

struggles. In order to serve their selfish ends they took help from the strong European nations. In the absence of strong central authority the foreign traders made these small rulers fight with one another and gradually they went on bringing them under their control. The story of expansion of imperialism in Asian and African territories was not of gallantry, bravery and power but of the mutual distrust, infighting and avarice and treachery.

From the study of 19th century it is revealed that at that time nationalism was being replaced by extreme nationalism, and African and Asian territories were disintegrating into regions, provinces and classes.

(5) Propagation of the Concept of Civilising the Backward People. Imperialism formation concepts on the mind and heart of the European people helped the spread of imperialism. In this respect the following view points are worth studying.

(i) Concept of Responsibility of the White People. The proponents of the imperialism have propounded that god has beloveted upon the white people of Europe the responsibility of civilising the backward tribes. So it was announced that the white people of European nations are going to Asian and African nations not to spread imperialism but to improve the lot of backward tribes there. The contemporary famous writer Rudyard Kipling called the backward tribes of Asian and African nations "white man's burden", and exhorted the white to complete this working happily. In the way French Political expert, Jules Ferry propounded that it is the great work of the civilised society to make the backward people civilised. These thoughts opened the doors of establishing imperialism by the white people.

(ii) To be a Christian a Sacred work. The Christian priests thought it a pious and sacred work to make people Christian. They sent missionaries to Asian and African countries to spread Christianity. They helped the backward people with money and converted them into Christianity after giving them a lot of baits. A number of traders and soldiers also helped a lot in this pursuit. To convert people into Christianity all the Christian people thought it a godly duty. Thus spread of Christianity also helped in the spread of imperialism. Like the Christian Missionaries the discoverers of new nations also played a significant role in the spread of imperialism. They went to far-off nations of Asia and Africa for which they had no prior knowledge. After studying the reports of these people governments of European nations first established their posts in these nations and then took the adjoining areas under their control, and finally established imperialism in these nations.

IMPERIALISTIC CONQUESTS OF ASIA AND AFRICA

European nations discovered numerous new nations in America, Asia and Africa and by establishing their rule in these nations, spread imperialism of their respective nations. In some countries these tribes went and settled and made them their colonies. They tortured the original tribes inhumanly and destroyed them completely. As far as the history of spread of imperialism in

107

Asia and Africa is concerned it is a different one completely. The European tribes went to these continents for doing trade and commerce and so they established there their posts. Gradually, through military action they established their imperialism spread over a long span of time. And even in the later half of 20th century some remnants of imperialism are found in these nations. In the following description the history of imperialism in these continents will be delineated.

(A) British Imperialistic Conquest of India

There is a long history of British Imperialism in India. In the 16th century of traders of Portugal, France, Holland and England had reached India and started their business activities and had also formed trading companies lawfully. In the last days of 1599 AD. The English traders formed East India Company and the Empress Elizabeth authorised this company to do business activities in India. The Britishers who came to India with the solve purpose of trading were encouraged by the favourable conditions here and they established their rule. After establishing their empire in India, they exploited it a lot. The true form of British Imperialism in India starts with the battle of Plassey, and the period between 1757 AD and 1947 AD. The period of two hundred years is termed the period of British Imperialism in India. From the battle of Plassey in 1757 to the Independence struggle in 1857 the British took most of India under their control. India became the part and parcel of British empire.

(B) Imperialism in China

The expansion of imperialism in China can be described in the following chronological order.

(i) The opium battles led the foundation of imperialism. Because of opium China witnessed numerous battles. Before these battles several restrictions were imposed on foreign traders. British traders bought tea, silk etc from China and British goods could be brought into China. These traders brought opium into China stealthily in bulk quantities to earn huge profits. When the Chinese authorities destroyed their opium leader ships in 1839 AD, the British waged war against China and defeated her in the war. because of the defeat, the political sovereignty of the British was established China. They got huge amounts of money as a penalty, they got authority to trade through five ports and the Chinese government had to accept that the crimes committed by the British would not be heard by Chinese courts. Later on other foreign countries too forced China to accept these conditions. When the foreigners get such rights in a country, these rights are termed as Extra Territorial Rights. Now the Chinese government could not even impose customs duties. Very soon France also came forward to establish its empire there and it too forced China to enter into sameful treaties with her.

(ii) Expansion of Japanese Empire. Japan wanted to extend its influence over Korea where there was Chinese control. With the interference of Japan a battle (war) was inevitable. In the war Japan came out victorious. Resultantly

108

China liberated Korea and Japan took numerous islands including Formosa (Taiwan) under its control. Not only this, China had to give huge amount to Japan as a penalty.

(iii) Cutting of Chinese Melon. China did not have ample amount to give to Japan as penalty. France, Britain Russia and Germany provided the amount to China and in exchanged they divided China into spheres of their influences. These nations used the resources of their respective spheres of influence in interests and exploited their resources to the maximum. Other countries did not interfere in the sphere of influence of another country. This division was as under:

(a) Germany on Kiaochi bay and its complete monopoly on Shantung and Huangho valley.

(b) Russia on Liatung and it got monopoly over laying railway line in Manchuria.

(c) France on Kuangcho Bay and its monopoly over three Southern provinces.

(d) Britain on Veyie he Veyie port and its monopoly on yangtise valley. The above division is known by the name of 'cutting of the Chinese Melon'

(iv) Intrusion of America. America also wanted to avail of the pitiable condition of China. Due to the division of China into the spheres of influence America could to avail of the chance of exploiting China by its intrusion. So, America proposed 'Open Door Policy' which meant equal rights to all the foreign powers for China's root. Britain supported this policy of America because of fear of Japan and Russia.

In the Battle of Boxer China once again tried to get rid of the imperialistic powers but it was defeated and the imperialistic hold was strengthened with more rigidity. Gradually all the rulers of Chinese territories went on becoming the slaves of foreigners. They went on being metted under the clutches of foreigners in exchange of obtaining facilities, loans etc.

(C) Imperialism in South and South-east Asia

South and South-east Asian nations include Nepal, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Indochina (Laws and Combodia), Burma, Thailand or Scam and Phillipines various European tribes tortured these nations very much in order to expand trade first in these countries and then establish their sovereignty there. The British maintained peace treaty with Nepal due to being situated in the east of the Himalayas and a Buffer state between Tibet and India, and after establishing control over India and bringing Tibet under their sovereignty Britain did not disturb the independence of Nepal. The incidents of establishing imperialism in South and South east India can be described as under:

(1) Control of Britain over Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka has a place of importance among the world nations in respect of tea and rubber production. After

establishing their control over this island nation the Europeans set up tea and rubber plantations here, and produced them in bulk quantities. First of all the Portuguese established their authority and later on Dutch (Hollandise) established their control. And in the last the British succeeded in bringing Sri Lanka under their control. It remained under British control by the middle of the 20th century.

(2) British Sovereignty over Malaya including Singapore. In the beginning the Portuguese had control over Singapore and Malaya. Later on the British established their authority. After Singapore and Malaya, Britain was able to establish its authority over entire sea-routes of South-east Asia as Singapore is situated on the Southern most tip of Malaya Peninsula. In this way the trading condition of Britain strengthened more than that other competitive nations.

(3) Sovereignty of the Dutch over Indonesia. The Dutch had established their authority over Indonesia from the very beginning. All the islands of Indonesia were under the control of the Dutch. Not only this, the Dutch also established their sovereignty over Malacca island.

(4) French Rule over Indochina. Indochina includes Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. When Britain was entangled with China over opium war, at that time France tried to establish its control over Indochina's trade and commerce. It gradually established its political power over all the parts of Indochina and entrusted its government into the hands of a governor-general. Gradually the French finished the struggling power of Indochina and started exploiting it.

(5) Burma-a part of British Imperialism. In order to have trade ties and increase economic relations with Burma, France got authorisation from Burma to lay railway line from Tonkin to Maundley. Britain was scared of the efforts of France to establish control all over Southeast Asia, because it was causing danger to British empire. In order to control French expansionism Britain started war with Burma. Burma was defeated in the war. The English imprisoned the King of Burma and sent him to India and annexed Burma to their empire in 1886 A.D.

(6) Foreign Influence over Thailand. Thailand is also known by the name of Siam. Though it is situated between Burma and Indochina, it remained free forever. Despite all this it could not remain free from the influence of British and French influence. These two nations remained internal affairs.

(7) Control of America over Phillipines. America too had not lagged behind in the pursuit of empire formation, though it took part in the work only at the end of 19th century. Phillipines was under the control of Spain. The Phillipinoes started struggle against the rule of Spain. America sent its troops to Phillipines against Spain. Spain was defeated and America took Phillipines under its control. The Phillipinoes also revolted against the Americans but this revolt was suppressed by Phillipines remained under the control of America.

(D) Imperialism in Centrol and West Asia

Various European nations tried to expand their empires in control and West Asia. Its description is as under.

(1) Push and Pull between Britain and Russia for control over Iran and Afghanistan. At the end of 19th century Russia was sufficiently powerful Britain not only had to protect its interests in Iran and Afghanistan but was also scared of the expansion of influence of Russia in control Asia as it could create fear in the empires of Indian subcontinent. Both Russia and Britain had taken vow to bring both these nations under their control, so it was natural to have differences of opinion. Meanwhile in 1907 AD there was treaty between Russia and Britain on the question of Iran and Afghanistan. The conditions of this treaty were:

(i) Russia promised not to take Afghanistan under its control,

(ii) Britain also promised that it would not annex Afghanistan.

(iii) Iran was divided into three segments. First was in the influence of Britain. Second under Russia and the third was neutral in which both of them could expand their influence. In this way we can say that Iran was divided by Britain and Russia in order to fulfil their interests.

(2) British and American Control over Iran. After the Russian Revolution the Russian interest lessened in Iran. On the other hand due to be attracted towards Iran. Very soon the Standard Oil Company of America and the Anglo-Persian Oil company of England established their control over Iran.

(3) British Influence over Tibet. Though in 1907 Russia and England entered into a treaty in which they consented that they would not interfere in Tibet, but with the end of empire in China in 1911 AD Britain extended its influence gradually over Tibet.

