

**A CRITICAL STUDY OF LIBERAL AND
COMMUNITARIAN DISCOURSES ON
MULTICULTURALISM**

*Thesis submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

MINAKSHI SINGH



**CENTRE FOR PHILOSOPHY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110067**

2017

Date: 21st July, 2017

DECLARATION

I, Minakshi Singh, do hereby declare that the thesis titled “**A Critical Study of Liberal and Communitarian Discourses on Multiculturalism**” submitted by me for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is an original work and has not been submitted by me for any other degree or diploma of this or any other institution or university.


(Minakshi Singh) 21/7/17

Centre for Philosophy
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110067



**CENTRE FOR PHILOSOPHY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI-110067**

Date: 21st July, 2017


CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis titled “A Critical Study of Liberal and Communitarian Discourses on Multiculturalism” submitted by Ms. Minakshi Singh in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is her original work and has not been submitted by her in part or full for any other degree or diploma of this or any other university to the best of our knowledge.

We recommend that this thesis may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Prof. Bindu Puri

(Chairperson)

 Chairperson
Centre for Philosophy
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi - 110067, INDIA

Prof. R. P. Singh

(Supervisor)

SUPERVISOR
Centre for Philosophy
School of Social Sciences
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110067

This Thesis is Dedicated to:

My Brother

Late Shri S. K. Singh

Preface

In the present study, I have attempted to examine the liberal and communitarian discourses on multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, as such, involves a study of human life within cultural framework, culturally derived values, meaning and significance. Culture has cognitive, connotive and normative aspects. The cognitive aspect consists of the world view, the apparent plurality with internal coherence and identity; and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. Connotive means acting in certain ways within the culture, a way of life with meaning and significance. Normative means judging or evaluating in terms of being good, equal, just, harmonious, dignified, etc. with the view of apprehending the crisis. The cultural lineage of such concepts like identity, equality, goodness, justice, dignity, harmony, etc. got re-evaluated in terms of individual identity, individual rights, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism on the one hand ; and collective identity, community right, social goods, etc. in communitarianism on the other. Since there are plurality of cultures representing different versions of good life, values and convictions, it involves that plurality is the most operative term in the discourse on multiculturalism, liberalism and communitarianism.

I am thankful to the authors whose works have directly or indirectly helped me. I have always tried to supply exact quotations and full references to original works, and in the general bibliography, I have also furnished suggestions for further reading. In referring to the works of Rousseau, Locke, Kant, Mill, Benedict, Will Kymlicka, Charles Taylor and Gadamer, I have used the most accurate available English translations. I am thankful to those translators of the texts. I am also thankful to *Online Sources* for the books and articles which have been immense help for me.

Acknowledgements

With the blessings of God, I have been able to complete my work in time. I wish to thank many people who have contributed in my work. First and foremost, I would like to express my heartiest gratitude to my mentor and supervisor Professor R.P. Singh for encouraging me to pursue research on a contemporary, socially, and morally relevant topic. I am thankful for his persistent help, his endless patience, and his generosity with time and ideas. I acknowledge with gratitude the affection and encouragement received from him. This work would have not been possible without his guidance and cooperation. I am thankful to him for making my research experience productive and stimulating.

I would also like to express my gratitude to other teachers of the Centre for Philosophy, Prof. Satya P. Gautam, Prof. Bhagat Oinam, Prof. Bindu Puri, Dr. Manideepa Sen, Dr. Ajay Verma. and Dr. Bhaskarjeet Niyog for their encouragement and support.

I would like to thank all the staff of the centre especially Rajendra Singh and Yogendra for their cooperation and support at all times.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge my parents, Late J. P. Singh and Late Pramila Singh. Despite the fact that I lost my parents at an early age in life. Yet, they continue to play an important role in my life. I sincerely believe that wherever they are, they continue to shower their blessings on me. Indeed, I owe my very existence to them.

I would express my deepest regards to my brother Late S. K. Singh, without his tireless love, care, support and encouragement it would have been impossible for me to pursue my studies. I am thankful to my bhabhi Mrs. Pooja Singh for encouraging me to pursue my higher studies. She has always been a source of inspiration to me. I am thankful to her for making me believe in my strength and giving me the freedom to chase my dreams. Without her immense love, inspiration and support this endeavor would have remained incomplete.

Apart from this, I would like to express my heartily thanks to my best friend Mr. Pawan Kumar Singh for being with me throughout this journey. I am grateful for his support in

all the stages of the formation and development of this work and for standing by my side in the face of all troubles and odds. My special thanks to my friend Mr. Sahastrangad Kumar who always extended his helping hand whenever I needed that. I would like to thank my friends Mr. Suraj Kumar, Ms. Vandana Kulhari and Ms. Sangeeta Das for their invaluable suggestions and support to enrich my carrier. I extend my thanks also to all my friends Jagriti, Golu, Sangita, Poonam, Vinay Pandey and Vikas Yadav for their support.

I would also thank Aditya and Shourya, my nephews, for their emotional and lovable support. And also thanks to all my well-wishers and friends whose names remain unmentioned here.

Special thanks to Indian Council of Philosophical Research, for considering me as one of their JRF fellows for last two years of my Ph.D, without this financial support it would have been very difficult to complete this thesis.

Above all, I owe my gratitude to Jawaharlal Nehru University for giving me chance to pursue my doctoral study and for providing hostel and fellowship. I am grateful to JNU for its progressive and innovative environment, which is very important for every student – all of which gave me much that I will treasure all my life.

Above all, errors and mistakes remains solely mine.

MINAKSHI SINGH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction	1–10
Chapter I Multiculturalism: Perspectives on Diversity of Culture	11–56
Part 1- Culture: Cognitive, Connotive, and Normative	13
1.1 Nature versus Culture: Jean Jacques Rousseau	18
1.2 Culture versus Culture: Patterns and Inter-cultural Hierarchies – Ruth Benedict	23
1.3 Integration in the Intra-cultural Hierarchies: Hans George Gadamer	28
1.4 Culture as a Way of Life: Sri Aurobindo	32
Part 2- Multiculturalism: Descriptive and Normative	40
2.1 Forms of Multiculturalism	42
2.2 Development of Multiculturalism	45
Chapter II Liberalism: A Normative Discourse	57–92
Part 1- Identity, Right, and Liberty: John Locke and J. S. Mill	62
Part 2- Autonomy, Dignity, and Equality: Immanuel Kant	79
Chapter III Communitarianism: Critique of Liberalism	93–134
Part 1- Identity and Human Rights: Individual versus Collective	98
1.1 Identity: Individual, Cultural, and Social	99
1.2 Human Rights: Individuality versus Universality	105
1.3 Human Rights and Minority Rights	113

Part 2- Social Goods: Community's Autonomy and Justice	118
2.1 The Idea of the Common Good	118
2.2 Justice: Liberal and Communitarian Perspectives	120
2.3 The Concept of Social Justice	128
Chapter IV Multiculturalism: Interfacing Liberalism and Communitarianism	135–189
Part 1- Liberal Multiculturalism	137
1.1 Liberalism and Multiculturalism	140
1.2 Multiculturalism and Minority Rights	143
1.3 Iris Young's Differentiated Citizenship	148
Part 2- Communitarian Multiculturalism	151
2.1 The Question of Identity	154
2.1 The Politics of Recognition	155
Part 3- Feminist Critique of Multiculturalism	164
3.1 Sexual Equality and Sexual Discrimination	165
3.2 The Public and the Private	169
3.3 An Ethic of Care	174
3.4 Susan Okin's Critique of Multiculturalism	177
Conclusion	190–203
Bibliography & Webliography	204–216

Introduction

I, in the present study, shall critically examine the liberal and the communitarian discourses on multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, as such, involves a study of human life within cultural framework, culturally derived values, meaning and significance. Multiculturalism is such a concept which ideologically accepts the cultural diversity and provides equal opportunities and equal protection to each culture. It does not allow any kind of external interference in the beliefs and values of different cultures. It protects the independent existence of each cultural community and rejects competition between them. It is related to the concept of equality among different cultural communities. Culture and diversity are the most operative terms of multiculturalism. There are diversities of cultures representing different visions of good life, value and convictions. Since, cultural diversity exists in form of religion, language, customs, traditions, and origin, therefore, multiculturalism recognizes the collective identity or group identity based on these factors. So, in this way, multiculturalism is closely associated with “identity politics,” “collective identity,” “the politics of difference,” and “the politics of recognition.”

Culture is created by a historical method, which contains sentiments and values. It is the compilation of such behaviour and conduct, on which the community recognizes and defines the meaning and purpose of life. It relates to ethics, religion and society. Since cultures vary in different societies, hence they are local. They do not have universalism. Each ethics is produced and nurtured by a culture. Changes in ethics are not possible without making changes in cultures. Society and culture cannot be separated because society without culture and culture without society is not possible. Thus culture is a historical fact, which contains diversities related to the society; it is related with ethics and is influenced by religion. The opinion of each member in the culture is having same importance as it is rich and democratic within.

Culture is a way of life in which the members of a cultural community related to it follow the values and beliefs collectively. We cannot imagine any society without any culture. Every culture is deeply rooted in the sense of affinity and diversity. We develop the affinity for a culture because we are born and brought up with that. It is the aspects of language, symbols, values, festivity, celebration of birth, marriage and even the concept of death that create the cultural affinity. By virtue of affinity, a culture creates diversity with other languages, values, etc. It implies that the moment a culture emerges and creates affinity; it simultaneously gives rise to diversity.

The term ‘culture’ entered into English usage with the publication of E. B. Taylor’s text *Primitive Culture* in 1871. Raymond Williams has articulated the development of culture under four stages particularly reference to the 18th and 19th centuries. “Culture came to mean, first, ‘a general state or habit of the mind’, having close relations with the idea of human perfection. Second, it came to mean ‘the general state of intellectual development, in a society as a whole’.”¹ “Third, it came to mean ‘the general body of arts’. Fourth, later in the century, it came to mean ‘a whole way of life, material, intellectual, and spiritual’. It came also, as is known, to be a word which often provoked, either hostility or embarrassment.”²

Culture has cognitive, connotive and normative aspects. “The cognitive aspect consists of the world view, the apparent plurality with internal coherence and identity; and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. Connotive means acting in certain ways within the culture, a way of life with meaning and significance. Normative means judging or evaluating in terms of being good, equal, just, harmonious, dignified, etc. with the view of apprehending the crisis.”³

In order to substantiate these points, I shall discuss nature versus culture in the context of Rousseau (1712-1778), culture versus culture: inter cultural hierarchies as developed by Ruth Benedict (1887-1948), culture as a way of life in terms of *vidyā*,

¹ Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. p. 16.

² Ibid. p.16.

³ Singh, R.P. “Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons,” *World of Philosophy: A Harmony*. Ed. C. K. Chapple. p. 190.

sāadhanā and *kalā* in Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950) and culture as *bildung* in Gadamer (1900-2002). Rousseau advocates culture versus nature; individual enters into social and political life through the medium of culture and moves himself from the state of nature. The social contract is the next step through which an individual can enter into social life. Ruth Benedict explains culture in terms of patterns, diversity and inter-cultural hierarchies in Zuni, Dobu, Kwakiutl, etc. I shall try to examine these contested issues in the context of culture as a way of life as explained by Sri Aurobindo and culture as *bildung* (formation, or elevation in terms of values) by Gadamer. I shall take up these four philosophers in order to give a comprehensive account of the concept of culture. Though they seem mutually exclusive and often contrary to one another, yet taken together their views give a substantive analysis of the concept of culture.

In every country there are various communities and it is impossible to think of a country where just a single community resides. And since there are many communities living together, so, there is need for the open space where people from all communities should be given due recognition. Multicultural society is that which opens its door for all. Cultural diversity is now a fact of life in today's "global village" and Indian culture is a living example of cultural diversity and harmony. India promotes multicultural policies from very early age through its concept of '*sarva dharma samabhāva*'. The oldest of the Indian texts, the *R̥g Veda*, gives the key to understand the concept of plurality. *Ēkaṃ sād viprāḥ bahudhā vadanti* has been the basic idea of philosophizing in India. This short and simple sentence is profound in its implications.

Multiculturalism is not a philosophical school with a distinct concept of man and his place in the world, yet it is definitely a perspective on or a way of viewing social nexus, spatio-temporal frame, and earthly existence, historical, cultural and actual human life. Multiculturalism as a perspective on cultural diversity is understood in terms of both descriptive and normative. As a descriptive sense, it refers to diversity of cultures arising from existence of two or more societies. As normative sense, multiculturalism endorses the cultural diversity and holds that such differences should be respected and publicly affirmed. It is implied that multiculturalism raises questions and critically evaluates the liberal notions of identity, freedom, dignity; on the one hand; and individuality,

citizenship, equality, rights, etc. on the other; and re-formulates its assumptions like property, life, etc.. In liberalism, freedom means individual freedom and equality pertains in treating individuals equally irrespective of their religion, race, sex, language etc. But multiculturalism recognizes the feature of difference in freedom, equality, dignity, etc. and considers these notions as culturally bound.

On identity, for instance, Locke holds that personal identity is a matter of *psychological continuity*. “When he first tackled personal identity, he himself defined person as a ‘forensic term’; we have to be able to re-identify persons in order to hold them responsible for their past actions and commitments.”⁴ “Locke further came out in support of citizenship as a cementing force which creates a uniform identity from the diversity.”⁵ But multiculturalism proposes an understanding under which individual's identity must be recognized on the basis of his community and the identity of community should be based on the culture. The individual is a social being and his socialism inspires him to be organized as a community. Multiculturalism accepts that the identity of a person is established from his community. People should be accepted as citizens with their distinct cultural identity. Multiculturalism represents the special right through which the ‘rights’ and ‘identity’ of the cultural community is recognized.

Multiculturalism is not a single doctrine in the sense that there is no settled or agreed view of how multicultural society should operate. Thus, the perspectives of, and the conflict between, individual needs and rights; and group needs and rights; have been conceptualized under as Liberalism versus Communitarianism. Liberals have considered the individuals as the ends. According to them all other political and social institutions are only means for this ends. The individualistic concept of liberals is called atomism because it focuses on ‘individual’ only for any kind of social, economic and political analysis.

Liberalism is generally considered to be the group of political philosophies which emphasize individualism, freedom, liberty, equality, rights, justice, etc. Liberals have

⁴ Tuckness, Alex. “Locke's Political Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/locke-political>, retrieved on 08/21/2014.

⁵ Ibid.

argued that the individual remained the basis of all interpretations of social and political analyses conducted so far. Therefore, all classes and communities should interpret their standards by focusing on the individual. In liberalism, individual is given more importance than anything else whereas multiculturalism advocates collective rights. In multiculturalism the notions of freedom, equality, autonomy, etc. are taken but with a different interpretation. At the level of multiculturalism, individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community. It shows the incompatibility between these two concepts. Hence, the question arises, how can liberalism go along with that of multiculturalism? Will Kymlicka and other liberal theorists of multiculturalism have developed the most influential theory of multiculturalism based on the liberal values of right, liberty, autonomy and equality.

Different from liberalism, communitarianism emphasizes the primacy of the group or community rather than each individual person. Communitarianism is a concept related to the community, in which the community is preferred over the person. Communitarians agree with Macpherson's criticism of liberal individual as "possessive individual". For liberals individuals are sole proprietor of its person and its capacity and he owes nothing to society. Individualists say that the individual's work and goal cannot be directed by the society. In this manner, Rawls says that "the self is prior to the ends which are affirmed by it."⁶ Communitarians reject this view because it denies individuals commitment to society. According to them, liberal view is against the sense of responsibility of moral standard in society. It will lead to problem like society disorganization and social disharmony. Likewise, liberals give minimal role to state because they believe each person can define his good and is able to seek his good. On the other hand, for communitarians political formation has significant role in defining what is good and what is right and also helping individuals in seeking this good. Government should actively strive for creation of well functioned society to enable citizens to participate in its functioning. Individual develops his identity, talents, and pursuits only as a member of corporate life and hence political life should focus on rights of community and not of individuals.

⁶ Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. p. 491.

Communitarians believe that the personality of a human being is shaped by the community. Hence the main centre of political analysis and discussion should not be focused on the individual but on the community. They instead embrace ontological holism, which views social goods as “irreducibly social”. This holist view of collective identities and cultures underlies Charles Taylor's normative case for a multicultural “politics of recognition.”⁷ The existence of community is central to the discourse of culture. Plurality implies communitarian life in society. Here, the question arises – what are the claims made by Communitarians for equal rights and how do they view multiculturalism?

The normative concepts like personal identity, individual rights, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism get re-evaluated in terms of collective identity, community rights, social goods, etc. in communitarianism. According to the communitarians, we should not ignore the cultural differences of individuals because people receive their traits only from their culture and community. A person cannot be separated from his society. “Communitarians view multiculturalism as an appropriate way of protecting communities from the eroding effects of individual autonomy, and of affirming the value of community.”⁸ In addition, multiculturalism proposes to study communitarian cultures in terms of civil and democratic rights, property and inheritance, marriage and settlement, and above all citizenship so that people belonging to each cultural community could be recognized as valid participants in the civil society.

There are imminent consequences of multiculturalism. I wish to take up feminist critique of multiculturalism by Susan Okin, since she is concerned with what happens *inside* the cultural groups which should not overshadow the discriminatory nature of gender roles in cultures. According to Okin, central concern of justice is gender injustice and not cultural injustice. She believes that male dominance cannot be denied in a culture and multiculturalism wants to maintain it on the name of cultural security. Some feminist believes that women are most disadvantaged section in every society. Both

⁷ Taylor, Charles. “The Politics of Recognition.” p. 37.

⁸ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 337.

minority group and majority group discriminate with women. But multiculturalism treats these issues non-seriously.

The concepts of multiculturalism and feminism, both, appears to have been emerged as a result of reaction to liberalism. Multiculturalism focuses on equality and justice among the dominant and subordinate communities, residing within a nation or the whole world whereas feminism focuses on equality and justice within the dominant and subordinate cultural communities. Multiculturalism wants to protect every cultural practice by considering it as positive. It does not talk about the negative aspects of these practices. Multiculturalism is criticized by feminists, primarily, on the basis that it favours conservation and equality of cultures under the national state, but does not attempt to overcome inequality imbedded in the cultures. Feminists say that multiculturalism should mainly focus on non-differentiation instead of diversities.

Thus the main objective of the thesis will be to discuss multiculturalism as a perspective on cultural diversity by proposing a critique and an interface between liberalism and communitarianism. Acknowledging the antithetical nature of these two realms and the distinctness of the philosophical visions of Locke, Kant, and Mill on the one hand, and Charles Taylor, John Rawls, Michael Sandel, and Will Kymlicka on the other, I shall argue that there is cultural lineage to normative discourses in liberalism and in communitarianism as well. The ambition and challenge of the present study is to develop feminist critique of multiculturalism in terms of women's identity, rights and well-being vis-à-vis identity with cultural difference, group rights, social goods, etc.

The method that I shall be adopting is critical, comparative, pluralistic and evaluative. It is critical and comparative because I have proposed multiculturalism as a critique of both liberalism and communitarianism. To substantiate these issues, I have used comparative method to develop the positions as diverse as Locke, Kant, and Mill on the one hand and Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel, and Will Kymlicka on the other. I want to address their differences by critically evaluating the concepts like dignity, autonomy, utility, etc., in the context of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism establishes cultural equality and cultural rights of cultural communities to preserve diversities of different

cultures of the society. With multiculturalism, I shall propose a critical evaluation of the liberal notions of freedom, equality, autonomy, etc., and attempt to elevate these concepts from individual rights to the level of collective rights of the cultural community. I shall vindicate the perspectives in multiculturalism like descriptive and normative.

In view of the scope and objective and the method of the study I propose to address the following problematic issue in the chapters.

In chapter I entitled “Multiculturalism: Perspectives on Diversity of Culture,” there is problematic in the formulation of culture in terms of its cognitive, connotive and evaluative aspects by Rousseau, Ruth Benedict, Sri Aurobindo and Gadamer. Rousseau advocates culture versus nature; and Ruth Benedict explains culture in terms of patterns, diversity and inter-cultural hierarchies. I shall try to examine these contested issues in the context of culture as a way of life as explained by Sri Aurobindo and culture as *Bildung* (formation, or elevation in terms of values) by Gadamer. To resolve the problematic, I will propose that culture is not ‘what we are’ as presumed by Rousseau and Ruth Benedict rather culture is ‘what we ought to be’ as developed by Sri Aurobindo on the one hand and Gadamer on the other. Rousseau is one of the representatives of the early enlightenment and Gadamer proposes a modified version of the enlightenment project. Further, I will bring out multiculturalism as a perspective on cultural diversity understood in terms of both descriptive and normative. As a fact, multiculturalism accepts the existence of cultures whereas accepting it as a value means that individuals and institutions accept the establishment of multiculturalism as their moral objectives. In this sense, it means to accept various beliefs and ways of life as values. Multiculturalism claims that the universalistic features of all cultures should be accepted. And the universalistic features are not only to be accepted but also be appreciated.

In Chapter II entitled “Liberalism: A Normative Discourse,” the problematic is concerned with expounding and critically examining the contending claims on normative concepts like identity, rights, freedom, equality, goodness, harmony, etc. which have got re-evaluated in terms of personal identity, individual right, liberty, equality, autonomy, dignity, etc. in liberalism of Locke, Kant, and Mill. In liberalism, it is individualism

which is at the centre of the normative discourse. For instance, Locke propagated individual's rights to life, liberty, and property, Kant developed individual rights, autonomy, dignity, freedom, tolerance, etc. and Mill attempted to defend individual's rights to his life, health, liberty, possessions/ property, etc. It raises the question of identity, not only individual identity but also *personal identity*.

In Chapter III entitled, "Communitarianism: Critique of Liberalism," the problematic is concerned with the normative discourse in communitarianism as a critique of liberalism. The normative concepts like personal identity, individual rights, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism get re-evaluated in terms of collective identity, community rights, social goods, etc. in communitarianism. Communitarians reject the idea that the individual is prior to the community. The concepts of identity, and human rights, which are regarded as individual centric in liberalism but the same concepts become collective and community centric in communitarianism. Both liberalism and communitarianism have accepted the concept of common good and social justice to some extent but there are considerable differences in both of its nature and shape. According to liberals, common good is addressed in such a way in society that this is fit in the pattern of good of determinations and priorities adopted by individuals, while communitarians accept the common good as the essential concept of the best life in society, which defines the lifestyle of community. Communitarians believe that Liberals devalue common good by equating it with selfish interest where as common good exists because it is morally worthy to pursue.

Finally, in Chapter IV entitled "Multiculturalism: Interfacing Liberalism and Communitarianism," there is problematic in the very conception of multiculturalism because it is not a single doctrine in the sense that there is no settled or agreed view of how multicultural society should operate. I shall raise the issues of disagreements among the multiculturalists about how far they should go in positively endorsing cultural diversity, and about how civic cohesion can best be brought about. The question arises, how can liberalism and communitarianism go along with that of multiculturalism? I wish to show that in multiculturalism, there is interface between liberalism and communitarianism. In liberalism, there is acceptance of freedom and recognition of the

other at the level of individuals only whereas at level of multiculturalism, individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community and in this way multiculturalism also includes communitarian approach. I shall take into account the position of Will Kymlicka, Joseph Raz and other liberal theorists of multiculturalism on the one hand and Charles Taylor's normative case for a multicultural 'politics of recognition', on the other. There are imminent consequences of multiculturalism. I wish to take up feminist critique of multiculturalism by Susan Okin, since she is concerned with what happens *inside* the cultural groups. I shall develop the two arguments that Okin has put forward; i) culture and community life should not be used as an excuse for rolling back on the movement of women's rights; and ii) minority cultures are hierarchal and oppress women, and as such should not be granted group rights particularly the male elites.

Chapter I

Multiculturalism: Perspectives on Diversity of Culture

I, in the present chapter, shall discuss the perspective and diversity of culture in terms of its cognitive, connotive and normative aspects. In this context, I shall discuss nature versus culture in the context of Rousseau (1712-1778), culture versus culture: inter cultural hierarchies as developed by Ruth Benedict (1887-1948), and culture as *Bildung* in Gadamer (1900-2002) on the one hand, and culture as a way of life in terms of *vidyā*, *sāadhanā* and *kalā* in Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950) on the other hand. I shall take up these four philosophers in order to give a comprehensive account of the concept of culture. Though they seem mutually exclusive and often contrary to one another, yet taken together their views give a substantive analysis of the concept of culture.

Further, I shall bring out multiculturalism as a perspective on cultural diversity understood in terms of both descriptive and normative. Multiculturalism is the principle of the regulating different cultural communities in a state. It accepts different assumptions of different communities and considers them to be the justifiable means of achieving the goals of the community. It advocates the acceptance, appreciation, and promotion of distinct ethnic, minorities and religious groups in a state. In this way, it is related to the concept of equality among different cultural communities.

In order to organize my discussion in this chapter, I intend to divide it into the following two parts –

Part I - Culture: Cognitive, Connotive and Normative

Part II- Multiculturalism: Descriptive and Normative

Before I come to Part I of the chapter, I would like to mention that multiculturalism is a recent development (1970s onwards) which emerges due to various challenges faced by contemporary society. There are different cultures exists in society and now the identity of culture is plural and multilayered. Each culture has its own importance and must be given due recognition. And this very notion lies at the root of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, as such, involves a study of human life within cultural framework, culturally derived values, meaning and significance. “It is a form of identity politics that seeks to advance the interests of particular groups in society, usually in the face of actual or perceived social injustice, by strengthening its members’ awareness of their collective identity and common experiences.”¹ Multiculturalism desires a logical change in the political theory so that cultural, linguistic and other differences can be adjusted as well as proper arrangements for the protection of their traditions could be ensured.

Culture and diversity are the most operative terms of multiculturalism. There are diversity of cultures representing different visions of good life, value and convictions. Thus, to understand multiculturalism, it is desirable first to understand the notion of culture and the diversity of cultures. The vital importance of culture, from the multiculturalists’ perspective, is that “it shapes the values, norms and assumptions through which individual identity is formed and the external world becomes meaningful. Culture is the core feature of personal and social identity, giving people an orientation in the world.”² Culture has a reference to the cultivation of customs, values, norms, practices etc. Language, geography and history provide the context and reference points

¹ Desai, Murali. *The Paradigm of International Social Development: Ideologies, Development systems and Policy Approaches*. p. 52.

² Ajani, Malik. *Citizenship, the Self and the Other*. p. 92.

to understand the differences between cultures. It could be understood in the operative terms like affinity and diversity.

Part 1

Culture: Cognitive, Connotive, and Normative

Culture is what people inherit. People either consciously adopt or uncritically accept the inherited culture. The word *culture* (L. *Cultura*, G. *Kulture*) from the verb *colere*, means to cultivate. Basically, culture is the embodiment of the way in which we think and do things. “All the achievements of human beings as members of social groups can be seen as aspects of culture. However, culture also includes the customs, traditions, festivals, ways of living and one’s outlook on various issues of life.”³ The word culture is most commonly used in three basic senses—

- (i) Excellence of taste in the fine arts and humanities, also known as high culture.
- (ii) An integrated pattern of human knowledge, beliefs and behaviour that depends upon the capacity for symbolic thought and social learning.
- (iii) The set of shared attitudes, values, goal, and practices that characterize an institution, organization or group.⁴

Cultures are the basis of the organization of human society. Cultural communities define and determine the goals of their lives, and create rules related to them. Members of the community have complete faith in these created rules and they follow them collectively to meet their prescribed goals. Culture shows a certain way of life and culturalism paves the way to achieve that method, practically. The cultural plurality is not the modern attribute of society. From ancient times itself, it flourished in various countries of the world. There are many such examples present in the history of the world, where different cultural communities co-existed with mutual understanding and cooperation.

³www.nios.ac.in/media/documents/secichcour/english/indian_culture_and_heritage/understanding-culture, retrieved on 15/03/2015.

⁴ Deji, Olanike F. *Gender and Rural Development*, Vol.- 1. p. 137.

According to Terry Eagleton, culture is associated with nature. It is related to the work of the person and arises from its nature.⁵ Eagleton thinks that if culture is a historical tradition, then there are some philosophical questions in it. Is culture a result of an individual's independent work or is it a defined concept? Is this a definite concept or is it variable?⁶ It is evident when evaluating these questions of Eagleton that culture is a conceptual system created by the actions of the individual or the group of the individual, which is conducive to the nature, belief, faith, and beliefs of the group and person. A culture develops on the basis of community beliefs, social conditions, social problems and their solutions. A person works according to his own ability to solve problems and achieve the goal of life. Along with this, the person also works for the determination and maintenance of social relations. Culture creates and develops from these works.

Thus, one can say that, culture is the way of life of a people. It comprises of language, religion, and specific lifestyles. It can never be easy to define culture, because there is no static definition of it. Rather, it is a continuously evolving, having dynamic entity, which characterized the entire lifestyle of a certain group of people. The term 'culture' entered into English usage with the publication of E. B. Taylor's text *Primitive Culture* in 1871. The following definition was given in this classic text;

Culture or civilization...is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as member of society.⁷

There are different meanings given to the term culture. In 1952, A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn have given 164 definitions of cultural aspects of human beings;

Culture consist of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artefacts'; the essentials core of culture consist of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as conditional elements of future action.⁸

⁵ Eagleton, Terry. *The Idea of Culture*. p. 1.

⁶ Ibid. p. 7.

⁷ Lane, J. E. and Errson, S. *Culture and Politics: A Comparative Approach*. p. 18.

⁸ Kroeber, A.L. and Kluckhohn, Clyde. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. p. 181.

Raymond Williams is generally considered to be the first social philosopher who started a discussion on the importance of culture and the significance of cultural aspects. Raymond Williams in *Culture and Society* (1961) has enumerated three features of culture; namely, culture as a way of life, culture consisting of norms and principles and finally the documentary aspects of culture such as oral/written aspects, museums, archaeology, symbols/meanings, etc. Williams has articulated the development of culture under four stages particularly reference to the 18th and 19th centuries. The conceptual evolution of culture is described by Williams in the following terms:

The word culture in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, came to mean, first, 'a general state or habit of the mind', having close relations with the idea of human perfection. Second, it came to mean 'the general state of intellectual development, in a society as a whole'. Third, it came to mean 'the general body of arts'. Fourth, later in the century, it came to mean 'a whole way of life, material, intellectual, and spiritual'. It came also, as is known, to be a word which often provoked, either hostility or embarrassment.⁹

The first two meanings of the culture presented by Williams are very narrow and the last two meanings are very broad. If culture is taken as a person's mental habit, it would mean that a person leads a lonely life. His spirit and actions will not be influenced by the community nor would it be affected by other people in the community. This meaning of culture can interpret the person but cannot interpret the group. If culture is taken as the level of intellectual development of the entire society, then it will be able to interpret the community. But in this interpretation, culture will be unattached to many aspects of human life. Since it is clear that intellectual development could be a very important aspect of life, but it cannot have a complete life.¹⁰ Accepting culture as an art and accepting it as a whole lifestyle is a very comprehensive concept. If art is considered as a culture, it will be linked to a specific class and the role of the mass community will be negligible in the formation and development of cultures.¹¹ So if all the definitions of the Williams are seen together then perhaps the useful meaning of the culture will be achieved. Culture is a belief in the incorporated life system through which the

⁹ Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. p. 16.

¹⁰ Upadhyay, A.K. "Multiculturalism as Political Concern," *CEPSR*, Vol. 19, No. 31. pp. 7–8.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 8.

individual's goal of life is achieved collectively and in which the distinction and exclusiveness are protected. Thus, culture is a way of life and Culturalism is to accept such a way of life and freedom to practice it. If we look in this context multiculturalism becomes the broad view of culturalism. In this methodology, keeping in view the cohesiveness of different cultures, their different life beliefs are encouraged.

Many philosophers in the past have tried to define culture differently. Here, three definitions from major thinkers can be taken into account:

Culture is an integral composed of partly autonomous, partly co- ordinate institutions. It is integrated on a series of principles such as the community of blood through procreation; the specialisation in activities; and last but not least, the use of power in political organisation. Each culture owes its completeness and self-sufficiency to the fact that it satisfies the whole range of basic, instrumental and integrative needs.¹²(Malinowski)

[Culture] denotes a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes towards life.¹³(Geertz)

From above definitions on culture we get an idea of the extensive category of connotations connected with the term 'culture.' Malinowski relates culture in general to institutions because a culture cannot be completely understood without its political aspects such as institution etc., where as Geertz relates culture with symbols because according to him through studying the symbols, one can access to the formations of social phenomena. For Geertz culture is a content in which people live their lives. Culture is only the pattern of meanings embedded in symbols. On the other hand, Pye gives the idea of political culture. Pye presents culture as:

Political culture is thus the manifestation in aggregate form of the psychological and subjective dimensions of politics. A political culture is the product of both the collective history of a political system and the life histories of the members of that

¹² Malinowski, B. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. p. 40.

¹³ Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. p. 89.

system, and thus it is rooted equally in public events and private experiences.¹⁴
(Pye)

Culture, according to Pye, is not primarily, a cultural concept at all, but identity, basically a psychological one. The concept of 'political culture' believes that a specific people share about how politics should be carried out.

With the help of above definitions, it is clearly seen that one definition of culture leads to the emergence of other definition. Human beings are culturally embedded; meaning and significance of their life-world depends on culturally derived system of meaning and significance. Man is born and brought up according to certain systems and social norms. In every culture we find that certain symbols are created which metaphorically and suggestively refer to knowledge and values. On the basis of these symbols certain conventions, typologies and belief systems are created in the society. A culture could possibly be evaluated in three ways- Cognitive, Connotative, and Normative.

The cognitive aspect consists of the world view, the apparent plurality with internal coherence and identity and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. Connotative means acting in certain way within the culture, a way of life with meaning and significance. Normative means judging or evaluating in terms of majority and minority, mainstream and subaltern, high and low, etc. with the view of apprehending the crisis. In a nutshell it can be said that culture consists of the aspects of religion/*dharma*, spirituality, philosophy, ethics, aesthetic, and archaeology, and so on.¹⁵

The Cognitive, Connotative, and Normative aspects of culture create certain perspectives within which we can identify a particular culture and go into the details of the pattern which a culture has created. Now I shall discuss the perspective and diversity of culture in terms of its cognitive, connotative, and normative aspects by Rousseau, Ruth Benedict, and Gadamer on the one hand and Sri Aurobindo on the other.

¹⁴ Pye, L.W. "Political Culture," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 12. Ed. D. L. Sills. p. 218.

¹⁵ Singh, R.P. "Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons," *World of Philosophy: A Harmony*. Ed. C. K. Chapple. p. 190.

1.1 Nature versus Culture: Jean Jacques Rousseau

The chronological process of evolution the term culture began in the 18th century. Rousseau (1712-1778) is the first political thinker to attempt to grasp human nature as a product of a process of social evolution. Rousseau's political philosophy was primarily influenced by Hobbes and Locke. Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau; all these three philosophers agreed that there was some type of state of nature, and each had a specific view of the social contract. According to Hobbes, the state of nature is a state of war. He argues that the brutal and depraved condition of the state of nature can be escaped only by the formation of a society and complete allegiance to the king. On the contrary, according to Locke, "men exist in the state of nature in perfect freedom to do what they want."¹⁶ He explicates the liberal tradition, expounds that the formation of a society and the government is primarily to protect the inalienable rights and liberty of its citizen. Rousseau, on the other hand, believes that; "men in a state of nature are free and equal. In a state of nature men are, 'Noble Savages'."¹⁷ Civilization is what corrupted him.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was the first political theorist, who founded the social contract theory as a distinct philosophical concept. He presented arguments in favor of the social contract to establish a political sovereign society. According to Hobbes, in the state of nature, life is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."¹⁸ So, in order to avoid such dreadful and brutal condition of the state of nature, people would mutually assent to a social contract.

Hobbes defines human nature to be primarily 'self-interested' and 'desire-driven'; and fight with one another for three reasons: competition, diffidence and glory. According to Hobbes, "they are in that condition which is called war; and such a war, as is every man, against every man. That is why the social contract is formed, because of this continuous fear of death, that at any moment you could be killed."¹⁹

¹⁶ Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*, Chapter II, Sec. 4.

¹⁷ Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality. Part Two: The Basic Political Writings*. p. 65.

¹⁸ Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Ed. and intro. Edwin Curley, p. viii.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 84.

He states that people would mutually agree to surrender their natural rights to a sovereign by conferring him with powers to execute, legislate and protect the laws. In this way, he would be able to provide and ascertain society with much required stability. The sovereign, entrusted with all powers, would be considered as the highest authority whose actions could not be judged, whereas the subjects would have to follow his commands irrespective. In this way, he is authorized to impose law and order according to his will.

Hobbes did not mention any rights given to the people; conversely, he considered the right to revolution as an immoral act. For Hobbes, “ethics is only something that comes with politics, and politics is rooted in selfishness.”²⁰ On the contrary, Locke develops it in a completely different way.

John Locke (1632-1704) gives a different account of the state of nature. According to Locke, “the state of nature; is the natural condition of mankind. It is a state of perfect and complete liberty to conduct one’s life as one best sees fit, free from the interference of others.”²¹ But the inability to judge one’s own faults impartially, the search for a common judge in case of a conflict and the need for the protection of property give rise to the social contract and the formation of political society. “This political government will be based on the consent of the people, who will entrust it with the power of making and executing laws.”²² The basic objective of this government will be the ‘good of mankind’.

Unlike Hobbes, who favoured an absolute monarchy, Locke favoured representative government. He considered man, in opposition to the Hobbes’s articulation of the nature of man, as equal, free and endowed with some natural rights, like the right to own private property, etc. He is governed by “the common rule and measure God has given to mankind.”²³

²⁰ Duncan, Stewart. “Thomas Hobbes,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

URL =<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/hobbes/>, retrieved on 09/24/2014.

²¹ Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*, Chapter II, Sec. 6.

²² Ibid. Chapter VIII, Sec. 96.

²³ Vaughn, Karen Iversen. *John Locke: Economist and Social Scientist*. p. 77.

In his *Two Treatises of Government*, Locke says that the fundamental aim of the government is the “preservation of mankind– to protect and promote their natural rights.”²⁴ Individual surrendered their rights and liberty of the state of nature to the supervision of government, in order to maintain peace, order, and harmony.

In this way, the fundamental difference between the views of Locke and Hobbes regarding the description of the state of nature lies in the fact that Locke presents the generous and noble nature of man, whereas Hobbes considers him to be very selfish and competitive. While Locke has accepted life, liberty, and property as the three cardinal virtues, Hobbes does not mention any natural rights of man.

Rousseau has further developed the social contract theory. He has presented a very happy and contented description of the state of nature where men were happy, free, peaceful, and equal. According to Rousseau, in the state of nature, people were like savages. Their actions were primarily stimulated by immediate needs, like food, sleep, sexual satisfaction, etc. The lives of savages were undistorted, peaceful, secluded, and reticent. They were not worried about the specification of future. People had simple, clear, trouble-free, happy and peaceful lives.

However, the increase in population resulted in dependence on one another and the idea of private property which resulted in the formation of small families, and then small communities. “Since the people wanted their property to be protected from others, they surrendered their rights not to the will of a single individual but to the ‘general will’ of the whole community.”²⁵

Rousseau claims that, in the state of nature, the sense of morality has not been developed in human beings. There is no understanding of right and wrong, virtue or vice, moral and immoral. The use of Reason made possible man’s social evolution from a primitive state of nature to a civilized society.

²⁴ Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Ed. Peter Laslett. p. 20.

²⁵ Bertram, Christopher. “Jean Jacques Rousseau,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*
URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/rousseau/>, retrieved on 22/09/2014.

