



INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY
Initiative in Education & Lifelong Learning

Certificate Programme

International Perspectives On Citizenship, Democracy And Accountability

Unit 6

Challenges And Strategies

International Perspectives on Citizenship, Democracy and Accountability

©2014 PRIA International Academy

Units Of Certificate In International Perspectives On Citizenship, Democracy And Accountability

Unit 1: Understanding Citizenship

- Citizenship Discourse: A Historical Overview
- Different Traditions On Citizenship Thought
- Different Dimensions Of Citizenship
- Understanding Citizenship
- Citizenship: Rights And Responsibilities
- Forms Of Citizenship: Active, Participatory, Inclusive

Unit 2: Claiming Citizenship: Influences And Practices

- Practice Of Citizenship: Role Of State, Market And Civil Society
- Factors Influencing The Claiming Of Citizenship
- Case Studies
- Overall Lessons And Conclusions

Unit 3: Participatory Democracy And Governance

- Democracy And Its Forms
- Questioning Democracy
- Approaches To Deepening Democracy

Unit 4: Practical Applications Of Participatory Democracy And Governance

- Case Study From India
- International Case Studies

Unit 5: Accountability

- Diverse Forms And Purposes Of Citizen Action
- Understanding Accountability
- The Accountability Of The State, Market And The Civil Society
- Case Studies

Unit 6: Challenges And Strategies

- Building Inclusive Citizenship
- Counter Attractions Of Identity Politics
- Constructing Relationships Between People And Public Institutions
- Whose Knowledge Counts?
- Contesting Local In Global Context

- Strategies

Table Of Contents

S. No.	Contents	Page No.
	Introduction	5
	Learning Objectives	6
6.1	Building Inclusive Citizenship	7
6.2	Counter Attractions Of Identity Politics	10
6.3	Constructing Relationships Between People And Public Institutions	12
6.4	Whose Knowledge Counts?	16
6.5	Contesting Local In Global Context	18
6.6	Strategies	21
6.6.1	An Integrated Approach	22
6.6.2	Increasing Access To Information	22
6.6.3	Networking	23
6.6.4	Diversity	25
6.6.5	Strengthening Civil Society	26
	Summary	27
	Required Readings	28
	Recommended For Further Readings	28
	References	29

Introduction

Unit 6 brings the course to an end with an examination of some of the critical challenges facing those who seek to widen the notion of citizenship, deepen the practice of democracy or strengthen the accountabilities of the State, the Market and Civil Society. The discussion on the subject begun in earlier Units is picked up and extended.

Section 6.1 begins with the examination of the challenges of building inclusive citizenship, especially when exclusions found in existing democratic processes and institutions are affecting the claiming of citizenship and associated rights.

Section 6.2 discusses challenges of 'counter attractions' of identity politics.

Section 6.3 extends another challenge raised in earlier Units, the role of institutions in supporting and facilitating people's struggles for citizenship and rights and for deepened democratic practices.

Section 6.4 questions whether knowledge possessed by 'experts' is greater, or less valuable than that possessed by people themselves.

Section 6.5 examines the challenge of contesting the local in the global context.

Section 6.6 maps out the ground that needs to be covered by future strategies.

Learning Objectives

After completing this unit, you should be familiar with the following issues:

- Building inclusive citizenship that reflects the interests, needs and potential of the marginalised, poor and excluded citizenry, including women;
- Counter attractions of identity politics;
- Relating people with institutions viz. State, Market and Civil Society for citizenship and rights and for deepened democratic practices;
- Contesting local in the global context; and
- Strategies to guide and underpin the future growth and development of participatory approaches to democracy and citizenship.

