

Globalization, Citizenship, and Subjectivity in Self Construction

Namita Poudel*

Abstract

One of the profound questions that troubled many philosophers is– “Who am I?” where do I come from? ‘Why am I, where I am? Or “How I see myself?” and maybe more technically -What is my subjectivity? How my subjectivity is formed and transformed? My attempt, in this paper, is to look at “I”, and see how it got shaped. To understand self, this paper tries to show, how subjectivity got transformed or persisted over five generations with changing social structure and institutions. In other words, I am trying to explore self-identity. I have analyzed changing subjectivity patterns of family, and its connection with globalization. Moreover, the research tries to show the role of the Meta field in search of subjectivity based on the following research questions; how my ancestor’s subjectivity changed with social fields? Which power forced them to change their citizenship? And how my identity is shaped within the meta-field? The methodology of my study is qualitative. Faced to face interview is taken with the oldest member of family and relatives. The finding of my research is the subjectivity of Namita Poudel (Me) is shaped by the meta field, my position, and practices in the social field.

Keywords: Globalization, Nation-State, Citizenship, Subjectivity, social field

Note: An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the International Conference by NSA on State Restructuring, Governance and Participation, 3-5 August 2019, Kathmandu

Introduction

The past two decades of the twentieth century saw the concepts of self and identity move to the center of intellectual debate in the social sciences and the humanities. Sociological forces outside of the academy contributed to a growing concern with selfhood (Callero, 2003). An emerging sociological approach to the self reflects new emphases on power, reflexivity, and social constructionism. As a student of sociology, I think it is essential for me, to understand myself in order to understand, and analyze the social phenomena happening around me. Sociology is a fast-growing discipline. Sociologists are at work to bring into their range of study almost all aspects

*Ms. Paudel holds MPhil in Sociology and teaches at Sarswati campus, Thamel as part time teacher.

of human's social life. It deals with a person's social life on the surface of the culture, norms, values, economic system, political system, mode of production, social institutions, religion globalization, subjectivity, citizenship, nation, etc. Among them, in this paper, I will focus on how individual subjectivity is changing with globalization, and how citizenship matter in this process.

To understand individual subjectivity, this paper provides unique insight into family history. Also, it is important to know, how globalization, the idea of citizenship, and the nation-state reconstituted social fields. These papers provide more than the unique insight on the author's family, but also provide insight into the history of Nepal, and how its own subjectivity was shaped, reshaped by globalization with the state-building process. Through this paper, I want to present how the four sociological concept- Nation-State, Globalization, social fields, and the concept of citizenship have shaped and transformed or "persisted" the subjectivity of its "citizen". The period I will be covering is roughly from 1820 to 2017 almost 200 years. Not only because of the long period but also the unique nature of this period in history brings in-depth analysis of how the subjectivity was transforming from one generation to another. Where, each generation was undergoing rapid and radical changes under social, economic, and political dimensions. This period observed the consolidation of the nation-state, the experienced industrial revolution, expansion of colonialism to democracy, a massive explosion of population, and technological advancement. Moreover, this period is the witness to the rising globalization and dominated by the social concept like nation-state and citizenship.

Mostly the primary data has been collected during this study. During the primary data collection, several in-depth interviews were taken with my mother, grandfather's friend, and elder sister (fupu). In the interview, I have used the mobile recorder to record oral communication. Later, it transcribed and analyzed. Two-generation were involved in this communication. In course of writing, several theoretical articles were taken as a reference to the secondary data.

Exploring Globalization Citizenship and Subjectivity

Meaning of Globalization

Globalization has been defined by many scholars in different ways. Globalization stretches social, political, and economic activities across political frontiers, regions, and continents. It also intensifies our dependence on each other through trade, investment, finance, migration, and culture increase (Held, D., et al., 1999). Jim Dator (See in reference) explains that historically, the speed and extent of globalization have increased with each change in modes of transportation and of communication. Moreover, globalization speeds up the world with new systems of transport and

communication means that ideas, goods, information, capital, and people move more quickly. It means that distant events have a deeper impact on our lives. Even most local developments may come to have enormous global consequences. The boundaries between domestic matters and global affairs can become increasingly blurred (Held, D., et al., 1999).

