

1. A gender sensitive reading in the interpretation of the women's movements within the context of civil society and new social movement theories

Most social theorists agree that social movements, as a mode of collective action, involve a specific type of social conflictual relationship. During the 1970s and the early 1980s a multitude of new forms of social movements emerged in North America, the Middle East and Europe that included; women's, ecological, anti nuclear and peace movements. Many of these new social movements challenge institutional structures, ways of life, thinking, norms and moral codes. In fact, these movements are closely linked to social change, and several features of contemporary societies are likely consequences of the action of these movements.

From a theoretical standpoint, social movements stand in the center of social scientific discussion. Herbert Blumer (1955) claimed early on that collective behavior and social movements are core concepts of sociological theory, as does Allain Touriane today (1995). This explains the loose use of this notion in many disciplines and from different standpoints, as it also explains the diverse developments in its emergence, outcomes, and contributions to social change. Contemporarily, social movements are being interpreted within the context of many theories and theoretical paradigms, the most recent of which is the interpretation of the notion within the context of civil society and new social movement paradigms. These interpretations and theoretical paradigms, based as we will see on one main argument, which states that the new forms of social movements can no more be analyzed and explained within the context of classical social theories and collective behavior; i.e. within the context of Structural Functionalism, and Neo-Marxism dominant until the early 1970s. Rather, new social movements are to be distinguished as for reflecting today's identities which are based on issues related to the new identities emerging in the world, and no more ideologies the way labor or students movements did in earlier stages.

1.1 The analysis of the women's movements within the context of civil society

The social movement concept and functions were interpreted relatively late within the context of civil society theory. More precisely, it has been linked to the concept of civil society within the contemporary interpretation of the notion, within which civil society and its organizations are being viewed as a basic mean of political transformation towards democracy or political liberalization.

Civil society organizations are nowadays linked to the general developments of modernization (rationalization) processes taking place in the world (Habermas 1981). Through this rationalization process, it is widely argued that old norms and traditions break down and new forms of identities and associations are negotiated. Social movements in this process are of a strategic importance. They are seen to mobilize the positive potential of the civil society, and to function as a link between civil and political societies. They are seen to influence the existing institutions of civil society and the state to be more egalitarian and democratic (Cohen/Arto 1995). In this context, Cohen and Arato understand civil society, as it is comprised -among many other organizations - social movements of different sorts. Civil society for them is “ A sphere of social interaction between economy and state, composed above all of the intimate sphere (especially the family), the sphere of associations (especially voluntary associations), social movements, and forms of public communication” (Cohen/Arto 1995:19). This understanding, as Cohen and Arato argue, is based on Habermas' theory of communicative action; and his main distinction between the life world “ Lebenswelt” and systems “Systeme”. Civil society for Cohen and Arato is to be compared to the level of the life world “Lebenswelt”.

Habermas argues that the modern society, through the process of its evolution, splits into a system and a life world(1981: 230). This means it is modernized⁵. The lifeworld (Lebenswelt) is the realm of personal relationship and communicative action. Yet, this realm counterpoises a “system” ordered on the basis of non-linguistic steering media

⁵ Following on the tradition of Max Weber, Habermas defines the modernization process as a process of rationalization “rationalisierung” . This rationalization is based according to Weber on the differentiation of the capitalist economy and the modern state, on the cultural rationalization (development of modern economy and rights; autonomy of art) and on the levels of personality systems “personlichkeitsystem, on principles of the methodical life control “ methodischer Lebensführung” (Habermas 1981a:226-238).

(Steuerungsmitteln)¹(1985:185). For Habermas the life world “Lebenswelt” comprises various institutions: Institutions of socialization, social integration and cultural reproduction institutions. These institutions of the lifeworld are situated in his view at the opposite side of both: The state’s system, which comprises (political parties, political organizations, and the Parliament); and the economy (1985: 186).

The modernization “rationalization” process also influences, the life world. In fact, at this level the rationalization could lead to a civil society which represents action areas of the bourgeoisie (1981:485). Within this framework, a constructed dichotomy (public- private) “Öffentlich- Privat“ is represented on both the lifeworld’s and the system’s levels in two different ways. On the levels of the life world, it is represented by the development of a (civil Public Sphere “Bürgerlicher Öffentlichkeit” and the (private sphere) “Privatsphäre”. On this level of the system, it is represented by the (State’s public space) “Öffentlichkeit repräsentierenden Staat” and the private economy.

For Habermas, the process of further modernization and the intensive dynamic growth of the economy leads always to a strong consideration from the side of the lifeworld towards the demands of the systems (Habermas 1981b: 522). Habermas describes this process as a process of (Colonizing of the life world) “Kolonialisierung der lebenswelt”, within which sparks new forms of social conflicts some of which are specific to welfare state capitalism. This conflict is no more class-based but rather it takes new forms on different levels. He argues that these conflicts emerge now in the realms of cultural reproduction, social integration, and the process socialization (576). Moreover, these conflicts are being carried out through sub-institutional and ‘outer-parliamentarian’ forces; in other words through protest (567).

New social movements emerge, hence, in this new conflict zone. For Habermas, these various social movements can be classified in respect to their emancipator potential as “Emancipation” and “Resistance” Movements (567). The main criterion upon which this distinction is being based; is to the extent in which they advance the “de-colonization” of the life world. Yet, this de-colonization encompasses three main

⁶ For instance, at the level of economy “Money” works as a steering media whereas at the state’s level “Power” does this function (1985:185).

things: First, the removal of system-integration mechanisms from a symbolic reproduction sphere; second, the replacement of some normatively secured context by communicatively achieved ones; and third, the development of new democratic institutions capable of asserting life world's control over state and economic systems.

For Habermas, while all other usual movements are characterized by being defensive, the fight against patriarchy provides the feminist movement with the thrust of an offensive movement. It alone is "offensive", while aiming to conquer new territory, and it alone retains links to historic liberation movements. Yet, fighting against the male monopolization of life makes feminism a movement of a particular project. For him, the project of feminism should go beyond the demand of equality and fighting against male privileges in society, but rather it should target the whole life structures that are manipulated by men (Habermas 1981b: 579).

Cohen and Arato, consider carefully Habermas' analysis and argue that although Habermas does not pay much attention to gender and gender relations in his interpretations; still "the critical potential of his theory and its relevance to the feminist movement can be demonstrated" (534). Yet, they take another approach of critique to Habermas' interpretations of the lifeworld and system distinction, arguing that from this perspective one can develop a theory of civil society as well as giving an explanation of forms and roles of new social movements with their offensive and defensive aspects (Cohen/Arato 1995:524).

For both authors Habermas has introduced two main roles of the new social movements. First, they are seen as the "dynamic element in social learning processes and identity formation". To be understood by this, social movements transpose the available structures of rationality into social practice and "by this they can find embodiments in new identities and norms" (524). The second role of social movements, as seen by Habermas, is that social movements with democratic projects have the potential to "initiate processes by which the public sphere might be revived and discourses institutionalized, within a wide range of social institutions." (527).

