**Citizenship and Exclusion**

The text explores how the concepts of democracy and citizenship have often led to discussions about who is excluded from being recognized as citizens throughout history. It raises the question of whether these exclusions in different times and places are random and unrelated or if they share common characteristics that change over time. In modern discussions about politics, the focus is often on exclusion rather than inequality, and this shift affects our understanding of citizenship.

Now, let's look specifically at the puzzling relationship in the modern era between universal citizenship (which is based on universal principles and goes beyond political and cultural differences) and certain forms of internal exclusion. These forms may seem conflicting or essential to defining citizenship. To address them, it's not enough to remove restrictions on rights; it requires rethinking the very principles of citizenship.

………………………………………………………………………………………

The text explores how the concepts of democracy and citizenship have often led to discussions about who is excluded from being recognized as citizens throughout history."

This text talks about how the ideas of democracy and citizenship have frequently sparked conversations about people being left out and not considered citizens over time.

"It raises the question of whether these exclusions in different times and places are random and unrelated or if they share common characteristics that change over time."

It asks whether these exclusions in various periods and locations happen by chance or have something in common that evolves over time.

"In modern discussions about politics, the focus is often on exclusion rather than inequality, and this shift affects our understanding of citizenship."

Nowadays, when talking about politics, the emphasis is more on who gets left out than on inequality. This change impacts how we think about citizenship.

"Now, let's look specifically at the puzzling relationship in the modern era between universal citizenship (which is based on universal principles and goes beyond political and cultural differences) and certain forms of internal exclusion."

Next, we'll examine the complicated connection between modern citizenship that's based on universal principles and goes beyond political and cultural differences. We'll also consider specific cases of exclusion within a country.

"These forms may seem conflicting or essential to defining citizenship. To address them, it's not enough to remove restrictions on rights; it requires rethinking the very principles of citizenship."

These exclusionary forms might appear contradictory or necessary when we define citizenship. Simply removing restrictions on people's rights isn't sufficient; we need to reconsider the fundamental ideas of citizenship.

**Exclusion, Inequalities, Discriminations**

Debates about who gets left out of citizenship aren't new. For example, people in certain neighborhoods in cities like Paris and London clashed with the police due to ethnic segregation.

Some say that calling this exclusion isn't quite right. They argue that even if young people of African or North African descent had conflicts with the police during the 2005 riots in France, they're still French citizens by law. Instead, they prefer the term 'negative discrimination.'

Others point out that these neighborhoods aren't like American ghettos because communities with foreign backgrounds aren't historically separated from the rest of the city. They also argue that young French citizens with immigrant backgrounds aren't entirely excluded, even though they face discrimination based on class, race, and age.

Still, there's some confusion. These young 'immigrants' may be better off socially and culturally integrated than some other groups worldwide. But there's still a significant contradiction.

Using 'exclusion' vaguely and passionately might not be the best choice, as it's often used to criticize those who argue that the issues in modern citizenship are similar to the old conflicts between 'citizens' and 'subjects' in colonial empires. But it doesn't mean these conflicts aren't real.

For instance, during the French Revolution, women were treated differently from men in politics. Even when women eventually got 'equal' citizenship rights, this discrimination had a long-lasting effect. It led to a clear division between the 'public' and 'domestic' areas, assigning different roles to each gender and not allowing women to have political power.

…………………………………………………………..

"Discussions about who gets excluded from being citizens aren't new."

Talking about who doesn't get to be citizens has happened before.

"Rancière quoted Bonald, who said that some people are in society but not really part of it. I couldn't agree more."

Rancière mentioned Bonald, who explained that some folks are part of society, but they're not truly a part of it. I totally get that.

"In the past decade, these talks have come up strongly in the Western world due to riots in cities like Paris and London. These riots happened because certain ethnic groups lived separately in certain neighborhoods."

In recent years, these discussions have become more important in Western countries because there were riots in places like Paris and London. These riots were caused by ethnic groups living apart in certain neighborhoods.

"Some people argue that the term 'exclusion' doesn't fit the situation correctly. They say that the young people, even if they're of African or North African background, who clashed with the police during the 2005 riots in France, are still French citizens according to the law. They prefer calling it 'negative discrimination.'"

Some folks say that the word 'exclusion' doesn't describe the situation correctly. They point out that the young people who, even if they have African or North African backgrounds, had conflicts with the police during the 2005 riots in France, are technically French citizens by the law. They like to call it 'negative discrimination.'

