterjee, who argues that social leaders saw their role as one of 'guiding [the then emerging] public to maturity' (2001: 167–8).

<sup>16</sup> For a broader discussion of other modernities, see Eisenstadt (2000).

<sup>17</sup> Even though in recent years, the emergence of notions such as that of global justice have probably furthered the scope and extent of penetration of these idea(l)s across the world.

<sup>18</sup> It was forged – or at least summarized – by Lord Hailey as a distinction between different forms of colonial rule subsumed by 'the doctrine of identity' and the 'doctrine of differentiation', respectively (Mamdani 1996: 7). Such a doctrine of differentiation, better known as institutional segregation or British 'indirect rule' and French 'association', culminated in the notion of apartheid. See also Metcalf (1995).

<sup>19</sup> 'Dans la formule "Etat-nation", le terme *nation* renvoie directement à une réalité ethnoculturelle particulière' (Savidan 2001: 3).

<sup>20</sup> Other instances of 'cross-pollination' can be found in other parts of the globe. See for instance Castro Leiva and Pagden



(2001) for early nineteenth-century Latin American conceptions of republicanism premised on the 'Ancient World' (Athens, Sparta, Thebes and Rome). On the Middle East, see Butenschon (2000); on Africa, see Mamdani (1996) and Bayart (2004).

21 Confucian-based moral education became a 'spiritual weapon' against socialism and Communist China's values. There is an interesting parallel here with Gandhi's use of the Jain principle of non-violence (*ahimsa*) (see Fox 2002), both being instances of turning 'traditional principles' into modern weapons geared towards resisting colonial or other external powers.

22 For a comparison of the cases of the former German Democratic Republic and Japan, respectively, see Noiriel (2001), and in particular Dierkes (2001).

23 This is certainly on the verge of becoming true in the Indian case, as the Hindu right-wing extremist parties in power in some states and, until recently, in central government explicitly assert that Hindus and others assimilable into the Hindu fold are the 'primary citizens' of India, while the rest are relegated to the status of non-Indians and should be given second-class

citizenship (Raman 2003).

24 Following state elections in May 2004, which reinstated the Congress Party back into power, however, there have been constant debates over how best to reverse the stream, especially in matters educational. Yet for the moment, most measures have been deemed insufficient.

25 As was seen above, members of minority communities may implicitly be considered as 'less equal' citizens; they may also be asked to prove their allegiance to the nation-state and relinquish all claims to collective representation (see Asad 1990). By the same token, recent immigrants regularly stand at the centre of discussions about special programmes of citizenship education.

26 Ironically, such a frontier is further strengthened by the very discourse that is aimed at promoting the integration of all citizens by means of assimilation under the banner of Han-dominated citizenship. Furthermore, as in many nation-states across Europe and South Asia, here, a correspondence between race, minority and backwardness is created by the Chinese nation-state.



<sup>27</sup> See also Viswanathan (1998) and Bénéï (2002) for a similar claim.

## ***Bibliography***

- Anderson, B. (1991[1983]), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin And Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition, London: Verso.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1990), 'Topographies of the Self: Praise and Emotion in Hindu India', in C. A. Lutz and L. Abu-Lughod (eds), *Language and the Politics of Emotion*, pp. 92–112, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1997), *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimension of Globalisation*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aretxaga, Begoña (2003), 'Maddening States', *Annual Review of Anthropology* October 32: 393–410.
- Asad, Talal (1990), 'Multi-cultural and British Ideology', *Politics and Society* 18: 445–80.
- Assayag, Jackie (2001), *L'Inde. Désir de nation*, Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Assayag, Jackie and Véronique Bénéï (eds) (2003), *At Home in Diaspora. South Asian Scholars and the West*, Delhi/Bloomington, IN: Permanent Black/Indiana University.
- Auslander, Leora (2001), 'National Taste? Citizenship Law, State Form, and Everyday Aesthetics in Modern France and Germany, 1920–1940', in Martin Daunton and Matthew Hilton (eds) *The Politics of Consumption: Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America*, pp. 109–28, Oxford: Berg.
- Balibar, Etienne (1984), 'Sujets ou citoyens? (Pour l'égalité)', *Temps modernes* 2: 1726–53.
- Balibar, Etienne (1992), *Les frontières de la démocratie*, Paris: La Découverte.
- Balibar, Etienne (1996), 'European Citizenship', *Public Culture* 8: 2, 355–76.
- Balibar, Etienne (1998), *Droit de cité*, Paris: Editions de l'Aube.
- Balibar, Etienne (2001), *Nous, citoyens d'Europe? Les frontières, l'État, le peuple*, Paris: La Découverte.



