



International Journal of Science, Architecture, Technology and Environment

SIR – The Fight for Citizenship: “We the People of India”

Dr. Pushpa Lenkapally^{1*}, Dr. Srinivas Potharaju²

¹Lecturer in Political Science, Government Degree College for Women, Wanaparthy

²Lecturer in History, Government Degree College for Women, Wanaparthy

*Corresponding author

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63680/ijstate102602.06>

Abstract

This paper examines the political and constitutional concerns surrounding the Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of electoral rolls and its relationship to citizenship, equality, and democratic participation in India. The source material emphasizes that SIR is formally an electoral-roll revision process and, as noted in the discussion of the Supreme Court's position, is not itself a process for determining citizenship. However, the practical experiences described in the material raise concerns about the possible blurring of electoral verification and citizenship verification. The paper highlights the burden of documentation on vulnerable groups, including poor people, migrant workers, women, Dalits, Adivasis, minorities, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities. It also considers the Assam experience, the importance of procedural fairness, transparency, appeal mechanisms, and the constitutional principle of equal citizenship. The central argument of the source is that electoral-roll revision should be conducted fairly, transparently, and consistently so that genuine citizens are not deprived of democratic rights.

Keywords: Special Intensive Revision (SIR); Citizenship; Electoral Rolls; Constitutional Equality; Democratic Rights; Documentation; Political Participation; Marginalized Groups; Due Process; India

1. INTRODUCTION

“We the People of India” expresses the principle that sovereignty rests with the people and provides the constitutional foundation of the Republic of India. In this framework, citizenship is presented in the source material as a constitutional status associated with equal rights, equal respect, and equal participation in democratic processes.

The Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of electoral rolls has become important in this context. The source material refers to the Supreme Court's clarification that SIR is not a process for determining citizenship and that deletion of a person's name from an electoral roll does not by itself terminate citizenship. At the same time, the material records concerns that electoral verification may, in practice, become connected with questions about citizenship and access to other rights.

The paper also discusses two competing conceptions of national identity. One is the constitutional conception of India as a republic based on popular sovereignty and equal political rights irrespective of religion, caste, or social background. The other, as described in the source, is associated with M.S. Golwalkar's conception of India as primarily a Hindu nation, in which national identity is linked more strongly to cultural affiliation than to constitutional citizenship. The source presents this distinction as relevant to understanding contemporary debates concerning citizenship.

The discussion further examines the documentary burden placed on individuals. Poverty, migration, changes of residence, marriage, and natural disasters can affect a person's ability to obtain and preserve official documents. The source therefore stresses that procedures affecting electoral inclusion must take account of social and economic inequalities.

2. METHODOLOGY

This paper uses a qualitative, documentary and analytical approach based on the material provided in the source document. The analysis is organized around five major themes: (1) the constitutional meaning of citizenship and popular sovereignty; (2) the relationship between electoral-roll revision and citizenship verification; (3) the documentary burden and its effects on marginalized groups; (4) procedural fairness, transparency and the right to appeal; and (5) the political and constitutional context of citizenship debates.

The paper also uses the cases and experiences cited in the source material, including references to Supreme Court observations, the Assam experience, Foreigners Tribunals, and individual experiences described in the document. These examples are used to identify concerns about documentation, procedural errors, unequal burdens, and access to appeal. The methodology does not independently verify or add claims beyond the uploaded source; it reorganizes and analytically presents the arguments contained in that material.

3. CONCLUSION

The source material concludes that electoral-roll revision is closely connected to fundamental democratic principles because the right to vote provides citizens with meaningful political participation and an experience of equal citizenship. Although SIR is described as an electoral-roll revision process rather than a direct determination of citizenship, the experiences discussed in the paper indicate that the distinction can become blurred in practice.

The Assam experience, the difficulties faced by people who lack documents, and the accumulation of cases before appellate bodies demonstrate the importance of procedural safeguards. The burden of proof can be particularly difficult for poor people, migrant workers, women, Dalits, Adivasis, minorities, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities. A formal right of appeal is meaningful only when people have sufficient time, financial resources, and legal assistance to exercise it.

The paper therefore emphasizes transparency, fairness, consistency, and effective appeal mechanisms in electoral-roll revision. It also draws on Ambedkar's warning that administrative systems can weaken the spirit of a Constitution even when its formal structure remains unchanged. The protection of popular sovereignty, constitutional equality, citizenship, and the right to vote requires electoral procedures that do not unfairly exclude genuine citizens from democratic participation.

Source note: *This reorganization is based on the uploaded document and does not independently verify the factual or legal claims contained in it.*

4. REFERENCES

Based on the uploaded paper, you can add the following **References** section at the end. The first group contains sources that are directly relevant to the claims and themes in the paper.

1. **Constituent Assembly of India.** (1948). *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 4 November 1948. New Delhi: Lok Sabha Secretariat.
2. **Constitution of India.** (1950). *The Constitution of India*. Government of India, Ministry of Law and Justice.
3. **Supreme Court of India.** (2026). *Judgment concerning Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of electoral rolls*. Supreme Court of India. The judgment records that ineligibility for inclusion in electoral rolls pursuant to SIR does not, by itself, terminate a person's citizenship under the Citizenship Act.
4. **Golwalkar, M. S.** (1939). *We, or Our Nationhood Defined*. Nagpur: Bharat Publications. Bibliographic records identify the original publication as 1939.
5. **Ambedkar, B. R.** (1948). *Constituent Assembly Debates*, 4 November 1948. Constituent Assembly of India.
6. **Roy, Anupama.** (2010). *Mapping Citizenship in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
7. **Jayal, Niraja Gopal.** (2013). *Citizenship and Its Discontents: An Indian History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
8. **Jaffrelot, Christophe (Ed.).** (2009). *Hindu Nationalism: A Reader*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
9. **Graham, Bruce Desmond.** (2007). *Hindu Nationalism and Indian Politics: The Origins and Development of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. **Khan, S., Svensson, J., Jogdand, Y. A., & Liu, J. H.** (2017). "Lessons from the Past for the Future: The Definition and Mobilisation of Hindu Nationhood by the Hindu Nationalist Movement of India." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 5(2), 477–511.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and publication of this article.