(Dator, J., et al 2006) again, describes in his book about globalization. The speed and ease of transportation have increased, and so the limitations of distance imposed by earlier technologies have decreased. Similarly, the inventions of speech, writing, the printing press, the telegraph, the telephone, the radio, motion pictures, television, satellites, computer networks, cell phones, and the World Wide Web each also increased the speed and scope of global communication, minimizing limitations of the earlier technologies and creating new social possibilities and problems.

We can explore our identity, our subjectivity by defining the central challenge of the global age rethinking our values in situations, and identities so that politics can remain an effective vehicle for human aspirations and needs. First, we need to understand what is distinctive about globalization today. We can do this only by studying the forms it has taken throughout history in all areas of activity the environment, the economy, politics, and culture. The thread that ties these things together is people, and so it is with the movements of people that we must start. (Held, D., et al., 1999).

Similarly, political sociologist Charles Tilly (Charles Tilly, 1997) said that “Globalization means an increase in the geographic range of locally consequential social interactions, especially when that increase stretches a significant proportion of all interactions across international and intercontinental limits. Tilly's definition calls attention to the fact that interactions involving globalization coexist with interactions that do not have an international or international character.

Therefore, globalization is synonymous with every day and everyone's life. The above reviews help me to understand the concept of globalization. Reviews show that it is about the connections between different regions of the world from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the environment. Therefore, globalization, in this sense, has been going on for centuries, and we can also observe that globalization today is genuinely different, both in scale and in nature. It has a great connection with the nation-state structure. But, it does not signal the end of the nation-state or the death of politics, also it does mean that politics is no longer, and can no longer be, based simply on nation-states (Held, D et al., 1999).

It has touched everybody. People living in rural areas, semi-urban, urban, developed countries, developing, and underdeveloped countries. But, they are not untouched by globalization. People can't escape from globalization. On the other side,

globalization is shaping everyone's position and subjectivity in society. The below reviews help us to understand the concept of subjectivity.

Subjectivity

The emerging direction of the contemporary theory is perhaps nowhere more evident than in the attention it lavishes upon the nature of the self-identity, and individual subjectivity (Elliot, 2001). Subjectivity is the condition of being a subject: i.e., the quality of possessing perspectives, experiences, feelings, beliefs, desires, and/or power. According to Mead (Mead, 1934), "it is by means of reflexiveness- the turning-back of the experience of the individual upon himself-which the whole social process is thus brought into the experience of the individuals involved in it." Subjectivity is used as an explanation for what influences and informs people's judgments about truth or reality. For Foucault (1982), the self is the direct consequence of power and can only be apprehended in terms of historically specific systems of discourse. So-called regimes of power do not simply control a bounded, rational subject, but rather they bring the self into existence by imposing disciplinary practices on the body (Foucault, 1982). From Foucault's perspective, the self is coerced into existence, not to become an agent but as a mechanism of control where a system of discourse works from the inside by creating a self-regulating subject. The Self at its most basic level is a reflexive process that regulates the acting, argentic organism. Subjectivity is an inherently social mode that comes about through innumerable interactions within society. As much as subjectivity is a process of individuation, it is equally a process of socialization, the individual never being isolated in a self-contained environment, but endlessly engaging in interaction with the surrounding world.

To summarize, as much as subjectivity is a process of individuation, it is equally a process of socialization, the individual never being isolated in a self-contained environment, but endlessly engaging in interaction with the surrounding world. Indeed, it is a new form we find an appreciation of the foundation of selfhood and more technically, understanding of the connection between self and social action.

Citizenship

In its most legalistic construction, citizenship is a status that confers rights and imposes obligations. As a lived experience, however, it is less sharply defined. The ideas of democracy and citizenship that organically evolved in the ancient Greek city-states about 2,500 years ago, especially Aristotle (1941) have found their way directly or indirectly in the modern nation-states, with ample modification. It includes what T. H. Marshall famously termed social citizenship, a sense of belonging and active

participation as well as political citizenship, such as suffrage; and civil citizenship, the protection of rights (Marshall, 1950).

