Globalization, Citizenship and Subjectivity in Modern Family: An Analysis of Continuity and Changes in the Last Generations

Gunanidhi Sharma

Assistant Professor

Resunga Multiple Campus, Gulmi

E-Mail : sharmagn1975@gmail.com

Abstract

Basically, Bourdieu focuses on cultural capital is a major source of social inequality. The conflicts which take place in each social fields have specific characteristics arising from those fields and that involve many social relationships which are not economic. Bourdieu developed a theory of the action, around the concept of habitus, which exerted a considerable influence in the social sciences.He introduces theoretical concepts habitus, practice, field, and different forms of capital, such as cultural, economic, social, and symbolic. While gender, class, ethnicity, culture, education, and the historical time period all shape an individual's habitus, what one does in everyday life is dynamic and fluid, like a jazz musician's improvisation on a theme. As we discussed on globalization, citizenship and subjectivity in the family through different generation, whether the globalization directly impact the family life and activities or families themselves have embodied own subjectivity to change interest, habitus and rationality. If we look from the eyes of Bourdieu or as a sociologist, we have to be skeptical of our social beliefs, cultures and should be reflexive.

Keywords: *Globalization, Citizenship, Subjectivity, Habitus, Reflexive Sociology*

Introduction

There is a discussion on dichotomy between globalization and subjectivity of citizen in macro-micro level. As Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, an American sociologist, has developed the general approach in sociology which led to the emergence of world system approach, the concept that everything around the world is influenced by the existing structure of world capitalist economy, nothing beyond it. On the other, French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu puts his idea on reflexive sociology, that deals with the human subjectivity and functions in day to day life creating habitus and social change.Globalization, subjectivityand social change is a central theme of this article. So here is a attempt to understand how globalization defines itself and how the concept of citizenship arise through traditionally to modern as well as Nepalese context and these all effect on subjectivity of our family through the generation.

The term globalization actually used in a way that indicates the process of globalized economy rather than sociopolitical, the development of an increasingly integrated global economy marked especially by free trade, free flow of capital and the tapping of cheaper foreign labor markets. Basically, globalization, according to sociologists, is an ongoing process that involves interconnected changes in the economic, cultural, social, and political spheres of society. As a process, it involves the ever-increasing integration of these aspects between nations, regions, communities, micro-institutions e.g. families and even seemingly isolated places.

In terms of the economy, globalization refers to the expansion of capitalism to include all places around the world into one globally integrated economic system. Culturally, it refers to the global spread and integration of ideas, values, norms, behaviors, and ways of life. Politically, it refers to the development of forms of governance that operate at the global scale, whose policies and rules cooperative nations are expected to abide. These three core aspects of globalization are fueled by technological development, the global integration of communication technologies, and the global distribution of media*(Nicki L. Cole,2019).*

The History of Our Global Economy

Some sociologists, like William I. Robinson, frame globalization as a process that began with the creation of the capitalist economy, which formed connections between

distant regions of the world as far back as the Middle Ages. In fact, Robinson has argued that because a capitalist economy is premised on growth and expansion, a globalized economy is the inevitable result of capitalism. From the earliest phases of capitalism onward, European colonial and imperial powers, and later U.S. imperialism, created global economic, political, cultural, and social connections around the world.

But despite this, up until the mid-20thcentury, the world economy was actually a compilation of competing and cooperating national economies. Trade was international rather than global. From the mid-20thcentury on, the process of globalization intensified and quickened as national trade, production, and finance regulations were dismantled, and international economic and political agreements were forged in order to produce a global economy premised on the "free" movement of money and corporations.

Cultural Aspects of Globalization

The process of globalization also involves the spread and diffusion of ideologies (values, ideas, norms, beliefs, and expectations) that foster, justify, and provide legitimacy for economic and political globalization. History has shown that these are not neutral processes and that it is ideologies from dominant nations that fuel and frame economic and political globalization. Generally speaking, it is these that are spread around the world, becoming normal and taken for granted.