(4) Struggle for Sovereignty over Turkey. The European nations were looking with a questioning eye the expanding influence of Germany over Turkey and other Asian nations. Germany made a plan and obtained a contract to lay railway line from Kustuntunia to Baghdad and from Baghdad to the Persian gulf. Through this plan Germany, on one hand could protect its interest and on the other hand it could make plan to advance towards Iran and India. In the beginning Russia, Britain and France opposed the treaty being done between Germany and Turkey, but later on Germany, France and England agreed to divide this region mutually. In the meantime the first world war started. Germany and Turkey were defeated and resultantly Syria, Philippines, Iraq and Arabian territory were snatched from Turkey. Now the control of the entire territory came under the control of England and France.

When oil resources were discovered in the Arabian Territory, the American oil companies made England and France their partners and obtained oil extracting facilities in Arabian Territory.

IMPERIALISM IN AFRICA

The history of imperialism in Africa is more pitiable. The examples of torture the European tribes did there are not easily found elsewhere. Imperialism in Africa had two forms—One in which African people were made slaves and sent them to other countries and the other in which European nations took the entire Africa under their control and divide them among them according to their convenience. Both these forms are discussed with the following lines:

(A) Sale and Purchase of African Slaves

European nations had little knowledge of the interiors of the African continent till the middle of the 19th century, though numerous European nations specially Spain had reached the coastal areas of American continents since 15th century. This period was the period when Spain had established the governments in American continents and finished the original tribes of the continents by killing them in large numbers. Now they needed the labourer who would work in the fields of their colonies. This necessity was fulfilled by the Spaniards by purchasing the slaves from Lisbon markets, who had been brought there from African countries, they sent these slaves to the fields of their colonies in American continents. In the beginning the sardars of the villages caught the villagers and sold them to the European traders. Afterwards European traders also attacked the coastal areas of Africa, caught the villagers as slaves and sent them to their colonies in American continents.

1. Slave Trade of the British. Though the slave trade was started by the Spanish in the beginning but gradually the European Tribes also started the trade of African slaves. The British government supported the slave trade by English traders. Not only this a very religious personality named John Hawkins went to Africa and he brought back countless African people as slaves. The British government also became partner in this trade and earned profit. In the 17th century a company was formed and the British government authorised this company to deal in slave trade. This trade went on for a longtime and at last came to an end in the middle of 19th century.

2. Inhuman Treatment with the Slaves. The description of slave trade would not be complete if we do not deal with the inhuman treatment by the European tribes with the slaves. European people caught a number of poor African village people as slaves and brought them to European countries or to their colonies. The villagers people protested their capturing, were loaded on the ships like goats and sheep. Half of them died of in sanitary conditions and suffocations. In the fields they were treated worse than animals. Because of fear, those who tried to feel were tortured beyond our imagination.

(B) The Conquest of Africa

Till the middle of 19th century the European Tribes went on with the slave trade in Africa and when this trade came to an end these people conquered

112

entire Africa and divided it among themselves. Till the middle of the 19th century the Portuguese, the English, the Dutch and the French were confined to the coastal areas only,

because except Algeria in the north (controlled by the French and Cape Colony in the South (controlled by the English) the European people did not have any knowledge of the interiors of the African continent. But by the end of the last decade of the 19th century they had brought the entire Africa under their control and they divided the entire territory among themselves conveniently.

Consequences of Imperialism

Imperialism established by the European nations in Asia and Africa had far-reaching consequences. In brief they are as under.

(1) Loss of Independence. Imperialism resulted directly in the loss of independence of most of the nations of Africa and Asia. They were forced to live a life of slaves. It was not only a political dependence but also a complete dependence. The European imperialists not only abducted political independence but through economic exploitation these and through implementation of various plans, made these nations dependent economically also. In a few years they became poor, deprived and totally dependent upon their ruling nation. Not only this, it was also tried to create their mental state of slavery socially, religiously and culturally. Gradually they began to feel that every thing of Europeans is refined and best and their own inferior and discardable. The slave mentality bust the colonial nations the most.

(2) Economic Exploitation. Due to industrial Revolution in European nations discovered new markets for their bulk production on a large scale. In Asia and Africa they, not only, found such markets but favourable circumstances also, which prompted them to establish their empires in these continents. Due to establishment of their empires they exploited their colonies to the maximum. On one hand they looted the resources of the colonies and carried them to Europe, on the other hand they made them completely dependent economically. Local small scale and cottage industries were destroyed and agriculture was made controlled by brokers and middle man. The colonial nations became the exporters of raw-material and importers of European manufactured goods. Later on the imperialistic nations of Europe invested huge capitals in these nations and put up large scale industries there, so that they could produce bulk quantities of manufactured goods at low costs due to cheap labour and easy availability of raw materials at low costs, sell them then and there and earn large amounts of profits. In this way they exploited their colonies economically to the maximum.

(3) Religious conversion at a very large scale. European imperialistic nations are the followers of Christianity. They, along with establishing their empires, converted the people of their colonies into Christianity. For this they adopted every means, whether good or bad. This is the reason why large population of Christianity followers live in these nations today.

113

(4) Denial of Basic Rights. The history of tyrannies and tortures which the European imperialistic nations did on the people of their colonies is very dreadful. The imperialistic nations deprived the people of the colonies of their basic rights. They also snatched the rights

relating to individuals, families, societies and individual developments, and forced them to live a life of animals. They taught them that dependence is a good result and low mentality exeot them.

(5) Racism. The white people proved the black races of Asia and Africa to the inferior and backward. They propounded them to be White man's Burden. On the basis of the doctrine they announced that to make the black people civilised had been entrusted to the white people by god. Under this veil they divided the people into two races the whites and the Blacks. They found ways and means to keep the black people dependent for ever, wearing the mask of ruling the blacks, making them civilised, and developing them. They treated them in humanly and developed the slave instinct in them to remain dependent to the White for ever.

(6) Effects on Imperialistic Countries. Imperialism had also for reaching effects on the imperialistic countries. First, the imperialistic countries, in a very short period, became very rich. They made new plans and abducted the wealth of the defeated nations. Secondly, before the establishment of empires, these European small nations were unimportant on the world map but after establishing their control over the countries of Asia and Africa. They became the fore runners of world politics. Thirdly, mutual distrust and conformation also increased among the imperialistic countries. In order to protect their empires they generally, engaged them in armed struggles. Fourthly when these European races came in contact with the defeated races, they felt that the defeated races were more civilised, more cultured and more refined than the European races. The White people had learnt a lot from these black people or races.

(7) Destruction of their Culture. In order to rule their colonies permanently the foreign imperialists. Though it necessary to destroy their cultures gradually. In this pursuit they made constant efforts they glorified the foreign languages, foreign culture and foreign civilisation and criticised and branded their languages, civilisation and culture as inferior discardable and ancient. Due to propagation of foreign languages, and religion-conversion the colonial people began to consider the civilisation and culture better and began to feel proud to adopt the foreign way of life. As a result the culture of the defeated nations began to perish.

(8) Internal Conflicts and World Wars. Every imperialistic nation all over the world wanted to enslave the most regions or make most regions protectorates and exploit them. There was a mad-rush for establishing imperialism. It was natural the selfishness would lead to conflicts. In order to establish control over the nations of Africa and Asia the European imperialistic nations fought among themselves off and on and also avoided these conflicts

114

sometimes after making numerous treaties. In the last they were divided into two powerful blocs and become the reasons of first and Second World Wars.

chapter 7 theories of power in the society

Apart from the forms of power, another equally important question is how power is distributed in the society, i.e. who holds power. Whereas politics as power implies a relationship, that is, it can

be used by somebody against somebody else, it also implies possession— something that one has and which one may use or abuse. If politics is the control over the wills of many by a few, the question arises who are these privileged ‘few’. There are a number of theories regarding the possession of power. We shall discuss the prominent ones. They are:

- i. Power of a class
- ii. Elitist theory of power
- iii. Pluralist theory of power
- iv. Power and Gender
- v. Patriarchy and Power

POWER AND CLASS DOMINANCE

The first answer to the question as to who holds power and how to understand the nature of power in the society was provided by Marxism. It declared that power in the society belongs to the economically dominant class. As explained above, Marxism analyses power in its totality - as a unique and complex combination of political, economic and ideological dimensions. This power belongs to the class which controls the means of production in the society and is used by it to secure and consolidate its own position, and suppress and exploit the subordinate class(s). This dominant class was described by Marx as the ‘Ruling Class’. In Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels wrote, ‘Political power, properly so called is merely the organized power of one class for suppressing

60

another’. Ever since the emergence of private property, society had been divided into two antagonistic classes—the propertied and the non-propertied, and power has been the privilege of the dominant class. In Greek society, power belonged to the masters; in the feudal society, it was the domain of nobility; and in the capitalist society, it belongs to the capitalist-industrial class. Control over the means of production involves control over the political and the ideological fields as well. Although in his later writings, Marx and Engels emphasized the point that power of the state in the capitalist society was not necessarily and always just an instrument of the capitalist class, yet, in the ultimate analysis, the politics of the state encouraged industrial activity and actually enriched the bourgeois class.