In his work, *The Social Contract*, he asserts: “Man is born free, but everywhere is in chains.”²⁶ Richard Hooker states, according to Rousseau, “civilization affected liberty in a negative way, as opposed to the original perception in which civilization enhanced human liberty.”²⁷ He believes that “a people could be free if it ruled itself.”²⁸

The debate of culture versus nature can be traced in the writings of Rousseau. Rousseau states that:

Culture is a storehouse of social meaning and value, which individuals draw on to understand and assess their lives. Culture motivates individual’s actions: people decide what actions to take and how to perform them on the basis of cultural norms. To be a member of a culture is to know what and how things are done in given situations: it is to participate in a system of expectations. In virtue of sharing norms, individuals act in similar or coordinated ways, producing large-scale regularities in social life. This is how, for Rousseau, culture shapes the prospects for society’s politics. Cultural norms shape the attitudes might lead them to act in ways that help or hinder political cooperation. Culture exercises its influence on political life.²⁹

Thus, individual enters into social and political life through the medium of culture and moves himself from the State of Nature. In his essay, *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences*,

Rousseau traces man’s social evolution from a primitive state of nature to modern society. The earliest solitary humans possessed a basic drive for self- preservation and a natural disposition to compassion. The development of agriculture, metallurgy, private property, and the division of labour and resulting dependency on one another, however, led to economic inequality and conflict.³⁰

According to Rousseau, the next step is the social contract through which an individual can enter into social life. Rousseau accepts that there is harmony between

²⁶ Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Trans. Christopher Betts. p. 45.

²⁷ Hooker, Richard. “*The European Enlightenment: Jacques Rousseau*.” www.richard-hooker.com/sites/worldcultures/ENLIGHTENMENT/ROUSSEAU, retrieved on 09/13/2015.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Trachtenberg, Zev. M. *Making Citizens – Rousseau’s Political Theory of Culture*. p. 250.

³⁰ Black, Jeff J.S. *Rousseau’s Critique of Science: A Commentary on the Discourse on the Sciences and the Arts*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php/Rousseau/title=theDiscourse_on_the_Art_and_Sciences&oldid=787802504, retrieved on 09/22/2015.

nature and man in the state of nature. But, increase of population and the invention of private property are responsible for disturbing this harmony.

The problem is, “to find a form of association which will defend and protect, with the whole of its joint strength, the person and property of each associate, and under which each of them, uniting himself to all, will obey himself alone, and remain as free as before.”³¹ The social contract theory provides a solution to this fundamental problem. According to Rousseau the contract is aimed at protecting the rights and property of every citizen and hence determining equality in the society. Along with this, he affirms that the power of the government can be taken back only if it fails to perform its duty towards the citizens.

Rousseau asserts that the formation of civil society was aimed at protecting the property of people and maintaining order in society. But, if the social contract be disobeyed, “the governed are free to choose another set of governors or magistrates.”³² Hence he is not promoting anarchism. He believes in civil obedience and seeks to establish order and harmony in society.

Rousseau, in his philosophy, introduces the idea of general will:

There is often a great deal of difference between the will of all and the general will. The latter looks only to the common interest; the former considers private interest and is only a sum of private wills. But take away from these same wills the pluses and minuses that cancel each other out, and the remaining sum of the difference is the general will.³³

According to Rousseau, individuals will surrender their particular wills to the general will of the whole community and by doing so they will enter into a commonwealth and yet remain free. He believed that all men are equal by nature, and hence no one claims to have a natural right to rule others. Only the sovereign authority which is established by the contract is entitled to govern people. This act, “where

³¹ Rousseau, Jean, Jacques. *The Basic Political Writings*. Trans. Donald A. Cress. pp. 54–55.

³² Hooker, Richard. “*The European Enlightenment: Jacques Rousseau.*” www.richard-hooker.com/sites/wolrdcultures/ENLIGHTENMENT/ROUSSEAU, retrieved on 09/13/2015.

³³ Rousseau, Jean, Jacques. *The Social Contract*. p. 46

individual persons become a people is the real foundation of society.”³⁴ In this society, free and equal individuals together form a social whole and follow the general will of society.

To sum up, it can be said that Rousseau believes that humans are innately good; it was society that corrupted the nobleness of man. Human beings can retract their freedom and equality that has been corrupted by the social contingencies. It can be attained by reconciling an individual’s will with that of the general will follow one’s free will.

In the light of above discussion, one can say that the social contract theory of each of the thinkers was different from each other. Hobbes supports absolute monarchy on the one hand, and Locke, sowing the seeds of liberal tradition on the other. Rousseau’s contract theory provides a base for democratic constitution. He asserts that the principal aim of the society was to establish the ‘general will’ of the people, i.e., the common good of the society and not the will of the sovereign. The debate of nature versus culture can be traced in the writings of Rousseau. Culture acts as a medium through which an individual enters into social and political life and moves away from the state of nature. It was social contract which became the medium between the state of nature and socio-political life.

1.2 Culture versus Culture: Patterns and Inter Cultural Hierarchies – Ruth Benedict

In the first half of the 20th century Ruth Benedict (1887-1948), an anthropologist has taken up different perspectives of culture and tries to illuminate the additional feature of the term ‘culture’. Ruth Benedict through her work *Patterns of Culture* (1935) seeks to explain the meaning of the word ‘culture’. She looks at the diversity of cultures and inter-cultural hierarchies, its integration, the nature of society and the individual and patterns of society. In *Patterns of Culture*, Ruth Benedict presents the sketches of three cultures – the *Zuni*, the *Dobu*, and the *Kwakiutl*. “She uses these cultures to elaborate her theory of

³⁴Rousseau, Jean, Jacques. *The Basic Political Writings*. p. 59.

‘Culture as personality-writ-large’.”³⁵ Benedict tries to explain the term culture, through the help of the first three chapters –

What really binds men together is their culture, the ideas and the standards they have in common...A culture, like an individual, is a more or less consistent pattern of thought and action. Within each culture there came into being characteristic purposes not necessarily shared by other types of society. In obedience to their purpose, each people further and further consolidates its experience, and in proportion to the urgency of these drives the heterogeneous items of behaviour take more and more congruous shape.³⁶

She, further, clarifies:

The diversity of culture results not only from the case with which societies elaborate or reject possible aspects of existence. It is more even due to a complex interweaving of cultural traits. The final form of any traditional institution goes far beyond the original human impulse. In great measure this final form depends upon the way in which the trait has emerged with other traits from different fields of experience. The nature of the trait will be quite different in the different areas according to the elements with which it has combined...If we are interested in cultural processes, the only way in which we can know the significance of the selected detail of behaviour is against the background of the motives and emotions and values that are institutionalized in that culture.³⁷

According to Benedict’s definition, for understanding a culture, there is need to understand the individual living in that culture, as is correctly stated by Franz Boas in the introduction of this book: “We must understand the individuals as living in his culture; and the culture as lived by individuals. A person within a culture can be understood in relation to the pattern or traits of their particular culture.”³⁸ To develop her position, she has used comparative method. Benedict says that the patterns of different culture can best be described by the comparative method. Comparative method will help us in understanding our own cultural process.

In her study, Benedict takes the analysis of three primitive cultures. According to her, “primitive cultures are the laboratory in which the diversity of human institution can

³⁵ Wren, Thomas. “The Strange Career of the Concept of Culture.”
<http://thomaswren.sites.luc.edu/philosophy423/wren1.htm>, retrieved on 11/08/2014.

³⁶ Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. p. 33.

³⁷ Ibid. p. 35.

³⁸ Ibid. p. x.

be studied.”³⁹ Primitive cultures because of its relative simplicity and lack of cultural change make the complete analysis possible. She asserts that:

The careful study of primitive societies is important today rather, as we have said, because they provide case material for the study of cultural forms and processes. They help us to differentiate between those responses that are specific to local cultural types and those that are general to mankind. Beyond this, they help us to gauge and understand the immensely important role of culturally conditioned behaviour.⁴⁰

Thus, after describing the importance of the primitive culture, Benedict begins to describe the three ‘primitive cultures’ – the *Zuni*, the *Dobu*, and the *Kwakiutl*.

The *Zuni*

Benedict mentions that the *Zunis* are a passionate, jealous, suspicious and ceremonious people. They valued rituals more than power and health which shaped the individual personality of the *Zuni*. Benedict says: “The *Zunis* are a ceremonious people, a people who value sobriety and inoffensiveness above all other virtues. Their interest is centered upon their rich and complex ceremonial life.”⁴¹ Nietzsche uses the terms *Apollonian* and *Dionysian* in *The Birth of Tragedy* to “designate the two central principles in Greek culture. He used the terms *Apollonian* and *Dionysian* for the two forces- *Apollo* and *Dionysus*. *Apollo* is describes as the sun-god representing light, clarity, and form, whereas *Dionysus*, as the wine-god, representing drunkenness and ecstasy. Nietzsche explicates the two categories contrasting one with the other.”⁴² In the same way one can find contrast between *Zuni* can be described as having *Apollonian* aspects whereas other cultures of North America can be described as having *Dionysian* aspects,

The *Dionysian* pursues them [the values of existence] through ‘the annihilation of the ordinary bounds and limits of existence’; he seeks to attain his most valued moments escape from the boundaries imposed upon him by his five senses, to break through onto another order to experience. The closest analogy to the emotions he seeks is drunkenness, and he values the illuminations of frenzy. The

³⁹ Ibid. p. 12.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 14.

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 42.

⁴² Kaufmann, Walter. *From Shakespeare to Existentialism: An Original Study*. pp. 207–08.

Apollonian distrusts all of this, and has often little idea of the nature of such experiences. He keeps the middle of the road, stays within the known map, and does not meddle with disruptive psychological states.⁴³

Benedict has tried to show the simplicity of *Zuni* culture by comparing it with the Native Americans cultures. The whole of the *Zuni* culture is explained in regard to the *Apollonian* aspect and its contrast is shown with the help of *Dionysian* aspects prevailing among other cultures.

The *Dobu*

In contrast to *Zunis*, *Dobuans* are dangerous people. They are considered as warriors and magicians. They are lawless and treacherous. They do not have any political organization. Benedict adds:

The treacherous conflict which is the ethical ideal in *Dobu* is not palliated by social conventions of what constitutes legality. Neither is it ameliorated by ideas of mercy or kindness. The weapons with which they fight carry no foils. Therefore they do not waste breath and risk interference with their plans by indulging in challenge and insult.⁴⁴

The way they approach their opponents can be describe in following manner—

If we wish to kill a man we approach him, we eat, drink, sleep, work and rest with him, and it may be for several moons. We bide our time. We call him friend. Therefore when the diviner weights the evidences in determining the murderer, suspicion falls upon anyone who has sought out his company. If they were together for no reason that appeared customary, the matter is regarded as proved.⁴⁵

They get prosperity by defeating his opponent in a conflict. According to *Dobuans*, a person who is having lot of conflicts with other person is considered to be good man. As Dr. Fortune says, “the *Dobuans* prefer to be infernally nasty or else not nasty at all.”⁴⁶ In this way; conflicts, struggles, cruelty, suspicion, and animosity holds a special role in *Dobuans*’s life. Thus, one can say that, *Dobuans* are completely opposite of *Zunis*, who are peace loving.

⁴³ Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. pp. 56–57.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 123.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

The Kwakiutl

In her last example, Benedict describes the culture of the northwest American Coast. The *Kwakiutl* tribes of the North-West Coast were considered as the *Dionysian*.

In their religious ceremonies the final thing they strove for was ecstasy. The chief dancer at the high point of his performance should lose normal control of himself and be carried into another state of existence. He should froth at the mouth, tremble violently and abnormally, do deeds which would be terrible in a normal state. Some dancers were tethered by four ropes held by attendants, so that they might not do irreparable damage in their frenzy.⁴⁷

Benedict describes them to be irrational with a thirst for self-gratification:

The *Dionysian* slant of the North-West Coast tribes is as violent in their economic life, their warfare and mourning as it is in their initiations and ceremonial dances. The pattern of culture which was peculiar to them was intricately interwoven out of their special ideas of property and of manipulation of wealth.⁴⁸

Thus, the Kwakiutl tribes were irrational, ambitious and violent in their economic life. Individuality and power played an important role in the life of the Kwakiutl tribes.

In this way, with the help of Benedict's explanation of culture, it is made clear that these three cultures –the *Zuni*, the *Dobu*, and the *Kwakiutl* differ from one another in their behaviour and acts. The *Zuni* are peace loving whereas the *Kwakiutl* are very much inclined to violence. A clear contrast regarding the pattern of culture is seen between the *Zuni*, the *Dobu*, and the *Kwakiutl*.

In this context, Ruth Benedict talks about cultural relativism. According to her, there cannot be any one universal moral principle by which the values and practices of all cultures can be understood. Benedict argues that “the recognition of cultural relativity carries with its own values, which need not be those of the absolutist philosophies. It challenges customary opinions and cause those who have been bred to them acute discomfort.”⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Ibid. pp. 126–27.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 131.

⁴⁹ Ibid. pp. 200–01.

Thus, one can say that, through her book *Patterns of Culture*, Benedict tries to expound that every culture has a different system of beliefs- the ideas, knowledge, opinion, understanding and standards. Every culture has its own traits, values and ends which according to them is right. A culture must not depreciate the customs or values of the other cultures. It is not possible to define and evaluate other culture by our own cultural standards. Every culture has its own institutionalized motives, faith, emotions, and imperatives, so, it is not possible to have a generalization of values in all culture.

1.3 Integration in the Intra-Cultural Hierarchies: Hans George Gadamer

After dealing with the notion of culture according to Rousseau and Ruth Benedict, I shall now focus on the other dimension of culture which can be explained through the philosophy of Hans George Gadamer (1900-2002). In the late twentieth century, Gadamer proposes fusion of cultural horizons by applying the method of hermeneutics. Basically, hermeneutics is the theory of text interpretation but for Gadamer, it emerges as a theory of human understanding. According to Gadamer, the method of hermeneutics can help us to understand the role of culture in any multicultural society because unless we understand a specific culture in terms of the meaning of the texts of the culture, we will not be in position to show its relevance to another culture.

Instead of focusing on the question what humanity is, he wanted to discover what humanity could be. All understanding, maintains Gadamer, has a practical orientation, situated in and shaped by a particular history and culture. This does not mean that he advocates subjectivism; on the contrary, he develops the notion of *Bildung* which leads toward the ‘fusion of horizons’.

In his work *Truth and Method*, Gadamer used the term ‘philosophical hermeneutics’ to explicate his theory of understanding. According to him, “philosophical hermeneutics is a shift from a methodological hermeneutics to hermeneutics of

experience, as its intention is...to ask the question of understanding relative to the entire human experience of the world and the practice of life.”⁵⁰

Gadamer asserted that we can reach the truth only by understanding our experience. He further elaborates that understanding is not merely a concern of science; rather it takes place in every aspect of human experiences. Gadamer states:

[t]he way we experience one another, the way we experience historical traditions, the way we experience the natural givenness of our existence and of our world, constitute a truly hermeneutic universe, in which we are not imprisoned, as if behind insurmountable barriers, but to which we are opened.⁵¹

Gadamer writes, “Understanding does not, in fact, understand better.... It is enough to say that we understand in a different way, if we understand at all.”⁵² “Through philosophical hermeneutics as a theory of understanding, Gadamer attempts to bridge the gap between the familiar world in which we stand and the strange meaning that resists assimilation into the horizons of our world.”⁵³ Gadamer wanted to discover the historicity of understanding. In order to contextualize a culture, we take into account history, geography, and language as the contexts within which hermeneutic discourse can take place. He pointed out that prejudices are an element of our understanding.

Gadamer argues that people come from a particular background, history, culture, gender, language, education etc. which constructs their horizon and which makes the understanding of an object possible. He define horizon:

Every finite present has its limitations. We define the concept of concept of “situation” by saying that it represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision. Hence essential to the concept of situation is the concept of “horizon”. The horizon is the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point. A person who has no horizon does not see far enough and hence over-values what is nearest to him. On the other hand, “to have a horizon” means not being limited to what nearby but being able to see beyond it. A person who has a horizon knows the relative significance of everything within this

⁵⁰ Risser, J. *Hermeneutics and the Voice of the Other: Re-reading Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*. p. 9.

⁵¹ Gadamer, H.G. *Truth and Method*. Trans. Weinsheimer Joel and G. Donald Marshall. p. xxiii.

⁵² *Ibid.* p. 296.

⁵³ Linge, D (ed.). *Hans – George Gadamer: Philosophical Hermeneutics*. p. xii.

horizon, whether it is near or far, great or small. Similarly, working out the hermeneutical situation means acquiring the right horizon of inquiry for the questions evoked by the encounter with tradition.⁵⁴

Gadamer posits that understanding consists in a process of “fusion of horizons.” It takes place during the dialogue and discourse between people belonging to different horizons. “Fusion of Horizons is a dialectical concept which results from the rejection of two alternatives: objectivism, whereby the objectification of the other is premised on the forgetting of oneself; and absolute knowledge, according to which universal history can be articulated within a single horizon. We exist neither in a closed horizon. Nor within a horizon that is unique.”⁵⁵

Gadamer states that there can be a possibility of speaking about the narrowness of horizon as every horizon has its limits. It can be expanded and transformed into a new horizon. The horizon can be described as something into which we move and which moves with us. So, it is not possible to speak of a closed horizon or a fixed horizon. Gadamer talks of “horizon” as a way to conceptualize understanding. One’s horizon is as far as one can see or understand. He describes a horizon as “the totality of all that can be realized or thought about by a person at a given time in history and in a particular culture.”⁵⁶

Gadamer asserted that by ‘fusion of horizons’, interpreter invalidate the distance between tradition and the present in which he is living. According to him, prejudices and language plays a vital role in attaining fusion of horizons. He writes:

It should be noticed that, some prejudices can be considered true and can lead us on to comprehension; other are false and lead to misunderstandings. So, it is necessary to work with our prejudices interpretively. Not to put them aside and ignore them. In this way, an integral part of comprehension is understanding oneself, one’s culture, and one’s biases.⁵⁷

⁵⁴ Gadamer, H.G. *Truth and Method*. pp. 301–02.

⁵⁵ Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Ed. and trans. John, B. Thomson. p. 75.

⁵⁶ Clark, Jeff. “Philosophy, Understanding and the Consultation: A Fusion of Horizons,” *British Journal of General Practice*. pp. 58–60. www.ncbi.nlm.gov/pms/articles, retrieved on 07/13/2015.

⁵⁷ Rees, Dilys Karen. “Gadamer’s Philosophical Hermeneutics: The Vantage Points and the Horizon in Reader’s responses to an American Literature Text.” www.readingmatrix.com/articles/rees/article, retrieved on 03/23/2015.

Along with this, the communication between the interlocutors can be possible only by means of language. They can be able to understand and interpret other's horizon through the medium of language. It is the understanding of the one's own language, as Gadamer claims, "Being that can be understood is language."⁵⁸

It can be argued that Gadamer presents the anti-subjectivism by his notion of 'fusion of horizons'. The whole process enlarges one's horizon by becoming more self-aware of one's own prejudices, culture, understanding, etc. The 'fusion of horizons' shows a passion for the others by providing an opportunity to hear and acknowledge the voice of the other. Hence, it holds a pluralist approach which gives full recognition to the other, developing a feeling of respect.

Gadamer's conception of *Bildung* is probably the touchstone of his work *Truth and Method*. He develops the notion of *Bildung*, which leads toward the 'fusion of horizon'. Gadamer elaborates the humanist concept of culture (*Bildung*) because he wanted to discover what humanity could be. *Bildung* is a German pedagogical term, which means 'formation, cultivation and education. "It refers to the individual's life in society, and this is why to speak of *Bildung* means to speak about the individual's relation to culture and the significance of culture for the individual's life."⁵⁹

Gadamer presents the word *Bildung* as a key idea for his theory of understanding. He explains the meaning of *Bildung* by citing Wilhelm von Humboldt:

[w]hen in our language we say *Bildung*, we mean something higher and more inward, namely the disposition of mind which, from the knowledge and the feeling of the total intellectual and moral endeavour, flows harmoniously into sensibility and character.⁶⁰

In this context, Gadamer asserts:

⁵⁸ Gadamer, H.G. *Truth and Method*. p. xxxi.

⁵⁹ Sampaio, Rui. "The Hermeneutic Conception of Culture."

<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Cult/CultSamp.htm>, retrieved on 05/17/2014.

⁶⁰ Gadamer, H.G. *Truth and Method*. p. 9.

“The concept of self-formation, education, or cultivation (*Bildung*) . . . evokes the ancient mystical tradition according to which man carries in his soul the image of God, after whom he is fashioned, and which man cultivate in himself.⁶¹

Bildung produces a transformation which requires the sacrifice of and rising above the particularity of one’s desire and needs for the sake of universality. This universality does not entail alienation, but a ‘fusion’ which unites us to others. Thus, *Bildung* for Gadamer is “one’s disposition that pursues an inner process of forming and cultivating the self as an intellectual and moral endeavour, while keeping himself open to the other with sensitivity for a fusion of horizon without sacrificing one’s past, biases, and particularities.”⁶²

This is Gadamer’s concept of *Bildung* in terms of which he has tried to explore the concept of culture. It can be pursued in the process of education and culture. *Bildung* is a process that helps one in moving from something very familiar to something very strange. This process helps in developing insight into other’s concern and in changing the horizon.

To sum up, it can be said that the main purpose of his theory of culture is the passion for the others. Through the notion of ‘fusion of horizon’ and ‘*Bildung*’, he has tried to show that no one meaning or culture is to be considered as absolute. Gadamer through his concept tries to provide the space where the voice of the other is heard and a strong pluralistic perspective is upheld. With the help of ‘fusion of horizon’ along with *Bildung*, one will develop the attitude to accept the other by giving him full recognition and respect. This is what lies at the roots of multiculturalism.

1.4 Culture as a Way of Life: Sri Aurobindo

On the other hand, different perspective of culture can be explained through the Indian philosophy. I, in my work will try to focus on the Indian culture as a way of life as explained by Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950). Indian culture is a culture of knowledge, of

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 10.

⁶² Gadamer, H.G. *Truth and Method*. p. 10.

dialogue, of spirituality, of yoga, etc. and as such it involves ontological, epistemological, and moral dimensions. Ontologically, it is a concept of human being, epistemologically it has cognitive aspects and ethically there are values and norms involved in it. Sri Aurobindo has defined culture as:

The culture of a people may be roughly described as the expression of the consciousness of life which formulates itself in three aspects. There is a side of thought, of ideal, of upward will, and the soul's aspiration; there is a side of creative self-expression and appreciative aesthesis, intelligence and imagination; and there is a side of practical and outward formulation. A people's philosophy and higher thinking give us its mind's purest, largest and most general formulation of its consciousness of life and its dynamics view of existence. Its religion formulates the most intense form of its upward will and the soul's aspirations towards the fulfillment of its highest ideal and impulse. Its art, poetry, literature provide for us a creative expression and impression of its intuition, imagination, vital turn and creative intelligence. Its society and politics provide in their forms an outward frame in which the more external life works out what it can of its inspiring ideal and of its special character and nature under the difficulties of the environment.⁶³

All human experience is supposed to be brought under three aspects as – science, morality, and art. Sri Aurobindo has used the terms *vidyā*, *sāadhanā*, and *kalā* respectively for science, moral, and art. Science covers the area of knowledge. *Sāadhanā* means practicing as following the rules and hence can be equated with term moral. *Kalā* includes art, poetry, literature, music, etc. Sri Aurobindo in *Foundations of Indian Culture* vindicates *vidyā*, *sāadhanā* and *kalā* as three inter-related aspects of Indian culture. According to Sri Aurobindo:

India's central conception is that of the Eternal, the Spirit here encased in matter, involved and immanent in it and evolving on the material plane by rebirth of the individual up the scale of being till in mental man it enters the world of ideas and realm of conscious morality; dharma.⁶⁴

The ethics of *Upaniṣhads* is deeply rooted in the four *Varṇas*, *Āśramas* and the *Puruṣārthas*. The four *varṇas*, *āśramas* and the *puruṣārthas* have the ethical orientation at every stage. In ancient India, there was a system of four *Varṇas* – *Brāhman*, *Kṣatriya*,

⁶³Aurobindo, Sri. *Foundations of Indian Culture*. p. 59.

⁶⁴Ibid. p. 4.

Vaiśya and *Śūdra*. Sri Aurobindo was also impressed by the four *Varṇas* system of the Indian culture. He explained its significance in following lines:

For the real greatness of the Indian system of the four *varṇas* did not lie in its well-ordered division of economic function; its true originality and permanent value was in the ethical and spiritual content which the thinkers and builders of the society poured into these forms.⁶⁵

Similarly the four *āśramas* have the ethical orientation at every stage. Sri Aurobindo explains:

This high convenience was the object of four *āśramas*. Life was divided into four natural periods and each of them marked out a stage in the working out of this cultural idea of living. Four *āśramas* were – *Brahmacharya*, *Gṛhastha*, *Vānprastha* and *Sannyāsin*.⁶⁶

They are *Brahmacārya* (student life), *Gṛhastha* (the householder's life, earning livelihood and wealth, fulfilling sexual desires and reproducing children), *Vānprastha* (the hermit's life with gradual detachments), and *Samnyās* (renunciation from family and worldly things). In this way this system elevates an individual to the highest stage of perfection.

Sri Aurobindo mentions that the whole system of society, founded on the four *puruṣārthas*. The concept of *puruṣārthas* is governing Indian Moral Philosophy. "The term '*Puruṣārtha*' consists of two words, viz., *Puruṣa* and *Artha*. '*Puruṣa*' means person or self and '*Artha*' means aim or goal of human life."⁶⁷ It has been rendered into English in several ways: Value of life, goal of life, aim of existence, meaning of life, etc. The understanding of *Puruṣārthas* (*Abhyudaya* and *Niḥśreyasa*) is very important to our individual and collective life as we move forward into the future in globalized world. We need to rediscover our understanding of *puruṣārthas* on individual, social, national and international levels. The four *puruṣārthas* are:

⁶⁵Ibid. p. 129.

⁶⁶ Ibid. pp. 131–34.

⁶⁷ Sethumadhavan, T. N. "Upanishads the Science of Freedom from Bondage." <http://www.esamskriti.com/essay-chapters/Upanishads-The-Science-of-Freedom-from-Bondage-2.aspx>, retrieved on 05/20/2014.

1. *Dharma* (righteousness),
2. *Artha* (wealth),
3. *Kāma* (desire) and
4. *Mokṣa* (salvation or liberation)

What is *Dharma*?

Dharma occupies first place among *puruṣārthas*. One which is adopted in the life is *dharma*. *Dharma* guides human beings towards performing good duties. It maintains a balance between various interests, desires and necessities of an individual. *Dharma* according to ‘Mahabharata’ is something that doesn’t inflict pain upon others. *Dharma* enshrines within itself the sentiments of public welfare. “The word for *dharma* in the *vedic* literature is *Rta* meaning first the cosmic order, then the field of sacrifice (*yajña*) and finally the sphere of human conduct.”⁶⁸ “Manu has brought out the implication of this classical definition by saying “*Vedo akhilam Dharma-mulam.*”⁶⁹ According to Manu, one who respects *dharma*, *dharma* always safeguards him. Through the noble paths of *dharma* individual finds solace in this physical world and also in the spiritual world. Human beings perform plethora of activities in their societies. *Dharma* provides a definite and positive shape to his social behavior.

What is the significance of *Artha* in Indian culture?

Artha is one of the most important pillars of the *puruṣārthas*. *Artha* is directly related with physical factors helpful in carrying out livelihood of an individual. Most of the people believe that, meta-physical world and salvation has been accorded more importance in Indian culture and physical lavishness is not entertained in that world. It is a wrong assumption. This world and that world, physical and meta-physical have indeed been given equal importance in the Indian culture. As Radhakrishnan says,

There was never in India a national ideal of poverty or squalor. Spiritual life finds full scope only in communities of a certain degree of freedom from sordidness.

⁶⁸ *Rg Veda* 1.24.8. Trans. R. C. Zaehner. p. 39.

⁶⁹ *Manusmṛti*, 2.6.

Lives that are strained and starved cannot be religious except in a rudimentary way. Economic insecurity and individual freedom do not go together.⁷⁰

Rich and benevolent relation that exists in the goals of individuals of physical world and metaphysical world in the Indian culture could hardly be found in any other culture. Due to this harmonious relation only, India on the one hand reached at the apex of philosophies and at the other hand physical attainments of India remained unparalleled. This is however true that, last goal of an individual in Indian culture is to find salvation but the importance of money is equally significant in Indian culture. Had Indians perceived money as their last goals they would have become slaves of it. There can be no *kāma* and *dharma* without *artha*. But *artha* is also meaningless without the other two. “*Artha* will not be *artha* if it is not in accordance with *dharma*.”⁷¹

What is the disciplined form of *Kāma*?

Kāma is the third *puruṣārtha*, which is ordinarily termed as pleasure. Under the *puruṣārthas* of Indian culture, the calculation and limits of desires has also been determined. The relevance of *Kāma* (desires) is equally significant as much there is the relevance of *Dharma* and *Artha*. “Both in *Rg Veda* and *Atharvaveda* *kāma* is introduced in the creation hymn: Thereafter rose desire in the beginning.”⁷² Thus, “the Vedas depict the origin of things as an act of begetting.”⁷³ *Kāma* is the name of hormonal tendencies of an individual. Hunger, sleep, fear and lust are found in animals in equal proportion to the human beings, but humans are social and intellectual animals. They perform everything with the help of wisdom. Animals have natural lust. They do not possess thoughts and sentiments. Human beings have disciplined and controlled desires.

The definition of pleasure in *Kamasūtra* is the following: “*Kāma* is the enjoyment of the appropriate objects by the five senses of hearing, feeling, seeing, tasting and

⁷⁰ Radhakrishnan, S. *Eastern Religious and Western Thought*. p. 353.

⁷¹ Sethumadhavan, T. N. “Upanishads the Science of Freedom from Bondage.” <http://www.esamskriti.com/essay-chapters/Upanishads-The-Science-of-Freedom-from-Bondage-2.aspx>, retrieved on 05/20/2014.

⁷² *Rg Veda*. 10.129.4. Trans. R.T.H. Griffith. *The Hymns of the Rig-Veda*. Vol. 1.

⁷³ Whitney, W.D. *Atharva - Veda Samhita, II Vol.* pp. 521.

smelling, assisted by the mind together with the soul.”⁷⁴ To provide stability to the lustful behavior of individuals, a permanent, civilized and cultured form has been accorded to the male-female relations. Uncontrolled desires of individuals have been tried to control by the institution of marriage. The goal of *Kāma* in Indian culture has been that of creation of new individuals rather than being lust.

How *Mokṣa* is possible?

Let us now look at the fourth *puruṣārthas*; *mokṣa*, which is said to be our *niḥśreyasa* (salvation). There is a strong correlation between *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa*. It is the state of Self-realization in which there is no change and there is no movement. *Mokṣa* means liberation; it is the ultimate destination of this human birth. *Dharma* is directly related with salvation. One cannot attain salvation by just adhering to the principles of *dharma* and behaving according to its ideals. Therefore, it has been said that one should try to attain salvation by moving on the path of *kāma* and *artha*.

The *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣads* describes the state of *Mokṣa* thus: “As a man in the embrace of his beloved wife knows nothing without or within, so the person when in the embrace of the intelligent self knows nothing without or within. That, verify, is his form in which his desire is fulfilled, in which the self is his desire, in which he is without desire, free from any sorrow.”⁷⁵ Kauṭilya has said that, human beings should enjoy everything in this world, they should fulfill desires, save monies but every such thing should be under the just purview of religion. The core of it should be the ideals of *dharma*. Vātsyāyana has said in his *Kāmsūtra* that only those desires would fall under the purview of *puruṣārthas* that are under the ideals of *Dharma*. Lord Krishna has said in the *Gīta* that god rests in religiously held desires.

Sri Aurobindo elaborates the idea of *Mokṣa* in his words:

Spiritual freedom, spiritual perfection were not figured as a far off intangible ideal, but presented as the highest human aim towards which all grow in the end and were made near and possible to his Endeavour from a first practicable basis of life and

⁷⁴ Kane, P. V. *History of Dharmasastra*. p. 9.

⁷⁵ *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣads*. VI. 3.21. Trans. Robert Ernest Hume. *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*.

the Dharma. The spiritual idea governed, enlightened and gathered towards itself all the other life-motives of a great civilized people.⁷⁶

Thus, religious consumption of money and lust reaches towards the ultimate *puruṣārthas* that is Salvation. It is clearly stated that the concept of *mokṣa* is the central point of the Indian culture. The order of the *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa* corresponds to the human nature. Each is considered more important than the previous. A human's life should be guided by these four ends. An application of them offers many possibilities through which we can create a more beautiful and more meaningful existence of human beings. So, the system of four *Varṇas*, four *Āśramas* and *Puruṣārthas* helped the Indian culture in its growth and development.

Sri Aurobindo through the systems of four *Varṇas*, four *Āśramas*, and four *Purushārthas* has tried to explain the intra cultural hierarchies present in Indian culture. All these systems have helped the Indian culture in its approach to integration. He has not only explicated the intra cultural hierarchy but also thrown light on the notion of inter-cultural hierarchy. In this way, he presents the notion of culture as a way of life.

Thus, in this way, we see that every philosopher is presenting the notion of culture in their own way. Rousseau presents the debate of nature versus culture and Benedict explains culture in forms of patterns on the one hand whereas on the other hand Gadamer and Sri Aurobindo are dealing with Inter-cultural and intra-cultural hierarchies. Sri Aurobindo presents the notion of culture embedded in spirituality whereas Gadamer presents the humanist concept of culture (*Bildung*).

Rousseau advocates culture versus nature; individual enters into social and political life through the medium of culture and moves himself from the state of nature. The social contract is the next step through which an individual can enter into socio-political life. The contract resulted in the protection of property, life and the establishment of laws. Rousseau, applied the theory of social contract to a democratic form of government, for the first time, and came up with the ideas the 'general will' of the people, i.e., the common good of the society and not the will of the sovereign.

⁷⁶ Aurobindo, Sri. *Foundations of Indian Culture*. p. 122.

Ruth Benedict explains culture in terms of patterns, diversity and inter-cultural hierarchies in Zuni, Dobu, Kwakiutl, etc. She is trying to compare these cultures and somehow also trying to establish hierarchies among cultures. She tries to show that no one culture is absolute. A culture cannot be evaluated through the standard created by another culture. There are patterns to cultural phenomena. On the other hand, Gadamer also explains both inter as well as intra cultural hierarchies among cultures and has explained the notion of 'fusion of horizons' in this regard. Through 'fusion of horizon' and '*Bildung*', Gadamer trying to creates an atmosphere where the voice of others will be heard and one will develop the attitude to accept the other by giving him full recognition. Sri Aurobindo also discusses intra-cultural as well as inter-cultural hierarchies. He explains the intra-cultural hierarchies inherent in Indian culture through the system of four *Varṇas*, four *Āśramas*, and four *Puruṣārthas*. All these systems helped the Indian culture in its approach to integration.

So, we see that, in every culture there lies the aspect of hierarchy either in explicit or implicit form. These philosophers have created an atmosphere where the notion of hierarchy has being discussed. Hierarchy is inherent in every culture in some way or the other. In general words, hierarchy is related with the aspect of power. In hierarchy, one culture tries to dominate the other considering themselves as superior and the dominant class gets more privileges.

In contemporary world, there are different cultures exists in society and now the identity of culture is plural and multilayered. Each culture regarded its principles to be universally valid. The clash of different cultures, ethnics and identities is a well known fact and it needs a solution. And the solution which is available comes from multicultural perspective. Multiculturalism claims of repudiating the hierarchical status of culture and accepting the universalistic features of culture.

Part 2

Multiculturalism: Descriptive and Normative

It is clear that culture is an important aspect of an individual's life. It is related to individual's nature and it is the product of individual's collective activities. An individual develops some of his beliefs, and on the basis of these beliefs he determines meaning and purpose of his life. To achieve these objectives, he also regulates his lifestyle. These beliefs developed within the individual cannot be effected alone. When people with the same beliefs form a group, and want to achieve their goal collectively, then the community is formed. For community the organization is needed and for organizing, the measures to control the individuals are needed. These measures are developed on the basis of religion, nation, need, mentality, etc. These measures create community rules or traditions. Therefore, the culture is the concept of belief in the collective way of life of the individual. Defining the best way of life and achieving it, is its goal. Excellence is its values and the necessary control on conduct for achieving its goal is its rules. Thus, cultural communities are a group of people who accept one culture. On the basis of religion, mentality or need, the meaning of life and the means of its attainment are changed. The creation of groups of different beliefs constitutes different cultural communities. It is clear that different cultural communities exist in the same society. A natural problem arises as to what should be the mutual relationship of these communities and what should be the principles to connect these communities with the society? Various theories provide different answers to these questions. One of the answers to this question is also the concept of multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism is a recent development which emerges due to various challenges faced by contemporary society. It has number of definitions and has been used in a variety of ways. Terence Turner in his book *Anthropology and Multiculturalism* defines multiculturalism as "it is one manifestation of the postmodernist reaction to the de-legitimization of the state and the erosion of the hegemony of the dominant culture in

advanced capitalist countries.”⁷⁷ Multiculturalism is related to the concept of equality among different cultural communities. In his article, ‘Is There a Case for Multiculturalism?’ Valerian Rodrigues states:

Multiculturalism draws our attention to the differences that inform our social existence and not merely to what is common to all human beings. These differences are constitutive of what we are and wish to be although in other respects we may have the same concern as the rest.⁷⁸

Generally, the term ‘Multiculturalism’ means –

1. Acceptance of cultural norms, beliefs, practices, etc. of all cultures by the State.
2. It recognizes series of practices or action based on norms, ideas and principles of all cultures.
3. Considering plurality and diversity or action based on norms, ideas and principles of all cultures.

Multiculturalism advocates the acceptance, appreciation, and promotion of distinct ethnic, minorities, and religious groups in state. It considers each culture as essential and equally important. In this way, multiculturalism is a concept based on cultural equalities. James Trotman in his book *Multiculturalism: Roots and Realities* points out:

Multiculturalism is valuable because it uses several disciplines to highlight neglected aspect of our social history, particularly the histories of women and minorities.... and promotes respect for the dignity of the lives and voices of the forgotten. By closing gaps, by raising consciousness about the past, multiculturalism tries to restore a sense of wholeness in a postmodern era that fragments human life and thought.⁷⁹

Thus, Multiculturalism is not a philosophical school with a distinct concept of man and his place in the world, yet it is definitely a perspective on or a way of viewing social nexus, spatio- temporal frame, and earthly existence, historical, cultural, and actual

⁷⁷ Turner, Terence. “Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What Is Anthropology That Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It?,” *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 8, No. 4. p. 416.

⁷⁸ Bhargava, Rajeev. “The Multicultural Framework,” *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Ed. Kushal Deb. p. 106.

⁷⁹ Trotman, James C. *Multiculturalism: Roots and Realities*. p. 66.

human life. It started in decade of 1960's. "The term multiculturalism was first used in Canada in 1971 and then, in Australia in 1978, to describe a new public policy that moved away from assimilation of ethnic minorities, and immigrants in particular, towards policies of acceptance and integration of diverse cultures."⁸⁰ After that, the idea of multiculturalism became popular in Europe and the United States during the 1980s. In the words of Jimmy Carter: "We become not a melting pot but a beautiful mosaic with different people, different beliefs, different earnings, different hopes, and different dreams."⁸¹

Today, most of countries like; Germany, Spain, France, etc. accept multiculturalism as their official policy. It is also emerged in the contemporary South-East Asian countries like – India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Philippines, Singapore, etc. India promotes multicultural policies from very early age through its concept of '*sarva dharma samabhāva*'. The oldest of the Indian texts, the *R̥g Veda*, gives the key to understand the concept of plurality. *Ékaṃ sād viprāh bahudhā vadanti* has been the basic idea of philosophizing in India. This short and simple sentence is profound in its implications. *Sat* means 'reality' which is one but wise men talk of it differently.

