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1.1 Introduction
The success of democracy is determined by the level of citizens’ participation in the process of political decision-making. The civil society facilitates regular and extensive popular participation, beyond, simply, voting in general elections. Hence, civil society is seen by many researchers and practitioners as a basic pillar of democracy. Before, explaining the role of civil society in the deepening of democracy and the political development of a state, it is important explain the concepts of civil society and political development. Both being value-loaded terms, this chapter would attempt to set a workable definition of both civil society and political development.

1.2 Civil Society
Civil society is the ‘buzzword’ in the contemporary political discourse. The role of civil society in the socio-economic and political development, peace-building and the protection of human rights is acknowledged by the scholars of various schools of thoughts. Civil society is considered as a take-off point for ‘humane governance’. At the same time, the presence and influence of civil society in various social movements—human rights, ecology, women, peace, humanitarian, etc., which seek to realise the goal of inclusive growth, and participatory and accountable government—makes its realm very large. It enables safe and secure conditions for all sections of society, particularly, the weaker and marginalised sections of the society, guaranteeing equal opportunity to all. The scope of civil society is too vast to explain in detail. Since, our objective is to deal with role of civil society in the political development and democratisation, therefore, our focus in this chapter would be more on political aspects of the civil society.

Before examining the role of civil society in the political development of the state it is necessary to trace its historical genesis.

1.2.1 HISTORICAL GENESIS
The origin of the concept of civil society can be traced back to the philosophical discourses, of the ancient Greek and Roman period. Thinkers of the early modern period, like, Hobbes, Locke, and later, Hegel, Marx and Gramsci have spoken volumes about the term. Ancient political thinkers, Aristotle and Cicero, mentioned about the term in their respective works. Aristotle used the term to describe something
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different from the contemporary usage of the term. Cicero used the term *societascivilis* for civil society, which had resemblance with the modern concept of civil society. Though, Cicero was not much vocal in its use nor was he aware about the importance the term was going to acquire in later times.

The civil society in the West evolved simultaneously with the evolution of modern nation-state. John Keane states that civil society was in its prenatal phase until 18th century when scholars described it as an association which ensures a peaceful and good government. To quote John Keane:

‘*Until the middle of the eighteenth century, European political thinkers without exception used the term civil society to describe a type of political association which places upon its members under the influence of laws and thereby ensures peaceful order and good government. The term formed part of an old European tradition traceable from modern natural law back through Cicero’s ideas of societascivilis to classical political philosophy above all to Aristotle, for whom, civil society is that society, the polis which contains and dominates all others*’.

Aristotle and Cicero used the term that fell into disuse much during the later part of ancient period and medieval period. The events of the Early modern period in Europe, which paved the way and helped in the evolution of modern nation state and such similar developments, also made the scholars of those revolutionary years to become vocal on civil society and its role in the new happenings. The following are the prominent thinkers, who spoke about civil society during the early and late modern period:

**Hobbes**

Thomas Hobbes, English thinker and philosopher, put forward his ideas which described civil society very much similar to the way we see it today. Hobbes used the term ‘*civitas*’ or ‘commonwealth’ to refer to a society which was hypothetically formed by the individuals living in a ‘state of nature’ to overcome the untenable anarchic situation prevailing there—a pre-social, pre-political condition where self-preservation is responsibility of each individual who is governed by considerations of self-interest and egoism. The Law of Nature is interpreted by each individual in such
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a way to suit his interests only, representing law of jungle, where life isn’t safe by any means. The self-regarding, selfish and asocial individuals, for Hobbes, are hostile and competitive, as they have to deal with the problem of limited resources and unlimited demands. In the state of nature, these individuals pose a threat to each other in order to increase their power. There being no authority to make laws and regulate human beings, threat of violence and war always loom large in the atmosphere. To put an end to this situation, people enter into a contract by which they decide to renounce their individual right to self-preservation at each other’s expense by appointing a sovereign. While putting forward his theory of social contract Hobbes states that civil society represents the refined and more secure form of natural society or ‘state of nature’. It thus represents the state where life and property was secure and safe and order prevails, unlike that of ‘brutish and nasty’ as it is there in the state of nature.³
Therefore, to sum up, civil society for Hobbes represented civility, peace and order, which were absent in the ‘state of nature’.

Locke
John Locke elaborated the concept of civil society. The conditions under which Locke put forward his ideas were quite different. A few decades after Thomas Hobbes, John Locke was writing at a time when England was passing through a period of turmoil and political instability because of the unending conflict between the supporters of monarchy, the Royalists, and supporters of the Parliament, the Puritans. The monarchy had considerably been weakened by then. In sharp distinction to Hobbes, Locke stated that human beings are peace-loving, rational and social creatures. The Lockean ‘state of nature’ is a condition of peace, freedom, equality and cooperation, instead of perpetual conflict. This is because human beings are rational creatures and can discover the moral truths and obey them. This rational capacity of the human beings, Locke referred to as the ‘natural law’.⁴

However, in Locke's alternative blue-print, that is, state of nature, there is no well-established, settled and common law, there is no executive power that can enforce the just decisions and there is no independent and neutral arbiter. These deficiencies of the state of nature compel men to constitute a civil society in order to protect, preserve

and enlarge their freedom. Locke, like Hobbes, also postulates the transition from state of nature to civil society.\(^5\)

Locke argues that when men possess the natural right to life, liberty and property. A common public authority is constituted through a contract, and thereby civil society or the commonwealth emerges. In the civil society, the natural rights get the backing of the law and Rule of Law is established. This contract takes place in two stages. While explaining Locke’s two stages of social contract Brian R. Nelson states that:

‘The first stage is the social contract that forms society; the second stage is the political 'contract' that creates a common authority. The social contract, Locke argues requires a unanimous consent of every party to the contract. The political 'contract' to form a government requires only a majority decision, and the subsequent actions of government are legitimate, says Locke, so long as they are based upon the will of the majority’.\(^6\)

For Locke, the sovereign or the common public authority, so created as a result of the contract, should provide a suitable atmosphere, wherein the individuals can enjoy their liberty and natural rights. While discussing the transformation of monarchy into constitutional state Locke introduces the concept of civil society. While making monarch subservient to civil society, he puts forward his ideas about some elementary form of democracy. He believes that while forming state, civil society is formed at the first stage, where people vest their authority not to the king but the civil society.

For Taylor, Locke’s civil society acts like a self-directing society, acting as a source of resistance and check upon the state authority. It is more orderly but is otherwise similar to the state of nature.\(^7\) But Mahajan states that Locke clearly differentiated civil society from ‘state of nature’ as well as ‘political society’ that was formed after the contract. She asserts that the existence of publicly recognised political sovereign, an established system of law, and a mechanism for punishing the offenders constitute conditions for existence of civil society, but, not civil society itself. Civil society emerges only when individuals’ right to ‘life, liberty and property’ is guaranteed by
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law. Therefore it is legal recognition of natural rights of individuals that transforms political society in civil society.\(^8\)

Hegel

Another key thinker to make significant contribution to the term civil society was George William Friedrich Hegel in the 19\(^{th}\) century. His ideas on civil society marked a departure from the ideas of Hobbes and Locke. Hegel, a resident of Prussia, was influenced by the French Revolution (1789). Prussia, during Hegel’s time, was feudal, backward and underdeveloped, unlike England and France, which were more advanced and developed states. Following French Revolution and Napoleon’s rise to power, Prussia (and other adjacent states which form today’s Germany) experienced a brief period of subjugation under France. But Hegel held Napoleon in high esteem, as he helped these states to come out from the stage of feudalism and put them on the path of development and progress. It heralded a new social order based on equality before law. In the light of these developments, Hegel forwarded his ideas about civil society. For him, civil society is only an intermediary which ultimately leads to the formation of democratic state.

