

Culture Centric Citizenship and Marginality

Mr. Namit Vikram Singh, Assistant Professor, Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies, New Delhi
Dr. Durgesh Tripathi, Assistant Professor, USMC, GGS IP University, Delhi

Abstract

The paper focuses on the aspect of understanding cultural marginality and the different debates revolving around the issue. In light of that, the focus is towards analyzing how the issues of cultural marginality are being addressed in the context of citizenship. The attempt is to explore the idea about cultural citizenship that delves into the question of cultural marginality. The issues of marginality are deep rooted and very much present in the social, economic and political spheres of the society. However, the rise of identity consciousness among distinct groups within the Indian society has led to the emergence of cultural front as a pivotal domain of attention. The assimilation of different cultural forms and the conflicts arising between the dominant and the vernacular cultural forms has developed areas of concern which have become organic to the issue of citizenship. As a result, it becomes pivotal to understand the overall impact it has on the society on the basis of the concerned issues.

Introduction

The paper is focused on understanding the concept of cultural marginality and the different debates revolving around the very issue. In light of that, the focus is also towards analyzing how the issues of cultural marginality are being addressed in the context of citizenship. The attempt is to explore the idea about cultural citizenship that delves into the question of cultural marginality. The issues of marginality are deep rooted and very much present in the social, economic and political spheres of the society. However, the rise of identity consciousness among distinct groups within the Indian society has led to the emergence of cultural front as a pivotal domain of attention. The assimilation of different cultural forms and the conflicts arising between the dominant and the vernacular cultural forms has developed areas of concern which have become organic to the issue of citizenship.

The cultural aspect of marginality was rarely given relevance earlier. Issues of cultural discrimination and alienation etc, were mostly associated with the social aspect of marginality rather than having an independent dimension of understanding. Gradually, it became evident that the cultural aspect could no longer be sidelined and would have to be critically analyzed, as an independent layer of marginality which is multi-fold. Cultural marginality is responsible for generating a feeling of deprivation within the individual which impacts his cognitive ability of locating his identity in a situation of cultural clash between the dominant and vernacular cultural forms. This very feeling is also responsible for impacting his social, economic and political role within the society. Such issues of marginality are evidently present in the urbanized settlements due to the process of cross-cultural exchange. It is important to dwell upon the cultural factors of marginality as these elements also reinforce themselves in the social space and affect other aspects of the society namely social, political and economic. These issues can no longer be understood or analyzed in the form of sub-set rather it is necessary to critically engage them in a separate, individual space and then try to thread the linkages it has with other domains. It is also imperative to understand that such issues of marginality do not remain largely confined to the minorities but rather affects each and every individual in the society. Therefore, the concern emerges as to how the marginality created within the cultural space can be solved or addressed from the viewpoint of citizenship.

The notion of citizenship has not been uniform; rather it has been changing with time. However, scholars like Toby Miller (2001) have argued that since citizenship is multifaceted and its different layers namely social, economic and political can be easily distinguished and defined. He, therefore, asserts to the importance of cultural layer of citizenship which should also be identified independently. He dwells into the notion of cultural citizenship and explains its focus on maintenance and development of the cultural lineage through customs, language and positive acknowledgement of difference in and by the mainstream. To him, the cultural citizenship is essential in safeguarding the cultural rights of the individuals and providing greater scope for engagement by protecting the citizen's access to his socio-cultural heritage. Cultural citizenship will be essential in understanding the problem of cultural marginality and how to approach to the solution rationally. It is because neither political nor social notions of citizenship are able to capture the idea and scope of cultural marginality and the dignity. As a result, the reliance on there on cultural citizenship is greater.

Understanding Marginality and Citizenship

The concept of marginality was first coined by Robert Park in 1928. The very concept has had a historical significance in terms of evolving the sociological thinking. The term marginality may have ambiguous implications but Robert Park has tried to explain it from the perspective of marginal man. He questioned as to who is a marginal man? How can one be identified as marginal? Marginality is generally seen as a situation rooted in socio-cultural, political and economic spheres of the society where disadvantaged people struggle to gain access (societal and spatial) to resources and full participation in social life. In other words, marginalised people might be socially, economically, politically and legally ignored, excluded or neglected, and are therefore, vulnerable to livelihood change (Gurung and Kollmair, 2005, p10). Specifically, it can be understood as *"the temporary state of having been put aside of living in relative isolation, at the edge of a system (cultural, social, political or economic) ... in mind, when one excludes certain domains or phenomena from one's thinking because they do not correspond to the mainstream philosophy"* (Gurung and Kollmair, 2005, p10). It is interesting to note that marginality is closely associated to the psychological attributes of an individual i.e., the fear or threat of being sidelined or excluded which can gradually manifest a form in any existing sphere of the society. Also degree of marginality cannot be exactly identified numerically as such a complexity can exist within a community which may be high or low in number. Confining the issue of marginality to a specific domain would be ethically wrong as marginality is deep-rooted and multi-dimensional. It may have different forms existing within the society but these very forms will do share a common overlapping ground.

