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Abstract: Nationality is the most basic of human rights and facilitates access to civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. However, South Sudan gained its independence in 2011, before the declaration of its independence, South Sudan instantly, introduced a new nationality act and adopted it as a modus operandi to surmount the citizenship and other issues linked to citizenship. However, the paper strenuously unpacks and expounds the procedure and requirement of obtaining the nationality or gaining citizenship in South Sudan. Furthermore, the paper painstakingly enunciates and the criteria and process of attaining citizenship which is based on ethnic affiliation and definition in which applicants have to portray their ethnic communities. However, this is to usher that application should be members of the one the ethnic communities in South Sudan approving that the applicants have to access public services and to find jobs in both the public and private sector and for students to gain access to government scholarships. Moreover, the paper thoroughly elaborate challenges that flounder by the applicants that do not directly link to categories and ethnic categories. Moreover, in the situation when evidence is not clear applicants resort to moral argument and that moral negotiations of citizenship redefine the state.
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1. Introduction

In the end of 1990s, there was a tremendous change in the development thoughts which enormously contributed to the emerge of citizenship as an imperative field of debate in developmental studies. However, the participatory approach broached to associate with political participation and the beginning of marginalised people movement and their influence over the decision-making processes that affects their lives. The result was a rise of a good government agenda and its concern with centralised governance and responsiveness of governments to the needs and priorities of citizens. This shift has opened spaces for participation and government to meet the concept of citizenship participation (Gaventa, 2012).

However, the late 1990s divulged a new relationship between the notion the human rights and development portrayed in the right based on an approach to the development. In various forms by international development institutions such as UK development for International development (DFID) and the United Nation development Programme (UNDP), the parts of international human right movement, many civil society groups and some governments, the right based approach to the development policies needs the entrance of right open for further spaces for the issue of citizenship within development. The moves between both human rights and development through participation itself have been reframed as a fundamental human and citizenship rights and precursor of making other rights claims.

Furthermore, the emerg of the concept of citizenship within development usher in the global increased in citizenship. The contemporary interest in citizenship could be explained through six factors. Among these factors, the contemporary processes of globalisation –localisation and the associated dynamic of increased of international migration, heightened the political awareness of ethnic cultural difference within a nation state and fragmentation of nation-states on the basis of these political difference. However, some government considered the nation of citizens as civic identity in an attempt to deem citizens together under a new form of form of commonality (Gaventa, 2012).

Moreover in the world the relationship between citizens and the institutions that affect their lives are put in a crisis with citizens showing disillusionment with the governments and lack responsiveness to the needs of the poor and by the growing recognition of the various benefits of citizen participation, direct democratic mechanisms are used as vehicle through which citizens can take role in the decision that affects their lives and state can increase their responsiveness to citizens. The citizenship becomes of one issue in across academic, policy and popular arenas over the over the past two decades. Citizenship as refers to a process that is much
broaden than the practices and requirements and formality (Uys, 2012). Also, it construed as something goes beyond the rights to hold documents to prove to belong to a certain nation state. However, Tina Uys portrayed the concept as Bryan Turner defines citizenship as that set of practices such as Juridical, political, economic and cultural which defines a person as a member of society and as a consequence determined the move of resources to persons and social groups. Here citizenship becomes a collection of rights and obligation by saying that it includes the social construction of citizenship which change, as consequence of politics. This accentuates the citizenship, in the debate about the inequality, power differences and social class, as citizenship associated with the hurdle of unequal distribution of resources in society (Uys, 2012). Meanwhile, the third world there is a fundamental contradiction, where in the political area citizens would be included and in social and economic life they would be excluded. The principle one person one vote would be recognised, whereas, in social and economic life structured on the lines of communities defined by race, caste, ethnicity, and religion, people would face exclusion.

The concept of citizenship is shown in ambiguity, where the presence of economic disparities and social exclusion such as class, caste, gender, ethnicity, and language is major factors that negate the enjoyment of citizenship rights and bringing the differentiated citizenship rights. The differentiated citizenship rights functions on the argument that they are unequally distributed. One’s location in the social structure based on class, caste, ethnicity, region, and language limits the possibility of engaging activity in the public life and for accessing one’s right (Uys, 2012).

