

Block 3
Concepts



BLOCK 3 CONCEPTS

Block 3 has four units that cover concepts of democracy, gender, citizenship and civil society. **Unit 7** gives the general understanding of the idea of democracy and its various types like classical, elitist, popular and e-democracy. **Unit 8** discusses the concept of gender through themes like patriarchy and its theories, gender mainstreaming and relationship between gender and politics. **Unit 9** highlights citizenship, its evolution as a concept, various theories like liberal, republican, feminist etc. and also the idea of global citizenship. **Unit 10** deals with the idea of civil society and state and their relationship as well.



UNIT 7 DEMOCRACY*

Structure

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction: Meaning of Democracy
- 7.2 Procedural/Minimalist and Substantive/Maximalist Dimension
- 7.3 Types of Democracy
 - 7.3.1 Classical Democracy
 - 7.3.2 Elitist Democracy
 - 7.3.3 Pluralist Democracy
 - 7.3.4 Participatory Democracy
 - 7.3.5 Deliberative Democracy
 - 7.3.6 People's Democracy
 - 7.3.7 Social Democracy
 - 7.3.8 E-democracy
- 7.4 Indian Democracy at a Glance
- 7.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 7.6 References
- 7.7 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

7.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, you will be able to understand democracy as a form of government. After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the meaning and evolution of democracy;
- Know various types of democracy;
- Comprehend features of Indian democracy; and
- Know the challenges to democracy in India.

7.1 INTRODUCTION: MEANING OF DEMOCRACY

Democracy has a Greek origin as the first democratic government is believed to have originated in Athens in 5th century BC. The word democracy is derived from the Greek word '*demokratia*'. It is a combination of two Greek words, '*demos*' meaning people and '*kratos*' meaning power. Hence, democracy stands for rule by the people which gives true legitimacy to the government as it is based on the consent of the ruled. It is generally agreed that democracy means popular rule and sovereignty, but how that will be achieved varies from one country to other. That is why, we today see different forms of democracy – totalitarian democracy in North Korea, Islamic democracy in Pakistan and Turkey, presidential democracy in the US to parliamentary democracy in India. There is an inherent tension between liberty and equality which democracies grapple with. Promoting individual liberty could have negative impact on equality and

* Contributed by Dr. Raj Kumar Sharma, Academic Associate, Faculty of Political Science, IGNOU, New Delhi

vice-versa. Another issue is that democracies are vulnerable to the danger of being reduced to the rule of majority at the cost of minorities. This can be checked to a large extent if there is a high degree of maturity and education among the voters in a democracy. This should be complemented by a genuinely free press which could keep the public opinion balanced and free from any bias. A well informed electorate and a free media ensure government's accountability, which is the true spirit of a democratic system.

There are a number of reasons why democracy is seen as a better form of government compared to others. In his 1861 book, *Considerations on Representative Government*, *JS Mill* has given three advantages of a democracy over non-democratic systems. First, democracy compels the decision makers to take into account public interest and opinion which would not be the case in an authoritarian or aristocratic form of government. Second, democracy brings in multiple views in the process of decision making which allows decision makers to pick up the *best* ideas. Third, democracy also helps in character building of citizens as it inculcates qualities like rationality, autonomy and independent thinking. This creates pressure of public opinion on political leaders who cannot ignore people's views if they wish to remain in power. Nobel laureate *Amartya Sen* has given the relationship between democracy and famines, arguing that there has been no famines in a functioning democracy as the leaders are accountable to the people and cannot ignore their basic welfare. Modern democracy came up in Britain and France and later spread to other countries. A number of reasons contributed to the spread of democracy – corruption and incompetence, misuse of power, absence of accountability and unjustifiable rule of monarchs based on the concept of divine rights.

In a broader sense, democracy is not only a form of government and state, but also a condition of society. A democratic society is one in which there is socio-economic equality while a democratic state is one where citizens get a chance to participate in an open and fair political process. Some frequent meanings attributed to the term democracy are as follows:

- Rule by the poor and the disadvantaged
- Society based on equal opportunity and individual merit instead of hierarchy and privilege
- Welfare and redistribution to reduce social inequality
- Decision making based on majority rule
- Protection of minority rights by placing checks on majority rule
- Fulfilling public offices through competition for popular vote.

A number of features can be attributed to a democracy. Written constitution, rule of law, human rights, independent media and judiciary, separation of powers between executive, judiciary and legislature could be described as some of the basic features of democracy. The idea of democracy has come a long way from its initial form in Greece which was not inclusive in nature. The Greek model of democracy excluded women, slaves and immigrants making it 'undemocratic' in spirit. This spirit continued even in modern democracies like France, Britain and the US where some sections were not allowed to vote while the voting rights were given to wealthy men. The French Revolution of 1789 talked about liberty, equality and fraternity apart from popular sovereignty for mankind.

However, the women did not get the right to vote and it was only in 1944 that France started universal adult suffrage. In Britain, women got the right to vote in 1928 while in the US, they got this right in 1920. However, discrimination on the basis of color remained in the US and it was only in 1965 that the African American women and males were given the right to vote. India has been progressive in this regard compared to the Western democracies as India adopted universal adult franchise from 1950 when its constitution came into force and in fact became the world’s first democratic state to have universal adult franchise since its inception. Saudi Arabia is the latest country which has allowed women to vote and in 2015, women for the first time exercised their right to vote in municipal elections.

Democracy can be classified as direct and representative depending on how the people rule. Direct democracy is based on direct and unmediated citizen participation in government rule. All adult citizens take part in decision making to ensure that all the viewpoints are discussed and best possible decisions are taken. Direct democracy wipes out the distinction between the government and the governed and the state and civil society. The ancient Greek city state model was an example of direct democracy. In contemporary times, direct democracy can be found in Swiss cantons. Direct democracy ensures greater legitimacy as people are more likely to follow decisions which are taken by them only. It also creates a highly informed citizenry which participate in decision making. However, there is vast difference in size (geography, population) between a city-state and a nation-state. That is why; practicing direct democracy is difficult in big modern nation states. This issue was solved with the development of representative democracy, which first appeared in northern Europe in the 18th century. Representative democracy is limited and indirect form of democracy. It is limited because popular participation in policy making is very less pertaining to voting in a few years while it is indirect as people do not exercise power directly but through their elected representatives. Presidential and parliamentary democracies are two main types of representative democracies around the world. There are more parliamentary democracies around the world than the presidential democracies. Parliamentary democracies are more representative than the presidential but at the same time, they are relatively less stable.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What do you understand by democracy? What are the advantages of democracy over other forms of government?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What do you understand by representative democracy?

.....

.....

.....

7.2 PROCEDURAL/MINIMALIST AND SUBSTANTIVE/MAXIMALIST DIMENSION

Democracy could be well understood by two different views – procedural (minimalist) and substantive (maximalist). The procedural dimension merely focuses on procedures or means in place to attain democracy. It argues that regular competitive elections on the basis of universal adult franchise and plural political participation would produce a democratically elected government. In his 1942 book, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, Joseph Schumpeter has said that democracy is “institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote”. *Huntington* has also echoed similar views saying, “The central procedure of democracy is the selection of leaders through competitive elections by the people they govern.” However, people are perceived as passive beyond electoral participation in the minimalist view and thus, are governed by their representatives. This view does not focus on liberty and freedom as it emphasizes on how to elect a democratic government. In the absence of checks and balances in the system, the elected leaders could manipulate procedures and power for their own benefit leading to concealed authoritarianism. The government could work for the elites who hold power instead of the people who should hold the ultimate authority in a democratic set up. Such instances have existed in Argentina and Brazil between 1980s and 1990s. The governments in Central Asian countries too could be described as procedural democracies as the power has been concentrated in the hands of a single individual although periodic elections are held from time to time. *Terry Karl* has pointed that minimalist view could also lead to ‘fallacy of electoralism’, a situation where electoral process is given priority over other dimensions of democracy. *Fareed Zakaria* calls it ‘illiberal democracy’, a case where governments are democratically elected, but ignore constitutional limits on their power and deprive their citizens of basic rights and freedoms.

Substantive democracy tries to overcome the shortcomings of procedural view arguing that social and economic differences could hamper people’s participation in the democratic process. It focuses on outcomes like social equality instead of ends in order to truly work for the governed. In a sense, it talks about ‘common good’ rather than the benefit of limited individuals. The rights of marginalized sections like women and the poor are protected through redistributive justice so that conditions can be created through state intervention for their participation in political process. Various political scientists like *John Locke*, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, *Immanuel Kant* and *John Stuart Mill* have contributed to emergence of this view. Unlike Schumpeter who believed that a conception of democracy which aims for ambitious forms of equality is dangerous, Rousseau argued that formal variety of democracy is equivalent to slavery and it is only egalitarian democracies which have political legitimacy.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Distinguish between procedural and substantive democracy.

.....

.....

.....

.....

7.3 TYPES OF DEMOCRACY

7.3.1 Classical Democracy

Classical democracy is based on the polis or the city state of Ancient Greece with a particular system of rule that developed in the largest and the most powerful Greek city-state based on mass meetings. The remarkable feature of this model was that the citizens were politically very active. Apart from participating in Assembly meetings, citizens also contributed to decision-making and public offices. However, it excluded women, slaves and foreigners from citizenship. It is pertinent to mention that it was only because of the slaves and women that the male Athenian citizens could get free time to devote to political affairs. Hence, their exclusion from citizenship was unfortunate and undemocratic. Plato in his book, *The Republic* criticized the Athenian democracy saying that people were incapable to rule themselves wisely and they require rule by philosopher kings and guardians who are suited to rule.

7.3.2 Elitist Democracy

This theory was propounded by *Vilfredo Pareto*, *G Mosca*, *Robert Michels* and *Joseph Schumpeter*. The theory was developed in *sociology*, but has major implications for political science as well. Michels gave his ‘iron law of oligarchy’, arguing that despite its original aim, every organization is ultimately reduced to oligarchy amounting to rule of a few. Mosca said that people can be categorized as rulers and the ruled. Most of the power, prestige and wealth are in hands of the ruling class irrespective of the form of government. The ruled follow the elite as they do not have leadership qualities. This theory poses serious questions for democracy and suggests that in practice, democracy is not achievable as the elites would control the power, wealth and hence, the decision making.

7.3.3 Pluralist Democracy

Contrary to the elitist theory, pluralists believe that policy making is a decentralized process where different groups bargain for their views to be accepted. It is result of interaction between different groups unlike few elites. Public policy is formulated by more organized and vocal groups. The main proponents of this theory include *Karl Mannheim*, *Raymond Aron*, *Robert Dahl* and *Charles Lindblom*. Dahl and Lindblom gave the concept of ‘polyarchy’ meaning rule by many instead of rule by all citizens. They concluded that although

the politically privileged and economically powerful exert more influence than ordinary citizens, no elite was permanently able to dominate the political process.

