State of the state: politics of power shifts and shifting power of the state in India

Sudha Mohan

CrossMark

States are more engaged in nation branding than nation building treating citizens as clients, customers and consumers, but not as citizens with rights. Governance not only changes the rules of the game but it allows new games to be played within those rules. An attempt will be made to understand and examine—whether the institutions, governance structures and organisations of the state are adapting, out of necessity or desire to flow along with the *mantra* of governance and globalisation. The very pluralisation of governance with its processes of outsourcing and subcontracting has commodified the state by converting statesmanship into salesmanship. This paper argues in favour of a return to responsible, accountable government as the only way to ensure inclusive development.

Address
Department of Civics and Politics, University of Mumbai, India

Corresponding author: Mohan, Sudha (smohan@politics.mu.ac.in)

Introduction

State is an indispensable idea or rather a crude reality that citizens and other stakeholders have to grapple with. The role of the state in development is an accepted fact for the states mould development as the actions and the policies of the state institutions have very important repercussion for development. However, the most critical fact is how it leads development that is inclusive.

At the most basic level, inclusive development (ID) is about the expansion of human capabilities [1]. It is associated with the equitable distribution of social and material benefits across social groups and categories. Inclusive development primarily is about social inclusiveness, ecological inclusiveness and relational inclusiveness. The challenge for any modern state is to ensure that it ushers in these changes in a manner that is inclusive. participatory and holistic.

The changing role of the state in India, especially since the 1990s in the context of globalisation and governance has to be linked to the ways in which its policies lead to or negates its central function of bringing about inclusive development, whether in the social, economic and ecological spheres. If the state is unable or unwilling to usher in such inclusion, it is bound to fail or succeed superficially. This paper highlights the fact that (i) The role of the state to bring about sustainable development is very important. (ii) Though some states are more interested in national branding than nation building, it occurs at the expense of inclusive development that in the end leads to unsustainable development. (iii) Nation building for ID requires revising the role of citizenship and the environment. (iv) ID and citizenship rights can be ensured by the state, constitution and institutions.

This paper primarily is an analytical descriptive work based on secondary sources of information to understand, analyse, problematic, critique and conclude on the previously mentioned concerns.

The fundamental importance in understanding state is the recognition that there are two distinct but related levels at which politics in general, the state in particular and political contestation over policy occurs [2].

1. The level which concerns the rules of the game (institutions); and
2. The level at which games within the rules occurs.

The rules of the game, agreement about the rules and agreements about the rules for changing the rules, are fundamental for any on-going political activity. Stable polities are characterized by lasting consensus about the central rules of politics, which has seldom been established without intense contestation over long periods of time [3,4].

Globalisation, governance and the State

The question that needs to be raised is, have formal rules, governance structures and organisation of the state, in globalising India undergone any transformation? The literature on the state and globalization is large and growing. For some scholars, states remain the key actors

and hence not much has changed for states and the interstate system [5–7]. A key strand in the scholarship on globalization and the state is 'hyperglobalism', which posits that national states are becoming weak and are on their way out. It is an approach, which sees globalisation as a new epoch in human history. This new epoch is characterized by the declining relevance and authority of nation–states, brought about largely through the economic logic of a global market. In the broader debate on 'globalisation and the state' within the social sciences, what has become known as competition state theory takes up what David Held has labelled a 'transformist' position. Transformationists contend that globalization has brought about significant changes in state authority and the work of states and view national governments as changing (being reconstituted and restructured) but a description of this change as merely growing or waning is oversimplified [8].

It is important to note that the competition state literature refuses to view globalisation and the state as two conflicting dynamics, destined to pull in opposing directions, and rather stresses 'the adaptation of the state to the new conditions' [9]. One way of understanding these issues is to ask whether the role of the state is simply one that reduces its authority—for example, as suggested with terms such as deregulation and privatization and generally 'less government and more governance.' (This was and continues to be the *mantra* of the current government in India).

One way of understanding this issues is to ask whether the role of the state is simply one of reducing its authority – *e.g.*, as suggested key terms such as deregulation and privatization, and generally 'less government' – or whether it also requires the production of new types of regulations, legislative items, and court decisions, in brief, the production of a whole series of new 'legalities'. There is an older scholarship on world-order systems (*e.g.*, Ref. [10]) invigorated by debates about cosmopolitanism [11,12] that examines and theorises the possibilities of transcending nationally oriented state authority and instituting world level institutional orders.

Studying the global, then, entails not only a focus on what is explicitly global in scale, but also on locally scaled practices and conditions articulated with global dynamics as well as a focus on the multiplication of cross-border connections among various localities. Further, it entails recognizing that many of the globally scaled dynamics, such as the global capital market, actually are partly embedded in subnational sites and move between these differently scaled practices and organizational forms [13]. Globalisation processes have led to transformations of governance specially at the local level as new kinds of social and political institutions emerged at the local level; with new 'spaces' that have been created for the mobilisation and articulation of concerns, issues and demands by local people [14].

Jan Kooiman makes a distinction between government and governance. Governance is the deliberative mechanism or process for making authoritative political choices. It defies simple definitions in a more plural political world with more complex set of societal problems [15]. The discursive shift from government to governance in India can be seen as a response to these developments. India witnessed a widening of income inequality during the phase of acceleration in economic growth in the post-reform period [16]. It was also pointed out that the where the socially disruptive impact of inequalities exacerbated by marketisation policies, with the explicit suggestion that these can be contained by socially sensitive policies [17,18].

Governance is the deliberative mechanism or process for making authoritative political choices. It defies simple definitions in a more plural political world with more complex set of societal problems. Government occurs when those with legally and formally derived authority and policing power execute and implement activities; governance refers to the creation, execution and implementation of activities backed by the shared goals of citizens and organisations, who may or may not have formal authority. More importantly, governance also has come to be centred on the association of state 'with' non-state and civil society actors at the site of living. Government action hitherto led to uneven development and uneven reach [19].

Pluralized and commodified state

Governance, propped and promoted by the India has to be understood in the context of an increasingly pluralised state sharing power with multiple actors within a complex network of associations and organisations. The state also had to reckon with its own changing role and of established rules that has transformed its functions. It has become what is called as the Commodified State, where Statesmanship is transformed into Salesmanship—where the Nation State is branded as a location to globally footloose capital and firms. It is also referred to as Nation Branding [20].

The notion of converting a state from a political entity to an economic commodity exemplifies economic logic through which a place is marketed and sold as something attractive for globally footloose capital. This notion of the 'entrepreneurial state' is used in line with the notion of 'entrepreneurial city' [21]. This notion of the State corresponds to the notion 'competition state' that was coined by [22] stating a shift 'from the welfare state to the competition state'—with the state forced 'to act more and more like a market player, that shapes its policies to promote, control, and maximise returns from market