The process of cultural globalization happens through the distribution and consumption of media, consumer goods, and the Western consumer lifestyle. It is also fueled by globally integrated communication systems like social media, disproportionate media coverage of the world's elite and their lifestyles, the movement of people from the global north around the world via business and leisure travel, and the expectations of these travelers that host societies will provide amenities and experiences that reflect their own cultural norms.

Because of the dominance of Western and Northern cultural, economic, and political ideologies in shaping globalization, some refer to the dominant form of it as "globalization from above." This phrase refers to the top-down model of globalization that is directed by the world's elite. In contrast, the "alter-globalization" movement, composed of many of the world's poor, working poor, and activists, advocates for a truly democratic approach to globalization known as "globalization from below." Structured

this way, the ongoing process of globalization would reflect the values of the world's majority, rather than those of its elite minority.

Sociology of Citizenship

Societies face two contradictory principles. They are organized around issues of scarcity, which result in exclusionary structures such as gender divisions, social classes and status groups, but they must also secure social solidarity. In social science, these contradictory principles are characteristically referred to as the allocative and integrative requirements. In a secular society, especially where social inequality is intensified by economic rationalism, citizenship functions as a major foundation of social solidarity. The article also explores the scope of citizenship studies through an examination of identity, civic virtue and community. In concludes with an extensive critique of the legacy of T.H. Marshall, pointing to the future of citizenship studies around the theme of globalization and human rights.

Citizen is the status of a person recognized under the custom or law as being a legal member of a sovereign state or belonging to a nation. Nationality is often used as a synonym for citizenship – notably in international law – although the term is sometimes understood as denoting a person's membership of a nation.

Determinants of Citizenship

Each country has its own policies, regulations and criteria as to who is entitled to its citizenship. A person can be recognized or granted citizenship on a number of bases. Usually citizenship based on circumstances of birth is automatic, but in other cases an application may be required.

- Citizenship by birth (*jus sanguinis*). If one or both of a person's parents are citizens of a given state, then the person may have the right to be a citizen of that state as well.Formerly this might only have applied through the paternal line, but sex equality became common since the late twentieth century. Citizenship is granted based on ancestry or ethnicity and is related to the concept of a nation state common in Europe. Where *jus sanguinis* holds, a person born outside a country, one or both of whose parents are citizens of the country, is also a citizen. Some states, like UK ,Canada, limit the right to citizenship by descent to a certain number of generations born outside the state; others ,like Germany and Ireland, grant citizenship only if each new generation is registered with the relevant foreign mission within a

specified deadline; while others like France, Switzerland, Italy have no limitation on the number of generations born abroad who can claim citizenship of their ancestors' country. This form of citizenship is common in civil law countries.

- Born within a country (*jus soli*). Some people are automatically citizens of the state in which they are born. This form of citizenship originated in England, where those who were born within the realm were subjects of the monarch (a concept pre-dating citizenship) and is common in common law countries. Most countries in the Americas grant unconditional jus soli citizenship, while it has been limited or abolished in almost all other countries.

o   In many cases, both *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis* hold citizenship either by place or parentage (or both).

- Citizenship by marriage (*jus matrimonii*). Many countries fast-track naturalization based on the marriage of a person to a citizen. Countries which are destinations for such immigration often have regulations to try to detect sham marriages, where a citizen marries a non-citizen typically for payment, without them having the intention of living together.[6] Many countries (United Kingdom, Germany, United States, Canada) allow citizenship by marriage only if the foreign spouse is a permanent resident of the country in which citizenship is sought; others (Switzerland, Luxembourg) allow foreign spouses of expatriate citizens to obtain citizenship after a certain period of marriage, and sometimes also subject to language skills and proof of cultural integration (e.g. regular visits to the spouse's country of citizenship).