Marxist writers in the twentieth century have been equally concerned with analysing the nature of the class structure of the capitalist societies, changes in the nature of capitalism and how far power is an instrument of the dominant class. Though there are disagreements within Marxism and between the Marxists and the non-Marxists about the class structure of the capitalist societies and the role of politics in maintaining the class domination, there is a broad agreement that the structure of power is based upon a state which acts as an instrument to serve the interests of the ‘ruling class’ which dominates the mode of production. Classical Marxism basing their theory on historical materialism explained that the economic base determines the political structure of the society. Changes in the society do not come from the autonomous actions of the individuals but from fundamental and objective changes in the economic base of the society. The changes and power in the society could be explained only as a result of the struggle between the contending

classes. However, Gramsci, a Marxist writer in the inter-war period, added another dimension to class power and dominance. According to him, the domination of a class is achieved not only through the economic structure and coercion but also through the active consent of the non-propertied class(s). Terming it as 'Hegemony', he suggested that their consent is achieved through the use of intellectual, moral and political persuasion and leadership. This may involve greater concession to the subordinate classes and political forms such as democracy which allow some degree of choice, in order to maintain overall

61

view which preserves the power of the dominant class by distorting beliefs, common sense assumptions and popular culture.¹

The rise of liberal-capitalist welfare state in the West after the second world war reduced the economic burden of the working class to a great extent. Marxism was faced with the question: how far the welfare state is an instrument of class power. In this context, contemporary Marxist writers have formulated a body of theory that is known as 'the relative autonomy of the state'. The main proponents of the theory are Ralph Milliband, Nicos Poulantzas, Claus Offe and others. The crux of their argument is that the social welfare policies have not challenged the capitalist system but have strengthened it by increasing its legitimacy in the eyes of the subordinate classes; economic growth has benefited the capitalist class much more than anyone else. In essence, economic growth is less an example of social welfare and more an example of class dominance. The Marxist writers have explicitly acknowledged the centrality of power to their analysis. As Ellen Wood says, 'the disposition of power is at the centre of Marxist political economy'. Similarly, Poulantzas asserts that inspite of changes, the politics still serves the interests of the ruling class even if the mechanisms of the relationship have changed. Politics still remains an act of securing conditions of capital accumulation, domination of capital and reproduction of the existing class relations. Though in the modern welfare state, a number of other classes have emerged, the two fundamental classes remain dominant. The role of the state is not to defend the interest of the economically dominant class on every specific issue but to provide for the Interest of the capital in general.² However, in the crisis, politics must act as an instrument to defend the imperatives of the capitalist system and hence still remains an instrument of class rule and repression. Though the state has acquired autonomy, it acts as its own right against both capital and labour. Taken as a whole, it still serves the interests of the owners of the means of production. Class power depends upon politics and politics depends upon class power.

Thus, inspite of autonomy, the class perspective -views the existence of the state apparatus as a necessary instrument to reproduce the conditions of class domination. If politics is the study of power, this mode of power is the power of economically dominant class in the society

62

ELITIST THEORY OF POWER

In opposition to the theory of class power, the power theorists of Europe and America introduced the concept of Elite power. The essence of this theory is that power is concentrated in the hands of a small group of people in the society who take day-to-day decisions of the government. The rulers in the political system are few in number compared with the ruled. The term Elite originally meant the 'elect' or the 'best'. Politically it means that societies are always dominated by a minority (elite), the selected few, who take major decisions within the society and who concentrate power in their own hands. The theory has its origin in the classical political ideas, but it found its contemporary expression during the interwar period in the writings of Pareto, Mosca, Michel and the sociologists and political scientists associated with American science of politics. Pareto argued that in all societies, people can be divided into (i) small governing elite and non-governing elites, and (ii) the mass of population. This small elite can consist of administrators, dictators, warriors, wealthy men, religious priests or any other group of men in the society. Though the composition of elites may change over a period of time, i.e. they continue to circulate, but they are always present. 'History is a graveyard of aristocracy'. He rejected the Marxist view that political power is determined by economic class structure but declared that power belonged to men who exercise political skill. And it must always be so because of two reasons: i) a minority can organize itself better, and ii) it has some attributes which are very influential in the society they live. Similarly Mosca wrote that the rule of a governing elite is ensured by its superior organization and caliber; the domination of an organized minority over the unorganized majority is inevitable. The distinguishing character of the elite is the aptitude to command and exercise political power. Michels formulated the famous rule of 'iron law of oligarchy' by which he meant 'rule of the few'. He declared it as 'one of the iron laws of history, from which the most democratic modern societies, and within those societies, the most advanced parties, have been unable to escape'³ The elite rule applies to all societies irrespective of their being liberal, socialist or communist.

The Elite theory claims that power in the society is the preserve of particular social groups and they hold power not only because

63

they are highly organized but also because they possess certain special qualities such as physical power, ability, skill, wealth, superior race etc. Empirical investigations of ruling elites carried out in America in 1920's came to the conclusion that a small number of people mainly from upper and upper middle class in the community and representing business interests were predominant in all spheres of life in the society. This elite has more power since political, economic and ideological powers are all concentrated in their hands. The nature of elites was investigated by a number of writers such as Karl Mannheim, Schumpeter, Anathony Down, Raymond Aron, Bottomore, Robert Dahl, C. Wright Mills etc. Mills, for example, in his book *The Power Elite* declared that three interlocking groups which dominated the 'command power' in American society were the political leaders, corporate leaders and the military leaders. Most of these elites groups, thought not elected, controlled the direction of American politics. The struggle for power virtually took place among these contending elites with the result that men in authoritative roles change from time to time, but power remained within the elite groups and never percolated to the masses. Even in democratic societies, government decisions and initiative of policy lie with the elites, unrestrained by masses.

Concern with the functioning of elites in politics is as old as the study of politics itself. However, the development of elite theory in the twentieth century was a reaction against Marxism and Western European socialist movements. Whereas Marxism emphasized the unified power of a particular class, the elitist theory argued that due to the separation of ownership and control of industry, such minorities were not necessarily owners of the means of production but might wield a variety of power resources. Any future society whether socialist or communist would also be subjected to minority rule. Genuine democracy was impossible in the face of elite rule. Power is not the monopoly of a particular group or a class. In understanding why elites develop, the crucial point is political and not economic. The elites are organized and the masses are not.

Thus if politics is power, then this power belongs not to a particular class but to a minority of elites in the society.

64

PLURALIST THEORY OF POWER

If the elite theory of power was developed as a reaction against Marxism, the pluralist notion of power emerged as a reaction against the 'ultra realism' of Elitism. Whereas elitism saw power in the minority, pluralism sees power in the 'minorities'. Pluralism is a doctrine of diversity. It claims that power in the modern democratic societies does not belong to a single elite but to different groups and interests which compete for influence, are able to share power, and influence the decision-making at some level or the other.⁴

A prominent theory as a model of studying politics developed in the twentieth century is known as the Interest Group Theory. The importance of group interest was highlighted by Bentley and Truman who said that from family to nation i.e. family, peasant organizations, caste and races, political parties and organizations, —all can be classified into groups. Politics is nothing except the struggle among groups for controlling the activities of the government or influencing its decisions. This understanding of politics as an act of conflict and cooperation among various groups in society is called pluralism. It is associated with a number of names such as Maitland, Figgis, Lindsay, Barker, Laski, MacIver etc. The concept also became popular in the context of community power debates in 1950s and 1960s and continued till 1970 and 1980s in America and was expressed in the writings of Floyd Hunter, Robert Dahl and Plsby.

Pluralism is a highly empirical theory based upon observable phenomena. According to the pluralists, power is 'an ability to influence policy outcome'. Any actual decision-making reveals that it is impossible to identify a single group or elite which dominates policy making. Decision is a complex process which involves bargaining among a plurality of individuals and groups, and the final outcome is a compromise. Rejecting both the Marxist and the Elitist notions, the pluralistic theory lays stress on the plurality of factors affecting policy outcome. The decisions arrived at may not be the best but the desired one and result of compromise and agreement among a variety of different groups. Since power is a type of influence, it does not belong to a single factor like wealth, but can be anything like ability, reputation, popularity,

65

charisma, or general favourable position with regard to any value. Power is not simply property that can be given to one group or denied to another on the basis of social and economic position. It can be an important factor but not the only factor. Those having formal political authority such as the Parliament or the Prime Minister can be influenced by outside social groups such as trade unions, peasant organizations, mass movements. No one single group possesses power to the exclusion of others. Interests such as industrial, agricultural, businessmen and consumers, housewives, students and others balance each other in the pursuit of their own ends. Politics acts as a 'honest broker' and is independent of any particular interest. The individual has his views represented in policy-making, not only through elections but also through the participatory mechanism of group politics.

The pluralist notion thus emphasizes major feature of the process of government decision-making, the plurality of actors involved, the emphasis on subjective rather than objective interests and the fact that the policy outcome seldom reflects the values preferences of one single group. However, the pluralists also accept the fact that only a very small minority of the population organized into groups determines the policy in most areas. It is sufficient if the ordinary people join a group.

Since 1980s, pluralists have been on defence. The emphasis on decision-making has been criticized for ignoring the issues or decisions which are not raised because the power-that-be wishes to keep them off the agenda. Decision-makers may be in agreement on certain issues they should not discuss, say for example, the issue of corruption in high places. If all the major political groups do not raise the issue, then it may be difficult to take any decision in spite of the feelings of the masses. Again, many people do not participate in politics and a large number of interest groups which are not formally recognized by decision-makers, the system has nothing to offer to them. Finally, critics also allege that the pluralists understate the independent role which politicians play in shaping policy and in deciding which interests to respond to. So it is being felt now that the pluralists only capture one facet of the distribution of power in the society.

66

GENDER AND POWER

Apart from the power of class elite and the dominant social groups, the feminist writers have drawn our attention to another kind of power in the society which is termed as power of gender i.e. domination of men as a group over women as a group. A major contribution of feminist scholars in the twentieth century has been to analyse the subordinate position of women in the society. Gender usually refers to the feminine and masculine attributes and social roles. But what is important is that this gender distinction structures every aspect of our life by constituting an unquestioned framework in terms of which society views men and women. Feminism views this gender difference as an elaborate, system of male domination and wants to make an end to this system. For them politics is a power structured relationship in which one group of persons (i.e. women) is controlled by another group (i.e. men).

There is a strong tradition that due to biological differences, men are superior to women. Women's natural role of wife and mother are viewed as genetically programmed, and male

aggression and women passivity as harmonically produced. Feminist writers criticize this pro-gender biological evidence as fallacious. They argue that the attributes which society considers natural for women are created by social pressures and conditioning. Gender is a product of social relations of sexuality because kinship rests upon marriage. Every gender system exhibits an ideology that relies on repression by presenting gender categories as fixed.⁵

Gender inequality is expressed in many areas of social life which include culture, ideology and discursive practices. The gender division in the home and in wage labour, the organization of state, sexuality, the structuring of violence, and many aspects of social organization contribute to the construction of unequal relations between man and woman. Though gender relations take different form in different societies, history periods, ethnic groups, social classes and generations, yet they have one thing in common - the gender relations are unequal and men are superior to women.

