

Civil Society, Governance and Justice: A Critique in Global Context

Hem Lal Paudyal

Abstract

The paper attempts to examine civil society, governance, justice in the current globalized context. In doing so, it makes a critical survey of the key works starting from Plato to the theorists in the present. Based on the qualitative and interpretive inquiry, this paper scrutinizes the secondary sources and discusses the interfaces between/among these works. Civil society, as a concept and reality, has traversed a complex trajectory across historical phases, shaping and being shaped by political, social, and cultural forces. This research paper explores the evolution of civil society on a global scale, tracing its origins from ancient philosophical foundations to its multifaceted roles in contemporary society. The study delves into key historical periods and the ideologies that have shaped civil society's development, analyzing how its functions, scope, and impact have evolved over time. By examining the interplay between civil society and various socio-political contexts, this paper offers insights into the dynamic relationship between citizen participation, governance, and societal progress. The paper finally concludes that creating an egalitarian society through civil society organizations is a noble goal, but it is one that has not been fully realized in practice. It is important to be realistic about the challenges involved. It will take a sustained effort from civil society organizations (CSO), governments, and individuals to create a more just and equitable world.

Key Words: Civil Society, Governance, Justice, Trajectory, Egalitarian Society, CSOs, Equitable World

1. Introduction

Civil society is a complex and contested concept, with no single definition that is universally accepted. However, there are, based on John Keane (1998), The World Bank (1994) and Robert Putnam (1993), a number of common elements that are typically associated with civil society. These include: (a) Voluntary association: Civil society organizations are typically formed by individuals who come together voluntarily to pursue a common goal;

(b) Non-profit: Civil society organizations are typically non-profit, meaning that they do not operate for the purpose of making a profit; (c) Autonomy: Civil society organizations are typically autonomous from the state and the market. This means that they are free to operate independently and to express their own views; and (d) Public sphere: Civil society organizations play a role in the public sphere, where they can engage in debate and discussion about important issues of the society.

There are a number of different definitions of civil society that have been proposed by various authors. Here are a few examples: (a) The realm of uncoerced human association and social interaction between individuals and groups, voluntary and spontaneous, entered into for a variety of purposes (John Keane, 1998); (b) The arena of non-governmental public life in which citizens associate voluntarily to advance common interests (The World Bank, 1994); and (c) The set of intermediary institutions that stand between the individual and the state (Robert Putnam, 1993). These definitions highlight the different aspects of civil society, such as its voluntary nature, its autonomy, and its role in the public sphere.

Civil society is, thus, the arena of independent activity and voluntary association. It refers to a variety of not-for-profit, non-governmental organizations that enable the members to engage in cultural, ethical, political, philanthropic, scientific, and religious day-to-day activities. There are seven functions of civil society: monitoring, advocacy, socialization, protection, social cohesion, facilitation, and service delivery. Civil society organizations (CSOs) play a vital role in promoting good governance, human rights, and social justice. They also help to improve the quality of life for people in marginalized communities.

2. Review of Literature

The topic of civil society in the globalized context is a vast and complicated area. In a tiny paper of this magnitude, it is virtually a futile task to venture to review literature comprehensively. For that reason, only key works on civil society have been critically reviewed. Based on the qualitative inquiry, as stated elsewhere, the paper attempts to synthesize various positions (such as Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Robert Putnam and others) and synthesize them by finding common factors in them and show the departure in the existing literature.

In their paper entitled, *Network approaches to global civil society*, Helmut K. Anheier and Hagai Katz (2004) offer a perceptive critique of civil society's role within the framework of global governance. The article presents a comprehensive analysis of the intricacies surrounding civil society's

engagement in shaping global policies and structures, offering a discerning evaluation of its potentials and inherent constraints. Although the work brings valuable contributions to the discourse on civil society's function in global governance, it also introduces certain aspects that warrant further exploration. Anheier and Katz deftly illuminate the intricate interplay between civil society organizations (CSOs) and mechanisms of global governance. They underscore the diverse avenues through which CSOs have exerted influence on policy formulation, championed human rights causes, and addressed pressing issues such as environmental concerns, poverty alleviation, and public health matters on a global scale. This multifaceted perspective challenges conventional top-down approaches to governance and underscores civil society's potential to inject grassroots viewpoints, promoting inclusivity in decision-making processes.