For Cohen and Arato, Habermas' dualistic conception of the "offensive" and the "defensive" characters as a base of analysis of contemporary institutions is also

problematic. Seeing Social movements only as a defensive reaction to the colonization process of the life world is for Cohen and Arato one-dimensional, as well as misleading. For them, Habermas fails to link the dimensions of the life world; the cultural reproduction, social integration, and socialization to the positive side of the institutions within civil and political societies. Moreover, they claim that Habermas was not able to recognize the role of social movements in modernizing these spheres. Habermas, they steadfastly argue, was rather more concerned with addressing the defensive aspect of social movements. At the best, Habermas sees social movement “as having the potential to contribute to learning along the dimensions of cultural transmission and socialization but not to institutional change within civil society”. Finally, Habermas was also wrong, in their view, to conclude that what is involved in the new social movements (through their focus on reinterpreting traditions and identities) is only an anti-institutional and cultural politics. For them social movements can generate new solidarities while also altering the institutional structure of civil society, and creating a plurality of new spaces (530).

Cohen and Arato situate civil society on the institutional levels of the life world; their concept comprises all associational forms that require communicative interaction for their reproduction (Cohen/ Arato 1995:429). Therefore, only such organizations are included within their civil society, namely, those which are politically and economically relevant, and also those which are rooted in the social structure. In other words, the organizations that stand in-between the state and the economy, and where individuals are differently considered “ as a client for the social state, as a citizen, as a consumer, or as an employee”.

Based on Habermas’ definition of the life world; institutions of socialization (family, child rearing); social integration (groups, associations, and social movements); and cultural reproduction institutions (science, art, religion) are counted as institutions of the civil society. Civil society, hence, is differentiated from political society, which includes parties, political organizations, and the parliament. There are also differentiated from the economic society, which includes firms, co-operatives, and the likes.

Social movements, according to this understanding, constitute the “dynamic element” in processes of realization of the positive potentials of modern civil societies (self-reflection, autonomy, liberty, and equality) through a radical but at the same time self-limited politics. They argue that their reconstructed theory of civil society is „indispensable“ to and „adequate“ in understanding the logic, stakes and potentials of contemporary social movements” (Cohen/Arato 1995:492). In explaining this however, Cohen and Arato argue that “Contemporary collective actors” have raised many concepts especially the “Self defence” of “Society against the state” and against the unregulated capitalist market economy, through struggling for an autonomous and democratic civil society.

Basing on the Habermasian dual politics social theory, Cohen and Arato argue that social movements develop simultaneously the two strategies; the defensive, as well as the offensive. By their offensive side, social movements try to influence state’s politics, as well as the economy, in order to initiate reforms that correspond to their new identities (505). Social movements have, for Cohen and Arato, a big project targeting the state, economy, and the civil society, specifically speaking de-traditionalization and democratization. They therefore develop the strategy of defense in terms of defending their autonomy from economic or administrative colonization. In doing so, however, social movements follow certain politics that are necessary to achieve the goals of targeting civil society. For the redefining of cultural forms, individual and collective identities appropriate social roles, modes of interpretation, and the form and content of discourse; social movements here are performing “politics of Identities”. “Politics of inclusion”, furthermore, targets political institutions to gain recognition for new political actors as members of political society and to achieve benefits for those whom they represent. “Politics of influence” are used by social movements aiming at altering the universe of political discourse in order to accommodate new need-interpretations, new identities, and new norms, is also indispensable. Finally, “Politics of reform” is needed as a further representation of democratization of political and economic institutions.

These politics for Cohen and Arato work together as a combination, in order to create what they call “Sensors”. They describe this process by arguing: “While the

democratization of civil society and the defense of its autonomy from economical administrative “colonization” can be seen as the goal of the new movements, the creation of “sensors” within political and economic institutions (institutional reform) and the democratization of political society (the politics of influence and inclusion), which would open these institutions to the new identities and egalitarian norms articulated on the terrain of civil society, the means to securing this goal” (562).

Yet, in order to develop the “offensive” and the “defensive” aspects of social movements; they argue that the “offensive” politics of social movements do not only involve a struggle for money or political recognition, but also politics of influence targets political “perhaps economic” “insiders“ and self limiting projects of institutional reform. This project of the self-limiting of institutional reform aimed at as they argue; “ those elements of the new social movements that target political society (and will one day perhaps target economic society as well) articulate a project of self-limiting, democratic institutional reform aimed at broadening and democratizing the structures of discourse and compromise that already exist in these domains” (533).

As an example in examining their theoretical framework of dual politics, Cohen and Arato studied the feminist movement. By giving such an example Cohen and Arato argue that they are in a position to give an alternate for Habermas’ interpretation of the dual politics, and his analysis of the feminist movement. For them, however, the primary target of social movements is civil society and its institutions. Social movements in this connection, “create new associations and publics, try to render existing institutions more egalitarian, enrich and expand public discussion in civil society, and influence the existing public spaces of political society, potentially expanding these and supplementing them with additional forms of citizen participation” (548).

In the case of the feminist movement, Cohen and Arato see their focus as overturning male dominated life structures and reinterpreting gender identities as part of practicing the politics of inclusion in both civil and political societies. Hence, Cohen and Arato see no reason to explain and analyze the emergence of social movements in general

and feminist movement in particular, as merely a reaction to the colonization aimed at stemming the formally organized systems of action. This is for them misleading.

The new feminist movement, for Cohen and Arato, does not only fight against the norms and structures of male dominance in the civil society. It questions also, in a likewise manner, the way in which “these norms inform the structuring of subsystems” (549). Hence, the “offensive” dimension of the feminist movement, which is mostly directed towards the state and economy, is not only aimed at inclusion and reform politics, but also it involves a criticism of the male standards behind the allegedly neutral structures of these social areas (549).

In conclusion, Cohen and Arato claim that this reconstruction of life world / systems makes them more able to solve two blind points in Habermas’s theory. On one hand, Cohen and Arato translate the concept of the life world into “the institutional articulation of a civil society secured by rights” (531). On the other hand, they argue that there are receptors for the influence of civil society within political (and economic) societies and that “these can, within limits, be added to and democratized” (531).

Yet, while Cohen and Arato provide a comprehensive approach in studying the dynamics of civil society, their approach still lacks the analytical tools necessary for the analysis of the emergence and structures of social movements. They therefore borrow these analytical tools by accommodating different other approaches normally used in the analysis of social movements, namely the New Social Movements-, and the Resources Mobilization- Paradigm (551). Next, we will go through these two main approaches emphasizing their connection to Cohen and Arato’s approach.

1.2 Social movements in the context of the New social Movements Theory

Two main paradigms were developed to explain and analyze the so-called new social movements, which started emerging in the late 1960’s and the 1970’s, such as the women’s, ecologists and peace advocates movements. Both paradigms; the “Resource mobilization” (developed in the USA), and the “New social movements” (developed in Europe) came as a response to the disability that the classic theories of social

movements show in explaining the emergence and the functions of new social movements.

The Resource mobilization is the American variant of the theory of New Social Movements. Theorists of different areas of interest (Olson/ economist; Salisbury/ political scientist; McCarthy and Zald/ sociologists) started developing the main concepts of this theoretical paradigm in the early 70's as an alternate explanation to the psychologically oriented classic social movements theories, such as the "Mass Society" (Kornhauser 1959; Arndt 1962), and the "Collective Behavior" (Smesler 1962). According to these classic two main theories, the formation of social movements is due to a rapid social change that touched the life conditions of individuals, forcing people to join collective movements. More precisely, for the theory of " Mass society", which is considered as a main variant of structural functionalism², concepts like " Alienation" and "Autonomy" work as decisively for participation in a collective action. However, according to this paradigm not only do industrial modernization and communication process lead to the alienation of individuals, but also economic catastrophes and war. The latter normally causes structural changes and destruction of traditional bonds. This makes people more susceptible to social movements.

