Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

A Comparative Analysis Of Hegel'S Ethical State And Partha Chatterjee'S Tactically Extended State

Muhammad Shahab ud Din
Visiting Faculty Member, Air University, Islamabad.
Dr. Ehtaisham Ahmed Khan
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Kohat University of Science and Technology.
Dr. Waqar Ilahi
Consultant, Department of Politics and International Relations, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad.

Abstract

This study presents a comparative analysis of two influential theories of the modern state i.e. G. W. F. Hegel's Ethical State and Partha Chatterjee's Tactically Extended State. Hegel, writing in nineteenth century Europe, views the state as the actuality of the ethical idea. It is the highest stage of ethical life, where the subjective wills of individuals are reconciled with universal reason and objective freedom is realized. Chatterjee, writing from the postcolonial world, challenges the universality of this model. He argues that in most of the world the state does not deal with a homogeneous civil society of rights-bearing citizens. It deals with large populations who live in conditions of precarity and illegality, and it extends itself tactically into a domain which he calls political society. The study uses a qualitative and comparative method based on the textual analysis of the primary works of both thinkers and the relevant secondary literature. It compares the two frameworks on six dimensions i.e. universality, institutional mediation, citizenship, law, poverty and democracy. The study finds that Hegel's framework offers a normative baseline for a rational and integrated political community, while Chatterjee's framework offers an empirical vocabulary for understanding how the postcolonial state actually governs. The study further argues that the two frameworks are not simply opposed to each other. Hegel's own unresolved problem of poverty and the rabble anticipates the governed populations of Chatterjee's political society. Together, both frameworks form an essential dialectic for political theory in the Global South.

Key Words: Hegel; Partha Chatterjee; Ethical State; Tactically Extended State; Civil Society; Political Society; Governmentality; Postcolonial State

Introduction

The philosophical and practical basis of the modern state is an important focus of enquiry in western political philosophy and postcolonial sub-altern studies. In the investigation of the state, the main focus of discussion is to draw lines between universal and particular, the rational and historical, and the lawful citizen as compared to the governed population. This study has tried to provide a sophisticated framework for analyzing and comparing two distinct but structurally interrelated theories of state sovereignty and mediating institutions. These theories are Hegel's conception of "Ethical State" (Der sittliche Staat) and Partha Chatterjee's critique of Hegel's Ethical State in the context of postcolonial societies in the form of "Tactically Extended State", which operates within the political society. By digging out and comparing these models, the text aims to critique the presumed universality of the western political structures when applied to the fluid and fractured realities of the Global South.

Hegel wrote in the nineteenth century European context. He constructed a speculative and dialectical framework. According to Hegel the state is the tool for the ultimate actualization of objective human freedom. The state, according to Hegel, is not merely a

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

utilitarian apparatus or a social contract actualized to protect and preserve private property of the individuals. The state, to Hegel, means an ethical totality where subjective individual wills of citizens are haromonized to add to universal social reason (Chotas, 2020).

Partha Chatterjee, writing from the perspective of the global south, deconstructs the singular and totalizing narrative of the state universality put forward by Hegel. Chatterjee argues that in most societies in the world, the state does not interact with an ideal and homogeneous civil society comprised of rights bearing citizens. The state, in the postcolonial societies, the state is forced engage or tactically extend itself into turbulent domain of "political society." Political Society, according to Chatterjee composed of precariously situated groups, squatters and informal workers. These groups do not negotiate with the state through the language of the constitutional rights. The state and these people negotiate with one another through political maneuvers, shifting alliances, exceptionalities and more of collective claims to survival (Joshi, 2018).

The comparison between Hegel and Chatterjee is not an arbitrary one. Chatterjee's distinction between civil society and political society is built in direct conversation with the European tradition of political thought, in which Hegel's account of civil society and the state occupies a central place. Hegel is among the first modern philosophers who gave civil society a separate and systematic place between the family and the state (Avineri, 1972). Chatterjee takes this category and asks what happens to it when it travels to societies which were shaped by colonial rule. In this sense, Chatterjee is not rejecting Hegel from outside. He is reading the categories of European political theory against the historical experience of the postcolonial world (Chatterjee, 2004; Kistner, 2014).

Research Questions and Methodology

This study is guided by three main questions. First, how does Hegel conceptualize the state as an ethical totality, and what role do civil society and its mediating institutions play in this conception? Second, how does Partha Chatterjee's notion of political society and the tactically extended state challenge the universality of the Hegelian model? Third, what are the main points of divergence and convergence between the two frameworks, and what do they tell us about the nature of the state in postcolonial societies?