Hegel believes that family, civil society and state are the three forms of ethical life and the dialectical interaction between them helps us to realise the freedom implicit in the human spirit.\(^9\) He states that family represents the private interests; state represents the universal interests and ideas; civil society is an intermediary between these two. While family represents ‘ethical life in its natural or intermediate phase’, civil society reflects the ethical life ‘in its division and appearance’, and the state represents freedom—universal and objective. Hegel’s concept on family, civil society and state are essentially rooted in his concept of dialectics. Dialectics means arriving at truth by contradictions, negation of negations, that is, thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis. While family represents thesis, civil society represents anti-thesis, and the state is represented by synthesis.

For Hegel, civil society represents a sphere of ‘universal egoism’. It is in brief an arena of economic activity, based on property exchange, where particular individuals
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develop their self-consciousness and set forth their claims for want satisfaction and personal autonomy.

Civil society represents one of the achievements of the modern world governed by division of labour, and competitiveness in the economy, through which individuals can achieve freedom. Hegel regarded civil society as a synthesis of moral and political community, as a form of ethical life, through which individuals can achieve freedom in the world. In other words, civil society is a collective body responsible for the freedom and welfare of all its members. He conceptualised civil society in terms of a system of needs. In contrast to the universal principles represented by the state, civil society represented particular subjective needs of individuals. It is a site of particularity, wherein, individual’s private needs are given primacy over the interests of community.

Hegel developed a symbiotic relationship between the state and the civil society, where state represents the law and public authority, and civil society forms its integral part. Similarly, civil society that signifies freedom pervades state and its institutions. For Hegel, state represents a rational order, which will help in realising the universality and actuality of the idea of freedom. It is within state that personal individuality and particular interests achieve their complete development and gain explicit recognition of their rights. Hegel declares state as ‘march of God on earth’ and the ultimate embodiment of the spirit. His presumption that state will ensure freedom of the individual follows from his belief that civil society will lead to the evolution of democratic state. He distinguishes between objective and subjective freedom. Objective freedom is realised within the state by abiding the laws, subjective freedom, which represents the private needs and interests of the individuals is also best safeguarded and ensured by the state and its institutions. Thus for him, both civil society and state are the embodiments of the idea of freedom, as both are guided by the spirit of ethical life.

Mahajan believes that civil society for Hegel was a form of ethical life in which objective and subjective co-exist in harmony. Civil society makes this harmony possible because it embodies a system of relations built upon the mutual recognition of rights of self and other.10 Similarly, Alexander Jeffery states that for Hegel, civil society is not only the world of economic needs but also the sphere of ethics. It is a

10 Mahajan, op. cit., 1190.
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moral realm differentiated from family life, which Hegel portrayed as fully concrete and particularistic, and independent from the state, an institution that for ideological and philosophical reasons Hegel considered a universalist realm.11 For Sudipta Kaviraj Hegel’s civil society was a ‘moral order’ where a harmony is maintained between individualistic claims (propounded by capitalism) and the collective interests, for civil society acts like a sphere of ideas.12 Hegel believed state as an important aspect of civil society because it is state which is responsible for its creation and sustenance.

Marx
Along with social contract theorists and Hegel, it becomes necessary to discuss the Marxist conception of civil society as well. Marx has also expressed his ideas about civil society. He rejected the views of ‘utopian socialists’, who emphasised on class-harmony and non-revolutionary politics. Marx was influenced by French revolution, Hegelian philosophy, and the industrial revolution of England in the 17th century. He professed the idea that the hitherto history has been that of history of class struggles. In order to achieve industrialisation, each state needs to pass through the previous stage of development, that is, feudalism. Similarly, in order to achieve socialism, entire society will have to pass through the stages of capitalism and so on.13 Marx didn’t accept Hegel’s presumption that civil society reconciles the selfish interests of the individual with that of whole community. Marx related civil society to bourgeoisie society, wherein economically dominant class would utilise the state and its machinery for furthering its own interests. The economic sphere of forces and relations of production are instrumental in causing all social and political changes and determine form and nature of civil society and state.
As Georgina Blakeley observes:
‘Marx saw civil society as a historically determined phenomenon; characterized by certain forms of production and certain social relations, coterminous with the growth of capitalism and the emergence of the bourgeoisie. Civil society arose as a result of the separation of spheres which depended on the rise of bourgeoisie in a market sphere structurally separate from formal state power. But although distinctions were

11 Alexander Jeffrey, op. cit., 133.
abolished in political society, the equality of political society masked the inequality of the real world of civil society’.\(^\text{14}\)

In other words, Marx considers civil society as the social organisation, which evolves directly out of the system of production and commerce. It forms the basis of the state and rest of the idealistic superstructure. Therefore, whereas Hegel subordinated civil society to state, Marx acknowledged the crucial role of civil society, acting as theatre of history.

**Gramsci**

During Inter-War period in the Twentieth Century, Antonio Gramsci, another prominent Marxist, carried forward the Marxian debate on civil society. While subscribing to Marxian ‘historical materialism’, he didn’t accept the method to establish communism by means of the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’. Instead, he advocated gradualism to establish communism. Post-Marxists, like Gramsci differed from Marx with regards to civil society. Civil society in Gramsci’s tradition belonged to the superstructure, since it carried the ideological and cultural relations. While Marx didn’t accord much importance to the superstructure, rather gave primacy to the base, Gramsci divided superstructure into two levels—civil society and political society. Civil society represented private sphere, while political society represented state and its institutions.

Gramsci, says NeeraChandhoke, believed that civil society is necessary prerequisite of democracy but actually civil society doesn’t always promote democracy. Gramsci argued that the state institutionalises invisible, intangible and subtle forms of power through multiple social practices in civil society, including educational, cultural and religious systems and other institutions. Political society disciplines ‘body’ through its penal codes and prisons, but civil society disciplines the ‘mind’ and ‘psyche’.\(^\text{15}\) Both help in establishing the hegemony which the dominant group exercises over the society. Thus, the state, according to Gramsci, includes both the civil and political society. While ‘political society’ represents state and its institutions, like, police, courts, etc. which act as an ‘instrument of coercion’. The civil society represents the institutions, like, church, schools, etc that help in socialization of individuals acting as