Moreover, there two distinctions of citizenship one active and passive citizenship and formal and substantive ones. Passive citizenship refers to the rights granted by the state and active citizenship to that is claimed by citizens. However, in the colonial countries, a social movement defined the community identity through active citizenship. The formal citizenship refers to rights subsumed in the constitution for individuals and groups, which becomes substantive once these individuals or groups have accessed and enjoyed these rights. The distinction between the passive and active citizenship and formal and substantive citizens allows us to view the situation that characterises the transition process where the state’s recognition of individual rights may lead to a fragmentation of social movements demanding community rights and negating the success of active citizenship and solidarity. It also generates social mobility of individuals and leaders to be included within the system (Uys, 2012).

2. Methodology

The article is written on the basis of the secondary sources and it is a qualitative study an argumentative in nature which was collected through review of literature and differences materials consulted for getting more view about this topic. Also, peripheral literature in the field of citizenship. The mean secondary sources subsume materials from libraries, books, newspapers, documents, internet web site scattered administrative reports, United Nation records, as well as another document about the citizenship.

3. The Concept of Citizenship

The concept of citizenship, a citizen is a member of a political community who officially has the rights and significantly exercised the duties of membership. However, the wider definition is understandable and comprehensible with scanty differences in the works of contemporary writers. However, in spite of the variation between eighteen-century discussion and contemporary debate are adamantly sufficient the basic preoccupation discernable for one living someone living in a monarchy that was the relationship between the concepts of the citizen and the subject. Furthermore, the concept of citizens subsumes three pivotal dimensions the first one is the legal status defined by social, civil and political rights, however, in this perspective, the citizens is the legitimate and legal citizen free to act according to the law and having the right to emphatic demand the protection of the law. Substantially, the dimension does not include the citizen’s participation in the formulation of the rules or equality rights are uniform between citizens (https:\plato.stanford.edu/entries/citizenship).

However, the second dimension eloquently deems citizens as political agents vehemently participating in a society’s political institutions. Moreover, the third dimension refers to citizenship as membership in a political community that rigorously provides a conspicuous source of identity. Consequently, the identity dimension is the last more importance of the three and this clearly incorporates all things associated with identity such as individual, collective and social integration. Moreover, the relation between the three dimensions of the concept of citizenship are ambiguous and ambivalent, the rights that citizens exercise could be defined in the limit of available political activities and a source of citizenship by boosting some self-authority and respect (https:\plato.stanford.edu/entries/citizenship). Consequently, stalwart identity could it self-motivated citizens to participate significantly in
their society’s political life. Substantially, the differences in the concept of citizenship asiduously engulf are around four arguments such as the precise definition of every element (identity, legal, and political), over their importance, over the conceptual relation between them and susceptible and normative standard (https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/citizenship).

Citizenship is the status of a person recognised under the custom or law of being a legal member of a Sovereign State. However, a person may have multiple or dual citizenships and a person who does not have citizenship of any state is said to be stateless. Accordingly, every country has its own policies, regulation and criteria about who should be entitled it citizenship. Moreover, a person could be granted citizenship for several reasons, sometimes citizenship could be granted on the granted on basis of the place of birth is an automatic in other cases, such as an application might be needed (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/citizenship). However, there are several conditions for granting citizenship to citizens in various countries in the world, these subsume the following occasions:

3.1 Citizenship through Birth

In case one or both of a person’s are citizens of a given country, then he or she might have a right to be legitimately weighed to be a citizen of that country as well. However, it might officially be applied in the paternal line only, but gender quality strongly became common in the twentieth century. Moreover, some country such as China, citizenship is granted on the ground of ancestry or ethnicity and it is associated with the concept of the nation-state. Furthermore, a person born outside a country, one or both his and her parents are citizens of the country is deemed to be citizens of that country. However, in some cases countries limits the right to a citizenship by a descent to a certain number of generations born outside the state and this form of citizenship is very rare in the civil law countries.

3.2 Citizenship through born within a country.

Citizens could instantly become citizens of the country where they are born. For an instant, this sort of citizenship is found in England whereas those who were born within the area were subject of monarch a concept of citizenship and it is available in common law countries. Moreover, in some cases, both cling citizenship by place or parentage.

