UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

TWO WAYS TO PRODUCE CIVIL SOCIETY

Pertti Lappalainen

Email: **pertti.lappalainen@jyu.fi**

Introduction

Civil society, as an empirical phenomena, seems to be of great interest to political actors from the right to the left. It is difficult for any political actor to resist the issue of civil society. There are good reasons to argue that a struggle concerning the quality and meaning of civil society is still alive and kicking. Actors perceive civil society in various ways and utilise the idea of civil society for their (political) purposes. As Adam Seligman (1992, ix) states, "civil society has come to mean different things to different people". Furthermore, theorists across the political spectrum have tried to grasp the social and political life with the help of the concept of civil society (Seligman 1992, 3). It is easy to agree with John Ehrenberg (1999, xvi) who concludes that civil society is a badly undertheorized category. The point of this paper is that various types of civil societies must be conceptualized; civil society is not a self-evident or a granted entity but there is a plethora of civil societies. The presence or absence of associations does not prove anything in itself.

Above all, civil society is not a self-evident and permanent entity but made by men more or less actively. Hence, it is incoherent to maintain that the nature of civil society depends on mere existence of associations, groups and movements that populate civil society but civil society is formed as a result of various types of civic activities. We have to make crucial distinctions, for example, between choral societies on one hand and Greenpeace on the other. People may bowl, play soccer and sing in choral groups in different parts of the country but their societies may vary greatly (Ehrenberg 1999, 235, 239). Hence, attention must be paid to the type of activities constructing civil society; certain kinds of activity will produce certain kinds of civil society.

There are diverse civil societies but the aim, here, is not to draw the big picture of the multiplicity of civil societies; several kinds of civil societies may flourish within a single society or between societies (cf. Alapuro 2005). The focus is only on two types of civic activity producing civil society, that is, on civil society that is formed as the result of activities of the public authorities and civil society that is constructed by the citizens. The character of civil society and, especially, the position of the citizens in them are due to activities of the actors who try to make

it. Naturally, two conceptions of democracy are included in these two types of civil society.

In this article, activity is used as an umbrella concept of which forms are *citizen engagement* and *civic action* or *civic politics.* In the case of the first one, the public authorities have the main role. In the course of citizen engagement authorities listen to the actors of civil society or pay somehow attention to them but not necessarily take account their views in the public decision making. The citizens are *invited* to co-operate in harmony with the public authorities.

The second type of activity emphasises citizens' experience as a starting point. As John Urry maintains, the presupposition of civil society is *specific human subject* and an individual becomes a subject "through *social experience*" (Urry 1983, 72 – emphasis added). Below in the paper I argue that the starting point of civic action or politics is just experience and that experienced-based action results in a given civil society. The point is that civic action is 'self-organised' around the time-space situated problems which the actors experience. This means that contention, deliberation, citizen surveillance and conflict orientation are the essential features of civic action. In a civil society constructed in this way "the honour of "action" belongs to the many and not to the few" (Walzer 1995, 173; also Seligman 1992, 5).

This article is predominantly theoretical. However, the theory sketched out is illustrated with several empirical cases taken from the Finnish political reality. Thus, we can conclude that, at least, two new types of civil societies have co-existed on the social and political map in Finland since the 1990s. I argue that Finnish civic activity has stepped into a new phase since the mid 1990s. To put it briefly, unpredictability and exceptionality are characteristic of this new type of activity; actors are ready to act in the most radical and surprising ways. This implies that a new type of civil society has sprung up, too and the traditional mode of Finnish civic activity has lost its importance or the social origins approach to Finnish civic activity have been challenged although the historical context still matters (cf. Alapuro 2010; Salamon and Anheier 1998).

Ideas of Citizen Engagement in History

It is useful to remember that "civil society was ultimately constituted by state power" (Ehrenberg 1999, 236) when citizen engagement is discussed. States often utilize civil societies for their own purposes and, therefore, civil societies can be created, supported, manipulated, or repressed by any state (Ehrenberg 1999, 238). Paradigmatic cases of civil societies constructed by (nation) states can be found from the 19th century onward. At that time, some social and political theorists stressed the primacy of the nation and state compared to civil society, and citizens' mutual reciprocity in the nation state was regarded as the criteria of citizenship (Seligman 1992, 101-102). A share was given to the citizens in the societal whole by state power, that is, the citizens were bound by blood and history as organic parts of some larger totality. It was maintained that a good life presumes participation in cultivating the best national conventions together with other citizens. Each single citizen had to aim at a good life by "seeking autonomy not for themselves but for their people" (Walzer 1995, 161).   Foundations of social solidarity and mutual assistance could be created in this way; an individual's highest value was the firm identification with a people and a history. According to this view civil society "is more a matter of identity than activity" (Walzer 1995, 161).

Some main elements of citizen engagement are strongly anchored in the social origins of the Nordic model of state/civil society -relationships. The common good, requiring homogeneity and conformism, was a firmly held belief in Nordic societies, in fact, conformism was the main feature of Nordic modernization. A good life requires conformism or having the same form. Voluntary associations dedicated themselves to striving for the common good instead of particular interests. In this respect, education, as understood in broad and profound sense of the German *Bildung,* had the main role.

