China have made it clear that they were inspired by and learned important lessons from the U.S. Civil Rights Movement.

For all its success and influences, however, the Civil Rights Movement did not solve all of America’s racial problems. As the twentieth century closed, African Americans and many other nonwhite groups were still at the bottom of the social and economic order. These current conditions are exacerbated by a mean-spirited political climate in which the poor and oppressed are blamed for their own suffering and oppression. Because of the success of the Civil Rights Movement, a relatively large black middle class has emerged. At the same time over a third of the black community is trapped in poverty. Black Americans are disproportionately housed in the rapidly growing prison industry. Thus with the dawn of the new millennium some blacks find themselves experiencing the best of times while millions of others experience the worst of times. Poverty and inequality are also widespread outside the black community. Global poverty and suffering are equally evident. It may be that protest remains the only viable means to achieve greater empowerment. If this is the case, the Civil Rights Movement has left a rich legacy to inspire and inform future struggles.

(See also civil disobedience; disability politics; Du Bois, W. E. B.; gay and lesbian politics; Hispanic Americans; inequalities; race and racism.)


ALDON MORRIS

CIVIL SOCIETY. For contemporary scholars, social activists, and development professionals, civil society is that collection of diverse interest groups and social organizations that is strong enough to provide some autonomy and protection to individuals from the authoritarian and hegemonic tendencies of states. Broadly, civil society underscores the importance of markets and liberal states to independent social life.

Since the 1970s, the concept of civil society has been used in diverse ways, reflecting its new popular appeal as an emancipatory ideal. The concept has helped to motivate and inspire democratic struggles under authoritarian regimes in eastern and central Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Scholarship on democratization, popular movements, “human rights, and community development in these regions has found the concept of civil society tremendously productive. Beyond academic scholarship, strengthening civil society has become a priority of thousands of non-governmental organizations through the world and a pillar of the multi-billion-dollar international development profession. Such conceptions of civil society trace their intellectual origins to Alexis de Tocqueville, whose 1835 classic Democracy in America emphasized the importance of independent associations to social life and to promoting democracy.

As a result of its recent popularity, the concept has become somewhat detached from its intellectual roots. The term civil society is now often used as an elaborate substitute for society, without any substantial difference in meaning. Sometimes, civil society is characterized as a society with rules for civility. While coherent definition and consistent use of a term cannot be, in itself, incorrect, some definitions of civil society do ignore the concept's rich history and conceal the implications of the original conception. To speak of the mobilization of civil society or the resolution of collective action problems within civil society, for example, is to mix conceptual metaphors in untenable ways. Social scientists and activists are now examining the ancestry of civil society more critically.

The origins of the concept lie in the Scottish Enlightenment (1740–1790). In the mid-eighteenth century, Francis Hutcheson, Adam Smith, David Hume, James Steuart, Adam Ferguson, and others began to regard the market less as a socially destructive force than as a cohesive element in modern society. Civil society was thought to be intimately related to commercial society. The conduct of business for profit was theorized to be an innocent occupation. Commerce was considered capable of pacifying political ambition and of thus promoting moral virtue. "To what purpose is all the toil and bustle of this world?" Smith asked in the Theory of Moral Sentiments (1759). "To be observed, to be attended to, to be taken notice of with sympathy, complacency, and approbation." The original theorists of civil society considered market interactions to promote manners of civility.

The Scottish enlightenment conception of civil society, with its emphasis on manners and values in commercial society, is not identical to the Roman conception of civilis societas. The two conceptions share the notion that individuals may make and live as equals under laws that they themselves make (as citizens). However, Scottish Enlightenment thought considered commercial society, which classical societies did not experience, to be uniquely capable of promoting the manners of a civil society.

The institution of private property and the mechanisms for its protection are fundamental to civil society. Jean-Jacques Rousseau summarized this nicely. The first person," he writes in A Discourse on the Origins of Inequality (1755), "who, having enclosed a plot of land, took it into his head to say this is mine and found people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society." In a similar way, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's conception of civil society (bürgerliche gesellschaft) literally designates the commercially vital segment of a population, namely, traders, businessmen, lawyers, and other professionals, who are afforded residence within the walls of fortified towns as the essence of civil society. Hegel regarded the market, or "the system of needs," together with public laws, the courts, the police, and corporations as the pillars of civil society, and civil society to be the ethical foundation of the state. John Locke's post-Scottish enlightenment contract-based conception of civil society is often contrasted with Hegel's post-Scottish enlightenment conception. For Locke, civil society was equivalent to political society. For Hegel, in contrast, political society, and the state are made possibly by the development of civil society. In contemporary usage, civil society and human rights activists prize civil society for its promise of independence, autonomy, and separation. It is also noted that the state, with its power, is not necessary to civil society. Important functions such as property and the economy can exist in society that contains no political, legal, economic, or social associations more comprehensive than civil society.