3.3 Citizenship through Marriage.

Some countries encounter naturalisation based on the marriage of a person to a citizen. However, countries which often regularly receive immigrants have regulations to try to overtly unearth or ascertain sham marriages where a citizen could marry a non-citizen for payment, without the intention of living together (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizenship).

3.4 Citizenship through Naturalization.

In many cases, states could grant citizenship to people who spontaneously came to the country legally and they have bestowed a permission to stay, or been given a political asylum and lived there for a span of time. However, in some states naturalisation is subject to potent criteria which might subsume succeeding an example attesting significant knowledge of the language or the culture of the host country, neat conduct and moral character showing vowing allegiance and loyalty to their new state and renouncing their prior citizenship. Moreover, some states could allow dual citizenship and do not need a naturalised citizens to publicly relinquish their previous citizenship (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizenship).

3.5 Citizenship through Excluded Categories.

Previously long time ago, there were some exclusions for granting citizenship on the ground of skin, colour, sex, religion, free status and ethnicity. However, many of these exclusions are not applicable now in many countries. Moreover, recently some countries incorporate Arab countries which negligibly give citizenship to non-Muslims, for example, the state of Qatar dedicated citizenship to athletes from other countries. However, they should countenance that they are Muslims as the sine qua non for granting citizenship. Moreover, US consents citizenship to those who are born as a repercussion of reproductive technologies and officially condoned children born after, 1983. Furthermore, exclusion exists for internationally adopted children born before the year of 1983, in spite, their parents comply with citizenship conditions or requirements (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizenship).

4. Citizenship in Different Thoughts

The ideas of the citizenship begin with explicitly enunciating the main notions of the approaches are the liberal thought and communitarian thought and the republicans thought. Basically, these three perspectives are groups of ideas with common structuring dimensions, rather than categories of
which can be juxtaposed, these three thoughts strenuously give divergence about citizenship

### 4.1 Citizenship in the liberal Thought

Liberal thought believed that citizenship is a status which gives an individual certain set of universal rights given by the state. The liberal thought is the notion that individual citizens act in a rational way. In order to, achieved their interests and the state liability is safeguard the citizens and to allow them to enjoy their inalienable rights. The protection role and the liberty could be discerned in forms of the negotiation bestowing every individual equal rights is construed to streamline equality through transforming an individual’s political and economic irrelevant to right claims (Gaventa, 2012)

However, in this perspective exercising right is viewed as the choice of citizens on the ground that they could have the sine qua non-resources. Moreover, these are rights to political participation and the right to vote within the representative democratic system. Marshall considered social rights to the right of political and civic rights and its deemed as springboard points for thinkers. Marshall notion of citizenship is based on belief in the capacity of the state to identify individual from economic and social conundrums through social welfare provision (Gaventa, 2012). Marshall believed that citizens have a right to s economic and social needs and the security be availed by the state. Marshall point of view was not for the complete elimination of inequality, but an erosion of the rights connected with capitalism for the poorest citizens, this view leads to a sense of community and social cohesion (Gaventa, 2012)

The principle of the republican thought is based on civic self-rule, enshrined in classical institutions such as rotation of offices succouring. A citizen as one of competence ruling and being ruled in turn. Citizens are those who participating in holding office. Civic self-rule is the main issue in the social contract and that the laws mak citizens free and legitimate. The republication thought is to accentuate the second dimension of citizenship of the political agency, the example of republican thought are in Roman Empire, Roman law and the Roman Empire expansion culminated in citizens rights granted to invaded people and formulation of the citizenship meaning. Citizenship accentuates being insulated by the law regardless of participating in its formation and implementation. It became occasional identity, a legal status and not a fact of everyday life under republicans citizens here is plumped a legal status rather than a political office. It could grant membership in a community of shared or common law, which may not be identical with a territorial community. The liberal tradition construes citizenship as a legal status and political liberty is a means of safeguarding individual freedom for aggression by other individuals or the authorities and citizens enjoy this freedom in private associations and attachments, but, in the political arena (Gaventa, 2012)