Education emphasized political and cultural *belonging* that became the most effective instrument of inclusion. The idea of belonging meant adopting a common national view as well as common thinking and identity. The idea of doing, that is, as concrete aims and regular activities, was not so noteworthy in the Nordic

countries. Voluntary associations concentrated on education or on enlightenment of the people. Belonging without special active participation was an essential aim for the single citizen joining the mass organizations. This kind of passive membership has been the typical feature in all Nordic associations compared to associations of European countries (Stenius 2010, 43-47). At the beginning of the 20th century, a citizen was not a proactive republican who entered the political agora with a purpose to solve common problems by horizontal deliberation. In Finland, there were no strong contradictions between civil society and the officialdom but the officials were regarded as "one of us" (Stenius 2010, 72-76; Kettunen 2008, 52-58).

The Finnish concept of the citizen has a very special meaning deviating clearly from the European understanding of it. Henrik Stenius concludes that the Finnish creators of the civic language chose a word referring to a totality as a starting point for the term of the citizen. In other words, the citizen belongs to the whole of the people, nation or society. The Finnish citizen was primarily a member of a nation and state but not a member of an association. Engagement in one and entire nation was emphasised because of the desire to eliminate conflictual action. The citizen has to be given the clearly definite share in the nation state but not the role of the enterprising actor. Consequently, the nationalist creators of the civic language favoured cultural holism and tried to justify the existence of the Finnish nation in this way (Stenius 2003, 320-321; Stenius 2010, 78).

The attitudes described above have echoed in the tradition of the Finnish state-civil society relationship. The traditional mode of Finnish civic activity has often been called "institution influencing". Finnish popular movements have been state-oriented; that is, demands have been addressed to the government. The Finnish political system has provided an institutionalised outlet for protest and new kinds of corporativist negotiation and handling mechanisms. Thus, the protests have lost their edge and have been channelled into the existing political parties. Institutionalised means have ruled Finnish politics; the Finnish state machinery has always been very open to demands and quite effective in integrating protests. Youth organisations, for instance, were granted state financing and the participation of young people was directed to the youth and child organisations of the political parties. Here, too, the state-centred Finnish model of interest promoting was realised: demands were addressed to the state and they were

handled with neo-corporativist methods. This is how most Finnish youth movements were institutionalised and neutralised (Siisiäinen 1990).

A belief in the power of education has been typical to Finnish civil society organisations. The collective action of many established associations is today closely connected with the tradition of national culture; knowledge-based rationality is conceived as the measure for competent activity. Enlightenment, education, and schooling have been the mainstays of the national tradition. An emphasis on "rational and organised behaviour based on knowledge" can be discerned in the activities of many traditional associations (Konttinen 1999, 211). The criterion of credibility is intellectual competence, "public argumentation ought to be based on intellectual and scientific competence" (Konttinen 1999, 199). Some associations have acquired "even a kind of semi-official status" (Konttinen 1999, 200; also Konttinen 2011; Siisiäinen 2004).

Applying Citizen Engagement

A recent modification of institution influencing is citizen engagement. The administration has to prepare for resistance to their plans at all levels, not only in the national level as formerly. For example, new motorways, waste burning and biotechnological plants often face powerful criticism organized by the citizens living near them (Beck 1995 48). For this reason, citizens are often *invited* to political discussions with the purpose to prevent possible resistance (cf. Slevin 2000, 47). This kind of top-down invitation can be called citizen engagement. The citizens are heard because the authorities want to know in advance if the citizens regard establishing of the new plans as harmful. The authorities prepare for the citizens' action in this way. Indeed, the modern state tends to alleviate and institutionalize all social protests (Bauman 1996, 205). However, the strategy to hear the citizens' voice, have citizen engagement, is not the simple continuum of the concept of the citizen of the 1800s analysed by Stenius. It is a question of the authorities' attempts to persuade the citizens to express their views but not of the citizens' spontaneous action.

It has been very popular to discuss citizen engagement in Finland since the middle of the 1990s, too. It crystallized in the Citizen Participation Policy Program adopted by Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen's government 2003-2007. The program tried to strengthen civil society by state policy and, thus, it emphasised traditional national missions. Democracy, civil society and citizenship were regarded as the issues of the nation state. However, activating the citizens was the new ideological element in the program. Activating is a part of broad state policy including on active social and employment policy, too. The program can be linked to the line of the national mission, that is, to the tradition of the Finnish civic education (Kettunen 2008, 67-96).

Before implementation of the policy program the mechanisms of citizen engagement were included in several laws, for example, in the laws regulating the environment. An example of citizen engagement is *Osallistavan suunnittelun opas luonnonvara-ammattilaisille* (*A Guide of Citizen Engagement for the Professionals of Natural Resources*). Some forest conflicts, which are widely known in Finland, are behind the publication. One of the authors of the guide book began his doctoral thesis by referring to comments made by a high officer of the forest administration after a challenging forest conflict in 1977. The officer said that the forest experts have been surprised at how environmental protection has been used for the unbelievable purposes in order to detract from the forest economy; the critics have dissolved innuendos, propagated groundless information, frightened people, hidden facts and even told lies as the means in the forest disagreements (Wallenius 2001, 11) The attitudes began to change after this comment so that the same person could state in the early 1980s that it is in the interest of society that the reasons for the forest conflicts are clarified (Wallenius 2001, 11). The methods of citizen engagement were developed to restrain or alleviate the conflicts.

The purpose of the guide book is to give special advice how the interest groups can be adapted in the planning processes. The authors emphasise that as many citizens as possible interested in planning must be integrated in the process (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 32). Listening to the critical organized actors is considered important from the point of view of planning. They are groups which bring multiple expertise

and new views into the discussion. Furthermore, it is essential to invite the groups which can prolong the planning process if they are left outside the process or can make it difficult to implement the plan (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 33). The aim of citizen engagement is to build up the procedures of regulation of the conflicts at the local level. Thus, citizen engagement resembles Ralf Dahrendorf's (I959) theory of regulation of the conflicts which he developed to the needs of the conflict resolution at the national level.