This was the case until the end of the 1970s when Gurr (1970) developed his " Relative Deprivation", by which he concludes that humans through being in certain situations could participate rationally in a collective action. Based upon this, the Resource Mobilization Approach theorists try to treat social movements as any other form of political arguments. They conclude that social movements should be analyzed in the context of interest's conflict, and accordingly human actions within social movements are rational.

The whole paradigm, is being based on a basic assumption that all movements develop in the wake of conscious organizational activity- if they succeed in mobilizing

² Structural Functionalism, defines social movements as a reaction of discontinuity of societal modernization. According to the main assumptions of this theory, the participation in a collective action or in a social movement (in a democratic society with institutional order, where settlements of interest conflicts are available) is characterized as deviation and irrational.

material and symbolic resources available to them, such as money, people's time and legitimacy. Thus, social movements are accounted for in terms of opportunities, strategies, modes of communications, sophisticated organizational forms and competition with groups and authorities having opposing interests. Moreover, the different variants within the Resource Mobilization perspective share a common logic: they think that social movements employ strategic instrumental reasoning, cost benefit calculations and pursue their goals and interests rationally (Olson 1965; Oberschall 1973; Tilly 1978). In addition, for scholars of this paradigm social movements never had abnormal occurrences, but rather their emergence comes as a part of the normal social life. By this, they reject the idea that states that "stress and discontent" cannot account for the emergence of social movements, on the contrary, they argue, it is social movements that focus "stress and discontent" in the society. Yet, whether a movement is able to do this will depend on its organizational capacities.

Finally, this paradigm provides various tools necessary to the analysis of social movements. Based on their main arguments; organizational structure and size, financial resources, and costs and benefits of participation are the main analytical tools of new social movements (McCarthy 1977). Some others would add the sociopolitical outcomes of the movement, as well as the changes in the sociopolitical atmosphere, which is normally discussed as usage of the political opportunity (Guigni 1994).

The paradigm of "new social movement" was developed in Europe by different scholars in order to explain the reasons for which many movements in the late 1960's, 1970's, and the 1980's were formed. The modernization process that took place after the war articulates the main standpoint for this paradigm. Scholars of this approach argue that the various women's, ecologists, peace, youth and student movements came as a response to the modernization processes taking place in the society. Despite having many different other concerns, criticizing the impacts of modernization stands as a common point in all these movements. This (all in the viewpoint of the new social movements paradigm) makes the classic theories, that are normally used to explain a social movement's emergence and functions, inadequate in explaining these movements.

In trying to answer what is ‘the newness’ of the new social movements. Most theorists³ conceive New Social Movements in terms of collective behavior, which opens up new social and cultural spaces. They are seen as politicizing institutions of civil society, thereby redefining the boundaries of institutional politics (Clause Offe (1987)); as offering through their own existence a different way of naming the world and challenging the dominant cultural codes on symbolic grounds (Alberto Melucci (1980;1985); or as creating new identities comprising non-negotiable demands (Jean Cohen 1992).

1.3 Women’s Movements, Social Movements and Civil Society: Feminist Critique

Nancy Fraser (1991) reviews Habermas’ analysis of social movements and that of feminist movements in particular. She argues that Habermas’ interpretations and analysis suffers from what she calls “Gender Blindness”. She summarizes his ideas in six main theses⁵, one of which is related to social movements; namely, their being a reaction to “Colonization of the life world”. Fraser finds using terms like “colonization”, very negative and one sided to account for the identity manifested in social movements (Fraser 1991:271). Moreover, she finds the whole colonization approach “inadequate” for the explanation of the new identity formation that women experienced in the post war period for example (273). She argues that women in this period have become paid workers, and have experienced independence, have a new identity outside the private sphere and an expanded political participation. This all has resulted in a “role conflict”, which means that these women now experience multiple roles, namely the role of a client and citizen and the roles of childrearer and worker. This role conflict cannot simply be explained away through negative terms, as it does not necessarily have “negative” consequences on women’s lives (278).

Consequently, she claims that his colonization thesis fails to “grasp the channels of influential interaction between the institutions of the domestic sphere and the official

³ Habermas’ interpretation of social and feminist movement is normally considered within this paradigm. However, because his contributions were developed by Cohen and Arato within the context of civil society theory; his contribution was explicitly discussed earlier under the theory of civil society.

⁴In this article, Nancy Fraser gives a review of Habermas’ ideas and contributions concerning both theories: the theory of communicative action and the critical theory, we are reviewing here only her comments in respect to the colonization of the life world and the emergence of social movements. Yet, in her article, Fraser provides further critique points against Habermas’ analysis, as well as pointing out clear gender blindness (See Fraser 1991).

economic and administrative systems” (281). She points out that the patriarchal norms continue to structure the state regulated capitalist economy and the state administration, this is indicated by the continued segmentation of the labor force and the structure of the social welfare system. Thus, the channels of influence between the system and the lifeworld are multidirectional and patriarchal. Therefore, the colonization thesis for the welfare state “compounds the error deriving from the original conceptualization of the lifeworld/ system divide” (268). She consequently, rejects the whole lifeworld/ system distinction thesis arguing that there is no meaningful way to differentiate between the spheres of “paid and unpaid labor”, as well as between the “‘family’ and the ‘official economy’”. In other words, she rejects categorizing symbolic reproduction and social integration actions within the context of the life world, and the material reproduction and systematic integration in the context of the system. This, she considers, gender blind and androcentric (281).

Feminists find the consideration of a women’s movement as part of a new social movement problematic. Along with peace or ecological movements, the women’s movement should suddenly now articulate the new dimensions of social conflicts. Women’s movements for Kontos (1986) are as old as all social movements, and cannot be compared to the new emerging movements such as peace or ecology (Kontos 1986:35). For Kontos, the approach of new social movements ignores what is specific in the women’s movement, for it disregards and excludes its critiques on patriarchy. Rather the new social movement paradigm focuses on their articulation of not only the late capitalist conflicts (the control over the natural resources, or the colonization of the life world), but they are also now thematizing these conflicts (36). Terms like life world colonization, or modernization fail to grasp what a women’s movement really is, as well as that their fight against patriarchalism cannot simply be connected to a certain period of history or associated with a certain phenomenon (36). However, while Kontos emphasizes this ‘taking into consideration’ the specificity of analyzing the women’s movement, she provides no other adequate analytical or theoretical framework for the analysis of women’s movements.

Bärbel Clemens (1988) shares this same standpoint and stands against the analysis of the women’s movement within this approach providing three main critique points. In

her first point, she argues that this approach does not consider the issue of a historical continuity of the women's movement. This historical continuity simply indicates the connection of the new women's movements with old forms of women's solidarities and other forms of social movements. For her the long history of the women's question forbids us from giving a quick analyses of the women's movement as a new social movement (Clemens 1988:7). Secondly, the themes that the women's movement deals with are also continuous. These themes are specific to the women's movement and therefore vary significantly from what other "new" social movements deal with (8). As a third critique point, Clemens doubts that the new social movement researcher, with the help of this approach, would be able to deal with gender relations theoretically, as well as empirically (6). This explains her viewpoint as to why female researchers working on women's movements provide no reference to this approach (13).