- Naturalization. States normally grant citizenship to people who have entered the country legally and been granted permit to stay, or been granted political asylum, and also lived there for a specified period. In some countries, naturalization is subject to conditions which may include passing a test demonstrating reasonable knowledge of the language or way of life of the host country, good conduct (no serious criminal record) and moral character (such as drunkenness, or gambling), vowing allegiance to their new state or its ruler and renouncing their prior citizenship. Some states allow dual citizenship and do not require naturalized citizens to formally renounce any other citizenship.

- Citizenship by investment or <u>Economic Citizenship</u>. Wealthy people invest money in property or businesses, buy government bonds or simply donate cash directly, in exchange for citizenship and a passport.

- Excluded categories. In the past there have been exclusions on entitlement to citizenship on grounds such as skin color, ethnicity, sex, and free status (not being a <u>slave</u>). Most of these exclusions no longer apply in most places. Modern examples include some <u>Arab countries</u> which rarely grant citizenship to non-Muslims, e.g. <u>Qatar</u> is known for granting citizenship to foreign athletes, but they all have to profess the <u>Islamic</u> faith in order to receive citizenship.

Historical Concept: Citizenship

Many thinkers point to the concept of citizenship beginning in the early city-states of ancient Greece, although others see it as primarily a modern phenomenon dating back only a few hundred years and, for humanity, that the concept of citizenship arose with the first laws. Polis meant both the political assembly of the city-state as well as the entire society. Citizenship concept has generally been identified as a western phenomenon. There is a general view that citizenship in ancient times was a simpler relation than modern forms of citizenship, although this view has come under scrutiny. The relation of citizenship has not been a fixed or static relation, but constantly changed within each society, and that according to one view, citizenship might "really have worked" only at select periods during certain times, such as when the Athenian politician Solon made reforms in the early Athenian state.

Historian <u>Geoffrey Hosking</u> in his 2005 *Modern Scholar* lecture course suggested that citizenship in <u>ancient Greece</u> arose from an appreciation for the importance of <u>freedom</u>.

Hosking explained

It can be argued that this growth of slavery was what made Greeks particularly conscious of the value of freedom. After all, any Greek farmer might fall into debt and therefore might become a slave, at almost any time ... When the Greeks fought together, they fought in order to avoid being enslaved by warfare, to avoid being defeated by those who might take them into slavery. And they also arranged their political institutions so as to remain free men.

Roman ideas

In the <u>Roman Empire</u>, citizenship expanded from small-scale communities to the entirety of the empire. Romans realized that granting citizenship to people from all over the empire legitimized Roman rule over conquered areas. Roman citizenship was no longer a status of political agency, as it had been reduced to a judicial safeguard and the expression of rule and law.Rome carried forth Greek ideas of citizenship such as the principles of <u>equality under the law</u>, civic participation in government, and notions that "no one citizen should have too much power for too long", but Rome offered relatively generous terms to its captives, including chances for lesser forms of citizenship. If Greek citizenship was an "emancipation from the world of things",the Roman sense increasingly reflected the fact that citizens could act upon material things as well as other citizens, in the sense of buying or selling property, possessions, titles, goods.

Middle Ages

During the European <u>Middle Ages</u>, citizenship was usually associated with cities and towns, and applied mainly to middle class folk. Titles such as <u>burgher</u>, <u>grand burgher</u> and <u>bourgeoisie</u> denoted political affiliation and identity in relation to a particular locality, as well as membership in a mercantile or trading class; thus, individuals of respectable means and socioeconomic status were interchangeable with citizens.

During this era, members of the <u>nobility</u> had a range of <u>privileges</u> above <u>commoners</u>, though political upheavals and reforms, beginning most prominently with the <u>French Revolution</u>, abolished privileges and created an egalitarian concept of citizenship.

Modern times

The modern idea of citizenship still respects the idea of political participation, but it is usually done through "elaborate systems of political representation at a distance" such as <u>representative democracy</u>.Modern citizenship is much more passive; action is delegated to others; citizenship is often a constraint on acting, not an impetus to act. Nevertheless, citizens are usually aware of their obligations to authorities, and are aware that these bonds often limit what they can do.