The objective of citizen engagement is to prevent disagreeing opinions becoming open conflicts. Citizen engagement aims at socially sustainable development, in other words, it aims at solving of tensions caused by the disharmonious development (Wallenius 2001, 255). The formation of unnecessary and exhausting conflicts is prevented when the participants interested in the planning processes are heard and when the different views are taken into consideration in the planning processes. The authors of the guide book advise that the alternative contesting views of the actors should be discussed in public (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 21). The conflicts should be utilised and ruled constructively; hence, the participants have to know, what the problems are in each situation. It is important to notice what citizen engagement is not. It is a distinct alternative for grass-root level action, such as the demonstrations and the spontaneous contacts with the authorities. (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 11.)

The authors of the guide book suppose that the turn of the disagreeing views to open conflicts is due to the participants styles of activities. It is for this reason that the persons in charge of citizen engagement must pay attention to the issues they stand behind, how the stand is taken and which issues are not taken into account (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 10). The guide book expresses what kind of activity citizen engagement is. One of the key ideas is cooperation which is emphasised throughout the book. It discusses "constructive cooperation", and "the necessity of planning, decision-making and long-term co-operation of various actors" as well as "long-term, confidential and continuous co-operation".

The persons in charge of citizen engagement are expected to behave like the traditional Finnish enlightening elite. The writers suppose that "people have usually little information of the organisations administrating natural resources and of natural resources themselves and of their use". That is why "people do not often know so much that they are able to form well reasoned views" (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 19). Objective information must be represented by the organisers of a citizen engagement meeting. Regarding the presentation of the "the information should not be distorted and manipulated and all the essential issues should be made public" (Loikkanen et al. 1997, 21). The role of this kind of education officer is not surely easy. It calls for special political art to convince to be neutral and objective. The environmental conflicts are struggles concerning "the right" knowledge produced by various actors. That is why, there is no single truth but there is dissention between "the truths". It is an openly interpretable question of what are "the essential issues" which must be made public.

An argument for citizen engagement is that it improves the functioning of democracy. One of its purposes is to carry out the general principle of democracy, by providing the citizens opportunities to participate (Wallenius 2001, 49). When providing opportunities to participate as the purpose of democracy, only the organisation of the *form* of democracy is attended to. In order that democracy could function at least moderately, the citizens *themselves* must act on their own initiative; indeed, the citizens must activate themselves. In addition to the formal setting of democracy realization of democracy necessitates the content.

What is needed is the form-with-content of democracy which, in turn, presumes civil society materialising as the result of civic action. John Dewey remarked in 1927 that the idea of democracy should not be identified with the formal organs and structures. The methods of citizen engagement might not have fascinated Dewey because the problems of functionality of democracy cannot be solved by forming more new machineries of democracy. The idea of democracy is lifeless and empty if it is not incarnated in the relationships between people. (Dewey 2006, 163.)

Furthermore, conceptions reflecting the idea of citizen engagement can be found in the report titleded *Kuntalaisten osallistumismahdollisuuksien parantaminen Tampereella* (in English: *Improving Participation of the Inhabitants of Tampere,* hereafter the IPI-report) produced by the city of Tampere in Finland. It states that participation means close interaction between the inhabitants, the officials and the elected representatives. The reason to get the inhabitants to participate is, naturally, a worry about decreasing activities of the citizens. The citizens neither participate in the activities of the political parties nor vote as lively as earlier. One crucial objectives of citizen engagement is to commit the inhabitants to the strategy of the city. The report admits that it views participation from the perspective of the organisation of the city, that is to say, it admits openly that it aims at citizen engagement (see Lappalainen 2008).

The IPI group proposes the establishment of an electronic forum of participation on the city's Internet-home pages. It would concentrate on preparation of the decisions of the city government. Here, strong elements of citizen engagement are easily seen: the group regards the forum of preparation as "controlled and regulated activity". It seems to be an instrument for gathering the inhabitants' opinions. The city administrators need to know the views of the inhabitants before decisions are made. These kinds of arrangements indicate the top-down character of citizen engagement: the inhabitants are asked to join the discussions. The director of communications of the city of Tampere argues that the Internet promotes the present process of democratic decision-making because the citizens receive more information and can better express their opinions. Thus there are more abilities in the decision-making (Seppälä 2002). However, it is very obvious that the officials in charge as well as the decision-makers use the citizens' arguments selectively in order to justify their own views.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the suggestions of the IPI-group are favourable for the initiatives of the inhabitants. Electronic participation also enables publishing of the inhabitants issues based on their own experiences. The report suggests, for example, the possibility to send an electronic civil appeal. In other words, citizen engagement is not useless from a perspective of civic politics.

Critical action may be innovative and spontaneous in the institutional structures, too. Everything depends of the actors themselves, that is, whether they are aware of the possibility of institutionalization and its consequences in the arrangements of citizen engagement.

Experience as a Point of Departure of Civic Action

John Dewey's work *The Quest for Certainty* (originally published in 1929) is a heuristically valuable point of departure of characterization of action-centred civil society. It is a defence of practical action and skills. Dewey himself was a man of action who reformed the school system, founded an experimental school, participated in campaigns for democracy, acted as a chairman of an independent political organisation for several years, and supported the women's movement strongly (Määttänen 1999). His objective was to show the difference between practice and theory and infertility of this kind of difference. It is foreign to Dewey's pragmatism to set a border between theory and practice (Shusterman 1997, 13). Dewey deviates from other philosophers when emphasising the significance of skills. The majority of the philosophers have ignored skills as means to control, for example, uncertainty of the future. The use of skills in changing of conditions has been considered insignificant. Instead of this, Dewey points out that the purpose is characteristic to human action. (Dewey 1999, 11-13.)