Further, Anheier and Katz's article stands out in its acknowledgment of the manifold facets of civil society. The authors aptly recognize the existence of a spectrum of CSOs, ranging from community-level grassroots entities to transnational non-governmental organizations. This taxonomy enriches the analysis by underscoring the varying levels of influence and efficacy exhibited by these diverse entities. Moreover, the authors' scrutiny of the internal tensions and power dynamics within civil society, as well as its interactions with governmental and corporate stakeholders, lends depth to the exploration. However, the article could be augmented by a more extensive exploration of the positive impacts and instances of success resulting from civil society's participation in global governance. While the authors astutely identify the challenges and limitations faced by CSOs, including fragmentation, accountability deficits, and legitimacy concerns, a more balanced perspective could be achieved by incorporating examples of instances wherein civil society catalysed favourable transformations in global policies. This approach could present a more nuanced view of civil society's potential as an agent of change. Likewise, Benjamin R. Barber (1984) *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong* presents a thought-provoking exploration of the relationship between civil society, democracy, and societal strength. In this critical review, we will assess the strengths, weaknesses, and contributions of Barber's work to the discourse on civil society and democratic governance. Barber's exploration of civil society and its role in strengthening democracy remains highly relevant even decades after its publication. The book's emphasis on the importance of active citizen engagement, community participation, and social cohesion holds significant value in contemporary discussions on democratic governance. Barber adeptly weaves together historical context, theoretical insights, and real-world examples to support his arguments,

offering readers a comprehensive understanding of civil society's implications for democracy. Barber's central focus on civil society as a crucial force in shaping the health of democratic systems is a commendable aspect of the book. By highlighting the role of community organizations, NGOs, and grassroots movements, he underscores the importance of a vibrant civil society in fostering active citizenship and participatory democracy.

Moreover, Barber's *A Place for Us* makes a significant contribution by underscoring the importance of civic engagement in strengthening democratic institutions. Barber's call for active citizenship and the cultivation of a sense of belonging to one's community resonates strongly in the context of contemporary debates on declining political participation. The book provides an alternative perspective to top-down approaches to governance, advocating for the empowerment of citizens and local communities. Barber's ideas challenge the notion that societal progress solely depends on government policies and interventions. Barber's acknowledgment of the potential limitations of civil society is a valuable aspect of the book. By recognizing that civil society is not immune to divisions, inequities, and challenges, he presents a more nuanced view of its role within democratic systems.

Interestingly, John Keane's (1998) *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions* presents a comprehensive exploration of the concept of civil society, its historical roots, and its evolving interpretations in contemporary times. In this review, we will analyse the strengths, weaknesses, and contributions of Keane's work to the discourse on civil society and societal development. Keane's book delves into the historical origins of the concept of civil society, tracing its roots back to ancient Greece and examining its evolution through different historical periods. This historical depth provides readers with a solid foundation for understanding the complex nature of civil society and its significance in different contexts.

Keane's rigorous approach to civil society, further, reflects its multifaceted nature. He highlights that civil society is not a monolithic entity, but a diverse and dynamic arena comprising a wide range of organizations, networks, and movements. This perspective contributes to a more accurate understanding of its complexities. He goes beyond a Eurocentric view of civil society by including perspectives from various parts of the world. Keane acknowledges the different cultural, political, and social contexts in which civil society operates, making the book more inclusive and relevant to a global readership.

While the book explores historical and theoretical aspects of civil society comprehensively, it could benefit from more in-depth analysis of contemporary issues and challenges faced by civil society organizations in the

late 1990s and beyond. Keane's exploration of the historical context of civil society enriches the understanding of its evolution and the diversity of roles it has played throughout history. By tracing the concept's origins, he provides readers with a broader perspective on its significance. He challenges common myths and misconceptions about civil society, such as the notion that it is purely a realm of non-governmental organizations. Keane's deconstruction of these myths encourages readers to adopt a more critical and holistic view of civil society. Keane emphasizes the interconnectedness between civil society and democracy. He highlights how civil society can both support and challenge democratic governance, offering a balanced exploration of their relationship.