### 4.2 Citizenship in Communitarian Thought

The idea of the self – interest independent individual which liberal thinkers invent has been argued by communitarians such as Sandal which opined that an individual sense of identity is provided only, through relations with others in the community of which she or he is a part and this attests that communitarian thought on the nation of the socially embedded citizens and community belonging. The individual can only fathom he, she interests and identifies through deliberation over, the common and individual liberty is maximised through public services and priorities of the common good over the pursuit of individual interest. In Communitarians’ thought citizen is defined as is seen to develop, certain civic virtues, such as respect for others and recognition of the importance of the public services with references to post-modern societies and he asserted that the civic virtue distribution over time, the capacity to negotiate our way among overlapping conflicting obligation (Gaventa, 2012). That claims us and to live with tensions to which over, multiple loyalties give rise. Communitarians assert that the group as defining certain of identity and that all individuals imagine us only in relation to the larger community as the basis of common ground (Gaventa, 2012)

### 4.2 Citizenship in Civic Republican Thought

Civic republican thought attempt is to subsume the liberal ideas of the self – interested individual within the communitarian’s framework of egalitarianism and community belonging. Its emphasis what binds citizens together in the community for civic writers, this underpinned with concern with the individual obligation to participation in communal affairs, but civic liberal republicans thought such as an old field. They argue that basic resource is precursor enable participation in community life rather than conceiving them as basic rights and civic republication thought is to promote forms of democracy. Some civic writers deemed that the ideas of citizenship should be discerned as a common civic identity, characterised by a common public culture.
The republicans argued that the concept of citizenship is a civic identity that can work to unite citizens so long identity is stronger than their separate identities as members of different groups. Citizens will form factional groups based on their interest in order to press for them in the political realm. And they opined that representative of this groups must be able to distance between their demands and those of others to be able to deal with the later objectivity. In the same way producing an effective balance between toleration and obligation involves citizens participating politically as advocates of particular interests with their concern focuses on fairness between differences section of the community and the pursuit of common ends. Therefore citizenship as common identification at the level of which most decisions affecting the shape of society are made (Gaventa, 2012).

5. The Citizenship issue in Sudan

The question of citizenship in Sudanese political discourses have been based on nationality which is a jinsiyya in Arabic instead of citizenship which is a muwatana in Arabic. However, the legal contract between the citizens and the state is focused on descent and the marginalized groups have been incorporated in the larger political community and being recognized as Sudanese. In spite of internecine wars which were fought by Sudanese people in their quest for a collective identity for their nation, some ideologies had been based on discriminatory approach. However, no political party has a policy of excluding another group from being Sudanese and they do not disagree about being all Sudanese (Marko, 2015).

However, Sudanese citizenship to some scholars was used to attest the issue of belonging which was used to differentiate and distinguish Sudanese society in order to marginalize the people of marginalised areas such as people of southern Sudan, the people of Bule Nile, the people of southern Kordofan and the people of Darfur and not to exclude them from the political activities in the country, and to succour the groups with an Arabic identity who usurped highest positions in the political arena in the country. However, the new South Sudanese system has made social stratification in a way that rather than the way that the old Sudanese practice where all people were included in Sudanese citizenship. Furthermore, in Sudan, the propensity for moving to highest social mobility is harnessed through the acquisition of citizenship (Marko, 2015).

However, in Sudan in the time of the British Colonisation, the name Sudanese was legally not defined but it was officially discerned as any person who is a citizen of Sudanese State. Furthermore, the question of Sudanese citizenship encountered the British rule in many ways, and, for the complexity and ambiguity of this issue, a senior colonial official observed in the 1940s that the position of the Sudanese is peculiar. There is a particular defined territory called as the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, the people of which are all Sudanese there is no law to usher who are subsumed in the name Sudanese. Moreover, that law could solace and underpin in effacing and plucking perversity and curiousness enormities the government could this as an administrative issue and not as political hurdles. However, to resolve this conundrum the colonial government endorsed the Definition of Sudanese Ordinance in 1948 and this definition had been used as the basis for the first Nationality Act of Independence of Sudan in 1956. Additionally, this Act deemed Sudanese citizenship through descent without linked with ethnic affiliation, postulating a person shall be a Sudanese by descent if his father a Sudanese by descent at the time his birth, that was superseded in 1993 and 1994 by two provisional decrees, endorsed into the law in 194 and amended in 2005 and these changes were cosmetics (Marko, 2015).