The concept of experience has the central role in Dewey's theory. The philosophic school (pragmatism) he represented connects the theory to people's concrete experiences and avoids abstract arguments and generalising. Dewey speaks of empiric experiences with which he seems to mean a kind of quasi-experiences. He describe them as abilities acquired by mere exercise or routines accumulated into memory. He emphasises experiences which form as the results of the situational experiments. Then, for example, the bridge builder cannot act in the same way as earlier but has to pay attention to different tensions and stresses in each situation (Dewey 1999, 76).

The experiences are uncertain by nature; they are full of threats and, hence, they are unpleasant. Activity is not always able to revise unpleasant issues and moreover, it can be dangerous because it is impossible to know the final results of an activity in advance. Uncertainty invokes impatience and the desire to act immediately. (Dewey 1999, 195.) I maintain that uncertainty is the cause of forming of civic action, which, indeed, is constructed on the base of the actors' experiences. Intentionality characterised by Dewey, that is, devoting to create future but not to glorify the past is typical of civic action.

Dewey emphasises the significance of the problem in his theory of action: the first step in knowing is to recognize the problems which have to be solved (Dewey 1999, 94). People identify the problems just by experiencing them. The everyday concrete world experienced by people is hard and unidealistic (Dewey 1999, 99). Hence, in this kind of empiric world, problems always exist and civic action is 'organised' around problems. My point is that civic action refers to defining some issue as the problem situation, which is followed by, attempting to solve it (Lappalainen 2002). This kind of problem-oriented civic action contains a dimension of experience. Civic action as bound to problem situations means beginning something new, to set something into motion. The perception of civic action owes much to the concept of action of Hannah Arendt.

By action, Arendt refers to starting something new, the launching of a process never seen before. This is the very aim of civic movements. Man's ability to act means expecting the unexpected from him/her, and this is why it is always directed against certainty. When taking action, men create something that at the time seems quite unlikely. The nature of action is to break down all barriers (Arendt 1958, 178-190). Taking action is, for Arendt, an example of events characterised by breaking routine processes. These kinds of events are miracles in a way (Arendt 1961, 168-170). Consequently, action, as distinct from routinized behaviour following cultural conventions, is something exceptional. Hence, action differs from activity.

Without experience there is civic behaviour which relies on prejudices and on routinized mores. Dewey considers this kind of behaviour and thinking as the

worst enemy of social thought. He diagnoses as a serious social illness, those symptoms such as the idealising of traditions, threatening of dissidents and the strong support of the idea that the social system must to function as it always has before (Dewey 2006, 187, 209) Instead of the illness, he emphasises imagination and creative ability expressing new perspectives. Men have to try different alternatives when solving problems ever arising. For example, an unhistorical basic form of the state does not exist, rather, the formation of the state has to be an experimental process; the state must be found again and again (Dewey 2006, 63).

 An example of the experience-based civic action is the concept of the sub politics developed by Ulrich Beck. He argues that political subjectivity reached an unexpected renaissance in the 1980s. He holds it most surprising and perhaps the most defectively understood phenomenon. Autonomous groups of the citizens have conquered power, because they brought the discussion to the endangerment of the world. Nowadays the themes concerning the future come from the small groups which defy the institutionalized ignorance of the leaders, parliamentary politicians, business-life and scientific and state power. This means that sub politics has reached an unexpected thematic victory (Beck 1995, 34-35).

The immanent elements of sub-politics, like the initiative and self-organizing of the citizens, generate from the everyday experiences and problems, such as school questions, tenants' situation or traffic regulations. The state has to face not only traditional organisations, such as trade unions, churches and mass media but quite new actors such as athletes, gays, motorists, disabled persons, parents, environmental activists and terrorists (Beck 1995, 60-61). Thus, politics, which previously belonged to the responsibility of the state, breaks up into numerous local or specialised activities in which the single issue movements are especially interested (Bauman 1996, 205). There is an important dimension; politicising of various issues is an immanent aspect of sub political activity. Simultaneously innumerable centres of power are formed not known in advance. In other words, contingency goes hand in hand with sub-politics (Lappalainen 2002, 56-57).

Action as Exception

Sidney Tarrow's concept of contentious politics sheds more light on civic action I mean. Contentious politics can be called as problem-centred civic politics because it takes place when ordinary people interpret a situation as the cause of injustice and join their forces against opponents, the elite and authorities. Before collective action is formed, people must define or frame their situation as injustice. Contentious politics is involved in the naming of enemies, too; thus, collective actors want to differ from other actors and create their own identities and ways of action (Tarrow 2005, 2, 111). Hence, the experience of injustice is a precondition of collective action. To be more exact, the emergence of civic action and contentious politics is a result of the experience of injustice or grievance.

Constructing contentious challenges through disruptive direct action can be conceived of as the very nature of the social movement. Innovations are intrinsic elements of contentious politics; there are innovative and spontaneous performances even within traditional forms of collective action. The aim of innovative action is to disturb routine activities of established social actors, that is to say, to waive the conventional forms of traditional collective *behaviour* (Tarrow 2005, 5, 102; Tilly and Tarrow 2007, 4-11). Performance as an element of contentious politics creates exceptionality; performances such as making of claims are unexpected and sensational events (Tilly and Tarrow 2007, 12-13; Tilly 2008).

