Rethinking Citizenship in a Globalized World

Vivekananda Journal of Research
July - December 2021, Vol. 11, Issue 2, 53-69
ISSN 2319-8702(Print)
ISSN 2456-7574(Online)
Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal
© Vivekananda Institute of Professional Studies
http://www.vips.edu/vjr.php

Rashmi Gopi*

Abstract

In a globalized world, any understanding of citizenship is layered with multiple power relations of class, race, ability, gender and sexuality. Issues of citizenship are today contested at both external and internal borders, where persons with different identities find that their access to the rights and resources as stratified.

In recent times, the rise of Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and the particular case of revoking the citizenship of Ms Shamima Begum, a former member of ISIS, by the United Kingdom (UK) government raised many questions on trajectories of being a citizen. This work attempts to engage with the questions of citizenship from the vantage point of a feminist. Women getting inspired by ISIS ideology and migrating in the hope of empowerment is gaining ground in the different parts of the world. What marks their lived experience is not only brutalities of war and domestication under ISIS but also the violence of the state to which they originally belonged. The question of how boundaries of nation-state become porous in the journey to join ISIS and later how these very same porous boundaries become rigid obstacles when one wants to come back. These women are seen as dependents, immature and irrational who need a saviour in the form of either ISIS or the state. It brings forth the relevance of gender in shaping citizenship.

Keywords: *Citizenship, Femininity, Masculinity, Nation-state, ISIS*

* Assistant Professor Miranda House, University of Delhi
Email: rashmi.gopi@mirandahouse.ac.in

THE VANTAGE POINT

Human beings by virtue of being human demand dignity in their existence. However, from the time immemorial, honour-based hierarchies amongst human beings are constructed wherein some human lives are valued more than the others. One of the bases for creating hierarchies has been the distinction between a citizen and others in a political community. This distinction reflects complex sets of rights and duties assigned to persons residing within a territorial boundary of a state. Here, the state occupies a significant position as the provider and protector of citizen's rights. Now the question is who is a citizen? What are the grounds on which the identity of a citizen is based? How it is experienced in a globalised world where traditional territorial boundaries of the nation-states are redefined? In recent times, the particular case of revoking the citizenship of Ms Shamima Begum, a former member of ISIS, by the United Kingdom (UK) government raised many questions on trajectories of being a citizen. This work attempts to engage with the questions of citizenship from the vantage point of a feminist belonging to a third world nation-state, that is, India. Theoretically today, in most of the nation-states, the definition of citizenship has expanded to accommodate persons beyond gender and property qualifications. But, in practice, the very same old prejudices define the lived experiences of citizens.

In International Relations (IR), human beings and human nature are an integral part of understanding politics. Scholars like Richard Ned Lebow, Chris Brown and Elizabeth Priigl (2012) raised the question: how is one to incorporate the human element in theorizing IR? If we theorize, masculine man as the norm (presence, stable and positive knower), then feminine woman and other genders become invisible and irrelevant. J. Ann Tickner and Christine Sylvester were among the pioneers who unmasked constructions of gender in IR theories and politics. In the works of Judith Butler (1993: 228), especially in her analysis of sexual abuse in Abu Ghraib, highlights the fact that the term queer is a site of collective contestation, the point of departure from a set of historical reflections and future imaginings. Queer identity can be twisted and redeployed in the direction of urgent and expanding political purposes. The reading of international politics as queer is echoed in Jasbir K. Puar's (2007) Terrorist Assemblages. Puar highlights that in the wake of 9/11 attacks on U.S. many Muslim gay men in Western Europe felt marginalised by white gay population for being a Muslim. Gay solidarity took a beating on religious and racial grounds. Puar notes that the figure of queer is no longer solely defined by stigmatization and exclusion but by "murderous inclusions". Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2003) speaks about how the monolithic image of 'Third World Woman' is constructed in Western feminist texts. Talpade emphasises that the difference is not just between the West and non-West but within these geographies and temporalities.

Among feminists themselves, there is insensitivity towards plural histories and muted voices. Swati Parashar (2013) explains camps and politics within feminists wherein voices of women from non-western regions are often ignored and at best suppressed in global engagements. Her works also trace how women are drawn to war, radicalisation and violence in different regions of the world and how their particular identities shape their journey differently.