However, until of independence of South Sudan in 2011, citizenship has not excluded ethnic groups from the political arena of Sudan. Also, ethnic affiliation is used as a basis for authenticating citizenship claim and in some cases, it is more difficult for members of cross-border ethnic groups to obtain nationality certificates of citizenship is based on parental nationality without a link to ethnicity. However, citizenship as alluded, before was used to stratify and separate populations and to persecute and marginalise people the peripheries of the state. However, members of disenfranchised communities were treated as second-class citizens. More than that South Sudanese officer stated that: second-class citizenship in Islamic definition first class is a man, second-class is a woman, and then some people described the third-class are these black Africans who are Muslims, and we South Sudanese we have not even been weighed as a class (Marko, 2015).

Moreover, after the separation of South Sudan, the National Assembly of the of Sudan unanimously approved amendments to the 1994 Sudan Nationality Act that officially efface Sudanese nationality from any person who the Government of Sudan deemed to have the nationality of South Sudanese. Despite dual nationality with other states has been permitted in Sudan since
1994. Furthermore, the law now stipulated that: A person shall instantly lose his Sudanese nationality if he or she has attained the nationality of South Sudan. However, the law caters no procedures to permit an individual to claim that he or she has not given the nationality of South Sudan. The main hurdle is that the general terms of the of Laws of South Sudan, which transpired to associates nationality immediately to those eligible even if they are living outside South Sudan, strongly exhort Khartoum government to claim that a plethora of people is truly South Sudanese people and they dramatically lose Sudanese nationality.

In lieu, the Sudanese Government has clearly ensured that there will be no forced repatriation of those who are weighed to be South Sudanese, but they had been bestowed nine months until 9/4/2012 to rearrange their movement. However, Sudanese Government has automatically introduced a new civil registration law and biometric identity card for Sudanese citizens. This was a very important move to streamline birth registration and documentation of citizens so that they could exercise and enjoy their rights. However, the procedures of application for the new ID cards was intended to stymie and profit Sudanese in the north from access to this new ID cards, meanwhile. South Sudanese were being laid off or sacked from employment and precluded to access to social services. Also those citizens with a parent from the north or other from the South who under the constitution have an undeniable inalienable right to Sudanese nationality, believed to have to flounder facing challenging in getting the required documentation to countenance it. However, due with that arduous situation, thousands South Sudanese origin decided collectively spontaneously move toward South in these year with the succour of the UN thousands of those who made up their minds started to voluntarily return and broached to sell their houses and other belonging and possessions, found themselves stranded in transient and fugitive way stations and camps before they were transported the exigent odyssey that took some years while tens of thousands of returnees had been biding their transportation back home.

6. The Citizenship Question in South Sudan

South Sudan became an independent state on July 9, 2011. However, the most contested issue which supposed to be given priority was the question of citizenship and the rules for determining who should become a citizen of the new state. Furthermore, the legal drafting issues were more technical, the significant woe was the dearth of political will and objection by the Sudan government to still consider as Sudanese, the several hundred thousand southerners living in the north for decades. Despite negotiations were to be resumed after the independence of South Sudan. Instead, both Sudan and South Sudan have differently adopted laws and processes to decide who will be deemed the citizens of the South Sudan and who will still continue to be considered citizens of Sudan.

However, the concept of citizenship portrays a mechanism for inclusion and exclusion from the political body which was a controversial issue in South Sudan in the leeway of the civil war. Furthermore, The SPLM/A used the slogan of universal human rights to garner a powerful and the Vision of New Sudan vehemently based on inclusive and equal citizenship. The vision of New Sudan was postulated in SPLM/A Manifesto as the concept of the New Sudan has no racial, ethnic or separatist connotations. It is rather a framework, a national project, for building a true and sustainable Citizenship State capable of accommodating the multiple diversities of Sudanese society (Marko, 2015). The SPLM vision is an intellectual contribution to the developing political discourse on the rebuilding of the Sudanese State, emendation mechanism intended to promote an inclusive sense of belonging which enunciate that all Sudanese citizens enjoy all rights of citizenship.