The study is qualitative in nature. It uses the method of comparative textual analysis. The primary sources of the study are Hegel's *Elements of the Philosophy of Right* and his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, and Chatterjee's *The Politics of the Governed*, *The Nation and Its Fragments* and *Lineages of Political Society*. The secondary sources include scholarly books and peer reviewed articles which interpret these works. The study does not aim to judge which of the two thinkers is right in an absolute sense. It rather aims to place both frameworks side by side, to identify their basic assumptions and to show how each framework explains the relationship between the state and the people it governs. The comparison is carried out on the basis of six analytical themes i.e. universality, institutional mediation, citizenship, law, poverty and democracy.

The paper is organized in the following way. After the introduction and methodology, the next section gives an overview of Hegel's political philosophy. The third section discusses Hegel's concept of the Ethical State and the problem of poverty in his account of civil society. The fourth section explains Partha Chatterjee's concept of the Tactically Extended State, its intellectual background and its empirical illustration. The fifth section presents a comparative analysis of both frameworks. The last section concludes the study and suggests some directions for future research.

An Overview of Hegel's Political Philosophy

In order to understand Hegel's political thought, it is necessary to locate it within the broader trajectory of his philosophical foundations, more specifically his philosophy of the objective spirit. Inherently Hegel's political philosophy is both teleological and dialectical. It tracks the historical development of human freedom as it transitions from subjective abstraction to objective institutional reality. Hegel's philosophy is teleological

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

because it aims towards the ultimate freedom of human species or we can say finality in the teleological terms. Hegel's philosophy is dialectical because he does not consider human thought as static. He is an idealist who is of the view that idea comes before material manifestation (Fusiek, 2021, p. 4-30).

Historically, according to Hegel, society moves forward when certain established knowledge or ideology is opposed by new knowledge and system of ideas, and the new ideas are then opposed by new ideas i.e. Thesis, Anti-thesis and Synthesis. This spirit of the thoughts moving forward and manifesting into material conditions will lead humanity into its final stage i.e the ultimate freedom (Hegel, 1820). According to Hegel, the state is very important in the read to ultimate freedom because it is the highest stage where all individual wills are homogenized and the history moves forward (Chotas, 2020). Hegel opposed the social contract frameworks of the state put forward by philosophers like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. according to Hegel, the philosophers of the social contract reduce the state an artificial and narrow tool made for protecting private property and self-interest of individuals. Such views, according to Hegel, reduce the public sphere into an external arrangement, as it misses the intrinsic and organic connection between the individual mind and the social collective (Houlgate, 2016, p. 104-116).

Hegel himself has summarized this view of history in his lectures on the philosophy of history. He writes: "The History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom" (Hegel, 1956, p. 19). For Hegel, freedom is not something which is given to man by nature. It is achieved gradually through history. Each stage of history represents a higher level of awareness of freedom than the previous one. In the Oriental world, according to Hegel, only one person i.e. the despot was known to be free. In the Greek and Roman world, some were known to be free. In the modern Germanic world, all human beings are known to be free as human beings (Hegel, 1956). This historical scheme is important for this study because it places Europe at the end point of history and treats the non-European world as an earlier stage of development. Many postcolonial thinkers have criticized this Eurocentric scheme of history (Chakrabarty, 2000; Fusiek, 2021).

Hegel, in his master work, "Elements of the Philosophy of Right", explains the dialectical development of the free will through three distinct phases i.e. abstract right, morality and Sittlichkeit (Ethical Life). Abstract rights deals with humans as mere legal persons. It deals with the realm of property, contract and wrong. Morality represents an inward or internal shift. It focuses on subjective conscience, intention, and moral duties. Both these spheres, abstract right and morality are abstract and fundamentally one sided. Thy need a concrete and historical foundation to make it truly manifested. This synthesis is only achieved in the realm of Ethical life. In the ethical life, the subjective desires of individuals and the objective laws of the society are absolutely reconciled. This synthesis allows freedom to be lived out self-consciously within shared human institutions (Hegel, 1820; Chotas, 2020; Houlgate, 2016).