In contrast to these views, Barbara Riedmüller (1988) does not find analyzing women's movements in the context of the new social movements theory, problematic. Moreover, she finds the concepts of modernization a valid analytical approach and argues that the analysis of women's movement should in a "final Step" be connected to the general societal development (Riedmüller 1988:24). In fact, the main question of analysis, in her view, is to be dedicated to the structural and the socioeconomic developmental processes, within which women's movements emerge and contributes to form (32).

Yet, what Riedmüller sees as "new" in the new women's movements is what she calls the (politicization of the reproduction question) "Politisierung der Reproduktionsfrage" (33). In this connection, she criticizes the new social movements approach in not taking into consideration the question of the division of labor in both the reproduction and production sectors and its impacts on work's qualification "Erwerbsarbeit". She argues that the discussion on the reproductive work represents the main ground for the different politics of women's movements (17). In fact, this exact political discussion of women's movements, with regard to work in the production sector, and work in the reproduction sector must form the theme of the analysis, and not however, the idealization of the feminine work as a reaction to the

industry culture (the way it is represented in Habermas' theory of "rationalization of the life world") (16). By this Riedmüller suggests an analysis from within "Innenperspektive" the women's movement (25). She finds in the modernization theory the standpoint for such analysis. Yet, when she comes to the question of how do collective actors become active (in order to bring in their demands into the public discourse), the question remains without an allusive answer. This is probably because the new social movements paradigm offers no further research instrument for such a level of analysis.

Regina Dackweiler (1995) bases her critique to the new social movements paradigm on this particular point. She mainly questions the ability of this approach in providing the researcher with the necessary analytical tools for women's and social movements. In other words, she doubts that the researcher, with the help of this paradigm, will be able to integrate the gender specific aspects of the women's movements within the analysis of their practice, discourse, objectives and strategies (Dackweiler 1995:39).

She concludes that the context of this paradigm does not consider the meaning of the Gender-Identity and its connection to the complete societal reproduction relations. It also fails to include the specific problems of women, which are based on societal construction of gender order, in their analytical focus. This critique makes this paradigm unable to question the real input of the gender hierarchies in the formation and the development, as well as in the praxis and discourse of the new women's movement (8). Dackweiler sees that a comprehensive and efficient paradigm to study women's movements should pay attention again to the production-reproduction, as well as to class and gender problems as a central focus point of analysis (53).

A final critique provided by Myra Marx Ferree (1992) and specific to the Resource Mobilization Paradigm argues that such an analysis of social movements, being based on the assumptions of the theory of rational choice, is very problematic. For her this micro-economic understanding, in which rationality is always connected to recruit, contains not only a one dimensional rationality (that individuals act always towards reduced costs and increased benefits); it has also, a problem in addressing the "free rider" problem. For her, the "free rider", as an economic-based concept, often leads to

renders the treatment of social actors as humans unaccountable. In other words, researchers to this approach deal with humans without considering their personal history, gender, race or even class positions where power and social sacrifice would also theoretically be included. She argues furthermore, that there is no consideration for structural conflicts, and if they are included, they are seen in her point of view as “... generating oppositional interests, but not distinctive experiences or prospective. In theory, the potential participant in collective action is seen as a pseudo-universal human actor: a person for whom race, class, gender, and historical circumstances do not determine perceptions in any systematic or socially significant way in practice, this means that the values and perspectives attributed to everyone are those of white middle class men in western capitalist system” (41).

Therefore, she sees that the problem of the “free rider”, which is central to the Rational Choice theory as it is also essential to the Resource Mobilization Paradigm, as theoretically and empirically irrelevant. She argues the definition of rationality constructed upon the “free rider” concept; whereby humans are conceptualized as independent individuals, for whom community and collective action are problematic. This individualism must have, however, not only sex-, but also a class –base and express the perspective of modern bourgeoisie. In this respect, she criticizes the exclusion of non-instrumental rational forms of human relations. In fact, this approach is not able to integrate concepts of moral commitment, which should be, as she argues, considered „as a reward itself” (41).

To go over the main points, so far we have discussed the theoretical approaches applied in social sciences in respect to the analysis of new social and women’s movements. As we have seen, these theories are developed mainly to explain the emergence of new social movements in the West, and in late capitalist societies. Yet, with our case here, namely the women’s movement in Jordan, does not provide an ideal for such analysis. Jordan, being part of the Third World, does not provide a similar “capitalist” developmental context. Moreover, the late “capitalist democratization” process that Jordan is enjoying lately has different social political and economic grounds that differ from the western cases. Finally, the emergence and development of civil society in Jordan has different contexts. Yet, what are the

specific aspects which should be considered in terms of analyzing a “women’s movement” in “Jordan”?

To answer this question we will start next by introducing some main analytical points provided by feminist analysis of women’s movements in the South; and then the analysis of the women’s movement and civil society in the Jordanian context.

1.4 Feminist analysis of women’s movements

Feminists identify three main analytical distinctions concerning the analysis of the women’s movement. Particularly, these analyses seek answers to questions related as to why women’s movements emerge and when they do; secondly, what are the interests they mobilize and represent; and finally, what politics do they employ in order to meet their objectives?

With regard to the question of why women’s movements appear and when they do, Molyneux (1998) suggests that the diverse forms of women’s resistance and organizations have been contingent on five main factors. She particularly names; prevailing cultural configuration, family forms, political formations, the forms and degree of female solidarity, and more generally on the character of civil society in the regional and national context. Despite associating the emergence of the women’s movement with the modernization process, Molyneux argues that there are some women’s movements which arose in opposition to what they see as coercive trends to modernize, and therefore sought to defend the women’s placement within a traditional society.

However, she claims that the women’s movement is a modern phenomenon. For her “the emergence of women’s movements and of particularistic conceptions of women’s interests and citizenship rights are developments, which were associated both with the spread of enlightenment ideas and institutions, and with the multiple processes of the social and economic modernization and the forms of political activity these entailed.” (67). She adds that while the women’s movement first emerged in the political and social conditions of 18th century Europe, it was the 19th and the early 20th centuries that women in many other regions began to organize against inequalities based on sex

and to demand legal reforms aimed at removing patriarchal rights within the family and in society at large.

Yet, feminists emphasize three main sources influencing the emergence of women's movements and the identification of women's interests and gender inequalities in the world, and particularly, in the third world. First, women's rights were handed down by liberal constitutionalists, socialist states, or by populist regimes anxious to broaden their political base. Second, the influence of the colonial powers on subject states, and from dominant powers over defeated states. Finally, they have also been adopted as a result of more than a half-century of UN advocacy in the international arena. In this respect, researchers should also pay attention to the various forms of institutionalized female collective action and the questions of autonomy related to them. In fact, some researchers distinguish between three main ideal types of direction in the transmission of authority within women's organizations, "these may be called independent, associational, and directed" (Molyneux); others refer to the direction within the feminist movement, namely: human rights groups, independent organizations, and feminist groups (Razavi, 2000).