7.3.4 Participatory Democracy

All the democracies are participatory in the sense that they are based on popular consent which ensures their participatory nature. However, there are chances that the role of citizens could be limited to just *voting* in a democracy. The gap between the elected representatives and the people widens in complex democracies which have variety of people divided by caste, class, religion, region etc. In contrast to elitist and pluralist theories, participatory democracy advocates active citizen participation in policy making to ensure common good is promoted, while it also makes the government more accountable towards the citizens. *Jean J. Rousseau, J S Mill* and *C B Macpherson* supported the idea of participatory democracy. Rousseau argued for popular sovereignty as the supreme power is vested in the hands of the people which is their inalienable right and the citizens should involve themselves in state affairs. Mill said that a government which promotes moral, intellectual and active qualities in its citizens is the best government.

7.3.5 Deliberative Democracy

Deliberative democracy argues that political decisions should be based on fair and reasonable deliberations among citizens. This is required to produce best decisions to achieve public good. In emphasizing on quality of process for best outcomes, *John Rawls* and *Jurgen Habermas* have argued for a deliberative democracy. Rawls believed that reason can overcome self interest to attain a just political society. Habermas believed that fair procedures and clear communication would lead to legitimate and mutually agreed upon decisions.

7.3.6 People's Democracy

People's democracy refers to democratic models generated by the Marxist tradition. Marxists have been interested in social equality and hence, have their own idea of democracy against the Western model which they say only generates political equality. People's democracy is established after the proletarian revolution when the proletariat starts making political decisions. This will eventually give way to Communism marked by self-regulation. While Karl Marx talked about the rule of the proletariat, Lenin changed the concept and introduced the role of party as the vanguard of the proletariat. However, Lenin did not establish mechanisms to check the power of the party and its powerful leaders to ensure that they remained accountable to the proletariat.

7.3.7 Social Democracy

Social democracy stands for a *basic* change in Marxist thought although it shares same goals with Communism. It aims to establish a socialist society, but *not* through the revolution but through state regulation of means of production. Social democrats do not believe in the Marxist critique of democracy, which sees it as a "bourgeois" facade for class rule. Instead, social democrats see democracy as essential for achieving the socialist ideals. That is why, they stand for state regulation of business and industry in order to ensure welfare of citizens. This

movement started with the efforts of *August Bebel* and *Wilhelm Liebknecht* who cofounded the Social Democratic Workers’ Party in 1869 in Germany.

7.3.8 E-Democracy

This is a relatively new concept but is based on the works done by earlier theorists. E-democracy or electronic democracy is the use of information and technology to enhance or even replace representative democracy. Common problems in all democracies – issues of scale, lack of time, decline of community values, and lack of opportunities for policy deliberation could be dealt with digital communication. Supporters of e-democracy have built on the ideas of participatory democracy to enhance active citizen participation in policy making.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What are the drawbacks of people’s democracy?

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) What do you understand by E-democracy?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

7.4 INDIAN DEMOCRACY AT A GLANCE

With more than 800 million eligible voters, India is often referred to as the largest democracy in the world which was created after India got independence from British rule in 1947. Indians did not want to adopt a constitution imposed by the British and hence, the Constituent Assembly was made with indirectly elected members to draft India’s constitution. It is remarkable though that an indirectly elected body later adopted the concept of universal adult franchise as the Constituent Assembly itself was not elected by the people. During the debates in the Constituent Assembly, J L Nehru, Sardar Patel, B R Ambedkar and N V Gadgil supported the adoption of parliamentary democracy in India keeping in mind India’s familiarity with this system since the British days. Others like R N Singh, Loknath Mishra and Brajeshwar Prasad opposed parliamentary democracy. R N Singh had said that it is difficult to find an army of honest ministers, deputy ministers and parliamentary secretaries etc. He argued for a presidential form of government saying it would be easy to find an honest

President. The Assembly adopted the parliamentary form of democracy keeping in view India's past experience with this system. Some scholars believe that democracy was a Western concept and democratic institutions were imposed upon people of India who lacked any experience in this regard. However, modern politics pertaining to organizing people around public issues and putting demands before the state started in India in the mid 19th century. Associations and organizations like Poona Sarvjanik Sabha were established by the middle class and traditional elites which laid the foundations of democracy in India. The idea of democracy gained ground in India through a gradual development of legislative councils at the provincial and central levels during the British period. In the post-independence era, periodic elections based on adult franchise have ensured that democratic institutions and practices are firmly rooted in Indian politics. The social composition of political parties is changing due to which the state legislature, the Parliament and the ministries are becoming more representative today. The main features of democracy in India are as follows:

- The Preamble to the Constitution of India describes India as a 'Sovereign Socialist Secular Democratic Republic'. India is a parliamentary democracy based on the concept of 'one person one vote'.
- Free and fair periodic elections to state legislatures and the Parliament are held based on adult franchise.
- The rule of law is ensured as the written Constitution of India is supreme which is interpreted and guarded by an independent judiciary.
- There is separation of powers between the executive, legislature and the judiciary.
- The Constitution of India gives Fundamental Rights to its citizens- Right to Equality (Article 14 to 18), Right to Freedom (Article 19-22), Right against Exploitation (Article 23-24), Right to Freedom of Religion (Article 25-28), Educational and Cultural Rights (Article 29-30) and Right to Constitutional Remedies (Article 32).
- There is existence of multi-party system in India with national and regional parties vying for space in politics making it dynamic and vibrant. The leader of the largest party in opposition in each House is designated as the Leader of the Opposition, but that party should have at least 10 per cent seats of the total strength of the House as per the Constitution of India.
- The media in India is free from state interference which plays an important role in mobilizing public opinion with respect to policies implemented by the government.

A number of achievements can be attributed to the functioning of democracy in India. The foremost among them is that the Indian democratic experience has proved the skeptics wrong who believed that democracy in India would not survive given India's diversity in terms of caste, religion, language, culture and region. Unlike its neighbors, democracy is functioning well in India which shows resilience of India's democratic institutions and practices. India has been able to increase its literacy rate, reduce poverty while the marginalized sections are being brought into mainstream through the democratic process. There has been a shift of power from dominant castes and classes to the backward castes and

classes almost without any violent means through democratic means. At the international level, India is gradually moving away from an aid recipient country to being an aid provider as it gives economic aid to its neighbors in South Asia.

However, there are some challenges that are still posing questions to democracy in India. Political violence is one of the prime issues in India which needs to be handled properly. For example, Naxalism and insurgency in North-east India are often cited as a blot on Indian democracy. Here, it is important to reiterate what Dr Ambedkar, Chairman of the drafting committee for framing India's Constitution had said. He had argued for economic and social equality saying only political equality would not be enough. Prolonged inequality in social and economic life would prove dangerous for political democracy as those who suffer could blow up the political structure. There is need for further electoral reforms in India to tackle issues like defection, fake voting, and role of money and muscle power during elections. Corruption and economic inequality is eroding the rule of law and impact working of democracy to the detriment of the weak. There is inadequacy of representation as the number of people voting to elect their representatives is not too high. Even the 'first past the post' system used in India is not representative in nature and can prove harmful for the interests of marginalized sections. In the overall analysis, it would not be fair to judge democracy in India as merely successful or a failure. The procedural democracy needs to be strengthened and made more representative and accountable so that it results in substantive democracy.

Check Your Progress 4

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What are the features of democracy in India?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

7.5 LET US SUM UP

Democracy has evolved as a concept over the years and has become more inclusive. It is one of the most debated topics in political science as people agree on its meaning, but do not agree on how to achieve democracy. That is why, there are several types of democracies from direct to representative. With changing times, there are new dimensions of democracy, like e-democracy which are coming up. Democracy in India has been able to survive despite India's diversity as democracy has given space to various sections for political contestation and opportunity to articulate various claims. India needs to make its democracy more representative and accountable so that this could lead to substantive democracy for the benefit of the marginalized.

7.6 REFERENCES

Abbas, Hovyeda and Ranjay Kumar (2012). *Political Theory*. New Delhi: Pearson.

Constitutional Government and Democracy in India, URL: <http://vle.du.ac.in/mod/book/view.php?id=11805&chapterid=23271>

Dahl, Robert (1989). *Democracy and its Critics*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dahl, R. (2018). *Encyclopedia Britannica*, URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/democracy>

Heywood, Andrew (2007). *Politics*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/democracy/>

Vora, Rajendra and Suhas Palshikar (2004). *Indian Democracy: Meanings and Practices*. New Delhi: Sage Publications India Pvt Ltd.

7.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should include the following:
 - Greek origins of the word.
 - Difference between direct and indirect democracy.
 - Rule by the people.
 - J S Mill's views on advantages of democracy.
- 2) Highlight limited and indirect nature of representative democracy

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Your answer should highlight the difference between the mechanism and actual practice of democracy.

Check Your Progress 3

- 1) There is no check on the power of the party and powerful leaders.
- 2) Use of information and technology to enhance and promote democracy.

Check Your Progress 4

- 1) Highlight the following points:
 - Preamble to the Constitution describes India as a democratic country.
 - Free and fair periodic elections based on adult franchise.
 - Fundamental Rights.
 - Existence of multi-party system.
 - Media free from state regulation.

UNIT 8 GENDER*

Structure

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Gender: Meaning
- 8.3 Gender and Politics
 - 8.3.1 Gender Equality as a goal; Gender Mainstreaming as a Strategy
 - 8.3.2 Gender: Issues and Trends
- 8.4 Patriarchy: Understanding Gender Inequality
- 8.5 Theories of Origin of Patriarchy
 - 8.5.1 Traditionalist View
 - 8.5.2 Radical Feminist View
 - 8.5.3 Socialist View
- 8.6 Gender: Concept and Theory
 - 8.6.1 Feminist Theory
 - 8.6.2 Liberal Feminism
- 8.7 Let Us Sum Up
- 8.8 References
- 8.9 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

8.0 OBJECTIVES

The main objective of this unit is to understand the meaning of gender and address some of the important theoretical issues connected with this concept. As you go through this unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the concept of gender;
- Know the relationship between gender and politics; and
- Explain the concept of patriarchy.

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Until the emergence of feminist theory as a recognized academic perspective, contemporary political theory was largely assumed to be gender-neutral in focus. This assumption has now been subject to extensive critique. Explorations of gender in political theory have to date been undertaken primarily by those pursuing a feminist agenda. For it is feminists who have been most sensitive to the fallacy involved in conflating men with individuals and masculinity with neutrality. So, while it is feminist political theory that has explicitly theorized gender in recent times, it is entirely possible to consider gender in political theory from perspectives other than feminist. There is, for instance, a growing body of literature exploring men and masculinity, which might usefully inform considerations of gender in political theory, and which is distinct from the extensive feminist literature that has developed. Nonetheless, given the overwhelmingly masculine nature of politics up to the present time, it has been

* Contributed by Dr. Rachna Suchinmayee, Magadh University, Patna

feminists who have had the strongest political motivation and intellectual ambition to explore gender in political theory.