\(^{15}\)NeeraChandhoke, “Global Civil Society and Global Justice,” *Economic and Political Weekly* 42, no. 29 (Jul. 21-27, 2007): 3016-3022
‘instrument of consent’. This hegemony, as stated, in the civil society is imposed by
the state through educational institutions, cultural and religious bodies, symbols,
practices, and other similar institutions that help in socialisation of individuals.
Gramsci, while, subscribing to the establishment of communism concludes that the
state will ultimately wither away. While withering away, its functions would be taken
over by the voluntary organisations of civil society. The goal of the workers should be
to establish an anti-bourgeoisie hegemony within civil society, considered as the link
between class-structured economy and the state institutions based on coercion.
Gramsci redefined the Marxist concept of civil society by introducing the terms like
‘hegemony’, ‘forces of consent’ and ‘forces of coercion’ in the political discourse of
civil society. Since, Marx defined society in terms base-superstructure relationship, he
stressed upon the base or economic part, which defined the superstructure or other
aspects of society like religion, politics, law, culture and traditions of a society. For
Marx, civil society is part of this superstructure, which is defined by the economic
base. Thus, civil society for Marx is not that active in shaping the structure or
functioning of society. But for Gramsci, civil society plays an important role, as much
as economic base plays, in maintaining and strengthening capitalist society. For him it
is a terrain of struggle between class forces contesting for political hegemony, in
which media, schools, unions, and other social and cultural institutions provides an
ideological environment conducive for the maintenance of capitalist mode of
production. Therefore, civil society is a terrain of ideological contestation in which
these institutions can sustain capitalist class dominance. Gramsci held that civil
society serves as a ‘force of consent’ wherein an individual is socialised in such a
manner that exploitative nature of civil society looks natural to him.

**Habermas**

JurgenHabermas defines civil society as ‘public sphere’ in terms of its ability to hold
a ‘rational-critical discourse’ between various groups of society. For Habermas,
there exist ‘free-actors’ in civil society that perform the voluntary actions required to
constitute the public sphere. It is the public sphere of a civil society where rational-
critical arguments rather than mere inherited ideas or personal statuses can determine

---


arguments and actions. It is operationalization of civil society’s capacity for self-organisation that focuses on plurality and reason.18 A political public sphere is successful that provides for a discourse about shared societal concerns that is both rational-critical and influential. A favourable organisation of civil society is very important for the success of public sphere. It brings to the forth the issue of ‘democratic inclusiveness’ that includes and recognizes within itself the diversity of identities people have as members of the civil society.

**Tocqueville**

Alex de Tocqueville was a strong exponent of the civil society. Though he put a lot of faith in democracy and the democratic state, he also believed that the democratic state had a tendency to become despotic, since it is empowered to control all the social spheres. Therefore, he put forward the idea of constitution with ‘separation of powers’ and a strong civil society which can withstand the pressures from the state and contribute to the general development and strengthening of the democracy.19

### 1.2.2 RISE OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Tracing the origin of civil society in contemporary discourse, Khilnani believes that it was disillusionment with the party politics in 20th century that provoked many thinkers in the West to take interest in civil society—as a means of rejuvenating public life and greater ‘civility’ among social relations.20 In order to speed up the developmental tasks, civil society and its constituents—private enterprises, church, denominational organisations, NGOs, etc.—were deemed fit to supplement the role of state. This also ensured accountability and representative form of political power. Khilnani further states that in order to restore to society its lost powers—economic, social and political—illegitimately usurped by state, civil society has come into being.21

While discussing about the development of civil society in Third World, Mahajan believes that it was loss of faith in the institutions of state that led to revival of civil society. While referring to Neo-Marxist point of view, she believes that democratic

18 Craig Calhoun, “Civil Society and the Public Sphere,” *Public Culture* 2, no 5, (1993): 269
20 Sunil Khilnani, *op. cit.*, 11.
struggle of power is located in civil society, since post-colonial bourgeoisie state cannot accommodate the interests of weaker sections. Neera Chandhoke has called civil society as a ‘leitmotif of movements struggling to free themselves from post-colonial and tyrannical and unresponsive states’. Similarly, fall of Communism (and the symbolic Berlin Wall) propelled people to recognise civil society as a force that could shake the very foundations of authoritarian states. Hefner believes that it became a rallying cry for the dissidents in the totalitarian states, in Eastern Europe, who believed it to be a vehicle for achieving the liberal-democratic norms by building social movements to oppose and overthrow authoritarian states. Emphasising upon the positive role of civil society in Eastern Europe, he further states that democratic opening, following the success of Solidarity Movement of Poland in 1980s, underlined civil society as a solution to socio-economic and political problems of people in these totalitarian states. Civil society evoked images of ‘freedom to speak and associate’ without fear. It presented a rosy picture of state, in which the words and actions of ordinary citizens would be duly acknowledged by the state.

Subscribing to the same view, Geremark states that it was during 1970s when communist states began to disintegrate, the intellectuals and political activists in Eastern Europe invoked the concept of civil society to mobilise citizens against the repressive states and reclaim a sphere of privacy in social life. These dissident leaders asserted their right to free speech and free association to carve out a social space for their activities. It grew out of conviction that state needs to be rescued from the communist oligarchy, and society must retain the power of independent self-organisation that overtly focuses on ‘non-political politics’. The main forms of resistance to the communist state was dissidence, that too was very narrow since these totalitarian states left little room for independent civic action.

Edwards and Foley consider that the concept was picked-up by the Western intellectuals of various political persuasions to articulate their discomfort with modern society and government. In Western Europe, neo-corporatist tendencies had brought
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organised labour and working class parties to an institutionalised pattern of governance, but that afforded little access to other sections of society. Efforts led by many, including the Greens, made it possible to open public spaces for new social and cultural organisations, and suggested civil society as an alternate way of accomplishing collective goals, as they were critical of procedural mode of representative democracy. So were neo-liberals and proponents of free market economy who saw civil society as a way of downsizing government, and empowering society. They emphasised capacity of social groups to regulate themselves and care for their own, enabling return of crucial functions of ‘private sphere’. Portraying government and society in a zero-sum game, these thinkers blamed government for disorganising and weakening society.

The communitarians, ranging from both left to right, believe that civil society can chalk out course of community life. Critical of overemphasis on individual rights and market, decline in civic engagement, with public works and public institutions and social disorganisation, Elshtain asserted, they see civil society as a ‘political philosophy’ that emphasized personal responsibility and commitment to collective good.

While tracing the historical genesis of the concept from ancient to modern times, it becomes important to set a workable definition the term.

### 1.2.3 DEFINING CIVIL SOCIETY

Alexander Jeffrey defines civil society as an arena in which social solidarity is defined in universalistic terms. He further states that it is “we-ness” of a community that transcends particular commitments, narrow loyalties, and sectional interests. Only this kind of solidarity can provide a thread of identity unifying people dispersed by religion, class, ethnicity, or race.
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Cohen defines civil society as any grouping that assumes representation of collective interests and a totality of civic engagements that is committed to join political process.  

Michael Edwards, like Putnam, relates civil society with social capital. He states that civil society includes civic engagements that promote associational life, a good society, and a public sphere in which ideas and ideologies can be discussed and debated.  

Cato Institute, Washington, states that civil society constitutes any reduction in role of politics in society by expanding free markets and individual liberty.  

After discussing these myriad definitions of civil society, the London School of Economics’ Centre for Civil Society has given a working definition which states that:  

1. Civil society refers to the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests, purposes and values.  
2. In theory, its institutional forms are distinct from those of the state, family and market, though in practice, the boundaries between the state, civil society and family and market are complex, blurred and negotiated.  
3. Civil society commonly embraces a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms, varying in their degree of formality, autonomy and power.  