2.1 Forms of Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism claims that the universalistic features of all cultures should be accepted. And the universalistic features are not only to be accepted but also be appreciated. It proposes civil and democratic rights, property and inheritance, marriage and settlement and above all citizenship so that people belonging to each cultural community could be recognized as valid participants in the civil society. And when these rights are given by the state then multiculturalism is established. So, multiculturalism recognizes ethnic diversity within a society.

In this way, multiculturalism as a perspective on cultural diversity is understood in terms of both descriptive and normative. In descriptive sense, multiculturalism refers to diversity of cultures. And in normative sense, it holds that such differences should be

⁸⁰ Ramaswamy, Sushila. *Political Theory: Ideas and Concept*. p. 503.

⁸¹ www.Img.pf.bw.schdule.de/faecher/english/files/meltingbowl.doc, retrieved on 05/14/2015.

respected and publicly affirmed. In this sense, it means to accept various beliefs and ways of life as values. Andrew Heywood states:

Sometimes, the term ‘multiculturalism is used to describe a condition of society; it has been taken to refer to cultural diversity that arises from the existence within a society of two or more groups whose beliefs and practices generate a distinctive sense of collective identity. Multiculturalism, in this sense, is invariably reserved for communal diversity that arises from racial, ethnic and language differences.⁸²

As a normative term,

Multiculturalism implies a positive endorsement, even celebration, of communal diversity, typically based on either the rights of different cultural groups to respect and recognition or to the alleged benefits to the larger society of moral and cultural diversity.⁸³

It is implied that multiculturalism raises questions and critically evaluates the liberal notions of identity, freedom, dignity; on the one hand; and individuality, citizenship, equality, rights, etc. on the other; and re-formulates its assumptions like property, life, etc. In this connection Rajeev Bhargava in his article *The Multicultural Framework* observes:

It is important to understand the current context within which such demands for political recognition are made. To emphasis this context, it helps to situate this issue in what I call the broader dialectic of multiculturalism. The first moment in this dialectic is the moment of ‘particularized hierarchy’, characterized by a dominant community to which other communities are subordinate...Difference between cultural communities is maintained but only with this relationship of subordination. In short, the only way in which difference is sustained is by treating communities unequally. The second moment may be named as the moment of universalistic equality. The only way to sustain equality here is to deny the significance of cultural difference. People are equal because their membership in a cultural community is deemed in consequential. Rather, what matters is their status as individuals and their membership in an abstracted political community. The third moment may be termed as the moment of particularized equality. Here people are different but equal membership in particular cultural group is important but so is the relationship of equality among different cultural communities.⁸⁴

⁸² Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. p. 314.

⁸³ Ibid. p. 315.

⁸⁴ Bhargava, Rajeev. “The Multicultural Framework.” p. 85.

This means every member and community should have recognition within society or state. In this context, pluralism is the most operative term in the formulation of discussion on multiculturalism. How to understand plurality or to recognize the others remains a fundamental question in multiculturalism. Every culture is deeply rooted in the sense of affinity and diversity. We develop the affinity for a culture because we are born and brought up with that. It is the aspects of language, symbols, values, festivity, celebration of birth, marriage and even the concept of death that create the cultural affinity. By virtue of affinity, a culture creates diversity with other languages, values, etc. It implies that the moment a culture emerges and creates affinity; it simultaneously gives rise to diversity. It can therefore be said that plurality implies an understanding of affinity and diversity.

People of different cultures and different lifestyle live together in modern nation-states. Many cultures exist in a state. But the existence of many cultures does not make a nation multiculturalist. The plurality of cultures can build a multicultural country but not a multiculturalist nation. Multiculturalism is a concept which demands certain expectations from both the state and society. If a state gives equal status to all available cultures/cultural groups and provides such a socio-political environment to minority cultural communities, in which their cultural rights can be protected and developed, then that state can be called a multicultural state. At the social level, if society and especially its majority class consider all cultures on same footing and promote the minority cultures and never try to absorb them, then that society will be called multiculturalist.

Multiculturalism relates the identity of a person to its culture. Cultural communities determine the person's experience and on the basis of such experience, the person determines his life-value and the goal of life. Rajeev Bhargava states that:

The term 'multiculturalism' gathers a number of interrelated themes; it underscores the need to have a stable identity, emphasizes the contribution of cultural communities to the fulfilment of this need and brings out the link between identity

and recognition. It stresses the importance of cultural belonging and legitimizes the desire to maintain difference.⁸⁵

Therefore, it is a concept, which attempts to safeguard the available and effective cultures in the public domain. Rajeev Bhargava has accepted multiculturalism both in ‘fact’ and ‘values’. He writes:

As a fact, multiculturalism simply registers the presence of many cultures. Its abstract enumerative character forms make it amenable to different interpretations, open to different ideological incarnations, with applicability across space and time. As a value, multiculturalism morally endorses the presence of many cultures, even perhaps celebrates them. To put it simply, multiculturalism as fact and value challenges the fact and value of a single culture society.⁸⁶

Thus, as a fact, multiculturalism accepts the existence of cultures whereas accepting it as a value means that individuals and institutions accept the establishment of multiculturalism as their moral objectives.

2.2 Development of Multiculturalism

The concept of multiculturalism is the result of a prolonged development process. Multicultural society is ancient, but the thought of political and social equality of cultures started only after Second World War. It is necessary to discuss the ideas of two thinkers to explain the development of multiculturalism. Both these thinkers – Bhikhu Parekh and Will Kymlicka, represent the thought of multiculturalism in the contemporary era.

Bhikhu Parekh believes that the concept of multiculturalism emerged after Second World War. In his book *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, Parekh says: “multiculturalism is best understood neither as a political doctrine with a programmatic content nor as a philosophical theory of man and the world but as a perspective on or a way of viewing human life.”⁸⁷ He has tried to define the basic traits of culture by explaining the relationship of culture and individual. According to him, internal and mutual practice of these traits is multiculturalism. These traits of cultures

⁸⁵ Bhargava, Rajeev, Bagchi, Amiya Kumar and Sudarshan R. (eds.). *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy*. p. 1.

⁸⁶ Bhargava, Rajeev. “The Multicultural Framework.” p. 20.

⁸⁷ Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. p. 336.

were from ancient times, but their social identities begin in modern times. After 1950, such circumstances were emerged in the world, which resulted into increase of the importance of cultural communities. As a result of various movements and demands of cultural communities, the concept of multiculturalism was established. He suggests three central insights to culture⁸⁸–

Human beings are culturally embedded in the sense that they grow up and live within a culturally structured world and organize their lives and social relations in terms of a culturally derived system of meaning and significance. Man is deeply connected with his culture. Culture has vast influence on one's way of thought. It is not possible for a person to totally cut himself from his culture. He can overcome some of the influence of his culture but not all.⁸⁹

Therefore, according to Parekh, an individual's personality and his values, beliefs, etc. are created by culture itself. In a society, a person can become what his culture wants to create him.

Different cultures represent different systems of meaning and vision of the good life. Since each culture realizes a limited range of human capacities and emotions and grasps only a part of the totality of human existence, it needs other cultures to help it understand itself better, expand its intellectual and moral horizon, stretch its imagination, and so on...Every culture is partial and not complete. One can lead a good life within one's own culture, but a culture can become richer and complete when it comes in interaction with other. In today's world it is not possible for a culture to remain aloof. No culture is perfect, but at least every culture deserves some respect because of the qualities inherent in it.⁹⁰

According to Parekh, cultures are only different - they cannot be kept in the framework of good and bad. No culture is so bad that it should be abandoned or no culture is so good that it should be imposed on other cultures.

Every culture is internally plural and reflects the continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thoughts. This does not mean that it is devoid of coherence and identity, but that its identity is plural, fluid and open. A dialogue between cultures requires that each should be willing to open itself to the influence

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid. pp. 336–37.

and learn from others, and this presupposes that it is self-critical and is able to engage in a dialogue with itself.⁹¹

Thus, according to Parekh, cultures are democratic because authoritarian cultures cannot exist for a long time. The significance of internal plurality and democracy is linked to personal freedom of the members of cultural community. If a community does not accept its internal diversities and does not ensure its participation in community decisions, then the community will not be plural or democratic. Members of such cultural community will not have a sense of devotion and dedication to the community. This will weaken the community organization and leads to downfall of the community and the culture, related to it. So if cultures are to exist, then they need to be internally plural and democratic. According to Bhikhu Parekh, the interaction of these three elements of culture is called multiculturalism.

Hence, we see that the concept of multiculturalism described by Parekh and the necessary conditions for its existence are in itself complete. But the basic problem is how can these conditions be fulfilled? How will these necessary conditions be created? In this regard, it can be said that; if all the political principles become inter-reliable and cordial, if all the minority cultural communities be ready for discussions and they accept their weaknesses and agree to make changes in them, if the state in its organization and actions accepts each cultural community, equally, then cultural problems can be solved.⁹² But it is extremely difficult to do this. Parekh could not give full details to achieve it. However, Bhikhu Parekh has tried to explain the structure of the cultural society.

The multicultural society has two opposite demands. Firstly, the political structure of this society should be such that can create a sense of strong unity among the members of the community. It is necessary for the members of the society to have an attachment towards their community. Only after this, the community will be integrated and will be able to implement community decisions. Secondly, there should be diversity in the society. Both of them are conflicting requirements. Multicultural society is the second

⁹¹ Ibid. p. 337.

⁹² Upadhyay, A. K. "Multiculturalism and the Crisis of Democratic Governance," *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 63, No. 4. p. 272.

name of the organization of diversities. However, more the diversities here, more the integrity are needed so that the community could keep these diversities bind together. It is clear that plurality is an integral part of collective life and it cannot be abolished. Since individual is related to his culture and he is created by his culture, so to respect an individual means to respect his culture. Respecting a person's cultural community makes him more sincerely connected with his community and it also creates a desire in him to communicate with other cultural communities. In this way, according to Parekh, establishing plurality will facilitate cultural harmony in society.⁹³

Bhikhu Parekh also clarifies that there is no harm in 'assimilation'. According to him, if a minority cultural community wants to assimilate with a majority cultural community, then it is the responsibility of the state to promote it rather to impose any restrictions on it. It is also significant that this assimilation is compatible with community's integrity.⁹⁴ But some problems arise here, as how the minority community will come know, on what basis and by considering which values as excellent, it wants to merge? Also, how will it be known who has the desire to merge and why? There is no definite answer to these questions. On this basis, it can be said that accepting the diversity is reasonable and its utility for multicultural society is significant. For this, the existence of minority cultures should be protected as far as possible.

Parekh, while clarifying the other aspects of multiculturalism, says that this principle does not forcibly detain a person with his culture. Multiculturalism emphasizes the values and traditions of culture, but at the same time also assures that the established ideology of culture can be criticized, if needed and different ideology can also be considered. Cultural diversity means that good ideology from other cultures can also be adopted along with their culture. Parekh makes it clear that multiculturalism accepts the values of different cultures from a critical viewpoint. Here, from a critical viewpoint means that no culture can be considered as complete because there may be some good and bad points in every culture. Different cultures strive to overcome their shortcomings through interaction, and adopt good ideology and values.

⁹³ Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. p. 196.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 197.

Multiculturalism promotes the importance of each culture on one side and on the other hand it promotes self-criticism of cultures.⁹⁵ According to this concept, every culture is not similar in beliefs and values; nevertheless we should be sensitive to all cultures. But, treating all cultures properly does not mean that we cannot evaluate a culture. If cultures are not evaluated as per the requirements and innovation is not done, then cultures will not be relevant. Culture is the basis of living so this innovation is essential in it. Some values are universal, though cultures inherent them in different forms. However, each culture inherent some of its own values. Here, it is necessary to keep in mind that these values should not be evaluated in relation to the values established by other cultures. So it is clear that cultures may be similar but similarly not good. Though every culture deserve respect as approach of each culture is very important for members associated with the community. If social peace is disrupted by any culture, which spread chaos in society then the state could interfere the internal affairs of the culture in legitimate ways.⁹⁶

According to Will Kymlicka, the development of multiculturalism can be divided into three phases. The concept of multiculturalism before 1990 was associated with the debate of liberalism and communitarianism. Liberals acknowledge that individuals should have the freedom to envisage their best life. According to them the person should get rid of all restrictions imposed on it. The liberals also argue that in accordance ethics the position of individual is ahead of the community. The importance of the community is only because it contributes to the wellbeing of those people who build it.⁹⁷ On the other hand, the communitarians do not accept the concept of an autonomous person. They argue that the individual engages in certain social roles and relationships. Being engaged likewise individual does not require to striving for best life at his own, but this is done by the community. These people find a way of life, which defines their inherited interests and desires. According to the communitarians, the person himself is emerged from social behaviour. Special emphasis on individual freedom is hazardous to the community.

⁹⁵ Parekh, Bhikhu. "Dialogue between Cultures." p. 14.

⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 15.

⁹⁷ Will, Kymlicka. *Politics in Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. pp. 18–19.

In this debate of liberalism and communitarianism, communitarians were found to be close to multiculturalism. Liberalism favours the individual's independence and believed that multiculturalism has led individuals to ignore because the entire focus is on the communities. On the contrary, according to the communitarians, multiculturalism protects the community from the frightening effects of individual's autonomy and keeps the social values alive. This protection is required more by the racial cultural minorities. In order to explain the development of multiculturalism, it was accepted equal to communitarianism, but in fact there are many differences in communitarianism and multiculturalism. According to Gurpreet Mahajan:

Communitarianism perceives communities to be collectivities with a shared conception of good life. Indeed, it values community membership because a common language of morality is only conceivable within a community...Multiculturalism, by comparison, is particularly wary of imaging the nation-state as a political community committed to shared conceptions of what is good and desirable. Against the communitarian vision of a nation-state that is anchored in the politics of common good, multiculturalism aims to construct a nation-state that can represent and accommodate diverse conceptions of good life.⁹⁸

Communitarians do not belong to the internal diversity of a community, but internal diversity is also an important aspect for multiculturalism. Communitarians have a conservative view of social customs, values and traditions. According to them, community values cannot be changed. They do not give any importance to the establishment of distributive justice and welfare at the state level. Whereas multiculturalism accepts the welfare schemes deployed at the state level.⁹⁹ Therefore, as the first stage of development, multiculturalism was accepted as protector of minority rights and custodian of the communities.

In the second phase of development, Kymlicka sees multiculturalism as an internal debate of liberalism and its related subjects. After 1990, the most important question before liberalism was that whether liberal theory is capable of protecting the rights of minority communities?¹⁰⁰ In response to this, multiculturalists argue that the rise

⁹⁸ Mahajan, Gurpreet. *The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy*. p. 49.

⁹⁹ Ibid. p. 50.

¹⁰⁰ Upadhyay, A.K. "Multiculturalism and the Crisis of Democratic Governance." p. 275.

and development of multiculturalism does not make any question mark on liberalism. Rather, multiculturalist wants to safeguard the liberal theory along with the diversities. For this, they want to bring collective rights related to community and races under the liberal democratic state. Kymlicka called it a 'liberal culturalism.'¹⁰¹ This is a type of liberal multiculturalism. It protects the individual's independence in a cultural community, on the other hand establishes equality between different communities. In this way, an attempt has been made by multiculturalism in the second phase to further increase the liberal values.

In the last phase of development, multiculturalism associated with the concept of 'nation-building.'¹⁰² Nation-building is a process that strengthens the spirit of integrity among the citizens. The democratic liberal state does accept the role of cultures in the nation - but at the same time, in the public domains, it gives priority to the majority. On the name of national culture, multicultural beliefs are imposed on minority communities and it becomes the reason for "benign neglect."¹⁰³ Kymlicka describes this as:

On this view, liberal states treat culture in the same way as religion—i.e. as something which people should be free to pursue in their private life, but which is not the concern of the state. Just as liberalism precludes the establishment of an official religion, so too there cannot be official cultures that have preferred status over other possible cultural allegiances.¹⁰⁴

In this stage, the concept of multiculturalism is established in such forms, which will end discontent. Minority cultural communities would join the nation and nation-building would be easy. So, in the last phase of development, multiculturalism was accepted as a requirement for nation-building.

Thus, multiculturalism is a concept which is based on cultures. It is different from pluralism and cultural society. Multicultural society is a sign of the presence of different cultures and cultural communities, whereas multiculturalism is based on cultural equality and cultural secularism. By giving the utmost importance to the cultural aspect of the

¹⁰¹ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 327.

¹⁰² Ibid. p. 343.

¹⁰³ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 110.

¹⁰⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 344.

individual, it has been defined as development, art and living values. It is related to the concept of equality among different cultural communities. Accepting the diversities in the society, it also got naturally linked to the concept of social justice. Safeguarding the cultural equality and rights of the members of cultural communities became the necessary condition of social justice. Presently, the aspect of cultural justice, which is related to the protection of the rights of minority cultural communities, is the most important dimension of social justice.

Bibliography & Webliography

Books

- Ajani, Malik. *Citizenship, the Self and the Other: Critical Discussions on Citizenship and How to Approach Religious and Cultural Difference*. Cambridge University Press: UK. 2015.
- Aurobindo, Sri. *Foundations of Indian Culture*. Sri Aurobindo Library Inc: New York. 1953.
- Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited: London. 1935.
- Bhargava, Rajeev, Bagchi, Amiya Kumar and Sudarshan R. (eds.). *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 1999.
- *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣhad*. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume. The Thirteen Principal Upanishads. Shivalik Prkashan: Delhi. 2004.
- Deji, Olanike F. *Gender and Rural Development*. Vol.-1. LIT Verlag: Munster. 2011.
- Desai, Murali. *The Paradigm of International Social Development: Ideologies, Development systems and Policy Approaches*. Routledge: New York. 2014.
- Eagleton, Terry. *The Idea of Culture*. Blackwell: Oxford. 2000.
- Gadamer, H. G. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Weinsheimer Joel and G. Donald Marshall. Continuum: New York. 2004.
- Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic Books: New York. 1973.
- Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan Press: New York. 2012.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited and introduction by Edwin Curley. Hackett Publishing Company Inc.: Indiana. 1994.
- Kane, P. V. *History of Dharmasastra*. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute: Poona. 1941.
- Kaufmann, Walter. *From Shakespeare to Existentialism: An Original Study*. Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1980.
- Kroeber, A.L. and Kluckhohn, Clyde. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology: Cambridge Mass. 1952.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. Oxford University Press: New York. 2002.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1995.

- Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 2000.
- Lane, J. E. and Errson, S. *Culture and Politics: A Comparative Approach*. Ashgate Pub Ltd.: USA. 2005.
- Linge, D. (ed.). *Hans – George Gadamer: Philosophical Hermeneutics*. University of California Press: Berkley. 2008.
- Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by Thomas P. Pearson. The Liberal Arts Press: New York. 1952.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited and introduction by Peter Laslett. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2003.
- Mahajan, Gurpreet. *The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy*. Sage Publication: New Delhi. 2002.
- Malinowski, B. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1969.
- *Manusmrti*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series: Banaras.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Palgrave: New York. 2000.
- Ramaswamy, Sushila. *Political Theory: Ideas and Concept*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.: Delhi. 2010.
- The Hymns of the *R̥g Veda*. Vol. 1. Translated by R.T.H. Griffith. Munshiram Manoharlal Publisher Pvt.: New Delhi. 2004.
- *R̥g Veda*. Translated by R. C. Zaehner. Hinduism: Oxford. 1962.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Edited and translated by John, B. Thomson. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1981.
- Risser, J. *Hermeneutics and the Voice of the Other: Re-reading Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics*. State University of New York Press: New York. 1997.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality. Part Two: The Basic Political Writings*. Hackett Publishing Company: Indianapolis, IN. 1754.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Basic Political Writings*. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing Company: Indiana. 1987.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Translated by Christopher Betts. Oxford: New York. 1994.
- S. Radhakrishnan. *Eastern Religious and Western Thought*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 1940.
- Trachtenberg, Zev. M. *Making Citizens– Rousseau's Political Theory of Culture*. Rutledge University Press: London. 2003.
- Trotman, James C. *Multiculturalism: Roots and Realities*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington. 2002.

- Vaughn, Karen Iversen. *John Locke: Economist and Social Scientist*. The Athlone Press: London. 1980.
- Whitney, W. D. *Atharva - Veda Samhita*. Vol. II. Harvard Oriental Series: New Delhi. 1997.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. Penguin Publishing: New York. 1961.

Journals

- Bertram, Christopher, “Jean Jacques Rousseau,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta.
<https://www.plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/rousseau>, retrieved on 22/09/2014.
- Clark, Jeff. “Philosophy, Understanding and the Consultation: A Fusion of Horizons,” *British Journal of General Practice*. 2008. pp. 58–60.
www.ncbi.nlm.gov/pms/articles, retrieved on 07/13/2015.
- Duncan, Stewart, “Thomas Hobbes,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta.
<https://www.plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/hobbes>, retrieved on 09/24/2014.
- Hooker, Richard. “The European Enlightenment: Jacques Rousseau.” Washington State University. 2005.
www.richardhooker.com/sites/wolrdcultures/ENLIGHTENMENT/ROUSSEAU, retrieved on 09/13/2015.
- Jeff, J.S. Black. *Rousseau's Critique of Science: A Commentary on the Discourse on the Sciences and the Arts*. Lexington Books. 2009.
https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php/Rousseau/title=theDiscourse_on_the_Art_and_Sciences&oldid=787802504, retrieved on 09/22/2015.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Dialogue between Cultures,” *Democracy, Nationalism and Multiculturalism*. Edited by Ramon Maiz and Ferran Requejo. Frank Cass: London. 2005.
- Pye, L.W. “Political Culture,” *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 12. Edited by D. L. Sills. Macmillan: New York. 1968.
- Rajeev Bhargava. “The Multicultural Framework,” *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Edited by Kushal Deb. Rawat Publications: New Delhi. 2002.
- Rees, Dilys Karen. “Gadamer’s Philosophical Hermeneutics: The Vantage Points and the Horizon in Reader’s responses to an American Literature Text.”
www.readingmatrix.com/artcles/rees/article, retrieved on 03/23/2015.
- Sampaio, Rui. “The Hermeneutic Conception of Culture.”
<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Cult/CultSamp.htm>, retrieved on 05/17/2014.

- Sethumadhavan, T. N. “Upanishads the Science of Freedom from Bondage.” <http://www.esamskriti.com/essay-chapters/Upanishads-The-Science-of-Freedom-from-Bondage-2.aspx>, retrieved on 05/20/2014.
- Singh, R.P. “Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons,” *World of Philosophy: A Harmony*. Edited by C. K. Chapple. 2011. pp. 190–
- Turner, Terence. “Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What Is Anthropology That Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It?,” *Cultural Anthropology*. Vol. 8. No. 4. American Anthropological Association: Wiley. Nov. 1993. pp. 411–29.
- Upadhyay, A. K. “Multiculturalism and the Crisis of Democratic Governance,” *The Indian Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 63. No. 4. Indian Political Science Association. December 2002. pp. 261–79.
- Wren, Thomas. “The Strange Career of the Concept of Culture.” <http://thomaswren.sites.luc.edu/philosophy423/wren1.htm>, retrieved on 11/08/2014. www.richardhooker.com/sites/worldcultures/ENLIGHTENMENT/ROUSSEAU, retrieved on 09/13/2015.

Online Sources

- www.nios.ac.in/media/documents/secichcour/english/indian_culture_and_heritage/understandingculture, retrieved on 15/03/2015.
- dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/culture
- <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jean-Jacques-Rousseau>
- [www.sparknotes.com > ... > Jean-Jacques Rousseau \(1712–1778\)](http://www.sparknotes.com/.../Jean-Jacques-Rousseau-(1712-1778))
- anthrotheory.wikia.com/wiki/Ruth_Benedict/anthropology_theory_project
- [http://www.rb/Ruth Benedict & the Anthropological Concept of Culture/livinganthropologically.com](http://www.rb/Ruth_Benedict_&_the_Anthropological_Concept_of_Culture/livinganthropologically.com) > Cultural Anthropology.
- <http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/2016/06/17/hans-georg-gadamer-hermeneutics/>
- [http://www.jrnl/Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics: Concepts of/metajournal.org/articles_pdf/286-303-regan-meta8-tehno.pdf](http://www.jrnl/Hans-Georg_Gadamer's_philosophical_hermeneutics:_Concepts_of_metajournal.org/articles_pdf/286-303-regan-meta8-tehno.pdf)
- www.aurosociety.org/sri-aurobindo-mother/index.asp
- [http://www.safic./Sri Aurobindo Foundation for Indian Culture \(SAFIC\) –Activities/.aurosociety.org/activities/](http://www.safic./Sri_Aurobindo_Foundation_for_Indian_Culture_(SAFIC)_-Activities/.aurosociety.org/activities/)
- <https://www.britannica.com/topic/multiculturalism/sociology>
- www.india-seminar.com/1999/484/484%20parekh.htm/bhikhu_parekh-what_is_multiculturalism
- www.southeast-europe.org/pdf/04/DKE_04_A_E_Berkes-Lilla_Kantor-Judit.the-development-and-meaning-of-multiculturalism.pdf

Chapter II

Liberalism: A Normative Discourse

I, in the present chapter, shall discuss the philosophical and political movement, known as liberalism. Liberalism is generally considered to be the group of political philosophies which emphasize individualism, freedom, liberty, equality, rights, justice, etc. Here, I shall critically evaluate the cultural lineage of such concepts like identity, equality, goodness, justice, dignity, harmony, etc. which have got re-evaluated in terms of personal identity, individual right, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism of Locke, Kant, and Mill.

In liberalism, freedom means individual freedom and equality pertains in treating individuals equally irrespective of their religion, race, sex, language, etc. One can say that, in liberalism, it is individualism which is at the centre of the normative discourse. For instance, Locke propagated individual's rights to life, liberty, and property, Kant developed individual rights, autonomy, dignity, freedom, tolerance, etc. and Mill attempted to defend individual's rights to his life, health, liberty, possessions/ property, etc. It raises the question of identity, not only individual identity but also *personal identity*.

John Locke is considered to be father of liberalism. He was the first person to suggest that liberty is a natural right. He extensively developed the notions of identity and rights including right to live, property, and liberty. John Stuart Mill was another liberal philosopher who through his work 'On Liberty' provided a rational justification of the

freedom of the individual. This doctrine further developed in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. That which is common among all the three advocates of liberalism is that they have accepted the space of individualism at the centre of identity, right, liberty, and equality.

In order to substantiate my discussion in this chapter, I propose to divide it into the following two parts:

Part I- Identity, Right, and Liberty: John Locke and J. S. Mill

Part II- Autonomy, Dignity, and Equality: Immanuel Kant

Before come to Part I of the chapter, it is very important to know about the genesis of liberalism. The 19th century is called as the age of Liberalism because during this period appeared so many thinkers who laid special emphasis on human personality and natural rights. The term liberalism has originated from the Latin word '*liber*' which means liberty or freedom. Liberty is a supreme or core value of liberalism. It believes in individualism. It emerged as a progressive force. It was inspired by enlightenment and held that man is rational. Liberalism believes in principle of toleration as the basis of society besides the principle of contract. It connotes broadmindedness generosity, moderation, progress and reform, opposition to privilege, and opinion and principles pertaining to freedom from prejudice.

The basic concept of liberalism is that every person should possess the right to take decisions about his fortune and career without any undue interference. Liberalism has laid emphasis on confirming state's activities. It has presented the following kinds of liberty e.g. civil liberty, fiscal liberty, political liberty, personal liberty, social liberty, national liberty, and economic liberty. Liberalism calls state as a necessary evil. It held that state is not divine but state is a means. State is machinery created by man. It considers man as rational who is capable of knowing his interests and hence does not require state or any authority to interfere in his life except in a minimal sense. As far as political system is concerned ethos of liberalism are consent, constitutionalism, rule of law, limited state. On the other hand, as an economic system, liberalism advocate free market economy as a model.

Liberalism is seen as a movement, vision, perspective, theory and ideology. As a perspective, it was derived from the Spanish word '*liberales*' which was a political party in Spain which had a theory of the capitalist welfare state.¹ Harold Laski has found it a dominant philosophy of the west for the last 400 years. Laski says that, liberalism is "hardly less a habit of mind than a body of doctrine."² It can be regarded as a faith, an attitude of mind, affair of spirit, or moral temperament. Liberalism, according to Laski, always needs restatement. It has never stopped and has always been progressive. Smith writes that, "Liberalism is the belief in and commitment to a set of methods and policies that have as their common aim greater freedom for individual men."³

Liberalism has no date of birth or parentage. Its shape and size have been conflicting. There is gap between its theory and practice. However, it originated in Western Europe during 15th and 16th centuries when the new or modern order of life was displacing feudalism. In this sense, it is offspring of modern age. Then it grew and matured in 17th and 18th centuries in England. From that, it flourished in Europe, USA and others. Growth of liberalism can be visualized in certain stages or periods –

- The Greek period – During this period, the Greek scholar advocated freedom of thought, political freedom and participation, but all these were confined to the leisured or elite classes.
- Judeo-Christianity period – Rise of Christianity spread the ideas of fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man indicating equality of man. It undermined slavery. But the impact of Christianity was limited to religion and philosophy.
- Religious Freedom and Toleration – Thinkers and scholars of many countries contributed to the clarification and final state mints of liberalism. Spinoza stood for complete separation of the Church from the state, and the freedom of thought and expression. Doctrine of religious freedom is found in the writings of Locke, Leibnitz, Galileo, etc.

¹ Johari, J. C. *Contemporary Political Theory: New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. p. 542.

² Laski, Harold J. *The Rise of European Liberalism: An Essay in Interpretation*. Vol. 8. p. 15.

³ Smith, D. G. "Liberalism," *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 9. Ed. David E. Sills. p. 276.

- Movements and Revolutions – These were Renaissance, Reformation, Enlightenment or the Age of Reason, Scientific Revolution, Industrial Revolution (1760-1830) etc. all together moved against feudalism, clergy or dominance of the Pope and Roman Catholic Church, and absolute monarchy. “Liberalism arose in response to an age characterized by the absolute state, established religion and a society encrusted with restrictive customs and authoritarian ways.”⁴

During this period, liberalism became an ideology of the merchant-industrial classes of Europe, including England. Early liberalism appeared in form of attitudes in many spheres-

- Religious sphere – it attacked on church, tradition, divine right theories and feudalism. Protestantism stood for reason, separation of church and state, in individual conscience.
- Economic sphere – It appeared in the writings of Adam Smith (The Wealth of Nations, 1776), David Ricardo (1772-1823), Thomas Robert Malthus (1766-1834), etc. They all were in favor of self-regulating economy. The utilitarian like Jeremy Bentham and J. S. Mill supported egoist individual, hedonism calculus, equality, and the greatest happiness of the greatest number.
- Political sphere – it fought for the constitutional restraints, representative government, individual rights, parliamentary and responsible government, consent, and reason.
- Social sphere – in this sphere, liberalism opposed discrimination on the basis of class, sex or race, and stood for dignity of the individual, and grant of gradual suffrage to all.

These entire attitude together generated till or the last quarter of 19th century, the classical or negative liberalism. According to the classical liberal view, “the state comes into existence as a result of a contract for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting

⁴ Johari, J. C. *Contemporary Political Theory: New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. p. 540.

the individual's natural rights to life, liberty and property.”⁵ The relationship between the individual and the state is contractual. The former has the right to establish a new government if and when the conditions of the contract are overrode by the state. The state, therefore is man's creation and it exists for the fulfillment of certain specific objectives.

By the middle of the last century, the classical liberalism had lost its appeal. The concentration of wealth on the one hand and mass poverty on the other posed a grave challenge to the classical liberal assumptions. Thus, modern liberalism emerged as reaction against classical liberalism. It was a product of idealists, humanists, utopian socialists, Marxists, etc. Modern liberalism believed in positive state, which was both a moral and social institution – means and ends together. It went beyond law and order. Freedom was to be realized, not from the state, but through the state. The latter had to play a positive role. It had reformatory character. It is committed to constitutional democracy and resorts to parliamentary methods. Its end is social welfare. Liberalism becomes theory and philosophy of welfare state. It believes liberty and equality are inseparable. State can bridge gap between self and other interest.

Neo liberalism is contemporary version of classical liberalism i.e. laissez-faire liberalism. “It is a term which has been used since the 1950s, but became more prevalent in its current meaning in the 1970s and 80s.”⁶ Neo liberalism denounce welfare state and oppose state intervention in economic activities. According to Neo liberalism theory, welfare state is antithetical to concept of individual liberty. It is also not a sound economic doctrine. It involves forced transfer of resources from more competent to less competent areas. Neo liberalism believes in freeing individual from all institutional constraints.

⁵ Fieser, James. “Great Issues in Philosophy.”
www.utm.edu/staff/jfieser/120/2008/chapter/Political_Liberalism_and_Property/=02, retrieved on 11/02/2015.

⁶ “Neoliberalism,” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Neoliberalism&oldid=789449410>, retrieved on 03/15/2016.

“The identity and continuity of modern society resides not in the common possession of a single morality but in the mutual tolerance of different moralities.”⁷ Liberalism is committed to moral pluralism. It has two major preoccupations;

Finding a set of rules which will secure to each individual the greatest amount of freedom to pursue his own good in his own way so long as he does not act unjustly and infringe the freedom of others. These rules are independent of a conception of good. They do not require the illegitimate imposition of morality upon those who disagree to it. And, Concern with individual liberty, of trying to determine the nature of the institutions which will give individuals the maximum opportunity to pursue their own plan of life without constraints and interferences from others.⁸

Thus, the positive conception of liberalism, presupposing a theory of human good and fulfillment is incomparable with the basic assumptions of liberal theory. John Rawls state that,

The unity of society and the allegiance of its citizens to their common institutions rest not on their espousing one rational conception of the good, but on an agreement as to what is just for free and equal moral persons with different and opposing conception of the good.⁹

Liberalism is gaining worldwide acceptance and found justifiable because on its refusal to take sides in the question of what counts as a good life. It allows individuals to make up their own minds. There is need to justify personal autonomy of the individual as a substantive good.

Part 1

Identity, Right, and Liberty: John Locke and J. S. Mill

The normative concepts of identity, right, and liberty are regarded as individual centric in liberalism. In this context I will take into account the position of John Locke and J. S. Mill. The 17th century philosopher John Locke (1632-1704) is often credited with

⁷ Brennan, Troyen A. *Just Doctoring: Medical Ethics in the Liberal State*. p. 20.

⁸ Dorn, James A. “Equality, Justice, and Freedom: A Constitutional Perspective,” *Libertarianism*. <http://www.libertarianism.org/publications/essays/equality-justice-freedom-constitutional-perspective>, retrieved on 06/15/2016.

⁹ Rawls, John. “Social Unity and Primary Goods,” *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. Ed. A. Sen and B. Williams. p. 160.

founding liberalism as a distinct philosophical tradition. “He employed the concept of natural rights, right to life, right to property, concept of consent, constitutionalism, people’s right to dislodge a government for its future to act in accordance with the terms and conditions of contract.”¹⁰

Like other liberal thinkers, Locke starts the study of his philosophy with his views on human nature. However, unlike Hobbes, Locke does not express his views about human nature in a systematic manner. Hence one has to collect his views from the scattered ideas in the *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and the *Second Treatise*. His, views on human nature differ from that of Hobbes. Hobbes had accepted only the animalistic tendencies in humans, whereas, Locke emphasizes on the human qualities of humans. According to Hobbes, passion dominates over reason in man; hence, Hobbes does not talk about the liberty of man. Hobbes prime concern is order. On the other hand, Locke presents a more optimistic and balanced view about man. Locke’s description of human nature is not one sided. He treats man as self- interested as well as rational. According to Locke, humans are cooperative, social and socially loved. They have faith in love and peace and believe in unity and goodness. They are not always selfish. Locke holds that “all human beings are equal, in the moral sense. Every individual enjoys certain natural rights viz. the right to life, liberty and property. He enjoys these rights not because of any position strength, wealth etc., but because he is a human being and possesses reason.”¹¹ Therefore, Locke believes, since all people are human beings, they are morally equal and they have equal rights. Thus, in this way, in the perception of human nature, where the human beings of Hobbes are blank animals, on the other hand, the human beings of Locke are a creature who accepts a moral system and behaves accordingly.

Locke believed that before man came in the civil state, he was living in the state of nature. According to him, the state of nature is, not, the state of war as depicted by Hobbes; rather it is ‘state of peace and goodwill.’ Locke does not accept the state of

¹⁰ Tuckness, Alex. “Locke's Political Philosophy.” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/locke-political/>, retrieved on 02/10/2016.

¹¹ Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*, Chapter II, Sec. 6.

nature as the state of war of each against all. On the other hand he considers it as an era of “peace, good-will, mutual assistance, and preservation.”¹² It was a state of goodwill. Locke’s idea was that in state of nature human beings lived with peace, they were completely independent at that time and used to live their lives according to their wishes. But this freedom was only in self-interest as the natural law made a complete arrangement of human rights and duties.

According to Locke, “the state of nature is not a state of license because though in it man is free from any superior power on earth.”¹³ Nevertheless in it, he has “the law of nature for his rule.”¹⁴ The law of nature governed in the state of nature. It presented moral and rational reasoning of the society. In the words of Locke,

Man being born as has been proved, with a little to perfect freedom and an uncontrolled enjoyment of all the rights and privileged of the law of nature, equally with any other man, or a number of men in the world, hath by nature not only power to preserve his property that is his life, liberty and estate against the injuries and attempts of other men, but to judge of and punish the breaches of that law in others.¹⁵

Therefore, the state of nature was controlled by natural law. Locke believed that ethical rules based on reason are the only natural law. In other words, reason is the only natural law. Locke accepts that, man has both reason as well as passions. Reason in man guides him to control his passions. Reason tells man that it is in the self-interest of man to give respect to the interest of others. He said that:

The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions.¹⁶

Thus Locke has presented a moral and logical interpretation of natural law. In the state of nature, this rule compels every person and also directs the human life in political

¹² Ibid. Chapter III, Sec. 17.

¹³ Ibid. Chapter IV, Sec. 22.

¹⁴ Ibid. Chapter IV, Sec. 22.

¹⁵ Ibid. Chapter VII, Sec. 87.

¹⁶ Ibid. Chapter II, Sec. 6.

society. Because of the natural law, in the state of nature, human beings had complete freedom to do their work and to use their property and their bodies. Thus, man enjoys natural rights in the state of nature. Man is able to enjoy the natural right because of the presence of reason in man. Man understands the natural law that he has to respect the freedom of others; so that, he can enjoy his freedom. Hence, he says that ‘No Law No Liberty.’¹⁷

According to Locke, “the law of nature is a body of rules which govern at all times and at all places the conduct of men.”¹⁸ Its arbiter is reason. Reason interprets that equality is the fundamental fact in men’s relation to one other. Locke means to say that man is in a position to enjoy liberty because of the presence of natural law in the state of nature and man understand it and applying it because of the presence of reason in man.

It is true that state of nature is a state of peace and goodwill, but state of nature has some inconveniences. Peace is prevailing because of good-will but at some point of time, it may happen that good will does not prevail. The reason is man has both, passions as well as reason. Hence things can be left alone on goodwill. In the state of nature, there is no common authority, hence every man is a law-giver; every man is his own judges and executioner. He admitted that from time to time offenders will arise who will break the law by injuring their fellow men or by seizing their possessions.