It is also important to note Hegel's famous claim in the preface of the *Philosophy of Right*. He states: "What is rational is actual and what is actual is rational" (Hegel, 1952, p. 10). This statement does not mean that every existing institution is good or justified. It means that philosophy should not build an imaginary picture of how the world ought to be. Philosophy should rather comprehend the rational structure which is already present in the existing world. Hegel, therefore, does not present the state as a utopian ideal. He presents it as a rational structure which already exists in the developed institutions of the modern European world (Houlgate, 2016; Taylor, 1979). This point will become important when Chatterjee questions whether this rational structure actually exists in the postcolonial world.

Hegel's Concept of Ethical State

According to Hegel, in sphere of Ethical Life, institutions manifest themselves through three successive moments i.e. he family, civil society, and the state. The family is the

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

primary and immediate phase which is characterized by natural affection. In the family, there is uncalculated unity and a mutual surrender of individual isolated personality (Hegel, 1820; Chotas, 2020).

As individuals grow and goes out of the family in the social space, the immediate unity in the family dissolves into the expanded and fragmented domain of "Civil Society" (die bürgerliche Gesellschaft). According to Hegel, the civil society is a system of needs. It is an atomized arena of economic interdependence. There are market relations and private self-interests and individuals treat each other as a means to their own self-interested ends:

"Civil society is the battleground where everyone's individual private interest meets everyone else's...Here, the ethical life is split into its extremes and lost in the atomistic mechanics of individual desire and economic necessity" (Hegel, 1820, p. 114).

According to Hegel, the civil society cannot resolve its inherent contradictions i.e. the polarization of extreme wealth and a marginalized underclass. The dialectical logic demands a higher institutional form which can preserve the subjective freedom of civil society as well as restoring ethical universality in the social space. This ultimate synthesis of this tremendous contradiction is the State (Fusiek, 2021; Houlgate, 2016).

The state, according to Hegel, is the actuality of the ethical idea. It is the self-conscious totality. It is the space where institutional mechanics of government, the legal system and corporate associations work as one body in order to manifest freedom. The state is not not an external imposition upon the individual rather it is the most objective realm where the citizen finds their true and rational self-determination. In a famous quote Hegel explains this concept by stating: "The State is the march of God in the world; its ground is the power of reason actualizing itself as will." Patriotism, in this framework, is not a blind sentiment but rather a rational trust built from an awareness that particular subjective rights of individuals are fully guaranteed and actualized only within the universal laws of the state (Fusiek, 2021; Houlgate, 2016).

Hegel opens his discussion of the state in the *Philosophy of Right* with the statement: "The state is the actuality of the ethical Idea" (Hegel, 1952, §257). A little later he adds: "The state is the actuality of concrete freedom" (Hegel, 1952, §260). Concrete freedom, according to Hegel, means that individuals pursue their own particular interests and at the same time recognize the universal interest as their own. The individual does not lose his particularity in the state. Rather, particular interests are allowed their full development and are at the same time brought back to the universal. In this way, the state does not stand against the individual. It is the condition of the real freedom of the individual. Hegel, in his lectures on history, expresses the same idea in more religious language when he writes that "The State is the Divine Idea as it exists on Earth" (Hegel, 1956, p. 39). Such statements have often been misunderstood as a justification of authoritarian power. However, many scholars argue that Hegel is not defending the worship of any existing government. He is describing the rational idea of the state which actual states approximate in different degrees (Avineri, 1972; Houlgate, 2016).

Poverty, the Rabble and the Limits of Civil Society

Hegel's account of civil society is not a simple celebration of the market. Hegel is very much aware of the problems which the market economy creates. He observes that the growth of wealth in civil society is accompanied by the growth of poverty. Hegel explains this problem in a very clear manner. According to him, "When the standard of living of a large mass of people falls below a certain subsistence level", and when these people lose the sense of honour of supporting themselves by their own work, "the result is the creation of a rabble of paupers" (Hegel, 1952, §244). The rabble (*der Pöbel*), according to Hegel, is not only materially poor. It is a group which has lost its position in society and its trust in the social order (Ruda, 2011).

Hegel considers different solutions to this problem. He considers the option of public relief by the wealthy classes or by public institutions, but he argues that such relief would violate the principle of civil society, according to which individuals should earn

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

their livelihood through their own work. He also considers the option of creating more work for the poor, but this would increase overproduction, which is itself a cause of the problem. Hegel reaches a very important conclusion: “despite an excess of wealth civil society is not rich enough” to check excessive poverty and the creation of a rabble (Hegel, 1952, §245). Hegel then points to colonization as one of the ways through which civil society tries to solve its internal problem by searching for new markets and new lands abroad (Hegel, 1952, §§246–248; Avineri, 1972).