The World Bank has adopted a definition of civil society which is developed by a number of leading research centres. The WB states that:  

‘the term civil society refers to the wide array of non-governmental and non-for-profit organisations that have presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) therefore refer to a wide array of organisations: community groups, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), labour unions, indigenous groups, charitable  

31 Cato Institute, Washington, is a public policy research organisation dedicated to the liberty, limited government, free markets and peace. The organisation claims that its scholars conduct an independent non-partisan research on a wide range of issues. url: http://www.cato.org  
32 Centre for Civil Society of London School of Economics is now functioning under the Department of International Development, since 2010. Established in 1995, by Dr. David Lewis, the centre ran programmes on CSOs and their management. The centre also hosted a range of research projects on topics such as civil society and gender, post-conflict reconciliation and civil society, civil society and aid.url: http://www.lse.ac.uk/CCS/home.aspx
organisations, faith-based organisations, professional associations, and foundations’. According to Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), civil society may constitute the following:

1. Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs)
2. Community organisations, community groups, and groups of residents directly affected by a Bank-financed project.
3. Non-profit organisations.
5. Universities, academia, research centres and professional associations whose field of study make significant contribution to IDB.
6. Religious institutions.

Sample of institutions that may represent civil society include the following: academia, activist groups, charities, citizens’ militia, civil groups, clubs (sports, social, etc), community foundations, community organisations, consumer organisations, cooperatives, churches, cultural groups, environmental groups, foundations, intermediary organisations for voluntary and non-profit sector, men’s groups, NGOs, NPOs, policy institutions, political parties, private voluntary organisations, professional associations, religious organisations, social enterprises, support groups, trade unions, voluntary associations, women’s groups, etc.

1.2.4 NATURE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Civil society came into being to express itself as a desire for greater civility in social relations. Invoked by almost all the ideological stances, civil society has become a buzzword and an idea of late twentieth century. For Khilnani, whosoever talks about the concept has an invisible desire to recover the powers of society which have been illegitimately usurped by states. Following the end of cold-war era that dominated late 20th century, civil society came to represent something better—democracy, prosperity, autonomy and the means to exercise the plural choices. Sources or location of civil society have been discussed at length by various schools of thought.

---
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36Ibid., 12
The liberals see civil society actually residing in economy and markets, where such rights are freely exchanged. The radicals see the civil society located in society itself—independent of economic domain and state, where ideas are exchanged publicly and associations formed freely. Finally, the conservatives see civil society residing in cultural acquisitions and inherent in manners of civility. Advocates of these strands—propagating economy, society and culture, respectively—portray these realms as limiting the authority of state against the individual. While discussing nature of civil society, Edwards divided civil society into three broad realms: Civil Society as group of associations, Civil Society as ‘Good Society’ or ‘Civility’, and Civil Society as public sphere. Thinkers, like Robert Putnam, also regard it as a condition of civility, in which ‘rule of law’ is the guiding principle. Open and secular systems of social stratification along with stance of neutrality become other attributes of civil society.

Robert Putnam has argued that even non-political organisations in civil society are vital for democracy. This is because they build the necessary social capital, trust and shared values, which are transferred into the political sphere and help to hold society together, facilitating an understanding of the interconnectedness of society and interests within it.

Eliot gives a mixed picture of the term when he stated how the concept meant differently to people: some regarding it to involve attitudes of tolerance and other—regarding patterns of discourse; some stating it to be a site of contestation and liberation; while as, for its critics it is seen as a potential of elitist hegemony.

Gurpreet Mahajan states that for some civil society represents autonomous associations existing independent of the state, simultaneously, allowing individuals and groups in society to manage their affairs. It may, thus, include football associations, theatre groups, trade unions, churches, caste panchayats, etc. She states that all forms of collectivities are seen agencies of civil society.

---

37 Ibid., 17
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41 Gurpreet Mahajan, op. cit., 1188-96.
1.2.5 SCOPE OF CIVIL SOCIETY
Although, the concept of civil society derives much from liberal theory, it has acquired new dimensions and visibility in recent times. There were many events that led to the development of civil society discourse. One of them was the disintegration of communist regimes in Eastern Europe that led to interest in civil society and its contribution in sustaining the health of liberal democracy. Active civil society was seen as a society independent of state and its presence was considered necessary for the establishment and sustenance of democratic institutions in those countries. Civil society was seen as a sphere of social self-management, private initiative and freedom of thought and association. Cohen states that strengthened by new social movements in Western Europe at that time, civil society aimed to further democratise state and society. The other factor that contributed to growth of civil society discourse was the renewal of interest in Tocquevillian tradition of associational pluralism in the US. During Cold-War, social pluralism and an active civil society were seen as democratic answer to Soviet totalitarianism and communism. Presented as a means of democratising bureaucratic welfare states, civil society was incorporated in neo-liberal theories that dominated the West in 1980s and 1990s, which advocated a powerful and regulatory state but balanced by an active society. Civil society was projected to mediate between state and market, thus, containing the state. It represented a sphere that is free from state control and one which gives maximum freedom and self-determination to the individual.

In a situation where democracy and its institutions are reduced to mere mechanisms of selecting and changing rulers, civil society could offer scope for the exercise of creative participation and self-reliance by people. Through active participation in decision making process, people consider themselves stake-holders rather than passive recipients of benefits. It has been argued that an active civil society could build support for democratic government by articulating and pressing new issues and people’s demands and encouraging greater public participation in different schemes.
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Civil society can also act as ‘public sphere’ in which different and even opposite interests can coexist and conflicts can be moderated.\textsuperscript{45} Civil society is believed to play an important role in promoting development, labour solidarity, democratic accountability, etc. It can challenge the abuses of executive and legislative authority, and checks the arbitrary policies of government. Sometimes, it compels authorised state authorities to prosecute, penalise, sanction and punish errant public officials.\textsuperscript{46} Civil society can also act as an institutional alternative that can promote social tolerance which can minimise political violence and defuse ethnic rivalries.\textsuperscript{47} An active civil society can establish a constant flow of information to the masses that can expose governmental malfeasance or inefficiency with high level of regularity and publicity. It can give masses a vehicle to articulate their demands in states that are marred by ideologically empty party systems thereby building a base for active economic and political reform movements.\textsuperscript{48} Contemporary discourse strongly agrees that civil society organisations play a significant and positive role in facilitating democracy. Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba linked civic culture with the growth of liberal democracies. It is civil society that plays important role in fostering civic culture among people.\textsuperscript{49} Robert Putnam’s work generated tremendous conviction that civil society promotes democratic sustainability and enhances state institutional performance.\textsuperscript{50} To this conviction follows the argument that state with low levels of civic associationalism is more prone to having substandard performance in terms of bureaucratic effectiveness. While, the states with vibrant autonomous groups experience effective governance, the states with vibrant civil society promotes a democratic political culture, that is , widely shared values and attitudes supportive of democratic institutions and procedures. It is further argued that when a civil society is formed, it creates ‘social capital’—a reservoir that allows citizens to cultivate elongated social networks. These networks promote a strengthened sense of democratic citizenship that compels citizens to demand state accountability.\textsuperscript{51} Recent
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scholarships have validated the claim that high levels of civic associationalism play important role in the process of democratisation. For example, organised and associational groups in Eastern Europe, Latin America and Central Asia gathered to sign petitions, promote anti-regime rallies and demonstrations against despotic regimes, calling for accountability, transparency and responsiveness of state institutions.\(^52\) Civil society enhances institutional democracy. By incorporating a network of voluntary-affairs self-governing institutions in all walks of life, civil society collectively provides grass-root models of mass politics, in which decision-making is people-centric rather than government-centric. In the age of globalisation, where state has, somewhat, lost its role as agent of social transformation, civil society provides alternate political spaces, which ensure direct and active participation of people in deliberations, which feature in the decision-making of government. Scholars, like Kothari, state that path of flawed development followed by the developing countries under the influence of globalisation and liberalisation, like, market efficiency, profitability, development and national security has made state unresponsive to basic needs of citizens—violating their liberties and rights. In such a scenario, civil society appears like an arena, where marginalised and weaker sections of society protest and struggle for their essential human and democratic rights.\(^53\) He further states that civil society acts like a domain of popular participation, though, outside the formal institutional structures of state. Civil society also presents an arena of self-management and active participation against a bureaucratic and highly centralised state, which is there to curb the freedom of the individual.\(^54\) Therefore, civil society as an arena helps in breaking this state tutelage which puts undue restrictions on the freedom of the individual. Similarly, Mohanty assigned new role to civil society in a democratic society believing that it transforms the same into a ‘creative society’.\(^55\)