Robert Putnam's (2000), in his pioneering work, *Bowling Alone: Civic Disengagement in America*, examines the decline in social capital and civic engagement in the United States. In this review, we will evaluate the strengths, weaknesses, and contributions of Putnam's work to the understanding of social trends and their impact on American society. Putnam's central thesis, that there has been a decline in social connectedness and civic engagement in America, is well-supported by extensive research and data analysis. He effectively uses a wide range of evidence, including historical trends, surveys, and case studies, to build a convincing argument. The book is rich in data, statistics, and graphs that illustrate the decline in various forms of social participation, such as joining clubs, attending community events, and voting. This empirical approach enhances the credibility of Putnam's claims and allows readers to grasp the extent of the problem. Putnam draws from various disciplines, including sociology, political science, and economics, to provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors contributing to the decline in civic engagement. This interdisciplinary approach enriches the book's insights and resonates with a wide range of readers.

Putnam's exploration of the cultural shifts and societal changes that have contributed to the decline in civic engagement offers valuable insights into how modernization, technology, and individualism have reshaped social interactions in American society. He popularized the concept of "social capital," referring to the networks, relationships, and trust that form the foundation of social cohesion. This concept has since become a central topic of academic and public discourse on community development and well-being. *Bowling Alone* sparked public conversations about the importance of community and civic engagement, prompting individuals, policymakers, and organizations to reflect on the state of social connections in their own lives and communities.

Taking Antonio Gramsci's notion of civil society into consideration, Molly Cochran (2002) offers a comprehensive analysis of the concept of global civil society from a Neo-Gramscian perspective. Cochran delves into

the intricate dynamics that shape the functioning of global civil society actors and critically examines its purported limitations. While the book contributes valuable insights into the field of global civil society, it also faces certain limitations that warrant consideration. Cochran begins by offering a clear overview of the concept of global civil society, positioning it as a space for transnational actors to engage in issues beyond the purview of nation-states. She then employs the Neo-Gramscian framework to shed light on the underlying power dynamics within global civil society. This approach is a significant strength of the book, as it adds depth and complexity to the analysis, going beyond mainstream perspectives. Cochran's work is her adept utilization of Antonio Gramsci's theories to critique the notion of global civil society. She effectively emphasizes the role of hegemony and counter-hegemony in shaping the agendas of global civil society actors. This Neo-Gramscian lens allows her to uncover the subtle power imbalances that may undermine the transformative potential of these actors. Cochran also highlights the limitations of global civil society, challenging the romanticized view that it is a panacea for addressing global challenges. She argues that global civil society may be co-opted by dominant actors and may inadvertently reinforce the very structures it seeks to challenge. This critical perspective is essential for avoiding overly optimistic narratives about the transformative power of civil society on a global scale.

Similarly, Jan Aart Scholte (2015), in his *Rethinking Global Civil Society: Towards Cosmopolitan Democracy*, suggests a comprehensive exploration of the concept of global civil society and its potential in advancing cosmopolitan democracy. Scholte's work contributes to the ongoing discourse on the role of civil society in shaping global governance structures. While the book presents a compelling argument for a cosmopolitan democratic order facilitated by global civil society, it also raises certain critical points that warrant consideration. Scholte successfully navigates through the intricacies of defining and conceptualizing global civil society, providing readers with a clear framework to understand its various dimensions and dynamics. The book highlights how global civil society transcends national boundaries, fostering transnational networks and collaborations that address global challenges such as human rights, environmental sustainability, and social justice. Scholte's advocacy for cosmopolitan democracy as a form of governance is a central theme of the book. He argues that global civil society, with its inclusive and participatory nature, has the potential to promote a more democratic and equitable global order. The book critically examines the limitations of state-centric governance models and proposes a cosmopolitan approach that emphasizes the importance of citizen engagement, transnational deliberation, and accountability on a global scale.