Citizenship has been defined in various ways. For some, it is the relationship between the political subject and the state. Others treat it as the ground of a critical distinction between citizens and aliens. Some view citizenship as the focal point for struggles over equality and inequalities. Still, others emphasize its foundational character in Hannah Arendt's much-cited phrase 'the right to have rights', or define it as 'being political' (Isin, 2002).

The modern conception of citizenship as merely a status held under the authority of a state (Isin et al., 2002). Citizenship always takes specific forms that are the outcomes of sets of processes, and are related to specific political projects, particular social contexts, and distinctive cultural configurations. Held (1993) mentions that "equality among citizens, liberty, respect for the rule of law and justice" as the main ideas of ancient Greek democracies that inspired the modern political thinking in the west. Citizenship is not merely the concept of an identity card is more a political concept. It is more related to the relationships between the people and its' nation. Citizenship the concept remained to keep changing with time. After 1950, Nepal has had a series of political movements, some armed, and others are peaceful. These movements gradually made the former Nepali 'subjects' into formal citizens. Nepal also embarked on an aggressive modernization drive through international development aid. However, as older social relations continue with little change, the previously subaltern subjects have turned into citizens but many remain subaltern citizens. Summing up citizenship is more than the legal status or can be explained as it is a mix up of political status, the feeling of ownership/belongingness, getting the formal protection from the nation in daily life, and inclusion in civic and social life from the nation/state.

The interrelationship between Globalization, Citizenship, and Subjectivity

These three concepts are clearly linked with each other. We don't miss to explain the fields which are also part of this paper. Bourdieu says that highly differentiated societies are an ensemble of fairly autonomous, historically constituted, social microcosms which he calls fields. In analytic terms, a field may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relation between positions (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). A field consists of social groups and agents who have different species of capital-economic, cultural, social, and symbolic-which define their power and therefore their position in it (Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant. J., 1992). Individuals may have a different social field at the same time. For instance, the academic field is a social field for one teacher because he/she maintains all his/her network from there. Similarly,

he/she may engage in agriculture. In this context, a person swinging in two fields at a time.

Field has a great connection with globalization. Therefore, we can take globalization as a meta-field. Meta-field is the head of the other fields. Globalization affects directly the thinking, behavior, and working way of people because globalization allows a single person to an established business in different countries. Different countries provide a different environment, which forced them to change the behavior, thinking, and working way of a person. Globalization (metafield) sometimes provides an opportunity to change the social field too. We all are witness to it. For instance, we may have observed, a farmer son's is a doctor. The doctor's daughter is a teacher. The teacher starts business leaving his academic field. People are changing their social fields, but the meta field is playing role in it.

Meta field equally playing a role to change the concept of citizenship. Citizenship always associated with Nation and nationalism. Nationalism is identification with one's own nation and support for its interests, especially to the exclusion or detriment of the interests of other nations the technological revolutions in transportation and communications and international migrations have changed the old concept of nationalism. Similarly, the rise of various international organizations with International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, World Trade Centre has transformed the "national economy" to the "world economy". There is more foreign population than the countries' citizens in some countries like Singapore and Macao due to free trade. In such a context, people are carrying dual citizenship, or visa of interest country. Therefore, people's identity (subjectivity) is changing/ transforming with their social fields.

Why the social field is changing from one generation to another generation? Because of Globalization. Due to technological and economic globalization, the world has been transformed into a village. The global economy needed people who could read write and had knowledge of the language or in other words, it needed a person with basic homogeneity. Thus an extensive investment in the education sector was made. Today though native culture, identity is brought forward, these are only superficial and the core entity to fix everything is not other than the economy. The globe is being homogenized due to the various causes along with the economy, education, and technology (Gellner, 1983).