\(^{52}\)Rollin F. Tusalem, *op. cit.*, 361-386.
\(^{54}\)Ibid., 3-4.
1.3 POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

1.3.1 HISTORICAL GENESIS

Political development, a value loaded term, has long been in the state of confusion defying a general agreement among scholars over its meaning and definition. Despite all the disagreements its application has been generating important theoretical advances in the field of comparative politics. One reason for the advances is the huge research agenda and political phenomena, the concept of political development deals with. It was the creation of new states and new democracies in Asia, Africa and Latin America that opened the doors for the operationalization of the concept of political development. The military takeovers and the dictatorships that marred much of Latin American and African countries in the 1970s forced it to shift gears to explain the failure of democracy. How to conceptualise the political development in authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes and illiberal democracies also broadened the research agenda of the field. With the democratic processes and civil society pushed to the background in these countries, scholars inquired how interests were represented and responded to. More recently, globalisation, multiculturalism, human rights, ethnic conflicts, etc., have made the scholars of political development to address these crucial issues. The scholars of the Political Science trained in behavioural mode continued with the analyses of voting behaviour, group behaviour, legislative behaviour, and analyses of public policies and political phenomena, but the political upheavals elsewhere brought the field of political development to the centre-stage. During 1960s, the field of political development was led by the Committee on Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council. The committee and the series of volumes which it published examined the connections between political development and a variety of influences, including, communications, bureaucracy, education, political culture and political parties. The modernization of Japan and Turkey was studied as well. So were the crises and sequences in political development. During this period the field was a less homogenous body of literature. Lucian Pye was exponential in developing the concept. He stated that political development refers to the patterns of behaviour identified as ‘modern’ replacing the ones that are ‘traditional’; when achievement considerations replace the ascriptive standards, when functional specificity replaces the functional differences, when
universalistic norms supersede particularistic ones. The goal during this phase of the subject was to study theoretically the development of these states and institutions and the transformation of subjects into citizens. Similarly, the politics of the developing world was studied in a systematic and comparative manner in order to develop a nomothetic theory of comparative politics.

The concept of political development could also be employed to view the growth or shrinkage in the capacity of societies to organise for political action and for states to govern. While studying political development, patterns of political association, channels of political participation, formal and informal institutions of political representation and governance were also studied. The emerging trends of political competition, and legitimacy, as well as the distribution of power between levels and branches of government could be delineated.

1.3.2 DEFINING POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

The level of disagreement between the scholars is so high that it has led to calls for the abandonment of the term, by one of the respected authorities on the field—Samuel P. Huntington. He argued that the concept neither integrated a body of related concepts nor distinguished one aspect of political reality form another. His work, Understanding Political Development begins with an acknowledgement of variety of definitions of political development, which have confused the state of affairs. However, he himself fails to attempt a precise definition of political development. Eckstein, while unable to develop the refined framework himself admitted that the then present literature on political development simply did not represent ‘developmental inquiry properly’. Willner argued much before that political development studies failed to throw a clear light on the nature of traditional polities and couldn’t relate the theories of politics of the third world to the established

58Myron Weiner and Samuel P. Huntington (Eds.).,Understanding Political Development. (Boston: Little Brown, 1987), 5-12.
traditions of scholarship in comparative government in the West. Therefore, the concept of political development was believed to be in a state of underdevelopment. However, all these confusions call for the refinement of the concept rather than its abandonment. Even the best known scholar on the concept, Lucian Pye, surveyed a lot of literature and definitions of the term, pointing out their deficiencies to clear the confusion. He attributed following characteristics to the term:
1. Political development as a prerequisite of economic development.
2. Political development as a politics typical of the industrial societies.
3. Political development as political modernization.
4. As the operation of a nation-state.
5. As administrative and legal development.
6. As mass mobilisation and participation.
7. As building up of democracy.
8. As stability and orderly change.
9. As mobilisation and power.
10. As one aspect of multidimensional process of social change.

A major difficulty in conceptualising development has been partly due to the over-emphasis of the scholars during 1960s upon empirical component of theorization to the neglect of the normative aspect of political development. The failure to recognise adequately its normative grounding only blurred the proper understanding of the concept. As development itself is a value-loaded term, the social scientists disagree over what development is or what does it entail.

It was after the criticism of Coleman about the teleological and modernisation dimensions of political development, in which he criticised it for having an ‘ethnocentric and Western parochial normative bias’, members of the Committee on Comparative Politics agreed to accept his definition of political development. Coleman defined political developments as consisting of rising demands for equality, greater need for capacity, and an inexorable tendency towards greater differentiation. Many scholars like Eckstein believe that the consensus came too late to provide coherence to the subject, since political development had suffered from so much of

---
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criticism that no one was prepared to accept it.\textsuperscript{63} However, due to lack of any competing alternative perspective, Coleman’s definition was generally accepted as a workable starting point for analysis of the process of political development. Coleman states that political development is the process of continuous interaction between the forces of modernisation and following:

1. Structural differentiation.
2. Imperative of equality.
3. Integrative, responsive, adaptive capacity of a political system.

There was also a tendency to identify political development with the functions and performance of certain political systems. Wriggins suggests that states unable to perform the functions performed by governments of more developed societies are politically underdeveloped.\textsuperscript{64} But, such comparisons are useless for the transitional societies, since it fails to give account of the rate and degree at which these societies need to perform these functions and moving in the direction of political development.