There are three main theories of gender relations i.e. liberal, socialist and radical feminists, though a number of other perspectives have also come into existence such as black feminism, ecofeminism, materialist feminism, social feminism etc. The liberal feminists see the gender inequality and male dominance in the lack of education and political participation and representation of women. Radical feminists argue that gender differentiation is primarily a matter of gender inequality with male being the dominant gender. All aspects of women's life are affected by male domination. They analyse the issue of male violence towards women, men's abuse of women's sexuality and issue of reproduction. The socialist feminists

67

see gender inequality as the product of class relations. For them, man as well as capital are the beneficiary of this domination. They concentrate on how domestic labour and wage labour compel women to be subordinated by men.

The focus on gender as the centre of power relations in the society set the terms of debate for most of the feminist writings after 1970s. It was argued that this gender differentiation is expressed through a number of inequalities and discriminations against women in the family and occupation, unequal educational opportunities, devaluation of their work etc., and only a transformation of social organization of gender can lead to the disappearance of sexual inequality and domination of men over women.

POWER AND PATRIARCHY

This notion of gender and power manifests in the concept of Patriarchy. Patriarchy in wider definition means 'the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women in the society'.⁶ It implies that if politics is power, then this power is enjoyed by men holding all important institutions and decision-making authority in their hands and depriving women of access to such a power. Maggi Humm has defined Patriarchy as a 'System of male authority which oppresses women through social, political and economic institutions...Patriarchy has power for man's great access to and mediation of the resources and rewards of authority structures inside and outside the home'.⁷ According to Michael Mank, 'Patriarchy is male

domination, a system of social relations in which men as a class have power over women as a class'. These power relations are social constructs and not biological. This power can be economic such as the right to be serviced; sexual such as marriage and motherhood; cultural such as devolution of women's work and achievement; ideological such as representation of women as natural biological creatures inherently different from

68

men'. Historically, the domination of men over women has been secured in a variety of way such as i) gender indoctrination, ii) education deprivation, iii) the denial to women of knowledge of their own history, iv) by defining 'respectability and 'deviance' according to sexual activities, v) dividing women from one another, vi) by restraint and outright coercion, vii) by discrimination in access to economic resources and political power, and viii) by creating an overall ideology that women are inferior to men.⁸

Patriarchy is a historical institution formed by men and women in the long process of their own evolution. The social roles and behaviour deemed appropriate to men and women were expressed in values, customs and laws. However, the natural and biological differences between man and woman led to the formation of social institutions and practices based upon the relations of domination of men and the subordination of women. How did this happen? A number of reasons have been advanced by feminist theories. Let us consider a few of them Early liberal writers like Mary Wollstonecraft and J.S. Mill analysed male domination in the context of liberal values of justice, equality and rights and felt that the cause of women's oppression was the denial of the means to develop their reason. As Wollstonecraft pointed out, the main distinguishing mark of human beings was reason. By reason she meant 'the simple power of improvement'.⁹ Similarly, the gender and the character, according to Mill, of women were not natural but the result of their lack of education. Women rarely accepted their own servitude as natural. More often, it is the unreasonable male habits that keep women in such servitude. Men, in complete ignorance, claimed that women were naturally inferior. In short, men, by depriving women of their legal, social, economic and political rights perpetuate male domination in the society.¹⁰

Marxist writers, on the other hand, locate Patriarchy and male domination in the materialistic context. Marx, for example, saw patriarchy as a cover for bourgeois property interests. Oppression is premised on the class and economic relations within capitalism. Women's oppression is rooted in the impersonal logic of capitalist expropriation. The family, private property, division of labour, domestic labour and the position of women are due to historical

69

and economic circumstances. Engles associated the subordination of women with the origin of private property and the rise of individual family which transformed the position of women from a free and equal productive member of society to a subordinate and dependent wife. Engles termed this as 'the world historical defeat of the female sex.'¹¹ Women were disassociated from the productive process and household management became a household service. The status of equality between sexes and their work changed into inequality and subjugation of women. Thus for Engles, the first form of exploitation can be observed in the family, namely, that the well-

being of the man is maintained on the basis of the repression of the women. The majority of women do not stay with men for love, but for the economic support. Thus the subordination of women was directly related to the mode of production. In short, Marxism recognized the power of patriarchy, analysed the material basis of women's oppression and equated the liberation of women's oppression and exploitation within the overall human liberation that only a socialist revolution could bring about.¹²

Another approach to the understanding of the power of patriarchy has been advanced by the Socialist Feminists. Socialist feminism analyses power of men over women in terms of class origin and patriarchal roots. They claim that patriarchy did not emerge with the origin of private property alone nor the end of private property will also bring destruction of patriarchal institutions. Patriarchy is cross cultural and cross nation, existing differently in different societies through the institutionalization of sexual hierarchy. Though not related with the origin of private property, the latter has helped in the perpetuation of patriarchy. For socialists, 'male supremacy and capitalism are defined as the core relations determining the oppression of women.'¹³ A mutual relationship can be established between gender and class. Patriarchy and gender relations based on power and control intensified with the advent of private property but its origin are more intimate and distant. For example, in the modern capitalist societies, men and woman as workers in the labour force are exploited whereas women's oppression arises from her exploitation as a wage labourer and also from sexual hierarchy obtained within the society and family. So it is a double oppression. Socialist feminists have attempted to widen our understanding of the division of labour and oppression of women, and focus our

70

attention on both the productive and reproductive factors. Patriarchal power is both a combination of economic and sexual factors.

Anthropological studies in the twentieth century have provided sufficient ground to develop parallel theories of male domination in the society. Another feminist group called Radical Feminists has explained that the subordination of women to the patriarchal organization in society is determined by a male hierarchical order, that enjoys both economic and political power. It is a system of social relation in which men as a class have power over women as a class because women are sexually devalued.¹⁴ This male domination is the religion of the entire planet and not related to the mode of production. It is the patriarchal organization which has its roots in the male biology and psychology, and not the class structure which defines women's position in the power hierarchy. Manifested through male force and control, the patriarchal system preserves itself through marriage and family. It is a sexual system of power, rooted in biology i.e. in the women's reproductive role rather than in economics or history. Hence the emancipation of women from male domination lies in the destruction of the biological family as the basic social organisation and revolutionizing the reproductive technology that would free women from the biological determined oppression. However, this view has been criticized on the ground that it considers the subjugation of women as naturally determined and considers man and woman as enemies rather than complimentary to each other.

Recent struggles in the status of women have enabled them to afford opportunities to exert some leverage within the system of patriarchy. Equal citizenship status, fundamental rights including political rights, no discrimination in pay between men and women, ' special provisions for improving their educational standards have changed the form of male domination considerably. Where women have economic power, they are able to control their lives better than otherwise. Modern technology is gradually removing most of the heavy work for which women are not physically well-equipped as men. With the latest advances in bio-technology and microbiology, birth control and small families, social reproduction may also cease to be the basis for female subordination. Again the existence of women groups and associations serve to increase the ability of women to counteract the dictates of patriarchal system. However,

71

all said and done, such reforms need to be integrated within a vast cultural revolution because the essence of patriarchy is less in the legal and social rights or economic determinism and more in the deep psychological roots of masculine psychology, thought and language.

Thus if politics is power, the patriarchal theory believes that power is exercised through male domination in the society.

CONCLUSION

In analysing the holding, exercise and distribution of power, it is difficult to ascertain who actually uses resources in an effective way and the different interpretations of power - the class, elite, pluralist and patriarchal - present practical difficulties. In some cases, the various types merge into one another. Within a ruling elite, one can find several groups competing for power. In the pluralist society, analysts encounter a series of elites controlling several social groups. Against in the communist states which were based upon class power, elites could be found claiming to rule in the name of the people. And the patriarchal power cuts through all ideologies and is always present in all modes of power. Yet inspite of difficulties, the various models help us to distinguish among various power concentrations in the society. Distribution of power ranges from the hierarchical to the relatively equalitarian dimensions and each model points to the distinctive dimensions of power relationship. The elite model focus on the coercive nature of power or on the ability of the power holder to initiate policy. The pluralist model reminds us of the difference between active and potential power, the scope of different power wielders and the importance of consensual power. The class model points to the exploitative content of power whereas the patriarchal model exposes the extent of male domination in the society. Together they all provide different standards for evaluating the exercise and distribution of power within a particular society.

CHAPTER 8 THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Since the primary concern of the state is with the people, the first issue of politics is to select the principle that governs this relationship. Some rules must determine who are to be recognized as members of the state and how their membership is acquired. If membership entails certain rights and responsibilities, these must be allotted according to certain principles. The division of society into government and governed raises a number of questions regarding their mutual relations such as: what kind of persons should compose the government? are all people fit to become the rulers? what are the duties of the rulers? what rights should be extended to everybody? should discrimination be made among the citizens. All such questions involve an inquiry into the nature of citizenship and the relations between those who compose a state.

Citizenship has been a persistent social human need. It is as old as settled human community. It defines those who are and those who are not members of a common society. It is more than a label. According to Heater, he who has no sense of civic bond with his fellows or of some responsibility for civic welfare is not a true citizen, whatever his legal status.¹ The social and political ties which hold an individual in community with his fellows is the essence of citizenship. A citizen needs to understand that his role entails status, a sense of loyalty, the discharge of certain duties and the enjoyment of rights not at individual level but in relation to the state as well.

WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP

During the last 2500 years, the concept of citizenship has been invented and defined, reinvented and redefined in distinct contexts

112

such as Greek city states, Roman Republics and modern nation-state. The nature of citizenship', wrote Aristotle long back, '...is a question which is often disputed, there is no general agreement on a single definition'.² But still the term is very common throughout the world and it is a central concept of everyday political discourse. Formally, it is a relationship between an individual and the state by which the former owes allegiance and the latter owes protection. This relationship is determined by law and recognized by international law. The citizen is a citizen only through the state. According to Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Institutions, citizenship means 'a full and responsible membership of the state', In social sciences, it has been used to denote the status of individual in the development of the modern state.³ According to D.W. Brogan, 'Citizenship has two aspects: i) that every citizen has the right to be consulted in the conduct of political society and the duty to contribute something to the general consultation, and ii) the reverse: the citizen who has a right to be consulted, is bound by the results of that consultation'.⁴ According to Barbalet, 'Citizenship is in the nature of a political bond. Upon it depends how fast the bond is'. According to T.H. Marshall, citizenship is a status attached to full membership of a community, and those who possess this status are equal with respect to the rights and duties associated with it. However, since different societies attach different rights and duties to the status of citizen, there is no universal principle which determines necessary rights and duties of citizenship in general.⁵ Following the line of Marshall, Bryan S. Turner in his book Equality has conceptualized modern citizenship in terms of three major dimensions. They are i) Civil citizenship i.e. equality before law, personal liberty, the right to own property and freedom

of speech, ii) Political citizenship i.e. political rights and access to popular institutions of political control, and iii) Social citizenship which involves a guarantee of basic level of economic and social welfare.⁶

In brief, the crux of citizenship is participation in the political community. However, any theory of political and social participation and rights must acknowledge that the role of the state in the development of citizenship is crucial because the conditions of citizenary are determined within each state depending upon the legal provisions. Different types of political communities give rise to different forms of citizenship. Making a comparison between

113

the Greek and modern concept of citizenship, Barbalet writes that whereas for Aristotle citizenship was the privileged status of the ruling group of the city state, in the modern democratic states, the basis of citizenship is the capacity to participate in the exercise of political power through the electoral process. Participation by citizens in the modern nation-state entails legal membership of a political community based on universal adult franchise and a civil community based on the rule of law. Today, it is equated with social, economic and political equality, social welfare and a means to enhance individual liberty.⁷ Similarly, according to Heater, though citizenship began as a means of differentiating between inhabitants of the state, yet today it is a means of equalizing their status. The essentials of modern citizenship are political participation, social and welfare rights, communal identity and civic responsibility'.⁸

DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF CITIZENSHIP AND FACTORS FOR ITS GROWTH

The idea of citizenship was developed by Greek city-states, and the classical political thinkers. Because of the internal strifes between rich and poor and wars with neighbours, the problem before these societies was how to bring social peace, i.e., by giving power to a few persons or spread it more widely. While Plato gave the idea of absolute authority to the Guardians, Aristotle developed the idea of citizenship. Political authority was distinctive because it was the authority of the office holder exercised over the members of the political community. For Aristotle, citizenship was concerned with securing stable government under the law. It consisted in the capacity to govern and to be governed, as a consequence of self-discipline and education, based upon full ownership of property. He defined citizen as 'one who has a share in the privilege of rule' and excluded certain categories such as slaves, aliens, women from it. In the Republican Rome and in the early imperial Rome, the idea of Roman citizenship also remained as one of privilege. Roman citizens were immune from the more humiliating forms of punishment such as crucifixion. But the idea of citizenship underwent a slow evolution as the nature of empire changed. The influence of jus gentium on the jus civile in the first two centuries narrowed the gulf between citizens and non-citizens. The famous decree of Caracalla in 212 extended citizenship to all subjects of the empire. However, as the proportion

114

of citizens increased, its significance declined. The participation in politics became meaningless and the magistracies ceased to have any independent influence and power. What Caracalla did by extending the citizenship to all was primarily to extend the burden of certain taxes and not to expand their political privileges and rights.⁹

The breakdown of Greek city states and the Roman empire and intellectual ascendancy of Christianity turned philosophers' gaze inwards or towards the next life. Man was considered to be the citizen of the whole world, or of the City of God. Earthly citizenship was not an essential part of good life. The revival of classical argument was done by Machiavelli who asserted that Roman freedom was preserved because of the virtues of its citizens. What citizenship contributed was self-discipline, patriotism, simple piety and a willingness to forgo private gains for the sake of public good.

Reformation, renaissance and industrial revolution in Europe produced a new political and social order, as a result of which the concept of citizenship also underwent a complete transformation. Modern citizenship has a history which parallels the growth of western capitalism, industrialization, creation of propertyless working class, the formation of professional middle class and the development of science and technology. It is associated with the extension of rights to the previously excluded groups such as working class. For example, the idea of citizenship in the French Revolution was associated with the rights. The declaration of 'Rights of Man and of the Citizens of France' is an important landmark in this direction. It also associated the idea of citizenship with political liberation. At the theoretical level, French Revolution was a major factor for the rise of modern citizenship because it ushered in an era of social change, political liberation and economic equality. Similarly, the fear of social revolutions in Europe led the English capitalist class to legalise the trade unions, extend the suffrage to working class and introduce social reforms.

Citizenship was also promoted through warfare. To wage a war, the state requires the commitment of population and this could be brought through extension of citizenship rights. Also warfare promotes social change through mass mobilization. People come to realize that if the danger to the country is to be shared, then the resources should also be shared. The war promotes full employment

115

and tight labour market and thus labour struggles are likely to put pressure on employers and government for expansion of citizenship rights. Examples of such expansion of democratic citizenship are Austria, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan, Sweden etc. Apart from war, according to Bryan Turner, migration and egalitarian ideologies of twentieth century have also been sufficiently responsible for the growth of modern democratic citizenship. For example, modern citizenship in the American continent has to be understood in terms of the migrant nature of those societies which created a pluralistic culture and supported the struggle for citizenship rights. Moreover, the ideologies of socialism, communism, welfare state helped in the struggle for political, industrial and social rights. Of late, new social movements such as feminism and sabiteranism have been struggling to extend full citizenship rights to those who are still excluded from them.

According to Heater, apart from the political needs of participation and loyalty, three major factors have been responsible for the rise of citizenship. The first was philosophical. Theories of citizenship contain assumptions and beliefs about the nature of man: that man is a political animal and that the exercise of power is legitimate only if based on the consent and sanctioned by the people. Citizenship evolved as a means of institutionalizing this basic belief. The second factor was the military needs. Every state required for its protection some kind of military service from its members and citizens were those who bore arms in defence of their city. Both the Greek and Roman citizens had this responsibility. Even during the medieval period, conferment of citizenship originated in its recruitment into the defence system. Machiavellian concept of civic virtue also depended upon an armed citizenry. The modern nation-state also universally requires, when necessary, the duty of military service of some kind from its citizens. The third factor was Economic. Theorists from Aristotle onwards were worried whether citizenship should be confined to the propertied class or should be extended to everybody. Initially, only the propertied class was given this status. Similarly, the modern state which was born in internecine war required money to pursue these conflicts and money was available only with the capitalist class. So 'out of this alliance of the state with capital, dictated by necessity, arose the national citizen class, the bourgeoisie in the modern sense of

116

the word'. It was only when these three factors—philosophical, military, and economic coincided that the idea of modern citizenship evolved.¹⁰

THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP

As stated above, the concept of citizenship has been invented and defined time and again depending upon the changing socio-economic and political realities. Some of the most influential theories of citizenship in its long history of development are the following.

GREEK THEORIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Different types of political communities give rise to different forms of citizenship. The idea and practice of citizenship was first thoroughly explored by Greek philosophers, for whom participation in public life was crucial to the full and proper development of human personality. The concept was developed by Aristotle in his book Politics. He held the view that man is a political animal, that he could reach the full potential of his life and personality only by participation in the affairs of the polis. Hence the question was who could participate and who could not. For Aristotle, citizen is a man 'who enjoys the right' of sharing in deliberative or judicial office'.¹¹ Citizens are 'all who share in the civic life of ruling and being ruled in turn',¹² those who 'must possess the knowledge and the capacity requisite for ruling as well as for being ruled, and the excellence of a citizen may be defined as consisting in 'a knowledge of rule over freemen from both points of view'.¹³ This, according to Aristotle, calls for special abilities of character and intellect not found in all people. Some human beings he classifies as 'slaves by nature'. Others he considers by reason of their occupation, incapable of leading a life of virtue. Hence the conclusion was that 'one need not class all as citizens'. Citizens form an

exclusive group. In brief citizenship contained three elements: i) A citizen is a person who performs certain functions, ii) one such function is to participate actively in the exercise of authority, iii) the number of persons competent to share in this is limited. Citizenship was a bond forged by the intimacy of participation of these limited number of men in public affairs. The bond was a relationship which was guarded with some jealousy by those privileged to enjoy it. It was neither a right to

117

be claimed nor a status to be conferred on anybody outside the established ranks of the class. Indeed, Greek citizenship depended less on rights which could be claimed and more on responsibilities which had to be shouldered with pride. It was a privilege and a status which was inherited. Resident foreigners, women, slaves and the peasantry of the rural environment of the city were all excluded. Only citizens were allowed to own freehold property, and they were expected to fulfill the functions of politicians, administrators, judges, jurors and soldiers. For Aristotle, citizenship was the privileged status of the ruling group of the city-state and was confined to the effective participants in the deliberation and exercise of power.

However, another school of thought in the Greek period known as Stoicism had a different view of citizenship. This school was of the view that man and God are rational beings. Since all men are sons of God and because of the common attribute of reason, all men—of whatever race or social status, slave or free—are equal. For them, the only qualification necessary for citizenship was wisdom, and all men the world over and without distinction are capable of attaining this status by developing their rational faculties. Hence the concept of citizenship was open to universal application. A good citizen was that who obeyed the law, 'the law of nature', which was 'a code consisting of fundamental principles of justice emanating from divine reason and discernible by man through the exercise of that same faculty'.¹⁴ If the man-made laws clash with the laws of nature, the latter must take precedence over the former. These two elements of Stoic citizenship—the concept of relationship of God and man, and the combination of law and nature had profound influence on the Roman and Christian ideas of citizenship, though at practical level, their concept remained hollow.

