

Review Note Assignment for Module A 2004

The Notion Of Race In Citizenship/ Non-Citizenship_

Ala Al Azzeh

In this essay I argue that race plays an important part in determining who is a citizen and who is a non-citizen as a function of the development of European capitalism, colonialism, and the anti-colonialism struggle and the process of nation building in the third world. It is impossible to understand this without observing the relationship between nation, state, and citizenship.

The concept of the nation was a European construct throughout the historical/ economic/ social development of Europe. In the meantime, the concept of the nation was adopted by the national elites in the colonized world as an anti-imperialist tool. In these two form of usages of the concepts of nation, state, and citizen (the colonial and the European), we find as Hobsbawm argues[i], that nationalists used the formula of state = nation = people, upholding the myth of the existence of a pre-existent people, distinct from others by notions of race, authenticity and purity. The revolutionaries on the other hand used different formulas, claiming that a sovereign citizen people = a state = nation. A central part of this formula is the concept of citizenship which can be exercised within national territorial boundaries.

In the first case (the nationalist formula) the category of race, together with other concepts, exists by fictitiously essentialising a people, or gerrymandering history to demarcate the lines of the inclusion/exclusion polarity (which also includes concepts like gender, sexuality, immigrant, foreigner etc). This formula tends to serves to entrench these concepts rather than eliminate them. In this sense, the 'race line' became a 'unit' of capitalist classification appropriated from a former meaning which did not include exclusivist tendencies. The race line, of course was in need of forms of moral legitimation (racism) and a modern state to implement it, dividing the subjects of the state structure between benefactors and marginalized.

The historical record tends to show how as European empires advanced and developed the sophistication of their means of control, centralization and organization of their colonies, a parallel process of determining who could and could not be the benefit from this also emerged. In a way the record of studying how the entitling of citizenship and non-citizenship/alien status parallels the advance of economic means of production in increasingly modern forms of appropriation, and the control of markets.

Paula Banerjee demonstrates this when she write how, despite the fact that the Portuguese "were the first group in India to claim superiority based upon their difference from the people that they ruled" they were unsuccessful in "impos[ing] concepts of insider/outside on the non-Portuguese in these areas." This was because they were unable to create a closed territorial system, and a controlled market as existed in European concept of the nation state.

This came however after the Persian (Parsi) traders, who despite considering themselves 'foreign', did not do so with a sense of superiority.

The concepts of superiority and the powers to deepen control were greatly developed and implemented throughout the course of British imperialism. This came in parallel with the process of enhancing being part of an imagined community[ii] (a nation), where it became necessary to differentiate and distinguish oneself from 'the other'. Hence, the concept of the 'alien', as Ranabir Samaddar argues[iii], was the shadow concept to that of the citizen. The British often did this through the enactment of increasing numbers of laws to determine the boundaries of the benefactors.

In the colonized world, the second formula (a sovereign citizen people = a state = nation) was more favored (by the elite of the national movements) because of its connection to the Leftist heritage of a nation's right to self determination.

Meanwhile, the theoretical conception of the state in the colonized world, did not reflect its implementation on the ground. Rather than citizenship becoming the medium through which the 'popular will' could be realized, or as the fulfillment of individual liberties and entitlements(as the state was originally conceived by revolutionaries), it became a space of exchange, where citizens' rights were negotiated and exchanged. As such, rather than liberating and doing away with pre-existent social structures, superficial differences and power hierarchies, through enforcing the *equality* of citizenship upon all, the modern state in colonized societies tended to entrench these differences – including things like emphasizing superficial physical attributes (such as 'racial'; differences) or concepts of 'original resident' versus outsider. In this way, as Samaddar argues[iv], the concept of citizenship was 'vaporized', as the 'state' was also 'vaporizes' as an instrument of enforcing equality.

[i] Hobsbawm, Eric Nations and Nationalism, Arabic translation, 1999.

[ii] See Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, Verso, New York, 1991

[iii] Banerjee, Paula "Aliens in a Colonial World", featured in Refugees and the State, edited by Ranabir Samaddar, Sage Publications, 2003

[iv] Samaddar, Ranabir "The Nation's Two Subjects" featured in A Biography of the Indian Nation, Sage Publications, date unknown.