Likewise, Peter van Tuijl's (2019) *Global Civil Society: An Answer to War* investigates the concept of global civil society as a potential solution to addressing and preventing conflicts and wars in the contemporary world. Van Tuijl presents a compelling argument for the role of civil society in promoting peace and stability on a global scale. Van Tuijl convincingly argues that civil society organizations, grassroots movements, and citizen initiatives can play a pivotal role in preventing and mitigating conflicts. He draws on various case studies and examples to showcase how civil society has contributed to peacebuilding efforts and how it has the capacity to bridge gaps between communities and governments. He demonstrates how civil society engages with global institutions, such as the United Nations, and how it influences policy decisions and conflict resolution mechanisms. This analysis offers a nuanced understanding of how civil society actors can operate within existing international frameworks to promote peace and prevent violence.

Moreover, van Tuijl's work challenges conventional notions of security by highlighting the importance of addressing root causes of conflicts, including inequality, social injustice, and lack of access to resources. By proposing a comprehensive and holistic approach to security, the book underscores the potential of civil society to address the underlying factors that contribute to the outbreak of conflicts. However, the book's ambitious premise might be met with scepticism from those who question the effectiveness of civil society in preventing large-scale conflicts and wars. While the book showcases successful cases of civil society involvement in peacebuilding, it could benefit from a more critical examination of instances where civil society efforts may have fallen short or faced significant challenges. The previous works have exposed the nuances of the civil society organizations but they have not adequately addressed the issue of praxis. The paper attempts to fill that gap.

3. Methods

Based on the qualitative and interpretive inquiry, the paper scrutinizes the secondary sources on civil society making a critical survey of the key works on the topic. The purpose is to synthesize various positions starting right from Plato, Aristotle, through John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, Robert Putnam and others. As stated earlier, the paper makes a critical inquiry on the existing works on civil society, nature, purpose, evolutions and challenges in the current globalized context. Finally, the paper offers its own interpretation on the topic in question.

4. Analysis and Discussion

The concept of civil society, bridging the individual and the state, has

evolved significantly within varied historical contexts. This paper scrutinizes the historical phases that have steered the trajectory of civil society, exploring its inception, growth, and metamorphosis across diverse socio-political landscapes. The origins of civil society can be retraced to ancient philosophical ideas. Aristotle's conception of a "political community" laid the groundwork for subsequent discussions on communal well-being and civic engagement (Aristotle, n. d. p. 127). Plato's emphasis on civic virtues and Socratic dialectics reinforced the concept of a just society (Plato, n. d. p. 331). These ancient thinkers underscored the importance of discourse, citizenship, and public welfare as foundational aspects of civil society.

The Enlightenment period introduced fresh viewpoints on civil society, with philosophers like John Locke and Thomas Hobbes contributing to the discourse. Locke's social contract theory emphasized individual rights and participatory governance (Locke, 2019, p. 287). Conversely, Hobbes stressed the necessity of a robust state to avert chaos (Hobbes, 2019, p. 64). These notions set the stage for discussions on civil society's role in upholding social order and balancing state authority. The 19th century marked the emergence of new ideologies shaping the interpretation of civil society. Hegel introduced the differentiation between civil society and the state, influencing subsequent thinkers such as Karl Marx. Marx's critique of capitalism and class struggle underscored civil society's role in shaping societal disparities (Marx, 2019, p. 173). Antonio Gramsci's ideas on cultural hegemony and civil society's function in maintaining power structures enriched the discourse (Gramsci, 2019, p. 12).

Hobbes and John Locke both advanced similar ideas regarding English political doctrine. The conflict/war between the political right of parliament and the king that was declared in England inspired Locke to develop the idea of a social contract between a small government and a strong society. According to Locke, mankind did not live in harmony with nature either. Nonetheless, in the absence of an adequate mechanism, it might be kept at a sub-optimal level (Brown 2001, p. 73). Locke clarified the concepts of a few treaties concerning the government's commitments to one another as a result. People bow to the common public power under the first treaty. Enacting and upholding laws are effects of this authority. Hobbes and Locke had described a system in which social contracts could be used to guarantee peaceful cohabitation amongst people. According to their viewpoint, civil society is a group that clarifies civil life, the area in which natural rules govern civic rights and privileges.