6.1 Building Inclusive Citizenship

What does citizenship mean to socially excluded people? We have seen in Unit 1 that citizenship connotes membership of a group or community that confers rights and responsibilities, as a result of such membership. The concept of membership implies that some are included and some excluded. The case studies in Units 1 and 2 have pointed out that experiences of citizenship are dependent on societal positions and roles formed on the basis of race, ethnicity, caste, class and gender. The roles and relationships within societies dictate who are “insiders” and who are “outsiders” and which activities of both these groups are valued. Different types and levels of exclusion emerge from the disadvantages that a certain membership incurs. The nomads living in illegal housing settlements in India, indigenous groups in Mexico, housing tenants in Kenya, and ethnicity groups in Nigeria have all experienced exclusion. They are defining their citizenship in relation to their specific and perhaps local community needs, and their exclusion has served as the basis of their citizenship struggles, including their right to basic resources. This is in contrast to the citizenship theories which, rooted in western political thought, emphasise the “universal citizen” – an individual, with rights, who engages with governance institutions or the State in the public arena of political debate.

As we have seen in Unit 3, ‘governance’ and in particular ‘good governance’ means efficient and cost effective public agencies delivering responsive public services. However, it also and more importantly implies the active and meaningful participation of all citizens, including the poor, the marginalised and the underrepresented in deliberations and decision making. The key word here is ‘all’- equal participation by both men and women is essential if governance is to:

“.....shift the political focus towards issues affecting the quality of life of both men and women by ensuring equitable distribution of productive resources and opportunities

for growth, giving visibility to reproductive roles of women in policy-making and increasing women's participation in the political process....." (Commonwealth Foundation, 2004, p. 85).

One of the most important factors constraining women's participation is the 'private-public divide'. The private domain of the household and reproductive labour is seen as a feminine one, whereas the public domain of political authority, decision making and productive work is seen as a masculine one, where women are either "being criticised for their inadequacies or patronised by men" (Pant & Farrell, 2007). Other hierarchies such as class, caste, ethnicity, religion and social and economic divisions inherent in both rural and urban communities further complicate and exacerbate women's inferior position in many societies.

In addition, the nature of the discourses, procedures, structures and functions of governance and democracy are heavily skewed in favour of men. When we look at citizenship and the rights associated with it, women and men do not have equal rights. In most cultures, women lack independent rights to own land, conduct business or even travel without their husband's consent. They also often have less command over or access to resources such as education, land, information and, money.

Thus, the experiences of citizenship and the nature of exclusion vary by context. Nevertheless, there are common values viz., justice, recognition, self-determination and solidarity. These values, although not universal, are widespread enough to suggest that they relate to the ways people connect with each other and organise themselves collectively for claiming rights and entitlements.

NOTE BANK: Values And Meanings Of Citizenship**Justice**

This is about when it is fair to treat people the same way and when it is fair to treat them differently. For example, citizens in Nigeria prioritised ethnicity as the basis for their identity and primary affiliation. However, they expected the State and its representatives to act fairly and impartially to all citizens and protested when citizens were discriminated against on the grounds of ethnicity.

Recognition

This refers to people's rights as human beings to be recognised, whether their identity or culture conforms to dominant expectations or not. The 'right to have rights' was at the heart of the Zapatista struggle in Mexico, when indigenous people demanded the right to be different from mainstream society. Dignity and respect are essential to the idea of citizenship in the less visible and more daily moments of life. In India, nomads experienced a lack of citizenship by having no dignity in their everyday interactions with others because of negative stereotyping in wider society.

Self-determination

People's ability to exercise some degree of control over their lives is self-determination. The struggle for rights is expressed in ways that reflect the experiences of people who have been denied self-determination. Naripokkho, a Bangladeshi organisation, works with women and their right to self-determination. They challenge gender inequality in access to resources such as education, property, jobs and health care. They also challenge patriarchal power exercised through various forms of control over women's bodies.

Solidarity

This is the capacity to identify with other people and to act in unity with them for justice and recognition. This takes various forms, based on the included or excluded status of individuals and groups. It depends on the extent to which people hope to overcome their excluded status. People's ability to exercise some degree of control over their lives is self-determination. Solidarity often takes overtly political forms such as the struggle of the Zapatistas in Mexico to claim their place in the nation's history.