How the Notion of Race Plays an Important Part in Determining Who is Citizen and Who is Non-citizen: Based on Paula Banerjee: Aliens in a colonial world And R. Samaddar: The Nation Two Subjects

Fatma Agbaria

Paula Banerjee and **R. Samaddar** illustrate how group category constituted mainly in the colonial and nation-state time. They describe its development and formation and explore how notions of foreign and aliens evolved and merged into the project of state building and citizenship. Both of them show how while the categories of race, alien, foreigner evolved in the context of the colonial project they are reproduced problematically in the contemporary Indian nation's state.

Both describe national and post colonial states used, produced and reproduced categories of race to include or exclude parts of society. The creation of fictive ethnicity was crucial act for the national state and its citizen. In the globalization era and the severe life condition in the 'third world' population flow within and from the 'third world' raised the question of who the citizens are and who aliens are. Aliens and citizens become an international question.

Paula Banerjee in her article: Aliens in a colonial world shows how the British administration since the beginning of the 19th century tried to acquire political stability through the control of mobility of itinerant groups in India. Difference became the ground on which was posted the idea of aliens or Foreigners whose movement whose movements needed to be harnessed. Any license given to them had to specify the routes they could take and the areas they could visit. If a foreigner violated it he could be detained or deported. By marking some as outsiders/foreigners/refugees/aliens or insider/citizen the state was legitimizing its right to exclude or include.

In 1911 the Dominion was allowed to decide for itself what elements it desire to accept in its population. Thus it was becoming common practice for states to control the entrance of 'aliens' into their territories. Aliens became a category about whom there was much uncertainty and suspicion. The other category whose relation with the state became tenuous as a result of this Act were women. By this Act the rights of nationality could be transferred only through the male line. Acts of Aliens Restriction of 1914 and 1919 imbued a racial dimension. The state control of the movement of those aliens who were considered racially inferior began to be legitimized. But there was hardly control of movement of European people.

The next round of Acts concerning foreigners or aliens appeared during the Second World War. It was here that the post-colonial Government inherited the British attitude to territoriality and made it a principle of its own policies of governance. For foreigners it was not permitted to leave India without the written permission of the Government. The State stopped completely the entrance of foreigners into India.

Nationalists of the post colonial state appropriated the discourses of the colonialists when it suited their purpose. They used Foreigners Acts for treating Indians as foreigners in India. **This showed that, the Foreigners Act came long before the Citizen Act.**

Ranabir Samaddar in his article: The Nation's Two Subjects concerned of the problematic definition of the concept citizenship both with the European and in its implementation in the Indian subcontinent. Despite the ideas of equal citizenship it is always been a tool of hierarchy and bringing in Gramsci citizenship is shown by Samaddar to be a product of national domination and hegemony.

He argues that the nation is composed of two subjects: citizen and alien. Alien is most often marginal groups, refugees, or immigrant from 'near abroad'. Apparently not both nations' subjects are citizens. In the national states only citizens gain protection that is why the alien seeks citizenship to guarantee their security. Nations gain legitimacy based on fictive ethnic majority whom get protection.

The 'aliens' unambiguously negotiate for citizenship rights to obtain security. 'aliens' were subject to violence. The decolonization of the subcontinent led to massive migration. **The category of 'immigration' has given rise to a new**

type of racism, a racism which does not depend on 'biological distinctions', but on cultural differentials and thus becomes a theory of racism without races. For example: Partition of the subcontinent of India, has brought into existence nation-states on clearly demarcated grounds of religion and territory.

In the new formation of states in the subcontinent aliens reappear within the country from 'near abroad'.

In national states while there was ethnic basis nationalism has always been a product of fictive ethnicity. Immigration category today helps the nation in constituting its fictive ethnicity. Thus we have the 'ever-recurring' paradox: the regressive imagining of a nation-state where the individuals would by their nature be "at home", because they would be "among their own", and the rendering of that state uninhabitable. This is a mark of political alienation of the nation – a nation that is alienated within.

Beginning with 1947, the narrative of the alien reaches the next racial chapter in the evolution of Indian nationalism in 1971.

Theory of citizenship for the Indian nation of today calls for a study of the histories of migration and also of the specific factor the 1980s and 1990s the factor of integrated market.

The problem of the alien facing the nation is not have been however unique to this country. The state is severely threatened with massive migrations of population, ethnic extremities, hunger and pestilence in large parts of the globe. The alien question remains a question of national state but in this liberal world system, poverty, hunger and pestilence in large parts of the globe threaten the stability of the international system.

Massive immigration realities have made race, ethnicity, citizenship and alienness the big question mark before the career of the state. Race (biologically and constructed) become one of the mechanisms which define who the citizens are and an aliens are.