With regard to the first typology, Molyneux challenges the general assumption that associates the real articulation of gender interests with autonomous form of organizations. She names three main reasons for such a claim. In the first place, she argues that the women's autonomous organizations being associated with a very diverse range of goals, demonstrating apparently to the conflicting definitions of interests which cannot support the above-mentioned general assumption. Women's (autonomous) organizations "have ranged from self-help activities of various kinds, to protest movement, to those associated with a self-conscious feminism, to ones entailing the abrogation of women's existing rights and envisioning the greater dependence of women on men and commitment to family life. There have also been apparently spontaneous movements of women in favor of practices such as suttee and female circumcision." (Molyneux: 71).

Secondly, she claims that the organization's autonomy, or internal organizational structure, does not indicate that it is a privilege vehicle for the expression of women's

interests, or indeed that it is internally free from authority, either internally in respect to the organization concerned or with regard to external influence. Finally, she stresses that the autonomous organizations do not necessarily lead to the empowerment of women: “first because informal power structures can operate “technically” to the absence of formal limits or procedural rules governing the exercise of power. Second, because autonomy can, in some contexts, mean marginalization and a reduced political effectiveness.” (72).

With regard to the second type of organizations, namely the directed form of women’s mobilizations, she identifies three forms of women’s mobilizations. First, there are the mobilizations of women who aim at achieving a general goal, such as the overthrowing of the government, or bringing a party to power. In this case she observes no special commitment in order to enhance women’s specific interests. The second type of directed actions are the mobilizations of women within the modernizing nationalist and socialist movements. These mobilizations are occurring both in the advancement of women as well as in achieving a general political goal. Finally, she observes where women are mobilized for causes, which may abrogate rights that they already have in the name of collective, national, or religious interests. An example for such mobilizations she provided through religious inspired movements.

Moreover, she calls the forms of organization which are formed at the grassroots level; “associational linkages”. Organizations of this form seek for several reasons a linkage to the state’s individuals or institutions. Alliances with state institutions in order to gain power or representation are the main purposes for seeking the state linkage. She argues that these alliances may be an effective means in securing concrete agendas for reform. Yet, it may also risk the organization’s capacity for agenda setting.

This takes us to the second area of analytical distinction employed in the discussion of women’s movements; that of women’s interests. Feminists identify two ways in which women’s gender interests can be derived; namely as “Practical Gender Interests”, and as “Strategic Gender Interests”. The former refers to interests based on “satisfaction of

needs arising from women's placement within the sexual division of labor. Nonetheless, the "Strategic Interests" are those involving claims to transform social relations in order to enhance the women's position and to secure a more lasting repositioning of women within the gender order and within the society at large" (Molyneux). The political as well as the potentially transformative nature of strategic interests have also been emphasized through a third notion that is the "Transformatory Potential". The term indicates " the capacity... for questioning, undermining or transforming gender relations and the structure of subordination" (Young 1993:156). In this connection women's movements are analyzed in respect to their potential and ability to mobilize the various interests addressed above, as well as to the strategies implied in such mobilizations.

The third and final analytical distinction is related to politics and the strategies implied in order to meet strategic or even practical gender needs. Molyneux observes in this respect a difference between women's interests in the south as from them in the north. In the South there is a different national context, as well as the changing global context, which is playing a part in identifying women's interests in the third world. She observes that there is a shift from needs- based agendas to rights- based issues. This new shift was supported by lobbying for human rights at the UN level. It mainly stressed the idea of citizenship, for it " signifies a way of problematizing the politics and the policies of the revitalized hegemonic order of liberal democracy".

To sum up, Cohen and Arato contributed to the analysis of the role of social movements within a social political context, emphasizing their dynamic character, and their project of democratizing both state and society's institutions. The feminist critique and analysis has provided a further step in this connection. They contributed to the analysis of the women's movement in many significant terms. For the feminist analysis, while the socio-political contexts are very essential, the analysis of the women's movement should take into consideration the specific emergence circumstances, the specific themes of work, as well as the specific forms of its organizations. Hence it seems very practical to combine to two main approaches: Civil Society approach, and the Feminist approach in analyzing the women's movement of Jordan. First, because the analysis of the women's movement cannot be separated

from the general sociopolitical contexts wherein they effect, and become affected (the theory of civil society). Second, because the specific project carried out by the women's movement cannot be separated from its specific emergence circumstances which are not similar to any of other components of civil society (assumption stressed by both approaches). Finally, their strategies are to be distinguished from other forms of action practiced by other civil society organizations (Feminist Approach).

1.5 Women's Movement and civil society in the contemporary Jordanian debates: a gender sensitive review.

A civil society theory that heavily depends upon a pattern of social organization is far from the reality in Arab politics in general, and in Jordanian politics in particular. Hence, if we were to apply the approach of Cohen and Arato to the case of analyzing the women's movement of Jordan, we would have to pay attention to the fact that the Arab interpretation of civil society differs from that of western interpretations in terms of structure and content.

Interpretation of civil society in Jordan and its emergence and development falls within the mainstream of interpreting civil society in the Arab World. The notion of civil society was discussed under many aspects: Some questioned the real existence of a civil society in the region; others questioned its status and its ability to challenge the state; and still others that its boundaries are to be emphasized. In this connection, we will avoid giving a detailed historical review of the concept, but rather we will follow the same analytical approach, which is based on a gender sensitive reading of the discourse related to the issue of civil society in both Arab and Jordanian debates.

Generally, two main approaches can be distinguished with regard to the use and function of civil society in the Arab world⁵. The first can be termed the secularist modernist approach, whereas, the second refers to a traditional approach. Within the context of the first approach, the definition most commonly used when discussing civil society delineates civil society as: "where a mélange of associations, clubs,

⁵ Ibrahim (1998) distinguishes two main schools with regard to identifying what comprises civil society organizations in the Arab World. He namely refers to a controversial discourse between Islam oriented attempts, and those of secularist scholars (Ibrahim 1998: 473). In fact he observes that there are two main terms used when civil society discussed: " the term Civil Society", and the term " Al mujtama' Al 'ahli". While the former refers to the various organizations, trade unions, associations, and the likes, the later refers to traditional forms of associations as well as the wider society of NGOs.

guilds, syndicates, federations, unions, parties and groups come together to provide a buffer between the state and citizen” (Norton 1995: 7). In other words, in its ideal, theoretical form, civil society is comprised of voluntary, non-kin based organizations that operate independently of state and market forces in order to actively pursue the common good. In this connection, the emergence of a new organization and associations in a western traditional sense were studied and analyzed (Ibrahim 1993).

The second approach or the (traditional approach) views the notion of civil society in its traditional forms of associations and organizations. Scholars of this approach argue that -in the Arab world, and in contrast to western societies, persons are deeply embedded in communities, in family, in ethnic, racial or other social groupings (Joseph 1986; Ghalyun 1995; Hinnebush 1992). The tribal structures or communal loyalties and identifications in the Arab world poses a significant challenge to the emergence of civil society according to the Western model. Under this understanding these organizations are considered which are religious, tribal or tradition oriented. These organizations and forms of association are believed to comprise the expression and response of the “everyday people” to the state’s interventions and control. This, as being reflected in the contemporary Arab debates, was expressed through more emphasis on the grassroots and traditional organizations. Therefore, for many scholars, traditional, familial, tribal and religious organizations are civil society organizations, for they are connected to the natural mechanisms through which the “everyday people” express their needs, interests, and demands (Ghalyun, 1995; Hinnebush, 1992). They are presetting protected arenas where state intervention cannot reach (Tetreault 1993).