However, the leaders of the Liberation Army regularly unpacked the conspicuous catalysts of the civil war as a grappling against second-class citizenship. However, the stratifying Sudanese citizenship system was challenged with the egalitarian citizenship of the imagined New Sudan. As a logical result the independence referendum of 2011 was designed as a decision between equal, first-class-for-all citizenship of New Sudan and the second-class Sudanese citizenship of marginalization, as a very regular used political posters quoted Dr John Garang’s statement shows: “I and those who joined me in the bush and fought for more than twenty years have brought to you Comprehensive Peace Agreement in golden plate. Our mission is accomplished. It is now your turn, especially those who did not have a chance to experience bush’s life. When time comes to vote at the referendum, it is your golden choice to determine your fate. Would you like to vote to be second-class citizens in your own country? It is absolutely your choice” (Marko, 2015). However, South Sudan required a legitimate definition and explicit boundaries to demarcate its own population, and they slated and anointed for an ethnic understanding. Moreover, The New Sudan Nationality Act was unanimously countenanced by
the SPLM/An in 2003, to conspicuously establish and foundation for legislation in the swathes pursued by the SPLA/.Substantially, the Act ensures that: A person shall be a New Sudan national by Decent (i) if he was or his parents, his grand and great grandparents were born in the New Sudan and (ii) he belongs to one of the tribes of the New Sudan. However, the ethnic definition stipulated in the National Act did ushers ramifications due unavailability of identity cards not being issued by SPLM during the war and the tribes in South Sudan remains a flexible issue (Marko, 2015).

However, the legal definition of who is Southern Sudanese was required in the advent of the referendum of South Sudan for independence, is conditioned only Southern Sudanese had the right to register and vote. The Referendum Act of 2009 was based on the New Sudan Nationality Act, with the little written with the legal definition, mentioning that a voter should meet the following requirements: born to parents both or one of them belonging to any of the indigenous communities staying in Southern Sudan on or before 1st January 1956, or whose ancestry is traceable to one of the ethnic communities in Southern Sudan. However, the main variation between the two acts was that the Comprehensive Peace Agreement polictically demarcated the boundaries of South Sudan, and the day-to-day flip-flopping category of the ethnic group of New Sudan was officially supplanted with the more broader belonging to one of the indigenous communities staying in Southern Sudan formula.

Moreover, the use ethnicity as a legal category was a politically motivated move by the governing movement. Furthermore, two criteria were staunchly adopted for the referendum to be achieved. Moreover, the majority of the votes and a turnout rate of above 60% of the adult population was catered according to the controversial 2008 census. For example, the SPLM/An intention was to collectively register mammoth voters as much as possible to ensure the turnout rate, but at the same time excluding anyone who could vote for unity. However, for that ethnic community believed to be colluding with the government of Sudan, mostly pastoralists who are Muslim groups such as Misseriya and Baggara Arabs and Fulani herders in Greater Bahr el Ghazal have been excluded from being part of indigenous ethnic communities of Southern Sudan (Marko, 2015).

However, South Sudan officially endorsed a new Nationality Act in July, however, the definition of South Sudanese came it was defined in the Referendum Act, but it holds some issues as follows:

(1) A person born before or after this Act has entered into force shall be considered a South Sudanese National by birth if such a person meets requirements:
   (a) any Parents, grandparents or great-grandparents of such a person, on the male or female line, were born in South Sudan, or
   (b) such person belongs to one of the indigenous ethnic communities of South Sudan.

(2) A person shall be considered a South Sudanese National by birth if at the time of the coming into force of this Act-
   (a) he or she has been domiciled in South Sudan since, 1.1.1956; or
   (b) if any of his or her parents or grandparents have been domiciled in South Sudan since 1.1.1956.

(3) A person born after the commencement of this Act shall be a South Sudanese National by birth if his or her father or mother was a South Sudanese National by birth or naturalisation at the time of the birth of such a person.

(4) A person who is or was first found in South Sudan as a deserted infant of unknown Parents shall, until the contrary is proved, be deemed to be a South Sudanese National by birth (Laws of South Sudan, The Nationality Act, 7th July 2011).