Locke believed that “to get rid of some of the inconveniences of the state of nature men entered into a contract.”¹⁹ By means of which they passed out of the state of nature into a political society. To get relief from natural inconveniences, human beings have created the state by adopting a line of minimum resistance through an agreement. This is a contract of all with all. It is a contract to which all must consent. Individuls have offered some of their rights to the society so that their collective balanced intellect could change to inconvenience into convenience. He said that, “men surrender only the right of enforcing the law of nature, all others right they retain as fully as before.”²⁰

¹⁷ Ibid. Chapter VI, Sec. 57.

¹⁸ Ibid. Chapter II, Sec. 6.

¹⁹ Ibid. Chapter VII, Sec. 87.

²⁰ Ibid. Chapter VIII, Sec. 98.

According to Locke, the state was created for the protection of the natural rights and the happiness of the individual. The individual is everything and that state is a means to achieve certain ends. Locke holds that the rationality of man guides him to lead a social life. Hence, social sense is also found in man. It means, man is capable of leading a social life even in the absence of state. It means, state is not so urgent and necessary as in Hobbes. There can be inconveniences, but, state less society will not be an anarchic society like Hobbes. It means, state is not essential, but optional. It is the supreme duty of the state to preserve and protect the natural rights of men. Revolution is justified when such rights were flouted, disregarded or disrespected.

Locke's individualism transpires from his ideas about the rights of the people to revolt against their sovereign. The people have power, to remove a government whose policies seem to be curtailing their rights. According to Locke, the state is formed for the benefit of the public to fulfill certain objectives. To overcome some inconveniences, people do not lose their right to protest by giving limited rights to the state. If the fundamental objectives of persons cannot be fulfilled, it is natural to be taken steps against the state; however this step should be supported by a majority. This feature of Locke's theory is that on the dissolution of the government, the society remains the same, because the place of society is above the government. Thus it is clear that Locke's system is individual centered. Nature of state, social contract, civil society, right to revolution etc. - these things are going to enhance the glory of an individual.

Locke's individualism raises the question of identity, not only individual identity but also *personal identity*. Personal identity deals with questions like; who am I? When did I begin? etc. Personal identity is a contested philosophical theory arising out of the lineages from theology, philosophy, psychology, linguistic, gender, political, cultural, and ethnic domains.

According to Locke, "personal identity is a matter of *psychological continuity, being foundationalist in method.*"²¹ When he first tackled personal identity, "he himself defined person as a 'forensic term'; we have to be able to re-identify persons in order to

²¹ Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Ed. P. Nidditch. Chapter 27, Sec. 9.

hold them responsible for their past actions and commitments. Locke further came out in support of citizenship as a cementing force which creates a uniform identity from the diversity.”²²

In his book *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, he wrote: “. . .when, considering anything as existing at any determined time and place, we compare it with itself existing at another time, and thereon form the ideas of identity and diversity.”²³

When we see anything to be in any instant of time, we are sure (be it what it will) that it is that very thing, and not another which at that same time exist in another place, how like and undistinguishable so ever it may be in all other respects; and in this consists identity, when the ideas it is attributed to vary not at all from what they were that moment wherein we consider their former existence, and to which we compare the present. For we never finding nor conceiving it possible that two things of the same kind should exist in the same place at the same time, we rightly conclude that whatever exist anywhere at any time, excludes all the same kind, and is there itself alone.²⁴

According to Locke, “a man or human being is distinct from a person. A man is a rational being shaped and joined to a body but a person is a consciousness, and personal identity consists in being the same consciousness.”²⁵ He says:

. . . .to find wherein personal identity consist, we must consider what person stands for; which, I think, is a thinking intelligent being, that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing, in different times and places; which it does only by that consciousness which is inseparable from thinking, and, as it seems to me, essential to it; ... Since consciousness always accompanied thinking, and it is that makes everyone to be he calls self, and thereby distinguished himself from all other thinking things, in this alone consists *personal identity*, i.e. the sameness of a relation being.²⁶

It is proved through this interpretation of the Locke’s personal identity; each person has a specific unit in itself. Everyone has their own special identity, which separates him from other people and the person does not depend on any other person,

²² Tuckness, Alex. “Locke’s Political Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/locke-political/>, retrieved on 08/21/2014.

²³ Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. p. 274.

²⁴ Ibid. p. 274.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 278.

²⁶ Ibid. pp. 280–81.

community or state for this identity. Thus, Locke associates the idea of personal identity with the concept of individual identity. Basically, liberalism support individual identity. According to the concept of individual identity, individuals are autonomous creatures who take decision rationally.

Through identity, Locke employed the concept of natural rights. He believes in the theory of natural rights. It means man is born with certain rights which cannot be taken away by the state, because they are an essential part of the personality of man. Locke accords a fundamental position to the innate and natural rights of life, liberty, and property belong to the individual due to the fact of his personality. Pro. Dunning says, "Locke's equal rights...are so in- wrought in his explanation of political institutions as to appear indispensable to the very existence of an actual political community."²⁷

Generally, rights are defined as those conditions and opportunities which are essential for the all round development of the personality of the individual. Each individual has certain hidden potentiality and he needs certain favorable social condition to develop these potentialities, therefore he makes certain claim to the state or society. When these legitimate claims of individuals are accepted or recognized by the state or the society they become rights.

One can say that, rights are those external conditions which are essential for the development of the personality of individual, which are not against social interest and which are recognized by the state. Liberalism gives rights to an individual to fulfill his self-interest. It maintains that rights are inherent in an individual. According to liberalism, rights have a universal character.

John Locke has accepted three rights as natural rights. Individual is born with these three natural rights. These rights were called natural because they did not depend for their validity on the recognition and enforcement by the state. Theory of natural rights is the basis for theory of Human Rights (1945). These natural rights are summed up by Locke as; Right to Life, Right to Liberty, and Right to Property.

²⁷Locke, John. "John Locke on 'Perfect Freedom' in the state of nature," *The Online Library of Liberty*. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/locke-john/perfect-freedom/quote/317>, retrieved on: 20/02/2016.

Right to Life – The right to life, is the right to “the preservation of life, the most primary motive of human action and whatever is reasonably directed to this end is everyman’s privilege.”²⁸ Thus Locke agrees with Hobbes that everybody has the right to preserve life.

Right to Liberty – As to the right to liberty, Locke departs from Hobbes and defines it as exemption for every rule except Law of Nature. Thus right to liberty means freedom “to do whatever one’s like as long as it is not incompatible with the law of nature.”²⁹

Right to Property – Locke’s right to property is his right to anything with which he has mixed his labour. For Hobbes there was no right in the state of nature. For Hobbes people have no inherent rights as private property. Ultimately the right to property is possessed by Leviathan. Locke’s conception of the right to property gave birth to modern conception of the right to property.

Of these, the right to property is so important that Locke uses the word ‘property’ to denote any right. Sometimes, he prefers to use the term ‘property’ in an inclusive sense to include right to life and liberty.

He is influenced by theory of Aristotle. Aristotle also says that property is sacred part of the personality of man. The individual, at the time of contract; does not relinquish his right to property. Locke goes further and claims absolute ownership over property. He says man is absolute owner of property, in which he has put labor, labor of his slave and workers.³⁰ Actually, man has created common wealth for the protection of his property. State is a night watchman; state’s role is to safeguard the property.

Locke believed that God has provided the land and all its things collectively to all the people. The person’s body is such property, on which he has only one right. When a person mixes his physical labor with the collective objects given by God, he makes them his personal property. Locke believed that “though the land and all inferior creatures belonged to all, yet every person had the right of property in his labour was his i.e. was

²⁸ Dunning, William Archibald. “The Political Philosophy of John Locke,” *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol. 20, No. 2. p. 237.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*, Chapter V, Sec. 26.

his own property.”³¹ If he mixed his labour became his own. Thus, “by mixing his labour with something, man removes that thing from the common right of other men.”³² Thus “whatever a man removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with it, and joined it to something that is how own, and thereby makes it his property.”³³ Locke said that the property originates from the labor and the value of the goods is fixed by this. Generally the utility of items depends on how much work has been done in connection with them. Locke’s theory was, thus, responsible for the later development of labour theories of value in classical and socialist economies.

But Locke was never in favor of infinite wealth. He had to say that the property is just as equitable as it is necessary for the maintenance of one’s life. Locke ethically nurtured the natural right of property, because his statement is that propertied man has mixed his labor with the property. With the help of this principle of Locke, the middle class received great help in acquiring property in opposition to the traditional rights of the church and the feudalists.

He is one of the greatest scholars, justifying man’s natural right to property that is why socialists and egalitarian thinkers call him a scholar of possessive individualism. Thus it is clear that Locke has made the individual the focal point of his entire system. As Vaughan has said that everything in Locke’s system rotates around the individual. Locke reserves the right to protect life, liberty and property to every person. He considers this as an innate and natural right of the individual. Although the Locke’s system is centered on the individual, still it cannot be accepted that he considered the individual as absolute sovereign; because Locke accepts the principle of majority rule in his social contract. At the same time, he gives the right to rebellion against the state only to the majority, not the person. Locke gave the theory of ‘natural right of life, liberty and property’; today it is accepted as fundamental rights in the constitution of all the countries. It is the cornerstone of modern democracy and liberalism. With this, Locke has also played an important role in the economic field. The importance of labor in respect to the property he provided, later Adam Smith, Ricardo and Marx used it in their own principles. Locke planted the

³¹ Ibid. Chapter V, Sec. 27.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

theory of division of legislative, executive and judiciary powers. Locke was probably the first modern thinker to use this theory as to protect the freedom of the individual.

Along with personal identity and individual right, liberty is the also a central concern of liberalism. John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), an English utilitarian, liberal, and democratic philosopher of the 19th century, through his work 'On Liberty' provided a rational justification of the freedom of the individual. No one before J. S. Mill, has attempted to deal with the question of liberty in such an extensive way. It was Locke who mentions about the three inalienable natural rights. However, he has elaborated on right to property; considering that, it includes right to liberty; it was Mill who has dedicated an entire book "On Liberty" (1859) to the core value of liberalism that is liberty.

The whole political thinking of mill is based on the value of the individual. Mill accepts person as social beings, but at the same time he also believes that the person does not cooperate with his wishes in the interest of the society. Mill believes that only the person can understand the interests of the person, not the society. Only the person can know his best interests well and he can get it better. On the basis of this concept related to individual, Mill present his thoughts regarding freedom. Mill's essay, *On Liberty* is one of the finest and the most moving essay on liberty. It offers a defense not merely against the state interference but also against the pressures of the society, public opinion and religious orthodoxy on the affairs of the individual.

The concept of liberty occupies an important place in social political ideals. Where ever individuals suffer from injustice, they invoke the name of liberty. In this sense, history is a record of the unending struggle for liberty. The history of mankind revels that liberty is the fundamental value that goes to make up the ethos of man and gives meaning and significance to human civilization. Human beings consider liberty necessary for the attainment of happiness and for the development of the diverse capacities of their personality.

Though liberty and other political ideals systematically developed in the modern age, ancient and medieval philosophers also talked about these ideals, though in different form. "For the Greek statesman Pericles, freedom meant advancement and political

activity for full citizen. For Greeks, liberty meant participation in the affairs of the state or society. However, Socrates and Plato did not accept the notion of individual liberty against the society or the state. During the medieval period, liberty was associated with the liberty of the ‘soul’ and was deemed to lie in salvation.”³⁴

Later on the 19th and 20th century the concept of positive liberty is the form of liberty through the state developed in the writings of Green, Bosanquet, Laski, Barker etc. Marxist and Socialist thinkers developed their own notion of freedom as creativity. In this way liberty developed as a fully fledged concept.

“Mill’s theory of liberty required was a thorough-going consideration of the dependence of personal liberty on social and legal rights and obligations.”³⁵ According to Mill liberty is the highest political ideal because the ultimate goal of human life is development of personality which is possible only in an atmosphere of liberty. It is necessary for the growth of a person, for his self actualization. Person should enjoy various types of freedom. Amartya Sen also established the connection between democracy and development; and defines development as freedom. Mill believed that liberty was essential ingredient for moral development of mankind. To quote Mill himself,

That principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number in self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will be better for him to do so: because it will make him happier; because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise or even right. These are good- reason for remonstrating with him, or reasoning within, or persuading him, or entreating him, but not for compelling him, or visiting him with any evil in case he do otherwise. . . .³⁶

³⁴ Lane, Melissa. “Ancient Political Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/ancient-political>, retrieved on 02/05/2015.

³⁵ Sabine, George Holland. *A History of Political Theory*. p. 644.

³⁶ Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. p. 73.

The most important point made by Mill is that, “over himself, over his body and mind, the individual is sovereign.”³⁷ In his words:

To justify that, the conduct from which it is desired to deter him must be calculated to produce evil to someone else. The only part of the conduct on any one, for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body, and mind, the individual is sovereign.³⁸

Mill believes that the person has complete freedom to live his life accordingly and to develop his personality. According to him, the person is the owner of his body and mind himself and so he should get the complete freedom in his regard. Society or state should not have any control over the person. The existence of social order is only for the person's interest. The criterion for social institutions is that to what extent they do the person's interests. Mill divides human liberty as -

i) The liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects; and includes the freedom of expressing and publishing opinions. ii) The liberty of tastes and pursuits, even if our conduct are considered perverts, and only, as long as they do not cause harm to others. iii) The ‘freedom to unite’, for any purpose not involving harm to others. The persons combining being supposed to be of full age, and not forced or deceived.³⁹

In the view of Mill, “no society in which these liberties are not, on the whole, respected, is free whatever may be its form of government; and none is completely free in which they do not exist absolute and unqualified.”⁴⁰ Mill believed in the individualistic or atomic conception of society. Mill viewed society as a collection of self-seeking individuals, and of the social good as nothing more than the sum total of their separate satisfaction.

According to mill, the goal of human beings is to develop their personality, but in achieving this goal, some obstacles are presented by the state and society, which are necessary to be resolved. The condition of resolving these obstacles is freedom. Mill

³⁷ Ibid. p. 70.

³⁸ Ibid. p. 70.

³⁹ Ibid. p. 75.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 117.

believes that the person must be protected from the autocracy of society and the state. Society mostly tries to impose a specific system on individuals through its behaviour. Due to which the proper development of the individual does not occur. Sometimes, the development of personality stops completely due to social rules. According to Mill, it is a bad tendency on the part of society to impose its will on the individuals. The emergence of such a situation is totally inappropriate. According to him,

The tendency of the society is usually to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas, and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them, to fetter the development and, if possible, prevent the formation of any individuality not in harmony with hits ways and compel all characters of fashion themselves upon the model of its own.⁴¹

Same as society, the state has no right to deny the independence of the person. Mill says that the state should at least intervene in the person's life. State can only intervene in person's life for self-defence. If any person is obstructing another's equality through his actions, the state's intervention is justified. In this way, Mill stressed the conception of individual liberty on the grounds that such liberty is significant for the development of human personality. Barker explains,

From the conception of liberty he meant an external freedom of action necessary for the discovery and pursuit of his material by each individual. Mill rose to the conception of liberty as free play for the spiritual originality with all its results in individual vigour and manifold diversity which alone can constitute a rich, balanced and developed society.⁴²

According to Mill there are two aspects of freedom-

1. Freedom of thought, speech and expression
2. Freedom of action

1. Freedom of thought, speech and expression

Out of all types of freedom, he has given greatest importance to freedom of speech and expression. Mill is known as defender and promoter of freedom of speech and

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 89.

⁴² Graham, Gordon. *Eight Theories of Ethics*. p. 132.

expression. He suggests that there should not be a restriction on freedom of speech and expression. Any person should have the freedom to express any kind of thoughts, whether it is favourable to society or unfavourable. According to Mill, society and state have no right to restrict the ideological freedom of the person. Intellectual and ideological independence is also very beneficial for the society and the state as well.

Speech is an essential component of human personality. It is a medium to express your views and personality. It is a gift of God, limited to the race of man. He is influenced by Plato who believed that dialectics is a means to understand the truth or to come near to the truth.

He supports and encourages absolute freedom in the domain of thought, speech and expression. His famous dictum was “if all mankind minus one were of one opinion and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power would be justified in silencing mankind.”⁴³

He based freedom of opinion and expression on three grounds:

- (i) Any opinion we silence may be true. (ii) Though the silenced opinion may be erroneous, it may be partly true and because the prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely the complete truth, it is only by the collusion of adverse opinion that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied. (iii) Even if the prevailing opinion may be completely true, it will inevitably become a dogma, prejudice and formula unless it is exposed to the challenge of free discussion.⁴⁴

According to Mill it is wrong to think in any way that any authority on earth has a right to suppress the opinion of others. Even a single dissent opinion should not be suppressed because it is disgracing to human race. Its denial could possibly result in exchanging error for truth. It is, therefore very essential that everyone should be given essential basic liberties for expression of self. According to Mill:

⁴³ Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. p. 81.

⁴⁴ Mill, J. S. “On Liberty,” *Online Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy*.
http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/Cavalier/80130/part1/sect4/texts/Mill_OnLiberty.html, retrieved on 11/02/2014.

The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that it is robbing the human race, posterity as well as the existing generation, those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clear perception and liberation. Impression of truth, produced by its collusion with error. . .⁴⁵

It is always a mistake of those in power to forbid expression. Those in authority should be exonerated for such slips. Mill stressed the need and necessity of variety of opinions. Hence, from Mill's point of view, society should allow man to speak. So we should open and tolerant societies. Our political system should be deliberative. He is such a great exponent of freedom of speech and expression; that he says, "majority is not right in silencing the minority."⁴⁶

Thus, even if a single person has a difference of opinion, he should be allowed to speak and others should listen to him. He even says that even a mad person should not be deprived from his freedom of speech and expression. Even if the person is saying something wrong, he will understand the limitations of his thought. If he had something relevant, there is no point to deprive us from that truth and truth is bound to emerge, there is no point to delaying the truth.

Mill says that freedom of thought and expression is very important for mental health. This political freedom leads to higher ethical freedom, because such freedom is humanitarian, it is just and decent. Mill has emphasized on thoughts with regard to ideological freedom that there should be a public opinion, that is tolerant, which values the differences and who is ready to welcome new ideas.

2. Freedom of action

Regarding freedom of action, Mill divided the activities of the individual into two parts:

- 1.) Self-regarding and 2.) other regarding⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. p. 77.

⁴⁶ Mill, J. S. *On Liberty*. www.eds.mill/faculty/onlibertyphilosophy/articles.routledge.com, retrieved on: 24/09/2015.

⁴⁷ Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. p. 79.

The self – regarding action may include those matters which affect the individual himself, having no concern with others. Other regarding actions are those actions of the individual which affect the society as a whole. As far as self – regarding actions are concerned, he does not permit, state’s interference. In self regarding actions, he again supports absolute liberty. But, as far as other’s regarding, he allows state interference to protect the liberty of others. At this juncture we can clearly see the emerging idea of positive liberty is Mills philosophy though his overall emphasis is in the favour of negative liberty.

The circumference of self-regarded action is the person himself, e.g., education, gambling, drinking, etc. According to mill, not giving the person the freedom of self-regarded action makes him an animal. Lack of freedom of personal works becomes a threat to the progress of society. Other- regarding action is the person’s work from which society or other people are affected. If a person encourages indecency and immorality in society, or builds organizations that break social peace and security, the state has the right to intervene in its actions. Mill believes that the personal act that damages even the individual himself can also be banned by the state - such as the act of suicide.

According to Mill man is free in so far as individual actions concerning his own self were concerned, and which did not prejudice his actions about others. But when his actions influence others man is bound by certain limitations. As Mill puts it,

He must not make himself a nuisance to other people. But it refrains from molesting others in what concerns them and merely acts according to his own inclination and judgement in things which concern himself; the same reasons which show that opinion should be free to prove also that he should be allowed without molestation to carry his opinion into practice at his own cast.⁴⁸

Mill put certain restrictions on enjoyment of liberty. Only those who were mature could enjoy liberty. Mill did not care for social customs and conventions. He had nothing to say about age-old institutions.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 42.

Mill has described the freedom of action as justified in the form of character and social development. The State should intervene directly to prevent bad habits and actions. Mill wants to free the person from the control of tradition, traditions, social customs etc., because it stops the development of the person. Thus the imposed unity is against the spirit of social welfare. While announcing the freedom of action, Mill emphasizes on the individual differences and diversities. He is strongly against the dull and dead uniformity. Prof Davidson has expressed Mill's individual freedom theory in this way.

The advocacy of the due recognition of the place and importance of impulse and desire in man, as distinguished from intellect, though in close connection with it the supreme need of amply acknowledging the active and energetic side of the individual nature....Revolt against the conventionalist of society that hinders or seem to hinder, the development and expression of individuality against the despotism of social customs....Insistence on the view that spontaneity or individuality is a necessary ingredient in happiness or human welfare.⁴⁹

But many thinkers have criticized the concept of freedom of mill that permanent basis of freedom cannot be achieved through logic. The foundation of Mill's freedom is utility, but there is lack of responsibility in it. In the absence of responsibility, freedom will take the form of arbitrariness. Many thinkers think that what differences Mill made between self regarding and other regarding action, is unscientific. There is lack of facts, because there is no work of the person that does not affect the other members of the society.

Mills defence of liberty is treated as hollow because he also brings a metaphysical concept of real will and actual will. He says that state is correct in stopping a person in crossing a bridge which is about to fall and a person may lose his life. Such a person is planning to cross the bridge because of his ignorance. His real will cannot be to die, so the state is justified to come and stop that person. Here, we observe the Greek influence. According to critics, freedom of mill is negative, not positive. According to mill, it is freedom to remove difficulties coming in the way of human development. Such a limited definition of freedom decreases its significance.

⁴⁹ Mill, J. S. "On Liberty," *Library of Economics and Liberty*.
<http://www.econlib.org/library/Mill/Liberty/mLbty2.html>, retrieved on 02/09/2014.

But despite all these criticisms, the principle of mill independence cannot be said to be completely hollow. The philosophy of Mill has made a profound contribution in the development and progress of individualism. The feeling of independence is limited not only to thoughts, speech, work, but it has taken a huge form. Imaginations of the freedom of intercession, religions-cultural freedom etc. has come true today. Mill is prominent in the pillars of democracy. He did this research in democracy that the majority could also become autocratic. Today this search has a practical value. Mill praised the freedom that is not a mere negative, but a very positive ideal. Mill is not complaining with the state and its organization, but it is from the enslavement and intolerance of citizens. Mill wishes for a state whose citizens are proud of their personality and their diversity, and in which a person respects himself and others. Mill believes that only spiritual progress can reach a person close to such ideals.

Part 2

Autonomy, Dignity, and Equality: Immanuel Kant

In the history of moral philosophy, the first known and mature moral theory was stated by Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). Kant’s moral philosophy provides an important guideline about how persons ought to be treated. Kant’s moral philosophy attempts to provide a rational ground for human autonomy, dignity and equality. Kant’s epistemology and morality are derived from enlightenment. Kant developed the liberal notions of individual rights, autonomy, dignity, freedom, tolerance, etc. in the context of enlightenment. The enlightenment is the age of science. Science serves as a means for human liberation. According to Jorn Bramann:

The Enlightenment aimed at a future for humanity that is characterized by democracy, scientific rationality, ever improving technology, religious tolerance (including the freedom to not believe in any god at all), self-critical awareness, right to property and universal peace.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Bramann, Jorn K. “Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason,” *Educating Rita and Other Philosophical Movies*. <http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>, retrieved on 10/5/2015.

Kant is the first philosopher who has tried to give a definition of enlightenment. “In Kant we find a remarkable conception of human Enlightenment as the self incurred liberation from immaturity and irresolution through the public exercise of one's reason.”⁵¹

Kant defines Enlightenment as:

Enlightenment is man's release from his self-incurred tutelage. Tutelage is man's inability to make use of his reason without direction from another. Self-incurred is this tutelage when its cause lies not in lack of reason but in lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. . . *Sapere aude!*⁵²

Sapere aude means ‘Think for yourself’ and thus, the courage to use one's mind is the motto of Enlightenment and the only condition necessary for beginning the process of Enlightenment is freedom. “Immaturity is man's incompetence to have direction for oneself. Kant feels that if we are going to liberate ourselves from immaturity then we must be able to make use of freedom. This kind of revolution will not lead to enlightenment, but rather lead to ongoing immaturity.”⁵³

Freedom is the central quest of Enlightenment rationality in Kant. Freedom is the first right of the individual and is also sovereign for the states while in the sphere of morality it is autonomous. Humanity is always autonomous, supreme, and sovereign. It is neither responsible nor dependent on anyone or anything else besides one's mind. It lives by one's own resources, whether it is rationality or fertile imagination. Freedom opens up an entire realm of morality (faith) for Kant. Freedom among three postulates i.e. God, Immortality of soul and Freedom of will is necessary condition of moral laws.

Kant believed man to be a rational being and the very fact of his being rational is the indication of this fact that he is mature enough to guide his actions and to tackle his problems. He is an autonomous being and master of his thoughts and actions. Hence, it is not his characteristic to follow the commands of others or to be dependent on other's supervision. He should only follow the commands of his own reason.

⁵¹ Losonsky, Michael. *Enlightenment and Action from Descartes to Kant: Passionate Thought*. p. 3.

⁵² Kant, Immanuel. “An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?,” *What is Enlightenment?: Eighteen-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Question*. Ed. J. Schmidt. p. 58.

⁵³ Ibid.

He gives so much importance to the notion of enlightenment that he contends, in his political view, that:

The only qualification required by a citizen (apart, of course from the natural one that he is not a woman, nor a child) is that he must be his own master (*sui iuris*) and must have some property (which can include any skill, trade, fine art or science) to support himself.⁵⁴

This idea become more intense in his political philosophy where he asserts that only those persons can be said citizens who are the master of their own actions and are not subordinate to others. Only those persons, who earn their living by selling what is theirs and are not dependent on others, can be said to be citizens.

According to Kant it is easier to remain immature and follow the path set by others. He writes, “It is so convenient to be immature.”⁵⁵ “Thus only a few, by cultivating their own minds, have succeeded in freeing themselves from immaturity and in continuing boldly on their way.”⁵⁶

Kant’s view of enlightenment and his insistence on the maturity of a person leads us towards two uses of our reason: public use and private use. Man guides his actions by his own reason and this reason can be divided in two parts on the basis of his area of use. When we apply our reason in expressing our views and opinions publicly, by the means of essays or literary works, it is the public use of reason. But, on the other hand, when we use our reason in our everyday life, in the place where we live and the work which we do, it is considered to be the private use of reason. Kant elaborates these two uses of reason:

By the public use of one’s own reason I mean that use which anyone may make of it as a *man of learning* addressing the entire *reading public*. What I term the private use of reason is that which a person may make of it in a particular *civil* post or office with which he is entrusted.⁵⁷

Kant has given the right of expression which belongs to ‘our public use of reason’. Hence, in a civil society, we are free to use our public reason, but he limits the

⁵⁴ Kant, Immanuel. *Practical Philosophy*. Ed. and trans. Mary J. Gregory. p. 7.

⁵⁵ Kant, Immanuel. “What is Enlightenment,” *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Ed. Lawrence Cahoon. p. 51.

⁵⁶ Kant, Immanuel. *Kant: Political Writings*. Ed. H. S. Reiss. p. 10.

⁵⁷ Kant, Immanuel. *Practical Philosophy*. p. 55.

use of private reason because he is against the right of revolution. He argues that we should not undermine the civil order by criticizing our post or job in our everyday life:

The public use of man's reason must always be free, and it alone can bring about enlightenment among men; the private use of reason may quite often be very narrowly restricted, however, without undue hindrance to the progress of enlightenment.⁵⁸

The individual has no right to directly interfere in the actions of the State. The State should accept 'the right of expression' as the public use of reason by the individuals, and reform itself in accordance with the free expression of their views. The people are not the passive members of the State; they have right to freely express the unfairness and injustice done by the State. Only in this way, the state can become an ideal commonwealth by hearing and accepting the call for reform by the citizens.

Thus, the significant aim of the Enlightenment was rationality and autonomy. For Kant, "a truly moral person cannot passively accept the customs and value of any society. A moral person has to determine rationally what is right and what is wrong; a moral person has to be *autonomous*."⁵⁹ Kant asserts that "autonomy is the ability to live by one's own laws."⁶⁰ According to this notion of autonomy, person is only bounded by his personal idea of right and wrong. Through autonomy (self law), you use yourself as a guide. "In one sense," philosopher Christine Korsgaard writes,

To be autonomous . . . is to be governed by principles of our own causality, principles that are definitive of your will. In another, deeper, sense to be autonomous . . . is to *choose* the principles that are definitive of your will.⁶¹

Kant is a great supporter of the right of individual. At the same time, he is a critic of utilitarianism. Liberty should not go to the extent of impacting human dignity. According to Kant, "rational beings are imbued, as an implication of their autonomy, with *dignity*, an 'unconditional and incomparable worth' that in turn demands respect

⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 56.

⁵⁹ Bramann, Jorn K. "Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason," *Educating Rita and Other Philosophical Movies*. <http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>, retrieved on 10/5/2015.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Kant, Immanuel. *Practical Philosophy*. p. 55.

from all persons.”⁶² He supports liberty, but suggests that human dignity cannot be sacrificed. Along with this, Kantian dignity cannot be “exchanged,” since it has no price. As Thomas Hills writes,

this may seem to imply that there can never be a justification for impairing the rationality or sacrificing the life of any human being, but this is not necessarily so. What is implied, strictly, is not only that one may not sacrifice something of dignity *in* exchange for something of greater value. Thus, if the sacrifice of something with dignity is ever justified, the ground for this cannot be “this is worth more than that” or a greater quantity of value is produced by doing so.⁶³

His famous statement is “no one ought to be treated as a means of ends of the other. Each man is an end in itself.”⁶⁴ This is Kant’s statement for respect for human dignity as an absolute principle, categorical imperative, the yardstick of all human actions as well as yardstick for state’s action or public policy. On this thought, is based the theory of human rights. It suggests that irrespective of caste, color, creed, sex or any other identity all human beings are supposed to enjoy certain human rights. Human dignity can’t be compromised. The theory of human rights suggests that if society does not allow a person to live with dignity, it is the responsibility of the state to ensure it. If state fails to protect human dignity or fulfill its primary obligation, then international committee has the responsibility to protect.

Kant’s ethical system represents universal categorical imperative rules of ethics. Kant’s aim is to provide the supreme principle of morality purely on the basis of Practical Reason. In other words he tries to formulate a foundational universally valid moral principle, which is not only morally binding on all human beings but on all rational beings. This principle he calls ‘The Categorical Imperative’.

According to Kant, “Morality must be based on the categorical imperative because morality is such that you are commanded by it, and is such that you cannot opt

⁶² Kant, Immanuel. *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. James W. Ellington. p. 436.

⁶³ Hill, Thomas E. “Humanity as an End in Itself,” *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant’s Moral Theory*. p. 49.

⁶⁴ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Ed. H. J. Paton. p. 91.

out of it or claim that it does not apply to you.”⁶⁵ It determines what our moral duties are. He gave three formulations of the categorical imperative. “The first concerns the *form* of the categorical imperative; the second concerns its *content*; and the third links these together.”⁶⁶ These are as follows:

1. Formula of universal law

Kant’s first formulation of the Categorical Imperatives states that you are to “act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law.”⁶⁷ Kant rejected the idea that ethics could be determined by the status quo but should instead be determined by reason and logic, requiring that they can be universalized.⁶⁸ Kant says that, - “I ought never to act except in such a way that I could also will that my maxim should become a universal law.”⁶⁹ This means that the principle behind any action should be applicable in any situation.⁷⁰ This was based on a principle of non-contradiction,

Kant believed that the maxim (or principle) upon which one acts should not cause a contradiction. A contradiction would occur if moral actions would become impossible were others to adopt the principle behind any action performed.⁷¹

2. Formula of Humanity as an Ends in Itself

Kant’s second formulation of the Categorical Imperative is - “Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end.”⁷² Kant believed that every action must have an end: a reason which motivates one to carry out the action. He suggested that if the categorical imperative was the end in mind when actions were performed, then only those who wish to achieve the categorical imperative would be

⁶⁵ Robert Johnson. “Kant's Moral Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Edward N. Zalta. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/kant-moral>, retrieved on 08/24/2013.

⁶⁶ Mao, Xavier Ffokrehe. *Virtue and Morality*. p. 99.

⁶⁷ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Ed. and trans. Allen W. Wood. p. 19.

⁶⁸ Loewy, Erich. *Textbook of Medical Ethics*. p. 18.

⁶⁹ Hill, Thomas E. *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*. p. 19.

⁷⁰ Hare, John Hare. *The Moral Gap: Kantian Ethics, Human Limits, and God's Assistance*. p. 8.

⁷¹ Brooks, Thom. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. pp. 74–5.

⁷² Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. p. 19.

obligated to act morally. Therefore, he argued that the basis of the categorical imperative must be an objective end, which Kant referred to as an “ends in itself” and found in humanity.⁷³

Kant states that no human being is to be treated merely as a means because he is a rational being. Every rational being exists as an end in himself and not merely as a means for arbitrary use by some will. A man must be viewed at the same time as an end in all actions, whether they are actions guided towards oneself or towards others. Kant adds that rational beings are called ‘persons’, as opposed to ‘things’ because they are ends in themselves in virtue of their nature or rationality.

3. Formula of autonomy

The third formulation of the Categorical Imperative is “the Idea of the will of every rational being as a will that legislates universal law.”⁷⁴

Kant's Formula of Autonomy expresses the idea that it is a rational will which obliges an agent to obey the categorical imperative, rather than any other outside influence. Kant believed that any moral law which was based on fulfilling some other interest would deny the categorical imperative, leading him to argue that moral law must only arise from a rational will.⁷⁵

Kant's ethical principle attempts to provide a rational ground for human autonomy, dignity and equality. His principle of humanity as an end in itself is a significant contribution in this direction. The principle of man as an end in himself lays down that “a human being should never be treated *simply as a means*.”⁷⁶ For Kant, a human being is important because he is also a rational being and as a rational being he is a moral agent. Thus humanity is significant not as a biological category but because it is conjoined with rationality and morality. While formulating his ethical philosophy Kant says categorically that ethical principles are binding on all rational beings. A human

⁷³ Wood, Allen W. *Kantian Ethics*. p. 75.

⁷⁴ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. p. 19.

⁷⁵ Kant, Immanuel. *The Moral Law: Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Tran. H. J. Paton. p. 34.

⁷⁶ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. p. 19.

being as a rational, moral being is an end in himself and should never be treated merely as a means.

I would like to focus on the spirit behind Kant's principle. The principle plows from the realization that all human beings are equal in so far as they are rational and autonomous moral agents. Kant emphasizes that our actions should not only be compatible with the principle of treating "humanity as an end in itself,"⁷⁷ but should also endeavor to strengthen the principle.

The principle demands that everyone should give due attention to developing one's capacities and give due consideration and help to others. Clearly Kant has a society in mind where individuals work in cooperation with each other. While he gives due importance to autonomy of an individual he does not have a conception of a society where individuals are in adversarial relations with each other. According to Kant, every individual is to decide for himself which of one's capabilities one would try to develop. Similarly each one is free to decide how and to what extent one would help others. It is clear, however, that no one ought to ignore completely the development of oneself or the ends of others. Moreover this self- development and help to others is to be derived from one's own decisions and must not be forced.

Kant's idea of 'the kingdom of ends' goes hand in hand with the principle of man as an end in himself. He defines 'the kingdom of ends' as "a systematic union of different rational beings under common laws, or Kingdom of Ends."⁷⁸ The laws are the ones, which each autonomous rational being lays down for himself and thereby makes them for all other rational beings at the same time.

The formulation of the Categorical Imperative states that we must "act in accordance with the maxims of a member giving universal laws for a merely possible kingdom of ends."⁷⁹ According to the principle,

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

People have an obligation to act upon principles which would be accepted by a community of rational agents. In such a community, each individual would only accept maxims which could govern every member of the community without treating any member as a means to an end.⁸⁰

A civil society ideally ought to be such a kingdom of ends. It follows that all members of this kingdom would be the makers of the laws that are adopted. Kant does not mean that each rational being actually makes these laws but only that the laws have to be such that every rational being would have freely chosen them or would freely accept these.

If we combine the two principles of man as an end in himself and the kingdom of ends, it becomes clear that treating a human being as an end involves an acknowledgement and affirmation of a person's rationality, equality, dignity and autonomy as an individual. Each one of us must respect the rational wills of all human beings and a rational being must not be subjected to a principle, which does not arise from or is not acceptable to this will.

Kant reiterates his commitment to rationality, equality and freedom of all human persons in his works. Thus Kant identifies the formula of respect for persons as the supreme principle of virtue and observes:

The supreme principle of the doctrine of virtue is: act in accordance with a maxim of ends that it can be a universal law for everyone to have. In accordance with this principle a human being is an end for himself as well as for others, and it is not enough that he is not authorized to use either himself or others merely as means (since he could then still be indifferent to them); it is in itself his duty to make man as such his end.⁸¹

We find that Kant not only demands that every person must treat individual human beings as ends but also demands that humanity or mankind as such should be treated as an end and never merely as a means. Accordingly, Kant outlines three positive

⁸⁰ Atwell, John. *Ends and Principles in Kant's Moral Thought*. p. 152.

⁸¹ Gregor, Mary (ed. and trans.). *The Metaphysics of Morals*. p. 175.

duties for persons as physical- moral beings, “self-preservation, preservation of the species, and preservation of their natural capacity to enjoy life.”⁸²

Freedom of the individual remains fundamental for Kant in his moral philosophy. He treats it as the only innate right of persons, i.e., “a right belonging to every human being by virtue of his humanity.”⁸³ It is subject to the constraint that this freedom can co-exist with “the freedom of every other person in accordance with a universal law.”⁸⁴ When he talks of the state, he gives due importance to the “general united will of the people”⁸⁵ as the legislative authority. By this he means, “the concurring and united will of all, insofar as each decides the same thing for all and all for each.”⁸⁶ The members of a state who unite to give the laws are its citizens. “Each citizen has freedom, civil equality and civil independence.”⁸⁷ Freedom implies that each person is to obey only those laws to which one has given his consent. Equality means that people have equal moral capacity to bind each other through laws. And independence implies that “one should owe one’s existence and preservation to one’s own rights and powers as a member of the society and not to the choice of others.”⁸⁸

It is clear that these principles give fundamental ideals towards which individuals, societies as well as a state ought to strive. But, Kant’s contention that if people rely solely on reason and are not influenced by their inclinations, likes and dislikes etc., then they would agree to a common set of principles may be unrealistic. Still if people have to live in a society, they need to evolve a set of rules to govern their conduct and interpersonal dealings. In this context it remains valid that as far as possible the will of people ought to be respected. How to resolve the conflict among the interests of different people and groups remains a difficult question. Despite this conflict, it cannot be denied that Kant’s formulation of the categorical imperative has certain implications so far as the private morality is concern. It attempts to elevate individuals to the level of autonomy

⁸² Ibid. pp. 151-57.

⁸³ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. p. 19.

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 30.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 91.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

and sovereignty. And at the same time it accepts the autonomy and sovereignty of other individuals. This is what is significant in the era of globalization and multiculturalism.