Women in the context of civil society were the focus of Tetreault’s (1993) analysis of the Kuwaiti civil society. In her article on Women’s Rights and civil society in Kuwait, she starts with the premise that there is an interpenetrating relationship between the state and the civil society, and this relationship should form the ground of analyzing civil society through an unconventional approach. Moreover, this interpenetrating relationship supports the argument that despite not meeting the criteria of western “norms of civility” , institutions like the “Home” and the “Mosque” cannot be excluded from the analysis of civil society. She, therefore, identifies the

“Home” and the “Mosque” as protected spaces from the state’s intrusion, despite not following a traditional definition of civil society; they do perform a political role that extends to the public space. Yet, for her the family or the home is more vulnerable than the mosque in regard to external manipulations. She argues, “although this space is protected, its legitimacy is derived from the external authorities of the state and the mosque, the two institutions that define the family and prescribe the behavior of its members” (47). This takes us back to the idea of considering the family and societal preoccupation with gender issues.

Women’s issues and particularly their political rights are being instrumentalized in this case, where the forces of the state and the mosque clash, or coincide. In fact, women issues were used in some cases by both the Islamists and the State to limit the role of secular forces, in some other cases they were used by the state to limit the role of the islamists. Concerning women’s political rights, she observes that the Islamists and the state have expressed one position that is supporting women’s political rights and participation. Yet, opposing these rights comes from the secular forces that associate women’s liberation with imported western, imperialistic ideas (45).

One may argue that none of the definitions presented by both approaches is exclusive for they both address important aspects of a knotty concept. With regard to the first approach, one prominent theme of civil society is its voluntary character, unlike the state, family, or market forces to which all individuals are subject regardless of their preferences. In this way, civil society is defined in terms of what it is *not*; it is not the family, the state or the market, in which all involve compulsory membership. At the same time, the state, market and society at large shape the space in which civil society operates. Yet, civil society, when viewed as it exists in the these social spheres, must remain free of domination by them in order to function as the 'home' for democracy and the arena for debate and struggle for the common good. Moreover, the impact and the influence of the various spheres (The state, the market, and the society) are therefore excluded in an attempt to draw the ideal image of a civil society that leads to democracy. Yet, the internal democracy of civil society being influenced by these spheres is not even questioned.

A gender sensitive reading on this approach and in light of the previously mentioned critique points shows that approaching civil society this way lacks the consideration of gender relations and gender hierarchies within the organizations of civil society as well as in the society itself. On one hand, women within the secular modern approach, despite being presented as one component of civil society organizations, were only represented by their own organizations, i.e. women's organizations. Their existence and participation in the wider sphere of civil society, as well as the public sphere, was not present within the analyses provided by scholars of this approach (New Woman Studies Center 1999). In fact, scholars of this approach were satisfied to find women working 'for women' and 'on women's issues' within their 'own (Women's) organizations'. Hence, analyzing the internal structure of civil society organizations and their internal democracy, taking into consideration the aspect gender and gender relations, is absent. On the other hand, when the family and social structures (where social groups are normally embedded) were considered within the 'conservative traditional approach', they were not seen as patriarchal institutions or as described by Sharabi (1988) neo-patriarchal. In fact, emphasizing the importance of considering the social structures of the Arab societies was not followed by the same consideration and focus as to how gender relations work within these societies, and here lies the gender blindness spot to this approach. Division of gender roles, as well as to gender hierarchies was absent from both approaches in analyzing the civil society. Aspects of the societal preoccupation with gender issues, with its two main sources in the Arab World were not even considered; namely the family and religion.

Neopatriarchalism as an approach to analyzing the Arab society can also be valid in the analysis of civil society in the Arab world. In fact, it is the family and the relevant social institutions, being the main element of the society, that contributes framing not only the forms of associations and allies among people, but also shapes any further development in the society and their forms.

Sharabi refers to the clan and the family as the main components of the neopatriarchal system in the Arab World. He argues that the emergence of the nuclear family started very slow, and was only evident on the levels of both middle and high classes in the cities. The rest of the city habitants are considered an extension of the village or the

Badia with their familial structure and norms (Sharabi, 1988: 49). Yet, this explains why it is those members of middle and high classes who seek social change and form social organizations⁶.

Sharabi's description of the Arab family as neo-patriarchal is based on three main considerations. The first is economic, and is related to the importance of a transformation process from the patriarchal economic system to a new capitalist one. Such a process will affect the relations between the father (the Patriarch) and the family members. In fact, their economic liberation (of the Family members) will break the hierarchal order of power and authority.

The second is related to the interrelation within the family itself. He argues that the democratic relations are a common aspect and normally related to the nuclear family, whereas the relations of control and obedience are normally associated with the extended families. Any change in this respect, he precedes, will transform the relation of obedience into a relationship of equality. Hence, he concludes that the destruction of patriarchal authority depends on the destruction of the clan/ tribe, and the expansion of the nuclear family.

The final consideration is related to women and the liberation of women. For him women will be the first to benefit from the transforming of the patriarchal family system to the modern democratic and nuclear one. While he believes that this transformation process is essential to the project of women's liberation, he notes that it might not be sufficient. In fact, he sees her real liberation in her economic independence (50).

In his search for the role and position of women in the neo-patriarchal system, Sharabi argues, that the 'woman question' has been dealt with so far within two main approaches, namely a conservative and a reformist approach. While on one hand the reformists succeeded in dealing with many other issues related to women's subordination, they were not able to deal with other main issues connected to religion

⁶ This was the case, as we will see of women's organizations in Jordan. In fact, it was high and middle class women who established the first women's organizations in the 1940s.

and the laws. On the other hand, the conservative approach rejected any changes in respect to women's status and roles in the society (51).

Yet, he highlights two main analyses done in the region describing the women's position within the Arab family, namely the work of Nawal al-Saadaway and of Fatima Mernissi. Both analyses are considered by Sharabi the most comprehensive and the clearest in the Arab World. While al-Saadaway associates women's oppression in the Arab World with the family structure and to its patriarchal aspects; Mernissi associate the oppression of women with the religion, namely the fact that religion stresses the importance of the God-Man's relation, which should not be competed by the Man-Woman relation. Sharabi ends with a general description of a proposed national liberation project. In this project, women and the women's movement are given the most important role, for they possess a powerful potential. Yet, he warns that this project will not succeed unless the male's awareness with regard to women and women's issues is also changed.

To summarize, civil society organizations, being represented by family and clan associations, or by modern organizations following the Western tradition, are either represented by males, while women little hardly access to them if any, or they function by masculine mentality and norms, and therefore women's active participation is ignored if not completely denied. In this connection, one might argue that any analysis of the Arab society and the development of social organizations should be based in the first place on a clear analysis of the Arab Family structure, which forms and affects proceeding developments. In other words, a special consideration should be dedicated to the societal preoccupation with gender issues, whereby the role of interrelations and status of genders are not only determined but can also be described. Thus, we believe that any analysis of social change, social structures, social movements, and civil society would be lacking if it does not take into consideration the societal preoccupation with gender issues and relations.