"Loïc Wacquant argued that these neighborhoods aren't exactly like American ghettos because communities of foreign descent aren't historically separate from the rest of the city. Then, Castel argued that young French citizens of immigrant descent aren't truly excluded, even if they face discrimination based on class, race, and age."

Loïc Wacquant said that these neighborhoods aren't exactly like American ghettos because communities with foreign backgrounds weren't separate from the city's history. Then, Castel argued that young French citizens with immigrant backgrounds aren't completely excluded, even if they deal with discrimination based on class, race, and age.

"But Castel had to admit that it might be a bit confusing. While these young 'immigrants' are safer from social risks compared to some populations in other parts of the world, there's still a deep contradiction. Even in terms of culture, they're not entirely outside of society; they actually contribute to a 'mixed culture' within it."

However, Castel had to acknowledge that it could be a bit puzzling. Even though these young 'immigrants' are better off regarding social risks compared to some populations in other places, there's still a significant conflict. Even culturally, they're not entirely excluded from society; they actively shape a 'mixed culture' within it.

"So, this makes us think that using the word 'exclusion' vaguely and passionately might not be right. It's often directed at those who say that the challenges in modern citizenship just repeat the old conflicts between 'citizens' and 'subjects' in colonial empires. But it doesn't mean these conflicts aren't real. To understand this, we can compare it to 'exclusionary democracy,' as Geneviève Fraisse talked about earlier regarding women's situation during the French Revolution."

This suggests that using the term 'exclusion' vaguely and passionately might not be the best choice. It's often used to criticize those who argue that the issues in modern citizenship are similar to the old conflicts between 'citizens' and 'subjects' in colonial empires. However, it doesn't mean these conflicts aren't real. To grasp this, we can look at 'exclusionary democracy,' which Geneviève Fraisse discussed earlier about women's status during the French Revolution.

"She traced it back to the conflicts during the French Revolution when women were treated differently from men in politics. Even though women got 'equal' citizenship rights later on, this discrimination had a lasting impact. It led to a strict separation between the 'public' and 'domestic' spheres, giving each gender a different role and not letting women govern."

She found that it all started during the French Revolution when women had different political rights than men. Even when women eventually got 'equal' citizenship rights, this discrimination had a long-lasting effect. It created a clear division between the 'public' and 'domestic' areas, assigning different roles to each gender and not allowing women to have political power.

**The Question of the "Right to Rights"**

In the context of Arendt's concept of a "right to rights," we can expand this idea. It has shifted from being a result of belonging to a political community (like a nation-state) to the active ability to assert one's rights in public or the possibility of not being excluded from the right to fight for your rights.

Many social groups face the challenge of being in a state of "resistance" (the minimal right) or "exclusion" (rightlessness) within liberal democracies. If there's no resistance, they could be pushed out of the territories where they had formal rights, even to places where freedom and survival are uncertain. Sometimes, these groups are found in refugee camps or among "illegal" immigrants. More often, they are on the boundaries, where they struggle to express themselves politically.

Resistance isn't always possible, and violent protests can be counterproductive. In cases like urban riots, class and race discrimination reinforce each other, leading to a situation where individuals are urged to behave as "entrepreneurs" of their own lives but lack the social conditions to assert their autonomy. Negative individualism emerges from the dismantling of the social-national state by neoliberal policies, and negative community forms can arise from violent revolts that neutralize their effectiveness. These dynamics are strategically linked to citizenship's current contradictions.

………………………………………………………………

Shift from "constituted power" to "constituent power": The idea that a "right to rights" has evolved from being a result of belonging to a political community to the active ability to assert one's rights. This change means that individuals and groups have the potential to fight for their rights actively rather than passively relying on their community's recognition. It's important because it highlights a shift in how we perceive rights and participation in a political community.

The challenge of "exclusion" in liberal democracies: The text discusses how certain social groups in liberal democracies may experience a fluctuating line between "resistance" and "exclusion." Even though they may have formal rights as citizens, they can still face discrimination based on factors like class, race, and age. This underlines that formal legal rights don't necessarily guarantee true empowerment and participation for all citizens.

Negative individualism: The text mentions that individuals are encouraged to act as "entrepreneurs" of their own lives but lack the necessary social conditions to assert their autonomy. This highlights a paradox in neoliberal societies where individuals are expected to be self-sufficient, yet systemic barriers prevent them from achieving this. It's significant because it underscores the disconnect between individual expectations and societal support.