From 1790 until the mid-twentieth century, United States law used racial criteria to establish citizenship rights and regulate who was eligible to become a naturalized citizen.<u>The Naturalization Act of 1790</u>, the first law in U.S. history to establish rules for citizenship and naturalization, barred citizenship to all people who were not of European

descent, stating that "any alien being a free white person, who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for the term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof."

Under early U.S. laws, African Americans were not eligible for citizenship. It was not until the abolition of slavery following the American Civil War that African Americans were granted citizenship rights. The 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, ratified on July 9, 1868, stated that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."Two years later, the Naturalization Act of 1870 would extend the right to become a naturalized citizen to include "aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent".

It was not until the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 that the racial and gender restrictions for naturalization were explicitly abolished. However, the act still contained restrictions regarding who was eligible for US citizenship, and retained a national quota system which limited the number of visas given to immigrants based on their national origin, to be fixed "at a rate of one-sixth of one percent of each nationality's population in the United States in 1920". It was not until the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 that these immigration quota systems were drastically altered in favor of a less discriminatory system.

The 1918 constitution of revolutionary Russia granted citizenship to any foreigners who were living within Russia, so long as they were "engaged in work and [belonged] to the working class." It recognized "the equal rights of all citizens, irrespective of their racial or national connections" and declared oppression of any minority group or race "to be contrary to the fundamental laws of the Republic." The 1918 constitution also established the right to vote and be elected to soviets for both men and women "irrespective of religion, nationality, domicile, etc. [...] who shall have completed their eighteenth year by the day of election." The later constitutions of the USSR would grant universal Soviet citizenship to the citizens of all member republics in concord with the principles of non-discrimination laid out in the original 1918 constitution of Russia.

National Socialism or "Nazism", the German variant of twentieth century fascism whose precepts were laid out in Adolf Hitler's, classified inhabitants of the nation into

three main hierarchical categories, each of which would have different rights and duties in relation to the state: citizens, subjects, and aliens. The first category, citizens, were to possess full civic rights and responsibilities. Citizenship would be conferred only on males of German (or so-called "Aryan") heritage who had completed military service, and could be revoked at any time by the state. The Reich Citizenship Law of 1935 established racial criteria for citizenship in the German Reich, and because of this law Jews and others who could not prove "German" racial heritage were stripped of their citizenship.

Citizenship status, under social contract theory, carries with it both rights and duties. In this sense, citizenship was described as "a bundle of rights -- primarily, political participation in the life of the community, the right to vote, and the right to receive certain protection from the community, as well as obligations." Citizenship is seen by most scholars as culture-specific, in the sense that the meaning of the term varies considerably from culture to culture, and over time. In China, for example, there is a cultural politics of citizenship which could be called "peopleship".

How citizenship is understood depends on the person making the determination. The relation of citizenship has never been fixed or static, but constantly changes within each society. While citizenship has varied considerably throughout history, and within societies over time, there are some common elements but they vary considerably as well. As a bond, citizenship extends beyond basic kinship ties to unite people of different genetic backgrounds. It usually signifies membership in a political body. It is often based on, or was a result of, some form of military service or expectation of future service. It usually involves some form of political participation, but this can vary from token acts to active service in government.

Citizenship is a status in society. It is an ideal state as well. It generally describes a person with legal rights within a given political order. It almost always has an element of exclusion, meaning that some people are not citizens, and that this distinction can sometimes be very important, or not important, depending on a particular society. Citizenship as a concept is generally hard to isolate intellectually and compare with related political notions, since it relates to many other aspects of society such as the family, military service, the individual, freedom, religion, ideas of right and wrong, ethnicity, and patterns for how a person should behave in society. When there are many different groups within a nation, citizenship may be the only real bond which unites

everybody as equals without discrimination—it is a "broad bond" linking "a person with the state" and gives people a universal identity as a legal member of a specific nation.