In the same manner, the issue of citizenship has directly impacted on shaping individual subjectivity. When the nation-state was weak subjectivity was in accordance with this. There was not much difference in having or not having citizenship a few years ago. According to Marhsall (1950), the importance of citizenship has been increasing since the 18th century when citizenship was linked with various rights and

responsibilities. The notion of citizenship or the feeling of a citizen of a nation and feeling of right and responsibilities towards it has affected also the subjectivity of an individual. When the state started to protect its people, protect and promote the political, social, and other rights then it has affected directly to the people. So those who did not accept citizenship some decades ago are being incorporated into the state self or forcibly. According to Foucault (1982) from the 16th century, the state has been shaping the subjectivity of individual people through power.

It has been increasing the notion of citizenship in people by showing the greed for rights. More importantly, while the government started insuring rights and responsibilities to only its citizen then people were obliged to accept also the obligations and responsibilities set by the nation. Citizenship was a membership of a nation-state earlier but according to Isin and Turner (2002) now this definition has been changed. Now citizenship has become a member of a supra-national state. In place of the single citizenship concept of the 18th and 19th centuries, the double citizenship concept has been put forth. According to Isin and Turner (2002), citizenship is a globalized issue. There is no person is the globe without citizenship. A refugee has also been recognized by the UN. In this way, the globalized notion of citizenship has made an extensive effect on the subjectivity of an individual. Thus a clear interrelationship can be seen between globalization, citizenship, and subjectivity.

Exploring 'me' in my context

My great grandfather was a priest. It is exciting to know that for me, he used to work in Rana Family, and my great grandmother used to work as a Nanny(Dhaiaama) Thousands of Nepalese citizens fight as soldiers for the British in World War I in 1918, my great grandfather was busy here offering goddesses and praying for life for them. He was dominated by the Rana's family that mean as an agent he is structured internally in terms of power relationships with some classes of the Rana Family. They had only one son and they died so early. Their son Mr. Ram Prasad Poudel tried his best to carry over his father's position or social field. Globalization speeds up the world with new systems of transport and communication means that ideas, goods, information, capital, and people move more quickly so this impact of globalization dropped on my grandfather, Mr. Ram Prasad Poudel. Dropped in a sense, globalization opens the door and provide him knowledge about outside of Rana Family, and outside of priest. Globalization pressured him to leave the unwanted social field. If he wouldn't have gained knowledge of the outside world, he had to stay, where his father was. He decided to leave his both social fields and subjectivity, which was linked with Priest's son. He didn't want to be called the priest explained by my fupu. Fupu further said that Ram Prasad Poudel even wanted to wear pants, a shirt not a dhoti kurta. Therefore, he

wanted to go somewhere, where no one knows him. He went to Krishnagar, west Nepal, and started to work and he changed the social field (Agriculture) and his position was Farmer. It was easy for him to change his own subjectivity because the community was new for him. The landowner used to practice the power on him and his subjectivity was under the control of the landowner. He spent around three years as a worker and when he got married to the daughter of the landowner, his position was changed. He married a single daughter of a landowner and he received all the property from his father in law as his father in law didn't have a son, fupu explained. Again, they are frustrated because they didn't receive the child even after four years of their marriage. Leaving their property to one of the wife's relatives, they came to Dhulabari Jhapa. According to Dinesh Niroula (My grandfather's friend), my grandfather was a priest in Jhapa.

Citizenship is a single legal status; it is a richer mix of legal status, the ability to have access to formal protections in daily life, and inclusion in civic and social life. So, carrying Nepali citizens, they were allowed to move within Nepal. Their social field was changed again. He started to work as a priest and this time he received very good respect from villagers and also started to trade between in Nepal and India as they were in Nepal-India Border. The notion of the subject is closely linked to our sense of self for the unique experience of who are and how we related to others. In our context, my grandfather subjectivity was changing sometimes priest, sometimes farmers, sometimes landowners, and my grandmother's subjectivity too. As Foucault's primary concern was to see how subjects are formed within specific historical situations through the operations of social instructions practices of inclusion, forms of knowledge. Here, we can observe the marriage system, a social institution, uses its power to increase the economic (Property) capital. According to my mother, they left the inherited property, but they keep buying land wherever they tried to settle.