The post-colonial State maintained its right to control refugees and women as it portrayed by the Imperial state. Banerjee, argues that women's-rights movement forced the State to clarify its position regarding women. Samaddar, argues that also human rights movements and internationalization of the globe have made the 'alien' question paramount. I think the 'alien' and 'women' question are very big question for the 21st century to deal witnessing the domination of the liberal market that privatizing almost every aspect of human life not promising.

'Aliens in a Colonial World' by Paula Banerjee and 'A Nation's Two Subjects' by R. Samaddar reviewed

Deeptima Massey

In the provocative article under review, both Paula Banerjee and Ranabir Samaddar call into question the role of state and colonial administration in defining who is a citizen and how he is distinct from a non-citizen (or an 'alien' as referred to in the articles)

Samaddar begins by taking up the idea of citizenship where an individual becomes a citizen by actively enrolling in the state's political process. This demands being a part of the state politics and also the ability to survive within a hierarchy of power distribution. Encapsulated within this political participation, a sense of belonging or an affinity develops in the individual. It is also maintained that this individual who is eventually designated as a citizen becomes a political person within the nation. As an example with a similar vision, it is explained and argued upon that the ruling politicians encouraged rapid infiltration of people into West Bengal. The motive was votes and votes alone. Once the aforementioned echelon was attained, the individual could readily be certified as a citizen by the ruling authorities. This was irrespective of his ethnicity and political relations could easily supersede the racial identity of the person.

Once this individual who was a commoner had been qualified as a citizen it became his duty to be a part of the political happenings (processes) within the state. At the same time, on his way to become a citizen he had to keep several other dimensions in mind. He had to know and remember his unique identity not only within the state but at the same time within his own group as well. He also needed to adjust and identify himself within the politics of existing class, caste, race and gender in the state. Further, in the process of his individual growth it was essential that it blended with a collective identity, ie. his role or position within the mass or culture. More crucially to survive in a state and to distinguish himself from others, the author points out, that the citizen had to search out 'his other'. It is here that the 'alien' or a 'non-citizen' emerges.

There is much to admire about who is this alien, where does he come from and how does he become an alien. Paula Banerjee argues that alien is not a person who has come from a foreign land, but is one who has his existence within the nation along with the citizen. If on one hand a nation has produced a citizen, at the same time it has also created an alien. However, the identity of aliens was distinguished from a citizen by formulating the Aliens Restriction Act of 1914. In a deliberate attempt of erasure, a racial dimension was imbued in this Act. It was portrayed through this Act that the State's primary relation with the alien was one of restriction. State was deemed to control the movement of those individuals who were racially inferior and who could not actively participate and enrol in the political activities of the ruling parties. Aliens have been forced to form a niche continuously facing insults and torture. With an unfulfilled desire for citizenship they were forced to negotiate on their social rights. Discrimination has been a ground to consolidate and control the movement of aliens in all British colonies, including those in India. The overall point that Banerjee makes is that in the process of state formation, the colonial government had included some people and excluded many others. The choice was made according to the requirements of the rulers to earn dividends for themselves. Although ethnic tensions were diffused to segregate an alien from the citizen, however we don't realise that it is the alien who actually built the theory of citizenship of the Indian nation and made a notable contribution to the history of migration.

A powerful argument is built by Pradip Kumar Bose in this regard. He interprets the role of an alien or a non-citizen in preserving Indian nationalism. According to him, an alien should be considered a subject of memory under which they reappear and enjoy their social autonomy. They remind us of partition, of a tantalising past, of an ethnic wound. They also add to the grammar of separation, disintegration and a paradise lost. Here their role changes. A cognitive shift from being excluded, unwanted turns into portrait where their memories and testimonies enrich our history. It is here that the notion of race and colour becomes primeval and an alien reemerges being an active citizen of the nation.

Short Review Note on "How Violence and Dispute are Important Features of the Formation of Nation-state" based on two articles from *Refugee Watch*:

K.M.Parivelan

The article written by Bandita on "Displacing the People the Nation Marches Ahead in Sri Lanka" is written in a very lucid manner with lot of empirical details. The author mentions that the very attempt to 'ensure conformity and religious/ cultural homogeneity' is seen as cause for forcing people into exile as refugees and forced migrants. It is merely mentioned that mass displacement of people is primarily rooted in the historic nature and structure of the state and its formation. Attempt could have been made to bring historical details from the colonial period onwards, by which the Sinhala-Bhuddist and Tamil-Hindu identity respectively, started taking shape and the post-independence state formation with Language policy of 1956 and religious policy of 70's could have been discussed in detail. The ramifications of language and religious policy in the socio-economic and cultural levels could have been useful.