ROMAN CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP

Whereas the Greek concept of citizenship was exclusive and limited, it was left to the Roman philosophers and emperors to develop a form of citizenship which was both pragmatic and extensible in application. The legally-minded and administratively adept Romans developed a form of citizenship which was more complex, flexible and legalistic. The basic difference from the Greeks was that it was extended to the plebeians—the underprivileged aliens domiciled in Rome, traders and merchants. However, in

118

practice, the discriminations persisted. Consequently, as a result of plebian protests, the Twelve Tables were produced which remained the basis of Roman civil law for centuries. According to the Tables, citizenship entailed six privileges: i) service in the army, ii) voting in the assembly,

iii) eligibility to public office, iv) legal right of action and appeal, iv) intermarriage and vi) trade with other Roman citizens.¹⁵ Citizenship opened up the possibilities of careers for which a non-citizen could be ineligible. In the fourth century, the Romans introduced three historically very significant adaptations to the basic concept of citizenship. Rome offered total incorporation of the defeated territories by conferring full Roman citizenship on its free male inhabitants. The concept of dual citizenship was also introduced. A man could become a citizen of his city as well as that of Rome. Moreover, Roman citizenship provided equality before law. Thus through this changed concept of citizenship, Romans annexed the loyalty as well as the territory of their defeated enemies and by making equality before law as the sole criterion, they eliminated race, religion or riches as the determinants of citizenship.

However, gradually the republican institutions began to crumble beneath the weight of mighty empire and important differences from the constitutional theory of citizenship began to emerge. By first century B.C., class status started to become more important than the rank of citizen. Landowners and the military class were treated with more respect than poor. Emperor Caracalla in 212 extended Roman citizenship to all men within the confines of empire except the slaves. However, since in practice class had already replaced citizenship as a realistic badge of status, Caracalla's decree finally debased the coinage of citizenship to virtual worthlessness. As the sense of honour declined, so did the sense of civic responsibility. The code of public duty decayed and the high standards of citizenship withered away.

RENAISSANCE AND CITIZENSHIP

Following the collapse of Roman empire, the Graeco-Roman tradition of citizenship based upon tradition, law, education and requiring a concentration of loyalty towards the state, was temporarily almost lost as a political theory. This was restored only in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries after the rediscovery of Aristotle's political theory and Roman law and history. Notable names in this context were Machiavelli and Bodin. Machiavelli argued that the

119

best form of government, though rare, is republican in which the people, endowed with a generous measure of virtues, guide the fortunes of the state. By virtue he meant two things—i) manly and martial qualities necessary to defend the state against internal and external disorder, and ii) the essential qualities of public mindedness, probity and patriotism; the citizen must guard the state against its seizure by a tyrant. Similarly, the French philosopher Bodin in his book Six Books of the Commonwealth devoted two chapters on citizenship. He rejected definitions which emphasized eligibility for public office or enjoyment of rights and privileges. What 'makes a man a citizen', he declared, 'was the mutual obligation between subject and sovereign by which, in return for the faith and obedience rendered to him, the sovereign must do justice and give counsel, assistance, encouragement and protection to the subject'. Legally, citizenship could be acquired by birth, adoption or enfranchisement but he rejected any equalizing function of the status, arguing that there never has been a state in which all citizens have been equal in rights and privileges. What was modern in Bodin's theory of citizenship was that he subjected the whole body of citizens to a single sovereign power, in spite of diversity of laws, language, customs, religion or race.¹⁶

LIBERAL THEORY OF CITIZENSHIP

The foundations of modern citizenship were laid in the 17th century due to a number of new factors such as the emerging doctrine of state sovereignty, the increasingly felt need to define allegiance and rights, and the issue of the right to depose a monarch. The supporters of monarchical authority, most notably Hobbes, did not advance the concept of citizenship very far. In *Leviathan*, he argued that until the citizens consciously withdraw their support from the monarch, he must be deemed to act with their authority. Hence in normal circumstances, citizenship means the passive function of obedience. However, another philosopher John Locke placed much greater emphasis on the need for popular consent for the legitimation of government. By emphasizing the rights of citizens, he revolutionized political thinking. He maintained that if the state exists to protect the lives and liberties of citizens, the needs and wishes of the citizens must clearly be given high priority as an absolute right. But the question was: who were the people? Here even Locke was not a democrat; he held that effective political

120

power should be in the hands of property owning oligarchy.

It was the rise of nationalism and consolidation of nation states, spread of industrialization and capitalist economy, awakening of political consciousness among the urban working class, socialist doctrines and movements during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which helped in crystallizing the liberal theory of citizenship. The theory was advanced by utilitarians, liberal idealist and social democrats, each contributing in its own special way.

The utilitarians like Bentham and Mill held that the essence of citizenship lies in individual liberty, participation and just apportionment of property. Making the ‘greatest happiness of the greatest number’ as the basic principle of citizenship also, Bentham and James Mill believed that this could be achieved politically by a democratic franchise. They held that citizens in the mass would vote for the representatives who would pursue policies beneficial to the whole community. But can the masses be trusted to act responsibly? Would the majority not misuse the freedom to the disadvantage of the minority. This was the question before J.S. Mill who struggled to reconcile the growing idea of democratic citizenship and individual liberty. He believed that since people are generally motivated by their self-interest and do not have any-developed sense of civic responsibility, mass democracy could lower the quality of life and become a threat to liberty. While it is true that people can become responsible citizens only through political participation and with a right to vote, but simultaneously it could lead to the domination of the wise and educated minority by the rude mass of people. Hence he laid a number of restrictions on the franchise with a view to enhancing the influence of superior middle class citizens and to keep the liberty intact. Mill also shared with the socialist belief that a more just distribution of the ownership of property and workers participation in the factory were essential for citizenship. This was necessary for two reasons: i) those who are industrious and hard working should not only get economic benefits but also political rights, ii) if citizenship is a pact of participation, then this sense of participation should also be reflected in the industry.

For the idealist liberals like T.H. Green, citizenship was the keystone and they emphasized on the creative form of citizenship

121

which lay dormant in the potential of the state and the consciousness of the individual. The essence of citizenship according to Green lies in 'promoting the good life for all irrespective of social class; to foster the moral nature of man and to provide a basic minimum of social welfare. The purpose of the state towards the citizens was to 'promote' and 'provide' an environment for good life. Three particular features of this concept of citizenship are worth mentioning: i) citizenship means positive freedom i.e. the positive capacity of the individual to develop his personality in the social context, ii) abolition of poverty by the state. No one could be a worthy citizen if his creative energies are devoted to subsistence. iii) the state must ensure a minimum level of welfare for all citizens but at the same time not intervene so forcefully as to weaken the capitalist and property system nor to lessen the individual's self-reliant pursuit of his freedom.¹⁷

Thus liberalism expanded the area of citizenship and embraced in real terms an increasingly large proportion of population. Also it deepened the level of rights and responsibility. At practical level, a great majority of citizens gave their loyalty to the state, helped in the development of capitalist economy and even fought and died for their country. For this, mere protection of law or a limited right to vote were not sufficient. It was increasingly felt that the state owed to its citizens measure of protection against poverty, ill health, illiteracy, unemployment etc.

During twentieth century, liberalism equated citizenship with an egalitarian state. The political participation, which was restricted to the property owning males during nineteenth century, was extended to all, including women. Universal adult franchise has become a norm in all democratic countries. The economic and social rights were also extended to increasing number of population. The social concept of citizenship was accepted by a number of states such as England, America, Scandanavian countries among others, although the process has been extremely hesistant.

If political participation is the test of citizenship, then spread of franchise opened the possibility of demands which the current institutions could not satisfy. Citizenship is distorted by the presence of gross economic and social inequalities. A large number of people in the democratic states are reduced to second class and third

122

class citizens. There is nothing new in this because they have always been like this. What is new is that democracy has given a consciousness to even the poor, ill-paid and unemployed that they do not enjoy their citizenship rights. The problem is universal in all countries whether rich or poor. This has led to a contradiction between political and economic-social citizenship. We shall study more about it in Marshal's theory of citizenship. But first let us see what Marxism to say on citizenship.

MARXISM AND CITIZENSHIP

The expansion of citizenship in the modern state has been both an achievement as well as a limitation. While it declared that all persons as citizens are equal before law, yet the existence of economically unequal classes meant that the practical ability to exercise the rights was not available to all those who possessed them. In other words, the victims of the class system were unable to participate in the community of citizenship in which they had legal membership. This criticism of modern democratic citizenship has been the hallmark, of Marxist views on citizenship. Marxism has been suspicious of citizenship and considered it as being contrary to class interest of the proletariat. Since for Marxism, state is an instrument of the dominant class and is likely to wither away in the communist society, it saw citizenship as a subjective and temporary condition. Reacting to the modern democratic citizenship, which Marx called as 'bourgeois citizenship', he wrote that the state in its own way abolishes distinctions based on birth, rank, education and occupation when it declares birth, rank, education and occupation to be non-political distinctions, when it proclaims that every member of the people is an equal participant in popular sovereignty regardless of these distinctions. Nevertheless, the state allows private property, education and occupation and protects the unequal conditions generated by them. Far from abolishing these factual distinctions, the state presupposes them in order to exist. Though Marx did not reject the achievements of modern liberal democratic citizenship and believed that the extension of rights has been worthwhile and a 'big step forward' within the 'prevailing scheme of things', yet his point was that mere political emancipation in citizenship is inadequate. Instead he advocated a general human emancipation in which people were freed from the determining power of private property and its associated institutions. Thus the

123

limitations of citizenship which arise because of the class division of society could be overcome only through a social revolution in which the class basis of inequalities in social conditions will be overthrown. With, the establishment of a classless and stateless society, there will be no need for the status of citizen since the individual will have no political institutions with which to relate, from which to claim rights, and to which to owe responsibility.