As a first finding of how my ancestor's subjectivity changed with social fields has been described in the above paragraph. Secondly, I am moving towards, which power forced them to change their citizenship?

The geo-political considerations of India, more than economic or cultural reasons account for the continuation of 'open-border' between Nepal and India. This provides the most important context for Nepal-India migration. As a consequence of this process of globalization, when there is an open border for Nepal and India, my grandfather decided to move to Shillong with one senior priest. He again compelled to change his social field because he already started a business and became a trader in Jhapa. His subjectivity wasn't changed, yet his field was changing. He remained in Shillong as a "Gawala" (A person who sells Milk). While staying in India, he faced many difficulties,

so he decided to take Rasan Card as an Indian citizen. As a consequence, he became an Indian Citizen.

Furthermore, He found life easier in India in comparison to Nepal. The Indian state was slightly forward for facilities towards its citizen. His subjectivity is changed now with his social fields and as well as citizens too. He started his life in Shillong with his girlfriend (Extra Marital affair). When he bought a house, he decided to take his children too. After taking them back to Shillong, he provided Indian citizenship to his two sons and wife. Moreover, two sons completed education in Shillong and the elder son returned to Nepal. Elder's son applied for Nepali citizens because he wanted to settle in Nepal. He received government jobs in Nepal as a health assistant.

Additionally, he received both, Nepali government job, and citizenship. That's how, the structure, interrelated fields compelled to change their citizens from time to time. Series of circumstances proved that allow us to subjectivity is transforming with globalization and citizenship. The daughters who married Indian guys also changed their citizenship because marriage stands here with such powerful social institutions which compelled everyone to change subjectivity as per need. The daughters who married with Nepali guy also changed and received the Nepali citizen. How my identity is shaped with meta-field? I am much concerned with these questions. I went through the root. I am only one daughter of Mr. Madhu Sudan Poudel (Elder son of Ram Prasad Poudel). Well, my father had dual citizenship but when he received the government job in Nepal, he didn't use Indian citizenship.

His subjectivity now associated with health fields which were interlinked with other social filed such as education, politics even economics. His salary system linked with Nepal's unstable political field. Sometimes it went up and sometimes constant. My mother was a village girl but with the help of my father, she received a good education and started to work in the office as an accountant. Her field was different than her father explained by her mother, Toma Sapkota. And I am shaped according to them. They send me abroad and I got married in Australia. When I was in Australia, my subjectivity was totally different. My driving license, my student card all were controlled by the Australian Government. I was a student there in Sydney and I didn't receive any facilities as permanent residents receive. So my subjectivity or lenses to view me were different. Being a student, when I go to search for a job, the company often asked me are you a permanent residence of Australia? Associated subjectivity with students remained the hardest time for me. As a result, I wanted to get PR to change my subjectivity from international student to permanent residence of my Australia. When my family didn't permit us to stay in Australia, then I had to change my social field. But, I didn't change my subjectivity because I remained a student at Tribhuwan University. I returned to my country as my dad passed away, and my mom's

responsibility was upon me. I returned with my daughter, after completing my M.A and Mphil, I started to work as a sociology faculty in a private college. Now my filed is education and my position is sociology faculty. Still, I am doing the same job that's how I am shaped.

T. H. Marshall famously termed social citizenship, a sense of belonging and active participation as well as political citizenship, I belong to my country Nepal and my responsivity towards the nation is my participation. However, exploring my self-identity, where I am working now, (education field) is my social field. Apart from that, I am carrying another subjectivity that I am the daughter of Mr. Madhusudan and Toma Poudel. If I go to Dhulabari Jhapa, people know the daughter of my parents. If I go to my workplace people know me by my work. If I go to university, where I am pursuing my study, people know me as a student. There are many fields, and they are interwoven. I am also connected with particular field and this is my identity, I have so far accomplished my objective which was, to explore my identity, my subjectivity by defining the central challenge of the global age rethinking what values and what situations, which identities where politics can remain an effective vehicle for needs. To find out the changing subjectivity was another objective, where I followed the track of my ancestor's global, as a meta-field, it time to time control the other social field such as the education pattern of Nepal, Common property, mode of production, etc. This process helped to change citizenship to my family. My grandfather kept changing his social fields and he adopted different modes of production for subsistence. In every field, his subjectivity was different.