Bringing all this critique to Jordan, scholars agree that the domain of kinship cannot be separated from the domain of politics either at the behavioral or the symbolic-cognitive level (Antoun 2000: 460). Therefore, many argue against the definition of

civil society as formal institutions and that civil society institutions already exist in Jordan, and have existed for a very long time, in the form of "indigenous process(es) of conflict resolution (Antoun :441), or in the form of Tribal based associations such as the Diwan (Shteiwi/ Hourani 1996). Others however, exclude all forms of familial and religious based association in favor of western oriented associations, unions and societies.

In this connection, we may introduce two main factors which we believe are framing the contemporary debate on civil society in Jordan. On one hand, there is the process of political transformation that accompanied the debating of the notion of a civil society in the region as well as in Jordan, and has framed the discourse concerning the function and role of civil society. On the other hand, what has also been emphasized and revealed through the practice of this newly emerged democracy; namely the active participation of tribal activists and Islamists in the elections, and the emergence of new forms of association that are modern and traditional at the same time.

Considering this, Shteiwi and Hourani argue that despite the wide range of clubs, professional associations, interest groups, and NGOs; two special forms of association cannot be excluded from the Jordanian civil society, namely associations with tribal or geographic backgrounds, and a number of NGOs with royal leadership and supervision. Justifying their view, the authors claim that if the form of organization and the internal norms of civility count; then these forms of association can be considered, without too much fear of exaggerating, civil society associations. Moreover, they argue that relations among the individuals and members at these family-based associations are based on more inheritance, blood or family relations. This, for them, cannot however be applied to all societies and leagues that have a family, clannish, or sectarian background, because some of them are launched on a voluntary basis with non-mandatory membership (39). Furthermore, their legal status, fields of activities and internal structure are very similar to some organizations that are counted as a civil society. Hence, these organizations could be one main component of civil society in Jordan in addition to the modern organizations mentioned above (42).

Regarding non-governmental organizations; Shtiewi and Hourani, claim that in Jordan there are some cultural NGO's that are legally affiliated with the government, yet they enjoy a high degree of independence in formulating their programs without government intervention (Shtiewi/ Hourani 1996: 30). They also consider the existence of a number of non-governmental organizations that are active in the social field and in voluntary work, yet have a governmental character. Since they are supervised by higher-level state managers (such as members of the royal family); such organizations may not meet the criteria of being independent from the state and this might not affiliate them under the definition of civil society which values their independence from the state. However, the legal status of these organizations, (being registered under the law 33/1966) grant the same equality to as them to any other independent NGO. Moreover, these organizations seek such connections to state's symbols in order to provide them with the necessary protection from state intervention, as well as some credibility, of which is high valued by international sponsors⁷.

However, studies connecting the issue of civil society to the process of democratization, refer to political parties, professional associations and labor unions as the most common forms of civil society organizations (Hammarneh, 1995). Hammarneh, defines civil society as: “ The sum of voluntary social organizations, which are non-governmental and non-kinship, and which look after individuals and increase their effective participation in public life”(Hammarneh 1995:44).

This view, as one can see, is relatively similar to the modern secular view, which we have introduced by discussing Arab interpretations of civil society. The study of Hammarneh was conducted within the main framework of a series aimed at studying civil society in the Arab region, a project undertaken by the Ibn Khaldoun Center in Egypt, and introduced by Saad Eddin Ibrahim. Therefore, Hammarneh shares the same view with Ibrahim that civil society organizations have been formed outside the borders of the family and tribe, being put in a middle position between these

⁷ The existence of the high level state management helped such organizations to get more external and internal funds. Such funds however, make those organizations more able, in comparison to other organizations, to work on macro level programs, which were only the state work field. On the other hand, this has raised questions about their transparency, and accountability, as there is no certain way to review, question, or evaluate their annual budgets.

inherited forms of organizations and state. Moreover, for Hammarneh, the political transformation that Jordan is recently enjoying represents the main groundwork for the development of a civil society in Jordan. This process enhances the establishment of many median organizations, which are responsible for regulating the relations between the state and society (156). In addition, for him the state still performs some political restrictions on civil society's activities in Jordan. These restrictions, however, have forced civil society organizations to perform mainly through social service frameworks. This situation, however, is changing gradually as civil society organizations are now working intensively on becoming politically active (132). Finally, Hammarneh observes that most organizations of the civil society suffer from financial and structural difficulties (130).

Some other researchers stress problems facing civil society and its organizations in Jordan. Studies in this respect have emphasized the weakness of civil society in relation to the state. Wiktorowicz (1999) argues that in the context of political liberalization controlled from above, the state carefully manages and monitors civil society organizations, transforming them into an instrument of state control. By creating restrictive requirements for civil society organizations and by overtly managing some of them, the state is in fact enhancing its control over society through the very institutions that are supposed to limit its reach. Thus, through a process theoretically intended to advance freedom, as well as political liberalization, the Jordanian state has paradoxically expanded its control. Wiktorowicz stresses a theoretical conception of civil society as a mechanism of collective empowerment, ideally leading to increased democratization, which for her clearly is not the case in Jordan.

Concerning women and the women's organization one may summarize the following common points regard to the general status of women's organizations in Jordan, all of which were derived from the above reviewed literature: 1) Contemporary women's organizations introduce many new ideas and concepts to the work agendas of civil society organizations, discrimination against women and violence against women are good examples of this (Shteiwi/Hourani1996; Brand 1993); 2) Financially, women's organizations are suffering from a permanent deficit in the funding of their programs,

activities, and in the running of their business. Perhaps this is due to the fact that women organizations are not qualified in themselves to persuade donors that their programs are viable, as most of these programs are often modest and traditional (Hammarneh:1995); 3) finally, women's organizations lack competent personnel and the necessary expertise for planning and executing programs. Consequently, the ability of these organizations to plan and execute properly is poor (Shteiwi/ Hourani: 546).

However, the diverse literature dealing with civil society suffers as we might argue from the very same problems as stated earlier in the context of reviewing the Arab interpretation of civil society. Women, again, were represented to a wide extent by women's organizations, and ignored totally when discussing the inclusion of the traditional organization within attempts seeking to find a challenging model of civil society. Moreover, women's organizations were again treated as either merely charitable societies, which started to be active in Jordan in the 1950s and were active in social services (Hammarneh, 1996; Brand 1993), or as specialized organizations working on a specific thematic area such as women, the environment, consumers and human rights (Shteiwi /Hourani). This takes us back to the debate concerning how particular can a social (women's) movement be on the national level?

Another problem related to women in the context of civil society is their active participation in the wider scope of civil society organizations. Although there are no written laws forbidding women from actively participating in civil society organizations, their participation is still very limited. Shteiwi and Hourani refer to only five percent of members in civil society organizations as being women. This becomes worse when it comes to tribal based organizations, where women have no access to participate and consequently are not represented. Again, the societal preoccupation with gender issues plays a significant role in identifying obstacles facing women's active participation in the public space as well as in organizations of civil society.