- Balibar, Etienne and Immanuel Wallerstein (eds) (1988), *Race, nation, classe: Les identités ambiguës*, Paris: La Découverte.
- Basch, Linda, Nina Glick Schiller and Cristina Szanton Blanc (1997[1994]), *Nations Unbound. Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-states*, Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Publishers.
- Bayart, Jean-François (2004), *Le gouvernement du monde: Une Critique politique de la globalisation*, Paris: Fayard. (In press.)
- Bayly, C. A. (1997), *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780\_1880*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bayly, C. A. (1998), *Origins of Nationality in South Asia: Patriotism and Ethical Government in the Making of Modern India*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bayly, Susan (1999), *Caste, Society and Politics in India: From the Eighteenth Century to the Modern Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellier, Irene and Thomas M. Wilson (eds) (2000), *An Anthropology of the European Union: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the New Europe*, New York: NYU Press.
- Bénéï, Véronique (2000), 'Teaching Nationalism in Maharashtra Schools', in C. J. Fuller and Véronique Bénéï (eds) *The Everyday State and Society in Modern India*, pp. 194–221, London: Hurst and Co.
- Bénéï, Véronique (2002), 'Missing Indigenous Bodies: Educational Enterprise and Victorian Morality in the Mid-Nineteenth Century Bombay Presidency', *Economic and Political Weekly* 37: 17, 1647–54.
- Billig, Michael (1995), *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.
- Blondiaux, Loïc (1998), *La fabrique de l'opinion: une histoire sociale des sondages*, Paris: Éd. du Seuil.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977), *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (trans. R. Nice), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1999), 'Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field', in G. Steinmetz (ed.) *Culture/State: State-Formation After the Cultural Turn*, pp. 53–75, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.



- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron (1990[1977]), *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, London: Sage.
- Brubaker, Rogers (1992), *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers (1996), *Nationalism Reframed. Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brunson, Michael (2001), 'The Media', in Bernard Crick (ed.) *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*, pp. 74–80, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burghart, Richard (1996), *The Conditions of Listening. Essays on Religion, History and Politics in South Asia*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Butenshon, Nils A. (2000), 'State, Power, and Citizenship in the Middle East', in Nils A. Butenshon, Uri Davis and Manuel Hassassian (eds) *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East. Approaches and Applications*, pp. 3–27, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Butenshon, Nils A., Uri Davis and Manuel Hassassian (eds) (2000), *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East. Approaches and Applications*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Calhoun, Craig (1997[1992]a), 'Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere', in Craig Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 1–47, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Calhoun, Craig (ed.) (1997[1992]b), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Callan, Eamonn (2000), 'Discrimination and Religious Schooling', in Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (eds) *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, pp. 45–67, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Callon, Michel, Pierre Lascoumes and Yannick Barthe (2001), *Agir dans un monde incertain. Essai sur la démocratie technique*, Paris: Seuil.
- Castro Leiva, Luis and Anthony Pagden (2001), 'Civil Society and the Fate of the Modern Republics of Latin America', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds) *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, pp. 179–203, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Certeau de, Michel (1998), *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. [Original (French) edition 1990.]
- Chatterjee, Partha (2001), 'On Civil and Political Society in Postcolonial Democracies', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds) *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, pp. 165–78, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coles, Robert (1986), *The Political Life of Children*, New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Comaroff, John L. and Jean Comaroff (eds) (1999), *Civil Society and the Political Imagination in Africa: Critical Perspectives*, Chicago: University of Chicago