Gramsci, who differed considerably from Marx, did not see civil society as a place of intimate and estranged relationships. Gramsci criticizes civic society for serving as a vehicle, namely for the bourgeois-dominated

class. Gramsci criticized the New Left for assigning civil society a crucial role in upholding the democratic desire to influence the state as well as in defending people from the state and the market. Neo-liberal philosophers viewed civil society as a place for conflict to oppose authoritarian and socialist regimes. The phrase “civil society” thus occupies a large space in the political discourse of the new left and neo-liberals.

The 20th century witnessed the ascent of welfare states, where civil society played a role in social welfare programs. However, neoliberal influences blurred the boundaries between civil society, the state, and the market. The 1990s marked a paradigm shift as civil society became an instrument for democratization and development on a global scale (Hulme & Edwards, 1997, p. 273). Former Soviet Union’s political opposition In the 1980s, East European nations were the first to adopt a postmodern understanding of civil society. Welfare payments to persons who are unable to work, Social Security, and federally required unemployment insurance programs are all aspects of the welfare state. The idea of civil society was adopted as a fresh approach to legitimize the third sector for neoliberal ideology’s benefit. This reorganization, not democratization, is what has led to the third sector of a society’s ongoing, systematic development with welfare. According to the Washington Consensus of the 1990s, the World Bank and IMF gave conditioned loans to developing nations with high levels of debt and put pressure on those states to contract and weaken. This in turn prompted concrete adjustments for civil society, which then affected the discussion at a theoretical level. Hulme and Edwards stated that the increased conditionality first led to an even greater emphasis on “civil society” as a panacea displacing the state’s service provision and social care; it was now portrayed as “the magic bullet.” With the rise of the anti-globalization movement and the conversion of many nations to democracy, civil society was less of a cure by the end of the 1990s. Instead, it was expected to defend its history and democratic credentials. As a result, the UN established a high level commission on civil society. Even if in the 1990s, civil society as a third sector was dealt with as a key area of diplomatic act to construct “an alternative social and world order,” this was due to the urgency of the NGOs and the new social revolutions on a worldwide scale. Although there are now noticeable distinctions between the study of the phenomena in richer nations and writing on civil society in underdeveloped countries, post-modern civil society theory has mostly returned to a more neutral idea.

In the 21st century, civil society’s roles have expanded to encompass advocacy, monitoring, service delivery, and policy engagement. It has evolved into a crucial actor promoting democratic values, human rights, and sustainable development. Nonetheless, challenges such as funding, legitimacy,

and the evolving global landscape introduce new complexities (Anheier & Themudo, 2005, p. 19). The global trajectory of civil society mirrors a dynamic interplay of historical contexts, ideologies, and societal demands. From its ancient philosophical foundations to its multifaceted roles in modern times, civil society's evolution reflects its adaptability to changing circumstances. Understanding this evolution offers insights into the enduring challenges and prospects for civil society's enduring impact on governance, social justice, and global progress. As societies continue to evolve, civil society remains a dynamic force that both shapes and is shaped by its environment.

Yet, they did not take up the civil society which was different region from the state. Moreover, they marked the co-existence of the nation and civil society. The well-managed approaches of Hobbes and Locke were hugely influenced by the experiences of that time. Their trails of explaining both human-made and natural laws were on the basis of social contract and as per the government favor which could challenge the divine and human rights theory. The empowered thinkers opined that humans are reasonable who can shape their destiny.

Established agendas, regarding political, economic, cultural or environmental globalization have been challenged by many global civic groups and associations. It has to counter the serious problems until the society is not financially ready for the expected evolution. It is better the fund to be regular timely increasing at least for 30 years to come for the sack of the fulfillment of basic necessities. The young people apply various methods and techniques different and rely on volunteering rather than following the formal authorities and organizations and professional staff. "Companies and banks too big to fail or recessions" have threatened the basic foundation of democracy on a global scale. How citizens might participate in such changes in power relations is a question that civil society has not yet addressed.