The theoretical and conceptual clarity is lacking as to what is identity formation or nation or ethnic identity. Along with the empirical analysis theoretical perspective could have been blended in systematic way. Since there is abrupt shift to war, military expenditures, environment, etc. there seem to be discontinuity in the argument that violence and dispute are important features of the formation of 'nation' and 'nation-state'.

The details on Sri Lankan State expenditure on defence is useful but there is no mention of Tamil separatist groups spending or fund raising methods. The analysis on war and displacement is very useful in understanding the IDPs. Particularly the highlighting the incidence of 'multiple displacements' is very pertinent.

Nevertheless, *highlight* of the article is the region-wise district wise situational analysis so as to get a glimpse of ground realities in a comparative perspective. Almost all the regions of north and eastern sector seem to be devastated and impoverished due to the civil war. Except that the present situation in east, in the post-Karuna dissent phase, is little different than mentioned in this article, in terms of control of the region by LTTE seems to be nominal.

The role and position of Muslims is mentioned very briefly, but it could have elaborated in the context of their claim for third party role in the recent peace process. The problems faced by displaced women and children are dealt well with its due importance. It is aptly mentioned how there exists a significant political maneuvering of the internal conflict and refugee crisis in Sri Lanka between the Sri Lankan state and the LTTE, both of whom have used these crises for their own political advantage. It has been while the state has used denial of emergency aid and assistance to the people as a political weapon to force people to surrender, the LTTE has used these crises to expose the government, to harden attitudes against the state and to increase recruitment.

It was referred that government in the past sanctioned the controversial 'peace through war' strategy. It is seemingly very apt statement at this present juncture. It could be possible for the Chandrika government to revise that same old policy of 'peace through war' given the nature of internal dissent and rivalry prevailing within LTTE. There is only hope against hope for the revival of dialogue and implement the outcome of peace process.

The second article by Nayana Bose, "*Mohajirs: The Refugees By Choice*" well analysed and brings a comprehensive portrayal of Mohajirs' plight and the gradual erosion of their position in Pakistan polity and society. It starts with a good definition, "A Mohajir is a person who has moved into Pakistan as a result of Partition or for fear of disturbances connected therewith". Approximately eight million people migrated to West Pakistan from India. Again this article lacks a concrete theoretical perspective and rather turns in to an empirical record of chronological events relating to Mohajirs. There could have been a focus on the 'identity' building process with the historical root causes and juxtaposition to the present situation. In the similar situation as seen in Sri Lankan case seem to have occurred in Mohajirs' case also in terms of 'Language bill', 'Quota system' and the nationalisation of industry and financial institutions, which was very detrimental to them and shaped their grievances in to a identity formation.

The emergence of MQM is very well dealt in this article, with lot of details with how the theme of ethnic assertion shifts to women's rights and working class issues. The pragmatic policy of shifting political alliance which otherwise could be termed opportunistic is also depicted.

In both the cases, the Tamils of Sri Lanka and Mohajirs of Pakistan did face the situation of violence and civil disorder which was the root cause of separate identity formation leading to perceiving themselves as separate 'nation'. Of course in the Mohajirs' case the focus has shifted from the ethnic distinction to economic and social issues with in the polity of Pakistan. Where as the case of Tamils in Sri Lanka is still not clear as to whether they are dropping the separate Eelam (homeland) demand. The very crux of peace process "Tamils to have internal self-determination with a federal framework of unified Sri Lanka" is yet to be realised in its implementation. Many delicate 'issues' and 'positions' are packaged in a delicate and subtle way in this mutually agreed statement at Oslo round of peace talks earlier. It has to be awaited as to what position the government and LTTE are going to take given the situation of Karuna announcing a new party.

Both the articles in their own way are very useful in getting the empirical details of nation formation for both Tamils and Mohajirs respectively. In addition they have given us comprehensive glimpse of the socio-economic and political dimensions of nation-state building process in the South Asian region.