UNDERSTANDING CITIZENSHIP IN UK

In the debate over citizenship, the case of British-Muslims is unique. There are many reasons for this. Firstly, multiculturalism allied to citizenship rights became the official policy of Britain after 1945. Secondly, Britishness allows more easily hyphenated identities like 'British-Pakistani' to develop. Thirdly, British Muslims have involved themselves in the institutions of the state, particularly through Labour party. Finally, the imperial past made obligations on the part of Britain to accommodate Muslims from former colonial states, including automatic citizenship for Commonwealth immigrants (Archer, 2009). The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 and the European Union's Racial Equality Directive in 2000 promote the lofty liberal ideal that rights should be attached to personhood alone. For example, as far back as 1985, the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) ruled in Abdulaziz, Cables and Balkandali vs. the UK that Britain's practice of barring foreign husbands from joining their immigrant wives in the UK violated Articles 8 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Such rulings gradually established a 'postnational' form of citizenship. Soysal stated, "It confers upon every person the right and duty of participation in the authority structures and public life of a polity, regardless of their historical or cultural ties to that community" (Soysal, 1994:3). Despite all these ideals to expand the meaning of citizenship, in theory, Muslim immigrants, in particular, experience higher levels of exclusivist discrimination no matter what their status is – whether already naturalized citizens or applying for citizenship or visas. In addition to this, Muslims face higher rates of unemployment and poverty, among high-school dropouts, those suffering incarceration and have other negative social indicators compared with the conditions of non-Muslim natives across Europe (Alba and Holdaway 2013). The Non-Governmental Organisations like UK Forum Against Islamophobia (FAIR), No One is Illegal and the Open Society Institute recommend ethnic and religious integration through dual citizenship. They suggest voting rights to Third-Country Nationals (TCNs) at all levels and integration of TCNs in sports, schools, workplaces and public associations. There is a need to strike a fine balance between individual aspirations and collective (communitarian) identity. Muslim migrants' homeland states have heavily lobbied for facilitating communitarian rights for

emigrant diasporas in Europe. As a result, community-based facilities for these emigrants like recreational, burial, commercial, financial and cultural have been established in Europe. In spite of these accommodative strategies, the reality is that only a few of the migrants are valued and wanted, those who are rich, influential, skilled and educated. Others (the majority of the migrants) are seen as an unwanted burden on the resources of the state. It is expected from the large chunk of migrants that they should go back to their homelands within a few years. The messy truth is that in the UK multicultural policies coexist with exclusionary and assimilative policies. It is echoed in what Maas (2013) said, "Citizenship is a constructed legal and political status that is protean, plural and contested." Muslims are stigmatised groups in the UK. Even after achieving naturalized citizenship, they suffer informal discrimination in many walks of life to such an extent that they experience citizenship differently from unstigmatized "co-citizens". Even within Muslims, those persons who possess high skills like engineering/information technology or plentiful funds for investment are treated with privileges. For instance, Jelena Dzankic (2015) highlights the fact that money can buy citizenship and cites how investor visas in the UK are designed to attract the best, brightest and richest. Joppke (2012: 844) in his work highlighted, "These lives do not seem to touch at any point, let alone overlap and promote any meaningful interchanges." Radical Right parties and politicians blame these separate networks of survival for increasing intolerance and violence in the UK. Gordon Brown said in 2004 that Britishness means a passion for liberty anchored in a sense of duty and an intrinsic commitment to tolerance and fair play. Repeatedly, the message sent out is that the UK stands for belief in democracy, the rule of law, tolerance and equal treatment of all, respect for the country and its shared heritage. In this narrative, Muslims are presumed to have illiberal attitudes (Michalowski, 2011). Muslims are criticised for suppressing individual choice of women in matters of dressing, education and employment. Muslims are seen with an eye of suspicion for having parallel societies and for living in ghettos. In the past two decades, Muslims in Britain are seen as illiberal especially in the context of their views on homosexuality and the increasing number of youths enrolled in radical organisations (Archer, 2009). In the past two decades, the defence of above mentioned supposed liberal values have alienated and distanced the Muslim population in the UK. One of the reasons for rising affiliation to ISIS in the UK can be traced to this phenomenon of alienation and distancing of the Muslim population. According to Amartya Sen (2006), the pluralities and peaceable options within a community are systematically erased to create an image of singular and belligerent identity by the artisans of terror. In the past two decades, the notion that the world is divided into neat civilizational and religious compartments are gaining acceptability. People want to build solidarity across nation-states on this belief. However, legally speaking, citizenship based on religious affinity

beyond nation-state boundaries have been used by limited players like Israel and non-state actor like ISIS. There is tension brewing up between these two notions of being a citizen, that is, citizenship based on territoriality of a nation-state and the citizenship beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. Globally, in the post 9/11 world, this question is raised that can a Muslim be a loyal citizen to a particular nation-state? Closer look exposes that prejudices and suspicion borne by the Muslim community on daily basis have redefined citizenship for all. This is where players like ISIS are tapping in emotions to create another version of citizenship.

THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND SYRIA (ISIS) AND THE CHALLENGES TO CITIZENSHIP

The ISIS aspires to rise from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. ISIS dreams of establishing an Islamic state at a global level wherein territories will become irrelevant for citizenship. Only on the basis of religion, that is, Islam, it aims to establish a state where values and voices will be drawn from the teachings of Allah. The main mission of ISIS is to build a new vision for a society based on strict and harsh interpretation of *Sharia* law. The first step towards this mission is to gather people committed to the Islamic state from all over the world. In June 2014, ISIS proclaimed Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi as caliph and «leader for Muslims everywhere". In the same month, a call was made by Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi to Muslims to immigrate to the "Islamic State", saying it was a duty. ISIS says it is forming an Islamic state, or caliphate, on the territories it controls in Iraq and Syria. It is estimated that over ten per cent of Westerners, who migrated to ISIS territories are females. This figure does not include those women who migrated to ISIS territories from non-Western countries. The rise of ISIS has changed the geopolitical image of West Asia (Hoyle et al; 2015). Therefore, it is important to understand that ISIS is not a mere insurgent organisation but an organisation in charge of running a functioning proto-state with a new category of citizens. ISIS's efforts for state-building in practice paved its path to recruiting thousands of women from around the world. Islamic jurisprudence puts restrictions on women's direct involvement in militant activities (Lahoud, 2014). The Islamic texts emphasise the importance of women's role as "mother, sister, daughter and wife of Muslim men at war". The restrictions on women's direct role in militant activities are based on *mahram* (either husband or a relative in the prohibited degree of marriage should accompany a woman in public) and sexual purity. It is sinful if women as warriors come in close proximity of men who are not their close relative. Therefore, Islamic jihadi organisations emphasise the domestic roles of women as virtuous wives to male jihadists. It emphasises duty-bound roles for women. The violence

perpetrated on the minds and bodies of women by aggressive masculinity of male members (both within and outside the family) is just in the name of honour and hierarchy. According to Mia Bloom, use of the Internet, social media, in particular, to recruit women from the West and girls is on the rise. The tactics employed mirror those that paedophiles use in online "grooming": It is very similar in terms of platform, process, alienation of parents and creating an environment of secrecy (Bloom, 2011). ISIS employs a form of grooming to gain the trust of potential recruits: "The girls are befriended online, told they're loved and showered with praise and flattery. These girls, like victims of child sexual exploitation, don't see themselves as victims. They see themselves as girls going to be with men who genuinely love them. Recruiters lure girls by painting a "distorted view" of life inside the Islamic State, falsely advertising the "joys of sisterhood" and living for a higher purpose; in reality, a "woman's role is circumscribed for childbearing, marriage, cooking and cleaning, and they may not even be able to leave the house."

According to Kian (2012), "ISIS is the first jihadi organisation to implement gender-segregation policy effectively throughout its territory." The gender-segregated parallel institutions in ISIS means a section within almost every existing institution is reserved for women only to address relevant women's affairs. These sections are completely handled by women and interaction with male counterparts is minimized. ISIS portrays the fact that for Muslim women in western and secular societies, it is impossible to lead pious and righteous Muslim life. ISIS promises a pious and righteous life to Muslim women in its territory. For example, wearing the veil will not be stigmatised in ISIS territories. The moment women from foreign territories enter ISIS territory, they are taken over by ISIS female officers to train in basic Arabic language and these officers act as matchmakers by introducing the single woman to a male jihadi fighter (Doost, 2017). In spite of ISIS's brutality against women, ISIS has inspired a large number of women abroad to an alternative narrative of divine redemption based on gender hierarchy as compared to the western narrative of emancipation based on gender equality.

Therefore, we can see that the version of citizenship propagated by ISIS is an alternative to the supposed liberal version of citizenship. Women who join ISIS fail to see the continuity of patriarchal grip in the alternative provided. The liberal version of citizenship gives the universal impression that it is based on liberty, rights and rationality of the individual, equality of identities and rule of law. However, the lived experience of citizens in nation-states that claim to be liberal is something otherwise. Citizens in these nation-states experience that rationality and liberty of certain individuals are valued more than the others. These valued individuals are most often belonging to the upper and upper-middle class, they are light-