Gender shapes our political and social landscape and our personal interactions. Gender is a crucial lens for contemporary political theory, which not only helps understand the limits and assumptions of mainstream theories, but it also brings new debates to light. Gender is embedded so thoroughly in our institutions, our actions, our beliefs, and our desires, that it appears to us to be completely natural. Politics as a real-world phenomenon and political science as an academic discipline are gendered. The study of politics has now broadened beyond the narrow focus on those holding formal office and the politics of distribution. It now encompasses many new groups espousing “gender trouble”(intersectionality, Sexuality and post-structuralism) as well as new ideas about masculinity and femininity across a range of contexts, from house and home to the houses of Parliament. Yet, despite the vibrancy of gender and politics and a long history of gender activism, gender is still ignored in much academic political science. The traditional focus on politics as the study of the machinery of government and electoral politics or on political elites and formal institutions rendered women and gender invisible in spite of their foundational importance for building the welfare state and for constructing postcolonial nations, for the conduct of war and terrorism, and for maintaining social and economic privilege more generally. The roots of these core assumptions about what constitutes politics in the Anglo-American tradition can be traced to the work of political theorists like *John Locke*, who based many of their ideas on the analytical separation of the public and the private spheres. The Anglo-American disciplines took up this widely accepted view of the transcultural and transhistorical universality of the public–private split, namely, that citizens or heads of household were the ones who were active in the public sphere. This subsumed women into the household or family within a private sphere where “every man’s home is his castle” and in which he can do as he pleases free from the interference of the state. This analytical exclusion of women from the public sphere created politics as a male sphere from which women were legitimately excluded as political subjects. In turn, at least when it came to women, the private sphere was seen as lying outside the political arena and therefore did not form part of the legitimate subject matter of the discipline. But regulation of women’s access to abortion, sexuality, and male violence against female relatives in the family was then, as now, seen as a legitimate area of action for governments, revealing the inconsistency and gender bias that undergirds the ideology of separate spheres.

8.2 GENDER: MEANING

The word gender is being used sociologically or as a conceptual category, and it has been given a very specific meaning. In its new incarnation gender refers to the socio–cultural definition of man and woman, the way societies distinguish men and women and assign them social roles. It is used as an analytical tool to understand social realities with regard to women and men. The distinction between sex and gender was introduced to deal with the general tendency to attribute women’s subordination to their anatomy. For ages it was believed that the different characteristics, roles and status accorded to women and men in society, are determined by biology, that they are natural and therefore, not, changeable. Every culture has its ways of valuing girls and boys and assigning

them different roles, responses and attributes. All the social and cultural “packaging” that is done for boys and girls from birth onwards is “gendering”. *Ann Oakley* who was among the first few feminist scholars to use this concept, says : “Gender is a matter of culture, it refers to the social classification of men and women into “masculine” and “feminine”. That people are male or female can usually be judged by referring to biological evidence. That they are masculine or feminine cannot be judged in the same way: the criteria are cultural, differing with time and place. The constancy of sex must be admitted, but so also must the variability of gender. Gender has no biological origin and the connection between sex and gender are not natural.

Gender consists in a pattern of relations that develops over time to define male and female, masculinity and femininity, simultaneously structuring and regulating people’s relations with society. It is deeply embedded in every aspect of society – in our institutions, in public spaces, in art, clothing, and movement. Gender is embedded in experience in all settings from government offices to street games. It is embedded in the family, the neighborhood, church, school, the media, walking down the street, eating in a restaurant, going to the restroom. And these settings and situations are all linked to one other in a structured fashion. It is the achievements of present day discourses and practices concerning development, that “women” and “gender” have come to occupy relatively prominent places within them. The concept of gender needs to be understood clearly as a cross-cutting socio-cultural variable. It is an overarching variable in the sense that gender can also be applied to all other cross-cutting variables such as race, class, age, ethnic group, etc. Gender systems are established in different socio-cultural contexts which determine what is expected, allowed and valued in a woman/man and girl/boy in these specific contexts. Gender roles are learned through socialization processes; they are not fixed but are changeable. Gender systems are institutionalized through education systems, political and economic systems, legislation, and culture and traditions. In utilizing a gender approach the focus is not on individual women and men, but on the system which determines gender roles / responsibilities, access to and control over resources, and decision-making potentials.

It is also important to emphasize that the concept of gender is not interchangeable with women. Gender refers to both women and men, and the relations between them. Promotion of gender equality should concern and engage men as well as women. In recent years, there has been a much stronger direct focus on men in research on gender perspectives. There are three main approaches taken in the increased focus on men. Firstly, the need to identify men as allies for gender equality and involve them more actively in this work. Secondly, the recognition that gender equality is not possible unless men change their attitudes and behavior in many areas, for example in relation to reproductive rights and health. And thirdly, that gender systems in place in many contexts are negative for men as well as for women – creating unrealistic demands on men and requiring men to behave in narrowly defined ways. A considerable amount of interesting research is being undertaken, by both women and men, on male identities and masculinity. The increased focus on men will have significant impact on future strategies for working with gender perspectives in development. Equality refers to equal opportunities in terms of access to sources of livelihood, health, and education, as well as to social, economic and political participation without discrimination.

Gender inequalities stem from relations of power and authority, class-caste hierarchies and socio-cultural traditions, customs and norms.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What do you understand by the term gender?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

8.3 GENDER AND POLITICS

In most modern democracies, equality between men and women has become the dominant ideal within the mainstream political discourse. Men and women should naturally have the same rights, and no one should be excluded from political life. Nevertheless, there are substantial differences both between countries and between different political spheres as to how much and what kind of equality exists. There are several reasons why some countries or some policy areas are more gender equal than others, and everything from regime and institutional features to elements of culture have been used to explain why politics is generally still dominated by male politicians. The literature on gender in politics is broad. Gender inequality in political acts are diverse, as voting, campaigning and leading, as well as gender differences in political knowledge, socialization, attitudes and women’s place in political theory. There are diversity of approaches with regard to range of themes concerning gender and politics.

- First, women are seen in the categories and analyses of political science—thereby gendering the classic “units of analysis” such as citizens, voters, legislators, parties, legislatures, states, and nations.
- A second strand on women has examined political activities in arenas traditionally seen as outside political science.
- A third strand has looked at gender as a structure of social organization.
- Finally, struggles within the broader feminist movement, women of color (women of marginalized races and ethnicities), women in the developing world, post-colonial feminists, and LGBTQ scholars who pressed for a place in the study of gender politics, sometimes finding a degree of accommodation and sometimes, frustrated with resistance.

There is an oddly paradoxical relation between politics and gender. On the one hand, issues of gender are clearly central to any understanding of the political.

Both the practice and the study of politics have long been notoriously masculine endeavours. So much so that many commentators have argued that politics has historically been the most explicitly masculine human activity of all. It has been more exclusively limited to men and more self-consciously masculine than any other social practice. The institutional manifestations of politics located in government have been resistant to the incorporation of women, their interests or perspectives. Women have, by and large, been excluded from traditional political activity and discouraged from defining their activities as political. In this sense, issues of gender have long been constitutive of the definition and operation of politics. On the other hand, issues of gender are largely assumed to be irrelevant to the political. If gender is understood, as synonymous with women, then women's absence from the political sphere can be taken to imply that gender issues are simply not relevant to politics

8.3.1 Gender Equality as a Goal; Gender Mainstreaming as a Strategy

Gender equality is the preferred terminology within the United Nations, rather than gender equity. Gender equity denotes an element of interpretation of social justice, usually based on tradition, custom, religion or culture, which is most often to the detriment of women. Such use of equity in relation to the advancement of women is unacceptable. During the Beijing conference in 1995, it was agreed that the term equality would be utilized. Gender Equality means that the rights, responsibilities and opportunities of individuals will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Equality does not mean “the same as” – promotion of gender equality does not mean that women and men will become the same. Equality between women and men has both a quantitative and a qualitative aspect. The quantitative aspect refers to the desire to achieve equitable representation of women – increasing balance and parity, while the qualitative aspect refers to achieving equitable influence on establishing development priorities and outcomes for women and men. Equality involves ensuring that the perceptions, interests, needs and priorities of women and men (which can be very different because of differing roles and responsibilities of women and men) will be given equal weight in planning and decision-making.

There is a dual rationale for promoting gender equality.

- Firstly, that equality between women and men – equal rights, opportunities and responsibilities — is a matter of human rights and social justice.
- Secondly, that greater equality between women and men is also a precondition and effective indicator for sustainable people-centred development. The perceptions, interests, needs and priorities of both women and men must be taken into consideration not only as a matter of social justice but because they are necessary to enrich development processes

Gender equality is a goal that has been accepted by governments and international organizations. It is enshrined in international agreements and commitments. However, there are global patterns to inequality in terms of violence against women, women political participation and representation in decision-making structures lagging behind, having different and discriminatory economic opportunities, trafficking and sex trade. These issues need to be addressed in

efforts to promote gender equality. Achieving greater equality between women and men will require changes at many levels, including changes in attitudes and relationships, changes in institutions and legal frameworks, changes in economic institutions, and changes in political decision-making structures.

Gender Mainstreaming is an organizational strategy to bring a gender perspective to all aspects of an institution's policy and activities, through building gender capacity and accountability. The 1970s strategies of integrating women into development by establishing separate women's units or programmes within state and development institutions had made slow progress by the mid-1980s. In light of this, the need was identified for broader institutional change if pervasive male advantage was to be challenged. Adding women-specific activities at the margin was no longer seen as sufficient. Most major development organizations and many governments have now embraced 'gender mainstreaming' as a strategy for moving towards gender equality. Gender mainstreaming is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. The calls for increased gender mainstreaming in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Agreed Conclusions (1997/2) are not for increased gender balance within the United Nations, but for increased attention to gender perspectives and the goal of gender equality in the work of the United Nations. Gender mainstreaming does not entail developing separate women's projects within work programmes, or even women's components within existing activities in the work programmes. It requires that attention is given to gender perspectives as an integral part of all activities across all programmes. This involves making gender perspectives – what women and men do and the resources and decision-making processes they have access to – more central to all policy development, research, advocacy, development, implementation and monitoring of norms and standards, and planning, implementation and monitoring of projects.

Gender mainstreaming was established as an intergovernmental mandate in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action in 1995, and again in the ECOSOC Agreed Conclusions in 1997. The mandate for gender mainstreaming was considerably strengthened in the outcome of the General Assembly special session to follow-up the Beijing Conference (June 2000). Gender mainstreaming is *not* being imposed on governments by the United Nations. Member states have been involved in the intergovernmental discussions on gender mainstreaming since the mid 1990s and have, in consensus, adopted mainstreaming as an important global strategy for promoting gender equality. The mainstreaming strategy does not mean that targeted activities to support women are no longer necessary. Such activities specifically target women's priorities and needs, through, for example, legislation, policy development, research and projects/programmes on the ground. Women-specific projects continue to play an important role in promoting gender equality. They are still needed because gender equality has not yet been attained and gender mainstreaming processes are not well developed. Targeted initiatives focusing specifically on women or the promotion of gender equality are important for reducing existing disparities, serving as a catalyst for promotion of gender equality and creating a constituency for changing the mainstream. Women-specific initiatives can create an empowering space for women and act as an important incubator for ideas and strategies than can be transferred to mainstream interventions. Initiatives focused on men support promotion of gender equality by developing male allies. It is crucial to understand that these *two* strategies -

gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment — are in no way in competition with each other. The endorsement of gender mainstreaming within an organization does not imply that targeted activities are no longer needed. The two strategies are complementary in a very real sense as gender mainstreaming must be carried out in a manner which is empowering for women.