(Kabeer, 2007)

6.2 Counter Attractions Of Identity Politics

We learned in Unit 1 that citizenship is closely related to identity and social inclusion. Identity can be both individual and collective. Each person has multiple identities, defined by race, gender, religion, class, age, and ethnicity. One feels oneself to be a 'citizen' of what one identifies with or feels part of. Therein lies the basis of a danger of the incompleteness of people's experience of citizenship at particular times and in particular contexts. This is because people of certain 'identities', such as ethnic, racial, religious and caste minorities have been consistently excluded by societies. By becoming aware of their own particular identity and the forces that discriminate, their groups, they become politically engaged and active. They express their citizenship by exercising and working to expand and enforce their rights. Through acting and mobilisation of key issues and identities, citizens learn and acquire new identities as political actors; they become conscious of their rights and their right to have rights. They build the alliances and solidarities which allow them to exercise power (Gaventa, 2005).

Identity politics, on the one hand, helps to build political bonds of solidarity among people of shared identities. On the other hand, such an approach also leads to discriminatory forms of politics that focus narrowly on individual group interests.

The danger is that the alliances and solidarities people build might not be with forces and actors that are within civil society, nor within the State's sphere; therefore they are not necessarily legitimate or even legal. In times and places where there is inequality, exclusion or insecurity (whether real or perceived), people may feel more attracted to see their 'citizenship' or rather their "identity", as that which comes from membership of, and participation in an extremist, or even terrorist group, rather than in a political, cultural, community, ethnic, or civil society group.

This is as true in the countries of the North, as it is in those in the South. Wherever there is exclusion or inequality, whether real or perceived, an 'uncivil' society lurks behind and within 'civil society', and the pursuit of 'anti-citizenship' will lurk behind that of "true citizenship".

"In order to be able to analyse adequately people's citizenship, especially in this era of ethnicisation on the one hand and globalisation on the other hand, and with the rapid pace at which relationships between States and their civil societies are changing, citizenship should best be analysed as a multi-tiered construct which applies, at the same time, to people's membership in sub – cross - and supra-national collectives as well as in States" (Yuval-David, 1997, p. 4).

6.3 Constructing Relationships Between People And Public Institutions

There is another challenge in the promotion of citizen sensitive structures and processes of governance, democracy and citizenship – the construction of new relationships between ordinary citizens and the public institutions, State, Market and Civil Society, which affect their lives. Rebuilding of relationships implies going beyond approaches based on ‘civil society’ ‘State’, or ‘neo-liberal Market’, to focus on new forms of active citizenship, where citizens view and interact with the institutions from which they are expected to benefit.

NOTE BANK

The neo-liberal Market approach views citizens as consumers. The assumption is that if one can understand and get the Market right, the benefits will follow for the citizen as a consumer.

A State based approach views citizens as users. It assumes that if one can get the institutions of the State right then citizens can play a role in holding it accountable and delivering its services.

In the Civil Society approach, if the NGO sector can grow and become more professional, it can help communicate the citizens’ messages as its constituents, to the Market, and the State.

(Development Research Centre, 2006)

Decentralisation and devolution are measures to bring governments ‘closer to the people’. Not only have there been shifts in approaches to service delivery; spaces for citizen involvement in public spheres have also widened. At the same time, the increasing ‘marketisation’ of service delivery has introduced new roles for citizens who were formerly the ‘beneficiaries and users’ of government services. They are now ‘consumers’ or ‘clients’. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) have become significant co-producers of what in the past were largely State functions. While new contexts of decentralisation and neo-liberal marketisation may suggest different roles for citizens and public institutions and new forms of partnership between the State, the Market and Civil Society in addressing citizens’ needs, the reality is that the State is off loading its larger social responsibilities to private or non-governmental actors (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001).

Improving the reach and quality of public services is an important step in building citizen-State relations, but this depends on how services are delivered. Merely receiving services from the State will not lead citizens to feel as citizens of the State - a great deal depends on how they are treated. For instance, in Rajasthan in India, most nomadic groups could not access the most basic of services, let alone take advantage of special provisions accorded to them because of their historical disadvantage and continued discrimination. This was due to the attitude of State officials and settled villagers. Yet, when a struggle was won, the word 'dignity' was also used. This was clearly reflected when people saw that acquiring their own land was not only meant economic progress but also brought along a feeling of dignity and self-pride (Pant, 2005).