skinned, they are educated and skilled, they respect and perform gendered roles prescribed by patriarchy and they follow religion as espoused by the powerful. In summary, valued citizens of liberal political communities have rich economic, political and social capital. In the veil of equality, hierarchies are established and celebrated. This very double-standard has been challenged by ISIS. It openly says that in ISIS territories citizens are marked by particularities and not by universality. Only those who have allegiance to Islam and *Sharia* law are welcomed as citizens. These citizens are to be driven by emotional bonding (not solely by rationality), by a sense of duty to serve Allah, the state and community at large. It is the community, its vision and mission which are more significant than individual aspirations and ambitions. ISIS openly places Islamic identity as supreme to any other identity. The citizens are expected to accept hierarchies of religion, gender and class as ordering principles of the political community. These hierarchies are justified as natural and significant for upholding faith and order in society. The differences in society will be preserved as complementary rather than eulogising uniformity in the name of equality. Here, citizens will not be guided by rule of law but by the rule of Allah as enshrined in *Sharia* law. The political authority that governs citizens is not merely legal entities but divine ones. Therefore, this kind of citizenship celebrates the connection between this world and the other world and the ultimate purpose of the citizen is to seek divine redemption. In this background, let us see the journey of Shamima Begum to understand the politics of citizenship in contemporary global politics.

THE JOURNEY OF SHAMIMA BEGUM

Shamima Begum is the daughter of Asma Begum and Ahmed Ali. Ahmed Ali had moved to the UK in 1975 and returned to his village in Bangladesh in 1990 to marry Asma Begum. The couple returned to the UK and had four daughters with Shamima being the youngest. Shamima Begum grew up in Bethnal Green North, a ward in Tower Hamlets of London, England. According to the census of 2011, this ward has 14.2% people with Bangladeshi roots and has 32.6% Muslim population. Thus, we can see it is an area having a predominance of Bangladeshis and Muslims. Shamima Begum was aged 15 and was the student of Bethnal Green Academy when she left for Syria in 2015. This school, on record, has witnessed nine girls being radicalised. The cause for radicalisation cannot be solely located to family and school but to the larger politics of UK where multiculturalism is externally advocated but lived experience is that of hierarchies and exclusions (this duality we have already discussed in the earlier section on citizenship in UK). These hierarchies, on the one hand, exist amongst citizens and non-citizens and on the other hand within citizens. Citizens with only British heritage are valued more. In the case of Shamima, the Muslim

migrant Bangladeshi heritage may act as a ground for discrimination in UK. Shamima's UK citizenship was revoked in 2019 by Sajid Javid, the then Home Secretary (Parveen 2019). The Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act of 2002 and The Immigration, Asylum and Nationality Act of 2006 have provisions to deprive British nationals of their citizenship if the Secretary of State is satisfied that they are responsible for acts seriously harmful to the vital interests of the UK. However, the revoking of citizenship should not render the person stateless. With rising cases of radicalisation in the UK, the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 was passed. It contains a duty on specified authorities like local authorities, education providers, health sector, police and prisons, to have due regard for the need to prevent people from being drawn to terrorism. Therefore, we can see this Act of 2015 as a preventive strategy to deal with the threat of terrorism whereas the Immigration Act of 2002 and 2006 were punitive in nature. When Sajid Javid revoked Begum's citizenship, he washed off any responsibility on the part of state authorities to stop this radicalisation of Begum. He said that Shamima is not rendered stateless as she is a Bangladeshi citizen. He cited Bangladeshi Law wherein a child born to a Bangladeshi parent is automatically a Bangladeshi citizen. This 'bloodline' law lapses when a person reaches the age of 21 unless they make active efforts to retain it. In the case of Shamima, she is aged 19. Thus empowered by this law the home secretary stripped Shamima Begum of her UK citizenship (Khan 2019).

Shamima Begum left for Syria in 2015 to join ISIS. Within ten days of her landing in Syria, she married the Dutchman jihadi, Yago Riedijk (as we have already discussed in the section dealing with ISIS on how a foreign woman national is immediately married off to a jihadi man). Within four years of marriage, they had three children, all of them are now dead. The last time Shamima saw her husband was 15 February 2019, that is, when he surrendered to a group of fighters allied to the Syrian Democratic Forces. When Shamima's UK Citizenship was revoked, she pleaded for its retainment. She denied Sajid Javid's argument of Shamima having Bangladeshi citizenship. Shamima said that she was not born in Bangladesh. She has never seen Bangladesh and does not even speak Bengali properly. She said that she has only one citizenship status and revoking of this citizenship is a life-changing decision and UK authorities unilaterally took this decision. Shamima Begum claimed that she had been "just a housewife" for the entire four years and that she had not done anything dangerous or made propaganda. However, she also said that she had no regrets about joining ISIS and suggested that the Manchester Arena Bombings were justified because of the bombing of civilians in Syria (Grierson 2019).