Bibliography & Webliography

Books

- Atwell, John. *Ends and Principles in Kant's Moral Thought*. Springer: USA. 1986.
- Brennan, Troyen A. *Just Doctoring: Medical Ethics in the Liberal State*. University of California Press: California. 1992.
- Brooks, Thom. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. John Wiley & Sons: UK. 2012.
- Graham, Gordon. *Eight Theories of Ethics*. Routledge: London and New York. 2004.
- Gregor, Mary (Trans. and ed.). *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1996.
- Hare, John. *The Moral Gap: Kantian Ethics, Human Limits, and God's Assistance*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1997.
- Hill, Thomas E. *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*. John Wiley & Sons: UK. 2009.
- Johari, J. C. *Contemporary Political Theory: New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. Sterling Publisher Private Limited: New Delhi. 2006.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and Translated by Allen W. Wood. Yale University Press: New Haven and London. 2002.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kant: Political Writings*. Edited by H. S. Reiss. Cambridge University Press: New York. 1970.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Practical Philosophy*. Edited and translated by Mary J. Gregory. Cambridge University Press: New York. 1996.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Moral Law: Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by H. J. Paton. Psychology Press: Oxford. 1991.
- Laski, Harold J. *The Rise of European Liberalism (Works of Herald J. Laski): An Essay in Interpretation*. Vol. 8. Rutledge: New York. 2014.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by P. Nidditch. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1975.
- Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by Thomas P. Pearson. The Liberal Arts Press: New York. 1952.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited and introduction by Peter Laslett. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2003.
- Loewy, Erich. *Textbook of Medical Ethics*. Springer: USA. 1989.
- Losonsky, Michael. *Enlightenment and Action from Descartes to Kant: Passionate Thought*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2001.

- Mao, Xavier Pfokrehe. *Virtue and Morality*. Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.: New Delhi. 2011.
- Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. J. M. Dent & Sons: London. 1910.
- Mill, J.S. *On Liberty and Other Essays*. Edited by John Gray. Oxford Worlds Classics: Oxford. 1998.
- Sabine, George Holland. *A History of Political Theory*. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt.: New Delhi. 1973.
- Wood, Allen. *Kantian Ethics*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2008.

Journals

- Bramann, Jorn K. “Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason,” *Educating Rita and Other Philosophical Movies*. Nightsun books, Maryland. 2009. <http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>, retrieved on 10/5/2015.
- Dorn, James A. “Equality, Justice, and Freedom: A Constitutional Perspective,” *Libertarianism*. <http://www.libertarianism.org/publications/essays/equality-justice-freedom-constitutional-perspective>, retrieved on 06/15/2016.
- Dunning, William Archibald. “The Political Philosophy of John Locke,” *Political Science Quarterly* .Vol. 20. No.2. Published by: The Academy of Political Science. 1905. pp. 223–45.
- Fieser, James. “Great Issues in Philosophy.” [www.utm.edu/staff/jfieser/120/2008/chapter/Political_Liberalism_and_Property/=02](http://www.utm.edu/staff/jfieser/120/2008/chapter/Political_Liberalism_and_Property/), retrieved on 11/02/2015.
- Hill, Thomas E. “Humanity as an End in Itself,” *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant’s Moral Theory*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY. 1992. pp. 38–57.
- Kant, Immanuel. “An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?,” *What is Enlightenment? : Eighteen-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Question*. Edited by J. Schmidt. University of California Press: California. 1996.
- Kant, Immanuel. “What is Enlightenment,” *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Edited by Lawrence E. Cahoon. Blackwell Publisher: UK. 1996.
- Lane, Melissa. “Ancient Political Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/ancient-political>, retrieved on 02/05/2015.
- Mill, J. S. “On Liberty,” *Online Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy*. http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/Cavalier/80130/part1/sect4/texts/Mill_OnLiberty.html, retrieved on 11/02/2014.

- “Neoliberalism,” *Wikipedia: the Free Encyclopedia*.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Neoliberalism&oldid=789449410>,
retrieved on 03/15/2016.
- Rawls, J. “Social Unity and Primary Goods,” *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. Edited by A. Sen and B. Williams. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982.
- Robert Johnson. “Kant's Moral Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/kant-moral>, retrieved on 08/24/2013.
- Smith, D.G. “Liberalism,” *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 9. Edited by David E. Sills. Macmillan and Free Press: New York. 1968.
- Tuckness, Alex. “Locke's Political Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/locke-political>, retrieved on 02/10/2016.

Online Sources

- <http://www.jstor.org>.
- <http://www.liberalism.wiki/online.com>
- <https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism>
- study.com/academy/lesson/liberalism-history-ideology-and-influence.html
- <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/02/the-origin...liberalism/283780/>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_liberalism
- <https://web.stanford.edu/group/scie/Career/individualism/Wisdom/indicom.htm>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Locke
- https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Locke/Biography_Treatises_Works_and_Facts.
- Oll.libertyfund.org/people/online-libraryofliberty/john-locke
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Stuart_Mill
- [www.sparknotes.com > ... > Philosophy Study Guides > John Stuart Mill \(1806–1873\)](http://www.sparknotes.com > ... > Philosophy Study Guides > John Stuart Mill (1806–1873))
- www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/
- <https://www.biography.com/people/john-stuart-mill-9408210>
- <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Stuart-Mil>
- [The Project Gutenberg eBook of On Liberty, by John Stuart Mill.](http://The Project Gutenberg eBook of On Liberty, by John Stuart Mill)
<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/34901/34901-h/34901-h.htm>
- www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers_mill/individualphilosophers.htm
- <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Immanuel-Kant>
- germanhistorydocs.ghidc.org/sub_document.cfm?Immanuel_Kant/document_id=359
- www.csus.edu/indiv/g/gaskilld/ethics/kantian%20ethics.htm
- www.iep.utm.edu/kantmeta/kANT:Metaphysics/Internet_Encyclopedia_Of_Philosophy.htm

Chapter III

Communitarianism: Critique of Liberalism

I, in the present chapter, shall discuss the normative discourse in communitarianism as a critique of liberalism. The normative concepts like personal identity, individual rights, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism get re-evaluated in terms of collective identity, community rights, social goods, etc. in communitarianism. Communitarianism emerged as a reaction against neo-liberalism. The basic idea of communitarianism is the belief that there has been too much emphasis on individual liberty in the liberal tradition, and too little emphasis on community. Criticisms of communitarianism basically focused on three areas:

Liberalism's alleged indifference to conceptions of human flourishing; its supposed exclusion of the pursuit of higher goals from the domain of politics; and inattention to the ways in which a well-ordered society and a good life depend upon the exercise of virtue, the responsibilities of citizenship, and participation in a common political life.¹

Hence, according to communitarianism, society or community is natural and prior to man. Man fulfills his nature only as a member of community. Liberals equated society or community with association. For communitarians association implies impersonal contractual relationship. They equate society with community because community is

¹ *The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibility*, Vol. 5. p. 54.

natural. It is network of intimate relationship. It is based on the idea of co-operation and nature of community is of durability.

In order to organize my discussion in this chapter, I intend to divide it into the following two parts –

Part I – Identity and Human Rights: Individual versus Collective

Part II – Social Goods: Community’s Autonomy and Justice

Here, it is very essential to know about the basic idea of community along with the concept of communitarianism.

Community and Communitarianism

Community is such group of people living in a certain place and part, who have a culture, have the same lifestyle, who fulfil their all necessities inside community. The word Community derives from the Latin word ‘*communitas*’,² which means ‘to live together’. In modern dictionary we can find definition of “Community” as “a concentrated settlement of people in a limited territorial area, within which they satisfy many of their daily needs through a system of inter-dependent relationship”³ and “a number of people who share certain common traditions or interests, such as an ethnic group or a community of scholars.”⁴

The theoretical study of community can be traced to Ferdinand Tonnies’ book *Community and Society*. Tonnies was concerned with the issue of social cohesion; that is, “...the sentiments and motives which draw people to each other, keep them together, and induce them to join action...which resulting there from, make possible and sustain a common existence.”⁵ According to Kingsley Davis, community is the smallest regional group, which absorbs all parts of social life. There is the feature of any community that the

² <http://www.en.wikipedia.org/Community/Comminitas/wikidiscussion=papers>, retrieved on 10/24/2014.

³ Sharma, Lokesh (ed.). *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Terms in Anthropology, Sociology and Allied Disciplines*. p. 50.

⁴ Ibid. p. 97.

⁵ Joseph, M. Palmisana (ed.). *World of Sociology*. Vol. I. p. 107.

individual can completely live his life in that. In any professional organisation or in any political party life cannot be spent completely, while the individual can live his life completely in any city or tribe. In this way, the basic criterion of society is that all the social relations of the individual can be found inside that.

Notion of community can be discussed with the help of Kantian formulation of disjunctive judgments:

In all disjunctive judgments the sphere (that is, the multiplicity which is contained in any one judgments) is represented as whole divided into parts (the subordinate concepts), and that since no one of them can be contained under any other, they are thought as co-ordinated with, not subordinated to, each other, and so as determining each other, not in one direction only, as in a series, but reciprocally, as in an aggregate.⁶

In this way, it can be said that experience of a world of co-existing things not only requires the experiences of individuality but also the presumption of their mutual interaction. Kant explains the notion of community in such a way that every part is excluded from one another but overall together they give a complete picture of whole.

Construction of community is possible on the basis of certain symbols which are the marks of the identity of a particular community. It is followed by certain belief systems, rituals and conventions of that particular community. The symbol, the ritual, the belief system and the values embodied in them create the moment of affinity, concern, inclination, and thus they give rise to the emergence of culture. Plurality of cultures emerges because of the plurality of the communities.

The existence of community is central to the discourse of culture. Plurality implies communitarian life in society. "A pluralistic society is one where different groups can interact while showing a certain degree of tolerance for one another, where different cultures can coexist without major conflicts, and minority cultures are encouraged to uphold their customs."⁷ In India particularly accepting the plurality of cultures has been

⁶ Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. N. K. Smith. p. 117.

⁷ England, John T. "Pluralism and Education: Its Meaning and Method." p. 2.
<http://www.ericdigests.org/pluralism-and-education-its-meaning-and-method/1992/method.htm>=
December 1992=No. ED347494.3, retrieved on 07/12/2015.

the basic ethos of the society. And it was on this general ethos that India has been regarded as democratic, pluralistic, and liberal society. In west, plurality leads to fragmentation but in India in spite of plurality, it does not lead to fragmentation and refers to collectivity. So, there are two different views regarding the concept of plurality between India and the western countries.

Behind the plurality in Indian philosophy, there is an underlying unity and collectivity which rejects individualism. In all Indian schools of Indian philosophy, one thing is common – all schools propound their own theory by criticizing the earlier school but do not repudiate their importance. So, in Indian system there lies a notion of - collectivity and not fragmentation. In India there is very healthy tradition of collectiveness. In India we find collectiveness at the level of community whereas in the west, collectiveness is found only at the level of institutions.

The term ‘communitarian’ was first of all used by Michael Sandel, in his book *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, during the liberal-communitarian debate. Communitarianism is a concept related to the community, in which the community is preferred over the individual. When some people are related with common interests and values, and companion of a common concept then they create a community. This gives them a unique identity. According to the communitarians, the individual is a social being by his nature. The existence of the individual is apart from his community cannot be accepted. The identity of the person is related to his community. So the individual should look at his work, purpose, abilities, life art etc. in the context of the community. Communitarians believe that the personality of a human being is shaped by the community. Hence the main centre of political analysis and discussion should not be focused on the individual but on the community. Similarly, community should only be the main basis of the theoretical thinking of a just state and not the individual.

The liberal thinkers consider the individual to be such a sensible being, which is secluded from others and is engaged to fulfill its own interest. According to them, an individual attaches with other people due to transactions, not for cultural reasons. Criticizing this nature of man communitarians explains that man is not a lone

and secluded being, but he is involved in his culture and community and he cannot be free from his culture and community instead of his efforts to do so. They believe the human being is not so individualist as liberals consider him.

Liberals demand complete independence and rights for the individual, but communitarians believe that the community cannot be ignored for the individual's independence. Welfare of the individual is only linked to his community, it is inappropriate to imagine his welfare different from the community.

Ronald Dworkin, a supporter of liberalism, believes that we should not shelter such political principles which attract us towards our communities and cultures while governing them. On the contrary, we should frame such principles that are based on the idea of generalization. According to him, our political principles should be of such kind that they can help us to distinguish which rituals and cultures we believe are based on truth, and which are baseless. Our principles should be universal and collectively accepted, which apply equally to the persons of different cultures, various religious and communities. Dworkin is not even in favor of the principles based on multiculturalism and believes that our communal inclined creates an obstacle in our fairness, which leads us towards conservatism.

Even before Dworkin, another liberal thinker John Rawls has also acknowledged in his book that to create the principle of an ideal and fair justice a person must separate himself from his religion, community, culture, etc. If we have to run our country's institutions fairly then we have to discontinue our communal tilt and we have to frame laws being impartial. He believes that while framing and practicing a law our cultural tendencies should be kept away. So we see that Dworkin and Rawls, both support individualism, and inspire individuals to create universal and commonly acceptable principles.

But, individualists have to face the objections of the communitarians. Michael Sandel, a famous communitarian while criticizing the liberals in his book says that views of liberalism about the attitude of human being and its society are completely wrong. The liberals' concept of universal principles of justice is also wrong. Sandel believes that

there are so much cultural differences in humans beings that everyone should not be bound to accept the same laws. According to the communitarians, we should not ignore the cultural differences of individuals because people receive their traits only from their culture and community. A person cannot be separated from his society. Therefore, the belief of the liberals to consider the individual as highest being and giving no importance to the community is not true in any way. Communitarians believe that liberals should pursue the politics of common good by leaving the politics of freedom and rights, based on individualism.

Another communitarian Michael Walzer also does not support the universal principles of liberals. He says that each community has different beliefs and values and different communities define social interests and justice differently, in such situation how could there be a universal definition. It is inappropriate to treat it as universal. Therefore, questions of social interest, rights, justice, freedom, etc. can be resolved only on the cultural level. To do this, we have to take care of the diversities of different societies and communities. A fair society would be that which is sensitive to these diversities. A society can never be reasonable which forcibly try to impose a single law on all the citizens by ignoring the diversities.

Thus, it is clear from this debate, how liberals do not consider the community as important by focusing on the person. Contrary to it, communitarians consider society as the creator of person's personality and also believe that community and culture cannot be ignored in the setting of the policies.

Part 1

Identity and Human Rights: Individual versus Collective

The concepts of identity and human rights are regarded as individual centric in liberalism but the same concepts become collective and community centric in communitarianism. Liberalism emphasizes personal identity and individual rights on the one hand whereas

on the other hand communitarians presents the notion of social identity and collective rights.

1.1 Identity: Individual, Cultural, and Social

Identity is derived from the Latin word “*identite*”⁸; the word “*idem*” which means “same”. It means continuity and stability of a person; it is a sameness of person at all times and circumstances. Basically, identity has two dimensions such as: ‘ontological’ and ‘epistemological’. “Ontological aspect of identity refers to the question ‘Who we are’ and while epistemological aspect to ‘Who we think we are’. When asked who we are, most of us say three things: (i) what we do for living, (ii) what group, community or region we come from, and (iii) what commitment and relations we have with other groups.”⁹ In short, identity is not mainly an individual affair. It has three elements: competence (or capability), community and commitment¹⁰:

The first element in identity is competence which is usually expressed in a job, role or an evocation. Competence is established when ability is matched by social recognition. The second element of identity is how people describe they are fixed in the social firmament – such as native of a particular region, believe in certain ideology or particular religion, belonging to a particular ethnic community. The third element is commitment. It means what a person’s commitments are to others – whether through marriage, partnership, familial responsibility, team loyalty or other forms of mutuality. These three markers of identity are quite consistent for individuals, groups, classes, races and cultures.¹¹

It can be said that, identity is one of the most basic features of social existence and it is often summed up in a tradition, culture and history of a particular society. Tradition, culture and history help us in finding answer to the questions; “Who we are, and where our root is?,” while the concepts of community give a feeling of identity that belongs to us.

⁸ Korfmacher, Carsten. “Personal Identity,” www.iep.utm/personal-identity/, retrieved on: 02/09/2016.

⁹ Paksoy, Hasan Bülent. “Identities: How Governed, Who Pays?”

http://www.eumed.net/malaga_entelequia/identity/entelequia/com, retrieved on 09/12/2014.

¹⁰ Vermani, R. C. *An Introduction to Political Theory and Thought*. p. 124.

¹¹ *Ibid*.

Communitarians present the idea of social identity and cultural identity. According to communitarians, “social identity and group belongingness are inextricably linked in the sense that one’s conception or definitions of who one is (one’s identity) is largely composed of self-descriptions in terms of the defining characteristics of social groups to which one belongs.”¹² In “The Politics of Recognition,” “Charles Taylor linked identity with the notion of authenticity, the demand for recognition, the idea of difference, and the principle of equal dignity.”¹³ Taylor clarifies:

Authenticity connotes the idea that each of us should live in a way that is true to himself, not conforming to a way of life simply because it is accepted by others. Recognition is the idea that others should be sensitive to my quest for authenticity. They have a responsibility to interact with me on the basis of who (as far as they can tell) I think I really am; they have a responsibility to respect me as the authentic self I think I am and am striving to be, rather than as the person they think it convenient for to be. The idea of difference begins with the fact that the sort of being I think I am and deserve to be recognized as may not be the sort of being you think you are and deserve to be recognized as.¹⁴

Further continues:

...accordingly different people may have different rights; we are not entitled to assume that one size fits all. Nevertheless, the principle of equal dignity implies that in some sense everyone’s identity is entitled to the same respect: there should be no second-class citizens in a liberal democratic society.¹⁵

Communitarianism locate individual within a community and believes that individual develops his identity only as a member of corporate life. On the contrary, liberalism presents the discussion of identity at the individual level. The main objective of the individualistic concept presented by liberal political thought is to give priority to individual over a class or community. Liberals have considered the individuals as the ends. According to them all other political and social institutions are only means for this ends. The individualistic concept of liberals is called atomism because it focuses on ‘individuals’ only for any kind of social, economic, and political analysis. According to

¹² Turner, J. C. “Towards a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group,” *Social Identity and Intergroup Relation*. Ed. H. Tajfel. p 14.

¹³ Waldren, Jeremy. “Cultural Identity and Civic Responsibility,” *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. Eds. Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman. p. 157.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

this concept, the existence of a self (individual) comes before any unit of society. They believe that any group or community is created for the benefit of a particular individual, so that they can fulfill its interests.

The liberals, while interpreting “the individualist conception of the self” say that the individual is intelligent and rational by his own nature as well as being able in self-determination; he also knows what favors him. According to them, the individual is so intelligent that he can take decision on his life-related issues. He is totally free in the matter about how to live his life and how to make his life meaningful. Individualists say that the individual’s work and goal cannot be directed by the society. The individual is completely free to do or not to do any objective or work, conferred by the society. Liberal considers that, the individual is free to raise question about his participation in existing social practices. If he feels that this social practice is not suitable and relevant to be adopted, he is free to abandon it. According to self viewpoints of liberals, the individual cannot be defined on the basis of their membership in any particular economic, religious or sexual relationship because the individual is free to put questions and reject any relationship or role. In this manner, Rawls says that “the self is prior to the ends which are affirmed by it.”¹⁶ According to Rawls, we can come back from any plan and we can question to each plan whether we want to continue adopting it or not. According to liberals, any type of feasibility or goal except from individual is not free from the possibility of amendment. This is often called Kantian view of self,

Kant was one of the strongest defenders of the view that the self is prior to its socially given roles and relationships, and is free only if it is capable of holding these features of its social situation at a distance and judging them according to the dictates of reason.¹⁷

Liberals say that the individual must have the freedom to re-assess his values and beliefs without any interruption and coercion, and adopt them. He should not be afraid of being punished and have all the necessary resources through which he can get a decent life. He should get such environment through various cultural activities and circumstances in which he can develop his personality. Based on this individualist

¹⁶ Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. p. 491.

¹⁷ Taylor, Charles. *Hegel and Modern Society*. p. 76.

conception of the self, the liberals have accepted the state as a minimum and neutral political power. According to them, a neutral and less governing state is the best form of government and it does not obstacle in the person's freedom.

Communitarians rejecting this viewpoint of self because it neglects the fact that self is embedded in existing social practices. On the opposite to liberals, communitarians say that we cannot always come back from these socials practices with own wills or cannot go out. Our social roles and relationships are already given as the situation of individual. According to the communitarians, the biggest mistake made by the liberals is having extreme individualist approach and having disappointing views towards the communities. They believe that the liberals present a limited and confused belief in the society through the extreme interpretation of freedom and authority of the people because the important role of communities and groups for the success of the social, political, and economic life of an individual cannot be ignored. The individual gets his identity only from the community and as a member of the community he develops his personality. Communitarians believe that liberals ignore the values and beliefs in which the individual lives and makes his life good along with the community. Communitarians have criticized liberalism's 'the individualist conception of the self', mainly on two points:-

1. The first criticism is made on the basis that liberalism has totally rejected the importance of 'community' and has not given it any place in social and political analysis. Communitarians argue through this criticism that liberals forget about formation of their individualism that a person must necessarily be a member of a community and in this community he lives his life and gets his social identity. The values, beliefs, and traits of a community or class affect the life-style of a human being in which he is born and brought up. Therefore, historically every person is definitely linked to a particular community, caste, religion or class, and through this the person knows who he is and what his values. Hence, he cannot separate himself from any of the social and political positions obtained through the community. The individual gets a sense of duty and responsibility through all these social identities. Therefore, the idea of full independence of an individual cannot be accepted in any condition. In this context, Taylor says that:

Complete freedom would be a void in which nothing would be worth doing, nothing would deserve to count for anything. The self which has arrived at freedom by setting aside all external obstacles and impediments is characterless, and hence without defined purpose.¹⁸

Taylor argues that the real freedom must be situated in the social atmosphere. It is said that we should have freedom for logical self-determination about all aspects of social status; it is irrational, because it is uncertain to demand the self-determination. Self determination “cannot specify any content to our action outside of a situation which sets goals for us, which thus imparts a shape to rationality and provides an inspiration for creativity.”¹⁹ Thus, we must accept this goal, which our social status determines for us.

Liberals believe that a person can develop his own potentials and he does not need any class or community for determining his personality. But communitarians say that it is a mere imagination, which has nothing to do with the practical social world, because through values and rituals provided by the community the person put his best life into the work. No matter how wise, intelligence and self-reliant the person is, but, he cannot live alone; the community is an important requirement for him.

2. In the second criticism communitarians say that liberal’s concept of relationship between the self and its purposes which they accept as pre-recognition is wrong. According to individualism, the person is completely independent to choose and create the goal of his better life and if needed he can modify and change social or community values and beliefs. On this basis, the liberals have accepted the idea of ‘the self to be prior to its ends.’ Communitarians believe that if this assumption of self is to be relied upon then they must also acknowledge that a person has a voluntary relationship with the communities and social goals, the person can change or leave them in any manner and any time, but it is not possible to believe this because every person is bounded by social roles and relationships and is embedded in them. Michael Sandel argues that: “the self is not prior to, but rather constituted by, its ends – we cannot distinguish ‘me’ from ‘my ends’. Our selves are at least partly constituted by ends that we do not choose, but rather

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 157.

¹⁹ Ibid.

discover by virtue of our being embedded in some shared social context.”²⁰ He further explains:

Since we have these constitutive ends, our lives go better not by having the conditions needed to select and revise our projects, but by having the conditions needed to come to an awareness of these shared constitutive ends. A politics of the common good, by expressing these shared constitutive ends, enables us to ‘know a good in common that we cannot know alone’.²¹

Communitarians, question the ‘self’ related concept of the liberals by asking that could a person really escape from his social roles and relations? Could a person denounce the values and beliefs adopted by him and criticize them? According to communitarians a person cannot refuse social and community relations and attachments as he is essentially embedded in a particular community and society. A person can never be free from the identity of community. A person develops his best life-related perception through the social and community membership.

According to Alasdair MacIntyre, “in deciding how to lead our lives, we all approach our own circumstances as bearers of a particular social identity. . . . Hence what is good for me has to be the good for one who inhabits these roles.”²² Therefore, the use of self- determination is exercised within these social roles, in place of standing outside them. With this regard, the state respects our self- determination by encouraging our deep clutch and deep understanding in these roles. The politics of common good also wants to get same position. According to him, state must protect and promote social cooperative activity and encourage development of human excellence. If state will treat individuals as atomistic, it will lead to social disintegration and moral disaster which is already showing signs in west in the form of prevalent crime, violence, breakdown of family, and widespread drug abuse in society.

Thus, it can be said that, communitarianism do make us conscious of our inherited traditions, it reminds us with the moral obligation we have towards our community. The idea of social solidarity adds to the problem of modern life which is based on atomistic

²⁰ Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. p. 152.

²¹ Ibid. p. 183.

²² MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. p. 204.

notions. The communitarians declare that a good society is one where the strong relationships between the individual and the community are maintained, and the individual maintains the attachments and commitments to his community. Also a good life is one in which loyalty of the person is maintained towards the community values and beliefs; and the person achieves his goals of life by playing social roles.

1.2 Human Rights: Individuality versus Universality

Both liberals and communitarians propagates the idea of human rights, but the difference lies in there conception of human rights. Firstly, I shall discuss the evolution and genesis of the concept of human rights. The idea of human rights are considered as supreme moral rights; they are conditions of human good and without these rights existence with human dignity is not possible. It refers to those rights which belong to the person equally for being a human. They are universal in nature because they are available to all human being irrespective of their religion, race, caste, gender, place of birth etc. They are absolute as they cannot be separated from individual. To separate human right from individual is to separate of his being human. Human rights are the secular version of natural rights. Like natural right, they are held by individual by birth. They are fundamental and universal, but they are different from natural right because their source is neither nature nor god. They held by being virtue of human being. James Nickel writes that:

Human rights are political norms dealing mainly with how people should be treated by their governments and institutions. *They are not ordinary moral norms applying mainly to interpersonal conduct* (such as prohibitions of lying and violence).²³

Similarly, Thomas Pogge argues that “human-rights violations, to count as such, must be in some sense official...human rights thus protect persons only against violations from certain sources.”²⁴ The main basis of human rights is to establish the ideals for providing equality, independence, social, economic, political justice, and rights of equal citizenship to each person. Thus, it can be broadly said that human rights establish

²³ Dhiman, O.P. *Understanding Human Rights: An Overview*. p. 47.

²⁴ Pogge, T. “The International Significance off Human Rights,” *Journal of Ethics*, 4, 2000. p. 46.

equality, non-discrimination, and equal social significance of the individual, which is essential for the overall development and happiness of a person.

Generally, the concept of rights defines the relations between individuals and the mutual relations of individual and political power. Various philosophers define the right in different ways. Broadly, the meaning of right is the circumstances granted by the state, to the person, in which he gets an opportunity for his development. So the right is the name of freedom to do some tasks. Rights are very important for giving shape to the hidden possibilities of the person, for living a respectful life and systematic operation of the society.

“In 1215, the concept of human rights first came into existence, when the rebellion of feudal barons against King John of England brought about the Proclamation of “*Magna Carta*”, which even today remains the innermost part of the constitution of Britain.”²⁵ It included such rights as church is free from government influences, free citizens including widows can own and inherit property, equality before law, prohibition of bribery, etc. In the course of time and historical developments those rights developed as human rights.

After the II World War, “United Nations General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights on December 10, 1948”²⁶ to establish international peace in the world and to protect the individual’s natural rights. This declaration is the greatest achievement of human history in 20th century. According to the Declaration of Human Rights, all human beings are born with equal rights and these rights are equally granted to the citizens of all the countries of the world. This is the idea that underpins Article 1 and 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. . . .Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language,

²⁵ Singh, R.P. “Human Rights in the Wake of Globalization: Kantian Perspective,” *The Philosophical Heritage of Immanuel Kant*. Ed. R. P. Singh. p. 105.

²⁶ Revlon Human Rights: International Bill of Human Rights, 1996, Fact Sheet No. 2, Centre of Human Rights, New York, UN.

religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.²⁷

In this declaration, social and economic rights were also implied for the first time along with the civil and political rights. UNO has also recognized other specific human rights from time to time to protect specific classes.

For the philosophical interpretation, we can trace the idea of human rights in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant. Kant is a great supporter of the right of individual. He supports liberty, but suggests that human dignity cannot be sacrificed. His famous statement is “no one ought to be treated as a means of ends of the other. Each man is an end in itself”.²⁸ On this thought, is based the theory of human rights. It suggests that irrespective of caste, color, creed, sex or any other identity all human beings are supposed to enjoy certain human rights. Human right is a necessary or essential idea of human dignity. The theory of human rights suggests that if society does not allow a person to live with dignity, it is the responsibility of the state to ensure it. If state fails to protect human dignity or fulfill its primary obligation, then international committee has the responsibility to protect.

UN charter accepted five types of human rights – Social rights, Economic rights, Political rights, Cultural right, and Legal rights.²⁹ Human rights according to some evolve in three generations.

In the 1st generation of human rights they develop in form of civil and political rights —

- (i) Right to speech and expression,
- (ii) Right to have family,
- (iii) Right to conscious,
- (iv) Right to vote,

²⁷ <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html>, retrieved on 10/09/2104.

²⁸ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Ed. H. J. Paton. p. 91.

²⁹ *Human Rights Today – A United Nations Priority*. New York: Department of Public Information, UN. p. 59.

(v) Right to contest election.

In the 1st generation, the nature of rights was negative. Rights were considered as claims of individual against state and society. Individual was considered as ‘atomized individual’ which had a free existence from society and state was considered as ‘limited state’. In the first generation, the emphasis was on liberty.

In the 2nd generation, human rights developed in form of socio-economic rights – (i) Right to employment (ii) Right to leisure/conditions of work. In the second generation, the emphasis was on equality. Socialism played important role in the development of rights. Now the nature of rights considered as positive. Interest of the individual and society considered complimentary to each other. Rights of individual were considered within society and not against state/society. ‘Welfare state’ role was emphasized than limited state.

In the 3rd generation of human rights emphasis was on some new rights which were essential for human survival as well as quality life. Various rights like— Environmental rights, Right to peace. In the third generation, right of those groups has also been highlighted who were/has traditionally neglected (ignored sections). Cultural rights, Minority rights, Gay/lesbian rights have been considered as human rights

In 1st generation and 2nd generation human rights were associated only with ‘individual’ but in 3rd generation they are also connected to individual as well as society hence they are also called ‘collective rights’.

According to liberal tradition human rights are universal and available to every individual irrespective of caste, religion, sex, etc. Since, ‘human Rights’ by definition are those rights which are available to every individual by virtue of human being, therefore they are universal. On the contrary, according to communitarian philosophers human rights are not universal. In every culture and society, there are different sets of rights. Therefore rights are also culture bound. This view believes that human beings are different in many ways. For example – man is different from women. Therefore there cannot be equal set of rights for them. Women may have maternity right, which is not

held by men. If human rights are universal then special minority rights would not be considered as human rights which are wrong. “The communitarian approach claims that the respect for Universal Human Rights such as freedom of speech needs to be balanced with other values.”³⁰

Supporter of universal human rights believes that human rights are absolute since they are available to individual by virtue of being human. Therefore if they are limited that means our existence as a human being is limited. Since these rights are not given by state, therefore state should not put limitation on these rights. According to second view if human rights are not limited then right of one will violate the other. For example – right to self defense and right to life in some conditions may conflict with each other. Rights are also limited by duties. Without duty, right cannot be exercised. For example – Right to privacy is meaningless, without being respected by others i.e. duty of others not to disturb. All human rights are not considered equally important. Some are more and some are less important. This clearly shows there is hierarchy of rights and some rights are less important. In other words, they can be limited.

Communitarians have logic that the individual is not an abstract category; rather individual freedom and welfare are possible only in community. So, community and cultural diversities should be taken seriously in relation to human rights. Communitarians believe that the logic associated with the universality of human rights is not realistic but merely formal. In order to attain equality in reality, it is necessary to take into consideration the social and cultural environment of different communities instead of the same conduct.

Liberalism gives rights to an individual to fulfill his self-interest. Liberals maintain that rights are inherent in an individual. Communitarians have criticised the liberal concepts of rights on the basis that they consider individuals as unit for the distribution of resources. Every individual is deeply embedded in his own culture. Therefore, the attention should be paid to his identity connected to community, despite paying attention to individual.

³⁰ Parekh, Bhikhu. “Dangers of Liberalism,” *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Ed. Paul Kelly. p. 147.

According to communitarians, this is not the problem of liberalism that it lays emphasis to justice and universalism, whereas its problem is that it lays more emphasis to individualism. Theories of liberals are based on the individual rights and concepts of freedom. But it is neglected that individual freedom and welfare are possible only in community. If we give importance to the dependence of human beings on society, our responsibility to establish the common good of society becomes stronger like our right and individual freedom. The main argument of Michael Sandel's book, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* is that:

Liberalism rests on a series of mistaken metaphysical and meta-ethical views, for example, that claims of justice are absolute and universal: that we cannot know each other well enough to share common ends, and that we define our personal identity independently of socially given ends.³¹

Therefore, communitarians give this logic that it is rather required to accept the 'politics of common good' than 'politics of right'.

"Communitarians claim that liberals misinterpret justice as an ahistorical and external criterion for criticizing the ways of life of every society."³² The people of various ideologies (utilitarians, liberals, egalitarians, and libertarians) cannot be agreed at the content of justice, but all of them think that every society should accept theories presented by them. They do not attach more importance to this criticism that their theories can contradict with local recognitions. Liberals consider it as a point to comment of justice. Their theories on justice put questions to our beliefs and make it certain that these are not local prejudices. As Ronald Dworkin puts it,

...in the end political theory can make no contribution to how we govern ourselves except by struggling against all the impulses that drag us back into our own culture, towards generality and some reflective basis for deciding which of our traditional distinctions and discriminations are genuine and which are spurious.³³

Michael Walzer has logic that this view of universal theories of rights is a delusive discovery. There is only one way to see in order to identify rights and necessities

³¹ Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. p. 183.

³² Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok (eds.). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. p. 99.

³³ Dworkin, Ronald. *A Matter of Principle*. p. 219.

that how each distinguished community understands the value of social things. The shared understanding of members of any society is expressed by means of their special behaviours and institutions. If any society works according to this institution, this is just.³⁴ It is more the problem of cultural explanation to determine the theories of right and justice inspite of philosophical interpretation.

Walzer speaks of “complex equality” in his concept. “This theory posits that inequalities in the several spheres of society should not invade one another.”³⁵ In *Spheres of Justice*, Walzer defines this concept as follows:

In formal terms, complex equality means that no citizen's standing in one sphere or with regard to one social good can be undercut by his standing in some other sphere, with regard to some other good. Thus, citizen X may be chosen over citizen Y for political office, and then the two of them will be unequal in the sphere of politics. But they will not be unequal generally so long as X's office gives him no advantage over Y in any other sphere – superior medical care, access to better schools for his children, entrepreneurial opportunities, and so on.³⁶

It is a process of equality which gives more attention to the fact that the inequality of any one area does not affect the other area rather than the equal distribution of goods. But Walzer also acknowledges that most of the societies do not consider such a system of equality. Resultantly, the inequality in one area of these societies affects every area of the person. In such a situation, this inequality gradually becomes unlimited and spreads deep throughout the society.

In this way, if human rights are seen in the context of liberalism and communitarianism two major issues emerges- Are human rights universal? Or their nature and scope changes according to different cultures and societies? Human rights are also criticized primarily on the basis that they have been accepted universally, whereas the fact is not taken into account that human nature is different. The dispute related with universality and diversity of human rights was first created during the Vienna Declaration, in which the universalism of human rights was accepted. During this

³⁴ Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok (eds.). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. p. 100.

³⁵ Axford, Barrie and Browing, Gary K. *Politics: An Introduction*. p. 210.

³⁶ Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*. p. 19.

conference several human rights activists of Asia demanded human rights in the cultural context of Asia.³⁷ One side of human rights supporters believed that the human rights related to diversity are merely a way to promote authoritarian politics.³⁸ While the other side believed that cultural diversities should be taken seriously in relation to human rights.³⁹

Thus, a section was associated with liberal and democratic human rights; according to it all persons should be given equal dignity in the form of equal citizens. It is necessary for them to be given equality in the social, economic and political spheres of life. On the contrary, the second thought was associated with the concept of cultural diversities. It has criticized the concept of equality for all citizens as it did not accept the diversities between them. The concept of liberal human rights has been mainly challenged by communitarians and multiculturalists theorists. They believe that the logic associated with the universality of human rights is not realistic but merely formal. In order to attain equality in reality, it is necessary to take into consideration the social and cultural environment of different communities instead of the same conduct.⁴⁰ Thus, it can be said that the concept of universality of human rights is not clear or beneficial for every society or country until it is implemented in conformity with the prevailing conditions in different societies. For example, a law that has been made in accordance with the conditions of the developed countries, where mostly people are above the poverty line and are engaged in simplifying their life. Such laws do not have any value for non-developed countries, as about half of the population does not even get two-time food. These types of situations can be in the social, cultural and political sphere of life. So in such conditions the concept of human rights cannot be equally applicable for every society or country.

³⁷ Tang, J. T. H. "Human Rights in the Asia Pacific Region: Competing Perspectives, International Discord and the Way Ahead," *Human Rights and International Relations in the Asia Pacific*. Ed. J. T. H. Tang. p. 7.

³⁸ Christie, K. "Regime Security and Human Rights in Southern Asia," *Political Studies (Special Issue: Politics and Human Rights)*, Vol. 43. p. 209.

³⁹ Baehr, P.R. *Human Rights: Universality in Practice*. p. 13.

⁴⁰ Adoo, A. "Africa: Democracy without Human Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol. 15, No.4. p. 710.

1.3 Human Rights and Minority Rights

Minority rights are those rights which are provided by a state to protect the rights of minority groups and to eliminate discrimination against them. While the Universal Declaration is based on the concept of individual human rights, under which all forms of discrimination have been prohibited. Individual rights have been provided through this, in which all individuals can protect their cultural traditions and practice them freely. In order to protect the minority rights under international laws it was provided that no restriction should be imposed on the members of minority communities, rather they should be granted such rights which help them to practice their cultural activities fearlessly.⁴¹ But there seems to be many problems in these rights and laws at ground level as these rights relate only to the rights of minority persons, not with the minority groups. Such laws do not define any duty of the state towards minority groups. Many more provisions have been made for the rights of minority groups through the United Nations but no one could provide security for the rights of minority groups.

In fact, the liberal democratic theory has not been created in such a way that the problems of minority cultural groups can be solved. Liberalism wanted freedom from traditional community restrictions in relation to the rights of the individual; hence it gave preference to individual's right over the rights of the community. Due to this reason the liberal democratic approach to address the problems related to minority rights has received widespread challenges at both practical and theoretical levels.⁴²

According to Will Kymlicka, under the majority society some cultures are definitely given priority due to that some minority cultures remain neglected. He believes that the individual observe his autonomy and freedom of choice under his cultural environment. Therefore, liberalism should provide the importance and security to the cultural communities, which is the basis of the individual's decision.⁴³ But Kymlicka also argues that such minority cultural rights should be given to those minority groups who do

⁴¹ Morsink, J. "Cultural Genocide, the Universal Declaration and Minority Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol. 21, No. 4. p. 1023.

⁴² Guttman, Amy (ed.). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. p. 9.

⁴³ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 3.

not impose restrictions on the freedom of their group members as the rights of the individual can never be compromised on the name of community freedom.