Citizenship in Nepal

The first citizenship Act was enacted on May 8, 1952, laying down formally for the first time the qualifications of becoming a Nepali citizen. The Act specified that the following persons born in Nepal; persons whose father or mother was born in Nepal; and persons with permanent residence in Nepal living with their families could acquire the citizenship of Nepal. The Nepal Citizenship Act, 1952 remained effective even after the promulgation of the Constitution of 1959. With the dissolution of the multi-party system and the introduction of the Panchayat regime in 1963, another constitution was promulgated in the same year. Under the constitution, the law on citizenship came in the form of the Nepal Citizenship Ordinance, 1963 which was enacted on December 15, 1963 repealing the previous Act of 1952. The same Ordinance was adopted in February 28, 1964 as the Nepal Citizenship Act, 1964.This Act made some drastic changes in the citizenship law of Nepal. Citizenship by descent could only be acquired by persons whose fathers were Nepali citizens at the time of the child's birth. With regard to naturalized citizenship, the residency requirement was increased from five to fifteen years and the mandatory requirement of being able to speak the national language was also added. Foreign women married to Nepali men could acquire Nepali citizenship if they provided evidence that they had initiated the process of rescinding citizenship of the foreign country.Despite the restoration of multi-party democracy in 1990, after 30 years of authoritarian monarchical rule under the Panchayat system, the citizenship Act of 1964 was retained. The second people's movement of 2006 led to the adoption of an interim constitution in 2007. This constitution had the same provisions regarding naturalized citizenship, but regarding citizenship by descent, it allowed citizenship to persons born to a father or mother who were Nepali citizens at the time of the child's birth. However, a prohibitory clause superseded this provision stating that persons born to Nepali mothers and foreign fathers could only acquire a naturalized citizenship certificate. This provision resulted in preventing children of single mothers and those whose fathers refused to acknowledge their relation from obtaining citizenship certificates.Almost nine years after the second people's movement, the Constituent Assembly (CA) promulgated a new Constitution on September 20, 2015. This period witnessed the dissolution of the first CA on May 28, 2012 and the election of a second CA on November 19, 2013 as a result of the top political parties failing to reach consensus on some contentious issues, including

citizenship. The new Constitution has some new provisions which were not in the Interim Constitution of Nepal 2007. Some provisions in the current Nepal Citizenship Act, 2006 are in contradiction with the new constitution and it needs to incorporate the new provisions in the new constitution of Nepal, 2015. In addition, the Supreme Court of Nepal has made a number of landmark decisions on citizenship directing to the Government of Nepal especially the Ministry of Home Affairs and District Administration Offices to comply with the provisions on citizenship. Citizenship laws are yet to be revised to comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court. Furthermore, Nepal is a party to a number of international human rights treaties including International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination(CERD).

Treaty bodies of the abovementioned instruments consistently call on Nepal to ensure men and women have equal rights to citizenship including right to transfer citizenship to children through mother.1Deriving from these treaties there are a number of obligations that Nepal has the duty to take into account while drafting new laws including on citizenship. With each passing year, countries around the world with discriminatory citizenship provisions are gradually amending their citizenship laws to ensure gender equality and to prevent putting persons at the risk of statelessness. With Nepal also listed as one of the countries that has discriminatory provision on citizenship2, the change needs to take place in Nepal as well. Nepal's citizenship law needs to be amended pursuant to the constitutional provisions, Nepal's international human rights obligations and the decisions of the Supreme Court. Best practices of other countries with regard to citizenship may also provide guidance. This document highlights the provisions in the citizenship law that need to be amended because they contradict constitutional provisions, international laws, Supreme Court decisions and the best practices of other countries. The document suggests changes in the current Nepal Citizenship Act, 2006 in line with the citizenship provisions in the new Constitution of Nepal 2015(Shrestha Sabin and Sabin Mulmi, 2016).