As people's understandings of citizenship grow outwards from local concerns, they begin to engage *politically* with the State. The preceding units have looked specifically at the ways through which citizens have been engaging politically with the State. These include *forums created by the State; non-governmental organisations; self-organised social movements, and parallel governance structures*. These forums have huge potential to engage citizens, including poor citizens and women, in debates about public policy from the local to the national level and in a range of sectors. However, their existence does not assure that citizens will participate. In addition to the design, objectives and functioning of these forums, developing the skills of those newly participating is also crucial. Creating new spaces for previously excluded groups, women for example, is not enough to erase deeply embedded cultural inequalities; in fact the styles of debate can be as unfriendly to women's participation, as can formal politics.

The State-citizen relations cannot be fully understood without taking into account the role played in shaping these relations by other such actors as Civil Society, the corporate sector and global organisations with a local out-reach, such as international aid agencies.

The accountability relations between the State and citizens become confused when non-state actors from the Market are involved in delivering services. In the Niger Delta, it is the oil companies rather than State institutions against which local people are making claims. However, in this situation, neither the State nor the corporate sector is capable of an adequate response because of unclear lines of accountability. A resource's importance to a country's economy and the relative position of that country in the global economy can have a strong bearing on which accountability mechanisms can be used and by whom.

The problems of very poor and marginalised people whose exclusion is so deep and long standing is that they lack the confidence and knowledge to mobilise themselves and articulate their demands without external help. There is a need for support and facilitation from CSOs to address the spectrum of needs and actions in this direction. These may range from claiming citizenship and its associated rights and responsibilities, to active participation in democracy and governance, to monitoring and holding the actors in the State, Market and CSOs themselves accountable. Some CSOs have historical experience of democracy related work (such as election monitoring and voter awareness raising campaigns) and of other such relevant fields as rights based development. Yet, civil society is a new field for many and one that has not yet been fully recognised by donors and governments, as well as by the CSOs themselves.

Civil Society is a dynamic and multifaceted sector. It should not be assumed that all CSOs would be participatory and democratic, or have the capacity to promote active citizenship for the poor and marginalised. Hence, citizens will also need to constantly keep vigil on what is actually happening within the sphere of Civil Society, just as they keep an eye on the behaviour of the State and Market.

The critical challenge is how to encourage participation of the excluded citizens in governance, as well as how to build their relations with the institutions and actors with whom they interact. It is a daunting task to manage and navigate the complexity of needs, expectations, and responsibilities of multiple actors within the governance arena using a participatory framework. Participatory processes on the one hand encourage excluded citizens to raise their voice and make demands on public institutions, and on the other hand, persuade public institutions to respond to citizens' demands.

6.4 Whose Knowledge Counts?

Whether rich or poor, marginalised or in the mainstream of life, people can only participate, or rather feel confident enough to take the steps needed in doing so, if they feel they have the knowledge to know what they wish to articulate. Many people may have acquired such knowledge from first-hand experience, but do not value or recognise this life experience or the power it could have to make their voice count. Often, people's experiences are crucial in seeking ways forward to change their lives, but this knowledge is not valued or appreciated by those in positions of power – for them knowledge is only recognised in formal formats of texts, books or other similar methods.

Whose knowledge counts the most? On the one hand there is the 'expert', in various guises, including those of the 'professional', 'academic' and 'scientist', whose knowledge stems from 'research' 'investigation' and 'analysis'. On the other hand, there is the 'affected person' or 'beneficiary' (i.e., the ordinary citizen) whose knowledge comes more simply and directly from first-hand experience, possibly accumulated and handed down over generations.

As we have seen in Unit 4, participatory development (and participatory research) emerged from a recognition that first hand, experiential knowledge, 'indigenous knowledge' on the part of those affected by a particular need or problem. This is powerful knowledge and by no means to be under estimated when designing and implementing development policies in the countries of the 'South'.