Gurung and Kollmair (2005) in their work "Marginality: Concepts and their Limitations" have largely identified marginality into two broad categories of spatial and societal marginality. Societal marginality is largely incepted and reflected by the unpleasant social conditions of people. The very conditions can be in the form of poor livelihood options like lack of resources, skills and opportunities, poor to no participation in public decision-making process, lower sense of community and poor self-esteem. People within this category are the ones who are usually discriminated against, stigmatized and ignored or suppressed on the basis of race, gender, age, culture, religion, ethnicity, occupation, education and economy.

Spatial marginality, on the other hand, revolves around the issue of geographical remoteness of an area from major community habitats. Here the scale seems to be the important factor for consideration. Marginality here can be expressed in terms of exclusion from a wider established societal base due to incompatibility with the pre-laid conditions of entry. The individual here may

experience marginality which will impact different aspects of his life namely social, political and economic (Gurung and Kollmair, 2005, p11).

However, these very categories are not enough to pinpoint the kinds of marginality that exist within the society, as marginality as explained before, is multi-dimensional and overlapping in nature. The possibilities of having societal marginality due to the existence of spatial marginality can be quite high and vice-versa. Robert Park and other social scholars like Billson (1988) and Lee (1995) who agree to his argument classify marginality in terms of social marginality, cultural marginality (will be covered in the next section) and structural marginality. Social marginality as explained by Janet Mancini Billson (1988) refers to a situation where an individual cannot fully belong to a positive reference group because of age, timing, and situational constraints or when an occupational role is defined as marginal. This type of marginality is generally produced due to a person's or group's role in a society. His or her location in the social structure does not make any difference. Social marginality keeps on changing with the changing contexts. For example, in the case of adolescents, restriction of institutionalized roles prevents them from acquiring full group membership in certain institutions. Structural marginality, on the other hand, refers to the political, social and economic powerlessness of certain disenfranchised/disadvantaged segments within the societies (Billson, 1988, p2). This kind of marginality springs from location in the socio-economic structure of the society rather than from cultural or social dilemmas. Besides these three types of marginality, several different dimensions of marginality can be delineated for better understanding the situation of marginality. For instance economic (unequal access to resources within society) and political (inability to make political choices) dimensions of marginality can be present within different types of marginality.

Citizenship can be understood as the privileges of membership of a particular kind of political community, one in which those who enjoy a certain status are entitled to participate on an equal basis with their fellow citizens in making the collective decisions that regulate their social life (Bellamy & Palumbo, 2010). Traditionally speaking, citizenship has largely been understood and defined in terms of its political aspect. However, it is one way of understanding citizenship. But there have emerged other aspects as well, which provide a different understanding to the notion of citizenship. It is so because the nature of the democratic political community and the qualities needed to be a citizen, have both undergone a change over a course of time (Mohanty and Tandon, 2006).

The notion of citizenship shares a strong bond with the idea of nation state. By nation state it means a state that identifies itself as driving towards political legitimacy through serving as a sovereign entity. Here the nation depicts a sovereign territorial unit and the state is seen as a political and geopolitical entity. The term nation state implies the coinciding of these two terms geographically.

Analyzing citizenship in the contemporary context implies the capacity to participate in both the political and socio-economic life of the community. The citizens should have a sense of belonging to a particular territorial region in which they reside and the ability to recognize the centre of power entitled to regulate their behaviour. Therefore, a working democracy may require some elements of common civic culture, broad acceptance of the legitimacy of the prevailing rules of politics and a common language or languages for political debate. Also the degree of trust and solidarity amongst the citizens would be important as well. The three key elements pivotal for citizenship that can be understood are 1) membership of a democratic political community; 2) the collective benefits and rights associated with membership; 3) participation in the community's political, economic and social processes. Keeping all these aspects in mind, citizenship may be understood as a condition for civic equality which consists of membership of a political community where all the citizens can

determine the terms and benefits of social cooperation on an equal basis (Bellamy & Palumbo, 2010).