Mehden, as such, gave thirteen criteria of the developed political systems.\textsuperscript{65} Similarly, Almond suggested a new and comprehensive scheme of functions and capabilities designed to relate the concept of political system as studied under the structural-functional approach to the problems of political change. Such an approach is fruitful for studying the transitional societies. All political systems, according to him, must acquire capability to solve four set of problems:

1. Integrative capability—the creation of national unity and centralised bureaucracy.
2. International accommodative capability.
3. Participation capability—creation of political culture of civil obligation and of democratic political structure.
4. Welfare or distribution capability—widespread dissemination of welfare standards and accommodation between political and social structures.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{66}Gabriel A. Almond, \textit{Political Development: Essays in Heuristic Theory} (Boston: Little Brown, 1970), 159-179
Almond’s Capabilities Approach is useful from the point of view of social equilibrium and political stability. However, it is highly inadequate from the point of view of suggesting positive even within the framework of liberal democracy. Pye, in league with Coleman, defined political development in a more comprehensive sense. He articulated three themes which run across the literature on political development. They are:

1. A general spirit of equality involving equality before law, achievement standards of performance and popular involvement in political activities.
2. An increase in the capacity and capability of political system to manage and control its affairs which means the magnitude, effectiveness and efficiency of the governmental performance.
3. Increased differentiation and specialization, and integration of political structures.

He states:

*The key elements of political development involve, first, with respect to the population as a whole, a change from widespread subject status to an increasing number of contributing citizens with an accompanying spread of mass participation, a greater sensitivity to the principles of equality and a wider acceptance of universalistic laws. Second, with respect to governmental and general systemic performance, political development involves an increase in the capacity of the political system to manage public affairs, control controversy and cope with popular demands. Finally with respect to the organisation of the polity, political development implies greater structural differentiation, greater functional specificity and greater integration of all the participating institutions and organisations.*

To summarise, Pye relied on the characteristics of *Equality, Capacity and Differentiation* of a political system. He states that measuring the degree of these three variables would give us an idea about the level of political development in a political system, but the biggest challenge for a political system is to harmonise these three attributes.

Though these dimensions serve useful purpose while defining political development but they ignore certain other aspects, which can be associated with the political development. Equality for Pye means formal equality, thus, fails to incorporate the
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dimension of equity. He is preoccupied with achieving equality before law rather than the difficult tasks of redistribution and targeting socio-economic inequalities.

Binder poses the question, whether political development is an independent or dependent variable, or whether modernisation is dependent variable of political development? He identifies certain stages involved in the process of political development:

1. People to identify themselves with ethnic and social identity rather than religious identity.
2. Legitimacy from transcendental to immanent sources.
3. Political participation from elite to mass and from family to group.
4. Distribution of status and privilege to ability, achievement and the control and management of capital.
5. Degree of administrative and legal penetration into social structure and into the remote regions of the country.

He states that political development is the process that makes these changes possible allowing groups to participate comprehensively.

The efforts to frame the comparative inquiry of politics and to study political change in the less developed countries were undermined by the intellectual challenges to the paradigms of modernisation and structural functionalism and other real world events. But the field made great advances in the subsequent time in the study of political institutions, democratic stability, state structures, civil society, etc. Today, there is greater focus on issues, like, democratic and transparent governance, modes of political representation and accountability, social justice and the autonomy of civil society, rather than debates around modernisation, administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the government and formal equality.

The field of political development through 1960s and 1970s, virtually, belonged to comparative politics. The scholars studying comparative politics scrutinized the concepts like political culture and political institutions, and political order and political breakdown. The field of political development being new in 1960s formed the very conceptual frontier of comparative politics. Political development as a field came to be associated with new states of Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and some states of Latin America. Political development was viewed as teleological process applied in a context of decolonisation and stretched to those areas of the globe which were taking off economic growth. The reason scholars focussed on such countries to
study their process and trajectory of political development was due to the tendency as well as challenge before these newly independent states to develop the capacity of the state. The modernizing nation-states provided perfect laboratory for these scholars to study changes and the process of political development, minutely.

The changes that dominated the post-1990 scene have revitalised the concept of political development. Globalisation and the third wave democratisation have led scholars to believe that economic and political development share a relationship. Globalisation tends to make world politics more homogenous. The international norms are making the global environment conducive for democracy; middle class is growing; new technology is being disseminated bringing more information more quickly to the people all across the globe and dictatorships are being toppled. All these changes signify that with the advancement of socio-economic changes, the new states tend to move towards western-style democratic governance. But the resistance to globalism, rise of ethnic conflicts, rapid shift of political loyalties and identities by the year 2000, suggest that it would be wrong to assume that a homogenous global politics based on universal victory of liberal-elitist democracy can be founded. The new and renewed roles of the states in development, the resurgence of ethnic identities and conflicts and the challenges that threaten the integrity of the nations, the establishment of new democratic political institutions in the former authoritarian states and the challenges being posed to liberal order and current patterns of development by terrorism to climate change, respectively, signify that the field of political development needs to be revitalised.

1.3.3 TOOLS TO STUDY POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

It was the sociological theory rather than political philosophy that inspired the study of developing world in the first decade of political development studies. Sociological and anthropological tools were employed, since the use of legal and institutional concepts of the political science were deemed inadequate for analyzing and comparing new political systems that differed so much in scale, structure and culture. Even Gabriel Almond stated that understanding politics in these countries should mean studying society rather than government. 68 While studying society, behavioural revolution played a crucial role in the development of literature of political

development. Scholars studying these developing countries employed three set of tools, which wasn’t shared by other comparative political scientists. The tools were as follows:

1. **Modernization:** It was Max Weber, who inspired the paradigm of modernisation. This paradigm was based on the premise that states economic development leads to the changes in the social set-up transforming political systems. With urbanisation, migrants would shift their orientation towards politics away from parochial loyalties to their villages and local patrons to their nations and legitimate state bureaucracies that governed them. The spread of mass communications and technology to the people would be part of this process, guaranteeing a modern citizenry. This change would witness the traditional subjects getting transformed into modern democratic citizens. Modernisation project became so popular that Lipset forwarded his popular maxim:

   “the more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances it will sustain democracy...”

2. **Structural Functionalism:** This was the second major strand of the first decade of political development studies, borrowed from Emile Durkheim. Considered as the most influential strand of political development literature, it aimed at establishing common categories that would help make possible the comparisons between vastly different processes of development among nations. It was based on the notion that all political systems perform same functions which are performed by an array of political structures. Structures may be formal institutions—parliaments, executives, bureaucracies, judiciary, and informal institutions—interest groups, kinship and lineage, status and caste groups, even riots and street demonstrations. A particular structure performs a special function in a political system. At the same time, a political structure may perform more than one function and the same function can be performed by more than one structure. The functions on the input side included: political socialisation and recruitment, interest articulation, interest aggregation, and political communication. On the output side were identified the regular functions: rule making, rule application and rule adjudication. Structural functionalism introduced a change in the analytic categories like state to political system, powers

---
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to functions, offices to roles, institutions to structures, public opinion and citizenship training to political culture and political socialisation.71

3. **Teleological view of Development or Development Syndrome:** This view saw political development as a movement towards one or more goals for political system, closely linked to the process of modernisation. The economic and political development was closely identified with each other. For Pye, leaders in these new states were themselves concerned about the political development as they were with the economic development. It was the movement of these states towards the ideal which were none other than the affluent liberal democracies of the West.