However, in contrast, the practices and cultures of science and technology, across a broad spectrum from medical research to economics and information technology, (which has been dominant) has consistently valued 'expert' and scientific knowledge to the virtual exclusion of all else. Yet, it is also true that in many contexts and situations,

the formal knowledge system of academicians and scientists uses the life experiences and informal learning of the poor themselves to build upon their “knowledge”. However, this aspect is seldom given recognition or acknowledged. It is portrayed as a new knowledge, a new learning and ironically, the people who provided the base to these theories and techniques are not allowed access to this “new knowledge”, Bio-engineering and the Monsanto experiment are examples of how newer forms of knowledge can potentially exclude poorer and marginalised groups from the decision-making process.

Now, these two previously largely separate fields of development and science have, through the beginnings of participatory democracy, come up against one another in both the ‘North’ and the ‘South’. It is said that knowledge is power, but whose knowledge should be most powerful, that of the ‘expert/scientific’ or that of the ‘indigenous/experiential’? The health field is the most obvious example in the case studies featured in the course. For example, ‘health experts’ and ‘citizens’ rub shoulders with the participatory health councils of Brazil, just as they do in circumstances as diverse as the village level initiatives of Bangladesh or the national Romanow Commission on health policy in Canada. Recognition of the knowledge of traditional midwives by the so-called modern health experts and contemporary efforts to complement their knowledge with modern techniques is another good example of recognising experiential knowledge.

The danger and challenge here is that, just as in the field of democracy where the liberal/representative ‘model’ emerged from the ‘north’ and was transplanted to the ‘south’, the northern view that the ‘expert’ is all powerful can also prevail and influence decisions.

6.5 Contesting Local In Global Context

Historically, the 'local' has been considered a key site for democracy building and citizen participation. Citizenship is derived largely from community identification and membership. Civic action and political participation are thought to be concentrated at the local level. Local governance provides a learning ground for broader understandings and forms of citizenship (Gaventa, 2002).

As we have seen, the 'downward' spread of democracy to local levels has been an important factor in promoting the development of more participative forms. Many of the new forms of participation and deliberation described in our case studies have come about at the local level. Indeed only one initiative, the Romanow Commission in Canada, has been at the national level. This is clearly not a matter of chance and people are simply more able to participate when the need and opportunity to do so are close at hand. This fact has now been more universally recognised, and national governments in many countries have in recent years chosen to devolve many of their powers and responsibilities downwards to the local level.

The globalisation and neo-liberal (economic reform) have changed the division of rights and responsibilities between States, Market actors and Civil Society, in ways that directly affect the livelihoods of the poor (Newell & Wheeler, 2006). The growth of the Market sector through the adoption of neo-liberal economic policies, by choice in the more developed countries and enforced by the conditionalities imposed through the Bretton Woods Institutions and/or the World Trade Organisation, in the case of many developing countries, have significantly reduced the powers held by national governments. These reduced powers have not only affected national economic and monetary policies, but had a 'knock-on' effect, social and development policies too. To take a simple and obvious example featured in our case studies, when water supply is no longer a public utility but run by a private company, (quite possibly a subsidiary of a

corporation based in a different country), it is priced by Market forces, and profits made from its sale go to shareholders. In this context, water becomes less accessible and affordable to poor people; the processes of water supply are now less open to their participation and the supplying companies are less accountable to these citizens.

These reduced economic powers of national government have gone *outwards*, to the Market sector and especially to the multinational corporations of that sector. They have also gone *upwards* to what are commonly called the institutions of 'global governance'. As national governments have lost power to the emerging institutions of global governance, it follows that citizens' ability to participate in, or exercise control or influence over national governments has diminished in the process.