T.H. Marshall has provided a three-dimensional model of citizenship consisting of civil, political and social elements where he does not agree that specific aspects of citizenship like the political aspect should be given greater importance. He explains that in the emergence of the notion of citizenship, civil rights came first and then it was followed by political rights. Social rights which garnered relevance in the 20th century, was earlier largely sidelined. Though he argues that the civil and social elements are pivotal parts of citizenship, but they require the support of the political element. He emphasizes on this argument because he relates citizenship to status which in a society should be equal with respect to the rights and duties with which status is endowed. He tries to point out that there cannot be any universal principle to determine those rights and duties in a society. A developing institution may create an image of an ideal citizenship against which the achievement can be measured and towards which aspirations can be directed (Marshall, 1950, p. 150). For him, citizenship should fulfil the primary principle of equality.

Despite the argument, it is the political element which is given a greater emphasis because participation of citizens would result in the setting up of a political framework which would help in regulating the social and economic life along with various other political institutions like the legal system, police, bureaucracy etc. This very framework will also provide a sense of security to the key actors i.e., the citizens and help in the creation of stable conditions for various forms of social and cultural interactions. The social and moral dispositions that are linked to citizenship can be considered as important supplements to any political framework. It is so because rules and regulation cannot cover everything and their being followed cannot depend on coercion alone.

Scholars here argue that most of the complex problems raise a range of moral concerns some of which may conflict and be difficult to solve like cultural problems. The political regulations may help in coordinating people's interactions in ways which would allow them to know where they stand in regard to others. However, the very form of citizenship may be more passive in nature rather than being active and may have a good possibility of skipping the process of social and cultural pluralism of the modern societies (Koenig, 2011).

In any democratic society, people would like to be treated as equals by the government and enjoy the freedom to pursue their lives as they choose on equal terms like everyone else. At the same time, they would also like to have a reasonable amount of personal security through the maintenance of an appropriate degree of social, cultural and political stability. The scholars argue here that merely political involvement of the citizens would not help in shaping the framework and achieving fuller participation. It is, therefore, essential that citizenship focuses on other domains which lie at the bottom of the hierarchy like cultural security etc, which in turn may help in ushering greater participation due to strong safety (security) nets by complementing other elements of active citizenship (Kabeer, 2005).

However, there may exist an issue that involvement of citizens over common issues would be few in numbers. A greater portion would prefer to act as free riders. But this cannot be sustained in the long run as these very citizens would be impacted individually and would gradually have to approach the situation as a collective (Mohanty & Tandon, 2006). As a result, it is imperative that the concept of citizenship is properly grounded to address the given issues.

Conceptualizing Cultural Marginality

The concept of cultural marginality has gained relevance in the contemporary era. Earlier it was associated with social marginality due to cultural and social aspects overlapping each other. It was

felt that the issue of cultural marginality could not be interpreted simply within social marginality as it would not be able to justify existing problems having cultural elements to its required extent. There may exist possibilities of social elements overshadowing the cultural elements (or the opposite) leading to inability of fully understanding the existing issues within the society. As a result, scholars began to interpret the concerns within the society distinctively from both social and cultural perspectives to identify the differences and the points of convergence between the two for greater clarity.

Cultural Marginality as defined by Janet Mancini Billson (1988) in “No Owner of Soil” refers to the dilemmas of cross cultural contact and assimilation that dominated the classical statements. Here race, ethnicity, religion and other cultural differences are seen as the defining variables which emerge out of the hierarchical valuation between two or more cultures within which the individuals participate. The individual is identified as either belonging to the in-group or the out-group. Cultural marginality is seen to have a kind of psycho-social impact on the individual’s personality and creates ambiguities in terms of his/her status and role in the society.