Global concept of Citizenship and Subjectivity in Nepalese Family:Oral Story

Politics is always concerned on two major aspects; state and civic. State stands for its sovereign power and authority over its subjects, on the other civic stands for its

political, social and economic rights with freedom. Citizenship was not major concern for citizen before early the traditional society. State, with its hegemonic power, created the concept of citizenship andsubjectivity on its people and land. Now, it has become compulsion to every people in their day to day life so that modern state could receive the taxes and control in every aspects of people's life. It is discussed above on globalization, citizenship practices in different countries including Nepal in brief. Similarly, here efforts have been made on how and in what extend global concept of citizenship and other family behavior of our own in Nepalese society through the generation. For that, to know the changesin family habitus and subjectivity, I have made three story through the oral history with help of questionnaire research methods.

Story I: An older man, age of 78 years of old, residing Resunga Municipality Gulmi district, a hilly urban village, with I met him and took the short story recently. Professionally he is an advocate with legal practice since more than forty years ago. But his father got citizenship after nine years he got it. Grandfather did not have citizenship as well as other documents also. His father did not have any use of citizenship too. Although, government implemented Malpot Ain 2034, but without citizenship, registration, property division of family in land office legally proved. His father time and in his early age, the land revenue used to be paid certain food grain as tax and to pay for this they used to go Palpa and Baglung. It all means that the state access to the people was more limited than now. But state started citizenship to make access people through their identity. He says that it was just introducing certificate which had no more use, but now after I got it, other my family member got it later, now my sons and grandsons and daughters use to have citizenship right after the completing school education.

Story II:An experienced social worker, age of 92 years old, inhabitant of small remote village of Arghakhanchi district, lived with a single spouse, has got six descents including three sons and three daughters. They all are married and left home already after urban settlement. An old person who involved as social worker at past decades becoming ward chairman in panchayat system, has said there has been changed in his family before and after. He received citizenship in 2036 BS, before forty years, through GhumtiSewa (door to door service of citizenship). His father and grandfather did not have, it was not necessary and managed by the state then. He used citizenship through relation with political elite of district level. But it had no function at all, just for identity. Before they used to pay certain food grain, not money, as tax to the state, and in registration of property, citizenship was not needed at all. His grandfather/forefathers

and his early age livelihood was depended on land and agriculture. But now, he says, situation is totally changed. All land are left barren and his descents left home for business, foreign labor. His all descents got citizenship right after their sixteen to eighteen years of age, because ofnewly emerged government system, rules and regulation to be effective in education, job, receiving good and service and other social, political, economic activities in day to day life. An old person says, actually he has large size family with twenty six members, but recently only couple in older age living at the village.

Story III: The researcher myself had a extended family before, but it is small in size recently, because of the separation and division of property among family members. Some members are staying and farming the agriculture land and some others left the home looking for urban settlement and for livelihood in world market. So far as the changes in family structure and citizenship, my grandfather says there have been many changes in behaviors, cultural practices, income sources, descendants throughout activities in his family and village too. My grandfather is ninety six years old now, he was born in 1923 in remote traditionally agricultural village northern side of Arghakhanchi district. His father did not have citizenship as well as no other state papers that linked them to the state or local government. He got citizenship to receive old age allowance (Vatta) from the state. Citizenship had no functions before this. Father of my grandfather and him too, did traditionally agricultural land for livelihood, embodied traditional cultures and values, did not detach with family structures and senior orders, but his six sons left home for India to earn money, except their wives and children staying at village. But we the grand sons and daughters gradually left the village for income generation and urban livelihood. Most of the agricultural land are barren and in position of unutilized. The descents of my grandfather owned citizenship right after their schooling age of sixteen to eighteen. His one granddaughter did inter caste marriage with non Brahmins. No rapidly cultural norms and values changed in my family, it has been a moderate way, but modes of production and process of livelihood is gradually changed in family throughout the five different generations. My daughter and son are trying to get foreign green card. It seems diaspora citizenship is being expanded in our family like national and global trend.