Yet globalisation is not just about finance, economics and trade. Political globalisation has also taken place. The industrialised countries and supra-national political forums and institutions are fast eroding the power of other countries' forums and their local institutions (Clark, 2003). Concepts of local participation are being mainstreamed throughout development discourse and are also being used to support and justify a variety of agendas. These range from consolidation of central powers, to support for a neo-liberal agenda and structural adjustment, to promotion of more progressive notions of development and democracy building. One needs to critically examine how and for what purposes the agenda is being used, and under what conditions the mainstream development discourse creates spaces for positive engagement. Several factors and elements need to be addressed:

- How do we forecast and assess when engagement with large institutions, which are promoting participation discourse, will widen the opportunities for genuine democracy building at the local level?
- Under what conditions will it risk co-optation and legitimisation of the status quo? How to build and support a local constituency?
- How to strengthen the possibility of effective democracy building 'from below'? (Gaventa J. , 2002).

The problem becomes more complex when questions of global governance and global citizenship are also taken into account. Increasingly, assertions of universal global rights (participation of women and children) may give shape to an engagement or conflict with understanding of local rights and citizenship. Local actors may use global forums as arenas for action (e.g. Chiapas), just as effectively, or more effectively, than they can appeal to institutions of local governance (Gaventa J. , 2006). The challenge is not only how to build participatory governance at differing levels, but how to promote the democratic and accountable *vertical links* across actors at each level.

6.6 Strategies

Before we move on from challenges to strategies for the future, let us pause and reflect on the fact that despite the significant spread of democracy, especially over the past two decades, inequality, poverty and marginalisation persist and indeed in the view of some have increased.

While innovative initiatives in citizenship, rights, participatory democracy, and accountability number considerably more than the handful we have referred to in this course, there is no firm evidence as yet, that they are having any marked impact on such persistent problems. An example of a possible exception may, however, lie in the Porto Alegre participative budgeting initiative. There, tangible improvements in living conditions and the improved infrastructure do appear, on the face of it, to be linked with the initiative. However, one cannot be sure of this.

In addition, there would appear to be at least the possibility that the impact is being limited because the fields and spaces for debate and deliberation that are being opened up are leaving large 'no-go' areas. Macro-economic policies are a good example of such a 'no-go' area. During the so called 'global economic crisis' of 2008 in the United States, even elected representatives found themselves not being consulted until after they had rejected the first 'rescue' package brought to them for approval by the executive. There were also public demonstrations protesting against too much assistance being given to failed financial institutions and too little to the poor people most affected by the crisis.

The following strategies put citizens at the centre of processes. It suggests an empowerment approach recognising the importance of power, identity and mobilisation. It emphasises the need to link community empowerment and institutional reform to strengthen inclusive citizenship. The strategies also indicate the need to:

- a. Support potential change agents who will in turn promote empowered citizenry;
and
- b. Promote alliances for interaction on concerned issues.

6.6.1 An Integrated Approach

Just as 'development' and 'democracy' need to be seen as inter-connected and to be pursued together, the pursuits of inclusive citizenship, participatory democracy and proper accountability need to be seen not as separate, but as parts of an integrated whole. That is an essential basis for a future strategy.

Similarly, within the pursuit of deepened democracy, 'strengthening Civil Society' and 'reforming the State's existing democratic and governance processes and institutions', and such matters as 'improving the accountability of the Market sector' should not be seen as 'either/or', or as entirely separate strategies. They are complementary and need to be pursued together.

6.6.2 Increasing Access To Information

Access to accurate, relevant and clear information and analysis of political, social and economic issues can enhance the quality of State-society dialogue and build the capacity of citizens to engage in policy processes.

6.6.3 Networking

Networking helps in mobilising and collectivising citizens around concerned issues to influence policy planning and implementation.

One distinctly positive outcome of globalisation has been the emergence of a 'global citizen movement' or rather a number of such movements *or networks*. From these are emerging some outlines of what agency based 'global citizenship' and 'globalised participatory democracy' might be perceived.

First, international bureaucracies and secretariats have established, within themselves, units and agencies that enable consultation with, and participation by, Civil Society to take place. Many regional financial and development agencies such as regional development banks have done the same. While this again raises questions about who participates, as only well organised CSOs with resources appear to be able to do so, it has to be seen as a step forward.