8.3.2 Gender: Issues and Trends

Gender is an issue because of the fundamental differences and inequalities between women and men. These differences and inequalities may manifest themselves in different ways in specific countries or sectors but there are some broad patterns that point to questions that should always be considered. The elements below could be taken as starting points to explore how and why gender differences and inequalities are relevant in a specific situation.

- **Inequalities in political power (access to decision-making, representation).** Women are under-represented in political processes throughout the world. It is important to look at and understand gender differences in power within formal decision-making structures (such as governments, community councils, and policy-making institutions). Given the underrepresentation of women and the low visibility of women's perspectives, the fact that women often have different priorities, needs and interests than men is often not apparent. National, regional or sub-regional priorities, or even the specific needs and priorities of a community, are often defined without meaningful inputs from women.
- **Inequalities within households.** Inequalities in negotiating and decision-making potential and access to resources have been documented within households. This has prompted questions about both research and policy which is based on the assumption that households function as units where each member benefits equally. The investigation of differences and inequalities at the household level is relevant to an understanding of a range of key issues, including the ability of women and men to respond to economic incentives, the design of effective strategies for HIV/AIDS prevention, and appropriate and equitable social security policies
- **Differences in legal status and entitlements.** Despite national constitutions and international instruments that proclaim equal rights for women and men, there are many instances in which equal rights to personal status, security, land, inheritance and employment opportunities are denied to women by law or practice. Addressing the resulting constraints for women is important as an end in itself, but it is also essential for formulating effective national strategies for increasing economic productivity and growth, reducing poverty and achieving sustainable resource management. Action to secure women's rights is not just a concern of a small group of women activists, but rather the responsibility of the international community as a whole.
- **Division of labour within the economy.** In most countries, women and men are distributed differently across manufacturing sectors, between formal and informal sectors, within agriculture, and among occupations. Women are also more likely than men to be in low-paid jobs and “non-

standard” work (part-time, temporary, home-based), and likely to have less access than men to productive assets such as education, skills, property and credit. These patterns mean that economic trends and economic policies are likely to have different implications for women and men. For example, trade liberalization has had uneven impacts by sector, with consequences for both gender equality and economic growth that have only recently become the subject of investigation.

- **Inequalities in the domestic/unpaid sector.** In most countries it is women who shoulder the responsibilities and tasks related to the care and nurturing of the family. These tasks add to women’s workload and are often an obstacle to engaging in political action or expanding economic activities. Recent research has sought to demonstrate the relationships between this “reproductive work” and the “productive” sector of the economy – in particular the dependence of all productive activities on the creation and maintenance of a healthy labour force through this work at the household level, and the way in which the reproductive sector can be affected by the consequences of economic policies related to trade, investment and public expenditure. There has been an important shift from focusing on how economic policies have affected welfare in a gender-specific manner, to illustrating how gender biases negatively affect the outcome of these same economic policies.
- **Violence against women.** Gender inequality is also manifested in gender-based violence, either by a woman’s intimate partner (domestic violence), by an enemy army as a weapon of attempted ‘ethnic cleansing’ or in sexual exploitation through, for example, trafficking of women and girls.
- **Discriminatory attitudes.** Gender inequalities are not only economic, but are also reflected in other ways that are difficult to measure and change. Ideas about appropriate behaviour, independence, and aptitudes are often grounded in gender stereotypes and vary for women and men. Ideas and practices tend to reflect and reinforce each other (the one providing the rationale for the other), which contributes to the complexity of achieving change.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Briefly explain gender equality.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

8.4 PATRIARCHY: UNDERSTANDING GENDER INEQUALITY

Patriarchy is the systemic societal structures that institutionalize male physical, social and economic power over women. Some feminists use the concept of patriarchy to explain the systematic subordination of women by both overarching and localized structures. These structures work to the benefit of men by constraining women's life choices and chances. There are many differing interpretations of patriarchy. However, the roots of patriarchy are often located in women's reproductive role and sexual violence, interwoven with processes of capitalist exploitation. The main 'sites' of patriarchal oppression have been identified as housework, paid work, the state, culture, sexuality, and violence. Behaviours that discriminate against women because of their gender are seen as patriarchal 'practices'; for example occupational segregation, exclusion, and unequal pay.

The concept of patriarchy has been drawn into gender and development theorizing; in order to challenge not only unequal gender relations but also unequal capitalist relations, sometimes seen as underpinning patriarchy. Feminists who explain gender inequality in terms of patriarchy often reject male-biased societal structures and practices and propose greater female autonomy or even separatism as a strategy. In some views, women are seen as having room for manoeuvre within a constraining patriarchal system by negotiating a patriarchal bargain with men. This entails a trade-off between women's autonomy, and men's responsibility for their wives and children. An overarching theory of male power may help to conceptualize the extent of gender inequality, but fails to deal with its complexity. It tends to assume that gender oppression is uniform across time and space. More recent thinking has therefore rejected such a universal concept, identifying the need for detailed historical and cultural analysis to understand gender-based oppression. Neither are women a homogeneous group constrained in identical ways. Gender inequalities are crosscut by other social inequalities such as class, caste, ethnicity and race, which could be prioritized over gender concerns in certain contexts. A rigid and universal concept of patriarchy denies women space for resistance and strategies for change. An in depth analysis is needed that takes into account difference and complexity, and the agency of women.

8.5 THEORIES OF ORIGIN OF PATRIARCHY

The major theory on the origin of patriarchy mixes biological and societal factors to explain how patriarchy came about to perpetuate gender difference.

8.5.1 Traditionalist View

Traditionalists opine that patriarchy is biologically determined. Men and women are born different and are consequently assigned different roles and tasks. Since their biological functions are distinct, men and women must 'naturally' have different social roles and tasks. According to the traditionalist arguments, since women produce children, their chief goal in life is to become mothers, and their chief task, child bearing and child rearing. Explanations which consider men biologically superior and the main providers of family have, however, been

negated on the basis of research on the hunting gathering societies. In these societies, tremendous complementarity existed between men and women. In several tribal societies, we find the prevalence of egalitarian ideology wherein women command respect and equal status. The traditional theory of male supremacy has been challenged by many since there is no historical or scientific evidence of such an explanation. This biological, deterministic explanation cannot become the basis of male domination. It is now recognized that patriarchy is man-made and historical processes have created it. An important explanation for the origin of patriarchy was given by Frederick Engels in 1884 in his book, *Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. Engels asserted that 'women's subordination began with the private property when the world historical defeat of the female sex took place'. Both the division of classes and the subordination of women developed historically.

8.5.2 Radical Feminist View

In the view of radical feminists, patriarchy preceded private property. The original and the basic contradiction, they believe, is between *sexes* and not between classes. Radical feminists consider all women to be a *class* and do not believe that patriarchy is natural. However, they contend that gender inequality can be explained in terms of biological or psychological differences between men and women. *Shulamith Firestone* believes that the basis of women's oppression does lie in women's reproductive capacity insofar as this has been controlled by men. According to some radical feminists, there are two systems of social classes.

- 1) The economic class system which is based on relations of production and
- 2) The sex class system which is based on relations of reproduction. It is this system based on sex that is responsible for women's subordination. The concept of patriarchy refers to this second class of system of classes, to the rule of women by men, based upon men's ownership and control of women's reproductive capacities. Consequently, women have become physically and psychologically dependent on men. These feminists also say that it is not women's biology itself, but the value men place on it and the power they derive from their control over it that are oppressive.

8.5.3 Socialist View

The socialist feminists combine both Marxist and the radical feminist positions. They feel that both the standpoints have something to contribute, but neither is sufficient by itself. Patriarchy for them is not universal or unchanging. They view the struggle between women and men as changing historically with changes in modes of production. According to them, patriarchy is related to the economic system, to the relations of production, but it is not casually related. Several other forces influence patriarchy such as ideology. Just as patriarchy is not a consequence only of the development of private property so, it will not disappear when private property is abolished. They look at both the relations of production and the relations of reproduction in their analysis. The Marxist scholars neglected the whole area of reproduction, family and domestic labour. Among the prominent socialist feminists have been *Heidi Hartmann*, *Maria Mies* and *Gerda Lerner*.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What is the radical feminist view on the origin of patriarchy?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

8.6 GENDER: CONCEPTS AND THEORIES

The concept of gender came into common parlance during the early 1970s. It was used as an analytical category to draw a line of demarcation between biological sex differences and the way these are used to inform behaviors and competencies, which are then assigned as either ‘masculine’ or ‘feminine’. The purpose of affirming a sex/gender distinction was to argue that the actual physical or mental effects of biological difference had been exaggerated to maintain a patriarchal system of power and to create a consciousness among women that they were naturally better suited to ‘domestic’ roles. *Ann Oakley’s* text, *Sex, Gender and Society* (1972) lays the ground for further exploration of the construction of gender. She notes how Western cultures seem most prone to exaggeration of gender differences and argues that the social efficiency of our present gender roles centers round women’s role as housewife and mother. This was not the first time that such distinctions had been made – indeed they were very much the stuff of anthropology, psychoanalysis and medical research; significantly for feminism, *Simone de Beauvoir* had explored this distinction in *The Second Sex* two decades previously with her statement that ‘One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman’.

8.6.1 Feminist Theory

Feminist theory aims to understand gender inequality and focuses on gender politics, power relations and sexuality. While providing a critique of these social and political relations, much of feminist theory focuses on the promotion of women’s rights and interests. Themes explored in feminist theory include discrimination, stereotyping, objectification (especially sexual objectification), oppression and patriarchy. Feminism supports social equality of men and women and is against sexism and patriarchy. The term feminism can be used to describe a political, cultural or economic movement aimed at establishing equal rights and legal protection for women. Feminism involves political and sociological theories and philosophies concerned with issues of gender difference, as well as a movement that advocates gender equality for women and campaigns for women’s rights and interests. The terms “feminism” and “feminist” did not gain widespread use until the 1970s. First feminism signs were seen in 1840’s America, for protesting of suffering of women and African -root- American people. At the

end of these protests, they won voting rights in 1920, but there is still defectiveness in gender equality in society. Feminists are against many issues in society; however, there are main five subjects that they focus on.

- Working for increasing equality in society.
- Making large area for choices of people in society: They suggest reintegration of humanity.
- Destroying the gender stratification.
- Finishing the sexual violence.
- Encourage the sexual freedom.

The history of feminism can be divided into three waves. The first feminist wave was in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the second was in the 1960s and 1970s, and the third extends from the 1990s to the present. The first wave refers mainly to women's suffrage movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth century (mainly concerned with women's right to vote). The second wave refers to the ideas and actions associated with the women's liberation movement beginning in the 1960s (which campaigned for legal and social rights for women). The third wave refers to a continuation of, and a reaction to the perceived failures of, second-wave feminism, beginning in the 1990s. Feminism has altered predominant perspectives in a wide range of areas within Western society, ranging from culture to law. Feminist activists have campaigned for women's legal rights (rights of contract, property rights, voting rights); for women's right to bodily integrity and autonomy, for abortion rights, and for reproductive rights (including access to contraception and quality prenatal care); for protection of women and girls from domestic violence, sexual harassment and rape; for workplace rights, including maternity leave and equal pay; against misogyny; and against other forms of gender-specific discrimination against women.