Kymlicka never acknowledges minority rights as human rights. In the *Multicultural Citizenship*, he clarifies:

It has become increasingly clear that minority rights cannot be subsumed under the category of human rights. Traditional human rights standards are simply unable to resolve some of the most important and controversial questions relating to cultural minorities: which languages should be recognized in the parliaments, bureaucracies, and courts? Should internal boundaries be drawn so that cultural minorities form a majority within a local region? Should political offices be distributed in accordance with a principle of national or ethnic proportionality? Should the traditional homelands of indigenous peoples be reserved for their benefit, and so protected from encroachment by settlers and resource developers? What are the responsibilities of minorities to integrate? What degree of cultural integration can be required of immigrants and refugees before they acquire citizenship?⁴⁴

According to Kymlicka, the human rights cannot fully address the problems related to minority rights. Minorities suffer from discrimination of majorities even under the liberal societies and this discrimination is done without violating any human rights. According to Kymlicka, minority cultural communities criticize human rights on two bases:-

The first is foundational. Some critics argue that the conception of human personhood and human needs underlying the doctrine of human rights is culturally biased. More specifically, it is 'Eurocentric', and exhibits a European commitment to individualism, whereas non-Western cultures have a more collectivist or communitarian conception of human identity. On this view, given the depth of cultural differences around the world, the very idea of developing a single set of universal human rights is inherently ethnocentric, and involves imposing one culture's view of human personality and human identity on other cultures.⁴⁵

First reason for criticism of the human rights is its structure. Minority groups believe that the nature of human rights is entirely based on cultural bias as they are centred on the individualistic concept of western culture, whereas non-western countries mostly stress

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 4.

⁴⁵ Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. p. 69.

collective sentiments. Therefore, cultural diversity should be given adequate importance in the universal concept of human rights.

The second challenge is more modest. Some critics say that the idea of universal human rights is acceptable in principle, but that the current list of human rights is radically incomplete. In particular, it fails to protect minority cultures from various forms of injustice, and so needs to be supplemented with an additional set of what are sometimes called 'collective rights' (or 'group rights', 'minority rights', or 'cultural rights').⁴⁶

The second basis of criticism of human rights is due to their incompleteness in original form. Minority groups believe that this incompleteness can be accomplished by linking them with minority cultural rights.

Kymlicka argues that no unfair conduct is done with minority cultural groups through the concept of human rights but the problem is that it remains unanswerable to the injustice being done in some areas. He claims that, "the problem is not that traditional human rights doctrines give us the wrong answer to these questions. It is rather that they often give no answer at all."⁴⁷ He, further, clarifies:

The right to free speech does not tell us what an appropriate language policy is; the right to vote does not tell us how political boundaries should be drawn, or how powers should be distributed between levels of government; the right to mobility does not tell us what an appropriate immigration and naturalization policy is.⁴⁸

The right to freedom of expression does not talk about the language in which it should be expressed. In most democratic countries the language of majority is accepted as official language. According to Kymlicka, "human rights doctrines do preclude any attempt by the state to suppress the use of a minority language in private, and may even require state toleration of privately funded schools that operate in the minority language. But human rights doctrines say nothing about rights to the use of one's language in government."⁴⁹ Similarly, on issues of internal migration and internal political subunits it

⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 70.

⁴⁷ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 5

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 5.

⁴⁹ Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. p. 78

does not do justice with minority groups. Human rights leave such issues in the hands of majorities which results into injustice to minorities.

In addition to Kymlicka, James Tully also presents his arguments against liberalism and universal human rights in respect of cultural diversity. According to Tully, we have entered the final phase of dictatorial politics; in which the first phase was related to the struggle for democratic citizenship, the second phase was against global colonialism and the third phase is related to identity politics.⁵⁰ He believed that cultural diversity is the basic features of today's society. The cultural interaction prevails in the individual's original nature. During mutual interaction the person gets familiar with each other's culture. Therefore cultural identity is the basic need of the person. Discrimination with minority cultural communities is ignored by liberalism. So, under the liberal system, the constitution should promote intercultural discussions to deal with minority cultures, in which the representatives of cultures can keep their viewpoints properly.

Unlike Tully, Brian Berry favors the principle of human rights based on the liberal democratic concept and rejects the concept of minority cultural rights. According to Berry, liberalism arranges all kinds of diversities in a justified manner.⁵¹ He believes that liberal democracy is justified because it is treated equally with everyone. Berry is against institutionalizing cultural diversities.⁵² According to him, equal participation in a common institution gives greater harmony to minority cultures and this is the most important method to provide security to minority groups.

Thus, we see that the concept related to minority rights favors two types of rights. According to the first views, citizens of minority groups should be given individual rights. This thought is associated with the principle of human rights. On the contrary, according to the other thought, minority groups should be given community rights. This thought disagrees with the principles of human rights.

⁵⁰ Tully, James. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. p. 15.

⁵¹ Barry, Brian. "Liberalism and Multiculturalism," *Ethical Perspectives* 4/2. p. 3.

⁵² Barry, Brian. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. p. 144.

Arguments against universal human rights given by Kymlicka cannot be rejected. Despite this, Kymlicka's views on minority rights do not appear to be more effective as he is in favor of granting minority rights to liberal groups only. In addition, Tully's approach to protect minority cultural rights is more arbitrary than liberal democracy. Berry's views about the problem of minority groups also do not pave the legitimate path, rather establishes the dominance of majority culture in the disguise of fair justice.

To sum up, it can be said that, human rights today has given voice to the traditionally neglected sections of society, whose rights were not protected by law. These rights are essential for dignity of humanity. Human rights act as shield or cover against dictatorship. In the contemporary time, when our identity, culture, and life is being shaped by market economy, new forms of production, and developments in information technology, the role of human rights become more important.

Community rights are essential to protect dignity of the person and are equivalent to human rights. In case of conflict between minority rights and human rights, the later should be protected and preferred as no general theory has yet been framed for minority cultural rights. Therefore, minority rights should be enforced with universal human rights. From this, the natural rights of the individual will be safeguarded in context to his cultural community. Minority rights do not create any obstacles in implementation of human rights, rather support them. If human rights are framed keeping view of the local requirements then the chances of conflict between the two will end automatically. Thus minority rights will be helpful in implementation of human rights, which will be beneficial for the entire society. Minority rights are for the benefit and advancement of a particular society, whereas human rights are the necessary conditions of life for each community. The actual purpose of human rights can be achieved only when all human beings are so capable that they can make proper and expected use of human rights. Minority rights are meaningful measures for the creation and development of this capability in a particular class of human beings. The base provided by the minority rights will definitely be accessible to human rights.

Part 2

Social Goods: Community's Autonomy and Justice

According to liberals, individuals are self-sufficient outside the society and do not require community to develop its capacity of self-determination whereas communitarians like Charles Taylor argues for a 'social thesis,' "according to which true capacity of individual can only be exercised in certain kind of society."⁵³ Communitarians believe that the individuals have to endorse the moral ideas and the conception of good life as perceived by the community. On the contrary, liberalism believes that every person should possess the right to take decisions about his fortune and career without any undue interference. Hence, in this manner, both liberalism and communitarianism accepts the importance of common good and justice in a society but there is a very significant difference between them.

2.1 The Idea of the Common Good

Both liberalism and communitarianism have accepted the concept of common good to some extent but there are considerable differences in both of its nature and shape. For liberals, common good is the sum total of goods of all individuals which is obtained by reconciliation of conflicting interests. This idea of common good is best depicted in Bentham's principle of greatest good of the greatest number. For communitarians, common good is a uniform entity, organic in nature. It is the convergence of good of all, and is not an aggregate.

According to liberalists, common good is addressed in such a way in society that this is fit in the pattern of good of determinations and priorities adopted by individuals, while communitarians accept the common good as the essential concept of the best life in society, which defines the lifestyle of community. For communitarians, common good itself does not adjust in the pattern of priorities of people. In place of it, common good

⁵³ Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition," *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. p. 255.

provides standard to evaluate these priorities. The lifestyle of community gives a base to the public ranking of determination for the concept of good.⁵⁴ According to liberals, the weight giving priorities to any individual depends on this matter how much it is according to the common welfare or how much it contributes in this. Therefore, it is said that the community attempted to get the shared ends⁵⁵ publicly and addresses the lifestyle. Communitarians have logic that it does not require any type of state neutrality. It has precedence on the claim of required resources and freedoms to get determinations of good by individuals. A communitarian state can encourage the determinations of good according to the lifestyle of community and it discourages those determinations of good, which contradict with it. In this way, the communitarian leads the communitarian state to a perfectionist state, because the public ranking of the value of various lifestyles are included in it. And the base of its ranking is that to what extent it is according to existing practice.

According to communitarians, the concept of relationship between the state and the person given by the liberals is totally inappropriate as discussing the state at one level and the person other level is not enough for any ideal and equitable state. Communitarians say that community holds an intermediate status among the person and the state, so it is wrong to ignore its significance. Communitarians, while criticizing the idea of state neutrality of the liberals says that it is due to the idea of ‘atomism’ of individualism, but social experience and collective evaluation is extremely important for any decision. Communitarians support the ‘politics of common good’⁵⁶ because as per their views the concept of common good defines community life. According to them the work of the person can be evaluated through the concept of common good. This concept is good for both the person and the society. Communitarians argue that an ideal just state is not what is neutral but it is the responsibility of the state to inspire its citizens to adopt the concept of public welfare. It is the duty of any government to help the citizens for the welfare of the person and the society. Communitarians argue that every person of society

⁵⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 220.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. pp. 16–17.

can achieve a better life through the politics of public welfare. Thus, an ideal, just, and lawful state can be established in this way.

2.2 Justice: Liberal and Communitarian Perspectives

Along with the idea of common good, communitarians also propagates the notion of social justice. Here, before analyze the notion of social justice; I would like to discuss the traditional concept of justice.

‘Justice’ is an important human value accepted in social-political philosophy. It is the highest objective of socio-political life, which coordinates with other concepts like rights, independence, equality, etc. This is an essential condition for any society to be civilized and progressive. According to Barker, “justice is the reconciler and the synthesis of political values. It has to coordinate and draw a harmonious balance between the rights and duties of people living in a society.”⁵⁷ In short, justice is to be looked at with reference to the total behavior in society and the characteristic of that society. A man is just if he performs his duties and a society is just if it enables a man to enjoy his rights and his ‘due share’.

“The word justice is derived from the Latin word ‘just’, which broadly means– to tie or to bind.”⁵⁸ As per this viewpoint ‘Justice’ is the name of the system through which the persons are related with each other. Society is a system of relations. One person is related to another person in different ways. On the basis of these relations his rights and responsibilities are associated and the name of the system of these rights and duties is justice.

The concept of justice is very ancient. The concept of justice began from the time the person started to lead an organized life and started thinking about a community and a cooperative life. In other words the concept of justice is as old as the organized life of human beings. Every society has its own concept of justice which becomes the norms of

⁵⁷ “Ernest Barker’s Views on Theory of Justice,” *Encyclopaedia of Political Science*, <http://www.politicalsciencenotes.com/theories-of-justice/ernnest-barkers-views-on-theory-justice-3/753>, retrieved on 02/03/2016.

⁵⁸ “Definition of Justice.” www.merriam-webster.com, retrieved on 03/01/2015.

that society. It can be said that justice relates to social values, justification and ideals. Thus justice is a standard norm but it is not a complete perception in itself, rather it is a relative perception. The perception of justice continues to change in according with the changes in time and circumstances. From ancient times to the present period various philosophers and thinkers have made continuous efforts to give a definite definition of justice.

Regarding the place and value of justice two views have been expressed. One view supported by Plato, Augustine, Aquinas, etc., suggests that the concept of justice is absolute and eternal and permanent. It does not change with or changing circumstances. Like truth, justice is infallible and unchangeable though it is governed by certain specific rules. Another view held by Aristotle, Bentham, and Mill, etc., is the opposite of the first view. These philosophers opine that 'justice' is a relative concept and is susceptible to change with changing times, conditions, values and circumstances.

A systematic approach of justice was first introduced by Greek thinkers. The Greek philosopher, Plato sees justice as a virtue. According to him, the virtue of justice is very significant. Justice is the virtue of both, the person and the society. In his dialogue *Republic*, "Plato uses Socrates to argue for justice that covers both the just person and the just state."⁵⁹ It establishes harmony and coordination among the person's three fundamental virtues - wisdom, courage and temperance. Similarly, these three virtues exist in the state and represent its various elements. The virtue of justice also coordinates among these virtues which exist in the state. Thus, through the virtue of justice a secured balance is maintained between the person and state.

Apart from Plato, Aristotle has also presented important thoughts about justice. Being a realistic person Aristotle has given more emphasis on the practical aspect of justice rather than its ideal aspect. He has given two theories about justice – distributive justice and remedial justice.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Plato. *Republic*. Trans. Robin Waterfield. www.iep.utm.edu, retrieved on: 06/07/2015.

⁶⁰ Kraut, Richard. "Aristotle's Ethics," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://aristotleethics.stanford-encyclopedia-of-philosophy>, retrieved on: 09/20/2014.

(i) Distributive justice is related to distribution of honour and wealth. According to this principle equal treatment should be given to the equal people. Aristotle believed that distribution of status and prestige and wealth should be in geometrical proportion. The essence of Aristotle's distributive justice is that - the person receive a position, honour, award or profit in the state, in the same proportion and in accordance with the services rendered by him for the purpose of the state as per his capacity and capability.

(ii) In addition, the purpose of remedial justice is to refute the injustice by controlling and regulating the interpersonal relations of the citizens. It is basically corrective in which efforts are made to recover the injustice done in past.

In the modern era, the ideas of the thinkers need to be analyzed on the theories of justice, among them the most important name is John Rawls. Rawls is a leading thinker of 20th century. The level of importance brought by his book, published in 1971, is perhaps incomparable. "Rawls' well-known book, *Theory of Justice*, presents a very strong defence of the idea of justice based in the basic tenets of procedural theory, i.e. justice requires a meticulous following of rules."⁶¹ He initiated many approaches to understand society and politics through his book. Some such approaches are - rise of political philosophy through upliftment of 'value' concept, philosophical support for the movement against differentiation, the attempt of equal freedom, etc. These approaches give utmost importance to Rawls in political principles. Rawls declares that his purpose is to establish a new political philosophy - one of such philosophy which is true alternate of the most popular philosophy of the 19th century i.e. 'utilitarianism.'

The theory of justice rendered by Rawls through his book is known as 'justice as fairness'. This theory of justice is based on two important concepts. While considering the theory of justice, Rawls declared it is more important to frame the process of justice rather framing any theory of justice. In order to frame the process of justice Rawls renders that this whole process should be based on certain impartial rules. To ensure this impartiality Rawls believes that the while framing these rules, framers must not have any information as how they will be benefited from these rules. As Rawls put it,

⁶¹ Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok (eds.). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. p. 78.

No one knows his place in society, his class position or social status; nor does he know his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and abilities, his intelligence and strength, and the like.⁶²

Nor, again, does anyone know his conception of the good, the particulars of his rational plan of life, or even the special features of his psychology such as his aversion to risk or liability to optimism or pessimism. . .they do not know its economic or political situation, or the level of civilization and culture it has been able to achieve. . . .The principles of justice are chosen behind a veil of ignorance.⁶³

It meant that before framing the rules, the people of the society who frame these rules should be unaware of – the circumstances of use of these rules, their benefits, abilities, natural benefits and social and economic status. Not only this, they should also be unaware of what would be their quality of life afterwards. Also, these individuals should be unaware of their religious status. They should not be aware whether it is good to be religious or to be non-religious and if it is good to be religious then choosing which religion will be better. Rawls kept all such ignorance under ‘veil of ignorance’. Rawls called the condition of individuals present in this veil of ignorance as ‘original position’. According to Rawls,

As a thought experiment, the original position is a hypothetical position designed to accurately reflect what principles of justice would be manifest in a society premised on free and fair cooperation between citizens, including respect for liberty, and an interest in reciprocity.⁶⁴

In other words, “original position is a hypothetical situation where those individuals who are formulating the theory of justice are under the ‘veil of ignorance’.”⁶⁵ In this original position, where a person is unaware of all things, impartial rules would be framed for the society. But here Rawls also say that despite much ignorance, individuals should be aware of some basic things as without it the rules would not be possible to be framed. Such person should have some basic knowledge, like awareness about the concept of good, capable to create theory in the context of good, and awareness about altering these principles. Also, the persons should have the information related to primary objects, freedoms, opportunities, powers, income, property, and self-esteem of the

⁶² Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. p. 118.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 19.

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 11.

people. According to Rawls when the rules framed in ‘original position’ where the framers having information about certain things and ignorant about other things, the outcome about the rules would be stated in following two points—

First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others.⁶⁶

Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonable expected to be to everyone’s advantage, and (b) attached to positions and office are open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.⁶⁷

In these rules, the first rule will get preference or priority above second rule. Therefore, the equal basic freedom cannot be ignored in any judicial society under any circumstances. As far as the second rule is concerned, social and economic capabilities should be so organized that they could benefit the lowest level to the greatest extent possible. Even if any inequality is done with any post or position then it should only be kept on the basis that it would provide the maximum benefit up to the lowest level in long term. The liberties kept as the basic freedom by Rawls in first rule are the freedom of expression, freedom of religion, freedom to form associations, freedom of business etc. Rawls believes that even in the case of neutrality no person will be willing to leave all these freedoms for any kind of economic and social equality.

The main feature of Rawls’ theory of justice is that he does not directly consider the market system as the format of procedural justice system. Rather, Rawls tries to make procedural justice a tool for social justice. According to the difference principle, a person will be entitled to special award only when he is ready to use his talents for the welfare of the downtrodden people. But the question arises that why would they do this? Rawls replies that our social life is based on coordination. Whatever a person earns is not only due to the support of his family but also due to the support of entire society. Therefore, in view of the vast welfare of society it is necessary that the income and resources be divided in such a way that the success of the collective interests can be achieved. Rawls says that to strengthen the chain of society its weakest bond has to be strengthened.

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 53.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

Rawls believes that government should distribute the income in such a way that the downtrodden classes are most benefitted. Rawls says that highly talented people should get more reward in accordance to their qualifications and it is significant. But it is more important that people who have less qualifications and fewer capacities are compensated.

Hence we see that the theories of Justice by Rawls coordinate among the market, society, and welfare state, which was a major concern of contemporary political philosophy. Rawls analyzed the relationship between equality, independence, and justice through his theory and showed that the co-existence among these three components is possible. Rawls clarifies that it is important to keep in mind the goal of social justice while determining the process of justice.

Yet, many socio-political philosophers and theorists, mainly the communitarians have criticized the Rawls theories of justice. Communitarians' centre of criticism is the Rawls concept of 'veil of ignorance' and 'original position'.

In the book "*Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*", Michael Sandel has attacked Rawl's theory of justice. Rawl's theory represent typical liberal attitude of representing individual in atomistic fashion. According to Sandel, man can be understood only in the context of his society and culture which he terms as "embeddedness."⁶⁸ Positively he recommends that state should make such laws which are conducive for just society. Such laws can only break "deeper commonality" and shared "self-understanding."⁶⁹

According to the communitarian critique of Rawls, people living in the original position are agreed with such theories, as work on the basis of universal thoughts of justice. Whereas on other hand communitarian says that individuals can be seen as the members of already established social organisations. If it is said in other words, it means that men and women are members of the society, from which they get thoughts. For example, the communitarian has this logic that many communities have respective recognitions, such as there are such communities, in which people think that gods and

⁶⁸ Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. p. 56.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 174.

priests have right to one part of their harvesting. Even though we reject this recognition completely, some people have been living for long time accepting this recognition and context, for them this is very important.

Communitarians criticize Rawls opinion that individuals have not knowledge about the real social context in Ignorance of Veil. Communitarians have questions, how such selected alternatives can be relevant to any real social context. There is objection at this opinion that individuals who are completely unknown with their own social, economic and cultural contexts, can choose their own alternatives. According to communitarians, the opinion of individuals is determined in the communitarian contexts and this matter determines the alternate chosen by individual what the concept of good is in the communitarian context. The communitarian thinks that the concept of Good is not the result of individual logic and selection, whereas it is collectively formed by a community and individuals are connected with this community. It comes to be known by the concept of good that which thing or thought to be consider as 'good' by a community.⁷⁰

Michael Walzer in his book *Spheres of Justice* represents the communitarian case against Rawls. Walzer has the basic logic that any system cannot be considered just or unjust in itself. It is possible to evaluate any system on the basis of its social significance regarding some points.⁷¹ In this context Walzer gives an example on the basis of caste system, a person is judged to be shudras or untouchable on the basis of his birth. In this way a person is allowed to approach to things like, water, land, education on the basis of his birth. Walzer gives this logic that until all members of any society accept the social significance of caste system, it means that the distribution will be continued according to it. In this way, the distribution cannot be decided without making the special sense of things. It is significant that the special significance of things is made socially. In place of works and opinions of any person, this significance is embedded in the community, its

⁷⁰ Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok (eds.). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. p. 81.

⁷¹ Armstrong, Chris. "Complex Equality: Beyond Equality and Difference," *Feminist Theory*, Vol. 3(1). p. 70.

behaviour and institutions.⁷² Therefore, Walzer suggests that things which are required to be distributed are social things. The reason is that its significance and value are made socially, that is why, the just cannot be considered on the basis of intangible universal theories. Because of this, it can be considered only under social frame. Walzer lays emphasis on this that various social things should be distributed separately and it should be done different methods and agents. Various types of understanding will cause these differences about social things; because every society has its own diverse and distinguished history and culture.

Michael Walzer has tried to construct “Criteria of Justice” by introducing communitarian approach. Criteria of justice should correspond to the sphere in which it is applied.⁷³ Nature of economics justice will be different from political justice and rules of distribution will differ in each case e.g. sphere of politics, health or education should not be contaminated by domination of money because money belongs to the sphere of economic justice. Similarly spheres of political office should not be contaminated by sphere of kinship and love. Kinship is sphere of society. It can lead to nepotism and male domination in politics. Walzer has given picture of “new order”⁷⁴ as based on principles of democratic decentralization.⁷⁵ Welfare state is run in part by officials and in part by local communities.

Justice is not limited to laws and legal procedures but the concept of justice in the modern era has become very widespread and its execution has started in many shapes. In fact, under the traditional perspective the main concern of justice was with the person’s character, rather the main concern of modern approach is social justice.

⁷² Tutui, Viorel. “Between the ‘Spheres of Justice’ and the ‘Right to Citizenship’: The Limits of the Communitarian Theory of Michael Walzer,” *Meta: Research in Hermeneutics, Phenomenology, and Practical Philosophy*, Vol. III, No. 1. p. 131.

⁷³ Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*. p. 11.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* p. 284.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* p. 304.

2.3 The Concept of Social Justice

Social Justice is a new concept in itself, but it cannot be understood by separating it from the concept of justice. A key difference in 'justice' and 'social justice' is its scope and priorities. Changes occurred in liberalism after 1950, transformed the liberal justice into social justice. The nature of justice should be such that it can empower the society. If justice provides its views on all components of social organization and mutual relationships which enhances the power of the organization and coordination in mutual relations, this type of justice will be social justice. From a political perspective it is not a concept which automatically develops in a society. Actually, it is a useful concept which develops as a result of the interrelationships of members of the society, which should be planned. This concept cannot be planned by anyone other than the state.

Krishna Iyer in his book *Justice and Beyond* points out that "social justice is not an exact static or absolute concept, measurable with precision or getting into fixed world. It is flexible, dynamic and relative."⁷⁶ The main basis for establishing social justice is equality. MacCormick regards, "equal well-being of individuals as basis to social justice."⁷⁷ Social justice seeks to establish a system in which every person can independently develop his personality and can fulfill all his responsibilities at social level. It is generally accepted that redistribution of social facilities and economic resources is necessary for to establish social justice. Rousseau argued that "men are equal by nature but the institution of private property has made them unequal and further perpetuated inequalities. Therefore, the perfection of man lies in the improvement of society that can be done by remarking man by cultivating natural feelings and sentiments which guarantee equality and social-justice."⁷⁸

The formation of social justice means - ending every system, beliefs and practices through which a class of society is benefited and another class is excluded from the mainstream. How to solve the problem of minorities? How to ensure equal distribution of facilities? How to develop the communities who have been deprived of education, health,

⁷⁶ Iyer, Krishna. *Justice and Beyond*. p. 63.

⁷⁷ MacCormick, Neil. "Justice: An Unoriginal Position," *Legal Right and Social Democracy*. p. 91.

⁷⁸ Jogdand, P.G., Bansode Prashant P. and Meshram, N.G. (eds.). *Globalization and Social Justice*. pp. 1-2.

and other basic facilities? The prevailing system of justice does not answer these questions. The concept of social justice is an attempt to solve these problems. In the border perspective:

Social justice means availability of equal social opportunities for the development of personality to all the people in the society, without any discrimination on the basis of caste, sex or race. No one should be deprived, basis on these differences, because these are those condition which are essential for social development. Therefore, the issue of social justice is associated with social equality and individual rights. Social justice can be made available only in a social system where the exploitation of man by man is absent, and where privileges of the few are not built upon the miseries of the many.⁷⁹

It is clear that the social justice establishes secular democracy and tries to incorporate politics of inclusion. It protects the life and beliefs of each individual. Thus, the social justice protects the religion and culture; and provides equal opportunity for self-esteem and development to all communities, downtrodden classes, tribes, homosexuals, women, minorities, etc. of the society.

Social Justice is basically an ideological movement against social inequality. The concept of social justice seeks to establish social justice on the basis of equality but this equality cannot be unlimited. Natural inequality cannot be abolished nor should it be. But there are some inequalities which have been created by society and they should definitely be abolished. The caste system in the Indian society and problems of women in world's society are some examples of the inequalities created by the society. Resolution for opposing and eradication of these inequalities created by the society is the main objective of social justice. The movement of social justice is to relieve the distressed and oppressed classes of the society from their sufferings. The subject area of social justice is so vast that there is no scope of life and principles is left untouched from it.

The most important aspect of social justice is cultural. Inequality of cultures confines a number of communities. Social beliefs, customs and traditions create dominance of a particular class in the society. Some communities become insignificant

⁷⁹ Ahamad, S. Waseem and Ali, M. Ashraf. "Social Justice and The Constitution of India," *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. LXVII, No.4, p. 767.

even prevailing in the society and their place becomes secondary. The existence of these communities cannot be protected without accepting their diversities. The identity politics has given strength to their demands and excluded communities are now started to demand their inclusion. Multiculturalism is a concept which accepts these demands. Multiculturalism establishes cultural equality and cultural rights of cultural communities to preserve diversities of different cultures of the society. So, it can be said that, the concept of multiculturalism creates the necessary conditions of social justice.

Bibliography & Webliography

Books

- Axford, Barrie and Browning, Gary K. *Politics: An Introduction*. Routledge: London. 1997.
- Baehr, P. R. *Human Rights: Universality in Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan: UK. 2001.
- Barry, Brian. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Polity Press: Cambridge. 2001.
- Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok (eds.). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. Pearson Publication: India. 2009.
- Dhiman, O.P. *Understanding Human Rights: An Overview*. Kalpaz Publication: Delhi. 2011.
- Dworkin, Ronald. *A Matter of Principle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1985.
- Gutmann, A. (ed.). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1994.
- Iyer, Krishna. *Justice and Beyond*. Deep and Deep Publication: New Delhi. 1982.
- Jogdand, P.G., Bansode, P.P., and Meshram, N.G. (eds.). *Globalization and Social Justice*. Rawat Publications: Jaipur. 2008.
- Joseph, M. Palmisana (ed.). *World of Sociology*. Vol. 1. Gala Group: New York. 2001.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by N. K. Smith. The MacMillan Press Ltd.: London. 1973.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited by H. J. Paton. B. I. Publication: New Delhi 1979.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. Oxford University Press: New York. 2002.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1995.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford University Press: New York. 2001.
- MacIntyre, Alisdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Duckworth: London. 1981.
- Plato. *Republic*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1994.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. 1971.

- Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982.
- Sharma, Lokesh (ed.). *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Terms in Anthropology, Sociology and Allied Disciplines*. Penman Publisher: New Delhi. 2003.
- Taylor, Charles. *Hegel and Modern Society*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2015.
- *The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibility*. Vol. 5. Centre for Policy Research: US. 1994.
- Tully, James. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1995.
- Vermani, R. C. (2008). *An Introduction to Political Theory and Thought*. Gitanjali Publishing House. 2008.
- Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*. Blackwell: Oxford. 1983.

Journals

- Adoo, A. "Africa: Democracy without Human Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol. 15. No. 4. 1993. pp. 703-715.
- Ahamad, S. Waseem and Ali, M. Ashraf. "Social Justice and The Constitution of India," *Indian Journal of Political Science*. Vol. LXVII. No.4. Oct. Dec. 2006. Indian Political Science Association. pp. 767-782,
- Armstrong, Chris. "Complex Equality: Beyond Equality and Difference," *Feminist Theory*. Vol. 3(1). Sage Publications: London. 2002. pp. 67–82.
- Barry, Brian. "Liberalism and Multiculturalism," *Ethical Perspectives* 4. 1997. pp. 3–14.
- Christie, K. "Regime Security and Human Rights in Southern Asia," *Political Studies (Special Issue: Politics and Human Rights)*. Vol. 43. 1995. pp. 204-218.
- England, John T. "Pluralism and Education: Its Meaning and Method," *In Department of Education ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services*. Michigan: Michigan State University: Michigan. December-1992. No. ED347494.3. pp. 1-8. <http://www.ericdigests.org/pluralism-and-education-its-meaning-and-method/1991-2/method.htm=December/1992=No. ED347494.3>, retrieved on 07/12/2015.
- "Ernest Barker's Views on Theory of Justice," *Encyclopaedia of Political Science*, <http://www.politicalsciencenotes.com/theories-of-justice/ernest-barkers-views-on-theory-justice-3/753>, retrieved on: 02/03/2016.
- *Human Rights Today – A United Nations Priority*. New York: Department of Public Information, UN. 1998.

- Korfmacher, Carsten, “Personal Identity,” www.iep.utm/personal-identity/, retrieved on: 02/09/2016.
- Kraut, Richard. “Aristotle’s Ethics,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://aristotleethics/stanford-encyclopedia-of-philosophy>, retrieved on: 09/20/2014.
- MacCormick. “Justice: An Unoriginal Position,” *Legal Right and Social Democracy*. Clarendon Press: UK. 1984. pp. 84-102.
- Morsink, J. “Cultural Genocide, the Universal Declaration and Minority Rights,” *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol. 21, No. 4. 1999. pp. 1009-1060.
- Paksoy, Hasan Bülent, “Identities: How Governed, Who Pays?,” Lubbock: Texas, 2nd Ed. 2006.
http://www.eumed.net/malaga_entelequia/identity/entelequia/com, retrieved on 09/12/2014.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Dangers of Liberalism,” *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Edited by Paul Kelly. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2002.
- Pogge, T. “The International Significance off Human Rights,” *Journal of Ethics*. 4. 2000. pp. 45-69.
- Rawls, John. “Fairness to Goodness,” *Philosophical Review*, 84. 1975. pp. 536-554.
- Rawls, John. “Social Unity and Primary Goods,” *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. Edited by Amartya Sen and B. Williams. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982. pp-159-185.
- *Revlon Human Rights: International Bill of Human Rights*. Fact Sheet No. 2. Centre of Human Rights: New York, UN. 1996.
- Singh, R. P. “Human Rights in the Wake of Globalization: Kantian Perspective,” *The Philosophical Heritage of Immanuel Kant*. Edited by R. P. Singh. 2006. pp. 103–124.
- Tang, J. T. H. “Human Rights in the Asia Pacific Region: Competing Perspectives, International Discord and the Way Ahead,” *Human Rights and International Relations in the Asia Pacific*. Edited by J.T.H. Tang. Pinter: London. 1995. pp. 1–19.
- Taylor, Charles. “The Politics of Recognition,” *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Edited by A. Gutmann. Princeton, Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1992.
- Turner, J. C. “Toawrds a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group,” *Social Identity and Intergroup Relation*. Edited by H. Tajfel. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982.
- Tutui, Viorel. “Between the “Spheres of Justice” and the “Right to Citizenship”: The Limits of the Communitarian Theory of Michael Walzer,” *Meta: Research In Hermeneutics, Phenomenology, And Practical Philosophy*. Vol. 3. No. 1. June 2011. pp. 130–140. ISSN 2067-3655.
- Waldren, Jeremy. “Cultural Identity and Civic Responsibility,” *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. Edited by Will Kymlicka and Norman Wayne. New York: Oxford University: New York. 2000.

Online Sources

- <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communitarianism>
- [“Definition of Justice”. www.merriam-webster.com.](http://www.merriam-webster.com)
- <https://www.slideshare.net/dragon888/individualism-communitarianism>
- www.postsustainabilityinstitute.org/individualism-vs-communitarianism.html
- www.shareyouressays.com/.../difference-between-individualism-and-communitarians
- link.springer.com/article/individualism,communitarianism,consensus/10.1023/A:1011925405156
- <https://www.amazon.com/Communitarianism-Individualism-Oxford-Readings.../0198780281>
- www://en.wikipedia.org/Community/wiki/Communitas
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/>
- [study.com/.../lesson/what-is-personal-identity-definition-philosophy-development.htm.](http://study.com/.../lesson/what-is-personal-identity-definition-philosophy-development.htm)
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minority_rights_and_human_rights
- www://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html
- http://www.youthforhumanrights.org/WHAT_ARE_HUMAN_RIGHTS?-Human_Rights_Definition.htm
- www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/MinorityRights_en.pdf
- <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/human-rights/what-are-human-rights/pdf>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Theory_of_Justice
- www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/what-is-justice/VicJSchol/2014/12.pd
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_good
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_dilemma
- <https://www.tutor2u.net/.../unit-1-micro-differences-between-merit-and-public-goods>

Chapter IV

Multiculturalism: Interfacing Liberalism and Communitarianism

Finally, there is problematic in the very conception of multiculturalism because it is not a single doctrine in the sense that there is no settled or agreed view of how multicultural society should operate. In the present chapter, I shall raise the issues of disagreements among the multiculturalists about how far they should go in positively endorsing cultural diversity, and about how civic cohesion can best be brought about. The question arises, how can liberalism and communitarianism go along with that of multiculturalism? I wish to show that in multiculturalism, there is interface between liberalism and communitarianism. Will Kymlicka and other liberal theorists of multiculturalism have developed the theory of multiculturalism based on the liberal values of right, autonomy and equality resulting in mix multiculturalism. Likewise communitarians view multiculturalism as an appropriate way of protecting cultural minorities. There are imminent consequences of multiculturalism. I wish to take up feminist critique of multiculturalism by Susan Okin, since she is concerned with what happens *inside* the cultural groups which should not overshadow the discriminatory nature of gender roles in cultures.

As such multiculturalism involves a study of human life within historical and cultural framework, culturally derived system of meaning and significance. It is the principle of the regulating different cultural communities in a state. Multiculturalism accepts different assumptions of different communities and considers them to be the justifiable means of achieving the goals of the community. Will Kymlicka in the book *Multicultural Citizenship* writes:

The basic premise of multiculturalism is that membership in a cultural community is essential to our personal identity and provides individuals with the necessary framework to exercise their true liberty.¹

Tariq Modood supports multiculturalism in his book *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea* saying that:

In the early years of the 21st Century, multiculturalism is mask timely and necessary and ... we need more not less, since it is the form of integration that one, it best fits the ideal of egalitarianism, second, it has the best chance of succeeding in the post 9/11, past 7/7 world and third, it has remained moderate and pragmatic.²

In this way, multiculturalism accepts diversities of cultural values and protects the independent existence of each cultural community. There are competing models of multiculturalism, each offering a different view of the proper balance between diversity and unity. The two main models of multiculturalism are - Liberal Multiculturalism and Communitarian Multiculturalism. In this chapter, I shall argue that there is cultural lineage to normative discourses in liberalism and communitarianism.

In order to substantiate my discussion in this chapter, I propose to divide it into the following two parts –

Part 1 - Liberal Multiculturalism

Part 2 - Communitarian Multiculturalism

Part 3 - Feminist Critique of Multiculturalism

¹ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 82.

² Modood, Tariq. *Multiculturalism: A Civic Idea*. p. 14.

Part 1

Liberal Multiculturalism

It is apparent that in liberalism, individual is given more importance than anything else; whereas in multiculturalism we talk of collective rights. It shows the incompatibility between these two concepts. Hence, the question arises, how can liberalism go along with that of multiculturalism? In this context, one can say that, in multiculturalism the notions of freedom, equality, autonomy, etc. are taken but with some different interpretation. Multiculturalism critically evaluates the liberal notions of identity, freedom, dignity, etc. on the one hand; and individuality, citizenship, equality, rights, etc. on the other; and reformulates its assumptions like property, life, etc. In liberalism, freedom means individual freedom and equality pertains in treating individuals equally irrespective of their religion, race, sex, language, etc. But multiculturalism recognizes the feature of difference in freedom, equality, dignity, etc. and considers these notions as culturally bound.

In liberalism, there is acceptance of freedom and recognition of the other at the level of individuals only. But at the level of multiculturalism, individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community. "Since the 1970s, liberal thinkers have taken the issue of cultural diversity increasingly seriously, and have developed a form of liberal multiculturalism."³ According to this approach, "equal recognition of cultural groups must be compatible with the requirements of basic individual liberties and perhaps even with individual autonomy."⁴ Liberal multiculturalism has three main assumptions:

It support toleration which means willingness to accept even those views which one disagrees but liberal multiculturalism is unwilling to tolerate certain principles like forced marriage, Hizaab, Parda, Female dress code etc.⁵

The second feature of liberal multiculturalism is that it draws an important distinction between 'public' or 'private' life. In private life individuals are free to

³ Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. p. 325.

⁴ Bhargava, Rajeev. "Introduction," *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy*. Ed. Rajeev Bhargava, Amiya Kumar Bagchi and R. Sudarshan. p. 12.

⁵ Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. p. 325.

express their language, culture, religious identity etc. But in public, there must be some shared civil values.⁶

The third aspect of liberal multiculturalism is that it regards liberal democracy as the legitimate political system. The virtue of liberal democracy is that it alone ensures that government is based on the consent of the people, and that it provides guarantees for personal freedom and toleration.⁷

Chandran Kukathas has divided various theories of multiculturalism, developed from beginning to till time, into two groups— classical liberal multiculturalism and modern liberal multiculturalism.

Classical Liberal Multiculturalism

By explaining the classical liberal multiculturalism, Kukathas says that the liberal tradition emphasizes the independence of individual and freedom of choice. So every individual has the right to live on his chosen path.⁸ Classical liberal multiculturalism expect from the state, same treatment for minority and majority cultural communities. State should neither impose any restriction nor award any incentives on the practices, values, norms and life style of any cultural community. State should not make any attempt to merge minority cultural communities.⁹ State should support equal rights to all cultures. The state can prohibit it only if it is harming another culture. Nevertheless, the problem here is, how it will be determined that the activities of one culture are harming the other culture. On the basis of this, the theory of classical liberal multiculturalism is criticized as the arrangement for prohibition in it is completely vague. It is also alleged that while talking about cultural equality, it indirectly supports majority cultures. Due to this reason emergence of modern liberal multiculturalism appeared as an opposite reaction to the concept of classical liberal multiculturalism.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid. p. 326.

⁸ Kukathas, Chandran. "Theoretical Foundations of Multiculturalism." p. 13.
http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/fall04/theoretical-foundation-of-multiculturalism/by/kukathas_/chandran.pdf,retrieved on:02/05/2016.

⁹ Ibid. p. 14.

Modern Liberal Multiculturalism

In the context of modern liberal multiculturalism, Kukathas says that this concept support only to empower liberal cultures.¹⁰ There are two main supporters of this theory – Brian Barry and Will Kymlicka. Barry sees the culture as an organization of matured individuals. This organization is created by an individual at his free will for his own development.¹¹ If such organization is involved in an illiberal act then the state should not give any rights or security to that organization. The state can only recognize cultural rights which increase the liberal values. Actually, Barry is an egalitarian liberal philosopher, whose main concern is to establish social justice. As per his thoughts social justice is needed for social life and civil society. Due to this reason, multiculturalism cannot be given special importance to establish social justice. Therefore, according to Barry equality cannot be subjected to culture.¹² The present time is not of single cultures, so multiculturalism cannot be completely denied. But the subject area of multiculturalism should be a liberal cultural community.