Critique on citizenship

Scholars suggest that the concept of citizenship contains many unresolved issues, sometimes called tensions, existing within the relation, that continue to reflect uncertainty

about what citizenship is supposed to mean. Some unresolved issues regarding citizenship include questions about what is the proper balance between <u>duties</u> and <u>rights</u>Another is a question about what is the proper balance between political citizenship versus social citizenship. Some thinkers see benefits with people being absent from public affairs, since too much participation such as revolution can be destructive, yet too little participation such as total apathy can be problematic as well. Citizenship can be seen as a special elite status, and it can also be seen as a democratizing force and something that everybody has; the concept can include both senses .According to <u>sociologistArthur Stinchcombe,</u> citizenship is based on the extent that a person can control one's own destiny within the group in the sense of being able to influence the government of the group. One last distinction within citizenship is the so-called consent descent distinction, and this issue addresses whether citizenship is a fundamental matter determined by a person choosing to belong to a particular nation—by their consent—or is citizenship a matter of where a person was born—that is, by their descent.

There are two kinds of criticism of citizenship education in schools. Firstly, some philosophers of education argue that most governments and mainstream policies stimulate and advocate questionable approaches of citizenship education. These approaches aim to develop specific dispositions in students, dispositions conducive to political participation and solidarity. But there are radically different views on the nature of good citizenship and education should involve and develop autonomy and open-mindedness. Therefore, it requires a more critical approach than is possible when political participation and solidarity are conceived of as goals of education. Secondly, some educationalists argue that merely teaching children about the theory of citizenship is ineffective, unless schools themselves reflect democratic practices by giving children the opportunity to have a say in decision making. They suggest that schools are fundamentally undemocratic institutions, and that such a setting cannot instill in children the commitment and belief in democratic values that is necessary for citizenship education to have a proper impact. Some educationalists relate this criticism to John Dewey(Dewey, 2016).

Conclusion With Bourdieu's Concept

As a French sociologist and anthropologist, Bourdieu school of thought is related with structuralism, genetic structuralism and critical sociology. But he was not consider himself Marxist, rather influenced by Marx too. Basically, he focuses on cultural capital is a major source of social inequality. The conflicts which take place in each social fields

have specific characteristics arising from those fields and that involve many social relationships which are not economic. Bourdieu developed a theory of the action, around the concept of habitus, which exerted a considerable influence in the social sciences.

At the heart of Pierre Bourdieu's sociological studies is an integrated theoretical framework of relevance to sociologists of food and nutrition on the other. One of Bourdieu's primary concerns is to overcome dichotomies in social theory, such as micro/macro, material/symbolic, empirical/theoretical, objective/subjective, public/private,structure/agency. His other sociological concerns are to understand the practical logic of everyday life, to understand relations of power, and to develop a reflexive sociology. Bourdieu introduces theoretical concepts habitus, practice, field, and different forms of capital, such as cultural, economic, social, and symbolic. While gender, class, ethnicity, culture, education, and the historical time period all shape an individual's habitus, what one does in everyday life is dynamic and fluid, like a jazz musician's improvisation on a theme. Practice is the result of the relationship between an individual's habitus, different forms of capital, and the field of action. Suppose an example of how Bourdieu's theoretical framework might be used to understand how single mothers on welfare feed their families in a small town, and suggest other areas in the sociology of food and nutrition to which it might usefully be applied.

Bourdieu's collective habitus, it develops a theory of the subjectivity of habitus, meaning the social-psychological processes comprising the agent and fueling deliberation. By incorporating George Ainslie's theory of the will and deliberation as the intertemporal bargaining of a population of interests, some scholar theorize the "saturated agent" composed of an economy of interests, analogous to Bourdieu's "economy of practices" invested and saturated with cultural capital. Here culturally saturated interests negotiate strategically within the agent, with the ending balance constituting the habitus. Additionally, reflexivity becomes amenable to habitus as "desaturation" or suspending the commitment to a set of culturally saturated interests as a result of a crisis, followed by "resaturation", the restructuring of the economy of interests.

