

CHAPTER: II

CIVIL SOCIETY: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction:

Civil Society is one of the most used terms in political discourse. Society refers to all people in our surroundings who live together. People create society as there is a great saying that man is a social animal. An individual is not complete without the companionship of other persons. The second chapter is the foundation of the study where all aspects related to civil society is tried to unearth. Starting from the definitions, myriad of perspectives by different scholars and philosophers on civil society, theories of civil society are rendered in this chapter.

2.2 Definitions of civil society:

Basically, civil society is a term that signifies a collective notion. It is ushered and conceptualized in different terms for centuries by the political philosophers. The luminaries who had given the civil society a concrete theoretical conception were Hegel, Karl Marx, Gramsci and Adam Smith and De Tocqueville, among others. The term shows people's participation for gaining a common cause, retrieving social interest, fulfilling rights of common people. Though people's participation is common for all definitions There are some differences in the view points and perspectives of all the scholars. Differences in perspectives of defining definitions drawn by the scholars create a lack of universal acceptance of one particular definition. In the following, some of the definitions are put forward.

Simply, the term civil Society clearly indicates few important points to be remembered.

- It is an arena of uncoerced collective action comprising interests, purposes and values.
- The civil society composed of voluntary civic and social organizations.

Civil society is a collection of individual and collective initiatives for the 'common public good'. In this definition, civil society is seen as linked to a public arena where the promotion of broadly defined 'public good' is the purpose of civil society action (Tandon, 2005, p. 64).

A classical definition of civil society has been given by St. Augustine by quoting Cicero, “Civil society or commonwealth as “an assemblage of men associated by a common acknowledgement of rights and by a community of interest” (Arora, 2012, p. 6.5)

Pelczynski says:

Civil Society in this sense is an arena in which modern man legitimately gratifies his self-interest and develops his individuality, but also learns the value of group action, social solidarity and the dependence of his welfare on others, which educate him for citizenship and prepare him for participation in the political arena of the state (Kumar, 1993, p. 379).

Of late, civil society is defined from different perspectives. In the neoliberal regime where civil society is pictured as an alternative to the state and it becomes the third sector and this sector performs well what does the state do for the welfare of the citizens. Thus, the definition says, Civil society is in the current debate, simultaneously being pictured as a neoliberal idea of an alternative and different third sector which can provide a substitute for functions earlier performed by the state, a donor endorsed ‘solution’ to democratization and economic development- and as a space for citizens to resist dominance and influence their own living conditions (Orjuela, 2008, p. 26).

Conflicts in many faces have been retarding the peace and development of the countries those facing the problem of conflicts. The Contemporary intra-state conflicts also provide a new context for civil society, involving multiple actors apart from the state which civil society organizations need to relate to. Civilians were not merely caught in the crossfire; they were targeted, deliberately and brutally, by military strategists. Of late, warfare has become “inclusive”- and civilian deaths are more common than soldiers’. Today the goal is not simply the absence of war, but the creation of sustainable peace by fostering fundamental societal changes (Hunt & Posa, 2001, p. 38).

Moreover, civil society is also being projected as a sphere of social life in which different and even opposed interests can coexist peacefully and conflicts can be bypassed although there is no evidence that this will always be possible (Joseph, 2002, p. 300).

Sudipta Kaviraj, the Indian writer, and political thinker has given the definition and idea of civil society from his perspectives relating to the state of nature. He has identified three contrasts which help exemplify the meaning of civil society. Kaviraj defines civil society as,

Kaviraj reiterates the ideas of civil society propounded by Hobbes and Locke saying that it denied through its opposition to 'natural society' or 'state of nature' in early modern contract theory; against the state in the entire liberal tradition, and contrasted to community in a theoretical tradition of modern sociology particularly said as by Toennies (Mukharjee, 2010). Another great thinker and political scientist of India, Sunil Khilnani says that civil society has come to express a political desire for greater 'civility' in social relations (Vinod, 2006).