This part of Hegel’s philosophy is very important for the present study. Avineri (1972) notes that the problem of poverty is one of the few problems which Hegel leaves unresolved in his system. It shows that Hegel himself was aware that the modern state cannot fully integrate all sections of society into the universal. There remains a group which lives at the margins of civil society, which does not enjoy the benefits of ethical life and which has no real stake in the state. It is interesting that Hegel mentions colonization as one of the outlets of this problem. In this way, the colonial world enters Hegel’s system as a solution to the contradictions of European civil society. This study argues that Chatterjee’s political society can be understood as the historical continuation of this unresolved problem in the postcolonial world.

Partha Chatterjee’s Tactically Extended State: A Post-Colonial Critique of Ethical State

Hegel’s philosophy explains that the state is a universal and rational realization of historical progress. However, postcolonial theorist Partha Chatterjee, encounters a radically different political ontology in the global South. According to Chatterjee, the classical Eurocentric model of the state that presupposes a seamless and a lawful relationship between the state and a homogeneous civil society fails to explain a rather fragmented political reality in most of the third world. Chatterjee’s foundational work is “The Politics of the Governed (2004).” It is where he introduces an interesting conceptual bisection of the public sphere. He splits the traditional public sphere into two separate domains i.e. Civil Society and Political Society (Chatterjee, 2004; Kistner, 2014). In the postcolonial states the civil society exists as a highly restricted and elite space. It is populated by the bourgeois and middle classes who possess formal state education and hold secure legal titles to properties. These people are capable of speaking the language of constitutional law and universal citizenship. According to Chatterjee, this civil society is the space which Hegel and most of the Western Political thought mistake for the totality of the modern public sphere. Vast majority of populations in postcolonial nation-states are systematically and structurally excluded from the domain of formal civil society. These populations live in conditions of precarity. These people inhabit illegal squatter settlements and work in unregulated informal economies. They operate outside the strict boundaries of legal property ownership. To fill out this tremendous gap, the state transforms into a "Tactically Extended State". This expansion utilizes a flexible governmentality to manage and govern these legally ambiguous populations (Joshi, 2018; Chatterjee, 2004; Fusiek, 2021).

The individuals within Chatterjee’s political society, as opposed to the formal citizens of civil society, are viewed by the state not as individual rights-bearers. They are treated as government’s registered populations that need to be managed, surveyed, and dealt with through bureaucratic calculations. These populations do not and cannot make claims based on abstract constitutional liberties. These people form associations, organize collective mobilizations, and engage in tactical maneuvers for securing the needed resources i.e. clean water, food subsidies, electricity and most importantly protection from forced eviction (Joshi, 2018). In Chatterjee’s own words:

“Political society is that domain of popular politics where the governed must constantly negotiate their terms of survival with the state. Deprived of full, unblemished citizenship rights, their collective existence is always teetering on the brink of unlawfulness, yet they successfully solicit recognition from governmental agencies as a matter of welfare and necessity” (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 89).

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

Chatterjee's critique directly undermines the Hegelian idea of the state. The postcolonial state, according to Chatterjee, cannot afford the luxury of pure Hegelian universality. The postcolonial state faces massive populations living in systemic illegality. The postcolonial state through its administrative, biopolitical, and governmental machinery extends itself down into the gray zone of political society. This action of the state is not carried out by applying rigid and uniform constitutional principles (Fusiek, 2021; Joshi, 2018). There the state treats law as a flexible, mutable instrument of constant negotiations and compromises. The hallmark of the tactically extended state is its reliance on the logic of exceptionalism in governance (Kistner, 2014).

Intellectual Background of Chatterjee's Critique

Partha Chatterjee is one of the leading members of the Subaltern Studies collective. This group of historians emerged in India in the early 1980s under the leadership of Ranajit Guha. The Subaltern Studies scholars criticized both colonial and nationalist histories of India for ignoring the politics of the subaltern classes i.e. peasants, workers and other marginalized groups. Guha argued that the history of Indian nationalism had been written as the achievement of the elite, while the autonomous domain of the politics of the people was neglected (Guha, 1982). Chatterjee's later work on political society carries forward this concern with the politics of the subaltern in the context of the contemporary postcolonial state.