8.6.2 Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism asserts the equality of men and women through political and legal reform. It is an individualistic form of feminism, which focuses on women's ability to show and maintain their equality through their own actions and choices. Liberal feminism uses the personal interactions between men and women as the place from which to transform society. According to liberal feminists, all women are capable of asserting their ability to achieve equality; therefore, it is possible for change to happen without altering the structure of society. Issues important to liberal feminists include reproductive and abortion rights, sexual harassment, voting, education, "equal pay for equal work", affordable childcare, affordable health care, and bringing to light the frequency of sexual and domestic violence against women

8.7 LET US SUM UP

The concept of gender emerged as a reaction to the marginality of women in existing critical frameworks, and sought to initiate changes in the substantive context and philosophical theory of knowledge of these disciplines. In social sciences, it became natural to analyze society in terms of caste, class and race alone was not sufficient because it neglected to take into account relations of

asymmetry between men and women. This term emerged to challenge the new categories and ways of understanding that could account for the nature and organization of male-female relations and the ways in which they are overlapped in a larger context of power relations. Thus, gender is inspired by a number of studies on different aspects of women's lives, but the interface of this with existing explanatory paradigms has remained a complex issue. Today, though gender has emerged as a major analytical category, it is marked by an interpretive angle wherein only certain questions can be raised in certain ways. The universal association of gender with inequality is one such rendering, where gender is read as a coterminous conflict between the sexes and is issued to go beyond patriarchy. It has been a crucial aim of the sociology of gender to establish that inequalities can be challenged because they are the result of social processes, not 'natural' bodily differences. Feminists and social science scholars in the late twentieth century tended to see bodies as natural biological entities upon which cultural (gender) meanings were inscribed. Later, especially under the influence of *Michel Foucault*, an appreciation developed of how cultural meanings and practices actually produce bodies in particular ways.

8.8 REFERENCES

Buckingham-Hatfield, Susan. (2000). *Gender and Environment*. New York: Routledge.

Daly, Mary. (1978). *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dankelman, Irene. (2010). *Gender and Climate Change: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

de Beauvoir, S. (1949, 1989). "The Second Sex".

Jaggar, Alison M. (ed.) (2014). *Gender and Global Justice*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Jaggar, Alison M. and Susan R. Bordo. (eds.) (1989). *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Jaquette, Jane S. and Gale Summerfield. (eds.) (2006). *Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice: Institutions, Resources, and Mobilization*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. (1995). *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Krijnen, Tonny. van Bauwel, Sofie. (2015). *Gender And Media: Representing, Producing, Consuming*. New York: Routledge.

8.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should include socio-cultural aspects and definitions given by Ann Oakley.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Highlight that gender equality means rights, responsibilities and opportunities of individuals will not depend on whether they are born as male or female.

Check Your Progress 3

- 1) Radical feminists do not believe that patriarchy is not natural and gender inequality can be explained in terms of biological and psychological differences between men and women.



UNIT 9 CITIZENSHIP*

Structure

- 9.0 Objectives
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Concept of Citizenship
 - 9.2.1 Determining Factors
- 9.3 Evolution of the Concept of Citizenship
- 9.4 Theories of Citizenship
 - 9.4.1 Liberal Theory
 - 9.4.2 Republican Theory
 - 9.4.3 Libertarian Theory
 - 9.4.4 Communitarian Theory
 - 9.4.5 Marxist Theory
 - 9.4.6 Pluralist Theory
 - 9.4.7 Feminist Perspective
 - 9.4.8 Gandhi's Views
- 9.5 The Idea of Global Citizenship
- 9.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 9.7 References
- 9.8 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

9.0 OBJECTIVES

The main objective of this unit is to understand the meaning of citizenship and address some of the important theoretical issues connected with this concept. As you go through this unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the concept of citizenship;
- Discuss some of the basic principles of citizenship; and
- Explain various theories related to citizenship.

9.1 INTRODUCTION

In general terms, citizenship is a relationship between an individual and state. It is seen in the context of complementary rights and responsibilities. According to *T H Marshall*, citizenship is 'full and equal membership in a political community'. The earliest forms of citizenship were limited and exclusionary in nature as only those who had property were given citizenship rights. Women and slaves were excluded from these rights. It was with the advent of modern liberal states that the demand for equality gained momentum and for the socio-economic inclusion of the marginalized sections, the citizenship rights were extended to them. For a democracy to improve itself, the citizens should take active part in governance which ensures accountability. Passive citizenship can lead to stagnation in any democracy and could further alienate the representatives from the people. A number of factors like state backlash against welfare policies,

* Contributed by Dr. Raj Kumar Sharma, Academic Associate, Faculty of Political Science, IGNOU & Hemalatha Gunasekaran, Research Scholar, SIS, JNU, New Delhi

increasing defence budgets, increased digital surveillance by the state, marginalization of weaker sections, environmental concerns and multicultural pressures in the West due to globalization have reignited the debate around the concept of citizenship.

9.2 CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship is the status of a person recognized under the custom or law as being a legal member of a sovereign state or part of a nation. A person may have multiple citizenships and a person who does not have citizenship of any state is said to be stateless. The term 'citizen' can be understood in a narrow or in a broad sense. In a narrow sense, it means the resident of a city or one who enjoys the privilege of living in a city. While in a broad sense, citizen means a person who resides within the territorial limits of the state. Citizenship and nationality are the same in a legal sense. Conceptually, citizenship is focused on the internal political life of the state and nationality is a matter of international dealings. In the modern era, the concept of full citizenship encompasses not only active political rights, but full civil and social rights. Historically, the most significant difference between a national and a citizen is that the citizen has the right to vote for elected officials, and to be elected. This distinction between full citizenship and other, lesser relationships goes back to antiquity. Until the 19th and 20th centuries, it was typical for only a small percentage of people who belonged to a city or state to be full citizens. In the past, most people were excluded from citizenship on the basis of gender, class, ethnicity, religion or other factors.

There are three types of rights associated with citizenship — civil, political and social. The civil rights are related to individual freedoms like liberty, freedom of speech and expression etc. These rights can be seen as power against the state as they safeguard dissent in a democracy. The political dimension includes political rights through which an individual takes part in political life of his country like the right to vote; right to form or join any political party etc. These rights are associated with parliamentary institutions in a democracy. The social dimension refers to right to share social and cultural heritage. The welfare state idea gained ground after the Second World War and it is the state's duty to guarantee a minimum living standard in order to iron out inequalities between its citizens. There has been a tension between civil and social rights where social rights have been losing out to civil rights.

9.2.1 Determining Factors

Each country has its own policies, regulations and criteria as to who is entitled to its citizenship. A person can be recognised or granted citizenship on a number of grounds. Usually citizenship based on the place of birth is automatic; in other cases an application may be required. Citizens are of two types: natural born and naturalised. Natural born citizens are those who are the citizens of a state by virtue of their birth or blood relations. Naturalised citizens are those foreigners who are granted the citizenship of the country on the fulfilment of some conditions laid down by the respective country. A person who desires to be the citizen of a foreign country has to give up the citizenship of his native country. Any person can acquire the citizenship of a foreign country after having fulfilled the conditions laid down by that country for this purpose.

- **Citizenship by Birth (*Jus Sanguinis*)** : If one or both of a person’s parents are citizens of a given state, then the person may have the right to be a citizen of that state as well. States normally limit the right to citizenship by descent to a certain number of generations born outside the state. This form of citizenship is *not* common in civil law countries.
- **Born within a Country (*Jus Soli*)** : Some people are automatically citizens of the state in which they are born. This form of citizenship originated in England where those who were born within the realm were subjects of the monarch and is common in common law countries.
- **Citizenship by Marriage** : Many countries fast-track naturalization process based on the marriage of a person to a citizen. Countries which are destinations for such immigration often have regulations to try to detect false marriages, where a citizen marries a non-citizen typically for payment, without them having the intention of living together.
- **Naturalization** : States normally grant citizenship to people who have entered the country legally and been granted permit to stay, or been granted political asylum, and also lived there for a specified period. In some countries, naturalization is subject to conditions which may include passing a test demonstrating reasonable knowledge of the language or way of life of the host country, good conduct and moral character, vowing allegiance to their new state or its ruler and renouncing their prior citizenship. Some states allow dual citizenship and do not require naturalized citizens to formally renounce any other citizenship.

In the international context, there is a marked distinction between an *alien* and a citizen. A citizen enjoys civil and political rights in his own country. An alien, on the other hand, is not privileged to enjoy the political rights of the country, but only civil rights like the right to life and religion.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Explain three types of rights associated with citizenship.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

9.3 EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP

The concept of citizenship goes back to the ancient Greek city-states where the population was divided into two classes —the citizens and the slaves. The citizens enjoyed both civil and political rights. They directly or indirectly participated in

all the functions of the civil and political life of the state. Whereas the slaves enjoyed none of such rights and suffered from all kinds of political and economic disabilities. Even women were not given citizenship rights which were reserved only for 'free native-born men'. In this way in ancient Greece, the term 'citizen' was used in its narrow sense. Only those who enjoyed civil and political rights and who participated in the functions of the civil and political life of people were regarded as citizens. Much similar process was followed in ancient Rome where people belonging to only rich class, known as Patricians, were privileged to enjoy the civil and political rights. Only the Patricians participated in the functions of the civil and political life of the state. The rest of the population was not privileged to enjoy any of such rights. The citizens were required to develop qualities of 'civic virtue', a term derived from the Latin word 'virtus' which meant 'manliness' in the sense of performing military duty, patriotism, and devotion to duty and the law. In the medieval times, citizenship was associated with protection by the state as the absolute states wanted to impose their authority over their diverse population. It was in tradition with the social contract theorists like Hobbes and Locke who believed that it is the main aim of the sovereign to protect individual life and property. It was a passive understanding of citizenship as the individual depended on the state for security. This notion was challenged by the French Revolution in 1789 and in '*The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen*', the citizen was described as a free and autonomous individual. The modern notion of citizenship seeks to strike a balance between freedom and equality. Inequalities like caste, class, gender etc. are being eliminated by providing conditions of equality through affirmative action.

9.4 THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Following theories have been put forward by scholars on citizenship.

9.4.1 Liberal Theory

According to this theory, civil rights constitute the foundation of citizenship and it revolves around the notion of individualism. Citizenship is a legal status, which confers certain rights on the individual protecting him from state interference. *T. H. Marshall*, in his book, '*Citizenship and Social Class*', published in 1950 has traced development of citizenship in Britain. He has divided citizenship in three elements – civil, political and social. Rights necessary for freedom come under civil, political covers the right to take part in politics while social rights cover the right to economic welfare and security. Marshall believed that social rights are the basis of civil and political rights. Their development has been in different time frames – civil (18th century), political (19th) and social rights developed in the 20th century. He argued that civil rights give 'equal moral worth' to individuals, but they will be meaningless if not supported by social rights which stand for 'equal social worth'. For ex, right to freedom of speech has little value if one has nothing reasonable to say due to *lack of education*. Citizenship stands for equality while capitalism breeds class inequalities. That is why, Marshall entrusted the state with welfare functions to take care of the needy ones by ensuring minimum standard of living (social security). Like the true liberal tradition, Marshall did not try to eliminate inequality but sought to reduce it. John Rawls too made a contribution to liberal theory of citizenship by arguing for redistribution of goods and services to benefit the least advantaged

sections of society. In practice, however, substantive equality still eludes liberal citizenship although it guarantees formal legal equality irrespective of differences in terms of caste, class, race, gender etc.