Civil society is correlated with democracy in the modern world. It is considered as a tool or instrument to save democracy and freedom of people from the intervention of state on one hand and market on the other hand. The intervention of market economy in the present context of globalization is taken for granted.

Thus, it can be implied that the sphere of civil society is a place where a person with rational self-determining mind create a social relationship with others in the society. The intention of such rational individual is good and this individual does this in a voluntary manner. The intention is good as the mentioned social relationship comprises some social virtues like equality, trust, respect, solidarity, networks and obeying the norms. Subsequently, the social relationship blooms up an associational life. In this way, a civil association takes birth amidst of associational life. Co-ordination and co-operation in the society are important for facilitating democratic principles so that common welfare can be done by the civil associations. If the civil associations really bears such features with virtues then they are recognized as a civil society, otherwise they termed as a 'mass society'. Mass society does not have social relationship and they are called society with people.

The challenge of definition becomes particularly acute when civil society organizations reject fundamental principles on which the state is organized. Yet including value judgments as part of a definition is problematic because it prompts the question of whose value judgments should be used. The challenge presented by defining and regulating "'good' and 'bad' associations" (Phillips, 2002: 84) represents a major dilemma of political theory on civil society (Phillips,

2002; Walzer, 1992, 2002). Camila Orjuela argues this dilemma is accentuated in conflict situations in which civil society may be divided along the very lines of the conflict and in which both state and non-state actors use violence to further their aims (Bell & O'Rourke, 2007).

For becoming a civil society, therefore it should have characteristics of good elements within the society. Conflict situation in the present world needs civil society with good elements and the study is trying to inculcate.

Notably, the scholars and thinkers of the present century, has accepted the intense severity of having a contested and debatable meaning and concepts of civil society. So, we cannot find out any unified and consensual meaning of the term.

2.3 Who are the members of a civil society?

Despite having many ambiguities in the definition of civil society due to vast range of different interpretations, most of the writers broadly refer this term as the social interaction between the individual and the state that could range from formal to informal non state organizations. Usually commentators refer community based groups, voluntary organizations, action groups, trade unions, church groups, cooperatives, business, media, professional and philanthropic organizations, and a range of other non-governmental organizations. But there is lack of agreement lies when it comes about the political and economic organizations. The key to what constitutes civil society rests on some form of coordinated activity beyond the sphere of the individual and household, and beyond the confines of the state (McIlwaine, 1998, p. 652).

In a common ground this term civil society is commonly regarded to represent one organized social life. This organized social life is voluntary in nature. Here in this social life people have self-generating, self supporting life which is bounded by a legal order with some shared values. Here the realm refers to a population which is vast and diverse in nature. They are the intermediary organizations and the persons from this realm are outside the family of their households. These members advance their own and same interests This realm is populated by a vast and diverse constellation of intermediary organizations formed by members of society outside of their households with the purpose of advancing their interests. Most of the members of

civil society are centered on their purpose of getting together which released a distance from political pursuit. So we can say that political parties are excluded from the realm of civil society.

Conventionally grassroots and loosely organized groups such as churches, neighborhood associations, and private charities as well as national and highly hierarchical organizations such as employers' groups and trade unions etc. are regarded as part of civil society.

2.4 The concept of civil society in classical period of political discourse:

The philosophy of political science was written in the writings of Greek philosophers. One of the Greek philosophers, Cicero pointed out that the term civil society merely represented a good society. At that time, civil society was so simple enough that the Greek philosophers never distinguished civil society from state. Plato and Socrates had given their own ideas on the concept of a civil society. Plato's philosophical view had brought many implications regarding state. Especially the ideal state or government was the one of the implications advocated by Plato. Plato connoted the 'ideal state' as a just society. As for Plato, the state would be ruled by a 'Philosopher King' and the duty and responsibility to look after his people in civility was solely on the shoulder of the 'Philosopher King'. Socrates, who was the influential scholar in Greek tradition, termed the civil society as nothing but political association. As a political association, civil society restrained citizens from engaging in social conflicts and in case of any societal conflict; use of 'dialectic' in the society was the solution to such societal conflicts. By the term dialectic, Socrates tried to point out dialogue as tool to resolve social conflict.