Second, many political 'summits' at the international level (for example the G8 meeting and Commonwealth Heads of Government meetings) have seen processes of dialogue and consultation with Civil Society take root and grow.

Third, the regular major UN special summits and conventions on such matters as social development, poverty, women and the environment, have grown into events where all three sectors actively participate. Global network activities such as *Social Watch* (see Note Bank below) have emerged and are dedicated to following up and holding governments accountable for the declarations made and the targets set at such gatherings.

Note Bank:**Social Watch**

Social Watch is an international network informed by national citizens' groups aimed at following up the fulfilment of internationally agreed commitments on poverty eradication and equality. **Social Watch** groups are organised on an ad hoc basis and have a focal point in each country that is responsible for promoting the initiative; submitting a national report for the yearly publication; undertaking lobbying initiatives before the national authorities to hold them accountable for the policies in place regarding the agreed commitments; promoting a dialogue about the national social development priorities and developing an active inclusive strategy to bring other groups into the national group. Through the national **Social Watch**, **these individual groups report** on the progress or regression towards these commitments and goals.

The international secretariat of **Social Watch** is hosted by the **Third World Institute** in Uruguay. Besides the annual "Social Watch" report that brings together thematic and national reports, Social Watch publishes "*The Big Issues*" – a long and continuing series of discussion papers. (Social Watch, 2014)

Fourth, the World Wide Web has proved a powerful tool not just for global information sharing, but also for mobilising and campaigning. The International Forum on Globalisation (see Note Bank below) is a good example of such an effort.

NOTE BANK***The International Forum On Globalisation (IFG)***

The International Forum on Globalisation (IFG) is a North-South research and educational institution composed of leading economists, scholars, Civil Society activists and researchers (60 organisations in 25 countries). It provides analysis and critiques on the cultural, social, political, and environmental impacts of economic globalisation. Formed in 1994, the IFG came together out of shared concern that the world's corporate and political leadership was rapidly restructuring global politics and economics on a level that was as historically significant as any period since the Industrial Revolution. Yet there was almost no discussion or even recognition of this new "free Market," or "neo-liberal" model, or of the institutions and agreements enforcing this system, the World Trade Organisation, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the North American Free Trade Agreement and other such bureaucracies. In response, the IFG began to stimulate new thinking, joint activity and public education about this rapidly rising economic paradigm.

The IFG based in San Francisco, USA, works through an active international board of key citizen movement leaders and a network of hundreds of associates representing regions throughout the world on a broad spectrum of issues. Its work is closely linked to social justice and environmental movements, providing them with critical thinking and frameworks that inform campaigns and activities "on the ground."

The IFG produces numerous publications; organises high profile, large public events; hosts many issue-specific seminars; coordinates press conferences at international events; and participates in many other activities that focus on the myriad consequences of globalisation. During the last few years, the IFG has launched a program that focuses on alternative visions and policies to globalisation that are more just, equitable, democratic, accountable, and sustainable for people and the planet (IFG, 2014).

6.6.4 Diversity

When discussing the question of what is currently wrong with democracy (Unit 3), we observed that part of the answer may lie in the fact that while there is no standard, 'identikit' model of democracy to be found in every country, there is a limited range of variations of democratic mechanisms, processes and institutions. In particular, the multi-party contested representative 'model' has come to be the most commonly practised, almost hegemonic, one.

In the present and future, therefore, there is a need to democratise the debate itself and to move beyond 'one size fits all' approaches. The issue is not replicating one version of democracy as a standard set of institutions and practices, but to recognise the diversity of forms of democracy. As has been noted in Unit 4, the Porto Alegre participatory budgeting initiative has already been replicated in many hundreds of locations in and even far beyond South America. While this is to be welcomed, there is surely a need for caution as the replication may be taking place "without any consideration of issues of appropriateness (to the new) context, nor understanding of the specific conditions under which it emerged in Brazil...." (Gaventa J. , 2006, p. 22).