In his book *The Nation and Its Fragments*, Chatterjee questions the idea that the colonized world can only follow the models of modernity produced in Europe. He criticizes the view that the nations of Asia and Africa had to choose their forms of imagined community from the modular forms already made available by Europe and the Americas. If this were true, Chatterjee says, then "Even our imaginations must remain forever colonized" (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 5). The same concern is present in his critique of the Hegelian state. Chatterjee does not accept that the institutions of the European state, including civil society, are the universal measure of political modernity. In a similar way, Chakrabarty (2000) argues that European thought is both indispensable and inadequate for understanding the political experience of the non-Western world. This position helps us understand why Chatterjee does not reject Hegel's categories completely but rather shows their limits.

Governmentality and the Politics of the Governed

Chatterjee's concept of the tactically extended state relies heavily on Michel Foucault's notion of governmentality. Foucault argued that modern power is concerned not only with sovereignty and law but also with the management of populations. Government, in this sense, aims at the welfare, health, security and productivity of the population, and it uses statistics, surveys and administrative techniques to achieve these aims (Foucault, 1991). Chatterjee applies this idea to postcolonial societies. He argues that the postcolonial state legitimized itself not mainly through the participation of citizens in the affairs of the state, but through providing welfare to the population. In this way, the relationship of the state with the majority of the people is defined by what Chatterjee calls "the line connecting populations to governmental agencies pursuing multiple policies of security and welfare" (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 37).

This relationship has important consequences for citizenship. According to Chatterjee, most of the inhabitants of India are citizens only in a very limited sense. They are citizens, in his words, "only tenuously, and even then ambiguously and contextually" (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 38). Such people cannot approach the state as equal members of civil society. However, they are not completely powerless. Chatterjee observes that these groups often violate the law in order to survive, for example by occupying public land or by using public services without payment. Yet, through their collective organization, "they make a claim to a habitation and a livelihood as a matter of right" (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 40). The state cannot recognize these claims as legal rights because doing so would undermine the rule of property and law. At the same time, the state cannot ignore them because these groups constitute a large population and an important electoral

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

constituency. The result is a flexible arrangement in which the state treats these claims as matters of welfare and political negotiation (Chatterjee, 2004; Kistner, 2014).

An Illustration: The Railway Squatters of Kolkata

Chatterjee explains his concept with the help of an empirical case study of a squatter settlement on railway land in the southern part of Kolkata. The residents of this settlement had occupied land belonging to the railways and were therefore living in clear violation of the law. Many of them earned their living through informal work in the city. In order to protect their homes, the residents formed a welfare association. This association negotiated with the railway authorities, municipal agencies, political parties and non-governmental organizations to secure electricity, water and, most importantly, protection from eviction (Chatterjee, 2004).

What is interesting in this case is the way in which the residents described themselves. They did not claim to be the legal owners of the land. They presented themselves as a community, often using the moral language of family and kinship, and as a population group which deserved the attention of the government. On the other hand, government agencies did not treat them as lawful citizens with property rights. They treated them as a target population for welfare policies. Both sides, therefore, entered into a relationship which was outside the strict framework of law but was still recognized in practice. This is exactly what Chatterjee means by political society. Similar arrangements can be observed among street hawkers in Indian cities, who negotiate their right to use public space through associations, political patronage and informal payments, and whose citizenship is therefore conditional rather than absolute (Joshi, 2018).

Comparative Analysis of Ethical State and Tactically Extended State

Universal Reason vs Fragmented Citizenship

According to Hegel, the primary attribute of the state is its universality. The particularity is structurally resolved within the framework of the state. The state ensures that the highly fragmented conflicts within the civil society are unified by bringing the society under a singular and rational framework (Chotas, 2020; Houlgate, 2016). Chatterjee, in stark contrast, is of the view that state lacks any absolute universality. The state, according to Chatterjee, is structurally fragmented, as it an empirical space of short-term compromises (Kistner, 2014).

According to Hegel, state resolve societal contradictions, while on the other hand Chatterjee is of the view that state tactically and dynamically manages these contradictions. Hegel views the state as ultimate personification of Reason (Logos), Chatterjee views it as a highly compromised space of pragmatic and tactical cunning.

Institutional Mediation: The Universal Class vs Political Brokers

Hegel and Chatterjee agree that the state cannot directly interfere with individual atomized persona without institutional mediation or interference but their mechanisms are essentially different. Hegel puts high trust in the der allgemeine stand “Universal Class i.e. bureaucracy. According to Hegel, bureaucracy is explicitly insulated from market pressures. Bureaucracy acts in the public interest alongside corporations which integrate individual trades into the fabric of the state (Chotas, 2020).