Another Greek philosopher Aristotle termed civil society as notion of *koinonia politike* (Chandhoke, 1995, p. 78). The Greek philosophers associated civil society with political society. Every individual in the Greek society are termed as *zoon politikon*, a political being. As for Aristotle, the *zoon politikon* was male, a citizen and a property holder.

The notable difference between the idea of civil society by the classical thinkers and the thinkers of the later period is that classical thinkers termed civil society synonymous with state but the later differentiated civil society with that of state.

2.5 History of civil society: Classical Western Political Theory on Civil Society:

Indian political scientist Sunil Khilnani (Kaviraj & Khilnani, 2001) has divided the historical development of civil society into three moments like

1. The ideas of John Locke
2. Scottish theorists of commercial society
3. Hegel's view on the development of civil society.

As far as the classical western political theory on civil society is concerned, there are mainly three Schools of thought: Marxian, Hegelian, Gramscian. These three great political thinkers have given concepts of civil society in detail according to their point of view.

Three main composers of Social Contract Theory had given the idea of Civil Society through the Social Contract Theory. The Social Contract Theory was assumed by political philosophers such as Thomas Hobbs and John Locke and civil society as an old theme originated in the 17th century and it was highlighted in the writings of these three political philosophers.

John Locke was regarded as the father of Liberal theory. It was Locke who made an elaboration of the term civil society. Locke started with a basic assumption that human beings are peace loving and they have the capacity to rationalize things. But for Locke, there is a no difference between civil society and political society. Locke postulated the transition from state of nature to civil society.

Thomas Hobbes for the first time elucidated the dichotomy between the civil society and "state of nature". Thomas Hobbes talked about religious struggle. Hobbes talked about reformation which was about religious struggle. It was Thomas Hobbes, who first counterpoised a dichotomy between civil society and natural society or 'state of nature'. But before we discuss this dichotomy, it is pertinent to understand the social and economic history of Europe, during which Hobbes has elucidated his idea of civil society. Hobbes was writing at a time when the Reformation was taking place. The Reformation was primarily a religious struggle, which wanted to establish a radically new religious doctrine, wherein the individual can communicate directly to God. However, the Reformation also has some political implications, as it played a key role in the evolution of the modern nation-state (Lahiry, 2005, p. 33).

It has become a general conception that the term civil society is the foggiest and vaguest idea of political thought. In spite of ambiguities surrounding the elements of civil society among the thinkers and academician, in some portions, the arguments developed by them meet at a point.

2.6 Hegelian concept of civil society:

In his book “Elements of the Philosophy of Right”, German philosopher Hegel discussed on civil society which is a benchmark for evaluating the concept of civil society. The sphere of civil society was described as a form of market society. He used a term ‘buergeliche Gesellschaft’ in German for connoting civilian society. His definition stands for redefinition to the civil society. We can call his definition as the contemporary definition of civil society. Hegel’s redefinition of civil society no longer used it as a synonym for political society but defined it on the one hand as distinct from the family, and on the other hand as distinct from family, and on the other (and most crucially) from the state (Riedel, p. 23). Hegel made an attempt to integrate the freedoms of individuals which is specified by natural law tradition as propounded by Hobbes to Rousseau and Kant with a rich vision of community.

Hegel is considered with theoretical innovation because he is widely regarded as the first theorist who distinguished the state from civil society (Chandhoke, 1995, p. 116). Therefore, we can say that Hegel was one of the thinkers of classical political economists to separate civil society from the state. Hegel demarcated civil society from the classical period of civil society notion and so he recognized civil society as the realization of a new world. But he distinguished the notion of civil society from the classical political economists in the way that it was rescued from excessive closeness with the economy. To Hegel, civil society is a set of social practices which are constituted by the logic of capitalist economy and which reflect the ethos of the market, but which have an existence distinct from the economy (Chandhoke, 1995, p. 117). So, his idea of civil society has a space between the market and social life.