Some ideas developed by Pierre Rosanvallon for overseeing power or citizen surveillance illuminate the concept of civic action. Vigilance as a form of surveillance, is very useful here. Citizen vigilance (e.g. activities of media, associations, trade unions, strikes etc.) still has a role of alarm and protest during times of crisis and conflicts. It is evident that a strong aspect of agency is included in vigilance, that is to say, being in a state of emergency and on the alert are the essential dimensions of citizenship. Citizen vigilance targets the decision makers; it implies constant and sensitive surveillance of the decision makers. The vigilant citizens judge constantly and criticize activities of the decision makers. An important element of citizen vigilance, and one of the main tasks of the social movements, is to raise new themes in public discussion. For this reason, vigilance

is more effective than many institutionalised and formally organised modes of activity (Rosanvallon 2008, 46-50).

Denunciation as of form of surveillance is interesting in this case, too. Denunciation refers to the evaluation of the competency of the power holders. Although it is an administrative method, it pays attention to the *argumentative* public discussion, that is to say, to the art of rhetoric of actors that is very often a forgotten subject in the movement literature. Denunciation obligates the power holders to give valid reasons for their decisions. By it, the citizens test the competence of the decision makers and repeatedly judge their results of activities. Rosanvallon argues that the citizens lean on practical expertness in their denunciation; the citizens' experiences have the central role as the basis of their argumentation (Rosanvallon 2008, 58-60)

Tarrow maintains that contentious politics is a conflict-oriented activity to the core due to its aspect of disruption. The culture of collective action aims at mobilising people out of their compliance into conflictual action (Tarrow 2005, 96, 112). The meaning of conflicts in political activity is emphasised by the republican theorist Iseult Honohan. She maintains that the theories of republicanism and civil society have some common features but they differ from each other, at least, in one important respect: deliberation and publicity are not conceived as the central elements of civil society (Honohan 2005, 234). This may be true in the sense that these elements are not explicitly specified in the theories of civil society. However, this view is immanently included, for example, in the theory of contentious politics of social movements which, as seen above, stresses challenging the existing and prevailing 'truths' and structures. It is not possible to conduct this kind of activity without public deliberation. A theorist of republicanism, Phillip Pettit, conceives democracy as a model of contention; the possibility to contest the decisions is an essential part of democracy. It is for this reason that the process of decision-making has to be based on debates (Pettit 1999, 185-187). The essential aim of social movements is to get their contentious voice heard publicity. The meaning of multiplicity of publicities and deliberation are the necessary elements of the

certain kind of civil society. These elements should be raised at the core of the theory of civil society.

The corner-stone of Honohan's theory is deliberation as an intrinsic dimension of all action. Deliberation refers to reflection of views and communication with others. Multiplicity of perspectives is accepted, the opinions of others are listened to, stands of one's own are explained and everyone is ready to change his/her stand in the course of deliberation. Thus, consensus is *not* necessarily needed in the social and political life. There may be strong differences in how to interpret, prioritise and realise common goods (Honohan 2005, 161-162).

An important part of civic virtue, as an element of republicanism, is to learn to live with conflicts; people must learn to live with differing views of what is common good. Deliberative politics emphasises just active debate between the citizens. It does not aim at compromises or consensus; although people disagree they can solve their problems with the arguments but not with violence. According to Honohan, deliberative politics may sometimes be antagonistic and confrontational action. The prevailing conception is that the conflicts are disruptive in the short term but conflicts can have an integrative force in the long term. They may lead people to closer contacts with those with whom they have previously had little contacts. To put it briefly, conflicts must be recognised as the intrinsic factors of politics. (Honohan 2005, 229-231.)

Argumentative deliberation is closely connected to politicizing. Actually, contentious debating in publicity, that is to say, deliberation *pro et contra* is an act of politicization (cf. Palonen 2011). Arendtian action means politicizing, too. Deliberative politicizing requires, however, the participation of several actors in the issue politicized by an individual political actor. Moreover, deliberative politicizing refers to the actors' struggles concerning their common problem. The Internet can facilitate the process of politicizing significantly. Different types of partial publicities formed on the Internet can give impulses, can highlight important questions, can begin new discourses and activities, and can challenge traditional structures and conventions. Citizens can raise important problems to

the public discussion with the help of the Internet and can act politically in a new way. Because openness is one central property of the Internet, a single citizen or a group of the citizens is able to politicize more easily, quickly and thoroughly than before.

Producing New Type of Civil Society

The process of deliberative politicization can be illustrated by Pierre Rosanvallon's concept of surveillance. Some acts of the new animal rights movement can be regarded as such surveillance. Expressed with Rosanvallon's phrase, it is the counter democratic movement whose aim is to raise problems in publicity and set limits to power exercise. Politics of the counter democratic movement concentrates on handling on situations but not establishing of permanent groups or managing of institutions (Rosanvallon 2008, 63-66). Because movements are bound to situational action the art of political judgement is necessary to them (see Arendt 2003), which is another neglected theme in the movement literature.

The main problem of Finnish Rights for Animals is the commercial exploitation of animals as "mass production": animals are increasingly only a means to promote economic growth (Tuomivaara 1998, 54). Taking action and the style of action taken are crucially affected by the degree of intensity with which the problems are experienced (see Lappalainen 2010). Values are also a factor explaining civic activity. The 'super-value' cherished by the animal rights movement is the perceived unjust treatment of animals. The intensity of experience explains the attempt to carry out style-intensive action from the very beginning. Indeed, one activist has said that Rights for Animals has used "radical means and hard demands"; by "unrelenting long-term exposure of things" it tries to make society notice the unjust treatment of animals (Tuomivaara, 1998, p. 161). The animal rights activists seem to think that in a specific issue such as the treatment of animals, broader societal problems are manifest; namely, the problems of present-day culture as a whole.