Negative community and violence: Violent protests, while attempts to challenge exclusion, can be counterproductive. They can neutralize their effectiveness, serve as a justification for security policies, and lead to negative community dynamics. This demonstrates the complexities of political movements and the potential for unintended consequences.

Strategic importance of the category of exclusion: The text suggests that the category of exclusion is strategically over-determined by the current contradictions of citizenship. This implies that understanding and addressing exclusion is crucial for grappling with contemporary challenges related to citizenship and social justice. It underscores the need to analyze and navigate the multifaceted nature of exclusion in today's society.

**Politics and Territoriality: Borders**

Let's take a little journey to understand how the idea of "internal exclusion" connects with the concept of citizenship. We're searching for a way to understand why it makes sense to expand the category of exclusion to cover everything from discrimination to elimination.

To get there, we'll start with the idea of territory. Think of politics as always linked to territory. It sorts people based on their connection to a place. To be part of a territory, people need recognition, either by being in the same "community" or by participating in "commerce," which means communication, exchange, and sometimes even conflict.

This brings us to exclusion, which is a lot like borders. Borders separate communities but also enable communication and sometimes lead to conflict. Exclusion plays with these two sides, just like borders do. Sometimes it pushes people out, like foreigners or immigrants, and sometimes it pulls people in, like when women are linked to a nation's identity. Exclusion works through rules of inclusion and exclusion, which can be implicit or explicit.

This idea of borders and exclusion ties back to how we think about citizenship. It's clear that political exclusion is linked to forming exclusive communities. But it gets complicated because there are various ways to be excluded. It's not just about being kept out of a territory, but also about being excluded from communication, translation, or moving around. In today's world of information exchange and mobility, this can feel just as discriminatory as being barred from a place.

It's crucial to understand that political communities don't just relate to themselves; they also rely on how others see them, even if it's not always mutual. This idea is vital for understanding modern nation-states and their relationships with one another, their international laws, and a kind of cosmopolitanism. Citizens of the world are like the counterparts to nation-states. They move between territories and countries.

Today, with large-scale population movements and cultural dispersion, we need to consider how contemporary shifts in trade, international law, and the movement of people might create new forms of recognition, but also new kinds of violence, both inside and outside the nation-state.

…………………….

"aIl political practice is territorialized." This line means that all politics is linked to territory, which involves identifying and categorizing individuals and groups based on their connection to a specific space.

"territory as weIl as recognition, exclusion as a general political phenomenon has a status that is very close to that of the border." This suggests that exclusion in politics is similar to borders. Exclusion separates communities, but it also enables communication and conflict, much like borders do.

"exclusion represents a quintessentially twosided phenomenon." This means that exclusion in politics has two sides, much like a coin. On one side, it isolates and protects communities, and on the other, it allows for communication and crystallizes conflicts.

"the existence of political communities implies not only a relationship to themselves, but also an external recognition of and by the other." This line highlights that political communities need not only an internal sense of belonging but also recognition by other communities, even if this recognition isn't always mutual.

"it is on this basis that we should ask what the contradictory results - what new possibilities for recognition, what new internaI and external violences - have been of the contemporary transformations of 'trade' and 'international law'." This suggests that with the modern movement of populations, cultural dispersion, and changes in trade and international law, we need to explore how these changes impact recognition and potentially lead to new forms of violence, both inside and outside nation-states.

These lines emphasize the relationship between politics, territory, exclusion, and the importance of how communities relate to each other. They also point out the need to understand how contemporary global shifts might affect recognition and violence.

**Rules of Inclusion, Rules of Exclusion**

Imagine the community of citizens is like a club, where people decide who gets in and who doesn't. To understand how this club works, think of two things: rules for letting people in and rules for keeping people out. Both rules are equally important because sometimes the process of getting in can be as harsh as getting kicked out. When people are forcefully made to become like everyone else or follow a particular culture, it can be just as harsh as being kept outside.

So, remember this: the club that is the community can both include and exclude. It isn't just about who gets excluded; sometimes, the process of inclusion can be tough too. Now, think of a dance where the rules are always shifting. Sometimes, you're in the circle, sometimes you're not, and sometimes you're in between. This "in-between" stage is when you're not completely in or out.