Pye identified five key problems associated with the developmental process that need to be overcome by all the political systems in order to develop. Those five problems are crisis of: 1. Identity, 2. Legitimacy, 3. Participation, 4. Penetration, and 5. Distribution.72

**1.3.4 CRITICISM OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT**

The concept of political development has been subjected to serious criticism particularly on following counts.

1. **Dependency theory:** The most severe criticism of the political development and its modernisation project came from a group of Latin American scholars who questioned the functioning of the global system mainly dominated by the industrialized developed countries. Their writings, which later became popular as dependency theory, incited shift in the level of analysis from national to international system.

The Latin American economists, like Raul Prebisch, maintained that the countries in Latin America were underdeveloped because of the uneven terms of global trade. Prebisch stated that exporters of raw materials (the Latin American countries) were disadvantaged in global trade, contrary to exporters of manufactured goods (the industrial developed countries of the West) because the ready possibilities of substituting raw materials drove down prices of the commodities relative to manufactured goods.73 The international system is so structured that it ensures

71Ibid. p.78
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permanent underdevelopment. The dependency theorists maintained that modern societies exploited the rural areas and urban informal labour markets of the traditional societies for cheap food and labour. These theorists rejected the modern-traditional dichotomy propounded by the political development theorists and predicted that traditional part of the society would not readily become modern. They argued that development wasn’t possible in the situations of dependency. Dependency theory constituted an attack on transnational companies, multilateral financial institutions, governments of developed countries, and local elites of the developing countries as agents of imperialism and neo-colonialism.

2. Political Decay: Another harsh criticism of the modernisation project came from Samuel Huntington. He ridiculed the notion that economic development would lead to the political development and stable democracy. He demonstrated that socioeconomic modernisation could lead to rising demands that could destabilise political systems and cause the political order to break down. Political development in short could be stalled or reversed, and modernisation may likely to lead to political decay, instead of political development.

O’Donnell, another critique of modernisation project, criticised the maxim of Lipset in which he had stated that economically developed countries easily sustain democracy. He attributed the breakdown of democracy in Latin America’s most urbanised, literate, modern countries, including his native Argentina, to structural economic factors. Stagnation and inflation—brought on by the limited opportunities for the expansion of domestic markets for existing industries, lead to the extravagant state budgeting, and trade discrepancies inherent in the drive to industrialise via import substitution—triggered distributional conflicts. In order to establish a social and political order that ensures reduction in inflation and to attract foreign investments to build local capital goods industries, an alliance of military officers, technocrats and local elites impose a bureaucratic-authoritarian regime. Therefore, for

75 Samuel P. Huntington, Political Order in Changing Societies (New haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 33
76 For example the military coups and Africa and Latin America, and the failure of democratic regimes in East Asia and the Middle East, though these countries were on the path of economic development, but failed miserably as democracies, testified Huntington’s account.
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scholars like him, modernisation could lead to political instability and non-democratic outcomes.

3. **Western Bias:** It has widely been argued that the scholars of the West have taken a value-neutral approach to the concept. But under the influence of System analysis, they have disregarded the values for the third world countries or the traditional societies.\(^ {78}\) The justification of the formal institutions of the government and their processes is quite visible in the writings of such scholars, while, ignoring the significance of traditional and local institutions associated with developing countries.

Similarly, the area specialisation studies undertaken by some scholars were also ideologically motivated rather than guided by normative theory, would have given direction and suggested patterns of change for the transitional societies. These political thinkers were more focussed on making efforts to keep communism away from these countries. As Robert Packenham called their concern for political development as ‘anti-communist and pro-American political stability’\(^ {79}\) Wiarda also argued that political development was set forth to counter the appeal of Marxism in the developing countries.\(^ {80}\) They were even prepared to accept the authoritarian ways of the government, which curtailed freedom and human rights in order to maintain stability and order, if they could avoid communism or if they could keep communist movement at bay.

Lijphart, in 1977, also condemned much of the literature on political development for its fundamental error of exaggerating the degree of homogeneity of the Western democratic societies. He stated that the western model, often floated by the political development scholars, was in fact not a ‘Western-parochial model’\(^ {81}\) but was rather a British-parochial model. Those who studied comparative politics now began questioning the assumption that one model was enough for the rest of the developed
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and developing world. Moore had already stated that there was more than one route to
the modern society. Similarly, Berger and Piore concluded that industrial societies
are lumpy and uneven and not likely to evolve in accordance with the set pattern
presumed by the modernisation theorists.

In addition, late industrialisation in the southern Europe apparently generated
tendencies towards authoritarianism similar to those found in Latin America. Further
advances in the studies on comparative political development shunned the socio-
economic modernisation as the foundation of understanding political development
and instead turned on studying political institutions and socio-economic phenomena
in many aspects where it impinges upon political development.

1.3.5 MEDIATING ROLE OF POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

The most profound development in the field of political development literature, post
1970s, is considered its rejection of the sociological determinism and the rediscovery
of the centrality of politics and political institutions in political development. Scholars
like Sartori gave a much needed impetus to the movement. He stated that politics isn’t
projection of society, rather, it is the political organisation that gives meaning to
social forms and shapes identities and ideologies.

Similarly, Huntington, who earlier stated that political outcomes are determined by
the socioeconomic processes of modernisation, parted company with other political
theorists in recognising that the destabilisation is often laid in modernisation; political
systems are prone to breakdown only because of weak political institutions. If the
institutions are weak, they can’t accommodate the growing social demands and
political mobilisation. Huntington helped in reinstating the study and efficiency of
political institutions into the process of political development.
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Lijphart, too, stated that the political institutions might provide promising solutions for achieving and strengthening democracy in many societies. He argued that the primordial identities that divided traditional or even modern societies can be easily managed with the right mix of institutional mechanisms. He suggested consociationalism as a means to democratically solve the problems of ethnically and linguistically divided groups.\(^{86}\) He rightly states that it is only by the means of constitutional engineering that problems could be solved between diverse groups. Therefore, it is the creative design of the political institutions, and not the political development or modernisation project, as such, that would guarantee peace, stability, harmony and would ensure minorities a democratic space.\(^ {87}\)

### 1.3.6 POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Almond and Verba once stated that political participation was fundamental to the success of democracy.\(^ {88}\) It was basically the *civic culture*, propounded by them, and the behavioural revolution which ushered this theme in comparative politics. But by 1970s, many scholars of the comparative politics found that social demands were overloading the political systems, therefore, political participation in the formal sense, as such was questioned. They were now looking for new forms of political participation.\(^ {89}\)

Much of the developing world, particularly Latin America, was under the clutch of dictatorial regimes. The urbanisation and its effects on political behaviour of citizens was given serious attention by another group of scholars.\(^ {90}\) They found that recent migrations were neither rebellious nor passive. Despite living in deplorable conditions they were not marginal to political or economic life, but, were like citizen’s groups aspired to hold good jobs, provide education to their children, and build a secure home by environment. Researchers also studied the political behaviour of the rural
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people in these areas. These finding later proved very fruitful to the comparative politics, in general, and political development in particular.