However, Chatterjee completely dismantles this thought. The bureaucracy in postcolonial state is never neutral, rather it is highly fractured and politicized. The institutional mediation in postcolonial state is not performed by formal corporations. It is performed by informal political brokers. These brokers navigate and maneuver through the gray zones between legal code and survival of the subaltern. This practice transforms bureaucracy into a space of competitive clientalism (Kistner, 2014).

Citizenship: Abstract Right vs. Differentiated Population

Both Hegel and Chatterjee defines individual in very different ways. In the Hegelian Ethical State, the individual is recognized as a legal person in civil society. Hegel elevates individuals to the status citizen in the state. Individual in hegelian logic is an abstract and universally recognized subject. Individual in this ethical state bears rights and duties (Houlgate, 2016).

Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)
www.thedssr.com

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

DIALOGUE SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW

Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

On the other hand, in Chatterjee's political society, the concept of the abstract citizen is replaced with empirical population. The groups of people or population are seen via the eye of empirical demography. The individual is the recipient of policy and targets of biopolitics. These populations do not enjoy stable constitutional guarantees. These people get access to resources through their collective capacity to disrupt public order tactically (Joshi, 2018; Kistner, 2014).

Law and Exception: The Rule of Law vs Negotiated Illegality

The two frameworks also differ fundamentally in their understanding of law. For Hegel, law is the objective expression of right. In the ethical state, law must be universal, publicly known and equally applicable to all. Hegel gives great importance to the codification of law and to the administration of justice through public courts. The individual, in this framework, is free precisely because he lives under rational laws which he recognizes as his own (Hegel, 1820; Houlgate, 2016).

Chatterjee presents a very different picture. In political society, law is not applied uniformly. The state often suspends the application of law in particular cases, and it allows illegal settlements, unlicensed trading and unauthorized use of services to continue on the basis of political considerations. These exceptions are not permanent rights. They can be withdrawn whenever the balance of political forces changes. The law, therefore, becomes an instrument of negotiation rather than a universal standard (Chatterjee, 2004; Kistner, 2014). In Hegelian terms, this would mean that the state has failed to achieve its ethical character. In Chatterjee's terms, however, this is not simply a failure. It is the actual way in which democracy works in most of the world.

The Rabble and the Governed: A Point of Convergence

Despite their many differences, the two frameworks share an important point of convergence. Both Hegel and Chatterjee recognize that there is a section of society which is not integrated into the formal structure of civil society. Hegel calls this section the rabble, and he admits that civil society, despite its wealth, cannot solve the problem of its existence. Chatterjee calls this section the governed population of political society, and he shows how it survives by negotiating with the state outside the framework of legal rights (Hegel, 1952, §245; Chatterjee, 2004).

The difference between the two lies in their evaluation of this marginalized section. For Hegel, the rabble is a problem and a danger for the ethical order. It represents a group which has lost its sense of right and its attachment to the state. Hegel does not see any positive political role for it. For Chatterjee, on the other hand, the governed are not merely a problem to be solved. They are active political agents who have developed their own strategies to make claims on the state. In this way, Chatterjee transforms Hegel's unresolved problem into a new site of democratic politics (Ruda, 2011; Kistner, 2014). What appears in Hegel as the limit of the ethical state appears in Chatterjee as the main arena of postcolonial politics.

Democracy: Rational Participation vs Popular Negotiation

The two frameworks also offer different understandings of democracy and political participation. Hegel was not a democrat in the modern sense. He was suspicious of direct popular participation and preferred a constitutional monarchy in which the interests of society are represented through estates and corporations. For Hegel, the people as an unorganized mass cannot express a rational will. Participation is meaningful only when it is mediated through organized institutions (Avineri, 1972; Hegel, 1820).

Chatterjee, on the other hand, sees political society as the space where democracy is actually expanding in postcolonial countries. He acknowledges that political society brings into politics some of "the squalor, ugliness and violence of popular life" (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 74). However, he argues that these negotiations offer the poor a way to influence the state which the elite space of civil society does not offer. For Chatterjee, the democratic promise of the postcolonial world lies not in the orderly world of civil society but in the disorderly negotiations of political society (Chatterjee,

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

2004; Chatterjee, 2011).