He considered the notion of civil society from the ethical point of view. It was one of the moments of ethical life. He termed civil society as *sittlichkeit* that regulates the life of the individual. In the modern world or modern society, people do not have an ethical life. This is very wrong. The loss of ethical life is a sad part the for the well being a human society. Moments of ethical life should be maintained in life. Hegel differentiated three moments of ethical life

such as the family, civil society, and the state. Among these three moments, the state is the basis or ground on which family and civil society can exist. Thus, the state is 'the end and actuality of the substantial universal order and public life. Hegel put forward a famous definition on civil society. According to Hegel, the state is the actuality of the ethical idea. The idea of the state is the supreme embodiment of freedom. He also accepted the existence of deficient states. The freedom of the individual does not stand in opposition to the moral primacy of the community in Hegel's political theory. On the contrary, freedom precisely consists in the membership of the individual in the community of the state. Concretely, the idea of the state has three components: constitutional law, international law, and world history (Jaeger H. M., 2002, p. 502).

Interrelationships with economic standpoint by Hegel's: As Hegel argues that the universal can be made worth living with justice when it is accepted and endorsed in particular cases. As a result, justice and administration of justice can constitute an ethical moment for civil society. So the court of justice can ensure individual action as well as the power of collective action in the society. Given the significance of this task in the life of civil society, Hegel argues that the members of civil society have the right to monitor and correspondingly, also have a duty of acknowledging the jurisdiction of the court. Moreover, the members of civil society have to accept the decisions declared by the jurisdiction as final decision even if their own interests may be on the line of dispute. So, the individuals residing in civil society have to abide by the decisions of the court. To follow the decisions of the court is an obligation for the individuals. As the court confirms and protects the human rights by administering the law so every individual in civil society. When it comes about the obligation, Hegel argues that for acquiring the rights individuals have to follow obligation either individually or in a collective way. For instance, the individual who lives in the civil society not only have to know their own individual rights but also have to respect the equal rights of other members of the society. When the individuals can obey the obligations conferred upon them they can acknowledge and accept the decision of the court with consent. The theme- rights of people and the related duties of people are elaborated by Hegel with taking an example, the case of a corporation. The corporation is truly spirited civil society, as Hegel views corporation as an institution. He is giving the example of the corporation to enable the people to understand that it is the good instance. He tries to make people understand that fellow feeling and taking the responsibility of the fellow associates is common in corporation. To secure the right to life and property is also taken care of by the separate and self-

subsistent persons of the corporation. It is the ethical obligation for the rich and wealthy people to help immensely, as it is believed by Hegel. There are two reasons behind the performance of the rich or wealthy towards their duty to help their fellow associates. First, the wealthy perform their duties to their fellow associates. Secondly, the rich people come to a close to inspire either arrogance or jealousy. As a collective body, civil society expected to provide a way to reach to their livelihood which can bring welfare to the society. The civil society must ensure it must that civil society can protect its members from certain contingency positions. Education is very important to become a member of society when education becomes a requisite to become a member of society itself so education should be provided well. The burden of educating the child is a duty for the members of a civil society. It is their right and duty inflicted to them. On the similar ground, civil society has to act as trustee of some needy people as a part of their right as well as duty. The needy may be the people who do not have security to live their life or for their families. As Hegel defined civil society in opposition to the state, it was opposed by other scholars. Notably, Norberto Bobbio has expressed his contradiction in this way. “It is difficult to provide a positive definition of “civil society” because it is a question of listing everything that has been left over, after limiting the sphere of the state (Kaviraj & Khilnani, p. 17).