Shamima's sister Renu Begum and father Ahmed Ali admitted that Shamima was wrong in joining ISIS and in justifying brutalities of ISIS. However, as UK citizen, she should

face trial in UK and if proved guilty of terrorist activities should be punished accordingly. Her citizenship should not be revoked. Former Conservative Home Secretary Ken Clarke also criticised Sajid Javid's decision. He said, "Refusing Britons who joined ISIS the right to return would be a great boost for Jihadism as the hundreds of foreign jihadis stuck in camps in northern Syria would be further radicalised." US President Donald Trump also supported the deportation of radicalised youth with ISIS to face the judiciary in the UK. Mr Javid could have imposed a temporary exclusion order under the Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015. This would have permitted Begum's return under strict licence conditions. If on her return, Begum is still considered a threat to national security, further restrictions on her liberty could be imposed through a Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measure (TPIM). Mr Javid's action has denied citizenship to Shamima not only in the UK but the governments of Bangladesh and the Netherlands have also followed suit. It is clear that Mr Javid, whom himself traces his heritage to Pakistan, has been driven by his passion to prove his allegiance to Britishness and his worthiness as a British citizen and Shamima Begum is a mere trump card for this display of loyalty. Shamima Begum had lost the first stage of her appeal against the UK government's decision to remove her UK citizenship in the month of October 2019. Begum's lawyers have questioned the circumstances under which her citizenship was revoked – she had just given birth to her third child, she was caring for the infant in the "camp of death". The lawyer said, "If someone is unable to appeal in any meaningful way, it must be unlawful." (Gardham 2019) Even now, from the Roj camp in northern Syria where Shamima is currently placed, it is very difficult for her to establish contact with her lawyers. On 16 July 2020, the Court of Appeal allowed Shamima Begum to enter the UK to effectively challenge the removal of her British citizenship. In the month of November 2020, the Supreme Court of UK has started hearing Shamima Begum's case to decide whether she should be allowed to enter UK for trial. Many in the UK feel that Shamima's case requires forgiveness and compassion.

THE CASE OF SHAMIMA BEGUM

Feminist scholar Cynthia Enloe (2004) famously declared that the "international is personal" as "governments depend upon certain kinds of private relationships in order to conduct their foreign affairs." Thus domestic and personal aspects of IR are an integral part of understanding global politics and the private/public dichotomy maintained in politics as irrelevant. Through the case of Shamima Begum, the biases in IR based on gender, race, colonial past, class and religion are brought to the forefront. This case exposes the way citizenship is embedded and experienced in hierarchies and how there is a long way to go

to make it egalitarian in practice. This case highlights the interconnections of politics at the individual, family and inter-state levels. In the subsequent paragraphs, these aspects are discussed in detail to argue for the need to rethink the concept of citizenship in contemporary global politics.

Individual: The decision to revoke the citizenship of Shamima Begum by then Home Secretary Sajid Javid was predominantly based on the 'protector and provider' syndrome of a patriarch. Sajid Javid solely took upon himself to decide that the UK will be threatened by the presence of Shamima Begum. Here more than a threat to the lives of people, the threat to patriarchy is evident. How can a state forgive and forget a girl/woman who took an independent decision to join a terrorist organisation located outside the territorial boundaries of the UK? The supposed hegemonic masculine qualities of courage, adventure, endurance, physical and psychological strength reserved for male bodies have been hijacked by Shamima (and girls/women like her). If these girls/women are not punished then the myth of masculinity created in patriarchal societies will be busted to the extent that it cannot be restored or justified in the future. If keeping gender hierarchies intact was one of the objectives of this step, then to maintain other power hierarchies also mattered. Shamima by abandoning British territory and by marrying a non-British in ISIS territory challenged the idea of citizenship based on a territory to its core. This act has been seen as a betrayal to the soil where one was born. This justifies revoking of citizenship.

Both Shamima Begum and Sajid Javid are children of immigrants from South Asia (thus tracing the lineage beyond British heritage - Javid from Pakistan and Begum from Bangladesh). Both are followers of Islam (a religion more often seen in opposition to Christianity in recent times). They represent two different types of Muslim citizens in the UK. Sajid embodies all the supposed qualities of liberal traditions – respect for rule of law, obedience to British values and traditions, following religion as a purely private belief, educated, suave and technocratic. Shamima flaunts her religion in public, shows disregard for the traditions and rules of the land. She is critical of the UK government's foreign policies. But the very important part of the identity that separates the two is their class location. As discussed earlier in the paper, rich, educated, skilled persons are valued more as citizens. Here, Sajid Javid is a poster boy for the UK to showcase how through education, skill sets have been polished of a citizen with non-British lineage. He is a symbol of the success of British multiculturalism in grooming citizens. However, Shamima reflects another side of British society. She is a product of ghettoization (as discussed earlier, she resided in an area – Bethnal Green – with a disproportionately large Muslim and Bangladeshi population). She didn't even complete her schooling when she got radicalised and joined a

terrorist organisation. She is unskilled and unfit for the capitalist market. She is uncivilised for a highly civilised erstwhile imperial society.