Nationalism, Ethnicity, Racism, Xenophobia Nationalism

Munawwar Rahi

Nationalism is a core piece of politics for both who utter handling the activities of the state as well as for people whoever citizen of the nation. much site about citizenship in the world like the citizen no longer makes or unmakes the state and politics, the citizen is a normative point in the network of exchanged benefits and beliefs. the citizen is a result of reciprocity between the rulers and the ruled based on laws and procedures unable to the maintenance of the community. the citizen is one who has progressively won three kinds of rights__ civil, political and social, over the past three centuries (Marshall, 1965)

The contemporary citizen is a pluralist citizen, whose multiple memberships in non-official, voluntary associations dissipate or weaken his attention on the state; to the modern theorists like Almond and Verba however this pluralist citizenship (Almond and Verba 1963, p.323).

Finally, and it is not that the modern political theory always confines citizenship to a transactional identity only. modern political theory replacing the classical one has not cared to come up with an adequate theory in which the citizen can be every thing except a political person with regard to Indian theory of citizenship the idea of citizen as the master, the maker and unmaker of political was not there. Even today our votes with the electoral pendulum showing violent swings and waves reflect the morality of mutual obligation. The government fails the people rejects. The Indian constitution in its preamble says, 'we the people of India given up to ourselves and is careful is not saying 'we the citizen of India. The citizen is then created and legally defined and acknowledged by the constitution. It is then a transactional identity the citizen as a member of the state encharge political allegiance for the right to certain privileges and protections. The entire exchange occurs in the

public sphere, so much so that we may be tempted to arrange that citizenship is the 'right to act in the public realm'. But with the Indian state increasingly unable to provide security to peoples life and livelihood, we are faced with the poser:

Nationalism is a strong caustive factor for forced migration. A current episode in this refrence is the event happened at SARADA Block of udaipur Distt. where minorities people are unable to reach there because the minorities people are impose anti national element in this area. Simillar episode were already happened in gujrat estate fes-may 2002 in villages of Modasa & Himat Nagar.

Ehtnicity

All asian states are multi ethnic. all aslan states, but especially Indian & china had people who could claim national ancestry or etancity so jousing in other countries. These overseas, were often symbols and sources of unease for new states where clonical policy had set ethnic groups against each other. by the same taaken, new states seeking international legitimacy. confronted peoples with in their territorial borders whose lived and nominal identitites borre only faint resemblance to the professed national identity of the news state. Infact the people associated with one country who found themselves living in another country had no recourse to exit. the unintended consequence was that the category of permanent ethamic minority whose true home land lies outside them natal country outside but dangerously close had been created. little wonder that the minority, whether Indian or Chinese, easily slides into a fifth column in moments of domestic strife and tension.

Racism

Protection of minorities has become a catch word for the liberal a genda in south Asia. This is precisely why we tend to ignore its complexities. protection of minorities it impossible given the way the states of the South Asia are developing both politically and economically and assuming the form of nationalising states.i.e. states which are not sufficiently nation but must develop into nations to gain leg it i may such states therefore, go on produccing of necessity, majorities and minorities for they can survively only on the basis of a continuing and permanent agenda of building an ethnic core and there by marginalising others. Forced Migration is directly related to race, ethnicity, language, culture or religionb deng has found to se present to some entent in virutually every major case of forced displacement. The divisions it causes under mine national unity. they make illusory any sense of political or social solidarity .(Dang, 1977)

Xenophobia

In a study of displaces person conducted in the after math of partition and again in the six he's Kanti Parkrashi points out that though a forced movement of population results invariably in loss of citizenship to the refugees. yet in the case of East Bengal refuges there was certainly no question of granting them new nationality truely speking they were no refugees, tey were displaced people from one socio-political -environment to another moreover with the common background of bengali tradittion a pervassive hindu religion, ties of common national kindship simiular system of cultural values, and familiar pattern for community behaviour, the displaced person concerned should not have any formidable hindrances to resolve problems of accomdation and ass imilation . yet the feeling of, what he calls,"we group" and "they group" persisted insituting a sharp contrast between the refugees and the non refugees.

Conclusion

Nationalism, Ethnicity, Racism, Enophobia and other issues are the major factors related to forced migration problem. one or two or more of these factors strongly drive forced migration problem. We can have model for it $FMP = NSLM + ETHN + RACM + XENPHOB + OTHERS$

Where FMP stands for forced migration

NLSM stands for forced Nationalism

ETHN stands for forced Ethnicity

RACM stands for forced Racism

XENPHOB stands for forced Xenophobia

OTHERS stands for forced other than above four elements

A Review Article on the basis of the reading of Paula Banerjee's "Aliens In A Colonial World" and R. Samaddar's "A Nation's Two Subjects" on how the notion of race plays an important part in determining who is a citizen and who is a non-citizen.