According to Nepali Nationality law, dual citizenship is not allowed. The constitutions of Nepal, strictly prohibited to accept other countries' citizenship for Nepalese citizens but people here are many with dual citizenship. Nepal also embarked on an aggressive modernization drive through international development aid which is a product of Globalization. However, as older social relations continue with little change. The subjectivity of the social field, the compulsion that peasant's son should be peasants or son of traders should be a trader is no more in time. Because of the changing pattern of subjectivity, we are in such an era where we are free to work as we wish. We are not forced to follow our ancestors' livelihood. The citizenship regime has had an impact on transnationalism in general and transnational migration patterns in particular.

Conclusion

Summing up, many ruptures in social fields have been observed in the Poudel family so the author couldn't provide continuity to her ancestors' position. The author's ancestors' subjectivity changed with social fields because in search of social position. It shows that social position can be changed. For comfort, they change their

citizenship. Grandfather changes his citizenship from Nepali to Indian and father changes his citizenship Indian to Nepali. Therefore, social value, occupation, marriage, and kinship forced them to change their citizenship. I didn't observe continuity either in citizens either in social fields. Moreover, state restructuring impacts can be observed in family history from Ranaarchy to Democracy. My journey from village girl to international students, again new social fields, which provides enough preseason, how meta field is shaping the author's personal lifestyle. The world is becoming one village because of globalization. A few days before, I have received a phone from Canada. I am using a mobile bank to transfer my electricity bill and buying goods from amazon. My lifestyle is controlled by a smart watch, smart mobile, and bread in the breakfast. Isn't it the result of globalization? Yes, globalization (meta field) is shaping my social values, social position, and social fields. Now, who am I is acceptable to me but where am I is another question raised from this research.

References

- Arnett, J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *Psychol.* 57:774-83.
- Bourdieu & Wacquant. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant. J. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Oxford and Cambridge: Polity Press, 94-139.
- Callero, P. L. (2003). *The sociology of the self*, Page 115.
- Charles Tilly. (1997). A primer on citizenship. *Theory and Society*, 26, 599-602.
- Dator, J., et al. (2006.). Dator, J., Pratt, D., & Seo, Y. (2006). What Is Globalization? In *Fairness, Globalization, and Public Institutions: East Asia and Beyond* (pp. 13-18). HONOLULU: University of Hawai'i Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctv3zp081.5.
- Elliot, A. (2001). Cited from *The sociology of the self* by Peter L Callero, 2003. p.8.
- Foucault, M. (1982). Foucault, M. (1982). "The Subject and Power". In H. Dreyfus, & P. Rainbow (eds.), *M. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 208-226.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nation and Nationalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 39-62.
- Guillen, M. (2001). Is Globalization civilizing destructive or feeble? A critique of five key debates in social science literature. *Social* 27, 235-60.
- Held, D., et al. (1999). Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Globalization. Global Governance*, 5(4), 483-496. Retrieved October 2, 2020, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800244>.
- Held, D. (1993). *Democracy: From city-states to a cosmopolitan order*. D. Held (ed.), *Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West*, Cornwall: Polity Press, 13-52

- Isin et al. (2002). Isin, Engin F. and Turner, Bryan S. (2002). "Citizenship Studies: An introduction", Isin, Engin F., and Turner, Bryan. (eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London, UK: Sage. 1-10.
- Isin et al. (2002). Isin, Engin F. and Turner, Bryan S. *Citizenship studies: An introduction* Isin, E. F. (2002). *Being Political: Genealogies of Citizenship*, U of Minnesota Press.
- Marshall, T. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mead, G. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1934.
- Robinson, W. I. (1998). Beyond Nation-State Paradigms: Globalization, sociology, and the challenge of Transnational studies. *Sociological Forum*, 13, No 4.