Econompoulos (1999) has tried to explain cultural marginalization from the perspective of migration. Migration of workforce from rural to urban settlements does not only lead to exchange of services but also exchange of cultural values and traits. A process of cross cultural assimilation takes place. However, this process is not always sound as it depends upon the aspects for example, the features, the alien cultural form shared in common with the existing dominant cultural forms. In case of absence of any common cultural aspect, there develops a friction between the two or more cultural forms. Due to the failure of such assimilation, the group of individuals influenced by both the cultural forms, experience a situation of marginality where they fail to identify which group they actually belong to. This very form of marginality has been interpreted as cultural marginality. It involves a shock to the individual or the group due to failure of recognition. Horback and Jackson (2014) both agree with the argument presented by Econompoulos. They feel that in the contemporary scenario with the rapid process of urbanization, there have emerged domains of cross-cultural convergence. The individuals are no longer influenced by uniform cultural form. They rather have allegiances to multiple cultures simultaneously. In this very process, an individual may experience cultural marginality as a feeling of passive between-ness between two or more cultures. They fail to perceive themselves as centrally belonging to either one. Gist (1967) does agree to an extent but he also presents a different viewpoint of understanding cultural marginality. According to him, the conflict between the social and cultural aspects creates a domain of marginality poised by psychological uncertainty. There emerge traits such as anxiety, divided loyalties, hypersensitivity etc which lead to identity confusion. This confusion of identity within society is seen as cultural marginality. This type of marginality is constantly under struggle between two or more cultural forms, each trying to influence or overthrow another, thus creating identity confusion for anyone at different multiple layers.

Gist (1967), therefore, explains cultural marginality as the marginal or peripheral position of an individual or a group with respect to the beliefs, traditions, social organization and system of values that distinguish it from other cultural groups or communities. These cultural elements are reciprocal with the social elements and each exerts influence or reinforces the other. This leads to the possibility of two outcomes namely, a) complete cultural similarity followed by absolute social rejection and b) complete absence of acculturation accompanied with complete social acceptance. According to Gist, cultural marginality lies somewhere between these two extremes. Ralph Pieris (1951) in his article “Bilingualism and Cultural Marginality” raises an important point that is, cultural marginality does not necessarily gives rise to frustration as it is commonly expected. The marginal community may develop new cultural synthesis which would help in providing the

individuals set of norms, patterns and goals which in turn would provide them adequate measure of security.

Both Horback & Jackson (2014) and Chrysoula Econompoulos (1999) agree with the argument of Janet Bennett who elaborates that cultural marginality encompasses two outcomes namely a) encapsulated marginality and b) constructive marginality. Encapsulated marginality is indicative of loneliness, alienation, self-segregation and internal distress. The degree of similarity between internalized cultures is seen as a factor in the intensity of disintegration for the encapsulated marginal. Thus, more vastly are the different cultural forms, the more prone is the individual to internal cultural shock (Horback and Jackson, 2014, p2). The state of cultural conflict where one form trying to influence other, may leave the encapsulated marginal to feel culturally homeless. This is so because they fail to resolve the interplay between multiple cultural identities which leads to greater degree of alienation (Horback & Jackson, 2014).

As a result, the marginals are unable to make clear decisions as they fail to shift the cultural frames of reference effectively and are therefore; pulled into often contradictory directions in all the actions they take (Econompoulos, 1999). Constructive marginality, on the other hand, involves conscious construction of identity by the individual where he/she is able to shift effortlessly between the cultural identities and create an integrated multicultural existence (Horback & Jackson, 2014, p 2). Individuals here try to look into their own self-reference and awareness for their identity as opposed to the established definitions provided by singular cultures. However, in the presence of identity crisis the encapsulated marginal cannot move beyond to the stage of constructive marginality. Despite that, it is seen that the knowledge produced for the constructive marginal is gained from the context of the situation and from the benefit of being a simultaneous participant and observer of cultures. This dual role helps in equipping a constructive marginal with more objective position as he/she is less subject to the biases inherent when functioning in the framework of just one culture (Econompoulos, 1999, p9).

Janet Mancini Billson (1988) in her work "No Owner of Soil" tries to classify between cultural and social marginality and in her classification she has highlighted certain important dimensions of cultural marginality. She argues that within cultural marginality there exists essential and processual marginality where more essential the marginality, the more likely it will result in maladjustment or change. She also presents the elements of salience (the more central the marginal situation to a person's identity, the greater the degree of maladjustment), visibility (the more visibly marginal the person, the greater the degree of maladjustment), cultural conflict (the greater the extent and degree of differences in the cultural forms of the two identity providing groups, the greater the degree of maladjustment), attitude of feeder-group (the more the marginal person's feeder group protests, resent or resists his or her movement into the recipient group, the greater the maladjustment) and direction of identification (the closer to equal identification with both groups, the greater the degree of maladjustment) as significant factors (Billson, 1988).