- Press.
- Cooper, Frederick and Ann Laura Stoler (eds) (1997), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Crick, Bernard (2001a), 'Introduction', in *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*, pp. 1–9, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crick, Bernard (ed.) (2001b), *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Daunton, Martin and Matthew Hilton (eds) (2001), *The Politics of Consumption: Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America*, Oxford: Berg.
- Davis, S. Rufus (ed.) (1996), *Citizenship in Australia. Democracy, Law and Society*, Carlton: Constitutional Centenary Foundation.
- Davis, Uri (2000), 'Conceptions of Citizenship in the Middle East', in Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis and Manuel Hassassian (eds) *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East. Approaches and Applications*, pp. 49–69, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard (2000), *Citizenship in a Global Age. Society, Culture, Politics*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Détienne, Marcel and Jean-Pierre Vernant (1974), *Les Ruses de l'intelligence. La métis des Grecs*, Paris: Flammarion.
- Dierkes, Julian (2001), 'Absence, déclin ou essor de la nation: manuels d'histoire d'après-guerre au Japon et dans les deux Allemagnes', *Genèses – Sciences sociales et histoire*, Special issue, 44 'Enseigner la nation': 30–49.
- Dirks, Nicholas, (2001), *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel (ed.) 2000, Special issue on 'Multiple modernities', *Daedalus*, Winter.
- Eley, Geoff (1997), 'Nations, Publics, and Political Cultures: Placing Habermas in the Nineteenth Century', in Craig Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 289–339, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fassin, Didier (2001), 'The Biopolitics of Otherness: Undocumented Foreigners and Racial Discrimination in the French Public Debate', *Anthropology Today* 17: 1, 3–7.
- Ferry, Jean-Marc (2000), 'Avatars du sentiment national en Europe à la lumière du rapport à la culture et à l'histoire', in Will Kymlicka and Sylvie Mesure (eds) *Comprendre n° 1: Les identités culturelles*, pp. 359–80, Paris: PUF.
- Firth, Raymond (1973), *Symbols. Public and Private*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Foucault, Michel (1991), 'Governmentality', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 87–104, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf; Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fox, Richard G. (2002), 'East of Said', in Joan Vincent (ed.) *The Anthropology of Politics: A Reader in Ethnography, Theory and Critique*, pp. 143–52, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. (First published in M. Spinkler (ed.) *Edward Said: A Critical Reader* (Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1992), pp. 144–56.)
- Fraser, Nancy (1997[1992]), 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy', in Craig Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 109–42, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fuller, C. J. and Véronique Bénéï (eds) (2001), *The Everyday State and Society in Modern India*, London: Hurst and Co.
- Geertz, Clifford (1973), 'The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States', and 'The Politics of Meaning', both in *The Interpretation of Cultures. Selected Essays*, pp. 255–326, New York: Basic Books.



- Geertz, Clifford (1980), *Negara. The Theatre State in 19th Century Bali*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford (2000), *Available Light. Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics*, esp. Ch. 11 'The World in Pieces: Culture and Politics at the End of the Century', pp. 218–63, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gellner, Ernest (1983), *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gilbert, M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (1994), 'Popular Culture and State Formation in Revolutionary Mexico', in *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Goody, Jack (2001), 'Civil Society in an Extra-European Perspective', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds) *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, pp. 149–64, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gupta, Akhil (1995), 'Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics and the Imagined State', *American Ethnologist* 22: 375–402.
- Gupta, Dipankar (2000), *Culture, Space and the Nation-State: From Sentiment to Structure*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1989), *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1997[1992]), 'Further Reflections on the Public Sphere', in Craig Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, pp. 421–61, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2000), *Après l'État-nation. Une nouvelle constellation politique*, Paris: Fayard (German original 1998).
- Hann, Chris (1996), 'Introduction: Political Society and Civil Anthropology', in Chris

Hann and Elizabeth Dunn (eds) *Civil Society: Challenging Western Models*, London: Routledge.

- Hansen, Thomas and Finn Stepputat (eds) (2001), *States of Imagination: Ethnographic Explorations of the Postcolonial State*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000), *Empire*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, José (ed.) (2004), *Civil Society in British History: Ideas, Identities, Institutions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayes, Carlton J. H. (1937[1926]), *Essays on Nationalism*, New York: Macmillan.
- Helman, Sara (2000), 'Rights and Duties, Citizens and Soldiers', in Nils A. Butenschon, Uri Davis and Manuel Hassassian (eds) *Citizenship and the State in the Middle East. Approaches and Applications*, pp. 316–37, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1997[1990]), *Nations and Nationalisms Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeffery, P. and A. Basu (eds) (1998), *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia*, New York: Routledge.
- Jelin, Elisabeth and Eric Hershberg (eds) (1996), *Constructing Democracy. Human Rights, Citizenship, and Society in Latin America*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Joppke, Christian (2001), 'Multicultural Citizenship: A Critique', *Archives européennes de sociologie* 42: 2, 431–47.
- Joseph, Suad (ed.) (2001), *Gender and Citizenship in the Middle East*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Judt, Tony (1996), *A Grand Illusion? An Essay on Europe*, New York: Hill and Wang.