One of its major tasks is to present counter-information to the hegemonic 'truths', claims that are portrayed as the only valid information available. This kind of style is typical of civic action. Argumentation based on knowledge is essential in constructing a movement and creating a counter-power. Defying the 'official truth is perhaps one of the most important tasks of civic movements. These movements have increasingly and thoroughly tried to produce alternative 'truths'. This kind of 'politics of competence' (Hänninen 1992), and divergent argumentation between specialists in different fields, can often pose a serious challenge to the assurances of bureaucrats and corporate leaders, to which it is often said there is no alternative. Movements spreading new enlightenments also politicise society in a novel way. Because of risk conflicts, previously unpoliticized areas of decision-making become politicised. Movements such as Rights for Animals have succeeded in bringing another style of politicking to the scientific or rationalistic approach.

There is a crucial difference between the animal (rights) movement and ideologist style of action dogged by compliance with ideologies and programmes. They do admit to adhering to wider societal models and being ideological, but they avoid making any doctrine into a dogmatic structure. Regarding this, one activist says that "creating a great unified ideology is not considered (to be) even needed" (Tuomivaara 1998, 123) or that "due to the small size of the units, there is no need for a unified or strict ideology" (Tuomivaara 1998, 125). Another activist maintains that "fixed plans only tie down our creativity, the chances to change" (Muutoksen kevät 8/1998).

The animal rights movement shuns ideologies because, in practice, applying them in their original form is almost impossible. The inevitable consequence of abandoning the ideologist style of activity, or rather of behaviour, is a proclivity to judge one's style over and over again. Due to the incessant re-judgement, the future of the animal rights movement's repertoire of styles of action cannot be defined in advance with any precision. The newest, perhaps the most essential dimension of the animal rights movement and of other newest movements, is their unpredictable style of action. In this respect, it differs, perhaps, the most from the mainstream of earlier Finnish popular movements and starts something decidedly

new in Finnish civic activity. Simultaneously, it has challenged the social origins of Finnish civil society.

Conclusions: Two Models of Civil Society

In addition to the question: what is civil society; we should ask: what kinds of civil societies are there in each society? In other words, I would maintain that it is too general to speak of, for example, a single coherent Finnish civil society, but we should pay attention to the various types of civil societies which exist simultaneously. Sometimes various civil societies overlap, sometimes they do not. Alternatively, one way to perceive civil society is to conceive of it as the comprehensive entity consisting of various smaller entities of which character, especially the position of the citizens, may vary greatly.

I propose, that each civil society should be typed by using the position of the citizens as the criterion. The public authorities and the executive level of the popular movements are the main actors in civil society produced by citizen engagement and the practices at its historical background. Close to Hannah Arendt's perspective (1958; 1961), I call this type of civil society as *fabricated civil society.* The key elements of fabrication are reliability and certainty; the world made by fabrication is permanent and durable. Citizen engagement and the arrangements preceding it aim at preventing the emergence of conflicts or, at least, of regulating and taming them. Nowadays, organic, predictable and conflicts avoiding civil society is not necessarily a (nationally) comprehensive civil society but a sectional one; it is built in the field of certain public authority, for example, in the field of a ministry or in the section of the city administration or at the national level.

Fabricated civil society can be characterised with the expression of "forced pluralism" (Alapuro 1997). The idea of forced pluralism is very compatible with Zygmunt Bauman's theory. Bauman argues that spontaneous, independent, and unexpected action has not been desirable from the view of the system. Instead,

such unexpected action was branded as destabilising or anti-social, that had to be tamed or weeded out. Attention was particularly paid to machineries promoting order and maintaining structure, and to increasing predictability and controlling ways of action (Bauman 1996, 196).

Citizen engagement is not useless from the point of view of the civic action. It is not an excluded possibility in the organizations of citizen engagement, that is to say, the citizens may carry out the initiatives of their own in these structures through civic action. In that case, *the citizens invite* the established officials and the elected representatives to different forums to explain their views and to deliberate with the citizens. Action in the organizations of the citizen engagement is often one strategy in the overall repertoire of collective activity. However, it is easy to find examples from the history of the Finnish civic activity how the actors have become the organic element of the system after being accepted in the institutions. Thus, participation in the organisational structures of citizen engagement may end the career be for the civic actors because the political institutions them to manifest restrained behaviour instead of spontaneous and autonomous action. The structures of citizen engagement are, in fact, the institutions which attempt to create "mechanisms of conformism and normative agreement" (Hodgson 2006, 7).

One of the key ideas of citizen engagement, and also of institution influencing, is to comply with (national) conventions which are, in turn, "the particular instances of institutional rule" (Hodgson 2006, 2). It is interesting, here, that the institutions create "stable expectations of behaviour of others" and impose "form and consistence of human activities" (Hodgson 2006, 2). Such civil society can be described with the Foucauldian concept of governmentality, too. In this case, civil society is conceived as an organic part of modern government and as techniques and procedures for directing human behaviour (see Pyykkönen 2010; Dean 2002).