Econompoulos (1999), however, points out that cultural marginality can be better understood through critical analysis of different stages of identity formation. She presents 3 stages of identity formation which are critical to the understanding of cultural marginality namely a) the diffusion/foreclosure stage; b) the moratorium stage; and c) the achieved identity stage. In the diffusion/foreclosure stage, under foreclosure, the individuals assume the values, traditions and attitudes of their particular ethnic group without questioning the origins of these cultural attributes. However, the multi-cultural individuals get entrapped in the stage of foreclosure because they fail to examine issues of ethnic differences for themselves. Similarly under diffusion, there is an absence of questioning one's own ethnicity. The individuals are characterized by their overall lack of

awareness of personal ethnicity which under foreclosure is present. Under both these sub-stages there is an overall lack of critical thinking on the matters of ethnicity (Econompoulos, 1999, p10).

Under moratorium stage, the individuals begin to explore culture. They attempt to gain greater knowledge of their particular culture in order to help resolve the questions about themselves and their people. It is seen as a stage of relative immersion into the culture that was present in the home and is comparable to the encapsulated marginality. If the home culture is especially strong, the immersion would be complex because the differences with the mainstream culture would be pronounced (Econompoulos, 1999). Finally, in the achieved identity stage, the individuals resolve the questions which are characteristic of the moratorium stage. Here the achieved identity projects evidence of exploration which is accompanied by a clear, secure understanding and acceptance of one's own ethnicity. It is very much similar to the resolution of identity which is achieved by constructive marginality. Since the identity crisis gets resolved here, the individuals, therefore, have better scope of addressing other aspects of their lives through a bicultural perspective (Econompoulos, 1999, p9).

It is, however, important to note that these very stages do not occur in the same respective order. There can be a possibility that it may not be experienced by people with different ethnic background from that of mainstream society. It is essential that the ethnic background of the individuals share a stronger role in the relationship with mainstream culture for these very stages to take place (Econompoulos, 1999, p9).

In the case of India, the issue of cultural marginality is not new. For instance, Dalits who were marginalized on the basis of caste had experienced a high degree of cultural marginality. The caste system unified and acultured the invisible pattern offering of different social responses, castrating the natural identity of the individual, dominated under the presumed religio-socio-cultural obligation, adhering to the norms of the caste affiliation and its socio-cultural responsibility (Kadun & Vinay, 2014, p 89). The process of Sanskritization as given by M.N. Srinivas also reflects the existence of cultural conflicts within the Indian society where a member of dalit community, lying at the edge of compulsion, had to engage in the process of Sanskritization in order to acquire his cultural resources as well as his socio-cultural heritage. For him access to the very resources as a Dalit was bound by countless presences of rules and restrictions. However, the issue is not simple as it looks. The above argument reflects just a part of the complex puzzle. For Dalits, marginalization from the cultural front event existed when the members began to engage in cross-cultural bonds which was generally seen in the urban settlements (Kadun & Vinay, 2014).

Both encapsulated and constructivist forms of marginality were seen in the very process. The members gradually transcended to the moratorium stage where cultural exploration was being done. However, complications emerged in terms of achieving a concrete identity due to the issues of acceptance which was reflected by both the in-group and the out-group. The issue of marginality for them was no longer confined to one absolute sphere of life, rather it was observed that different layers of marginality impacted them in different processes of their livelihood due to the emergence of identity crisis (Horback & Jackson, 2014) For example, these members may not experience marginality in terms of political participation but in terms of equal economic access, they may be restricted or vice-versa. Any member of the Dalit community associating with a member of higher social hierarchy through the bonds of marriage faced cultural issues of acceptance from both the ends. He /she was bound by the conditions and values of both the cultural groups. For him/her the cultural conflict existed in terms of his/her vernacular language, art and cultural forms being practiced, as well as building bonds of marriage with other cultural communities (Kadun & Vinay, 2014). Since cultural marginality has a reciprocal effect with social marginality, the very members

of cross-cultural association experienced marginality from the social front as well. E.g., despite the policy designs of the state to offer relative social and economic access to opportunities for all, Dalits have failed to achieve equality with the dominant social groups in both economic and political spheres due to social and cultural incompatibility. Also, the members influenced by the cross-cultural association were largely seen as a threat as they challenged the dominant norms imposed upon them as well as the rigid power structure that existed within the Indian society (Gist, 1960).