- Kaviraj, Sudipta (1997), 'Filth and the Public Sphere: Concepts and Practices About Space in Calcutta', *Public Culture* 10: 1, 83–113.
- Kaviraj, Sudipta (2001), 'In Search of Civil Society', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds) *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, pp. 287–323, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaviraj, Sudipta and Sunil Khilnani (eds) (2001), *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khilnani, Sunil (2001), 'The Development of Civil Society', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds) *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, pp. 11–32, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will (1996[1995]), *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, Will and Wayne Norman (eds) (2000), *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lê Thành Khôi (2001), *Éducation et civilisations: Genèse du monde contemporain*, Paris: Bruno Leprince, UNESCO/Horizons du Monde.
- Levinson, Bradley A. (1999), 'Resituating the Place of Educational Discourse in Anthropology', *American Anthropologist* 101: 3, 594–604.
- Lutz, C. A. and G. M. White (1986), 'The Anthropology of Emotions', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 405–36.
- Lutz, C. A. and L. Abu-Lughod (eds) (1990), *Language and the Politics of Emotion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macintyre, Stuart (1996), 'Citizenship and Education', in S. Rufus Davis (ed.) *Citizenship in Australia. Democracy, Law and Society*, pp. 225–40, Carlton: Constitutional Centenary Foundation.
- Mamdani, Mahmood (1996), *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Marshall, Thomas Humphrey (1950), *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, Thomas Humphrey and Tom Bottomore (1996[1992]), *Citizenship and Social Class*, Chicago: Pluto Press.
- Metcalf, Thomas (1995), *Ideologies of the Raj*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metzger, Thomas A. (2001), 'The Western Concept of Civil Society in the Context of Chinese History', in Sudipta Kaviraj and Sunil Khilnani (eds) *Civil Society. History and Possibilities*, pp. 204–31, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neveu, Catherine (2000), 'European Citizenship, Citizens of Europe and European Citizens', in I. Bellier and T. M. Wilson (eds) *An Anthropology of the European Union: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the New Europe*, pp. 119–36, Oxford: Berg Publications.
- Noiriel, Gérard (1991), *La tyrannie du national. Le droit d'asile en Europe 1793–1993*, Paris: Calmann-Lévy.
- Noiriel, Gérard (ed.) (2001), 'Enseigner la nation', *Genèses – Sciences sociales et histoire*, Special issue 44 'Enseigner la nation': 2–75.
- Nora, Pierre (ed.) (1996–8), *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, English language edition edited and with a foreword by Lawrence D. Kritzman; translated by Arthur Goldhammer, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ong, Aihwa (1999), *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pandey, Gyanendra (2001), *Remembering Partition: Violence, Nationalism, and History in India*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pandey, Gyanendra and Peter Geschiere (eds) (2003), *The Forging of Nationhood*,