9.4.2 Republican Theory

The Republican tradition focuses on civic self-rule through participation of citizens. Rousseau argued in *Social Contract* that co-authoring of laws through general will makes citizens free and laws legitimate. That is why, active participation in deliberation and policy making is advocated by republicans as it ensures individuals are not subjects, but citizens. Unlike liberals who see citizenship as being protected by law, republicans want participation in formulation of law. Liberals want representative democracy while republicans promote deliberative democracy. Republicans further argue that citizenship should be seen as common civic identity shaped by a common public culture. As civic identity, citizenship can unite citizens as long as this identity is stronger than their other identities like religion, ethnicity etc. Republicans criticize communitarians as well as they are apprehensive of local identities being placed above the civic goals. However, given the scale and complexity of modern nation states, ensuring citizen participation is a tough task.

9.4.3 Libertarian Theory

Libertarian citizenship can be traced to British Conservative government under Margaret Thatcher in 1979 who gave more importance to market rights over social rights. It was believed that the social rights (welfare policies) were becoming unaffordable for the state. They argue that people seek to pursue their values and preferences through private activity rather than public redistribution. Libertarians say citizenship is the product of free choice and contract among individuals. It considers market society as its basis and a suitable model of civic life. *Robert Nozick* is the chief exponent of this theory. He observes that individuals resort to private activity, market exchange and association to realise their values, beliefs and preferences. Libertarians prioritize market rights which are seen as ‘entrepreneurial freedom’. They want freedom to earn and own property as well as its protection. Accordingly, for the protection of right to property, protective institutions are needed and state proves to be the most efficient of all. Critics point out that free market based individualism does not provide for adequate foundation of social solidarity.

9.4.4 Communitarian Theory

Communitarians argue that an individual does not exist prior to the community. They criticize the liberals for ignoring social nature of individuals by focusing too much on the individual. Further, communitarians also argue that liberals have not given any importance to duties and responsibilities towards community as their focus is on rights of an individual. *Skinner* said that individual liberty is maximized through public service and prioritization of common good over pursuit of individual interests. Here, the citizen is conceived as someone who plays an active role in shaping the future direction of society through political debate and decision-making. The main tenet of this theory is that a citizen should identify himself with the community, of which he is a member, and take part in its political life and contribute to the realization of civic virtues which include respect for

others and importance of public service. Hence, unlike the liberals who focus on individual, communitarian citizenship give more importance to *group* rights. However, critiques argue that this model would be suitable only to a small, homogenous society with common traditions.

This brings out the debate about citizenship and multiculturalism. Since the modern societies are increasingly being recognised as multicultural due to globalization, the liberal understanding of the idea of citizenship focusing on the individual is being challenged now. Critiques opine that specific contexts like cultural, religious, ethnic, linguistic etc. should be the determining factors of citizenship. Equal rights of citizens are seen in contradiction with group-rights and culture of minority groups. *Will Kymlicka* in his 1995 book, '*Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*' has argued that certain sorts of 'collective rights' for minority cultures are consistent with liberal democratic principles, and that standard liberal objections to recognizing such rights on grounds of individual freedom, social justice, and national unity, can be answered. Some liberals worry that granting concessions to national or ethnic groups hurts democracy: democracy, for them, requires a common citizenship based on treating people identically as individuals. When a particular group seeks some accommodation, this requires us to treat people differently based on their group affiliation, which strikes many as illiberal. Kymlicka argues that the request for accommodation actually reflects minorities' desires to integrate. For example, *Orthodox Jews* in the US seek an exemption from military dress codes so they can wear their yarmulkas. They want the exemption not to be different, but so they can join the army and be like everybody else.

9.4.5 Marxist Theory

According to the Marxist theory, rights associated with citizenship are a by-product of class conflict. Existence of economically weaker sections is a challenge for ensuring equality before law. These sections are not in a position to exercise their citizenship rights due to dominance of economically powerful sections. Marxists believe that since the state will wither away after the revolution, the concept of citizenship itself is temporary. Since there are no political institutions in a communist state, there will be no need for citizenship. However, in practice, there have been differences. Lenin abolished the terms 'state' and 'citizen' in the Soviet constitution, but Stalin restored them in 1936. This constitution listed a number of rights and duties for the individuals.

Anthony Giddens argued that the development of modern democracy and citizenship began in the 16th century when the state started to increase its administrative power to supervise the population and store data regarding them. This could not be done with the help of force alone and the state required cooperation from citizens in the form of cooperative social relations. The state generated more opportunities for subordinate groups to influence the state which Giddens refers to as a 'two-way' expansion of power. He has further argued that contemporary capitalism is different from 19th century capitalism as it has been shaped by labour movements. This has brought welfare capitalism into focus which takes care of civil rights of workers. He has revised Marxist perspective on citizenship and concluded that citizenship rights can be maintained within a liberal framework.

9.4.6 Pluralist Theory

This theory treats the development of citizenship as a multi-dimensional and complex process and attributes the evolution of the concept of citizenship to a diverse set of factors. It holds that citizenship means a reciprocal relationship between individual and community as argued by *David Held*. According to this theory, individual is entitled to certain rights against the community and he also owes certain duties to the community and hence, essence of citizenship lies in the life of the community. Pluralist theory insists on inquiring into all types of discrimination against people, whether on grounds of gender, race, religion, property, education, occupation or age. In the contemporary world so many social movements have been launched against different types of social discrimination. These include feminist movement, black movement, religious reform movements, workers' movement, children rights movements, dalit movement, adivasi movement and ecological movement, among others. Pluralist theory recommends that the problem of citizenship should be analysed in the *context* of all these movements.

9.4.7 Feminist Perspective

Feminists have argued that women are second class citizens world over due to dominance of men in civil, political, cultural, economic and social spheres of life. It is evident from the general trend in which women have less level of political participation in any country while they also have less political representation compared to men. They have also questioned the distinction between public (political participation) and private (domestic) spheres which is a tool to perpetuate male dominance at the cost of women's rights. That is why, in the 1970s, the main slogan of women's movement was '*The Personal is Political*'. *J S Mill* had famously said, "An egalitarian family is a much more fertile ground for equal citizens than one organized like a school for despotism". To bring about equality between men and women, liberals believe there should be constitutional reforms by which men will contribute to household work. This is called civic feminism. Socialist feminists want expansion in areas like free birth control, abortion, health facilities for women and state recognition of domestic labour. Radical feminists want women's entry into public sphere for making them active citizens.

9.4.8 Gandhi's Views

Gandhi's views on citizenship focused on ideas of common good and active citizenship. According to Gandhi, all states have coercive power often used to oppress citizens. That is why, he believed that a state should not have centralized power. Dharma (moral law and duty), ahimsa (non-violence in thought and deed) and *satya* (truth and sincerity) were three central pillars of Gandhi's conception of citizenship. He further did not trust the state due to its coercive power and entrusted the individual to resist the state's coercion. He believed that the state represented compulsion, uniformity and violence in a concentrated form which is why his ideal was a non-violent state that would be self-governing and self-sufficient in which the majority rule would prevail with due respect for minority rights. At the same time, Gandhi believed that freedom is indivisible – one cannot be free if others are enslaved. That is why, he pointed towards the concept of citizens of the world where entire world is the canvas for an individual's activity.

This is implicit from his words, “think locally, act globally”. One should open oneself to ideas from around the world accepting that every struggle in the world is his or her own struggle.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What are T H Marshall’s views on citizenship?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2) Distinguish between liberal and republican conceptions of citizenship.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3) Explain feminist views on citizenship.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

9.5 THE IDEA OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

The supporters of idea of global citizenship believe that all people have certain rights and responsibilities by virtue of being a citizen of this world. Under globalization, the territorially limited idea of citizenship is being challenged by activities like migration, transnational economic, social and cultural exchange. According to *Hannah Arendt*, global citizenship means ‘an ethic of care for the world’. According to *Oxfam*, an international non-governmental organization, “A global citizen is someone who is aware of and understands the wider world—and their place in it. They take an active role in their community, and work with others to make our planet more equal, fair and sustainable.” *Immanuel Kant’s* conceptions of world citizenship give importance to personal responsibility for conduct which may have damaging consequences for the environment, and they defend compassion for peoples elsewhere. They emphasise the virtue of actions

which benefit the wider community and they concede that international society provides limited opportunities for participation in joint rule as the idea of world government still remains elusive. The idea of global citizenship can be criticized as it largely focuses upon duties towards others, and on loyalties to communities which are wider than the nation-state, rather than on active citizenship. Traditional approaches argue that appeals to cosmopolitan citizenship amount to little more than an exercise in moral exhortation while the nation-state is the dominant form of political community. However, the idea of global citizenship cannot be totally wished away in the times of non-traditional security threats like climate change, food-water-energy security, terrorism etc. To tackle such threats, nation-states must cooperate with each other and in the overall framework of this cooperation; every individual has a role to play in dealing with these issues. This is similar to global citizenship where people think of a better future even for others who are not part of their country i.e. to make the world a better place to live for all involved.

Check Your Progress 3

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.
 ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What is meant by global citizenship?

.....

9.6 LET US SUM UP

Citizenship is a relationship between the state and the individual. Three types of rights – civil, political and social rights are associated with citizenship. The earliest versions of citizenship were exclusionary in nature as groups like slaves, women and non-propertied class were not given citizenship rights. This has changed with time and countries today try to extend citizenship rights to all individuals. An active participation of the citizen in a country’s politics shapes the political space as per the desire of the people, a real feature of any democracy. The contemporary understanding of citizenship is close to liberal tradition where individuals have certain rights against the state. At the same time, there are other perspectives like Gandhian, feminist and global which try to offer new insights into the concept of citizenship by breaking gender and national barriers.

9.7 REFERENCES

Acharya, Ashok. (2012). *Citizenship in a Globalizing World*. New Delhi: Pearson.
 Dawn, Oliver and Derek, Heater. (1994). *The Foundation of Citizenship*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Kymlicka, W. (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lal, V. (2008). *Gandhi, Citizenship and the Idea of Good Civil Society*. URL: <https://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/southasia/History/Gandhi/GANDHIUdaipurLectureF.pdf>

Linklater, Andrew. (1998). Cosmopolitan citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 2:1, 23-41.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pocock, J., 1995 (1992). The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times, in *Theorizing Citizenship*, R. Beiner (ed.), Albany: State University of New York Press, 29-53.

Young, I. M., (1989). Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship, *Ethics*, 99: 250-274.