7. South Sudan`s procedures for applying for official documents

7.1 Instructions

a. Citizen of South Sudan & another country can apply for recognition of your dual citizenship & endorsement in your foreign passport. b. A person born outside South Sudan can only be a citizen by birth if on the date of birth one or both of parents were/are citizens by birth. c. Always carry originals documents in addition to photos because an officer may request to look at them. d. All application forms must be signed and dated by the applicant. e. Application forms must be filled in person. f. Application forms must be filled by hand thus do not computer print.

7.2. Required Information

a. Full name of applicant. b. Nationality. c. Date of Birth. d. Names of parents and nationality. e. Procedure. For an applicant to obtain dual citizenship in South Sudan; The Issuing Authority inquires into the facts relating to an application.

7.3 Requirement procedures for applying for South Sudan Identity Card
The responsibility to adduce sufficient evidence to support the application remains primarily with the applicant. The applicant may establish the facts supporting his/her application by documentary evidence. The applicant must provide a witness who is believed to be elders and next of kin.

7.4 Required documents for applying for recognition of dual citizenship; and

a. Request for an application form and complete it in duplicate by hand.  
b. Take Form 2 to either Notary Public or Commissioner of Oaths for signing. 
c. Attach photocopies of supporting documents, and take foreign passport for endorsement. Where documentary evidence is not available to support an application, the Issuing Authority takes into consideration sworn statements by any witnesses adduced by the applicant. Such witnesses may be, primarily but not only,

- Community leaders,  
- Traditional authorities,  
- Church and/or religious leaders,  
- County, Payam, and/or Boma officials,  
- Chiefs and/or sub-chiefs from the applicant’s local indigenous group;  
- Relations of the applicant,  
- Any other persons of good standing who has own first-hand knowledge of the identity of the applicant.

The Issuing Authority decides on the application on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence, considering whether the facts alleged by the applicant are more likely to be true than not.

7.5 Required documents for applying for South Sudan passport

a. Request for an application form and complete it.  
b. Attach three recent passport pictures, and take it for signing, ensure that one is counter-signed by the person signing your application.  
c. Attach supporting documents.  
d. Submit application to South Sudan Immigration if in Juba or to any nearest South Sudan Embassy, High Commission or Consulate if abroad.

7.6 The after ten 10 days Collection of the passport.

a. Born abroad should, in addition, apply for a Certificate of Birth of a Citizen of South Sudan Occurring Born Abroad.  
b. Obtain and complete the form by hand.  
c. Attach photocopies all necessary documents.  
d. Go to the Civil Registration Office and submit an application. It will be delivered to the headquarters for approval.  
e. When approved, an applicant then has to make payment and then collect certificate in 3 - 10 days.

The collation and amalgamation of ethnicity and territoriality for obtaining citizenship, in South Sudan, has created challenges that face many people, as it alluded before an applicant had to countenance that he or she comes from one of the well-known ethnic groups. However, the importance condition for the law grant citizenship to a person whose parents or he or her ancestors were born in South Sudan. Moreover, the criteria are for people with foreign ancestry, such as Sudanese or Greek merchants who have to reside in South Sudan for decades was not familiar to the. However, in South Sudan citizenship is equated o or tantamount to the belonging to one of the indigenous ethnic communities. However, after the secession of South Sudan, similarly, the Government of Sudan countermanded and revamped nationality legislation, repudiating dual citizenship to foist on people the option of anointing between the North and the South as mentioned earlier, rescind and abrogate the citizenship of people South Sudan still residing in Sudan. Furthermore there a number of people had no real ties with South Sudan. It the first time for Sudan citizenship from a group of people South Sudan reverts back to the colonial notion of citizens and subjects (Marko, 2015).