Vanita Sharma

Before leaving for India to conduct research in Delhi, I asked the advice of my supervisor about how I could get access to the National Archives. She told me that I needed a letter of introduction from the British Consulate because I am a British citizen. Naively I asked, "Doesn't the fact that I am Indian make any difference?" "No," she replied, "because you are *not* Indian. You were born in England and live here, so you will have to get permission." I was taken aback, because I suppose I presumed that the fact that I was "ethnically" Indian would mean that I would have the same rights as any Indian

citizen to look at those records. In England, the fact that I was Indian as well as British was always a factor that I remembered, as on ethnic diversity forms I always had to tick the box for Indian. My white, English supervisor sympathized with the irony of the situation, explaining to me, "I was born in India and spent my childhood there, as my father worked for the Raj but I too have to get permission, as I am British." This was the first time I began to seriously think about the complicated relationship between citizenship and race. This ambiguity has continued to be at the forefront of my mind, as it has had a vital impact on my PhD research on the partition of India and Pakistan. Being a British citizen meant that I was able to visit and work in Pakistan without the restrictions faced by Indian citizens, but being of an Indian family meant that in practice some of the people I interviewed were nervous to talk to me. Whereas in India, whilst my Indian heritage gave me no special rights or privileges, it meant that the refugees I interviewed were often very accepting and forthcoming with me, marginalizing my British identity and taking me as one of their own.

Despite increasing moves towards globalization, our legal citizenship thus continues to have a crucial role in determining the course of our lives. Citizenship is a marker of "belonging", as well as an award of entitlement to certain "rights" and "privileges" within the nation to which we are affiliated. These rights vary between countries, but can include the right to equality, the right to work, the right to reside and buy property, the right to state welfare and the right to expect the state to ensure our protection from attack. As well as shaping how we are treated in our country of domicile, citizenship also has an important impact on how we are treated abroad. For instance, it determines our entitlement to travel to different countries and how much freedom we have once we get there. European citizens for example benefit from freedom of movement and the right to work in all EU countries; whilst Indian and Pakistani citizens when visiting each other's countries have to comply with police registration requirements during their stay, which other foreigners do not need to fulfill.

Whilst there may appear to be a transparent correlation between citizenship with race and / or place of birth, my own experiences have given me an insight into how in practice, the relationship is much more problematic and ambiguous. The conflation between race and citizen is undermined by the existence of ethnic, linguistic, religious diversities within nations. In practice populations are not static and homogenous, but fluid and heterogeneous featuring a regular influx of new migrants. Since race, nationality and citizenship are not inter-changeable concepts, the state thus appropriates the power to regulate citizenship. Ultimately, state recognition determines our citizenship. The articles by Sammadar and Bannerjee rigorously investigate the dialectical relationship between citizen and alien, exploring how the state determines who it will recognize and who it will not – and the implications of this attribution of status. Both argue that the attainment of citizenship status is crucial. Sammadar explains that the whole relationship of the people with the state depends on the recognition of them as citizens – because without being able to participate in the exchange of "transactional rights", (where the state agrees to award certain privileges in return for loyalty), they are left in a situation of complete powerlessness. There are a variety of methods of attaining citizenship – through birthright, via our parents or through migration. It is the latter route which is shown to be the most difficult, as it complicates the relationship between race and citizenship – particularly in the case of refugees. As Sammadar points out, the strict regularization of who is defined as an "insider" and "outsider" is an important way in which the post-colonial state attempts to define both its national borders and national identity. Those who are unable to inherit citizenship rights through being born in the country or from their parents, are regarded as non-citizens and are deprived of rights. The notion of "transactional rights" between state and citizen does not apply to them and the state has no obligations of allegiance to them. As Bannerjee highlights, this has particularly serious repercussions for refugees, who are thus given the benefit of care from their host state through notions of charity, but not due to the recognition of "human rights". For refugees trying to attain citizenship status, the barrier of race is an obstacle they have to struggle to overcome. Their current acceptance into the nation is due to their "outsider" status, which they have difficulty in transcending because national identity is so often predicated on the state's ability to differentiate between "outsider" and "insider". Due to economic, political and social upheaval, migrations and forced migrations in South Asia and globally are continuing on a large scale. Sammadar and Bannerjee's articles highlight how the regulation and frequent exclusion of citizenship and its associated rights to these migrants, on the basis of racial difference, is a serious issue which needs urgent attention.