9.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should highlight three types of rights – civil, political and social.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Highlight civil, political and social rights and social rights form the base for civil and political rights.
- 2) Highlight the point that Liberals want representative democracy but the Republicans promote deliberative democracy with active participation of citizens.
- 3) Feminist conception of rights argues that women are second class citizens due to dominance of men in all spheres of life; they also question the distinction between public and private spheres.

Check Your Progress 3

- 1) Global citizenship argues for active role of individuals in their community and efforts by them for making our planet more equal, fair and sustainable.

UNIT 10 CIVIL SOCIETY AND STATE*

Structure

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Theories of State
 - 10.2.1 Classic Understanding of State
 - 10.2.2 Liberal-Individualistic Understanding
 - 10.2.3 Marxist Understanding
- 10.3 Concept of Civil Society
- 10.4 Relationship between State and Civil Society
- 10.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 10.6 References
- 10.7 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

10.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit discusses one of the most basic and important concepts in political science which is the state. It also sheds light on the concept of civil society. After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Know what state is;
- Discuss the concept of Civil society; and
- Examine the relationship between state and civil society.

10.1 INTRODUCTION

The idea of state occupies a central place in political science. As Prof. Garner stated 'political science begins and ends with state'. This concept of state and what it entails have changed and evolved over time. The focus has shifted from authority of the state to the duty of the people. Similarly, civil society has emerged as one of the most debated concepts in political theory. It is undeniable that the concept of civil society is inextricably linked to the modern state. This relation between state and civil society has given rise to a number of questions like: what is the concept of state and civil society? What is the nature of their relationship? These issues have been dealt with in the succeeding sections.

10.2 THEORIES OF STATE

The concept of state occupies the core of political theory. State has been defined and re-defined over centuries as some sort of political organisation that has existed since ancient times. The notion of state begins with Plato and Aristotle through their definition of polis. For both of them, state was a natural, necessary and ethical institution. The state or polis was there to enable a high level of

* Contributed by Dr. Ankita Dutta, Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi

moral and good life. The contemporary definition owes its origin to *Niccolo Machiavelli*, who defined state as ‘the power that has authority over men’. From this definition followed what is known as the most acceptable explanation of state by Max Weber. Weber defined state as a ‘human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’.

10.2.1 Classic Understanding of State

Plato, throughout his work, makes a case for an *Ideal State*. For him, an ideal state ruled by the philosopher rulers was nothing short of a divine institution worthy of emulation and imitation. He described his ideal state as one based on timeless and unchanging principles, suggesting that an ideal state existed which could be discerned and employed to reform a diseased polity and transform it into a thing of beauty. Plato believed that the ideal state comprises members of three distinct classes: rulers, soldiers, and the people. Therefore, the ideal state possessed four cardinal virtues – wisdom, courage, discipline and justice. It would have wisdom because its rulers were persons of knowledge; courage because its warriors were brave; self-discipline because the harmony that pervaded the societal matrix due to common agreement as to who ought to rule; and, justice of doing one’s job for which one was naturally fitted without interfering with other people. Plato emphasised that a good political community was one that promoted general well-being of all its citizens. An important feature of this society was the strong sense of community that its members shared. No one was favoured at the expense of other, all were granted fair share in the benefits. The philosopher ruler was the right kind of ruler, for he was least concerned in capturing power or making money.

Aristotle defined state as a community, the state must exist for an end and the end of the state is the highest good of man. Aristotle identified three stages of development of state - first, there are two basic instincts which were instrumental in bringing people together. The reproductive instinct that leads men and women to unite, and the other is self-preservation. Out of these, ‘first thing to arise is the family...family is the association established by nature for the supply of men’s everyday wants.’ The family is the *first* stage of formation of state. Second stage was when several families are united and associations aim at more than supply of daily needs. Thus, is formed a village, which in its most natural form is the union of family of common descent. Third stage, he defines as, ‘when several villages are united in a single complete community, large enough to be nearly self-sufficing, the state comes into existence, originating in the bare needs of life and continuing in existence for the sake of good life’. For Aristotle, the state is a natural society; man’s natural end is the good life which is to be found only in the state. Therefore, the state is a natural society. Man is by nature a political animal. And he, who by nature and not by mere accident is without a state, is either a bad man or above humanity. For Aristotle, state was the highest form of political union for it represented the pinnacle of social evolution. The state was prior to the individual, in the sense that it provided opportunities for the achievement of full humanity. Social affiliation gave to individuals their species identity.

For both Aristotle and Plato, the state and its laws were more than a product of convention. It was a natural institution reflecting individuals' needs and purposes, given human gregariousness and sociability. For both of them, polis was a complete form of reality. They did not distinguish between state and society, for them polis was an ethical entity whose purpose was to maintain good and happy life. The purpose of Cicero in *Republic* was to set forth a conception of an ideal state as Plato had done in his *Republic*. However, Cicero's ideal state is not polis, it is a commonwealth. For him, the commonwealth is an assemblage of people in large numbers associated in an agreement with respect to justice and a partnership for the common good. He identifies three causes for the creation of the commonwealth. The first cause of such association is that man is not a solitary or unsocial creature, but born with such a nature that not even under conditions of great prosperity of every sort is he willing to be isolated from his fellowmen. Second, his state is based on an agreement to share common good (*populi res*). For him, it is the rational behaviour of men which is responsible for the foundation of state and was useful for achieving common good. The desire to share common good is so much ardent that people have overcome all enticements to pleasure and comfort. Third, the members of the group must agree with each other as to the law which will govern their commonwealth. Cicero has suggested three types of government — royalty, aristocracy and democracy. But in each form of government, there is the germ of corruption and instability and this leads to the fall of government. Only a mixed form of government is the proper guarantee of stability and corruption-free society. Cicero preferred a republican form of government as the perfect example of checks and balances for the stability and good of the political system.

10.2.2 Liberal-Individualist Understanding

The theory of state, from medieval times, has been dominated by the dictums of the *Roman Church*. After the fall of the Roman Empire in the 5th century, there was no single powerful secular government in the West. There was, however, a central ecclesiastical power in Rome, the Catholic Church. In this power vacuum, the Church rose to become the dominant power in the West. Gradually, the social life became a religious life governed by the laws of the Church. With the ushering of modern Western Europe in the fifteenth century, the idea of state became important again. Many new definitions were propounded by various scholars. One of the most important theorists was *Niccolo Machiavelli*. So far, political thinkers from Plato, Aristotle to the Middle ages had concerned themselves with the central question of the end of the state and had considered state-power as a means to a higher end conceived in moral terms. But Machiavelli adopted a quite different line. To him the power of the state is the end of the state, i.e. every state must aim at maximizing its power. The failure of the state in this enterprise will throw it into great turmoil. Consequently, he confined his attention to the means best suited to the acquisition, retention and expansion of power. In his doctrine of *Raison D'Etat* (Reason of State), the state must preserve itself before it promotes the welfare of its people. For Machiavelli, the state is the highest form of human association. State is to be worshipped like a deity even by sacrificing the individual. The state has some primary objectives and responsibilities like protection of life, maintenance of law and order and looking after wellbeing of its members. Hence, the state must have adequate means at its disposal. Machiavelli's state was a secular entity, with no relations to Church. It was morally isolated with no obligations to anything outside itself. He saw good

laws, religion and a citizen army as support structures for a strong and stable state.

The idea of state differs sharply among theorists. For Hobbes, the state of nature is characterized by the “war of every man against every man,” a constant condition of competition in which each individual has a natural right to everything, regardless of the interests of others. Existence in the state of nature is, as Hobbes famously states, “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” The only laws that exist in the state of nature (the laws of nature) are *not* covenants forged between people, but principles based on self-preservation. What Hobbes calls the first law of nature, for instance, is that every man ought to endeavour peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it; and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war. For him, this unsustainable condition comes to an end when individuals agree to relinquish their natural rights to everything and to transfer their self-sovereignty to a higher civil authority, or *Leviathan*. For Hobbes, the authority of the sovereign is absolute, and its will is law. That, however, does not mean that the power of the sovereign is all-encompassing: subjects remain free to act as they please in cases in which the sovereign is silent. The social contract allows individuals to leave the state of nature and enter civil society, but the former remains a threat and returns as soon as governmental power collapses. Because the power of Leviathan is uncontested, however, its collapse is very unlikely and occurs only when it is no longer able to protect its subjects.

For Locke, in comparison, the state of nature is characterized by the absence of government but not by the absence of mutual obligation. Beyond self-preservation, the law of nature, or reason, also teaches “all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, liberty, or possessions.” Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed individuals are naturally endowed with these rights (to life, liberty, and property) and that the state of nature could be relatively peaceful. Individuals nevertheless, agree to form a commonwealth (and thereby to leave the state of nature) in order to institute an impartial power capable of arbitrating their disputes and redressing injuries. Locke believes that the rights to life, liberty, and property are natural rights that precede the establishment of civil society. The idea of the state of nature was also central to the political philosophy of *Rousseau*. He criticized Hobbes’s conception of the state of nature characterized by social antagonism. The state of nature, Rousseau argued, could only mean a primitive state preceding socialization; it is, thus, devoid of social traits such as pride, envy, or even fear of others. The state of nature, for Rousseau, is a morally neutral and peaceful condition in which solitary individuals act according to their basic urges as well as their natural desire for self-preservation. This latter instinct, however, is tempered by an equally natural sense of compassion. In Rousseau’s account, laid out in his *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* (1775), individuals leave the state of nature by becoming increasingly civilized — that is to say, dependent on one another.

For Hegel, ‘State is the march of God on Earth’ implying that it is a divine manifestation on earth. The state, as the third moment of Ethical Life, provided a synthesis between the principles governing the family and those governing civil society. In particular, he saw in the national state of his own day, a reconciliation of the concept of the state as a moral community that prevailed in

the ancient world, with more contemporary concepts of the state that supported freedom and individualism. The idea of the state is itself divided into three moments: (a) the immediate actuality of the state as a self-dependent organism, or constitutional law; (b) the relation of states to other states in international law; (c) the universal idea as mind or spirit which gives itself actuality in the process of world-history. The state was absolutely rational and had ‘substantive will’ for realising itself through history and was therefore, eternal. Hegel perceived the state as an end in itself, it was mind realising itself through history.

10.2.3 Marxist Understanding

Marxist theory of state is one of the most prominent theories in political science. Marxist views challenged the basic concepts of liberal state which needs to be abolished or smashed without which the emancipation of common people will never be possible. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* defined state as the “Political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another”. Adding, “The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie”. For them, the state was not eternal, it would eventually disappear. Marx regarded state, irrespective of type of government, as evil. It belonged to the realm of superstructure and was conditioned and determined by its economic base. In the course of history, each mode of production would give rise to its own political organisation which would further the interest of the economically dominant class. The alternative that Marx envisioned was a classless, stateless society of true democracy and full communism, in which the political state disappeared.