Therefore, to teach a lesson to this girl/woman becomes imperative to set a correct precedent so that no other girl challenges both patriarchy and the supposed liberal traditions of the UK in the future. Boys/men are given a second chance to prove their loyalty as a citizen. This is evident in the way the UK dealt with boys or men who got radicalised and joined terrorist organisations. The Nayadaur television reported that "Far from revoking the respective citizenships of Ed Husain and Maajid Nawaz — who had in their misguided youth joined the ranks of Hizb-ut-Tahrir (HT) — both were welcomed in from the cold." (Husain 2019) Here, individual identity and experience define global politics.

Family: Shamima's case is projected as how a family failed in avoiding the tragedy. The masculinity of Shamima's father, Ahmed Ali, has been put in question. Shamima's father failed to play the part of a patriarch with an obedient wife and daughters. A migrant Muslim father failed as a householder in protecting his own daughter. He failed to stop the radicalisation of Shamima. The mother and sisters of Shamima Begum failed to instil feminine submissiveness and surrender in Shamima. The family failed in selecting a better neighbourhood and school for Shamima which led to her radicalisation. The UK's citizenship rules allow double citizenship and this fact has been conveniently side-lined in the case of Shamima Begum. Shamima's father Ahmed Ali said that in recent years he had lived mainly in Bangladesh and had been visiting London for periods of between two and four weeks. He said that the time he stayed with Shamima, he never felt she was planning to go to Syria or is going to join ISIS. In the media, Ahmed Ali, now aged sixty, was projected as a frail, anxious and worried father. In the media, the absence of a father and the broken family of Shamima was also shown as a reason for the shift towards radicalisation. The state and its agencies want to project the case of Shamima Begum as a case of a failed family rather than of a failed society. It is not only Shamima but her family itself that is shown as a misfit in British society with its liberal values.

In analysing Shamima's case, her own decision to join ISIS and to get married highlights the blurring of boundaries of consent and coercion. It is very difficult to separate the role of ISIS as an alternative family structure influencing Shamima's action. To what extent Shamima signed for what she ended up is difficult to determine. When we hear narratives of family members from Kerala, India, where their daughters had love marriages, conversion to Islam and the ultimate step of joining ISIS, the family's role in it are debatable. Family members of Nimisha and Merrin claim that their daughters have been tripped into love-jihad

module active in Kerala. They cite that the educational institutions to where their daughters went for higher education had ISIS module to allure girls to Muslim boys and then leading to conversion, marriage and joining in ISIS (Paul 2018). One of the cases in India where family interfering in the choice of a girl to convert to Islam and marriage to prevent her from joining ISIS is Akhila/Hadiya Case. The girl's father seeks the help of police and judiciary to prevent his daughter from joining ISIS. The father claims that his daughter has been brainwashed and she can be taken outside India to join ISIS. Even the verdict of the High Court of Kerala, in this case, reflects the same. The court maintained that as per Indian tradition, the custody of an unmarried daughter is with the parents until she is properly married. In this case, the court annulled the marriage and gave custody of Hadiya to her parents. Later this case reached the Supreme Court of India and Hadiya's conversion to Islam, her marriage, her right to choose where she wants to stay and continue her education was upheld (the case judgement accessed from https://www.scobserver.in/court-case/hadiya-marriage-case on 29 October 2020). In this case, the family, the agencies of the state and Hindu Right-wing politics continuously question the ability of the girl to have informed choice and exercise of choice. The fear of love-jihad and later possibility of joining ISIS portrays absence of agency on the part of the girl. In the case of Shamima also, the society blames the family for Shamima joining ISIS. The family blames the educational institution and state authorities for Shamima's journey to ISIS. In all these narratives, the agency of the girl to make an informed choice and consent regarding her future are undermined.