Another interesting phenomenon seen in the urban setting which provides an alternative viewpoint to the issue of cultural marginality within the Indian society is the emergence and existence of urban slums due to the culture of poverty. Once this form of culture is incepted, it perpetuates itself. The issue of people living in slums due to poverty cannot be exactly interpreted as a cause of unequal distribution of benefits and burdens. Rather it is the socio-cultural marginality which has kept them in the state of poverty (D'souza, 1979, p 13). Because of this form of marginality, the disadvantaged condition is forced upon them by the dominant sections for their own vested interests. They are basically seen as "outsiders" because of their different culture or sub-culture which fails to associate well with the existing dominant culture. However, for them these are basically seen as the entry points to the dominant cultural hierarchy, and therefore, the people of slums try their best to achieve the benefits of dominant hierarchy through the process of struggle. However, this very process is not sound as ultimately despite coming closer to the achieved identity stage, they yet fail to fully establish themselves as belonging to the dominant cultural community due to existence of strong structured bonds with their past cultural identity (D'souza, 1979). Thus, what can be understood here is that they get entrapped in a quagmire situation where more they try to advance themselves the more they complicate their situation of marginality.

Economopoulos (1999), points to the fact that cultural marginality within any developing society like India is essential because it leads to the identification of certain key skills that are necessary when two or more cultural frames exist. The knowledge of cultural beliefs and values helps in promoting cultural understanding rather than conflict. An effective intercultural communicator is able to shift cultural frames of reference depending upon the situation as well as possess positive attitude towards both groups of cultures with which he/she might be dealing. The very individual is able to appreciate the value of both the cultures he belongs to and can pick out the positive qualities of each culture and apply them creatively to attain an optimum result (Economopoulos, 1999, p12).

Cultural Citizenship: Answer to Cultural Marginality?

Cultural Citizenship is a new term which primarily focuses upon analysis of the cultural dimension of citizenship. The concept has emerged in light of the cultural issues of the citizen which have largely been sidelined by exploration of other aspects of citizenship. Cultural citizenship primarily concerns the maintenance and development of cultural lineage through education, custom, language and religion and the positive acknowledgement of difference in and by the mainstream (Miller, 2001, p2). The concept of cultural citizenship is primarily about the status of culture as discursively constructed. It emphasizes on cultural rights which can be compared to civil, political and social rights. It helps in expanding the legal framework of governance into the cultural sphere for the construction of cultural discourse. The cultural understanding of citizenship entails looking at the emotional aspects of collective identity. It is an extension of the trajectory traced by Marshall of civic, political and social citizenship, not confined to ethno-cultural or a single set of minority rights but rather involves all kinds of minority rights. Since culture is not divisive, it can be used as a basis of citizenship essential to the working of a democratic order (Delanty, 2002, p64).

Cultural citizenship critically looks into the question of identity. It tries to assess the space provided by the dominant elites to the minorities. The very concept looks into the issues of cultural representation of different groups. It focuses upon the necessity of such membership either in the legal sense to make the society more governable, to promote greater inclusion and equity (Koeing, 2014, p4). Cultural citizenship can be primarily seen as a theoretical approach which includes all those cultural practices that unfold on the background of uneven power structures and that make a competent share of symbolical resources of society possible. Culture is deeply essential for understanding citizenship and how it should function. Cultural citizenship is important because it allows for the reconstitution of indigenous cultures and communities which have been seriously eroded through conquest, colonization and assimilation (Miller, 2001). In the form of participation, cultural citizenship pays emphasis to the local identities and challenges the elitist hegemonic attempt to govern the masses (Hensbroek & Vega, 2010).

In the case of India, it can be found that culture is not well defined in the constitution. Culture has shared more of an incomplete understanding from India's context, with greater reference towards the material side of culture. Gradually it was understood that cultural kinships transcend territorial bounds and arouse and deepen awareness about local cultures, and leads to further diffusion of identities which may help in creating a rich diversity of India's composite culture. Therefore, culture was seen as an entity that could be geographically localized. From citizenship perspective, the involvement of the element of culture would provide more weightage to the cultural dimension as well as provide a more holistic understanding of citizenship and its policy outreach. It would also help in the shift of the concept to the political sphere as well as help in promoting greater horizontal integration in the domain of culture (Koeing, 2014).

Cultural citizenship has an important role to play when it comes to addressing the issues of cultural marginality. It helps by ensuring there is no improper trade-off between the gains and losses in granting rights for the citizens especially the minorities who are targeted the most. It empowers them to name, create meaning, and construct personal biographies and narratives by gaining control over the flow of information, goods and cultural processes. It also promotes participation in the political community by challenging the issues of dominance and marginalization and promoting greater cultural coercion (Hensbroek & Vega, 2010). Apart from that, cultural citizenship plays a critical role in understanding the contemporary issues of the public sphere. It provides a conceptualization of the 'politicisation of difference' explicitly from the perspective of citizenship. It thus complements and competes with the notions of cultural rights and cultural capital and allows scope for greater integration between classical notions of citizenship with culture (Hensbroek & Vega, 2010).