The popular concept of empowerment is connected to two models of civil society I try to sketch out. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* (2001) defines the term as if it were directly from a textbook of citizen engagement. According to the COD, empowerment means *giving authority or power, to authorize or give strength and*

confidence. However, it is evident that the authority or body that empowers also ensures that this kind of the donated power remains in control. This state of affairs is very problematic from the point of view of the democracy. Because power is donated, it is a question of donated democracy but not democracy enabling the citizens' real participation.

Another type of civil society is based on spontaneous or voluntary pluralism instead of forced pluralism. In this type of civil society the toleration, even antagonistic views and alternatives for any political elite prevails (Shils 1995; Walzer 1995). The most important lesson that people learn in civil society is, how to live with diverse social conflicts (Walzer 2002, 38). That is why the theory of civil society should pay attention to the theory of republicanism. The emphasis of participation or action included in the theory of republicanism is of most importance for the theory of civil society. In addition, one should not forget what the aspects of deliberation and rhetoric can offer to the theories of civic action or politics and of civil society.

The mechanisms of citizen engagement can be conceived as counter forces of action; however, the relationship between action and citizen engagement is not symmetrical. This kind of citizens' initiative has had a noticeable effect in a society that is no longer an organic and balanced whole, unified in its values. Previously, it was much easier to say how civic movements act, but things have changed since the mid-1990s. The potential repertoire of collective activity has clearly enlarged; actors are ready to act in the most radical and surprising style. The style of the animal rights movement is an expression of deep mistrust and an unwillingness to cooperate with policies purported to promote the general interests of society. Traditional political barriers have blurred and a new kind of politicization has appeared. The activists of the newest movements want to challenge the traditional Finnish culture of collective activity through institutional influence.

Actually, this kind of civil society is not conceivable without the idea of active politicizing. Here, politicization means marking of a phenomenon as political, as a *Spielzeitraum* for contingent action. Politicizations refers to an act of naming something as political which is why controversies and alternatives, that is, real

deliberation is an inseparable aspect of a process of politicization (Palonen 2003; also Ehrenberg 1999, 249). However, Tilly and Tarrow (2007, 5) argue that "most contention also occurs outside politics" and "most of politics involves little or no contention". If a social movement is regarded as "as a sustained campaign of claim making" (Tilly and Tarrow 2007, 8), it is always a *political* movement, too. Indeed, the very nature of the movements and other agents of civic action practicing contentious politics is one of politicizing. In other words, they are agents constructing social and political reality. Thus, they create *constructed civil society* which is the other type of civil society in my theorizing.

Deliberative action, including politicizing, creates such dynamics which can be considered as the most essential aspect of this kind of civil society; dynamics is the chronic feature of civil society. As John Keane states, self-organising, self-reflectivity, innovativeness, conflict, compromise and consensus characterise civil society. The non-governmental actors of civil society are constantly in tensional relations with each other. Particularly, global civil society is never a fixed or permanent entity but a temporary unity; it changes continuously. Hence, the civil society described by John Keane is in a permanent state of contingency (Keane 1998, 6; Keane 2003, 7). Everything in this kind of civil society is tentative and liable to revisions because its politics is experimental; it is an experiment or a long line of experiments (Walzer 2002, 44).

Civil society tolerating real deliberation is full of conflicts. It is a pluralist and heterogeneous entity. The ideas of spontaneous sympathy, automatic consensus and people's natural sociability are alien to it. Especially the non-governmental institutions and actors of global civil society are counter-forces to the various forms of the government and they attempt to pluralize power. Civil societies of Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s are an example of this kind of a process. They were strong moral and political counter-forces to the governments in spite of the attempts of the governments to crush the independent centres of power formed by the citizens (Keane 1998, 31; Keane 2003, 8-15).

In terms of empowerment, action based civil society can be described with the thoughts of strengthening of oneself, empowerment-as-enablement or self-empowerment. In that case, it refers to a kind of feeling of power generating from the individual human being and thus excludes coercion. When the concept in question is understood in this way it is inseparably connected with the experience. People create information on the basis of their own experiences. In that case, learning is just Deweyan *learning by doing*, that is, by acting and creating something new. Empowerment in this sense is a part of autonomous grass-root level action, that is to say, of sub-politics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Alapuro, Risto: Älymystö Venäjän varjossa. Hanki ja jää, Helsinki, 1997.

Alapuro, Risto: Associations and Contention in France and Finland: Constructing the Society and Describing the Society. Scandinavian Political Studies, 28 (4), 2005.

Alapuro, Risto: Conclusion: How History Matters in Putting Nordic Associations in to European Perspective. In Alapuro, Risto and Stenius, Henrik (eds.): Nordic Associations in a European Perspective. Nomos, Baden-Baden 2010.

Arendt, Hannah: The Human Condition. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1958.

Arendt, Hannah: Between Past and Future. Meridian Books, Cleveland, 1961.

Arendt, Hannah: Responsibility and Judgment. Schoken Books, New York, 2003.

Bauman, Zygmunt: Postmodernin lumo. Vastapaino, Tampere 1996.

Beck, Ulrich: Politiikan uudelleen keksiminen: kohti refleksiivisen modernisaation teoriaa. In Beck, Ulrich & Giddens, Anthony & Lash, Scott: Nykyajan jäljillä. Refleksiivinen modernisaatio. Vastapaino, Tampere 1995.

Dahrendorf, Ralf: Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Routledge and Kegan: London 1959.

Dean, Mitchell: Liberal Government and Authoritarianism. Economy and Society, 31 (1), 2002.

Ehrenberg, John: Civil Society: The Critical History of an Idea. New York University Press, New York and London 1999.

The Concise Oxford Dictionary. Oxford 2001.