Conclusion

The comparison of Hegel's Ethical State and Partha Chatterjee's tactically extended state uncovers a profound ontological divergence. They have varying explanations of possibilities and limits of political modernity. The idealist framework of Hegel offers a sophisticated and normative baseline for a highly rational, emancipatory and integrated political community. Hegel's explanation presumes a historical luxury of self-contained institutional development. This luxury, according to Chatterjee, is tactically denied in the postcolonial world.

Chatterjee's framework is a profound and critical corrective to Hegel's political idealism. Chatterjee's explanation maps the state as it actually exists and functions in the postcolonial world. Chatterjee sheds light on the structural compromises, informal negotiations, tactical extensions. In this way he provides political scientists with the necessary analytical vocabulary to do research on patronage systems. Chatterjee has developed the strategic logic of subaltern resistance in the knowledge system.

The analysis of this study shows that the main difference between the two frameworks is a difference of standpoint. Hegel looks at the state from the standpoint of the rational idea and its historical realization in Europe. Chatterjee looks at the state from the standpoint of the governed populations who live at the margins of legality. Hegel's framework is normative and asks what the state should be in its rational form. Chatterjee's framework is empirical and asks how the state actually governs in societies shaped by colonial rule. The study also shows that the two frameworks are not completely separate. Hegel's own discussion of poverty and the rabble reveals the limits of his ethical state, and these limits become the starting point of Chatterjee's analysis.

The study has some limitations. It is based on the textual analysis of selected works of the two thinkers and does not include primary field research. The study also mainly relies on the Indian experience on which Chatterjee's work is based. Future research can apply this comparative framework to other postcolonial societies. In Pakistan, for example, the informal settlements known as katchi abadis, and the street vendors and informal workers in large cities such as Karachi and Lahore, offer an important field for examining whether the state functions as an ethical state or as a tactically extended state. Such studies can help political scientists to develop a better understanding of the relationship between the state and marginalized populations in the Global South.

Both Hegel and Chatterjee's frameworks together form an essential dialectic in modern political science. Hegel puts forward the vocabulary of universal institutional hope, while Chatterjee delivers the tools for postcolonial structural realism.

References

Avineri, S. (1972). *Hegel's theory of the modern state*. Cambridge University Press.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton University Press.

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments: Colonial and postcolonial histories*. Princeton University Press.

Chatterjee, P. (2004). *The politics of the governed: Reflections on popular politics in most of the world*. Columbia University Press.

Chatterjee, P. (2011). *Lineages of political society: Studies in postcolonial democracy*. Columbia University Press.

Chotaš, J. (2020). The state and ethical life in Hegel's philosophy. In J. Chotaš & T. Matějčková (Eds.), *An ethical modernity? Hegel's concept of ethical life today* (pp. 154–172). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004432581_010

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 87–104). University of Chicago Press.

Fusiek, D. A. (2021). Hegel in a postcolonial world: Populist authoritarianism, postcolonialism, and the master–slave dialectic. *Central European Journal of*

ISSN Online: 3007-3154
ISSN Print: 3007-3146

Politics, 7(2), 4–30. https://doi.org/10.24132/cejop_2021_6

Guha, R. (1982). On some aspects of the historiography of colonial India. In R. Guha (Ed.), *Subaltern studies I: Writings on South Asian history and society* (pp. 1–8). Oxford University Press.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1952). *Hegel's philosophy of right* (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Clarendon Press. (Original work published 1820)

Hegel, G. W. F. (1956). *The philosophy of history* (J. Sibree, Trans.). Dover Publications. (Original work published 1837)

Hegel, G. W. F. (1991). *Elements of the philosophy of right* (A. W. Wood, Ed.; H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1820)

Houlgate, S. (2016). Right and trust in Hegel's Philosophy of Right. *Hegel Bulletin, 37*(1), 104–116. https://doi.org/10.1017/hgl.2016.7

Joshi, K. (2018). 'Conditional' citizens? Hawkers in the streets of contemporary India. *Articulo – Journal of Urban Research*, (17–18), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.4000/articulo.3533

Kistner, U. (2014). The 'political society' of the governed? Marginalia beyond 'marginalisation'. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies, 70*(1), Art. #2618, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i1.2618

Ruda, F. (2011). *Hegel's rabble: An investigation into Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Continuum.

Taylor, C. (1979). *Hegel and modern society*. Cambridge University Press.