In the case of the processes of migration and urbanization, it was found there was issue of inclusion and exclusion in the domain of culture. It was further extended with the impact of globalization. In India, the kind of inclusion and exclusion is visible in the urban scenario. This has contributed to marginalization in the cultural space. Cultural citizenship here offers new forms of inclusive public space which can help the marginalized make themselves and their social struggle visible and open to dialogic engagement. It promotes cultural inclusion through concretizing access to cultural rights which empower the individual to engage in debate and dialogue in a democratic environment to protect his/her cultural heritage (Stevenson, 2003). Apart from that, the cultural disrespect shown by dominant community over other vernacular cultural forms can be checked through the safety nets provided by cultural citizenship. Most importantly as Nick Stevenson (2003) points out in "Cultural Citizenship in the Cultural Society", cultural citizenship will be able to accurately identify the individuals who are silenced, marginalized, stereotyped and rendered invisible by the hegemonic forces at cultural front. Cultural citizenship in that sense will help in providing a balance and

plurality in terms of voices that ought to be heard. It will also concern the degree of self esteem accorded to an individual's manner of self realization within a society's inherited cultural horizon (Stevenson 2003, p336).

Caste based concerns, issues of homosexuality, feminism are not "minority" issues but are dependent upon the construction and deconstruction of dominant codes and discourses. Cultural citizenship, in this context, will help in fixing such dominant discourses so that the identities of such communities become unified and social order normalized. It will also help in the identification of the politically correct narratives, images and rhetoric that construct hierarchies. However, cultural citizenship in India is also simultaneously underpinned by the universal norms while recognizing the need to deconstruct dominant cultures of exclusion. It is, therefore, essential that the destabilization of the meaning needs to be connected to the normative models of citizenship and the politics of difference linked to the possibility of inter-cultural dialogue (Stevenson, 2003).

Cultural Citizenship further helps in the formulation of cultural rights to empower people in terms of their cultural space. Cultural rights guarantee everyone the right, the freedom and also the responsibility to take part in the social life. It offers respect of the identity of people and communities and the specificity that every individual can bring; their freedoms and capabilities to choose their values in the respect of other people's rights, as well as the respect of the cultural resources that are necessary to practice their rights, their freedom and their responsibilities; their freedoms and capabilities to participate and organize themselves according to the most appropriate democratic structures and institutions (Bisch,2004).

Cultural rights help in guaranteeing access, permit freedoms and identify responsibilities. By doing this, cultural rights offer the scope of merging of knowledge which is essential for a plural society. They also protect the act of identification, with which everyone recognizes their personal capacity through contact with others through appropriation of cultural references. It thus expresses an interface capacity between oneself and the others. They can be seen as links which they form through inter-discipline, inter-publics, inter-places, inter-institutions and inter-economies which helps in promoting greater assimilation and reducing the gap between the dominant and subordinate forms of culture, hence providing scope for greater cultural diversity (Bisch, 2004).

However, cultural citizenship has certain limitations as well. Firstly, cultural citizenship builds on the assumption of weakened national citizenship regimes. It envisions a transnational notion of citizenship and ignores the fact that nation-state is an important contender in the arena of citizenship. It may be argued that nation-state has lost its central place, and faces challenges of globalization. However, it still holds a dominant authority especially in terms of granting citizenship, integration regimes and immigration issues. It is a fatal error in cultural citizenship to underestimate the role of nation-state. Secondly, fear plagues the notion of relocating and localizing decision making, which is another hallmark of cultural citizenship. There is no guarantee that relocating governmental controls will foster a more horizontal and accountable relationship between the citizens and the state. Cultural citizenship still remains ambiguous with regards to its potential for state abuse through strict control of cultural policy. Just because it is creating avenues for participation, it does not necessarily mean that people will participate as citizens as they might have different affiliations and may relate with other social institutions more than they do with the state. Thirdly, cultural citizenship, despite its positive connotations, remains highly broad, vague and ambiguous. Instead of introducing new and radical options to undo social justice, it relies on the traditional views of citizenship. As a result, it remains crippled with all the previous drawbacks. It, therefore, fails to address the issue of inclusion of minorities into the host society by failing to

properly address the identity issue of different groups involved in the process of cultural assimilation (Munir, 2013, p 19).