The State and its agencies

Floya Anthias and Nira Yuval Davis (1989) recognised the ways in which the state (the political entity) sees women as a significant player in maintaining the honour of the nation (the emotional entity). Firstly, women are seen as reproducers of the boundaries of the nation. Therefore, women are expected to marry within the nation-state. However, here Shamima has married a foreigner who is a member of a terrorist organisation. To punish Shamima is to reclaim the lost honour of the nation-state. Secondly, women are bearers of culture. Shamima by joining ISIS out rightly rejected Christian-Western culture in favour of Islamic-Non-Western culture. By doing so, instead of preparing herself, her husband and sons to fight for the nation, she has waged a war against the state. Again this act is projected by the UK government as an unforgivable act. Thirdly, in a patriarchal order, the female body is a symbol of lineage and community purity. When Shamima's purity is in question, then the honour of UK is put in question. Shamima is projected as a violated, impure and polluted body who has reached this stage due to her association with ISIS, her pre-adulthood marriage to an ISIS fighter and subsequent stay in war camps in Syria. In this scenario, taking back

Shamima would be seen as polluting the honour of UK.

These are the reasons that even when dual citizenship is allowed in the UK, Shamima is projected solely as a citizen of Bangladesh. The resistance from the government of Bangladesh to admit Shamima Begum as its citizen has been ignored by the UK government. This act of not recognising the concerns and challenges of Bangladesh is also a reflection of the continuity of the colonial mind set in the UK wherein UK believes in one-sided decision making as fixed and final. Theoretically, the UK and Bangladesh are equal and sovereign states in global politics. However, in practice, the UK is still carrying forward the colonial baggage of assumed superiority over South Asian countries (Third World Countries).

In realist theories of IR, the state is seen as masculine, rational and aggressive player. Therefore, emotions and feelings have no place. In delivering justice, only the rational aspect is emphasised as if binary opposition between emotions and rationality are fixed and final while the fluidity, plurality and continuity of emotions and rationalities are ignored. In IR, western rationality is projected as universal rationality. Therefore, the reasons presented by the UK will have more weightage over reasons presented by Bangladesh. As discussed earlier, the UK, by virtue of belonging to the West is seen as an adult, mature, rational and civilised nation-state. Moreover, the reasons given by Bangladesh and people of its origin (in this case, it is Shamima and her family) will be packaged as a bundle of emotions irrelevant for high politics at the global level.

In citizenship matters, emotions and rationalities of all human beings have to be treated at par. Citizenship has to recognise the relevance of the fluidity and plurality of emotions and rationalities in any given context. It should be the prerogative solely of an individual to decide his or her citizenship. Whether that individual wants to retain single or plural citizenship should be a personal call. Ultimately, citizenship is not merely a set of rights but also of duties. How far an individual could respect the position of being a citizen should be decided by the individuals themselves.

Increasingly, the nation-states in the context of the crisis of capitalism (lack of job creation and social cohesion) and COVID 19 are questioning whether citizenship in the era of globalisation should become a more reserved category. Simultaneously, borders are becoming rigid and meaningless. Kimmel (2005) highlights the fact that Islamic radical organisations are calling upon recovery of manhood through going back to one's particular religion and protectionism in the economy as a way to reclaim the masculine virtues of citizens. As we have seen through the case of Shamima Begum, the citizenship question is intrinsically tied up with other power structures in society from the local to the global. Citizenship will

become meaningful only for a few in hierarchical and honour driven societies. Only in non-discriminatory and dignity based societies (from the local to the global), will the discourse of citizenship have substantive value.

In rethinking citizenship, we have to move beyond binary oppositions of self/other, feminine/masculine, West/East, First World/Third World, colonial masters/colonised slaves. We have to recognise that none of these categories is monolithic in themselves and none of them is in constant contestation. Rather these divisions are fluid/flexible and exist in a continuum. Therefore, this paper would conclude the argument by proposing human citizenship rather than citizenship based on any particular identity and territory. A person would decide to which terrain, organisation and power structure, they would like to align their rights and duties. No person would like to have plural strings of commitments and duties attached. It is best to leave the citizenship question to each individual wherein that person will select his or her relationship with an immediate community, state and non-state actors. The provision of free and fair conditions to exercise this choice should be facilitated by nation-states and non-state actors. When basic facilities, rights and dignity of personhood are provided to all individuals on a non-discriminatory basis, then gradually the fight for exclusive privileges and benefits of being a citizen of a particular territory will wither away.

Plurality is the condition of all political life. Beyond satisfying the necessities of life like food, shelter, clothing and education, human beings need recognition and dignity for what they are. All human beings aspire to be wanted and valued. In the process, one must be able to freely express one's perspectives and must always seek to reconcile one's position with those of others. As Hannah Arendt says, "for without a space of appearance and without trusting in action and speech as a mode of being together, neither the reality of one's self, of one's own identity nor the reality surrounding world can be established beyond doubt" (1958: 215). Similarly, Seyla Benhabib adds that not just entry into the public domain but also to acknowledge individual and groups' historical experiences and cultural identity is important in having substantive citizenship (Benhabib, 1992). The burden to mingle with people who have different historical and cultural contexts should not be solely on the shoulders of subordinate groups (like people with 'non-white' skin colour, women, other gender and sexual identities, migrants, the working class in European context) but also on the predominant groups of the society. Care and justice in both private and public spheres are expected, not as essentialised qualities of a particular gender or group but primarily as a human quality.