However, *neo-Marxists* do not agree fully with the view that the state is an instrument of a particular class. They have argued that this view was particularly true of *Russian Bolshevik Society*, but cannot generally be regarded accurate for the present times. They have also argued the state instead of withering away as predicted by Marx, would become even stronger in the name of dictatorship of the proletariat. In his seminal work, *The State in Capitalist Society: The Analysis of the Western System of Power (1973)*, *Ralph Miliband* said, “There is one preliminary problem about the state which is very seldom considered, yet which requires attention, if the discussion of its nature and role is to be properly focused. This is the fact that “the state” is not a thing that it does not, as such, exist. What “the state” stands for is a number of particular institutions which, together, constitute its reality and which interact as parts of what may be called the state system”. Miliband said that in order to understand the real nature of state, it is essential to study the institutions which constitute the bourgeois state. He calls these institutions the different elements of state.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What is the Marxist theory of State?

.....

.....

.....

10.3 CONCEPT OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The idea of civil society is deeply entrenched in political thought. The idea of civil society is quite old, but it has become important in the last few decades because of the political evolution worldwide, particularly after the fall of the former communist countries in Eastern Europe. Moreover, many times non-state actors, especially non-governmental organisations and various issue-based movements, have become influential in shaping public policy debate, sometimes helping the state to formulate and implement policies. The term “civil society” can be traced through the works of *Cicero* (*societas civilis*) and other Romans to the ancient Greek philosophers, although in *classical* usage civil society was equated with the state. The modern idea of civil society emerged in the *Scottish* and *Continental* Enlightenment of the late 18th century. A host of political theorists, from John Locke, Thomas Paine to Hegel, developed the notion of civil society as a domain parallel to but separate from the state — a place where citizens voluntarily associate according to their own interests and wishes. This new thinking reflected changing economic realities: the rise of private property, market competition, and the bourgeoisie. It also grew out of the mounting popular demand for liberty, as manifested in the American and French revolutions. The idea of civil society took a *back* seat in the mid-19th century as political theorists turned their attention to the social and political consequences of the industrial revolution. It came back in use after World War II through the writings of the Marxist theorist *Antonio Gramsci*, who revived the term to portray civil society as a special nucleus of independent political activity, a crucial sphere of struggle against tyranny.

The concept of civil society flourished along with the idea of individual with respect to his rights, his relations with other individuals and the state. Civil society finds resonance in the theories of *Thomas Hobbes* and *John Locke*. For Hobbes, the state plays the most important role as it guarantees peace and self-preservation. Civil society may flourish only when the state is strong. According to Hobbes, it was a novel argument that the government by institution arises through contract between individuals excluding the sovereign for he is not a party to the original contract. In his view, society and the state require justification since they are not natural. What is natural is the state of nature where people follow their emotions rather than reason. On the other hand, for Locke, the most important aspect of social life was freedom of individuals who first create civil society and then the state which protects individual's rights. In *The Second Treatise of Government*, John Locke expounds protection of property interests as the reason why members of civil society unite to form a government. For him, legitimate governments are those that have the consent of the people. Locke states very clearly that civil society and state are different. He argued that the state is a fiduciary power which depends upon the trust of the civil society. He argued, if the state started acting tyrannically or irresponsibly and tried to curtail the rights of individuals, then the civil society must act to check the transgressions. Locke's views were further advanced by *Adam Smith* and *Adam Ferguson*. For Ferguson, civil society is a state of civility as he referred to the deterioration of civic spirit in political society, whereby the successful commercial classes had become servile to the administrative state. Although the state provided members of these classes with the rule of law, at the same time it also deprived them of their basic rights. Smith in his writing, *The Wealth of Nations* explained the

foundation of the conception of civil society as one of ‘economic man’ actively pursuing ‘the necessities, conveniences and amusements of human life’. Smith opines that civil society is mediated by a social order constituted by private property, contracts and ‘free’ exchanges of labour, and it is the duty of the state to protect that particular order. In short, both Ferguson and Smith view civil society as a regulatory and socializing force that curbed man’s unstable nature in order to protect market practices, property rights, and the enhancement of capitalism.

Hegel has further explained the relationship between state and civil society. For him, ‘The creation of civil society is the achievement of the modern world which has for the first time given all determinations of the Idea their due.’ Civil society, for Hegel, reflected a “system of needs” where an individual pursued his own interests according to his inclinations and abilities. For him, civil society contained three different but inter-related things: i) the system of need; ii) the administration of justice (security of person and property); and iii) need for police and cooperation. Individual pursuits are linked through a web of mutual dependence that is governed by a system of formal rules described by Hegel as ‘external state’ or state based on need and abstract reasoning. For Hegel, what defines civil society as civil, as opposed to a political society, is its division into various classes and estates that have their own distinctive outlook, interest and way of life. These estates – the peasantry, the business, and the universal class of the state functionaries – provide the crucial links or mediations between the natural society of the family and the more abstract rationality of the state. Hegel regards the state as the highest and the final form of social institution. Calling state as a synthesis, of the thesis of family and the anti-thesis of civil society, he describes civil society as ‘an expression for the individualist and atomistic atmosphere of middle class commercial society in which relationships are external, governed by the unseen hand of the economic laws rather by the sub-conscious will of the person’. In Hegel’s concept, civil society *passes* over into state - the highest level of the development of the Spirit. And though civil society precedes the state in the logical order, it is ultimately dependent upon the state for its very existence and preservation.

Unlike Hegel, Karl Marx was very critical of the concept of civil society. He viewed the state as the political consolidation of the bourgeois domination that existed in civil society. According to Marx, civil society was created by bourgeois society; therefore, it was nothing but the representation of the interests of the bourgeoisie. He added that civil society was the ‘base’ where productive forces and social relations were taking place, whereas the political society was the ‘superstructure’. In this context, the state as ‘superstructure’ represents the dominant class. On the other hand, *Antonio Gramsci* portrayed civil society as the centre of independent political activity and an important sphere of struggle against the tyranny. Gramsci’s concept of civil society is premised on the idea that it is a site of struggle for the legitimate use of state power. He argued civil society is neither a state of nature nor is a consequence of the industrial society, but is a function of ‘hegemony’, which can be both political and cultural. He divided the super structure of society into *two* – the civil society and the political society. He argued the dominant groups in society exercise hegemony through these two elements of the super structure by both coercive as well as ideological means. Gramsci explained that the civil society embodies the material as well as the ideological and cultural relations in society. In his view, any state regardless

of its type of regimes that deny the citizens' political and civil rights are to expect the eruption of discontent against exclusions from structures of citizenship and representation. He views the civil society as a vital entity and reckons that states which do not possess civil societies are more vulnerable than those that do possess them. Differing from Marx, Gramsci did not consider civil society as linked with the socio-economic base of the state. He stressed the vital role of civil society as the contributor to the cultural and ideological capital for the survival of the hegemony of capitalism, and then reproduced it through cultural terms. At the same time, the civil society also became the arena where the struggle over hegemony takes place and where the societies can defend themselves against the market and the state. In sum, many political philosophers have come up with their own definition of civil society. For Hegel, civil society is a necessary stage for the formation of a state; for Marx, civil society is the source of power of the state; and for Gramsci, civil society is the space where the state constructs its hegemony in alliance with the dominant classes.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Discuss Hegel's views on civil society.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

10.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STATE AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Civil society and the state, although distinct, are never wholly autonomous in their relations with each other. But they are different in the objects they pursue. The limited state cannot be deprived of a necessary power to maintain the conditions of a well-ordered society such as the rule of law, security and justice. On the other hand, a strong civil society can flourish only within a strong state - in the sense of its legitimacy and the effectiveness of its political institutions, rules and orders. A weak and contested state can be a major impediment for the development of an active citizenry. The state and civil society, as argued by *David Held*, must become the condition for each other. The state is usually described as 'society politically organised'. Society is an association of human beings which fulfils all their needs. The state fulfils their particular need of political organisation – subject them to binding laws and decision to provide security. When a society is capable of performing these functions under the direction of a supreme decision-making authority, only then does it qualify being a state while it is true that one is the extension of other, still there needs to be certain distinctions made. The state is identified by its unified, formal structure

comprising different organs of power, particularly legislature, executive and judiciary. On the other hand, civil society is comprised of loose organisations of citizens voluntarily pursuing public interest. The state is armed with supreme legal authority i.e. sovereignty; however, civil society enjoys *no* formal or legal authority. The state is empowered to exercise compulsory jurisdiction over its citizens and territories; civil society does not have jurisdiction anywhere, it largely depends on its ability to motivate and inspire. The state is responsible for the maintenance of law and order; protection of its citizens from internal and external forces. The civil society voluntarily undertakes protection of common interest of citizens. Most importantly, the existence of state is almost universal, some form of political organisation is found in every modern society. However, civil society comes into existence only in relatively advanced societies where citizens have become adequately conscious of their rights, duties and common interests.

Despite several distinctions, it cannot be refuted that an active, diverse civil society often does play a valuable role in helping advance democracy. It can discipline the state, ensure that citizens' interests are taken seriously, and foster greater civic and political participation. The rise of civil society induces some to see a nearly stateless future in which tentative, minimalistic states hang back while powerful non-governmental groups impose a new, civic order. The relation is depicted as a zero-sum game – stronger state to weaker civil society and vice-versa. Civil society groups can be much more effective in shaping state policy if the state has coherent powers for setting and enforcing policy. Good non-governmental advocacy work will actually tend to strengthen, not weaken state capacity. The relation between state and civil society is reciprocal at best. It has to be of integrative nature, each furthering the cause of the other. It is the responsibility of the state to provide a platform and a framework within which the civil society would function. The state and civil society need to go hand in hand. The progress of civil society depends upon the progress of the state and the working of the state is in turn influenced by social customs and traditions. The state has to respond to the ever-growing demands of civil society. On the other hand, civil society has to be open and diversified. The concepts of state and civil society have developed simultaneously – the state cannot be imagined without a civil society and in a similar way, no civil society can find legitimacy without a state.

10.5 LET US SUM UP

The state's relationship with civil society is the key issue in political sociology. This unit has explored the basic understanding of how state has been defined via the three most important theoretical positions – Classic understanding, Liberal Individualist and Marxist. Similarly, the understanding of how civil society came into use has been traced from Roman and Greek philosophers to modern ideas of civil society as reflected in the writings of Hegel, Marx etc. This unit has also highlighted that civil society and the state, although distinct, are never wholly autonomous in their relations with each other. But they are different in the objects they pursue. The progress of civil society depends upon the progress of the state and the working of the state is in turn influenced by social customs and traditions. The state has to respond to the ever-growing demands of civil society. On the other hand, civil society has to be open and diversified.

10.6 REFERENCES

Cohen, Jean L. and Arato, Andrew. (1997). *Civil Society and Political Theory*. Unites States: MIT Press.

Dorota I Pietrzyk. (2001). *Civil Society – Conceptual History from Hobbes to Marx*, Marie Curie Working Papers – No. 1, University of Wales.

Mukherjee, Subrata and Ramaswamy, Sushila. (2007). *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.

10.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Your answer should highlight the following points:
- Marxist view of state opposes the liberal concept of state;
 - State reflects the interests of the economically dominant class.
 - Aims to achieve classless, stateless society.

Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Your answer should highlight the following points:
- Three different but inter-related features of civil society.
 - His reason for calling civil society as civil in comparison to a political society.
 - Relationship between state and civil society.