It might be noteworthy here to claim that the tribe, as a component of the societal preoccupation with gender issues in Jordan, works as the most patriarchal obstacle in

the way of women's active participation. In fact, women have no access to the tribal based association, which is considered the most active in the Jordanian political scene⁸.

This explains to a wide extent, moreover, why women's political participation is very limited. Yet, this view cannot apply in the case of Jordanian Islamists, who show less conservative approaches in dealing with the issue of the modern women⁹(Robin, 1998). This again supports our argument that the study of the civil society and the women's movement cannot be comprehensive unless the societal preoccupation with gender issues is taken into consideration and adopted as a main fundament of analysis. This is still lacking, when we look at the previous literature dealing with civil society in Jordan.

General discussion

So far we have tried to situate social movements within the main theoretical contexts of the social and political sciences. In this respect, we have reviewed two main theoretical paradigms that aimed at associating the development as well as the role of social movements within the political transformation processes taking place in the third world. This is namely the theory of civil society, and also the feminist analysis of women's movements. The former approach, namely the one provided by Cohen and Arato, identifies social movement as the dynamic component of civil society, which carries out the task of reforming both the institutions of the state and those of the civil society.

Yet, when applying the paradigm of civil society and its accommodation of new social movement approaches to the case of Jordan in particular, as well as similar cases in the south, we may argue that some aspects and critique points should be taken into

⁸ In Jordanian elections, tribalism plays a significant role in electing a candidate. In this way, tribes function as a political party. The candidate (recognized as the tribal candidate) should compete with other tribe members who feel qualified for the parliament. After primary elections at the tribal level, the winner then has to be supported and consequently elected by all tribe members. Although no clear mechanism is used to guarantee the selected candidate's winning, "patriot" tribe members feel obliged to elect the "tribe candidate".

⁹ Jordanian Islamists elected six women in their Shura council (the highest executive council) in the Islamic Action Front Party. Three other women were elected at the same level in the competing Islamic party recently established by members who broke from the Muslim Brothers Movement and the their political expression the IAF (a detailed discussion is provided later in this study).

consideration. First, civil society is viewed as an ideal concept in an ideal status. In fact, when linked to the idea of democracy and democratization the term was given a “noble” mission being the main mean of change in a peacefully envisioned democratic transformation. Yet, when thought of this way, several interrelated issues were neglected. Mainly the capitalist form of democratization processes taking place in the third world, within the so-called third wave of democracy. These capitalist democratizations did not only influence the people-state’s relations, but also the markets i.e. the state-economy-people’s relations. In other words the democratizing state is also turning capitalist, which means it is withdrawing from spheres of social services and social security. Yet while this is widely viewed in negative terms, especially in respectto the poor, it has significant impacts on the development of civil society, mainly those organizations run by women in the field of development aimed at covering the gap behind the state’s withdrawal from providing social services(Molyneux 1998: 82).

Secondly, the association of civil society along with the modernization process, which is also problematic in the third world context besides just viewing civil society in an ideal form, ignores the existence of anti-modernization mobilizations of interest, or those seeking the mobilization of interests from traditional standpoints. On one hand, it is very clear that the theory of civil society in its continuous wish to find a practical formula for democracy, was unable to handle the issue of new forms of social movement that are anti-democratic or even anti-modern. Some new social movements however, are representing a contradiction to the dynamic peaceful image provided by Cohen and Arato. In fact, new social movements are no more the decent and peaceful way of expressing demands or simply objections to the way the society functions. Rather they use violence to declare their existence and to express their demands or objections. On the other hand, the theory of civil society and the envisioned project of engendering the state and civil society, as being the main task of the women’s movement, is not a valid approach to considering the mobilization of women and women’s interests within traditional anti-modernity (democratization) movements, or even these mobilizations of women that are anti-feminism, such as: women who want to be women, anti-feminist mobilizations, and church/Islamic oriented “feminist” discourses. Therefore, civil society theory is not able to understand new social

movements as “destructors” of the ideal values of “civility” and “modernity,” and as being developed from traditional contexts¹⁰.

Thirdly, in respect to Cohen and Arato’s justification that civil society with its dual offensive and defensive politics, will not turn radical because of a self-limitation project. Habermas (1994) sets a number of conditions for this project to succeed. Responding to the critique points that Cohen and Arato provided in respect to his theory of the life world and systems, as well as to his contribution to the new social movements theory, Habermas argues in his “Faktizität und Geltung” that such a project can only be successful within three main limitations. First, the self-limitation project of civil society can only develop by an energetic citizenry, as well as only in the context of a liberal political culture. Otherwise, social movements would blindly emerge defending the traditions of the lifeworld from being endangered by capitalist modernization. These Movements are, however, in their aims and in the form of their mobilization modern and anti-democratic at the same time (Habermas 1994: 449). Secondly, actors in the public sphere (in a liberal public sphere) can only acquire influence, but not political power. Therefore, their ability for political change is also limited. Finally, the instruments that are provided by the administrative power (Politik mit Recht) have in different societies different levels of influence. This means, that the analysis of civil society should take into consideration the internal capacity of civil society for political change.

Bringing now the discourse to Jordan and the Jordanian context, we have seen that a theory of civil society following along the tradition of the theory in the West, cannot function in the case of Jordan. To analyze the outcomes of the women’s movement in Jordan we have to take into consideration the various spheres wherein the movement acts and therefore performs its politics. In other words, we have to consider the impact of the social, the political, as well as the economic spheres on women’s activism, discourse, and politics, as well as the impact of the women’s movement on the transformation or better the modernization process taking place in Jordan. This means

¹⁰ The current happenings in the world (the attacks on the USA) are forcing the theory of civil society to reconsider its assumption. New forms of associations that work even on a global level are taking place in the world, and redefining the courses of many traditional ideas we used to share about the global system, wars, and global civil society.

that the relationships that connects the women's movement with other civil society organizations as well as with the state are of a great significance for our analysis. Provided that civil society- for the purposes of this study- includes both traditional as well as modern organizations, yet above all significant active social movements and groupings such as the women's, the tribe-based groups and the Islamists, for their interaction supplies the public space in Jordan with a very vivid nature. Therefore, the several interrelated outcomes of the social structures and economic variables are also to be considered. The impact of the growing international interest in women's issues and rights as well as gender democracy is also of great significance with regard to the analysis of women's movements at national levels in the Third World. Finally, as we have mentioned before, the socioeconomic and political atmosphere of the women's movements are performing its projects.

Consequently, not only will the development of women's organizations and actions in Jordan be the focus of our analysis, but also, and as we've learned through reviewing the various theoretical approaches that issues like; the internal autonomy, leader and memberships, project, politics and strategies are also of significant importance in the analysis of the women's movement. In one final step, the analysis will target the impact of all of these variables on the civil society- state relationship and the process of democratization in Jordan.

To conclude, we might argue that the three paradigms (Civil Society, New Social Movements, and the Feminist analysis of women's movements) do not contradict as much as they complement one another. Cohen and Arato argue in this respect that their interpretation of civil society and social movement is able to accommodate both the RM, and the NSM paradigms as well as the feminist critique to Habermas' lifeworld and systems. This however, would support our analytical attempt which aims at analyzing the women's movement in the general context of the sociopolitical development of the society in Jordan, that is in the context of changing patterns of people's lives (men and Women) and the changing political and economic atmosphere at both the national and international levels.