The flow of new political structures and facing– the challenges and real issues of inequality, challenging of the global environment, continuing force on liberty like the ebbs and flows, etc. occasionally hinder the civil society and humanity. There are limited means and sources of production for the sake of unexpectedly increasing number of population. A gap of haves and have not has been widening day to day so that the government policies should be considerable and rational. However, a moderate unification of civil society is needed to resolve such kind of problematic issues.

The link between civil society and business are two specific types of issues. Because of this, it is an easy and frequently profitable approach for business interests to present themselves as members of civil society, or what Americans

sometimes refer to as “Astroturfing.” There is the interaction between the state and civil society. It also establishes the conditions for political involvement and makes investments in civil society groups, in addition to establishing and enforcing the fundamental legislative foundation for civil society.

The main tenets of civil society are empowerment, service delivery, dedication, adaptability, involvement in policymaking, and credibility. Empowerment is important from various prospective for successfully leading society. Participation in formal politics and in policy, statutes and law making processes which tends to be an expensive, specialist effective activity. A robust civil society is essential for empowering people to uphold democracy. In the framework of a healthy society, involvement in a robust civil society can also have particular advantages.

Civil society makes donations to organizations in some places for better reasons. There is a divide between members of civil society and representatives who speak on behalf of a particular group of people, specialists who offer original insights, and politicians who are skilled at politics. They are aware of how to empower their future working whims. CSOs and the interests they represent are different. Some of them just don’t mesh well with established government policy. There are other more ways to inform, hear from, or invite citizens to participate in the creation of policy. Others have claimed that engagement is a crucial tactic to foster ownership and guarantee legitimacy. Yet, the legitimacy of CSO influence is also contested. A trustworthy civil society is one that is independent of the government and the market. Via contractual obligations, statutory restrictions, and participatory processes, the government can have an impact on civil society. In order to increase the credibility of policy, civil society is required. Ultimately, there isn’t much evidence to support the idea that civic society is a cure-all.

The job of a CSO is to protect people, assets, infrastructure and technology. Everyone has the right to learn about their fundamental human rights, including the rights to life, liberty, and the protection of property, per the 2015 Nepali Constitution. Locke argues that the primary function of government is to safeguard those fundamental liberties that an individual cannot. The term “civil society” describes the characteristics of organizations operating in a public domain or setting as well as their function in politics and society. Campaigns against rape and other forms of violence against women are just a few of the topics, as are tribal conflicts over land rights, devolution of urban governance, and others. In society, social movements are essential for advancing an agenda Locke (1690) thought that men’s agreement to forgo life in the state of nature in favor of life in a political or civil society was the origin of government. The purpose of social movements is to provide individuals the

chance to come together in large groups to speak out against unfair practices. The exchange of cultural values among many nations is facilitated by cultural globalization. Genuine and active community-based groups are a defining characteristic of social ties within a civil society. Interdependence is neither a theory nor an ideal, but rather our reality, according to Barber (2004).

The more a CSO delivers the government and funders, the more it gets risks of autonomy and commitment of getting knowledge and credibility. CSOs have various capacities in five main areas: accountancy, poor oversight, governance, systems and limited bureaucratic experience. An open society allows the individuals to change role and get benefits from corresponding status. In fact, there are two types of societies: closed and open. The closed society follows the traditional rule and regulations with the habituated code of conducts ethnicity and rituals. But, the open society can follow and permitted to do the modern activities moderating the previous ones or change their role to have more benefits in a short period of time. Civil society has five fundamental political principles: consent of the governed people, rule of law, democracy and representative government. This can be dangerous if the added content is not legal. Everyone enjoys promoting their own institutions and ideas abroad, but they must ensure that their goods are not destructive.