2.7 Marxian concept of civil society:

In the nineteenth century, Karl Marx (1818-1883) expounded his views on civil society. While defining the term civil society, he identified the study of bourgeois society. Later Bourgeois society became a description of all non state aspects of society. As Marx related civil society with bourgeois society, he pointed out that the economically dominant class would utilize the state and its machinery to further their own interests. In other words, the economic sphere of labour, production, and exchange became the guiding principles for civil society. Marx was influenced by the French Revolution occurred in the last of the 18th century, i.e. 1789. As Marx believes on withering away of the state, so he was influenced by the industrial revolution in England and so he accepted the notion that a country needs to be industrialized in order to move from feudalism to capitalism and so on (Lahiry, 2005, p. 40).

Division of class and society is an integral part of the civil society in the Marx’s writings. For the Marxists, the liberal conceptualization of civil society as a sphere of rights legitimizes the domination of the capitalist classes. Civil society, in the Marxist perspective, is the arena for

selfish competition, wage-linked exploitation, and class inequality. Marxist theory has consequently seen civil society as the sphere for the buying, selling and reproduction of labour power. The State, in this perspective, by maintaining the fiction of equal rights and freedom, actually guarantees the depredation and moral squalor of civil society.... Liberals concentrate on the oppressions of the state, but they do not inquire into the oppressions of civil society. And the Marxist concentration upon the oppressions of this sphere has led them to neglect any analysis of the institutions and values of civil society (Dash, 2001, p. 249).

In the analysis of Marx, we can find out two types of stages. In the first stage, he identified himself as a critique of the Hegelian system of philosophy. In this regard he reveals that the claims of the political principles of universality were illusory. In the second stage, Marx through a use of the method of political economy launched an inquiry into civil society itself (Chandhoke, 1995, p. 135).

2.8 Gramscian concept of civil society:

Gramsci defined civil society as synonymous with political society. Gramsci defined civil society as an arena of political institutions where legal constitutional control will be there. Gramscian civil society is commonly seen as the 'private' or 'non-state' sphere. Here this sphere is confined to the capitalist or bourgeoisie society. Gramsci focused on the composition of domination of capitalist society. The structure of capitalist society offers legitimacy to the bourgeoisie class. Thus bourgeoisie class can rule the common people with their consent. The power of the bourgeoisie class compels the common people to abide by them. When the power is apparently exercised with the consent of its subject is called hegemony. Gramsci's theory of civil society is so called as Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony.

Gramsci's views on civil society as a post- Marxists fundamentally differed with one another. The classical Marxist theory on civil society refers to the totality of material condition and relationships; whereas Gramsci's civil society is based on a superstructure. This superstructure encompasses ideological and cultural relations. For the Marxian concept of civil society, primacy is the base and superstructure is secondary on the other hand Gramsci regarded the vice versa of the concept.

The concept of civil society viewed by Gramsci has two levels of the superstructure. Civil society is one of those superstructures and civil society is the private sector; another is political society or the state. When these two levels of superstructures assemble in one, the term called 'hegemony' comes out. The term 'hegemony' refers to the power that is exercised by the superstructure. The dominant group exercises that particular power throughout the society on the other hand; hegemony is exercised as direct domination by the state and others like 'juridical' government.

The formulation of the State by the Gramscian tradition encompasses political as well as civil society. From his point of view, the State is instrumental to exercise coercion and domination. The State imposes the hegemony upon the civil society through its various bodies like educational institutions, cultural and religious bodies, symbols, mythologies, practices and other institutions where he termed civil society as a voluntary association. In one point Gramsci also meets up with Marx as he also believes that the state would ultimately wither away.

