INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD

ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47] Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value: 86.87

Volume - 11, Issue - 07, July - 2025



DOIs:10.2015/IJIRMF/202507041

--:--

Research Paper / Article / Review

Creation of Society and Norm of Othering – Historiography of Lifeworld in Civils Society

¹ Anagh, ² Prof (Dr) K M Sudhakaran,

¹Research Scholar, PG and Research Department of Political Science, Maharajas College, Ernakulam, Kerala, India ²Principal, SSV College, Valayanchirangara, Ernakulam, Kerala, India Email – ¹researchpurposeanagh@gmail.com, ²sudhakaran1974@yahoo.com

Abstract: This paper tries to dwelve in to the process of formation of a society under the set norms which historically oppressed and set aside a group of people who are historically unseen and oppressed. The hierarchy was created by this people who had capital with them which could oppress and create a vaccum to the entry of the others into this strata. This article tries to draw a picture of this ommission.

Key Words: Civil Society, Marginalisation, Othering, Hierarchy in Society

1. INTRODUCTION:

The term society implies groups of individuals living within themselves. Since they live in a society they are bound to follow certain rules and regulations with respect to the society in which they live. In this case, the preferences of the concerned cannot be taken into account beyond a large extend for the convenience of one person might become inconvenience of yet another person. Hence it would be appropriate to socialise without causing any kind of disturbance to another members of the society. When the activities of one person seem to disturb the existence of yet another person or groups of persons, the result is the creation of chaos and misunderstanding. The actions of the members of a society should be such that those should not cause any disturbances or ill fealings amongst the rest of the members. This could avoid unnecessary misunderstanding. A free and frank discussion on matters relating to violation (if so) would be, perhps meaningful and fruitful further misunderstanding. There existed a time period when peaceful and adjustable coexistence was the way and there was a mutual understanding on most of the aspects relating to the life of human being. In cases of differences the same where sorted out without chaos but with atmost friendliness and cooperation. One person could easily understand and visualise the difficulties faced by yet another person. There was a time when mutual help was readily acceptable in addition to the fact that the same was easily given without delay as and when warranted. In such cases both the parties had an equal say in all matters relating to the existence of humankind. Mutual differences did not go beyond a certain limit, that was because both the parties where in dire need of help on all sides. And for the purpose friendliness and humanitarian feelings was the only way to create such a conducive atmosphere.

As history reitierates human was one time nomadic and hence wandered from one place to another in search of food and shelter. In those days, there was no home built up for the nomads. These nomads continued to wander from one place to another. They would cook food at one place or eat raw food since cooking was not feasible and they would go into another place for shelter. There were no thoughts about home or private properties were they could sleep in comfort. Being nomadic these were never a problem for them. Within a certain period of time they began to contemplate on settling themselves and they wanted something to live upon. In the end, they relied upon agriculture and they began agricultural farming as a means of livelihood. This was the reason for the advent of the concept of "private property". Each person had lot of land to be cultivated and the same was done. This made them think of new modes of farming. This was the beginning of the concept of self alone in which case human beings began to think of their own property and the security of the property for self and their people alone gained momentum. Each person had separate views of living and separate modes of living despite the fact that agriculture was main source of income for all the families which were living as separate entitites with their own savings and modes of livings. This was the cause for the onset of public to private dichotomy. Wherein there was a transformation from public to private. The public properties were treated with joy, because the same was common for one and all and none had more rights or less. Righs were equal and there was no room for any kind of differences. But in the case of private each person had their own responsibility of looking after their property so that the same could be made use of in the coming days. Here, people learnt about the way to

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD

ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47] Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value: 86.87

Volume - 11, Issue - 07, July - 2025



manage their private property and understood that that was the only source of income which they had to manage single handed. Aboveall, this property had to be managed for the subsitence of self and family of the head of the family. They had to ensure that the same was made available for the ensuing periods. Unless it is kept and managed in an orderly way, it would be lost within no time in which case there would be none to help them. This situation was responsible for creation of chaos amongst human beings themselves. This gave rise to mutual misunderstanding. Humans became too selfish and this selfishness forbaid them to either seek the help of others or in turn help the needy people in times of crisis. The differences among people in the name of private property laid to the misunderstanding as said before. This created more differences in such a manner that they lost control over each other and this led to physical attacks which became almost a daily affair. Persons had no intention neither the mood to help their own kith and kin. As time went on this rift increased altogether leading to animal like behaviour amongst the society on the part of the persons concerned. This imbibed in them a feeling of civic sense and from then on they felt the need for a civic society. The humans felt in need of a civic society. Heirarchy was defined to a small extend. As mentioned above chaos amongst the people themselves was on the increasing trend and hence the need for a civic society was felt by the members. Accordingly, the same was created with a certain amount of society imbibed in it. The idea of civic sense developed in human beings with the feeling of oneness which gave birth to the concept of family. The concept of one man changed to several men. The number increased by leaps and bounds. At this juncture the need to set up the family was felt by the population. From the family the term called group arose. Several people gathered to form one group. And this number slowly increased with the feeling of necessity for additional groups. There groups were created with a purpose and once that purpose is solved further groups would be created to solve other necessities. This was the reason or the cause groups and slowly large number of groups were created with a common purpose. When the groups were too large in numbers, the feeling of society was felt by the humans. And this was the reason for the reason for the onset of the general society. When a general society was created humans in groups and separate ownership became automatically members of the society and thus chaos began amongst them. In order to curb the chaos and live in peace, humans created a civil society. This society was pre political in nature as well as it was in the state of pre maturity. That was due to the lack of adequate knowledge with regard to politics and redressal of chaos and related greivances within the society. They had the feelings regarding basic rights, they were very concious about the same. Because of the conciousness of the basic rights this made them realise that they could not continue a life in chaos itself for that would end in misery. Apart from them so called misery would lead to poverty and other means of degradation for they were not in a position to concentrate and improve themselves way for daily bread. This made them realise that unless the chaotic situation does not end in itself life would be miserable on all aspects. This compelled them to initiate efforts towards the creation of a hierarchy of the creation of a system. Thus the process of creation continued and ultimately they were successful in their mission. This was the cause of creation of a hierarchy in order to launch a system. Ultimately they were again successful in the elimination of chaos to a large extend in their midst. Human beings realised at this juncture that it would not be easy or feasible at all to exist in isolation. This gave birth to the idea of hierarchy in all walks of life and each and every corner of the society. Hierarchy and the power of each person was created in a chronoligical order so that the persons concerned could easily follow in letter and spirit. People began to realise that living in chaos is totally miserable and that cannot be extended beyond a certain limit for this would create lot of mental tension due to which they would not be able to concentrate on their work. And how would they earn their daily bread? This gave them food for thought and they began to view things on a positivie outlook.