Will Kymlicka, the second supporter of this concept advocates for providing cultural foundation to liberal minority groups on the basis of their diversities. Minority cultural groups should be given equal rights and protection as given to the majority, so that they remain active and committed to the state. Through appropriate representation, they should be given a proper place in the state. According to Kymlicka, the people of minority communities are also required to be given special privileges such as special relaxation in terms of clothing and holiday etc.¹³ Doing so will protect the identity of these groups. With this special feature, the unity of the state will get a positive boost. Modern liberal multiculturalism is in favour of giving minority rights for providing security to minority cultures. Thus, this type of multiculturalism tries to establish

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 15.

¹¹ Barry, Brian. *Culture & Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. p. 16.

¹² Kelly, Paul (ed.). *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: 'Culture and equality' and its critics*. p. 189.

¹³ Kukathas, Chandran. "Multiculturalism as Fairness: Will Kymlicka's Multicultural Citizenship," *The Journal of Political Philosophy*: Vol. 5, No. 4. p. 409.

multiculturalism as a positive policy by removing the shortcomings in classical liberal multiculturalism.¹⁴

1.1 Liberalism and Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism desires a logical change in the political theory so that cultural, linguistic and other differences can be adjusted as well as proper arrangements for the protection of their traditions could be ensured. Multiculturalism denies the principle of liberal universal citizenship. The principle of liberal universal citizenship takes the form of colour-blind policy to impart justice. It means equality before the law. According to Kymlicka, "...the logical conclusion of liberal principles seems to be a 'colour-blind' constitution—the removal of all legislation differentiating people in terms of their race or ethnicity. Liberal equality requires the 'universal' mode of incorporating citizens into the state."¹⁵ The law does not discriminate between people on the basis of language, colour or caste. This is a very popular policy, which is accepted by most of the democratic countries through their constitution. Under this concept, neutrality is followed by the state. All cultures and religions are of equal importance to the state. Kymlicka says that liberalism accepts plurality, but does not give any importance to cultural diversity.¹⁶

Multiculturalism does not agree with the concept of an individual as defined in liberalism. Liberalism accepts the individual in an autonomous form. But an individual is a member of a community by birth. He receives membership of the group by default. Liberalism does not recognize cultural diversities in the public domain. It ignores discrimination being faced by minority cultures.¹⁷ In particular, it ignores the cultures based on traditional customs. Liberalism accepts the concept of an exceptional human being. According to it, the community which has more individual freedom is superior and better to the community in which individual freedom is low and worse.¹⁸ Thus liberalism,

¹⁴ Kukathas, Chandran. "Theoretical Foundations of Multiculturalism." p. 17.

¹⁵ Kymlicka, Will. *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. pp. 141–42.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 144.

¹⁷ Parekh, Bhikhu. "Superior People: The Narrowness of Liberalism from Mill to Rawls," *Times Literary Supplements*. p. 12.

¹⁸ Mahajan, Gurpreet and Sheth, D. L. (eds.). *Minority Identities and the Nation-State*. p. 15.

even by providing equal civil rights to all does not actually gives equal rights to all in the public domain.

James Tully has opposed the liberal, universal, and individualistic concept in his arguments.¹⁹ According to him, cultural diversity is the basic feature of contemporary society, and cultural interaction is embedded in the nature of the human beings. Members of a culture get familiar with the members of another culture through interaction and conversation. Cultural identities are the basic needs of human beings. Tully says that under the liberalism instead of having the same political and legal system for everybody, minority communities are discriminated. Ultimately, they are not even given justice. Liberal constitutions give preference to majority cultural values, even after accepting the policy of neutrality. The politics of recognition do not even exist in the nature of liberal states.²⁰ This politics make various demands and the solution of these demands cannot be met by any single culture. Concept of multiculturalism is the best method to resolve these demands. Through multiculturalism a fair cultural identity can be established in the liberal state.

Joseph Raz also considers that liberal's individualistic concept is incompetent to provide equality. Raz is one of the main philosophers who tried to improve liberalism to face new challenges. He thinks that during the 18th to 19th century when liberalism emerged, the political and social conditions were different. Therefore, the liberalism should accept changes in its present form in accordance to the current needs. According to Raz, liberalism gives importance to individual freedom and autonomy. It attempts to eliminate all the problems, which come in the way of the individual's independence. Since a person cannot live alone, therefore his independence is subjected to certain rules. He receives these rules and controls from his community. Joseph is of the opinion that culture provides complete support for the development of a person. The dignity and identity of the person is in the context of the cultural community.²¹ If a person is separated from his culture, then there will be a negative change in his attitude towards life. His emotional base will be destroyed and he will not be able to plan for his

¹⁹ Tully, James. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. pp. 15–16.

²⁰ *Ibid.* pp. 5–6.

²¹ Raz, Joseph. "Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective," *Dissent*, Winter, Vol. 41, No. 1. pp. 70–71.

life's goal and development. Considering a person's cultural community as weak and unethical in comparison with others, the person suffers from inferiority complex. According to him, all such concepts should be rejected, which prevents the development of the individual 'self'²² and create inferiority in him. Therefore, liberalism should attempt to create such concepts in which the potential of the person's development and opportunities are available. Thus, Joseph argues that by giving importance to the cultures and giving them equality within the state multiculturalism ensures independence of the individual and promotes its autonomy.

Like Joseph, Kymlicka also criticizes the principle of liberal universal citizenship. He first interpreted the theory of multiculturalism in his books *Liberalism, Community and Culture* and *Multicultural Citizenship*. He says that the person sees his freedom in his cultural context.²³ The liberal democratic state is indirectly a supporter of a majority group. Liberal states do not deal equality and justice based on minority cultures. Kymlicka argues that minority cultures should be provided freedom and autonomy in public areas to ensure fair and equality with them. By doing so, the life of different minority cultures can be ensured for a long time. According to Kymlicka, the biggest issue with liberal states is that how they make themselves fair in the context of minority cultures.²⁴ In response to this, Kymlicka says that for the protection of minority cultures, they should be given special rights or group-differentiated rights by liberal states. In the *Multicultural Citizenship*, he states:

Group-differentiated rights—such as territorial autonomy, veto powers, guaranteed representation in central institutions, land claims, and language rights—can help rectify this disadvantage, by alleviating the vulnerability of minority cultures to majority decisions. These external protections ensure that members of the minority have the same opportunity to live and work in their own culture as members of the majority.²⁵

²² Ibid. p. 73.

²³ Kymlicka, Will. *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. p. 62.

²⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 6.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 109.

Along with the broad principles of justice, the principle of cultural diversities should also be included in the laws of liberal states. By doing so, the liberal state will be able to give necessary protection to minority cultural communities.

1.2 Multiculturalism and Minority Rights

Because of the expansion of human rights after World War II, efforts were made to resolve various problems of minority groups through universal human rights. Though, Kymlicka considers these efforts to be insufficient. He opposes to keep the minority rights under human rights. According to Kymlicka, the principle of human rights should be established by linking them with the rights of minority cultures.²⁶

Each culture is associated with a specific type of community. The character of these communities is local and their social, religious, and economic structures are affected by locality. Therefore, problems of all communities cannot be solved with the same principle. The general nature of human rights is universal, because according to it human nature may vary but not of humanity. But Kymlicka is not satisfied with this argument. According to him, human nature defines the humanity and makes changes in it. Therefore, it is not fair to apply human rights by ignoring local standards. The problem of minority cultural communities can only be solved by applying human rights in the context of minority rights and locality.

Similarly, Kymlicka stress on multicultural citizenship and considers it more broad and sensitive than universal citizenship. Kymlicka advocates “mirror representation.”²⁷ According to this view, representatives of various cultural, linguistic, and religious groups should be available in the legislature and other institutions. Such groups should be represented by the members of these groups only, although, in case of necessity, the persons who are not members of these groups can also represent them. But the question is which group do Kymlicka thinks eligible to represent? In response to this question, Kymlicka says that if any one of the following conditions is being fulfilled, then it is necessary to give representation to such a group—

²⁶ Ibid. p. 5.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 149.

- (i) If a group has been continuously neglected in the political process or
- (ii) If the claim of self-governance of members of that group is valid.²⁸

In the words of Kymlicka:

Groups have a claim to representation if they meet one of two criteria: (1) are the members of the group subject to systemic disadvantage in the political process? Or (2) do the members of the group have a claim to self-government?²⁹

Simultaneously, Kymlicka says that minority cultural rights or group-differentiated rights can be divided into three types of groups—

1) Self-government rights:

“...the delegation of powers to national minorities, often through some form of federalism”³⁰

Kymlicka believes that minorities should get the right to self-governance in multi-cultural states. This right should be provided only to indigenous communities because they are connected to their motherland since birth. These communities developed on the same land and environment.³¹ The indigenous community has an emotional attachment to their country. Hence, it is essential and justifiable to give the right of self-governance to these communities for maintaining their cultural traditions.

2) Polyethnic rights:

“...financial support and legal protection for certain practices associated with particular ethnic or religious groups”³²

These rights are given to the community so that it can maintain its cultural identity. Ethnical rights are to safeguard the autonomy and cultural rights of minority and tribal indigenous groups. These are state-backed, financial, legal, and political

²⁸ Ibid. p. 145.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid. p. 6.

³¹ Ibid. p. 27.

³² Ibid. p. 7.

rights.³³ The biggest problem of minority cultural communities is related to their identities. These rights are to maintain their identities.

3) Special representation rights:

“...guaranteed seats for ethnic or national groups within the central institutions of the larger state”³⁴

In democracy, such groups should have the right of special representation as they have been deprived of proper representation. According to Kymlicka, in national institutions special representative rights should be provided to minority cultural groups, which include both indigenous and immigrant groups.³⁵

According to Kymlicka, “each of these forms of group-differentiated rights helps reduce the vulnerability of minority groups to the economic pressures and political decisions of the larger society.”³⁶ One of the main criteria for success of democracy is the position of the minorities in relation to their representation. Therefore, existence of such rights is very significant for a strong democracy.

Kymlicka favours right to self-governance, which should be given to minorities. Kymlicka believes that granting such rights to the minorities in Canada and America suited to liberalism.³⁷ He believes that the liberals consider the idea of cultural citizenship to be extremely important because it is an issue associated with the autonomy of a person. Kymlicka while speaking in the context of the minorities say that it is very important to pay attention to the aspect that the position of deprivation of minorities has either been chosen by them at their own or it has been imposed on them. He believes in any nation, national minorities never choose to become minority. Such condition is due to their birth, not because of their desire. Under such circumstances, in a structure of liberalism also, it is appropriate to give special privileges to those minorities who have not chosen the situation of being deprived themselves. But such special privileges should

³³ Ibid. p. 30.

³⁴ Ibid. p. 7.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 31.

³⁶ Ibid. p. 38.

³⁷ Ibid. pp. 29–30.

be granted only to the national minorities, not those migrants who are deprived of rights, but they have chosen themselves such a situation by deciding to leave their own country. There is no need to give special privileges to such migrants who are living in other countries willingly for business or other reasons. This is the state of choosing the situation of being deprived at self-choice. Although Kymlicka is not unaware of the fact that such migrants, whose cultural identity is different from mainstream and established cultural identity of that country, often face torture and discrimination. This discrimination can be as serious and deep as the national minorities have to undergo. But the fact that distinguishes the national minorities from migrant minorities is that national minorities have not chosen the state of inequality, while the migrant minorities have chosen their own to live as minorities.

Liberals appear to be worried about giving the right to self-governance by Kymlicka. They believe that if the provision of self-governance is made for minorities, the situation of separatism will arise and there will be a threat to national integrity and unity as demand for separation from the country will be started by separatists again. In return Kymlicka put opposite question to such critics, whether the danger of separation will be from not giving the autonomy or self-governance rights or by giving such rights. Kymlicka believes that danger of separation arises by not giving autonomy rather than giving the same.³⁸

Brian Barry criticized the multiculturalism supported by Kymlicka, in his book *Culture and Equality*, saying that sometimes multiculturalism, in the name of protecting culture, also starts defending the customs which are rude and inhuman.³⁹ He also accuses multiculturalism by saying that multiculturalists ignore the ability to mold themselves according to the situations. Kymlicka in his reply states that it is not appropriate to support any wrong practice on the name of culture. But protecting cultural values is mandatory as they are linked to the basic interests of human beings.⁴⁰ Where culture is linked to the basic interests of human beings, but if it is unable to protect the basic interests of them, then protecting such culture is not mandatory.

³⁸ Ibid. p. 182.

³⁹ Barry, Brian. *Culture & Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. p. 298.

⁴⁰ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 85.

Barry also says that multiculturalism proves an obstacle in the way of redistribution to achieve social justice. It would be absolutely wrong to believe that all social discrimination arises due to cultural reasons.⁴¹ In today's capitalist system, economic reasons are responsible for much more discrimination than cultural reasons, but the attention of multiculturalists is limited to cultural reasons only. The famous feminist, Susan Okin also criticizes the multiculturalism of Kymlicka by stating that to what extent does a culture support a person's dignified life, it depends on what role the person is given in that culture.⁴² Especially in traditional cultures, women play a lower role in society and they have to live in inferior situations in patriarchal societies.⁴³ As such, Okin considers Kymlicka's attitude of defending the cultures erroneous and advocates revolutionary change in cultures.

An important problem is the conflict between cultural rights and personal rights. If a community enjoys cultural rights and the state does not restrict those rights, then the cultural sovereignty of the community is established. But if this sovereign community disregards individual rights of one of its members or interferes in its independence, then what is the theoretical situation? Should the community be the priority or the individual? Kymlicka is against violation of individual's fundamental rights by the group's rights. According to Kymlicka, external protection should be provided to minority cultures. Their existence should be protected in the public domain on the basis of equality. But if the freedom of a community member is violated on the name of cultural rights, or its fundamental rights are violated then the state's intervention becomes mandatory. "In order to ensure that individuals enjoy freedom of conscience, Kymlicka suggests that the liberal state should support external protections to minority cultures and at the same time reject internal restrictions."⁴⁴ Kymlicka discusses in his *Multicultural Citizenship*:

By supporting external protections, the state must take action in order to ensure that the group is not treated disadvantageously at the inter-group level. In the same way,

⁴¹ Barry, Brian. "Liberalism and Multiculturalism," *Ethical Perspectives*. 4.2. p. 8.

⁴² Okin, Susan Moller. "Feminism and Multiculturalism: Some Tensions," *Ethics*, Vol. 108, No. 4. p.664.

⁴³ *Ibid.* p. 683.

⁴⁴ Iordanou, George. "Kymlicka's Multicultural Citizenship."

<http://www.iordanou.org/kymlickas-multicultural-citizenship/wordpress>, retrieved on 06/12/2016.

the guarantee that no internal restrictions take place, is to make sure that the basic liberties and freedoms of individuals at the intra-group level are secured as well.⁴⁵

Kymlicka says that rights and security are given to any cultural community so that the members of that community can develop properly. These rights are not given to restrict the individual rights of members. If a cultural community does not provide protection to individual rights, then the community should not be given any right from the state. Such communities should not be provided any kind of protection by the state. Therefore, it is clear that in case of confliction between community rights and individual rights Kymlicka favours individual rights.

1.3 Iris Young's Differentiated Citizenship

The most important query raised about the diversities accepted by multicultural society is how can diversity be adjusted in such a society? Many multiculturalist thinkers have accepted the concept of 'differentiated citizenship' as a solution of this adjustment.

The theory of differentiated citizenship has been rendered by American thinker Iris Marion Young. Young has criticized universal citizenship. She believes that the concept of universal citizenship is insensitive to diversity and does not accept the diversities of citizens. According to her, the concept of universal citizenship is problematic because this concept believes that all persons are members of the same political community and thus it decides same civil laws should be enforced. Iris Young do not accept this idea. She believes that all people who consider themselves the member of the same political community ignore that all personnel are related to different cultural communities.⁴⁶ So everyone's beliefs, values and lifestyle are different. In such a case, the same rules cannot be framed for everyone on the name of universality. In her view, universalism is a false concept because in the name of universalism the majorities try to impose their own culture and beliefs on minorities. She describes this as:

“...is not likely to succeed under circumstances where there are cultural differences among groups and some groups are privileged. If one cultural group possesses

⁴⁵ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. pp. 35–36.

⁴⁶ Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. p. 163.

greater power (economic, social and political) than its ideals and characteristics are perceived as the norm. This has a corrupting effect.⁴⁷

So, according to Iris Young, universalism is for the sake of the name, in fact it is a hidden thought through which efforts are made to eliminate minority culture.

Right, justice, freedom, equality, etc. are some such concepts which are considered universal. These concepts are derived from the American and French Revolution. Basically, these revolutions encouraged the ideal of universal citizenship. Iris Young opposes these ideals. Such universality is an attempt to end the diversities on the name of adjustment whereas dominant culture is only accepted as universal culture. If a group tries to follow its different and diverse culture beyond the culture of this dominant group, then it is even called as a traitor. People who do the politics of diversities are opposed. It is thus clear that the diversity cannot be adjusted by universalism in a pluralistic society. Therefore, Iris Young presents the concept of differentiated citizenship for the adjustment of diversity.

. . . insists on liberation of the whole group of Blacks, Women, American Indians, and this can be accomplished only through basic institutional changes. These changes must include group representation in policy making and an elimination of the hierarchy of rewards that forces everyone to compete for scarce positions at the top.⁴⁸

This theory believes in politics of diversity. It demands proper protection for rights of disadvantaged social groups. The rights of these groups may have threat from the majority because majority and minorities may come to a face-to-face confrontation on some issues due to their diversities. Under such circumstances possibilities for loss of interest of minorities is more. In such a scenario, differentiated citizenship could adjust to diversity peacefully. Keeping in view the diversity prevailing in society, this concept advocates the protection of the interests of the disadvantaged groups.

Iris Young in her book *Justice and the Politics of Difference* mentions that there are five forms of oppression: “exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural

⁴⁷ Young, Iris Marion. “Together in Difference: Transforming the Logic of Group Political Conflict,” *Principled Positions: Postmodernism and the Rediscovery of Values*. Ed. Judith Smith. p. 163.

⁴⁸ Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. p. 171.

imperialism, and random violence and harassment motivated by group hatred or fear.”⁴⁹ She argues that “special representation rights should be extended to oppressed groups because”⁵⁰:

In a society where some groups are privileged while others are oppressed, insisting that as citizens persons should leave behind their particular affiliations and experiences to adopt a general point of view serves only to reinforce the privilege; for the perspective and interest of the privileged will tend to dominate this unified public, marginalizing or silencing those of other groups.⁵¹

According to Young, “oppressed groups are at a disadvantage in the political process, and the solution lies at least in part in providing institutionalized means for the explicit recognition and representation of oppressed groups.”⁵² According to Iris Young, true equality can be attained not only by the equality of behaviour but by understanding of different conditions of the people. To achieve equality, it is necessary to recognize all cultural groups and grant them equal civil rights. It also meant that they get proper representation. She considers special facilities to exploited classes as well. She believes that by doing so the exploited classes could be linked to the mainstream. But Iris Young also is criticized as she could not properly define what the minority and exploited classes are.

Despite the concept of common rights of citizenship, still several groups (such as blacks, women, indigenous peoples, ethnic and religious minorities, gays and lesbians) feel themselves marginalized, stigmatized or insulted. Many members of these groups do not feel themselves marginalized because of socio-economic status, but they feel themselves marginalized because of being different from others, in other words because their own socio-cultural recognition. They allege that basically the equal rights of citizenship have been defined considering whites, heterosexual, able-bodied men. These rights cannot address the necessities of other groups. Therefore, these groups have some different demands. According to this viewpoint, members of certain groups are not only

⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 40.

⁵⁰ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 141.

⁵¹ Young, Iris Marion. “Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship,” *Ethics*, 99/2. p. 257.

⁵² Ibid. p. 259.

as individuals, but they will be included by the community in the political community too. As well, the right of these people will be dependent on the membership of group. These people reject this opinion that there should be a common national culture and we accept that the best method to include for common welfare is to adopt rights of differentiated citizenship.

On the account of the above description of the concept of liberal multiculturalism, it is apparent that in liberal multiculturalism, individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community. Will Kymlicka believed that "a healthy community maintains a balance between individual choice and protection of the communal way of life, and seeks to limit the extent to which the former can erode the latter."⁵³ Liberal multiculturalism accepts the theory of intellectual parallelism between different ethnic communities. According to this, some cultures do not have the expected development; because of this, there is no defect in the values of those cultures. Rather, the reason is that the people of those cultures and related communities could not get the opportunity of equal participation in educational and economic activities in the public sector. In liberal multiculturalism, while acknowledging the diversity of different cultures, the arguments were given to provide the universal equality rights to the citizens of all cultures. But many thinkers say against it, according to them, liberal multiculturalism gives importance to freedom in its traditional form, but it remains unable to establish the principle of equal freedom. The main criticism of liberal multiculturalism is on the basis that by this, indirectly, western cultural values and American culture were better accepted than other cultures.

Part - II

Communitarian Multiculturalism:

Multiculturalism is generally quoted as a form of communitarianism. As such, "multiculturalism is rooted in an essentially communitarian view of human nature, which

⁵³ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 337.

emphasizes that people cannot be understood ‘outside’ society but are intrinsically shaped by the social, cultural and other context within which they live and develop.”⁵⁴ In the contrary of liberal multiculturalism, communitarian multiculturalism emphasizes the primacy of the group or community rather than each individual person. According to them, individuals are the product of social practices. For them the interests of communities is higher than the interests of any other:

From the metaphysical claim about the constitution of the self, and out of concern for the dignity and well-being of the *individual* selves that are so constituted, communitarians infer the practical imperative to sustain and protect constitutive communities such as families, religions, the nation, and the variety of civic associations that give human life substance and depth.⁵⁵

Multiculturalism proposes to study communitarian cultures in terms of civil and democratic rights, property and inheritance, marriage and settlement, and above all citizenship so that people belonging to each cultural community could be recognized as valid participants in the civil society. The existence of community is central to the discourse of culture. Plurality implies communitarian life in society. Here, the question arises – what are the claims made by Communitarians for equal rights and how do they view multiculturalism? In communitarian multiculturalism, individual’s rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community:

Communitarians view multiculturalism as an appropriate way of protecting communities from the eroding effects of individual autonomy, and of affirming the value of community. Ethno cultural minorities in particular are worthy of such protection, partly because they are most at risk, but also because they still have a communal way of life to be protected.⁵⁶

Multiculturalism accepts cultural diversities on the basis of equality for the purpose of establishing social justice. Culture is a system of achieving prescribed goals by coordinating the person’s life value and way of life. Different goals are prescribed by

⁵⁴ Robson, Richard. 2014. “In What Sense is Multiculturalism a Form of Communitarianism?,” <http://www.RICHARD-ROBSON/Ideologies/multiculturalism/In-What-Sense-is-Multiculturalism-a-Form-of-Communitarianism?co.uk/?p=142>, retrieved on 01/12/2016.

⁵⁵ Berkowitz, Peter. “Communitarian Criticisms and Liberal Lessons.” Review of Communitarianism and Its Critics, by Daniel A. Bell, Looking Backward, by Derek Phillips, and Liberals and Communitarians, by Stephen Mulhall and Adam Swift, *The Responsive Community*. p. 59.

⁵⁶ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 337.

different communities in different ways. The way of life of different cultural communities also varies. The multicultural society recognizes different cultures and thus diversity becomes a major feature of this society. In such a society, the importance of identity is increased automatically as without recognizing the real identity of different cultural communities they cannot be assured in terms of security.

Multiculturalism accepts the integrity in diversities as a concept. It also believes that accepting the presence of minority cultures by the majority cultural communities is not enough. At the same time, it is also very important that the equalities of these cultures are also secured in the public domain. Every citizen has the right to equality in democracy, so the practice of equality is not a special feature. Multiculturalism represents the special right through which the 'rights and identity' of the cultural community is recognized. The concept of multiculturalism demands from the social system about the solution for the identity crisis. It proposes an understanding under which person's identity must be recognized on the basis of his community and the identity of community should be based on the culture. The multiculturalists argue that if identity is based on the recognition is preserved then democracy will be functioning smoothly as in such a situation it will get the support of both the majority and the minority communities.⁵⁷ Thus, multiculturalism is a political, social, and cultural movement under which social structures maintain different cultures in a society.⁵⁸

Charles Taylor has offered an alternative theory in his "The Politics of Recognition" by rejecting as "inadequate the liberal theory of multiculturalism".⁵⁹ In Taylor's view, liberal multiculturalism is "incapable of giving culture the recognition it requires.... The liberal ideal of public neutrality is inapplicable in culturally diverse societies and should be replaced with the idea of equal worth of cultures."⁶⁰ According to Taylor, values are important in the individual's cultural rights. He does not accept the existence of a person outside the community. Taylor supports holding of cultural values

⁵⁷ Mahajan, Gurpreet. *The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy*. p. 15.

⁵⁸ Willet, G. *Theorizing Multiculturalism: A Guide to Current Debate*. p. 1

⁵⁹ Nicholson, Linda. "To Be or Not To Be: Charles Taylor and the Politics of Recognition," *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory*. Vol. 3, Issue 1. p. 3.

⁶⁰ Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition," *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. p. 61.

and rejects the concept of universalism occupied by present political thoughts. He clarifies, “liberalism emphasizes on sameness, viewing individuals as bearers of rights and possessors of dignity as equal citizens, but cultural groups desire recognition of their distinctness and not sameness.”⁶¹

Taylor does not accept the concept that the only basis for evaluating any individual’s work is the amount of benefit he receives from that work. Every culture has a natural value which we cannot deny. Cultural values cannot be subjected to individualistic values. The person receives membership from the cultural community only by birth. His membership is natural without being mechanical. Therefore, membership of the cultural community is not a subject of voluntary selection. Each culture has its own traditional values, which it receives in the order of a long growth. Therefore, it is not fair to evaluate cultural values on the basis of individual values. In this context, Taylor has rejected the policy of Kymlicka about securing the cultural diversities on the basis of differences.⁶² According to Taylor, these types of rights can be considered beneficial for the present communities, but communities, which would be organized in future, are not likely to get benefit from it. He rejects Kymlicka’s efforts “to develop a liberalism that might accommodate difference by granting individuals differentiated rights to enable them to pursue their particular ends”.⁶³ According to Taylor, this solution works only “for existing people who find themselves trapped within a culture under pressure, and can flourish within it or not at all. But it does justify measures designed to ensure survival through indefinite future generations.”⁶⁴

2.1 The Question of Identity

Identity is an important concept in this discussion. Rajeev Bhargava in his paper *The Multicultural Framework* while emphasizing the importance of identities in multicultural societies elaborates on the “need to have a stable identity, the contribution of cultural

⁶¹ Ramaswamy, Sushila. “The Incompleteness of the Multiculturalist Agenda: Overlooking the Need for a Shared Identity,” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 42, No. 37. p. 3792.

⁶² Taylor, Charles. “The Politics of Recognition.” p. 62.

⁶³ Ramaswamy, Sushila. “The Incompleteness of the Multiculturalist Agenda: Overlooking the Need for a Shared Identity.” p. 3792.

⁶⁴ Taylor, Charles. “The Politics of Recognition.” p. 62.

communities to the fulfillment of this need, the link between identity and recognition, the importance of cultural belonging and the desire to maintain difference.”⁶⁵ The person is a social being and his socialism inspires him to be organized as a community. It is true that no person can remain separate from the community. The identity of a person is established from his community. Therefore, it is necessary for development of a person that the community also develops continuously. But the community will only develop in real form when it is recognized in public domain. Each community wants its universal recognition and it wants this recognition with its traditions and community values. But an important fact with it is that the traditions and values of a community are different from other communities and due to these reasons identity crisis arises. When it comes to cultural communities, this problem becomes even more intense. Multiculturalists have stressed upon the spirit of community unity for its solution; and to establish this unity, diversities should get proper recognition from the society. Now the question arises, what is the nature of this identity? How can the state identify various cultures which maintain cohesion and unity between different cultural communities? In this regard, what kind of principles would be favourable to multiculturalism? In this discussion of cultural identity, eminent thinkers like Charles Taylor, Bhikhu Parekh and Will Kymlicka have presented important theories.

2.2 The Politics of Recognition

Charles Taylor has presented the concept of “the politics of recognition” in relation to these questions. It can be said that there was a change in the form of multiculturalism after the publication of John Rawls’ well known book, *A Theory of Justice*. Since then, a new kind of communitarian ideology emerged, which opposed all the principles of universality. It resulted into evaluating the multiculturalism to assess about what could its role to abolish cultural inequalities. Communitarians’ ideology has tried to inquire whether multiculturalism can be an appropriate philosophy to grant recognition to the identity.

⁶⁵ Bhargava, Rajeev. “The Multicultural Framework,” *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Ed. Kushal Deb. p. 77.

In Charles Taylor's essay, "The Politics of Recognition", Taylor mentions that there are two forms of recognition; "intimate recognition and public recognition."⁶⁶ He mainly propagates the idea of public recognition. "This form of recognition is about respect and esteem for one's identity in the public realm; being misrecognized in the public realm means to have one's identity disrespected in a way whereby one is treated as a second-class citizen."⁶⁷ According to Taylor, cultural communities need protection because these communities provide identity to their members. Political recognition of the cultural communities is essential. This identification makes the person active and gives perfection to his personality, but it is also important to keep in mind that the existence of the cultural community cannot just mean that the people of the community simply utilize the cultural sources. For this, it is necessary that the community should be growth oriented. It is the obligation of each and every community to set its values and beliefs as per the convenience of its members.⁶⁸ The political recognition of cultures is just not meant to protect the cultural rights of the person only. Its intention is collective cultural rights and collective welfare. Its purpose is to set a target of community development and community rights in the public regulations of the society. It is a community politics.

An identity whose existence is recognized or it can be said that who has demanded this recognition is an official recognition. The politics of recognition is very significant in context of cultures. Not giving recognition to someone is a moral evil in itself. Taylor says that misrecognition of a person or community may prove to be fatal for it. In his words:

Misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being. . . . misrecognition shows not just a lack of due respect. It can inflict a grievous wound, saddling its victims with a crippling self-hatred. Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition." p. 37.

⁶⁷ Rodrigues, Luis Cordeiro. "The Politics Of Recognition," *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. http://www.iep.utm.edu/multiculturalism/the_politics_of_recognition/, retrieved on 09/24/2015.

⁶⁸ Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition." p. 59.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 26.

Misrecognition provides false identity to a person or community. It is a kind of harassment and it prevents the person from its self. Occasionally, the person begins to think of himself as inferior due to misrecognition and due to it sometimes such situations arise when people hate themselves.⁷⁰

Clarifying the meaning of recognition Taylor states, recognition means that culture and community are to be protected and they may be considered capable and appropriate.⁷¹ But here the queries arise: Who will determine this qualification? How can the majority of communities be prevented from imposing their values on minorities? In reply to these queries it can be said that it can be prevented through political discussions between cultures. Some shared values can be established through inter-cultural discussions. The cultures get familiar with each other through such discussions, which gives them advantages in their development. By knowing the good and bad qualities of each other, they can make themselves more prosperous and strong. While adopting the principle of neutrality for the culture liberals say that the state has no culture at all. They believe that liberal states are neutral in the context of all the communities. But in reality, different types of cultures cannot exist due to such neutrality. If cultural equality is accepted at the place of cultural neutrality then it will be more useful for multicultural society.⁷² Taylor suggests that liberal democratic states need to be cautious in identifying cultures. Only those cultures should be accepted who recognize the diversities. As per his views the cultures which secure minimum rights and equality of their members' and fully committed to the independence of the persons are only entitled to be recognized. Taylor believes that liberal states should not recognize the cultures which do not confirm liberal moral beliefs and violate their moral boundaries.

Charles Taylor gives importance to the cultures on the basis of their life span. But at the same time, he also considers discussions and interactions among cultures as the basis of cultural cooperation and progress. His "politics of recognition" can be understood by linking it to the desire of cultural communities. It is for the minority

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 26.

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 61.

⁷² Ramaswamy, Sushila. "The Incompleteness of the Multiculturalist Agenda: Overlooking the Need for a Shared Identity." p. 3792.

cultural communities who want to maintain their cultural identity and also want the benefits of liberal values. We can see that Taylor's theory has given much emphasis on the historical existence of cultures. It automatically get clarifies when he talks of authoritative culture and long life span. But it is important to keep in mind that acknowledging authoritativeness can also be harmful. Granting special privileges to a community may also leads to discriminate between different forms of identity. If seen practically, we find that the theory of the social origin of the individual identity do not clarify the idea about which type of community this identity demands. Taylor agrees that culture of our ancestors must be protected.⁷³ But here the question arises that who will decide who their ancestors are? And what was their culture? As per Taylor's idea new members should also continue to be included in cultural communities.⁷⁴ It is clear that Taylor's concept of 'politics of recognition' creates a common cultural community. And in order to do so, this concept restricts the freedom of the people from which they form their identity.

While criticizing Taylor's concept of 'politics of recognition', many thinkers believe that the idea of discussion between cultures, offered by Taylor, is not useful for multiculturalism. According to them, 'the thought of interaction' may make cultural identity more conservative. Simultaneously, it is also difficult to expect shared values and means among the cultures. This may increase the possibility of imposing majority views and values on the minorities and in this way it will prove harmful to the existence and development of diversities. Taylor sees liberalism as a struggling concept, which means that the values of liberal culture are much better. Other cultures are expected to respect the values of liberals. Also, they are instructed that the ethical boundaries created by liberalism are never to be encroached. In one sense, it itself is the implantation of one culture on another culture. It is clear that the idea of diversity can also be suppressed by the setting the qualifications for cultures and doing so would be contrary to multiculturalism and pluralism.

⁷³ Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition." p. 58.

⁷⁴ Ibid. p. 63.

Multiculturalism believes that cultural diversities should always be accepted and it should be considered as a permanent and vital part of the society. Apart from Taylor, Will Kymlicka and Bhikhu Parekh have also given their views on the principle of conservation of these diversities. As far as the cultural recognition is concerned Bhikhu Parekh supports civic multiculturalism which accepts cultural equality of minority communities just like Taylor. Civic multiculturalism believes that the long availability of cultures and their long-standing existence cannot be recognized as the basis of identity. Accordingly, it is necessary for the cultures to keep their community members committed and at the same time it tries to maintain stability in their beliefs and values. Parekh is of the opinion that only giving protection to the cultures or giving them some community rights does not end the question of their justification and necessity. We cannot deny the likelihood that safe and available culture can also be considered as frivolous and incompetent. So, civic multiculturalists consider that cultures should be given equal status on the basis of their merits and needs.⁷⁵

Parekh acknowledges that the membership of his cultural community is mandatory for the meaningful life of an individual. But he also believes that culture is not the only solution. According to him, it is true that the cultural community and cultural identity give the person an opportunity to gain meaningful life, but possibility of this fact can also not be denied that these opportunities may be directed in many directions and they can be used in many ways.⁷⁶ Protecting a cultural community only for its traditions is not advisable. Its importance is to provide a lifestyle to members of the community so that they can collectively achieve their significant life. A cultural community cannot be followed only on the basis of its continuity, traditions, values, and beliefs, but it is to be relevant and competent to follow. It is not necessary that all the beliefs and features of a culture deserve to be protected. That is why this question becomes very important that which feature of the culture is to be protected and others not. According to Parekh, features of the culture need to be protected should be decided by mutual consultation of its members. This discussion should be directed by the concept of public culture and it

⁷⁵ Ramaswamy, Sushila. "The Incompleteness of the Multiculturalist Agenda: Overlooking the Need for a Shared Identity." p. 3793.

⁷⁶ Parekh, Bhikhu. "Discourses on National Identity," *Political Studies*. Vol. 42, No. 3. p. 504.

should be tried that universal values may be established through it. But mutual discussions of the members are a difficult desire because many communities do not take interest in verifying their beliefs through negotiations and the real problem arises only when mutual discussions does not establishes among the members.⁷⁷ In such situations proper verification of cultural beliefs and traditions becomes difficult. If different communities participate in the discussion and present themselves for the interaction then shared values can be set up through it.

Many thinkers criticized civic multiculturalism on the basis that it could not explain the problem of separatist cultures. The abandoned and expelled groups develop their own identity on the basis that they are different from others.⁷⁸ But critics say that civic multiculturalism does not have any proper solution for these types of communities.

Will Kymlicka adopts the theory of universal approach for cultural identity, which differs from the ideas of Charles Taylor and Bhikhu Parekh. The concept of universal citizenship was offered for the purpose of identifying the society. But Kymlicka opposes this concept by saying that it only attempts to establish psychological equality in society and the idea of diversities and multiplicity was completely rejected. Kymlicka alleges liberalism that it emphasizes on individual's liberty, but completely ignores community rights. Liberalism accepts that a person is completely independent to make his life better and make changes in it. But liberalism does not pay attention to the fact that a person can choose his best life, which depend on the extent of his access to his culture. Kymlicka clarifies:

In order to avoid assimilation, cultural membership must be maintained, since culture is the structure within which a person is able to live a good life...Cultural membership is so important, because it 'provides meaningful options' and also 'affects how others perceive and respond to us'. Moreover, culture as a source of identification, is more secure because it depends on 'belonging and not [on] achievement', and is directly related to our self-esteem and dignity.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Parekh, Bhikhu. "Cultural Pluralism and the Limits of Diversity," *Alternative: Global, Local, Political*, Vol. 20, No. 4. pp. 436-37.

⁷⁸ Glazer, Nathan. "Is Assimilation Dead," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 530, No. 1. p. 129.

⁷⁹ Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. p. 89.

So, it is essential for the individual to choose his goal independently, for which he should have access to his own culture as the person is created and developed by his own culture.

According to Kymlicka, the majority communities dominate in the liberal democratic states. Hence, if the minorities are also to be provided same autonomy and rights as the majority it essential to safeguard the culture of minority communities. For this, minorities should be provided certain special rights (such as territorial autonomy, veto powers, guaranteed representation in central institutions, land claims, and language rights etc.⁸⁰) in a just and fair manner. Kymlicka clarifies that by providing equal opportunities for autonomy and participation to minority communities not only benefits the minorities but also the entire society. It has a positive impact on the entire political and social system. Cultural diversities can be properly protected through minority rights. Kymlicka presents the concept of '*societal* culture'.⁸¹ He describes this as:

Societal culture is a culture which provides its members with meaningful ways of life across the full range of human activities, including social, educational, religious, recreational, and economic life, encompassing both public and private spheres. These cultures tend to be territorially concentrated, and based on a shared language...these '*societal* cultures' to emphasize that they involve not just shared memories or values, but also common institutions and practices.⁸²

According to him, a stable, appropriate and inclusive culture can only provide autonomy to its members. Kymlicka called these cultures as societal cultures.⁸³ He believes that societal cultures can only provide freedom of choice to members of their community. A societal culture which is liberal can only provide facilities to its member to take their decision independently and present their diversities. Such cultures do not impose restrictions on their members. Kymlicka is of the opinion that societal cultures have the ability to protect themselves from external harmful powers, but do not try to suppress their members' resistance.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Ibid. p. 109.

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 76.

⁸² Ibid. p. 76.

⁸³ Will, Kymlicka. *States, Nations and Cultures*. p. 43.

⁸⁴ Will, Kymlicka. *Politics in Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. p. 25.

The universal principle of cultural recognition presented by Kymlicka is objected due to its universality itself. Critics say that it categorizes the communities by splitting the rights of the community. This makes some communities important and some less important. While evaluating cultures, it identifies liberal values as standard and on that basis it considers those cultures comparatively lower, which are not liberal.⁸⁵ Thus, it goes against the concept of multiculturalism, because if liberalism is considered to be the only appropriate way of life, then the pluralistic concept will end automatically. Critics objected that Kymlicka do not give cultural rights to conservative cultural communities. According to them, Kymlicka's approach does not encourage liberal cultures to assess themselves and make changes, if needed.