6.6.5. Strengthening Civil Society

The presence of active, informed CSOs is an important precondition to amplify the voices of the poor. CSOs can empower marginalised groups, act as checks and balances and provide an opportunity to engage in collective action and social mobilisation. However, CSOs need to enhance their networking, research and communication skills and their understanding of political processes to improve their policy engagement.

Summary

Upon completion of Unit 6, you have examined the challenges faced by those who seek to deepen democracy, make citizenship more inclusive, or strengthen the accountabilities of the State, Market and Civil Society. You have analysed how these challenges are also related to authority accorded to different types of knowledge, and the challenges presented by globalisation in terms of participatory governance. There is still little evidence to show that new forms of democracy and citizenship are having a greater impact on human development. We have therefore looked at future strategies to foster new forms of participatory democracy, citizenship and accountability. These should include integrated and diverse approaches, and take advantage of globalisation to create a global network of citizens working towards a common cause.

Required Readings

- Gaventa, J. (2006), 'Perspectives on Participation and Citizenship', in *Participatory Citizenship: Identity, Exclusion, Inclusion*, Ranjita Mohanty & Rajesh Tandon (Eds), *Participatory Citizenship: Identity, Exclusion, Inclusion*, Sage Publications, New Delhi. (pg. 51 - 67)
- Tandon Rajesh (2007), 'Governance of Public Goods: Local and Global' in Rajesh Tandon & Mohini Kak (Eds) (2007), *Citizen Participation and Democratic Governance: In Our hands*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company (pg. 22-45)

Recommended for further readings

- Gaventa J. (2005), *Seeing like a citizen: Re-claiming citizenship in a neo-liberal world*, Synthesis paper prepared for the Citizenship DRC synthesis conference, Institute of Development Studies
- Chandhoke Neera (2003), 'Governance and Pluralisation of the State: Implications for Democratic Citizenship', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 38 No. 28 July 12 - July 18, 2003
- Cornwall Andrea and Gaventa John (2001), *Bridging the gap: citizenship, participation and accountability*, *PLA Notes 40*, February

References

- Clark, J. (2003). Introduction: Civil society and transnational action. In J. Clark, *Globalizing Civic Engagement*. London: Earthscan.
- Commonwealth Foundation. (2004). *Citizens and governance toolkit*. London.
- Cornwall, A., & Gaventa, J. (2001). *Bridging the gap: citizenship, participation and accountability*. International Institute for Environment and Development. London: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Development Research Centre. (2006, June). *Building effective states: Taking a citizen's perspective*. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from Department of International Development:
<http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/PDF/Outputs/CentreOnCitizenship/drcrcitizensperspective.pdf>
- Gaventa, J. (2002, August). Towards participatory local governance: Six propositions for discussion. *Currents*(28), 29-35.
- Gaventa, J. (2005). *Seeing like a citizen. Re-claiming citizenship in a neo-liberal world*. Brighton: Institution of Development Studies.
- Gaventa, J. (2006). *Triumph, deficit or contestation? Deepening the 'deepening democracy' debate*. Institute of Development Studies. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- IFG. (2014, April 2). *International forum on globalization: Home*. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from International Forum on Globalization: <http://ifg.org/>
- Kabeer, N. (2007). Building inclusive citizenship and democracies. *Claiming Citizenship*.
- Newell, P., & Wheeler, J. (2006). Taking accountability into account. In P. Newell, & J. Wheeler, *Rights, Resources and the Politics of Accountability*. London: Zed Books.
- Pant, M. (2005). The question for inclusion: Nomadic communities and citizenship questions in Rajasthan. In N. Kabeer, *Inclusive citizenship*. London/New York: Zed Books.
- Pant, M., & Farrell, M. (2007). Gender and governance: Empowering women's leadership. In R. Tandon, & M. Kak, *Citizen participation and democratic governance: in our hands*. New Delhi: PRIA/Concept Publishing.
- Social Watch. (2014, April 2). *Social watch: Poverty eradication and gender justice. About us*. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from Social Watch:
<http://www.socialwatch.org/about>
- Yuval-David, N. (1997). Women, citizenship and difference. *Feminist Review*(57), 4-27.