1.3.7 CIVIL SOCIETY AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

It is believed that Latin Americans were the first to discover the true potential of civil society in the 1980s. Abandoning focus upon state and its structures, scholars decided to turn up towards the collective political action and, in particular, how citizens chose to identify themselves and organise for political action in response to the state repression. Civil society was found to organise itself along the lines that expressed new and horizontal solidarities—in grassroots religious organisations, women’s groups, neighbourhood associations, and indigenous groups. Scholars found that by socialising the members in participatory democratic practices and, even, offering leadership opportunities to the previously politically alienated, civil society spreads democratic political culture.

There exist vast differences of opinion about what civil society is and the precise manner in which it is linked to democracy, and political development. Civil society is seen as inspirational shorthand to equity, participation and public accountability. It is widely held an authoritarian state that tries to control the society, fraught with tensions and conflicts, gives rise to a vibrant civil society. Civil society is recognized not only as a force putting a check on the powers of the state, but infusing in the people the sense of ‘civility’. When the problem of conflict between groups in a society aren’t easily settled by the state, civil society as a catalyst infuses in the people the values such as self-control, compassion, justice and recognition for one another. Therefore, the process of civilising helps in the mediation of the conflicts between various groups.91

Discussed by various schools of thought, liberal tradition regarded civil society as an opposition to state and its authority. But the neo-liberal tradition is widely acknowledging the role of civil society as an institution that fosters democracy—by limiting state, providing space to autonomous groups, generating demands, monitoring excess state authority, confronting power-holders, sustaining a balance of power between state and society.

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13507486.2011.574680
Marxists define civil society as an instrument of bourgeoisie domination over the society and state. Antonio Gramsci termed civil society as an ‘instrument of consent’ that ensures the enforced hegemony of the dominant class over the proletariat. While non-Marxist leftist tradition led by thinkers, like Michael Walzer, regard civil society as a way forward which tries to reconcile the competing views of different groups on the conception of ‘good-life’, making it more flexible and responsive to local needs.\textsuperscript{92} For Taylor, civil society includes those dimensions that cannot be confounded with or swallowed up by state. He further states that doing away with state and its institutions seems remote, civil society should be seen as ‘independent form of social life from below’.\textsuperscript{93} Scholars like Putnam have highlighted the role of civil society in deepening of democracy and making democratic governments more effective.\textsuperscript{94} Its ability to facilitate the regular and sustained participation has made it a very important pillar of democracy. In order to institutionalise and consolidate democracy, civil society and political parties need to work together.\textsuperscript{95} Civil society is regarded as the best catalyst in the promotion and furthering of democracy and the values associated with it. For example in an authoritarian or dictatorial political order, civil societies can perform the role of political parties. They can defend and advocate the human rights, disseminate the uncensored information, give voice to citizens’ concerns and the interests of the society against the state. It is thus held that civil society in its struggle to perform these functions, it serves as an arena of citizenship, awakening in oppressed and powerless people the consciousness of their rights and helping them to overcome fear, and preparing them to take responsibility of their own lives.\textsuperscript{96} Civil society has played such a role in the States like Spain and Portugal before their transition from authoritarianism to democracy.

Similarly, in other states, other than authoritarian and dictatorial, civil society can help in fashioning a democratic state to become more responsive to popular needs and attitudes. It can monitor its performance, and insist on its accountability, transparency and effectiveness. It can also encourage citizen activism in solving various kinds of
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problems, therefore, fostering tolerance and inclusiveness. In a war torn or post conflict state, civil society is more far developed than the political parties, since they are active in providing humanitarian assistance to the victims of the conflict, building and repairing of school, community centres and similar other facilities. These groups try to prevent violence and human rights abuses, encourage a culture of tolerance and rule of law. Civil society, combined with educators, journalists, entrepreneurs, can form the basis of a national political formation that can compete in the elections and thus help in the consolidation of democracy.  

While consolidating democracy, civil society becomes fundamental in its continuous process of diffusing the democratic process, at both elite and mass levels. It can, therefore, encourage popular participation, promote vertical accountability, and act, as Diamond calls it, a ‘transmission belt’ between society and state by aggregating and promoting citizens’ demands.  

The promotion of values like human rights, particularly those of disadvantaged groups or those belonging to rural areas, or by running voters’ educational campaigns and educating citizens on democratic forms of conflict resolution and participation, by civil society helps in the deepening of democracy. The civil society organisations (for example those in South Korea) working against the corrupt and inefficient administration have also played a vital role in the arena of economic justice, environmental promotion and public transparency. Sometimes, civil society’s influence on democracy can be called as both ‘soft’. While as it cannot influence the democratic political regimes in huge manner, but as pointed out by Tocqueville, Mill and Putnam, it can instil in the participants democratic norms and values. Habermas, Avritzer, Cohen & Arato, have stated that the democratic culture nurtured within the civil society organizations has the potential to spill over into the public sphere, thus providing the political regime democratic stability. Similarly, civil society is vital in generating the ‘social capital’, again put by Robert Putnam, which make the liberal democracies of the Europe and North
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America successful, have been accredited to a vibrant civil society. Liberal democratic states aiming to achieve economic growth, and at the same time addressing the problem of poverty, need a strong and vibrant civil society, which aggregates and channelizes the interests of the poor and at the same time ensures the governments are accountable.\textsuperscript{102} The role of civil society organisations in challenging the apartheid policies, till the release of Nelson Mandela, in South Africa, under the banner of United Democratic Front, is a prime example of how civil society can help in the furthering of democracy. Similarly, the role of civil movements in opposing the power of military juntas, while holding nationwide demonstrations brought about the collapse of authoritarian regime, thus paving the way for first democratic elections, in South Korea.\textsuperscript{103} Similarly, the role of civil society organisations in the revolutions in North African countries, particularly Tunisia and Egypt, against their dictators, what came to be known as ‘Arab Spring’ highlights their power to garner the support of wider sections of society in opposing an oppressive regime and advocating a democratic regime.

It is a well-known fact that ethnicity plays a vital role in the determination of political behaviour of the citizens.\textsuperscript{104} In an ethnically divided state like Kashmir, it becomes important that civil society manages these groups, and doesn’t let them to get politicised, as has been, hitherto, the case.

1.4 Conclusion:

Political development an integrative and overarching intellectual framework has highly ambitious dimensions and goals. It cannot afford to leave the study of political institutions to the institutionalists, of citizens to those studying citizen politics, and of the constraints and opportunities nations face in attempting to achieve economic development to the students of political economy. The scholars of political development can theoretically address the issues of these sub-fields in a distinctive
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and holistic manner, which is different from those who specialise in any one of them but can’t situate the problems in holistic perspective and, thus, fail to provide synthetic solutions to the problems under study. However, it can’t be fruitfully realised unless the concept is freed from its ethno-centric bias, and it’s theoretically, further, refined.

The future of political development lies not only in its ability to predict the political outcomes in various countries, including the developments, like, regime changes by peaceful or violent means. Its success will depend more on its ability to suggest change as a means to improve the social and political condition of restive societies. In order to become a more applied and objective subject, the field needs to become thoroughly interdisciplinary. The development of economic resources, proper resource utilization, institutional integrity, quality of democratic participation, improving the choices and capabilities of people, accommodation of diverse groups ensuring the sovereignty and integrity of nation-states are going to occupy a centre-stage in theorising about political development.