What's interesting is that the rules for getting in are not the exact opposite of the rules for keeping out. Sometimes they overlap. For example, some citizens can't fully get in, and some non-citizens are not fully kept out. This blurry area is where it gets complicated.

The club's own members, the citizens, are the ones who decide the rules. Sometimes, they all agree, but not always. People might be included or excluded to some degree, and it can differ from place to place. This way, the process of who's in and who's out isn't just a clear decision but involves a lot of disagreement and struggle.

Keep in mind that the citizens themselves are not all on the same page when it comes to exclusion or inclusion. Some might be strongly for it, while others are against it. The line between who's in and who's out isn't always fixed but can change because of these different opinions.

Also, the power of deciding who's in and who's out is often given to the government and the law. They decide the rules, which might not always be fair. In fact, sometimes the citizens want stronger rules to protect themselves from feeling left out or losing their status, especially when they fear becoming poor or disadvantaged.

So, the bottom line is, the community decides who's in and who's out, but this can be very complicated and subject to change. The rules for inclusion aren't just the opposite of the rules for exclusion, and it can lead to conflicts and issues within the community.

…………………

"Exclusion itself can be just as violent, whether it takes the form of forced 'conversion' or assimilation."

Explanation: This line highlights that exclusion from citizenship doesn't only mean keeping someone out; it can also involve violent attempts to make people conform to the standards and culture of the community, like forced assimilation. This is an important point because it shows that exclusion can manifest in various ways, some of which may be less obvious.

"Citizenship as exclusion of the exclusion must always be grounded upon struggle."

Explanation: This line emphasizes that the process of defining who's in and who's out of a community is not straightforward. It involves conflict, disagreement, and struggle among citizens. This struggle is a fundamental aspect of the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion.

"It is always citizens, 'knowing' and 'imagining' themselves as such, who exclude from citizenship."

Explanation: This line underscores that citizens themselves play a pivotal role in deciding who gets excluded from the community. They actively participate in this process, based on their perceptions, beliefs, and ideas about who belongs and who doesn't. It highlights the agency of citizens in shaping the community's boundaries.

"The gray area discussed earlier appears not only as a zone of indecision between inclusion and exclusion, but as a zone in which exclusion is indirectly demanded of the 'representative' state by a quasi-community of quasi-citizens."

Explanation: This line points out that there is often an uncertain and ambiguous area where people are neither fully in nor fully out of the community. Within this gray area, some citizens may indirectly push for exclusion of others through the government or the state. This further complicates the dynamics of inclusion and exclusion.

These lines collectively emphasize the complex and dynamic nature of exclusion and inclusion within a community, highlighting that it's not a fixed or one-sided process but one that involves struggle, the active participation of citizens, and the potential for indirect exclusion even within the community itself.

**The Concept of the Political and**

**the Anthropology of Citizenship**

In simpler terms, the text talks about the idea of citizenship and exclusion in society. It suggests that the way we understand political concepts, especially the idea of who is considered a friend or an enemy in politics, has evolved over time. Modern citizenship, based on universal principles, was supposed to end exclusion but, ironically, has led to new forms of exclusion.

The text discusses how the rights of citizens, meant to apply to everyone, have sometimes been used to justify discrimination. Even as legal systems aimed to eliminate inequality, they often ended up excluding certain groups. As traditional forms of exclusion based on social background or status diminished, new forms emerged, often grounded in broader, more universal categories.

The text highlights a paradox: the very universal principles meant to unite people often coexist with exclusionary practices. This exclusion, even when based on universalist ideas, becomes widespread in society, a concept termed "biopolitics" by Foucault. It points out that citizenship, despite its universality, can lead to discrimination based on various factors like gender, age, or differences between normal and abnormal.

The text raises questions about the future of citizenship, wondering whether global citizens will seek a transnational model that is more egalitarian or if new forms of exclusion will arise. It also suggests that the sovereignty of states might shift towards policing roles, leaving international bodies to handle the humanitarian issues related to non-citizens. Overall, it envisions a potential shift from intense universality to extensive universality, creating a "post-national citizenship" with both benefits and challenges.

Bujhar jonno:  
As discussed by Balibar (2020), The very universal ideals that are supposed to bring people together frequently coexist with practices that exclude certain populations. Although citizenship presents benefits, it can also present obstacles for indigenous communities. This complex relationship illustrates the dual character of citizenship, showing how it can benefit marginalized groups like Bangladesh's indigenous communities while also posing challenges to them.