Gramsci expressed his views on the situation after withering away of the state. A regulated society will take over the functions of the state. The voluntary transaction by the civil society is termed as 'regulated society' by Gramsci. This regulated society will not have the presence of the state. Gramsci also remarked that anti bourgeois hegemony within civil society will be established by intellectuals (Lahiry, 2005)

2.9 Theories of civil society in recent thoughts of civil society:

As per different perspectives and aspects of civil society, few theories of civil society are discussed in the following. These theories of civil society strictly based on the views of the recent thoughts on civil society. The modern view of civil society is circled by some perspectives and views. First, civil society is regarded as the third sector from the perspectives of development. Secondly, as a non state actor civil society is also regarded as the private sector which is an independent sector. Thirdly, Civil Society is also called as a public sphere from the view of humanist stand point. Fourthly, as a revised socialist perspective, civil society is regarded as polity, fifthly, post capitalist perspectives regard civil society as the order of associations. And lastly, civil society is a symbolic order in the oppositional view (Dey, 2009, p.

109). The study has tried to understand the development view on civil society and civil society as a public sphere.

2.9.1 Development theory: From the era of globalization the term Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) has emerged. In the neoliberal paradigm, the functions of the state have been curbed in the promotion of developmental activities. NGOs are standing as an alternative to the promotional activities in the democratic countries. Aftermath Second World War II, in war torn Europe the relief works by Western missionaries, had started and the humanitarian assistances were spread as development projects in the third world countries. The arena of civil society in worldwide had grown big and asserted by the early 80's of the last century. Subsequently, the idea of peace making by international agency mainly the United Nations (UN) have started since the early 1990's specifically titled with 'Agenda for Peace' in 1992. Under the initiation of Boutros Boutros Ghali, UN manifested the peacebuilding where non-governmental organizations and governmental organizations working in the field of research and teaching peace and conflict resolution.

Civil Society as third sector: Professor Nira Chandhoke immensely discussed on this aspect and elaborated in her many writings on third sector. Chandhoke argues that civil society consists only of voluntary agencies, and what is euphemistically termed the 'third sector'. Third sector refers to the voluntary organizations. (Although a western-identified model, the term is not widely known in either Britain or the US (to the consternation of my Russian activist friends, I was no better informed than they were). The third sector is a realm of informal groups-associations, clubs, or NGOs (non-governmental organizations). It derives its name from its role in a triad, where the first is the state, the second is the private sector of businesses and enterprises, and the third is the realm of citizens' initiative.) (Hemment, 2004) Arguing this comment, Chandhoke realized importance of other agencies like social movements or political struggles are being discarded from the contemporary versions of civil society. Ending up in many authoritarian countries resulted in fallout of emergence of civil society; with the advent of nongovernmental organizations.

2.9.2 Humanist perspectives: Civil society is the public sphere

According to Craig Calhoun (1993:273), "public sphere" stands for an "arena of deliberate exchange in which rational-critical arguments rather than mere inherited ideal or personal statuses could determine agreements and actions". By definition, this has to involve the state. Government data must be available and reliable for the public sphere to operate, there must be ways to make the authorities accountable. Without a minimum of governmental transparency and responsiveness, there can be no effective public sphere, and civil society must remain politically impotent. The inclusion of government agencies in the bargaining and negotiating networks of civil society is so typical of western countries, that the distinction of public sphere and civil society has become blurred (Dembowski, 1999) .

2.10 Civil Society and democracy:

Democracy and civil society has a very close interrelationship. According to the liberal political thinkers, the term civil society gradually came to be recognized as an essential requirement to preserve democratic ethos and spirits. The liberal theory insisted on the need to create and sustain a sphere of individual and social interaction free of state intervention, and the state will not get an opportunity to suppress the voice of the civil society. Individuals are largely free from the encroachment by the state and hierarchical bureaucratic administration. By maintaining its autonomy civil society can function as per the good wishes of the community in promoting common welfare. The issue is better conceived as the freedom of individuals within institutions and the autonomy of institutions within their legitimate sphere, or in other words, how to achieve effective democratic governance of both public and private institution. The issue of autonomy assumes greater significance for centralized and unitary states, like United Kingdom which does not have a written Constitution, where there is a threat of 'bureaucratic monoculture'. Bureaucratic monoculture thrives due to people's indifference to freedom at work and in relation to social and public services but indulging only in activities of private life and leisure. Tocqueville argued for the autonomy of secondary associations from the state precisely because he saw the consequences of the centralizing tendencies of those who had inherited and implemented the programme of the bureaucratic reformers under the monarchy, the officials of the Revolution and the Empire (Dash, 2001)