5. Conclusions

As has been discussed in earlier section, the history of civil society can be traced back to ancient Greece and Rome. However, the concept of civil society as we know it today emerged in the 18th century, during the Age of Enlightenment. Enlightenment thinkers believed that civil society was essential for the protection of individual rights and liberties. In the 21st century, civil society is more important than ever. CSOs are working to address a wide range of challenges, including climate change, poverty, and inequality. They are also playing a leading role in promoting democracy and good governance around the world. Here are some of the key roles that civil society plays in the 21st century: (a) Promoting good governance: CSOs can help to hold governments accountable and ensure that they are responsive to the needs of the people. They can also help to build trust between citizens and the state; (b) Protecting human rights: CSOs can work to protect the rights of marginalized groups, such as women, children, and minorities. They can also help to raise awareness of human rights abuses and campaign for change; (c) Promoting social justice: CSOs can work to address issues of inequality and poverty. They can also help to build a more just and equitable society for all; (d) Improving the quality of life: CSOs can provide essential services to people in need, such as education, healthcare, and shelter. They can also help to promote economic development

and job creation; and, (e) Building peace and democracy: CSOs can play a key role in building peace and democracy in countries that have been affected by conflict. They can also help to promote tolerance and understanding between different groups.

In the 21st century, the ideology and principles of civil society must move beyond the nation or state. Everyone should opine as one another's neighbor or the kingship. The attitude of global economy has made us work together to develop appropriately for the development of political and social systems. Equality, empowerment and renewal of civil society accumulate the trust that allows civil society to flourish by prioritizing on social values and norms. Purpose of CSOs is to work for public interest. Similarly, social movements create a sense of self identity and citizenship. CSOs give voice to the disorganized, voiceless and dominated people of society. As per Locke, life, liberty and property are among the fundamental natural rights. Purpose of CSOs is to work for the mass of people. As it is not a purely commercial profit-making entity as it plays a critical role against the corruption, criminalization and discrimination. Civil society consists as a host of institutions that look after the activities of the state. Civil society plays a mild role to resolve the problematic issues with the combination of concerning authorities. Thus, CSOs assist in making free, democratic and secular citizens with the basic principles of secularism, democracy, participation, sovereignty, justice, creativity and transparency.

However, creating an egalitarian society through civil society organizations is a noble goal, but it is one that has not been fully realized in practice. There are a number of challenges that civil society organizations face in this pursuit, including the power of wealthy and privileged interests, the lack of resources, and the lack of political will. In addition, there are also challenges that are specific to creating an egalitarian society, such as the legacy of inequality, the power of ideology, and the human condition. Despite these challenges, there are a number of examples of civil society organizations that have made a positive impact on creating more egalitarian societies. These organizations have worked to promote human rights, fight for social justice, and empower marginalized groups. They have also played a role in raising awareness of inequality and advocating for change. The slogan of creating an egalitarian society through civil society organizations is still a worthy one to strive for. However, it is important to be realistic about the challenges involved. It will take a sustained effort from civil society organizations, governments, and individuals to create a more just and equitable world.

References

- Anheier, H. K., & Themudo, N. (2005). *Civil Society: Measurement, Evaluation, Policy*. Earthscan.
- Anheier, H., & Katz, H. (2004). Network approaches to global civil society,' in Aristotle. (n.d.). *Politics* (Translated by B. Jowett). Digi reads Publishing.
- Barber, B. R. (1984). *A place for us: How to make society civil and democracy strong*. Hill and Wang.
- Cochran, M. (2002). Democratic critique of cosmopolitan democracy: Pragmatism from the bottom-up. *European Journal of International Relations*, 8,4, 517-548.
- Gramsci, A. (2019). *Prison notebooks*. Digireads Publishing.
- Hobbes, T. (2019). *Leviathan*. Digireads Publishing.
- Hulme, D., & Edwards, M. (1997). *NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* Macmillan Press.
- Keane, J. (1998). *Civil society: Old wine in new bottles?* Polity Press.
- Locke, J. (2019). *Two treatises of government*. Digireads Publishing.
- Marx, K. (2019). *Capital*. Digireads Publishing.
- Plato. (n.d.). *Republic* (Translated by Benjamin Jowett). Digireads Publishing.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: Civic disengagement in America*. Simon & Schuster.
- Scholte, J. A. (2015). *Rethinking global civil society: Towards cosmopolitan democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- The World Bank. (1994). *Governance: The World Bank's experience*. The World Bank Press.
- van Tuijl, P. (2019). *Global civil Society: An Answer to War*. The Broker.