2. RESULT:

As a result of the above human beings came to understand that they could not live alone and needed the protection of their rights and welfare. This made them contemplate of protection of their personal interests as well as protection of their own rights. This was to be made on institutional basis because human being felt that their own fundamental rights in addition to their own personal interests could be protected only on an institutional framework. They began to understand the value of mutual understanding and feeling fraternity for a common purpose. Such understandings existed for purposes that were innumerable, as time went on. On an institutional framework, when their rights and needs were protected to a large extend it was responsible for the creation of the better environment were their work was satisfactory enough and they could manage their own needs with maximum utilities. This was the reason for the formation of the State. The state was equipped with the responsibilies to look after the needs and rights as well as protect them too by means of a suitable hierarchy. Though the groups of members of the society themselves were part of this "state" the responsibility of looking after the needs and ensuring them in addition to protection of the rights of the population rested with the state itself. The role of the persons were defined in addition to powers of each and everyone. The state work for a common purpose and each one of its members had a say in its working. The state had the power to curb chaos and other kinds of misunderstanding within the people as and when necessitated with the help

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD

ISSN(O): 2455-0620 [Impact Factor: 9.47] Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value: 86.87

Volume - 11, Issue - 07, July - 2025



WIRME

of the hierarchy hiterto created thereunder. The state was divided into three – viz Legislative Executive and Judiciary respectively with the respective roles and duties defined for each section in toto. It was the duty of the state to abide by the rules and regulations that are created as part of the creation of the state. In this case, powers were defined in an adequate manner – in chronological order. Members of the society were to abide by the rules and regulations that were formulated by the state. Members could approach the state directly for rectification of any kind of confusion with regard to powers and roles of state. To create any kind of they had a say in the system. This was created in a crude shape. Entry was restricted and it was strictly disciplined. Violation of any kind would be viewed seriously and punishable under law.

A group of persons have been excluded from the hierarchy and hence, they are not part of the hierarchy as created above. They were the marginalised section of the population and hence excluded from the hierarchy. They were less visible. They were ill treated and put to untold misery and suffering. They faced several difficulties on this account, to make the two ends meet. They were never part of either the civil society, or the institutional framework or the hierarchies, etc. Consequently, they had no space to express with regard to their grievances or difficulty. In actual practice, they were too ignorant for a long period of with regard to the availability of the institutional framework or a civil society or any other system formed as part of the formation of the civil society. They came to understand that they were purposefully exlcuded from these limits and they have been outcasted from the society which has been hitherto created and they could analyse that they are no one in the hierarchy. In such a pecuiniary situation to whom would they turn for advice. This question remained unanswered for a long period of time. They could visualise that they had no resources in particular to eak out a living. The privileged groups of the society continued to remain so and the poor marginalised section had no other way of livelihood. They were blank with regard to power and other facilities and amentities of livelihood. They were cornered by the society in which they live. Money, muscle and land were distributed to the privileged class alone for a long time. They could choose their way of enjoyment in addition to the way of living. The privileged class was never borthere about the oppressive class.

REFERENCES

- 1. Kate Nash, 'Contemporary Political Sociology Globalisation, Politics and Power, Blackwell Publishers USA, 2000, p.16
- 2. David Theo Goldberg (ed) Multiculturalism A critical Reader, Blackwell Publishers, USA, 1994, p.29
- 3. Lewis A Coser 'Masters of Sociological Thought Ideas in Hisorical and Social Context'. Rawat Publication, Jaipure, 2004, pp.52-53
- 4. Robert G Dunn, Identity Crises: A social critique of Post modernity, University of Minnesoata Press London, 1998. P.3
- 5. Rajni Kothari, 'Rise of the Dalits and the Renewed Debate on Caste' in Partha Chatterjee 9ed) 'State and Politics in India', Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2006, p.439
- 6. Nandu Ram, 'Social Mobility and Status Identitification Among the Scheduled Castes in KL Sharma (ed), social Inequality in India, Rawat Publications Jaipur, 2001, p.441