The foundational linkup between civil society and democracy was formulated by American political philosopher Alex de Tocqueville in the mid of the 18th century. Tocqueville is the chief advocator of the concept of civil society. In the western tradition of democracy, America is one of the examples of having robust and vibrant civil society and civil society became the reason of democratic success for America. America's democracy was rooted by the richness of civil society initiatives by the voluntary associations existed in America. Voluntary organizations like religious groups, commercial associations worked vibrantly with their diverse functions and operations. Voluntary organizations served America's democracy to bloom up through developing many democratic values such as trust, tolerance and compromise. Standing in the opposite of monarchy and authoritarian legacies, America's victory over them inspired the academy and policy making community to nominate civil society as political panacea for all democracies. This new concept neo- Tocquevillian era was put for forwarded by Robert Putnam's 'Social Capital' (Encarnación, 2001, p. 59)

2.11 Concept of Social Capital:

A robust and strong civil society is vehemently dependent on one vitamin what is called 'social capital'. Society should have the presence of the term 'social capital'. Capital is usually known for human and physical capital but here social capital is different from these two categories. In simple words, we can say that the term social capital refers to the communal resources that a community acquires. Despite intangible in nature, when it is effectively utilized it can yield tangible results for well being of the society. Social capital is primarily defined as interpersonal trust that makes it easier for people to do things together. The name after the term 'social capital' is Robert Putnam who in his pathbreaking study of modern Italian society He defines social capital as ground for having some features of social organization, such as trust, norms and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions. Coleman also defined this term social capital and according to him this term is defined by its function. We cannot confine social capital into a single entity. Rather this term social capital has more than one variety. Moreover, two features are very common in these two entities. All of the two entities are consisting of some aspect of social structure; the people who live within the social structure are facilitated by those entities. As far as the other forms of capital are concerned, they have the feature to connect relations between persons and among persons. Social capital also

inherits this feature. When human capital assembles virtues like talent and knowledge one individual carries in his life, the term social capital helps the human being to enrich that particular talent or knowledge. So, this term social capital cannot be caged by the human being who possesses the human capital. Social capital refers to institutions, relationships, networks and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's interactions (Dash, 2001). Putnam has made some relevant remarks in this regard. As Putnam argues that voluntary association is very important to mobilize greater resources and also achieve goals which are common among the people of their surroundings. The sense of voluntary co-operation could only be possible when people of a community inherit and utilize the social capital. For inheriting the social capital people need some civic networks. In this connection he also says that civic networks and civic engagements help to reduce the burden of transaction cost. Reduce of transaction cost helps people benefitted. A good example has been cited by Putnam to synergies the view. For a community social capital can be very useful through full co-operation for each other. If a farmer borrows tools then this lowers the cost of production but helps to increase mutual co-operation. So, he offers his faith on an associational life. An associational life boosts up trust, and then helps to facilitate common goods and better institutional performance. Four indicators are identified by Putnam for acquiring better institutional performance. These four are (a) associational life; (b) participation in elections; (c) level of preference voting; and (d) newspaper reading. Voluntary associations strengthen the civic communities and results in collective action for mutual benefit. Social capital, in this sense, is a set of structural requisites that refines or strengthens the functional ability of a social organization (Dash, 2001).