Conclusion

It can be well understood that the issue of cultural marginalization has risen gradually with the change in the structure of society and cannot be sidelined over other societal issues. It is, therefore, essential to critically understand the roots of its cause and taking active steps in curbing its spread. Cultural citizenship does possess the potential of addressing this contemporary issue, however, it should be able to highlight responsibility, the acknowledgement of difference, inclusion in policymaking and increased interaction in the community with the aim of building participatory public life. It should propagate solidarity among the citizens through various plans and programs where citizens come together and learn about the advantages of having a cosmopolitan society. The collective learning has to be based on equity and equal rights. Spaces for socialization have to be promoted and conditions for social and cultural integration need to take into account the different demands and different contexts. Cultural citizenship should have the capacity to properly challenge the hegemony of the state at different spheres. Cultural citizenship should not be conformed with to some form of shape, but rather it should inform the inquires of the citizens to empower them to challenge the structures of power and find agencies within the cultural practices. Cultural citizenship can only then become an important means of cognitive transformation of self and others and hence contribute towards reducing the xenophobia in society by giving voice to personal identities, rather than unifying groups into collectivities i.e, to empower the minorities and immigrants through their own self-understanding and sense of belonging and identity (Munir, 2013, p 21).

References

- Bisch,P.M. (2004). Cultural rights, ends and means of democracies? The protection and the creation of cultural rights, condition of any citizenship. Retrieved from <http://www.houseforculture.eu/upload/Docs%20EHfC/Brussels%20Conversations/BrusselsConversationsTexts.pdf>
- Billson, J.M. (1988). No owner of soil: Redefining the concept of marginality. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 18(2), 183-204.
- Bellamy,R., and Palumbo,A.(eds)(2010). Introduction. *Citizenship*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Bellamy,R., and Palumbo,A.(eds)(2010). Citizenship: An unnatural practice?. *Citizenship*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd
- D'souza, V. (1979). Socio-cultural marginality: A theory of urban slums and poverty in India. *Sociological Bulletin*, 28(2), 9-24.
- Delanty, G. (2002). Two conceptions of cultural citizenship: A review of recent literature on culture and citizenship. *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 1(3), 60-66.
- Econompoulos, C. (1999). On the border of cultures: Transitions, theories and training applications for culturally marginal individuals. *Sword & Ploughshares*, 8(2), 1-16

- Gist, N.P. (1967). Cultural versus social marginality: The Anglo-Indian case. *Phylon*, 28(4), 361-375.
- Gurung, G.S., & Kollmair, M. (2005). Marginality: Concepts and their limitations. Retrieved from http://www.nccr-pakistan.org/publications_pdf/General/Marginality.pdf
- Hensbroek, P.B., & Vega, J. (2010). The agendas of cultural citizenship: a political-theoretical exercise. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(3), 245-257.
- Horback, S., & Jackson, C.R. (2014). Cultural marginality: Exploration of self-esteem and cross cultural adaptation of the marginalized individual. Retrieved from <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr14/horback.htm>
- Kadun, P.B., & Vinay, K.M. (2014). Dalit writings: Reconstructing memory from the margins. *IJMSS*, 2(3), 87-98.
- Kabeer, N. (2005). Introduction. *Inclusive Citizenship*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Miller, T. (2001). Introducing cultural citizenship. Retrieved from <http://www.tobymiller.org/images/Cultural%20Studies/LaborCulture/Introducing%20Cultural%20citizenship.pdf>
- Munir, S.R. (2013). A bridge too far? Understanding the limits of cultural citizenship. Retrieved from http://arts.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/FILES/publications/general/Euroculture/2013/rethinking_citizenship/Theme1/bridge.pdf
- Mehretu, A., Sommers, L.M & Pigozzi, B.W. (2000). Concepts in social and spatial marginality. *Geografiska Annaler*, 82(2), 89-101.
- Mohanty, R., & Tandon, R. (Eds). (2006). Citizen participation in development: Issues of identity, inclusion and voice. *Participatory Citizenship*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Mohanty, R., & Tandon, R. (Eds). (2006). Identity, exclusion, inclusion: Issues in participatory citizenship. *Participatory Citizenship*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, T.H. (2009). Citizenship and social class in *Inequality and Society*. J. Manza & M. Sauder (Eds). New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Pieris, R. (1951). Bilingualism and cultural marginality. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 2(4), pp 328-339.
- Stevenson, N. (2003). Cultural citizenship in cultural society: a cosmopolitan approach. *Citizenship Studies*, 7(3), 331-348.
- Stevenson, N. (1997). Globalization, national cultures and cultural citizenship. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38(1), 41-66.