As we discussed above globalization, citizenship and subjectivity in the family through different generation, whether the globalization directly impact the family life and activities or families themselves have embodied own subjectivity to change interest, habitus and rationality. If we look from the eyes of Bourdieu or as a sociologist, we have to be skeptical of our social beliefs, cultures and should be reflexive. Due to the long

process of globalization and modern political practices by the state, some aspects and activities of family have seemed changed, but some cultural field and habitus do not completely changed. All individual activities are relational with social field, not rationale. As a social and symbolic capital father got the citizenship and that become trend to get all these for forth and fifth generations as well. Later generation in the family left home for urban global market, but they follow the culture of succession and do not detach from the parenthood. As article focused on above, social fields and cultural habitus gradually seems changeable , not rapid changes have been seen in the families. Therefore, some cultural habitus seems durable and some are changeable. These all depends on social fields and subjectivity of individual himself/herself.

Reference

A History of U.S. Citizenship.*1997; The Los Angeles Times.* Retrieved 21 September 2016.

Beiner, Ronald. 1995;Theorizing citizenship. (editor)J. G. A. Pocock, Michael Ignatieff. USA: State University of New York, Albany. pp. 29, 54. ISBN 978-0-7914-2335-6.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, J.1992;*An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Oxford and CambridgePolity Press.

Carens, Joseph.*2000;Culture, citizenship, and community: A contextual exploration of justice as evenhandedness. Oxford University Press,* ISBN 978-0-19-829768-0.

Coplan, David. 2010; "Introduction: From empiricism to theory in African border studies." *Journal of Borderlands Studies*,25.2 : 1-5.

Heater, Derek. 2004;A brief history of citizenship. New York: New York University Press. p. 157. ISBN 978-0-8147-3671-5.

Hosking, Geoffrey. 2005;Epochs of European civilization: Antiquity to renaissance. Lecture 3: Ancient Greece. United Kingdom: The Modern Scholar via Recorded Books. pp. 1, 2 (tracks). ISBN 978-1-4025-8360-5.

Google/website: references used for different concept.

Isin, Engin F.; Bryan S. Turner, eds. 2002;Handbook of citizenship studies. Chapter 5 -- David Burchell -- Ancient Citizenship and its Inheritors; Chapter 6 -- Rogers

M. Smith -- Modern Citizenship. London: Sage. pp. 89–104, 105. ISBN 978-0-7619-6858-0.

Marshall, T.H. 1950;Citizenship and social class and other essays. Cambridge University Press.

Oldfield, Adrian. 1994; Bryan Turner; Peter Hamilton (eds.). Citizenship: Critical Concepts. United States and Canada: Routledge. pp. 476 pages total, source: The Political Quarterly, 1990 vol.61, pp. 177–187, in the book, pages 188+. ISBN 9780415102452.

Scott,V. Sandford.*1857; Legal information institute : Cornell university law school.Retrieved 21 September 2016.*

Shrestha, Sabin and Sabin Mulmi.2016;*Legal analysis of citizenship law of Nepal:A comparative study of the Nepaal   act, 2006 with the constitution, precedents, international human   ligation and best practices.*

Taylor, David. 1994; Bryan Turner; Peter Hamilton (eds.). Citizenship: Critical Concepts. United States and Canada: Routledge. pp. 476 pages total. ISBN 978-0-415-07036-2.

Turner, Bryan S. 1994;Citizenship and social theory. Sage, ISBN 978-0-8039-8611-4.

Virginia, Leary. 2000;Citizenship,human rights, and diversity. In Alan C. Cairns, John C. Courtney, Peter MacKinnon, Hans J. Michelmann, David E. Smith (eds.).

Votruba, Martin. "Nationality, ethnicity in Slovakia". Slovak Studies Program. University of Pittsburgh.

Wallerstein, I.1987; The construction of peoplehood : Racism, Nationalism, Ethnicity. Sociological Forum.

Weber, Max. 1998;Citizenship in ancient and medieval cities. Chapter 3. Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota. pp. 43–49. ISBN 978-0-8166-2880-3.

Weis, Paul. 1979;Nationality and statelessness in international law. Sijthoff&Noordhoff. p. 3. ISBN 9789028603295.