2.9 Difference between civil society and political society:

Political society and civil society are differentiated from one another. And this differentiation between political society and civil society was made by the great political thinker Tocqueville. Political society was termed as *societe politque* by Tocqueville. But Tocqueville made the distinction in two ways. First he distinguished political society as relations between the state governments and federal governments, on the hand relations between the citizen of the union and of each type of state. Religious society is also distinguished by him and it is distinguished as relations between God and members of the society. God is superior and members of the society are the inferior, the essence of the relations as describes. So, civil society is the term according to

Tocqueville which involves relations among individuals. Neither state nor church can control the freedom of civil society. Thus the nature of civil society defined by Tocqueville is closed with that of the capitalist economy propounded by Karl Marx. Tocqueville perhaps considered civil society to be complementary to democracy. People's participation in civil society and participation in political life is noted as symbiotic mutually reinforcing relationships. He also depicts Associations as free school which is large in size. In this school, political interests were enthused and political and organisational skills are enhanced. Though linkup between civil society and democracy was viewed for the first time but it was not connected well. Civil society is not an alternative to the state, as argued by Tocqueville. Rather civil society is the indispensable counterpart to a stable and vital democracy. In a stable democracy, liberty and equality should be properly maintained and equality and liberty are incompatible. Equality is an essential pre-requisite for democracy. To safeguard the liberty of each individual, where without liberty the term democracy even cannot be thought. So, voluntary organizations come forward to control excessive control by the state so to protect the liberty of the citizens. Voluntary associations can make sure that state do not encroach the state controls. For him, civil society is a compound of two elements: 'the whole sum of social and associational elements and those that comprised the active political (republican) community' (Dash, 2001)

2.10 Perspectives of Civil society in the Indian context:

As far as Indian political society is concerned, the great political thinker Chatterjee has put forward in the Indian framework. India is a democratic country and it has very existence of political society. So, Partha Chatterji argues that political society is the arena where political transactions take place outside the framework of formal institutions. Thus it shares some common ground with the concept of the on-party political process. Partha Chatterjee defines the term political society very well. As per his definition goes, it is comprised of a sphere of social interactions and this social interaction is not included in the definition offered by the classical definition of civil society. Later, Chatterjee's notion of political society was developed more by him and he argued that it could provide a creative way of understanding developments in postcolonial societies like India. An important suggestion was also made by him that developments in political society have the potential to liberate Indian society. Thus Chatterjee prays that this sphere of social life should not be dismissed from attention.

Here another Indian political thinker Parekh can be quoted to realize the differences between civil society and political society. As an arena of uncoerced associative life, civil society includes such associations as a family, trade unions, universities the press, professional bodies, churches, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and social movements. But it excludes the state... political parties are also excluded. Political parties are excluded from the arena of civil society because the ideology of political parties never distances from acquiring the state and political parties do use coercive power to gain their objectives (Gellner, 2009, p. 4).

Not only Parth Chatterjee but also Sudipta Kaviraj forwarded his idea on the difference between political society and civil society. Common notion between both of these writers regarding civil society is that none of them accepts the existence of civil society in India. Instead of civil society, they assured about a narrow bourgeois enclave in India. Pre condition of a civil society is to have autonomous individual and choice among the people. But Kaviraj argues that both of the two pre conditions for civil society are absent in the case of Indian civil society. On the other hand, Chatterjee explains the absence of civil society in India more elaborately. He argues that communities under modern India act as a political society. So, he makes it clear cut that in India, instead of rights bearing citizenry in civil society, most Indians are the object of government policies providing protection and welfare. Chatterjee also confirms it with the explanation that the division between civil society and political society as a conflict between corporate and non-corporate capital under conditions of post- colonial primitive accumulation of capital (Mukharjee, 2010, p. 59). But as democracy, India has to act on the reverse gear and the government should provide people an appropriate livelihood that meets the needs of the people.

2.11 Global civil society in the present world:

Of late the term global civil society is used by critics and activists. Globalization is the reason behind the reference by these critics and activists. There are both pros and cons effects by the wave of globalization in the structure of socio political economy around the globe. Global civil society supports and protects the emergence of globalization. The civil society who supports globalization includes businesses and institutions. On the other hand, who contested globalization says that globalization is a social phenomenon. In this regard, civil society can play an important role as replacement of politically derived state institutions.