Dewey, John: Pyrkimys varmuuteen. Gaudeamus, Helsinki, 1999.

Dewey, John: Julkinen toiminta ja sen ongelmat. Vastapaino, Tampere 2006.

Hodgson, Geoffrey, M.: What Are Institutions. Journal of Economic Issues, XL (1), 2006.

Hänninen, Sakari: How to Combat Pollution by Words. Alternatives, 17 (2), 1992.

Honohan, Iseult: Civic Republicanism. Routledge, London and New York, 2005.

Keane, John: Civil Society. Old Images, New Visions. Polity Press, Cambridge 1998.

Keane, John: Global Civil Society. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003.

Kettunen, Pauli: Globalisaatio ja kansallinen me. Vastapaino, Tampere 2008.

Konttinen, Esa: Ympäristökansalaisuuden kyläsepät. SoPhi, Jyväskylä 1999

Konttinen, Esa: Civil Society Relationships of the Finnish Environmental Movement. A Paper to be Presented 2011 at the The Voluntary Sector in the Nordic Countries, May 18-20 2011, Bergen, Norway.

KOP-raportti: Kuntalaisten osallistumismahdollisuuksien parantaminen. http://www.tampere.fi/osallistuminen. Luettu 14.3.2004.

Lappalainen, Pertti: Poliittisen tyylin taito. Vastapaino, Tampere 2002.

Lappalainen, Pertti: The Internet as the Forum for Multiple Styles of Political Activities. In Häyhtiö, Tapio & Rinne, Jarmo (eds.): Net Working/NetWorking: Citizen Initiated Internet Politics. Tampere University Press, Tampere, 2008.

Lappalainen, Pertti: Breaking the Traditional Style of Finnish Civic Activity. Alternatives 35 (2010).

Loikkanen, Teppo & Simojoki, Timo & Wallenius, Pauli: Osallistavan suunnittelun opas luonnonvara-ammattilaiselle. Metsähallitus, Vantaa 1997.

Muutoksen kevät, 8/1998

Määttänen, Pentti: Saatteeksi. In Dewey John: Pyrkimys varmuuteen. Gaudeamus, Helsinki, 1999.

Palonen, Kari: Four Times of Politics: Policy, Polity, Politicking, and Politicization. Alternatives, 3/2003.

Palonen, Kari: The Parliamentarisation of Elections. A Redescription of the Relationship between Two Concepts. Redescriptions, vol. 14, 2010.

Pettit, Philip: Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government. Oxforf University Press, Oxford, 1999.

Pyykkönen, Miikka: Pyykkönen, Miikka (2010). Governmentalisation of the Civil Society? Power, Governance and Civil Society in Gramsci's and Foucault's Analytics of Power. In Matthias Freise, Miikka Pyykkönen and Egle Vaidelyte (eds.), A Panacea for all Seasons? Civil Society and Governanbce in Europe, European Civil Society 5, Nomos: Baden- Baden, 2010.

Salamon, Lester, M and Anheier, Helmut, K.: Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally. Voluntas:

International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organixations, 9 (3), 1998.

Seligman, Adam: The idea of civil society. Princeton University Press: Princeton 1995.

Seppälä, Jari: Internet avaa aktiivikansalaisille nopean tien päätöksentekoon. Haastattelu Helsingin Sanomissa 23.11.2002.

Shils, Edward: The Virtue of Civil Society. Government and Opposition, 26 (1), pp. 3-20.

Shusterman, Richard: Taide, elämä ja estetiikka. Pragmatistisen filosofian näkökulma estetiikkaa. Gaudeamus, Helsinki 1997.

Siisiäinen, Martti: Suomalainen protesti ja yhdistykset: Tutkijaliitto, Helsinki, 1990.

Siisiäinen, Martti: The Newness of the Movements for Animal Rights in Finland. International Journal of Contemporary Sociology, 41 (1), 2004.

Slevin, James: The Internet and Society. Polity Press, Cambridge 2000.

Stenius, Henrik: Kansalainen. In Hyvärinen Matti & Jussi Kurunmäki & Kari Palonen & Tuija Pulkkinen & Henrik Stenius (toim.): Käsitteet liikkeessä: Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria. Tampere: Vastapaino, Tampere 2003.

Stenius, Henrik: Nordic Assocional Life in a European and Internordic Perspective. In Alapuro, Risto and Stenius, Henrik (eds.): Nordic Associations in a European Perspective. Nomos, Baden-Baden 2010.

Tarrow, Sidney: Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.

Tilly, Charles. Contentious Performances. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

Tilly, Charles and Tarrow, Sidney: Contentious Politics. Paradigm Publishers, London, 2007.

Tuomivaara, Salla: 1st Part. In Tuomivaara, Salla and Purmonen, Joni: Ulos häkeistä! Kaksi näkökulmaa uuden eläinoikeusliikkeen sisältä. Tammi: Helsinki, 1998.

Urry, John: The Anatomy of Capitalist Societies: The Economy, Civil Society and the State, 1983.

Wallenius, Pauli: Osallistava strateginen suunnittelu julkisten luonnonvarojen hoidossa. Metsähallituksen metsätalouden julkaisuja 41, Metsähallitus 2001.

Walzer, Michael: The Civil Society Argument. In Beiner, Ronald (ed.): Theorizing Citizenship. Sate University of New York Press, New York 1995, pp. 153-174.

Walzer, Michael: Equality and Civil Society. In Chambers, Simone and Kymlica, Will (eds.): Alternative Conceptions of Civil Society. Princeton University Press, Princeton 2002, pp. 34-49.