REFERENCES

Alba, R and Holdaway, J eds. 2013. *The Children of Immigrants at School: A Comparative Look at Integration in the United States and Western Europe*. New York: New York University Press

Anthias, Floya. and Yuval-Davis Nira. eds. 1989. *Woman-Nation-State*. London: Macmillan.

Archer, T. 2009. 'Welcome to the Umma: The British State and it's Muslim Citizens since 9/11'. *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol.44, No. 3, pp. 329-347.

Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Benhabib, Seyla. 1992. *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. New York: Routledge.

Bloom, M. 2011. *Bombshell: The Many Faces of Women Terrorists.* C Hurst & Co Publishers Ltd.

Butler, Judith. 1993. Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of "sex". New York: Routledge.

Dzankic, Jelena. 2015. 'Investment-Based Citizenship and Residence Programmes in the EU'. Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies Research Paper No. RSCAS 2015/08, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2558064 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2558064.

Doost, HM. 2017. 'Women of the Caliphate: the Mechanism for Women's incorporation into the Islamic State'. *Perspectives on Terrorism.* Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 17-25.

Gardham, Duncan. 2019. 'Shamima Begum faces 'extreme scenario' in citizenship appeal'. Accessed from https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/oct/24/shamima-begum-faces-extreme-scenario-in-citizenship-appeal. Accessed on 23 November 2019.

Grierson, Jamie. 2019. 'Lib Dems to call for overhaul of revocation of UK citizenship rules. Accessed from https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2019/sep/15/lib-dems-to-call-for-overhaul-of-revocation-of-uk-citizenship-rules-shamima-begum. Accessed on 23 November 2019.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2004. *The Curious Feminist*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoyle, C; Bradford, A; and Frenett, R. 2015. 'Becoming Mulan? Female Western Migrants

to ISIS'. A report by the Institute for Strategic Dialogue

Husain, Miranda. 2019. 'The Shamima Begum Case Is A Feminist Issue'. Accessed from https://nayadaur.tv/2019/04/the-shamima-begum-case-is-a-feminist-issue/. Accessed on 2 May 2020.

Jacobi, Freyberg-Inan, Lebow and et al. 2012. 'Human Being(s) in International Relations'. *International Studies Review,* Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 645-665.

Joppke, C. 2012. 'Citizenship and Immigration'. *Ethnicities*. Vol. 12 (6), pp. 844-863.

Khan, Rabina. 2019. 'If Shamima Begum is to be prosecuted at home, the public must be told exactly how she was radicalised'. Accessed from https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/shamima-begum-isis-bride-syria-bethnal-green-prosecution-tasnime-akunjee-a9045151.html. Accessed on 23 November 2019.

Kian, A. 2012. 'Gendered Citizenship and the Women's Movement in Iran' in Rouzbeh Parsi (ed.) *Iran: The Revolutionary Republic in Transition*. Paris: Institute for Security Studies European Union.

Kimmel, Michel. 2005. 'Globalisation and its mal(e)contents'. *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lahoud, N. 2014. 'The Neglected Sex: The Jihadis' Exclusion of Women from Jihad'. *Terrorism and Political Violence*. Vol. 26(5), pp. 780-802.

Maas, W. 2013. *Multilevel Citizenship*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Michalowski, I. 2011. 'Required to assimilate: The content of citizenship test in five countries. *Citizenship Studies*, Vol. 15 (6-7), pp. 749-768.

Mohanty, Chandra T. 2003. 'Under Western Eyes: Revisited Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalism Struggles'. *Signs*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 499-535

Parashar, Swati. 2013. 'Feminist Insecurities and Camp Politics'. *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 14, No.4, pp. 440-443

Parveen, Nazia. 2019. 'Shamima Begum must be allowed to keep UK citizenship, says father'. Accessed from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/mar/06/shamima-begum-must-be-allowed-to-keep-uk-citizenship-father-syria-isis. Accessed on 7 March 2019.

Paul, Cithara. 2018. 'Come back, children'. Accessed from https://www.theweek.in/theweek/

cover/2018/07/26/come-back-children.html. Accessed on 12 July 2020.

Puar, Jasbir K. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Soysal, Y. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sen, Amartya. 2006. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*, London: Penguin Books Pvt. Ltd.