However, for the process of granting citizenship in South Sudanese citizenship office use the logic of the aforementioned procedures which is based on ethnic belonging to indigenous communities of South Sudan. However, in the process of issuing the nationality, the tribe which is a sine qua non for belonging to the communities in South Sudan is a precursor question for an application to answer sincerely and openly. Moreover, in investigations which are conducted by immigration officers subsume beseeching or grilling about the tribe or ethnic and the applicant’s tribe or his or her witnesses should give the background of applicant’s tribe However, Ethnic belonging in South Sudan is expected to be in the patrilineal descent line, however, for inter-ethnic marriages what is importance is their father’s ethnic group or...
if their mother’s family was staying with them. When there is a doubt case, about people who come from cross-border ethnic groups, in such a situation a recommendation letter is required from traditional chiefs which could be used as prima facies evidence. Moreover, Citizenship acquisition is a prerequisite and mandatory for access to education, and for middle-class, and burghers. Furthermore solely citizens with nationalities could have access to business, and regional universities, jobs. However, for those who flunk to countenance their citizenship, they could have access to political and economic benefits. Therefore Citizenship and identity documents and sine qua non to the accessibility for economic and political work, in South Sudan (Marko, 2015).

However, the issue of ethnicity or tribalism, South Sudan as Country composed of many ethnic groups with the diversity in language, cultures and all these tribal groups were engaged in the long struggle for liberation and eventually the independence of South Sudan. In the internal vying for power and leadership the politicians moved the nation toward the ethnic line, this ethnic issue became hurdle and the growing crisis. Moreover, tribal group animosity is reflected in the distribution of power and other privileges (Lupai, 2014). However, politicians articulate ethnic identities which are constructed and imagined after the loss of power exaggerated or manipulated as tribal loss of power and eventually mobilisation of the tribe to grapple for allegedly rights which are achieved upon the reinstatement of those who was sacked. However, the politicians take a turn in articulating ethnic interests achieved privileges. Therefore tribalism in South Sudan became an instrument in the hands of power seeking elites. Moreover, South Sudan ethnic conflict is a politically made by elites and politicians who do not care about lives of the people, the despicable and deplorable conditions of people in South Sudan could be attributed to negligence and insensitivity of these elites who deprived off the public fund which led to the current conflict (Malith, 2016). Moreover, the absence of collective interest and belonging that that could transcend ethnic identities precipitated the conflict. Finally, the current crisis necessitates and warrants the watershed that would introduce renegotiation reconstitution of the nation identity which will be based on the common and collective interests of the people in the country regardless of their ethnic, religion or region and this will be a harbinger for building the state on a new basis and legitimacy.

Conclusions
The question of stratifying citizenship which was a practice in Sudan was made to persecute and marginalise people of peripheries in Sudan and created what considered by the marginalised people of being classified as the second class citizens. How the Sudanese citizenship triggered much rebellion led by these marginalised groups including SPLM/A which was fighting for unite Sudan, with the first citizenship to all Sudanese people irrelevant to ethnic, religion, colour and region and it was a widened project to transform all Sudan with insurance of an equal citizenship to all its citizens. However, the referendum of South Sudan triggered the notion of ethnic belonging which is based on the descent and it came as in the colonial definition of Sudanese citizenship. The ethnicity was deemed to be utmost for making a successful and peaceful independence of South Sudan which was unanimously voted by South Sudan and culminated to the Independence. Moreover, the ethnic became a core issue in granting citizenship in South Sudan, to equate with being to one of the indigenous ethnic counties in South Sudan. However, this logic of citizenship acquisition which akin ethnicity make it harder and difficult for the cross-border ethnic groups and other communities who have been living in South Sudan and not directly linked to the main indigenous ethnic communities of South Sudan.

Meanwhile ethnicity in practice as it was a logic for determining who is really South Sudan has taken a different dimension of the class differentiation between ruling elites who believed to be from some eminent group and other groups that felt of being marginalised and led to formation of ethnic identities leading to more rift and fissure among of people of the young nation. However, the logic of citizenship became more complex and associated with many conundrums in South Sudan after the separation. Furthermore, the ruling elites used ethnic identities for their own interests and the corruption flourishes and misappropriation of public funds, embezzlement and misuse of public property and identity politics adopted by elites as the way of ethnic balancing in the government. Additionally, unfair allocation of resources and employment, poor services delivery and unequal distribution practices are the overarching catalysts causing ethnicity which is exaggerated and manipulated by power seeking elites which, eventually culminated in bloody internecine conflict and mass displacement and finally the crisis brought bewilderment and turmoil in the country.
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