(See also CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE; DISABILITY POLITICS; DU BOIS, W. E. B.; GAY AND LESBIAN POLITICS; HISPANIC AMERICANS; INEQUALITIES; RACE AND RACISM.)

CLAUSEWITZ, WILHELM VON (1780–1831) analyzed war and warfare. He developed a theory of warfare that emphasized the role of strategy, his book On War. Clausewitz's vision of modern war was not a science. War is not a science, but a specialized art. It is a specialized art with a specialized theory. Clausewitz's vision of modern war was one of the most important in the history of military thought, and his ideas have influenced the development of modern war.
and separation from the state. Nevertheless, it should be noted the state both protects and makes possible civil society. Important functions of the modern state are to protect private property and to produce patterns of expectation and behavior in society that promote a public order that specific governments cannot easily alter. In this way, by promoting a political, economic, and social environment in which independent associations may form and operate, the state helps to create civil society.

(See also Citizenship; Pluralism; Social Capital.)


CHRISTOPHER CANDLAND

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS. See Non-Governmental Organizations.

CLASS AND POLITICS. See overleaf.

CLAUSETZ, Carl von. The first modern writer to develop a nondidactic theory of war, Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831) analyzed war as a permanent phenomenon of the human condition, with its own dynamic and timeless as well as changing elements. He entered the Prussian army at the age of twelve, and served as an infantry officer and in staff positions in the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. Between 1818 and 1830 he was director of the Berlin War Academy, during which time he wrote his major theoretical work, On War. He died before completing the extensive revisions he had planned.

Clausewitz believed that although war, like politics or art, was not a science, it could be studied scientifically. By combining historical research with the experience and study of contemporary wars, he created a broad evidentiary base to which he applied the analytic methods of German idealist philosophy. He developed his arguments dialectically and by making comparisons between past and present, which alone, he thought, made possible the discovery of universals. He tested these theoretical results against actual events, which called for further historical study. Not coincidentally, history rather than theory makes up the larger share of his writings.

According to Clausewitz, theory should identify the various elements (operational, tactical, etc.) of war, explain their function and interaction, and place war in its political context. Hypotheses and explanations must be logical, consistent, and above all realistic. Reality will always differ from its theoretical image, if only because reality includes imponderables. Theory must build chance, accidents, and emotions into its structure, but will never be truly comprehensive. Theory cannot provide laws for action, but by helping people think logically and realistically about war it might indirectly improve performance.

War is distinguished from other social activities by its element of large-scale, organized violence. Because violence is its defining property, the philosophically "ideal" conflict contains the highest degree of violence—absolute war. Not only are extremes of violence a logical necessity, war in the real world tends to approach the absolute as the result of technological development and of the dynamic process Clausewitz termed "escalation," in which each opponent is tempted to outdo the other.

The concept of absolute war, logically valid and supported by some historical evidence, helps us analyze all wars. But real wars have usually fallen short of the highest level of violence. This contradiction between theory and reality is partly explained by "friction," a concept Clausewitz developed to analyze chance, misunderstandings, and accidents in war. Its basic explanation, however, is found in an antithesis that Clausewitz joined to the thesis of absolute war. War is always influenced by forces external to it: by its political goals, and by the characteristics of the societies and governments in conflict. War is a continuation of policy by other means. If a particular war does not seek the opponent's annihilation but a lesser goal—defense of a border zone, for instance—then even theory does not demand the extreme. The concept of absolute war and the concept of war limited by friction, policy, and other factors, together define the dual nature of war.

It is a consequence of war's dual nature that a purely military evaluation of strategic or operational decisions is inappropriate. In a rational context, the kind and degree of violence should agree with the goal of policy, and the political implications of its use should be weighed.

These central tenets of Clausewitz's theory are supported by concepts such as friction, escalation, and "moral elements"—psychological characteristics of society, the armed forces, and the military leadership, which are difficult to analyze and quantify, but are of supreme importance. Lesser propositions address specifics of warfare, for instance the assertion that every attack loses impetus as it progresses.

Clausewitz wrote with great precision, but readers have often found his dialectic difficult to follow, or have mistaken the concept of absolute war as advocacy instead of a theoretical construct, which with its antithesis enables us to analyze the entire range of armed conflict. Despite many attempts, it has never been proved that his writings have seriously influenced the conduct of modern war. For instance, Germany's invasion of Belgium in 1914, regardless of the political consequences that were sure to follow, contradicts his warning against purely military decisions. His influence has been intellectual. On War is still read and discussed today because the work's concepts and formulations have proved to be an excellent introduction to the systematic, realistic study of war, past and present.

(See also Force, Use of Strategy.)


PETER PARET

CLIENTALISM. See Patron-Client Politics.

CLINTON, Bill. It is probably the case that all presidents hope to "go down in history"; indeed, the goal of leaving behind a substantial "legacy" is generally regarded as an important influence on the behavior in their last years in office of that minority of modern presidents who have been lucky enough to serve for two full terms. William Jefferson Clinton need have no concern about whether or not his name will be