However, the theory and practice of citizenship as evolved in the communist states in the twentieth century was quite different. Working on the Marxist line of thinking, Lenin in 1924 constitution banished both 'state' and 'citizen', and the Soviet people were identified as 'proletariats', 'peasants' and 'soldiers'. But the Stalin constitution in 1936 felt the need to restore both the state and the citizen. The constitution provided a number of rights to its citizens including the right to vote, freedom of conscience, speech, assembly and inviolability of person and his home. The list also included a number of duties such as 'observing the law, maintaining the labour discipline, honestly performing public duties, respecting the rules of the socialist community, safeguarding and strengthening, socialist property and defending the socialist fatherland. Above all, the state had the right to 'reform the traitors and counter-reactionaries'. A novel feature of the communist countries has been that thousands were completely stripped of their right to citizenship such as kulaks in Russia and landlords in China. They were not only disenfranchised but also exterminated. The idea of citizenship in such states placed greater emphasis on the need for a positive commitment by the individual than in the liberal democratic

countries. The citizen was expected to support the state as embodied in the party or the fatherland. In fact, the absorption of Marxist doctrine has often been less in evidence than adherence to collectivist mentality, productive labour, patriotic loyalty and civic duty.¹⁸

MARSHALL'S THEORY OF CITIZENSHIP

T.H. Marshall in his book *Citizenship and Social Class* has explained the nature of citizenship in the context of welfare state in Europe. It provides an account of the emergence of citizenship in the modern nation-state in terms of historical development of capitalist society. But contrary to Marxist conclusion, Marshall argues that as capitalism evolved into a social system and as the

124

class structure developed, the concept of citizenship also underwent transformation. From being a system of rights which supported the market system and the propertied class, it changed to a system of rights which were opposed to market and a particular class i.e. rights of the non-propertied class. Through their antagonistic relationship, citizenship and class inequality mutually contributed to change each other. The development of citizenship rights helped in the necessary integration of the working class into the capitalist society and the decline of class conflict.

Marshall starts from the fact that citizenship is a status attached to full membership of a community and that those who possess this status are equal in respect of rights and duties associated with it. However, since there is no universal principle which determines necessary rights and duties of citizenship in general, different societies attach different rights and duties to the status of citizen. Talking in the context of England, he wrote that the development of the institutions of modern citizenship coincided with the rise of capitalism. As a doctrine, citizenship was the quest of the bourgeois class for greater representation in society in opposition to aristocratic privileges. Hence it undermined the customary privileges of feudal class and consolidated incipient capitalist class relations. Hence citizenship entailed legal and civil equality. The civil element of citizenship essentially laid in the rights necessary for individual freedom and the institutions most directly associated with it were the rule of law and a system of courts. However, while it undermined one set of class system (i.e. feudal), it promoted and secured a second because citizenship rights were civil rights and civil rights were those which promoted competitive market economy based upon private property. During nineteenth century, a number of political rights including the right to franchise were granted to the urban working class through the institution of bourgeois democracy to achieve some regulation of the capitalist economy. However, the full danger to the capitalist class could be avoided because the newly enfranchised working class was too inexperienced to wield political power effectively. But the working class was able to create trade unionism and through collective bargaining was able to wrest a number of concessions from the capitalist class to raise their economic and social status. Thus the collective exercise of rights by members of the working class in creating and using

125

trade unionism established 'the claim that they, as citizens, were entitled to certain social rights'

The addition of social rights in the twentieth century made the situation more complex as well as interesting. It brought 'citizenship and capitalist class' at war, because citizenship is based on the principle of equality, capitalism is based on inequality. Social citizenship attempted to reform capitalism through legislation. The gradual development of universal provisions for basic education, health and social security changed the nature of cash nexus between capital and labour. Legislation on minimum wages, hours of work, employment of children, working conditions, occupational safety and compensation of occupational accidents made the employees less vulnerable to the capitalist class. Thus the conflict between the two seemed inevitable. But the problem, according to Marshall, is more complex. Between the rival demands of capitalist class for profit and the working class for welfare, the state through positive intervention and by reformulating its taxation and expenditure policies has been able to resolve the conflict between the two. Though the creation of social citizenship has not removed the class inequalities, neither has it been able to fundamentally transform the economic basis of capitalism in terms of private appropriation of wealth—rather it has given rise to new forms of inequalities, nevertheless, it has been able to reduce certain social inequalities and especially those associated with the operation of the market. Thus citizenship has 'imposed modifications on the class'. But on the whole, it has created a 'hyphenated system' because it combines a progressive expansion of egalitarian citizenship rights with the continuity of de facto inequalities in terms of class, status and power.¹⁹

CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY ANTHONY GIDDENS

Anthony Giddens gives some other reasons for the development of the idea of citizenship. According to him, citizenship and democracy are both associated with the expansion of state sovereignty. The development of state's sovereignty meant increasing administrative power to supervise the subject population and to collect and store information about them. Since this could not be done through force, cooperation from other sections of the society became necessary. Hence citizenship was the result of the greater

126

reciprocity between the rulers and the ruled. Giddens calls this as 'two way expansion of power' or 'dialectics of control'. Citizenship was bound up with the new administrative ordering of political power and the politicization of social relations and day-to-day activities which follow in its wake.²⁰

The pursuit of equal membership in the new political set up coloured the concept of citizenship. The struggle for citizenship took many forms but the most important has been class conflict. First, it was the conflict of the bourgeoisie against the feudal privileges, followed by the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie. The struggle between the bourgeoisie and feudalism led to the separation of the state from the economy and the establishment of civil and political rights by the state. Also democracy was adopted as a means to protect the freedom and equality of the citizens. Later, the institutional changes led to the success of the working class to gain economic rights. These struggles produced the welfare state—the modern interventionist states. According to Giddens, the social and economic rights cannot be regarded as a mere extension of

civil and political rights, but are a part of an attempt to improve the worse consequences of the worker citizen's lack of control over his working conditions and place.

Thus in Giddens' assessment, class conflict has been the medium of extension of citizenship rights and the basis of the creation of an insulated economy, democracy and welfare state. The state sovereignty was a critical factor in the struggle for rights and to remould citizenship. These were major historical changes. But what is important is that there is nothing inherent about them; with the change in political and economic circumstances, they can be eroded. These rights still remain fragile achievements.

CITIZENSHIP AND RIGHTS

The concept of citizenship involves the concept of rights. Citizenship is both a status and a set of rights. As American Chief Justice Earl Warren declared. 'Citizenship is man's basic right for it is nothing less than the right to have rights'²¹ A citizen is someone who possesses rights which are denied to non-citizens and to resident aliens and foreigners. Similarly, according to Rawls, 'The position of equal citizenship is defined by the rights and liberties required by the principle of equal liberty and the principle

127

of fair equality of opportunity. When the two principles are satisfied, all are equal citizens'²². However, all rights are not citizenship rights. Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a national community and citizenship rights are those which derive from and facilitate participation in this 'common possession'. They are rights of a person in the community of a nation-state which are ultimately secured by the state. These rights in a way impose certain limitations upon the state's sovereign authority, and entail certain duties from other persons. According to Marshall, the growth of citizenship has been 'stimulated by both the struggle to win (those) rights and by their enjoyment when won'. Examining the concept of citizenship in the context of social classes, Marshall pointed out that its unique element can be defined in terms of specific set of rights and the social institutions through which these rights are exercised. Tracing the development of the institutions of modern citizenship, Marshall writes that while capitalism created inequalities, citizenship created a status through which members shared equal rights and duties. The three elements of citizenship rights identified by Marshall are: Civil, political, and social. The civil element of citizenship is composed of rights necessary for individual freedom and institutions most directly associated with it are the rule of law and a system of courts. They include right to property, contract, freedom of speech, religious practice, assembly and association. Moreover, they can be used to create groups, associations, corporations and movements of every kind. They are a kind of power against the state. The political aspect consists of a set of political rights such as right to take part in the elections and right to serve in bodies endowed with political authority. Such rights are associated with the parliamentary institutions. The social component of rights subsumes the right to share the social heritage. Citizenship in the twentieth century has been associated more with the development of the idea of social rights. After the second world war, the belief that the state has a duty to ensure social justice and an adequate level of welfare for all its citizens has rapidly gained ground. The guiding principle of the policies commonly implemented has been that the state should raise

funds through taxing the rich and these funds should be used for educational and health services and protecting the citizens from illness, unemployment and old age etc. If by citizenship we mean the recognition of reciprocal rights and responsibilities,

128

then the state has an obligation to provide basic welfare to its citizens. The rich have an obligation to contribute funds for social welfare and the beneficiaries of the welfare state have an obligation not to abuse these rights and services. In this sense, the provisions for welfare are unrelated to the specific status of citizenship. Heater has called this aspect of citizenship as 'social citizenship'. This is a belief that since all citizens are assumed to be fundamentally equal in status and dignity, none should be so depressed in economic and social conditions as to make a mockery of this assumption. Therefore, in return for the loyalty and virtuous civic conduct displayed by the citizens, the state has an obligation to smooth out any gross inequalities by a guarantee of basic standard of living in terms of income, shelter, health and education. Essential minimum standard in these areas of life should be enjoyed as a right of citizenship, irrespective of wealth, bargaining power, sex, age or race. Further, no stigma should be attached to the communal source of provisions',²³

Thus the modern idea of citizenship includes not only civil and political dimensions but also a social component. However, it would be imprudent to assume that the different component of rights of modern citizenship are equally guaranteed by the state. Not only are the civil and social rights founded on different principles and basis, there may exist some tension with each other. The social rights are always under a threat to be eliminated by the civil rights.

In recent years, the debate over citizenship rights has broadened to include recognition to a variety of groups such as groups struggling for the rights of women and ethnic minorities, rights of children, the poor of the third world, and even rights of animals and plants. Some writers have interpreted these new social movements as shifting and widening the definition of social and political membership to encompass previously excluded and oppressed social groups. They look to an expanded set of rights to match a broader and cosmopolitan concept of citizenship. In this way rights come to define our identity as citizens of a global community. However, inspite of popularity, the belief is unfounded because the hope that they can be included in a reformed and fuller concept of citizenship rights is practically not feasible.