- New Delhi: Manohar.
- Parekh, B. (2000), *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain. Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain*, London: Runnymede Trust.
- Prakash, Gyan (2003), 'The Location of Scholarship', in Jackie Assayag and Véronique Bénéï (eds) *At Home in Diaspora. South Asian Scholars and the West*, pp. 115–26. Delhi/Bloomington, IN: Permanent Black/Indiana University Press.
- Pring, Richard (2001), 'Citizenship and Schools', in Bernard Crick (ed.) *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*, pp. 81–9, London: Blackwell.
- Putnam, Robert (2000), *Bowling Alone*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rajan, Rajeswari Sunder (2003), *The Scandal of the State. Women, Law and Citizenship in Postcolonial India*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Raman, J. Sri (2003), 'Hum Hindustani: "Non-Indian" Minorities', *The Daily Times*, 29 April.
- Robb, Peter (ed.) (1997), *South Asia and the Concept of Race*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Rubinstein, Kim (1996), 'Citizenship, Membership and Civic Virtue: Similar But Not Quite the Same', in S. Rufus Davis (ed.) *Citizenship in Australia. Democracy, Law and Society*, pp. 69–88, Carlton: Constitutional Centenary Foundation.
- Sarkar, T. and U. Butalia (eds) (1995), *Women and Right-Wing Movements*, London: Zed Books.
- Savidan, Patrick (2001), 'La constellation post-nationale et l'avenir de l'Etat libéral', paper presented at the conference on *Nationalisme, libéralisme et pluralisme*, CERI, Paris, 5–6 February.
- Schnapper, Dominique (1994), *La communauté des citoyens. Sur l'idée moderne de Nation*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Schnapper, Dominique (2000), in Will Kymlicka and Sylvie Mesure (eds) *Comprendre n° 1: Les identités culturelles*, Paris: PUF.
- Schnapper, Dominique (2002), 'Citizenship and National Identity in Europe', *Nations and Nationalism* 8: 1, 1–14.
- Schuller, Tom (2001), 'The Need for Lifelong Learning', in Bernard Crick (ed.) *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*, pp. 90–9, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scott, David (1995), 'Colonial Governmentality', *Social Text* 43: 191–201.
- Seyd, Patrick, Paul Whiteley and Charles Pattie (2001), 'Citizenship in Britain: Attitudes and Behaviour', in Bernard Crick (ed.) *Citizens: Towards a Citizenship Culture*, pp. 141–8, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shafir, Gershon (ed.) (1998), *The Citizenship Debates. A Reader*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shore, Cris (2001), 'Manufacturing European Citizens: The Europeanisation of School Children in Britain', paper presented at the international conference on *Manufacturing citizenship: Europe, South Asia, China*, Maison française, Oxford, 6–7 July.
- Skocpol, Theda (1979), *States and Social Revolutions: a Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spencer, Jonathan (1997), 'Post-Colonialism and the Political Imagination', *Journal of the Royal Anthropology Institute* 3: 1, 1–20.
- Spinner-Halev, Jeff (2000), 'Extending Diversity: Religion in Public and Private Education', in Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (eds) *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, pp. 68–95, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steinmetz, George (ed.) (1999), *State/Culture: State-Formation After the Cultural Turn*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Stocking, George W. Jr (ed.) (1991), *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*, Madison, WI: University of



- Wisconsin Press.
- Subrahmanian, Ramya, Yusuf Sayed, Sarada Balagopalan and Crain Soudien (eds) (2003), *Education Inclusion and Exclusion: Indian and South African Perspectives*, *IDS Bulletin* 34(1), Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Taylor, Charles (1992), *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Multiculturalism*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thiesse, A.-M. (1999), *La création des identités nationales: Europe XVIIIè-XXè siècle*, Paris: Seuil.
- Thomas, Nick (1994), *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (2001), 'The Anthropology of the State in the Age of Globalization: Close Encounters of the Deceptive Kind', *Current Anthropology* 42: 1, 125-38.
- Van der Veer, Peter (2001), *Imperial Encounters. Religion and Modernity in India and Britain*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Vasavi, A. R. (2003), 'Schooling for a New Society? The Social and Political Bases of Education Deprivation in India', in Ramya Subrahmanian, Yusuf Sayed, Sarada Balagopalan and Crain Soudien (eds) *Education Inclusion and Exclusion: Indian and South African Perspectives*, pp. 72-80 (*IDS Bulletin* 34(1), Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton).
- Viswanathan, Gauri (1998[1989]), *Masks of Conquest. Literary Study and British Rule in India*, Delhi/New York: Oxford University Press/Columbia University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (2003), 'Citizens All? Citizens Some! The Making of the Citizen', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 45: 4, 650-79.
- Werbner, Pnina (1998), 'Exoticising citizenship: Anthropology and the New Citizenship Debate', *Canberra Anthropology* 21: 2, 1-27.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira and Pnina Werbner (eds) (1999), *Women, Citizenship and Difference*, London: Zed.
- Zask, Joëlle (2001), 'L'élève et le citoyen, d'après John Dewey', in *Le Télémaque. Philosophie, Éducation, Société* 20: 53-64.