129

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

According to Professor Janowitz, effective citizenship rests on a rigorous and viable system of civic rights and obligations. In this context citizenship education becomes very important. The training for citizenship can be traced from Plato and Aristotle onwards. The basic objective of teaching of citizenship in any state is to convey to the learner the body of knowledge, set of values, attitudes and skills which are considered necessary for the sustenance and well-being of the nation. Citizenship education seeks to gain people's support for the nation's civic culture through a variety of educational processes. The Greeks expected from its citizens to fulfill the

functions of politicians, administrators, judges, jurors and soldiers on the one hand and obedience to the laws, submission to the government and a readiness to defend the state by recourse to arms on the other. During the period of Republican Rome, education became largely a family function, and the task of inculcating the characteristic Roman civic qualities into the boys fell on the fathers. The qualities were many: firmness, courage, religious reverence, self-restraint, dignity, prudence and justice. The boys were also expected to learn about the exploits of past heroes, singing suitably patriotic songs and learning by recitation the famous Twelve Tables. With the rise of modern-nation state, citizenship education was meant to foster a personal and perpetual relationship of allegiance between king and his subjects. During the eighteenth century Europe and American, it was concerned with the creation of national identity by fostering commitment to slowly evolving democratic values, national loyalty and patriotism. During nineteenth century, which was the century of nationalism, liberal democracy as well as socialism, state intervened to ensure the transmission of political values through the school system. To this end, the governments made widespread use of flags, patriotic songs and celebration of national anniversaries. The state came increasingly to take interest in the control of schools and a number of theorists argued and justified the 'nationalization of education'. The liberal writers like Bentham and Mill felt the general need for educational provisions. J.S. Mill was convinced that the advance of democracy depended crucially on the general spread of schooling. T.H. Green, who believed in the egalitarian form of citizenship, declared that the task of education should be to undermine

130

the class barriers and create means of bonding its citizens more tightly to the community. During twentieth century, citizenship education is more meaningfully viewed as democratic political education. Primarily political in nature, it addresses public affairs and is not directly concerned with personal or social activities. Its goal is to sustain and refine a democratic political community-a group of people who share both a commitment to certain principles such as freedom, equality, due process of law, justice, diversity, as well as involvement in governing process based on mutual consent. Here 'we the people' are the ultimate source of legitimate power and authority. The subject matter of citizenship education in these countries consists of a complex inter-relationship between individual and the democratic political community, responsible participation in public affairs, formal and informal political process including critical scrutiny of public officials, institutions and political operations. In short, citizenship knowledge in these countries consists of:

- i. knowledge of and respect for public law and policy at any level. This does not mean blind and unquestioning obedience to any set of rules; it is individual's duty, however, to abide by laws and policies which are formulated and applied for security and well-being of the society;
- ii. development of the skills and activities which go into making or changing public law and policy. The citizen must accept responsibility for effective participation in shaping or altering the rules which are required by the society at any time;
- iii. acquisition of knowledge necessary for effective participation. Knowledge about public issues and problems is vital for the participatory role of citizens; voting or seeking to influence government officials on the basis of pure emotions in the absence of

enlightenment about public policies is not meeting the responsibilities of effective citizenship;

- iv. the knowledge and behaviour which recognize and respect equal rights and opportunities for all in a diverse and pluralistic society. It also includes knowledge and behaviour which advance the individual self-reliance and responsibility in economic and social life.

131

CRITICAL EVALUATION

According to Heater, citizenship as a useful political concept has been so much overloaded in the twentieth century that there is a danger of its being disintegrated.²⁴ The nature and utility of citizenship in the Greek city-state was totally different from the ways in which the concept has been realized in the modern nation-state. The concept which evolved to provide a sense of identity and community is on the verge of becoming a source of communal dissension. There are problems of disagreement over the interpretation and actualization of the idea of citizenship. More importantly, the granting of citizenship to virtually all inhabitants of the globe has given rise to a number of contradictory problems, some of which can be identified. Firstly, if citizenship means political participation, then there has been a tendency towards a low level of participation by the people in the political process. And yet if all citizens are equal, then they must have equal opportunity and motivation for participatory activity. Secondly, citizenship is distorted by the process of gross inequalities in economic and social spheres. In fact the concept of social citizenship is still an area for greater pessimism. Social equality has been achieved only in a fraction of countries. At global level, social citizenship is far from being a reality both in theory and practice. Thirdly, in underdeveloped countries where vast gaps exist between rich and poor, the benefits of citizenship are yet to reach to the low and marginal groups. These societies still cling to local, communal, religious or tribal loyalties and the sense of national cohesion is conspicuous by its absence. Fourthly, in the multicultural societies, serious tensions are emerging with regard to minority rights. And lastly the women liberation movements have put a serious question mark on the concept of citizenship because citizenship had deliberately excluded women not only from the political process but also from a number of social and economic rights.²⁵ Let us discuss a few of these criticisms in detail.

LIBERTARIAN critique of citizenship

The modern western democratic tradition associates citizenship with the liberal version of individual rights. By 1980s, more citizens were enjoying freedoms of thought, expression, assembly and association. The state, in the name of welfare measures, intervenes positively in the life of the individual. The demands and opportunities

132

for the citizen to participate have never been greater. But of late, the reaction against this intervention has been equally powerful. There is a tendency to withdraw from civil concerns in order to pursue a private, family life and a revulsion to the need to participate democratically in

order to preserve political freedom. The proponents of elite theory argue that a view of politics which gives central role to citizenship in the sense of participation is an illusion. Political power is the handiwork of elites and at the very best, the involvement of citizens is limited in choosing between the competing elites on political agenda drawn up by the elites and on the goals determined by the elites. On the other hand, libertarian writers like Hayek and Nozic leave little room for rich citizenship because they see government as empire rather than being an institutional structure serving certain common good. The duty of the citizen, they claim, is to observe certain rules of this game such as to pursue one's own interest and observe the rights of others. They define citizenship in terms of forbearance, i.e. as not interfering in the rights of others rather than actually participating in the realization of certain communal values through political activity and political institutions. The duty of the citizen is not to attempt for certain common good but to maintain the legal framework which secures space for them to realize their private non-civic interests. In short, they have brought the conflict between political-social citizenship and socio-economic citizenship to the forefront once again.

FEMINIST critique of citizenship

The women liberation movements have historically been a struggle against the presumption that sexual distinction made the human female not just different but that in legal, political, social, economic and cultural terms, she is inferior to his male counterpart. Feminists have argued that women are on the whole treated as second class citizen. They are considered as a different social class—defined as a class membership of fathers and husbands. Their opinions on public issues are considered to be borrowed from fathers or husbands. They vote less than men and tend to vote the same way as their men in the family.

For much of the historical time, women have been deprived of citizenship rights. As citizens they have been subject to the decisions of male political leaders. Male dominance has been used to exclude

133

women from political and economic decision-making. Women are under-represented in formal political institutions everywhere in the world whether in the legislature, executive, judiciary or bureaucracy. Political activity is primarily considered a masculine activity. Their voting right was achieved in stages even in the liberal democratic countries like England, France, America, Switzerland. In some countries they still do not have voting rights. Again women have no power over their rights and obligations. Public laws for women are made and enforced by men, whether they are property rights or rights to inheritance, obligations to their children, their education, nourishment, safety, employment selection, conditions of work etc. Marriage laws in many countries continue to place women at considerable disadvantage compared to their husbands with regard to property rights and marital status.

Another feminist argument is that by making a distinction between public (participation in the political affairs) and private (mainly domestic) spheres, women are deprived of participating and control over their private existence. It is in this context that the slogan of the women liberation movements in 1970s was 'The personal is political', i.e., the distinction between public and

private is a political and manipulative device to perpetuate male dominance and to keep women as second class citizens.

How to secure full citizenship for women? On this questions, there is great divergence of opinion within the feminist movement. The primary objective of the liberal feminists has been to bring women into full rights of democratic citizenship. The suffrage rights, more recent reforms such as participation of women on juries, equal pay, anti-discrimination legislation, reform in marriage laws, decriminalization of prostitution are seen as allowing women to become full citizens. The liberal feminists envisage a future where legal, political, social and economic rights will be achieved and women will be on equal footing with men in all spheres. This will be brought about by reason, persuasion and constitutional reforms. The family will remain but men will have equal role in domestic duties and women's career will not be hampered by rearing of children. This is what they call 'civic feminism'. Socialist feminists want to achieve this objective through expansion of free birth control, abortion, health care for women, child care centres and state recognition of domestic labour. The radical feminists go

134

a step forward and accord less significance to monogamy in order to facilitate the entrance of women into the public world with men.²⁶

SUBALTERN critique of citizenship

The existence of politically, economically, socially and culturally inferior classes and groups in the underdeveloped countries poses a serious challenge to citizenship. By subaltern groups, we mean people of 'inferior rank'. The word is used for the general attribution of subordination particularly in the underdeveloped countries of South Asian ex-colonial societies irrespective of class, caste, age, gender, office or any other way. This subordination can be understood in contrast to 'domination' by certain privileged groups in each and every sphere of life. Historically, property has been associated as an essential precondition of citizenship. The poor and the lower classes, because of their inability to meet this criterion, could not be considered as full citizens. Whatever relief to the poor was given was more an act of charity. Although the social citizenship rights in the modern liberal welfare states have changed the position of non-propertied classes and certain rights and services are made available to them irrespective of wealth, yet in the underdeveloped countries, citizenship still means domination of a large portion of population by a few elites. Though millions are classified as citizens in these states, only a small portion of that number can be truly said to enjoy it as a status of social dignity and source of effective rights. To the peasants and tribals scattered in villages and jungles, or the petty workers and lumpen masses huddled around megalopolitan slums and juggi jhopris, citizenship rights are meaningless. Deprivation experienced by these group is not only physical; it involves breaking down various ties of citizenship— whether it is acquisition of skills, education, access to justice or enjoyment of rights. Political consciousness, where it exists at all, is resigned acceptance of manipulation by local leaders or of sheer and utter impotence. In many states, social equality is denied as a valid test of citizenship. In short, for such people, the matter of civil, political and social citizenship still remains an act of domination rather than egalitarianism.

Effective citizenship in these state in future will depend on how far these groups are integrated into the society.

135

CONCLUSION

The modern citizenship is a legacy of 2500 years of political thinking, popular pressures and educational preparations. The Greek city-states of Plato and Aristotle, Imperial Rome, renaissance, industrialization, French revolution, process of decolonization provided the most power emerging forces for the development and consolidation of the citizenship idea. At the turn of the century, we are perhaps in another period of comparable political creativity. While citizenship has been legally extended to a very large extent, a large majority of mankind has to live under regimes which have no idea of citizenship. Again how to remove poverty in societies marred by inequalities of wealth, property, income and ownership; the questions posed by unprecedented over-population and relentless destruction of nature are the problems which pose a great threat to citizenship. Hence the direction in which citizenship will evolve in the coming generations will depend on the extent to which mankind will be able to come to grips with these problems.