The above discussion of the principles of cultural recognition clarifies that multiculturalism is surrounded by many problems related to recognition. It is not fully successful in procuring enough recognition to diversities and plurality. Therefore, for the success of multiculturalism, it is necessary that members of liberal and conservative cultures should be given equal opportunity to define their life. Cultural categorization of any kind should not be accepted. In such a system, multiculturalism can solve the problem of cultural identity.

Nancy Fraser, while interpreting the politics of recognition, has not considered it enough for real multiculturalism.⁸⁶ Nancy thinks that the question of cultural inequality cannot be solved only through 'recognition'. For this, it is essential that the 'redistribution' should also be combined with 'recognition'.⁸⁷ Both, recognition and redistribution can be reformist and transformative. Now it is essential to establish the real identity of those cultural communities which had so far been misidentified. According to Nancy, as long as the financial condition of minority groups does not improve, their cultural rights have no significance. Therefore, attempts can be made to remove cultural inequality with the combined effort of recognition and redistribution.

⁸⁵ Kukathas, Chandran. "Are There Any Cultural Rights?," *Political Theory*. Vol. 20. No. 1. p. 117.

⁸⁶ Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking Recognition," *New Left Review*-3. p. 113.

⁸⁷ Fraser, Nancy. "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation," *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. pp. 8-9.

Therefore, it cannot be denied that the politics of recognition is significant for the establishment and development of multiculturalism. Social commitments of cultural communities can be enhanced by providing them a reasonable position in the public domain. Recognition has a great role in securing equality of cultural communities and their existence. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to say that multiculturalism transformed itself into politics of recognition to enrich its subject matter. The question of the equality of cultures and cultural communities arises only after identifying cultural communities. Hence recognition and multiculturalism can be accepted as complementary to each other.

On the account of the above description of the concept of liberal and communitarian multiculturalism, it can be said that, there is no contradiction between individual liberty and social responsibility. Individual and community, both are equally important. We cannot say individual are more important than community or community is more important than individual. Of course, individually is very important to have some liberty, freedom, justice etc. but community is also very important for get these values. Here, I would like to mention the Kantian view about it. Kant's ethical theory is thus both individualistic and communitarian. According to Kant, "it is basically due to the faculty of reason that people are able to think as social beings, and not just as isolated individuals with their one-sided desires and goals. It is reason that, most plausibly, connects human beings with each other, and which turns a merely natural society of competing individuals in to a human community with common ground. An autonomous person thinks of himself or herself as a social being, not just as a solitary individual."⁸⁸ In this way, there is cultural lineage to normative discourses in liberalism and communitarianism. In liberalism, there is acceptance of freedom and recognition of the other at the level of individuals only whereas at level of multiculturalism, individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community and in this way multiculturalism also includes communitarian approach.

⁸⁸ Bramann, Jorn K. "Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason," *Educating Rita and Other Philosophical Movies*. <http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>, retrieved on 10/5/2015.

Part – III

Feminist Critique of Multiculturalism

The concepts of multiculturalism and feminism, both, appears to have been emerged as a result of reaction to liberalism. Multiculturalism focuses on equality and justice among the dominant and subordinate communities, residing within a nation or the whole world whereas feminism focuses on equality and justice within the dominant and subordinate cultural communities. Feminism primarily focuses on diversity and equality within a group and multiculturalism stresses that there should be equality between different groups, residing in a nation. Multiculturalism and feminism both have supported differentiated or dual citizenship in response to the liberal's concept of equal citizenship.

Feminist thinkers try to publicize the inefficiency of multiculturalism through their criticism. According to feminism, central concern of justice is gender injustice and not cultural injustice. Some feminist believes that women are most disadvantaged section in every society. Both minority group and majority group discriminate with women. But multiculturalism treats these issues non-seriously.

Feminism is a subject of social justice, so feminist opinions explain the relationship of social justice with multiculturalism. Contemporary feminist theory is full of diversity, not only with the views of its subject matter, but it is also from the point of view of their conclusions. Alison Jaggar says that “a commitment to eliminating the subordination of women unifies the diverse strands of feminist theory. But this agreement soon dissolves into radically different accounts of that subordination, and of the measures required to eliminate it.”⁸⁹

Contemporary political theory broadly adopts the basis of equality. It accepts the belief that all people are to be treated equally. Most effective political opinions so far have either endorsed gender discrimination or have approved it in some form. Presently, the conventional idea of gender discrimination has been side-lined. According to feminists the principles which are based on the experiences and interests of men do not

⁸⁹ Jaggar, Alison. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. p. 5.

understand or recognize the needs and experiences of women. Three arguments can be considered in this context⁹⁰—

- 1) Sexual equality and sexual discrimination
- 2) The public and the private
- 3) An ethic of care

First two arguments claim that the very important aspect of the liberal-democratic concept of justice is that it is completely male-biased. Whereas, the third argument claims that putting too much emphasis on the justice is itself appears to be male-bias. Therefore, any theory, which takes care of the concerns of women's interests, will give importance to their 'care'.⁹¹ These three arguments present three valid points as a link between feminism and the mainstream of political philosophy.

3.1 Sexual Equality and Sexual Discrimination

The first argument highlights the gender-neutral details in respect of gender discrimination. Most of the male-theorists have recognized the argument that as per their nature itself women are not fit for political and economic activities, outside their home. On this basis, they try to justify the restrictions imposed on the social and political rights of women. In this context, Susan Okin writes:

. . . until well into this century, most male theorists on all points of the political spectrum accepted the belief that there was a 'foundation in nature' for the confinement of women to the family, and for the 'legal and customary subjection of women to their husbands' within the family.⁹²

But attempts have been made by the contemporary theorists to abandon the concept of women's natural inferiority, gradually. Most of the theorists have now started relying that women are also free and equal like men. Women can take their own decisions as they have the capability to develop the understanding of justice. On this basis it is now

⁹⁰ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 378.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Okin, Susan Moller. *Women in Western Political Thought*. p. 200.

believed that women should also be considered independent to enter the public domain. Gradually, liberal democracies have also adopted anti-discrimination laws to prevent discrimination against women. Its basic purpose is to grant fair and equal opportunities to women in the fields of education, employment, business, social, and political positions etc. But, in reality, these anti-discrimination laws have not yet accomplished the goal of gender equality. Catharine A. MacKinnon argues that:

Sex equality law has been utterly ineffective at getting women what we need and are socially prevented from having on the basis of a condition of birth: a chance at productive lives of reasonable physical security, self-expression, individuation, and minimal respect and dignity.⁹³

According to MacKinnon, gender discrimination can be clearly seen when a woman is refused for a job, despite any logical link with gender. According to MacKinnon, this is the ‘difference approach’ to gender discrimination. It causes is practicing of discriminatory behaviour.⁹⁴ This discrimination cannot be justified on the basis of gender differences.

Generally, the goal of laws for gender equality is to establish a society where no discrimination is made on the basis of a person’s sexuality. But it must also accept the legitimate examples of different behaviour on the basis of sex, such as different restrooms, sports etc. People who support the ‘difference approach’ believe that cases of legal differences are very rare whereas lots of cases are of arbitrary differences. The ‘difference approach’ ethically emphasizes that whatever things are available to men, essentially women should also have access to those things.⁹⁵ According to MacKinnon,

Grant women access to what men have access to’, and it has indeed ‘gotten women some access to employment and education, the public pursuits, including academic, professional, and blue-collar work, the military, and more than nominal access to athletics’.⁹⁶

To grab the social benefits, the difference approach has created a situation in which social neutrality is established in relation with gender.

⁹³ MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. p. 32.

⁹⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 381.

⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 379.

⁹⁶ MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. p. 33.

Unfortunately, this idea did not succeed. Although being gender neutral, roles are elaborated and described to be more favourable to men. Difference approach acknowledges the argument that gender condition should not be imposed for awarding jobs to the people. But it ignores the fact that in most of the jobs such conditions are kept in which the men are in a better position. According to MacKinnon, “that day one of taking gender into account was the day the job was structured with the expectation that its occupant would have no child care responsibilities.”⁹⁷ It is a fact that the rules related to a particular weight and length in police, army etc. are not suitable for women.

In our society, it is expected from women only to take care of the children. From very beginning itself women could not become part of operation of the society for being engaged in the care of children and family. Consequently, men captured on the major and main positions of society. Gradually, women became financially dependent on men. Women work at home, without any salary. Accordingly, they depend on men for everything. According to the difference approach, getting freedom from child care is a relevant qualification, so stressing on it cannot be considered as being discriminatory.⁹⁸ It is a different matter that it harms the women as much as it might be:

Indeed, the difference approach sees the concern with childcare responsibilities, rather than irrelevant criteria like gender, as evidence that sex discrimination has been eliminated. It cannot see that the relevance of childcare responsibilities is itself a profound source of sexual inequality, one that has arisen from the way men have historically structured jobs to suit their interests.⁹⁹

Basically, the subordination of women is not only the matter of irrational differentiation on the basis of gender. Actually, it is mainly a matter of male-dominance. Due to this, the difference in gender gap plays an important role in distributing social roles and women are kept in an organized disadvantage position. To overcome this problem, dominance approach of gender equality has been presented by MacKinnon. MacKinnon purposes the “dominance approach to sex equality, which aims to ensure that gender differences are not a source of disadvantage.”¹⁰⁰ According to the

⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 37.

⁹⁸ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 381.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. p. 42.

difference approach, if there is a reasonable difference between the male and the female then only the situation of sexual inequality can be accepted. On the other hand, the dominance approach says that gender disparities can never be claimed due to gender differences.¹⁰¹ Also, on the basis of gender differences, the idea of male-dominance cannot be accepted in any circumstances. Therefore, gender differences should not be used to justify gender inequality or male-dominance.

Since the problem here is dominance or supremacy, so it cannot be solved only by non-discrimination. Availability of power is essential to solve it. To maintain equality, it is necessary that women get equal opportunities to achieve the roles defined by men. Also, the women should have the power to define roles for themselves. They should have the power to form such gender free roles, in which men and women get equal advantage to achieve them. Elizabeth Gross argues that women should be free to redefine their social roles. Gross argues that “since women must be free to redefine social role, their aims are best describe as a politics of ‘autonomy’ rather than a politics of equality”¹⁰²:

Autonomy implies the right to see oneself in whatever terms one choose—which may imply an integration or alliance with other groups and individuals or may not. Equality, on the other hand, implies a measurement according to a given standard. Equality is the equivalence of two (or more) terms, one of which takes the role of norm or model in unquestionable ways. Autonomy, by contrast, implies the right to accept or reject such norms or standards according to their appropriateness to one’s self definition. Struggle for equality...imply an acceptance of given standards and a conformity to their expectations and requirements. Struggles for autonomy, on the other hand, imply the right to reject such standards and create new ones.¹⁰³

Gross believes that gender equality should generally be understood only in the context of ending arbitrary discrimination. It is a fact that, the ‘dominance approach’ is also an interpretation of equality. If it is accepted properly, autonomy no longer remains as competitive value, but it becomes the most successful segment of theory of gender-

¹⁰¹ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 383.

¹⁰² Gross, Elizabeth. ‘What is Feminist Theory?’, *Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory*. Eds. Carole Pateman and E. Gross. p. 193

¹⁰³ Ibid.

equality. In a broad view, equality also means that the persons should have equal values as the human beings.

Similar to the mainstream theorists, the main focus of the ‘dominance approach’ is equality. It is also committed to equality. In MacKinnon views, ideologically, the dominance approach takes us much beyond the basic principles of liberalism.¹⁰⁴ Liberal theorists have historically accepted the difference approach to gender equality and for that reason they did not abruptly criticized the status of women’s subordination.

Indeed, the disjunction between the difference approach and liberal principles seems obvious. Liberalism’s commitment to autonomy and equal opportunity, and to an ambition-sensitive, endowment-insensitive distribution of resources, would seem to rule out traditional gender divisions.¹⁰⁵

It seems that liberalism rejects the conventional genders division. Rawls also does not say anything about it. Thus, the ‘dominance approach’ can also demand from the liberals to leave their traditional beliefs about the relationship between “public and private” and “justice and care,” or re-express their beliefs and review it appropriately.¹⁰⁶

3.2 The Public and the Private

The second argument highlights the public-private distinction. It can be seen in the present scenario that contemporary theorists have refused to accept the fact that only men have the ability and competence to work in the public domain. Now the fact of gender equality has been accepted in some form. But, in reality, this equality is still applied to relationships outside the family. Even now, male theorists of justice by not accepting the importance of relationships within the family continued to ignore them. As in past, it is still basically seen as a natural sphere. Even today, the meaning of family is understood to be a traditional family, whose leader is definitely a man. It is believed that the role of the women in a family is only continued to produce children and work at home without any wages.

¹⁰⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 384.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* p. 385.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

It is generally observed that employed women have also to work at home. Because of this, most of the women have to satisfy with low paid part time jobs. Even today, women have to choose between family and career in our society. But men do not have to face any such problems. In this context, Mill argues that:

Like a man when he chooses a profession, so, when a woman marries, it may in general be understood that she makes choice of the management of a household, and the bringing up of a family, as the first call upon her exertions . . . and that she renounces, not all other objects and occupations, but all which are not consistent with the requirements of this.¹⁰⁷

Mill's claim that "a woman who enters a marriage accepts a full-time occupation, just like a man entering a profession, is strikingly unfair."¹⁰⁸ Men also get married - then why should there be different consequences for women and men in marriage? It is very important to take care of this fact that the desire to be a part of a family should not interfere in anybody's career, whether it is a man or a woman and if such a situation arises which affects the career of the people, then this affect must definitely be equally for both men and women.

Another question arises that what is reason for ignoring the issue of giving more public recognition to domestic labour. Basically, domestic labour means women's works and in this male-dominated society, considering domestic work in the house is widely associated with the tendency to treat women's work less important. Due to this reason women's work or domestic labour is not given any attention and they are denied public recognition. Therefore, to enhance respect for women, firstly it is essential to give respect to their contribution in the family. Okin writes:

The family is at the centre of both the cultural devaluation and economic dependence which attach women's traditional roles. And the predictable result is that men have unequal power in most marriages, power which is exercised in decisions concerning work, leisure, sex, consumption, etc., and which is also exercised, in a significant minority of marriages, in acts or threats of domestic violence.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Donner, Wendy. "John Stuart Mill's Liberal Feminism," *Philosophical Studies*, 69. p. 159.

¹⁰⁸ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 387

¹⁰⁹ Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. p. 129.

Thus the family should be considered as the main centre of struggle for gender equality. Feminists argue, if gender equality is to be established, this struggle must definitely be taken beyond the public discrimination. At the same time, it is also essential that it should be taken up to the devaluation of women in domestic work and private sphere. If it is to face the injustice done in the private areas, firstly it is essential to make a substantial change in family life and for this many changes are needed in the principles of justice.¹¹⁰ Feminists see gender discrimination, in family, as a cheating with liberal autonomy and equal opportunity. Whereas we see that Liberals are clearly committed to public and private divisions. Therefore, it can be said that the liberals must definitely make it clear that they should either leave the idea of gender equality or leave their commitment to public and private divisions.¹¹¹ Liberals have to leave any of these ideas.

There are two different conceptions of the public-private distinction in liberalism¹¹² –

- A) The distinction between the political and the social (state and civil society),
- B) The distinction between the social and the personal (the right to privacy)

A) State and civil society:

First type of public-private division of liberalism is linked to relationship between civil society and state. It one side connects the public to the state, on other side a private to the civil society. Due to this reason we can also call it a state-society division. Society is glorified in liberalism. “Since it supposes that the private associations which individuals freely form and maintain in civil society are more meaningful and satisfying than the coerced unity of political association.”¹¹³

Question arises that in the state-society division where does the place of family exist. If seen naturally, the place of family exists in the private sphere of the civil society, as the family is unit of companions which is formed freely. In this regard, most of the feminists believe that the descriptions given by the liberals about social sphere is seems that it involves only adults. Also, it ignores the works being done by women within the

¹¹⁰ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 388.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Wolin, Sheldon. *Politics and Vision*. p.363.

family. Therefore, it can be said that the description of state-society given by the liberals mainly signifies the details of division of male's domain. As per this description women are considered to be naturally associated with the domestic area.

The biggest protest of the feminists is that the liberals who opposed the ascriptive hierarchy in the field of science, religion, culture etc. did not do so in domestic area? Why did not they show interest in opposing hierarchy in the domestic area? To answer these questions, theoretically, liberals have resorted to the plea that domestic roles are fixed 'naturally' and 'biologically'. Male theorists have accepted that "the confinement of women to the [domestic] sphere is justified by reference to women's particularistic, emotional, non-universal nature. Since she knows only the bonds of love and friendship, she will be a dangerous person in political life, prepared, perhaps, to sacrifice the wider public interest to some personal tie or private preference."¹¹⁴ This argument of liberals was an assumption that was based on claims of inferiority of women or based on recent claims of sentimental family.¹¹⁵ According to Okin, "the ideology of sentimental family says that the sentimental tie which naturally arises between mother and child is incompatible with the character traits needed for social or political life".¹¹⁶ On this basis, liberals have admitted the piercing division between the domestic sphere of women and public sphere of men. Non-liberals have adopted this division due to ratification of natural roles of women. Liberals have also made piercing division in recognition of this cause.

Liberalism and feminism have both agreed on the point that it is essential for the development of individuals to choose their priorities and create goals independently, without any obligation. But tendency to accept it differs in both of them. Liberals say that the situation of oppression can be resolved by the protection of individual rights and distributive justice. While feminists say that active policies of the state are needed to overcome the negative stereotype image of women in areas of schools, media, advertising etc. During past several years liberalism has initially created a second division, which is

¹¹⁴ Kennedy, Ellen, and Mendus, Susan. *Women in Western Political Philosophy*. p.10.

¹¹⁵ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 389.

¹¹⁶ Okin, Susan. "Women and the Making of the Sentimental Family," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 11/1. p. 68.

also linked as supplementary in the public-private division.¹¹⁷ This division separates the individual from public.

B) The personal and the social: the right to privacy:

It can be said that this second division occurred due to resistance of liberals. This division occurred between Romantics instead of liberals. According to Romantics, personality was threatened not only by political repression but also by universal pressures of social expectations. According to romantics, ‘private’ means: “detachment from mundane existence, [and] is associated with self-development, self-expression, and artistic creation.”¹¹⁸ Romantics attempted to incorporate social life into the public domain and reason given for it was that despite the bond of civil society being non-political, people still depend on others’ decisions. Romantics claim that social life has also many expectations and restrictions, like political life. In fact, the most relevant work of modern privacy is to protect people’s close relations.¹¹⁹

Modern liberals have presented a new idea while accepting the concept of Romantics. They have tried that the emphasis on social pressures given by the romantic approach be combined with the emphasis on social independence given by classical liberals. Accordingly, we can see that today modern liberalism is not only related to the security of the private sphere of social life, rather, it is also related to create an area at personal level where individuals can get their privacy comfortably.¹²⁰ “Private life, for liberals, now means both active involvement in the institutions of civil society, as classical liberals emphasized, and personal retreat from that ordered social life, as Romantics emphasized.”¹²¹

Similar to the first division, this split has also been criticized by the Feminists. Supreme Court of United States interpreted that any kind of interference in family matter is a violation of privacy. However, this decision turns out to be against the rights of

¹¹⁷ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 393.

¹¹⁸ Rosenblum, Nancy. *Another Liberalism: Romanticism and the Reconstruction of Liberal Thought*. p. 59.

¹¹⁹ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 394.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.* p. 393.

¹²¹ *Ibid.* p. 395.

women. According to MacKinnon, “the right to privacy reinforces the division between public and private that . . . keeps the private beyond public redress and depoliticizes women’s subjection within it.”¹²² Indeed, she says that, “the doctrine of privacy has become the triumph of the state’s abdication of women.”¹²³

Therefore, it cannot be denied that this division encourages the opinion to keep family out of the preview of public justice and for this reason women cannot claim their privacy within the family. Hence, to achieve the right kind of privacy for women, it becomes necessary that the right to privacy is not implemented in the collective units of the family only; rather women should also be given the right to privacy. However, there are many such cases where the courts have fully supported the private privacy of women within the family. In 1960s, the principle of family autonomy was challenged by many theories and rules. Many people have admitted that the family itself is an institution from which they should have privacy. But in reality, women have not yet got their privacy. It is very important to take care of certain things to abolish gender inequality, like - What is the status of women in the public world as well as in the domestic world? What impact does the family and organizations have on the lives of women? How to give real privacy to women?¹²⁴ The theoreticians of justice need to consider these issues. It is due to the reason that the gender-related roles do not only conflict with public ideals of equal rights and resources, rather they conflict with the liberal’s view about circumstances of private life and values.

3.3 An Ethic of Care

As it is clear that public and domestic spheres have been differentiated due to traditional patriarchal ideas and after this differentiation, women have been deported to the domestic sphere. As a result of the differentiation in the public-domestic spheres, it began to accept that men and women have different kinds of thoughts and emotions. If the entire history of western philosophy is seen, we find that most political theorists have clearly admitted that different thoughts and emotions are found in men and women. According to them,

¹²² MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. p. 102.

¹²³ MacKinnon, Catherine. “Reflection on Sex Equality under the Law,” *Yale Law Journal*, 100. p. 1311.

¹²⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 396.

women have instinctive emotionalism, kindness, love, and many particularistic qualities which are necessary for family life. These theoreticians distinguish between these qualities of women and rational, unbiased and dispassionate qualities of men, which are being considered essential for the public life.¹²⁵ According to them,

Morality is fragmented into a 'division of moral labour' along the lines of gender The tasks of governing, regulating social order, and managing other 'public' institutions have been monopolized by men as their privileged domain, and the tasks of sustaining privatized personal relationship have been imposed on, or left to, women. Justice and rights have structured male norms, values, and virtues, while care and responsiveness have defined female moral norms, values, and virtues.¹²⁶

Therefore, the specific and particularistic qualities found in women are considered essential for family life. Simultaneously, it is believed that these qualities are sufficient only for domestic realm as these qualities subversive the fair-justice necessary for public life. On this basis it was being accepted that for efficiency of public domain, it is necessary to keep women outside its perimeter. In reality, this protest has been used to justify patriarchy.¹²⁷ Mary Wollstonecraft argued that:

Women's particularistic emotional nature was simply the result of the fact that women were denied the opportunity to fully develop their rational capacities. If women thought only of the needs of the people around them, ignoring the needs of the general public, it was because they were forcibly prevented from accepting public responsibilities.¹²⁸

Some feminists argue that women's attitudes are rational and they have the ability to play a key role in the public domain. They claim that the particularistic thoughts used by women are morally better than the impartial thoughts used by men in the public domain. On this basis, they advocate that it is essential to remove the traditional public-domestic paradox for gender equality.

¹²⁵ Ibid. p. 399.

¹²⁶ Friedman, Marilyn. "Beyond Caring: The De-moralization of Gender," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, supplementary vol. p. 94.

¹²⁷ Pateman, Carole. "Sublimation and Reification: Locke, Wolin and the Liberal Democratic Conception of the Political," *Politics and Society*, 5/4. p. 454.

¹²⁸ Pateman, Carole. "'The Disorder of Women': Women, Love and the Sense of Justice," *Ethics*, 91/1. p. 31.

In a broad view, the studies made by Gilligan about the moral development of women have only led to the renewal of women's ethical rational methods of feminist interests. Gilligan says that the moral sensitivities of men and women have a tendency to develop in different ways. According to her, women have a tendency to argue in a 'different voice'. Gilligan writes:

In this conception, the moral problem arises from conflicting responsibilities rather than from competing rights, and requires for its resolution a mode of thinking that is contextual and narrative rather than formal and abstract. This conception of morality as concerned with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships, just as the conception of morality as fairness ties moral development to the understanding of rights and rules.¹²⁹

However, it is disputed whether the existence of these different voices can be accepted in reality? And if it is accepted, will it be presumed that these voices are attached to the gender? In this regard, some people say that there are two different moral voices related to care and justice and tendency to use these voices is found equally in both the man and the woman. Also, some people argue that when men and women generally speak in different voices; at the same time, it obscures the similarities located in their origin.¹³⁰

“Whatever the empirical findings about gender differences, there remains the philosophical question of whether we can identify a care-based approach to political questions that competes with justice, and if there is, whether it is a superior approach.”¹³¹ As per the feminists approach the initial development of care ethics has been made in the context to private relations, but the perimeter of care ethics is not limited to it, it also has public importance. Therefore, it is necessary to understand its significance and develop it up to public affairs.

¹²⁹ Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. p. 19.

¹³⁰ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 400.

¹³¹ Ibid.

3.4 Okin's Critique of Multiculturalism

It is evident from the above three arguments that which types of issues feminist discussions are related to and what are the problems and paradoxes in front of these issues in political philosophy. Through the discussion of these arguments, we get the background by which relationships between feminism and multiculturalism can be explained. Controversial situation has long been concerned about the relationship between multiculturalism and feminism. Feminist thinkers believe that multiculturalism and feminism are contradictory to each other, because of this; stressful conditions are found in them. In support of feminism, the concept of multiculturalism has been mainly opposed by Susan Okin. Okin defines feminism as:

The belief that women should not be discriminated against because of their gender; recognition of their human dignity... and similarly to the rights enjoyed by men, the recognition of a woman's right to enjoy the opportunity to have a satisfying life in accordance with her free and deliberate choice.¹³²

Okin discusses multiculturalism in a different context, such as; social, economic and political context, "...largely ignores various groups such as women, members of non-white racial groups, homosexuals...or ethnic and religious groups."¹³³ She accepts, "there is tension between feminism and multiculturalism",¹³⁴ but then maintains, "multiculturalism also contains aspects that do not contradict feminist ideology and goals."¹³⁵ She, further, continues,

...doubts about the opinions of those who hold that there cannot be any conflict between the goals of feminism and multiculturalism", claiming that "it is highly probable that there will be a conflict between feminist demands and fulfillment of rights of cultural minorities."¹³⁶

Okin has criticized multiculturalism on the basis that it strongly emphasizes the uniformity of a culture and its historical traditions. Multiculturalism not only recognizes the existence of different cultures under a national state, but also advocates for treating

¹³² Okin, Susan Moller Okin. "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Eds. Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard and Martha C. Nussbaum. p. 10.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid. p. 11.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

them equally. It also focuses on equality among different communities. Multiculturalism supports for providing minority cultural rights to minority cultural communities so as to protect their culture. According to multiculturalism, each cultural community is completely independent in respect for its internal affairs. Cultural communities follow some traditional influences on the name of cultural customs, which can never be accepted under a liberal state. For instance,

...in the case of immigrant Muslim communities, the prevalent practices of female and male circumcision have come to be seen as a sign of their difference. Votaries of multiculturalism invariably defend these practices as being an integral part of the creation of a community identity”¹³⁷, or “as voluntary actions of individuals belonging to a community.”¹³⁸

In view of the feminists no culture is completely closed, rather it changes regularly as per the need of time due to result of different opinions and mutual struggles. However, multiculturalism does not give significance to any such cultural changes.

Okin says that multiculturalists have given a lot of emphasis on culture, community and minority rights and in doing so; he totally disregards the discussion of gender discrimination. Okin believes that most of cultures are male dominated and men's dominance over women remains. According to Okin,

Most cultures are patriarchal . . .and many (though not all) of the cultural minorities that claim group rights are more patriarchal than the surrounding cultures. So it is no surprise that the cultural importance of maintaining control over women shouts out at us in the examples given in the literature on cultural diversity and group rights within liberal states.¹³⁹

Or, more simply,

“[m]ost cultures have as one of their principal aims the control of women by men”.¹⁴⁰

Therefore, according to Okin, the status of women in each community is of lower-level. In the private realm, women spend their lives subjected to men. Okin has the opinion that multiculturalism does not make any effort to strengthen the status of women.

¹³⁷ Gilman, Sandra. “Barbaric Rituals,” *Boston Review*. pp. 33-34.

¹³⁸ Parekh, Bhikhu. “Equality in Multicultural Society,” *Equality*. Ed. Jane Franklin. p. 139.

¹³⁹ Okin, Susan Moller. “Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?” p. 17.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.* p. 13.

There is no change in the situation of women with differentiated rights or minority rights supported by them and their position still remains on the margins. Multiculturalism does not bring forward issues related to injustice in private realm. Therefore, Okin supports women's equality and rights in public realm as well as in private realm. She asserts,

The subjugation of women, by men or by cultures, is wrong. Liberal democracies should protect the individual rights of all women within their borders, including women whose cultures and religions sanction practices that deny women's fundamental rights. A culture or religion that deprives women of human dignity is not worthy of preservation.¹⁴¹

'Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?', 'Feminism and Multiculturalism: Some Tensions' and 'Mistresses of Their Own Destiny: Group Rights, Gender, and Realistic Rights of Exit' - Okin has explained the situation of tension and dispute between multiculturalism and feminism, primarily in these three articles. In her first objection against multiculturalism, Okin opposes the grant of any special rights to patriarchic minority groups. She believes that giving special minority rights to such 'hazardous' patriarchic minority groups is to ruin the struggles that have been done by feminists. According to Okin, due to such special minority rights, the fight for equality of feminists will go back to its first stage.

Okin also criticized the theory of Kymlicka on the basis of that he advocate for minority rights so loudly, but do not pay any attention to the issue of gender equality. Here, Kymlicka clarifies that by providing special group rights to minority communities not only benefits the minorities but also the entire society. But, if, like Okin claims "most cultures are patriarchal, [...], and many (though not all) of the cultural minorities that claim group rights are more patriarchal than the surrounding cultures",¹⁴² "then granting them group rights might not be such a good idea after all: she states that by doing this, the level of gender inequality might actually rise in liberal societies, since giving more

¹⁴¹ Ibid. p. 26.

¹⁴² Ibid. p. 17.

autonomy to patriarchal groups will only strengthen male domination over women.”¹⁴³

This is Okin’s first claim.

In relation to this criticism, Kymlicka says that, “multicultural liberalists should distinguish the ‘bad’ minority rights that involve restricting individual rights from the ‘good’ minority rights that can be seen as supplementing individual rights.”¹⁴⁴ Because of this reason, “he distinguishes internal restrictions and external protections when it comes to group rights: the first are about ‘intra-group relations’ and arise when group members use their rights to oppress other members, the latter involve ‘inter-group relations’ and are needed so that minority groups can survive.”¹⁴⁵

Kymlicka clearly states that “liberalism should not support group rights that are made out of internal restrictions, since liberalism, in the end, is all about the value of liberty.”¹⁴⁶ Therefore, it is clear that Kymlicka himself opposes any kind of oppression in the community and does not support any such rights that are made out of internal restrictions.

But in reply to this response of Kymlicka, Okin says that the logic given by Kymlicka regarding sex discrimination and oppression in private sphere is not relevant anywhere. This is Okin’s second claim. Okin writes: “But what he fails to acknowledge,...is that sex discrimination and oppression are often at work behind closed doors, in the private sphere. This is something that Kymlicka’s liberalism won’t be able to tackle, since it still adheres to the private/public dichotomy.”¹⁴⁷

Okin puts question marks the problem of exit rights in its final objection. Okin says that Kymlicka and other liberals have given common ideas about exit rights, but the solution of problem is not got by them. Okin sees things differently: “for some group

¹⁴³ Ibid. p. 16.

¹⁴⁴ Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. p. 340

¹⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 341.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 342.

¹⁴⁷ Geerts, Evelien. “An Analysis of Susan Moller Okin’s Problematic Approach to Multiculturalism. A Feminist Comprehensive Liberalism Gone Wrong,” *Contemporary Feminist Debates*. <http://www.academia.edu/403092/An-Analysis-of-Susan-Moller-Okin’s-Problematic-Approach-to-Multiculturalism.-A-Feminist-Comprehensive-Liberalism-Gone-Wrong/papers>, retrieved on 04/10/2016.

members (most likely women and children) leaving their group isn't easy at all, since they are so embedded in a culture where education is often either not intended for girls or not directed towards the liberal value of autonomy."¹⁴⁸ Okin claims that:

To call on the right of exit as a palliative for oppression is unsatisfactory for another reason, too, for in many circumstances, oppressed persons, in particular women, are not only less able to exit but have many reasons not to want to exit their culture of origin; the very idea of doing so may be unthinkable. Rather, they want, and should have the right, to be treated fairly within it.¹⁴⁹

Thus through these three objections Okin tries to prove that extending special rights to the cultural minorities will promote patriarchy and gender inequality. Okin actually does not talk about banning any cultural traditions or minority groups. But he says that no patriarchal groups should be given any special group rights as this may prove to be fatal for women. She asserts that, "in deciding whether to extend special rights, [the] degree to which each culture is patriarchal and its willingness to be less so should be taken into account."¹⁵⁰

Thus, Feminists believe that male dominance cannot be denied in a culture and multiculturalism wants to maintain it on the name of cultural security. Feminists mainly criticize multiculturalism on the ground that it favors in securing diversities and doing justice with them within a national state, but does not pay attention to the discrimination being faced by women within a culture, nor does accept their natural structure on the basis of equality.

Many feminists argue that uniform civil laws have not been accepted in the public domain to protect the cultural rights of all cultures and to maintain diversity. Whereas on the other hand no attention is paid towards diversities available within the cultures by different cultural protection rights, resultantly it gradually leads to varnish. If seen basically, we find that many types of cultural identities and diversities are available in

¹⁴⁸ Okin, Susan Moller. "feminism and multiculturalism: Some Tension," *Ethics*, Vol. 108, No. 4. pp. 672–74.

¹⁴⁹ Okin, Susan Moller. "Mistress of Their Own Destiny": Group Rights, Gender, and Realistic Rights of Exit," *Ethics*, Vol. 112, No. 2. p. 207.

¹⁵⁰ Okin, Susan Moller. "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" p. 25.

Hindu, Muslim, Sikh and other religions. But multiculturalism does not pay any attention to the diversities and equality available in these cultures. Multiculturalism is only concerned with the protection of presently existing cultures. Multiculturalism does not care about how these cultures were created or under what circumstances they were introduced.

Multiculturalism accepts a person as a member of a certain culture. It does not accept a separate independent identity of the person. In today's globalization era, especially in Asian and Islamic societies, most of the women consider themselves a prisoner of that culture because of being a member of that culture. Feminists have alleged that multiculturalism supports the existence of every prevailing culture in its historical form as it wants to keep the ancestral aristocracy of cultural traditions.

According to feminist approach the internal diversities and inequality of a community cannot be ignored under diversities and cultural membership. Also, another important fact is that multiculturalism also wants to protect those cultures even whose members don't want to safeguard them because these members claims that they were tortured by their culture on personal level. Feminists believe that mostly cultures of the world remained discriminating and harassing toward women in their conventional form. As per their version, elites of all cultures have attempted to preserve discrimination and harassment against women within the cultures on the name of cultural rights and diversities available in them.

If seen it theoretically, feminists' demand for equality has not been rejected by multiculturalism. It is not the problem that the multiculturalism wants to avoid providing safeguards to feminists' cultural diversity. Rather the problem is that multiculturalism also wants to protect such cultural practices, which promote gender discrimination. Time and again multiculturalism does not oppose the cultural practices which adversely affect women's status. For instance,

On the issue of polygamy, it does not just suggest that non-recognition of the practice may disadvantage women and children who are necessarily left behind when the husband immigrates to a country that does not recognize all his wives. It

often goes further to say that polygamy may well provide a sense of sisterhood; it places women 'in a situation of solidarity'.¹⁵¹

In this way, multiculturalism wants to protect every cultural practice by considering it as positive. It does not talk about the negative aspects of these practices. Multiculturalism is criticized by feminists, primarily, on the basis that it favors conservation and equality of cultures under the national state, but does not attempt to overcome inequality imbedded in the cultures. Feminists say that multiculturalism should mainly focus on non-differentiation instead of diversities.

Therefore it can be said that multiculturalism does not pay any kind of attention to the discrimination and inequality inherent in various cultural groups. But in its reply, multiculturalism argues that when any cultural community is given absolute rights to exercise all kinds of practices related to their culture then such a problem will end itself.

Multiculturalism presented following two types of arguments in response to the criticisms made by feminists about cultural rights:-

1. Multiculturalists argue that any kind of discrimination under the communities is due to colonialism and it should not be understood as the basic characteristics of a culture. As per their views there is no logical and reasonable basis behind the objection that inequality or discrimination towards women will be promoted by providing cultural and community rights.

2. According to them, discrimination and inequality should not be accepted as the basic feature of any culture. Therefore, discrimination against women under any cultural community is not a fundamental feature of any culture, but it becomes an abrupt part of the culture that can be removed. According to multiculturalists,

This conclusion is backed by the claim that communities whose way of life is being protected within multiculturalism have societal cultures. They have institutions by which the community conducts its affairs and takes decisions. Consequently, there

¹⁵¹ Honig, Bonnie. "Complicating Culture," *Boston Review*. p. 31.

is no reason to assume that women will be excluded and their perspective marginalized within the community.¹⁵²

According to feminists, it should be expected from each culture that it does not give any room to any kind of discrimination within itself. The cultural communities should have same equality and rights as they expect from the state. In other words, the effort should be made for democratization, even under the cultural community. According to Rajeev Bhargava,

. . . minority communities have a moral responsibility, as it were, to initiate a process of internal democratization because that follows from their rationale on which their own claims for special rights are based. If they expect rights to protect their difference then they must also allow space for expression of internal differences.¹⁵³

Hence many allegations have been made against multiculturalism in context to feminist approach. Multiculturalist theorists have tried to answer some of these allegations, but their answers could not satisfy the feminists. In spite of the arguments, these questions become more assertive and come before us as to what should be done against the cultural beliefs which are the main causes for women's oppression. Universal values have to be established to remove the contradictions arise in context to cultural beliefs and these values must be beyond caste, sex, gender, etc. In reality, it the main problem is that multiculturalists do not accept demand for limitation of cultural rights. It cannot be denied that if multiculturalism has to give a meaningful answer to these allegations then it will have to change its classical shape. A positive multiculturalism is an option. There is no problem to provide autonomy and cultural rights to cultural communities. But it is very important to keep in mind that if a cultural belief or practice is against plural social system and social coordination, then such belief or practice should definitely be restricted. Positive multiculturalism is based on this concept.

¹⁵² Mahajan, Gurpreet. *The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy*. p. 140.

¹⁵³ Bhargava, Rajeev. "The Right to Culture," *Communalism in Indian History, Politics and Culture*. Ed. K. N. Panikkar. p. 168.

Bibliography & Webliography

Books

- Barry, Brian. *Culture & Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. 2002.
- Bhargava, Rajeev, Bagchi, Amiya Kumar and Sudarshan R. (eds.). *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 2007.
- Bhikhu, Parekh. *Contemporary Political Thinkers*. Martin Robertson: Oxford. 1982.
- Deb, Kushal (ed.). *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Rawat Publications: New Delhi. 2002.
- Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass. 1982.
- Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan Press: New York. 2012.
- Jaggar, Alison. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Rawman and Allanheld: Totowa, NJ. 1983.
- John, Rawls. *Political Liberalism*. Columbia University Press: New York. 1993.
- Kelly, Paul (ed.). *Multiculturalism reconsidered: 'Culture and equality' and its critic*. Polity Press: Cambridge. 2002.
- Kennedy, Ellen, and Mendus, Susan. *Women in Western Political Philosophy*. Wheatsheaf Books: Brighton. 1987.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. Oxford University Press: New York. 2002.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1989.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1995.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 2001.
- Kymlicka, Will. *States, Nations and Cultures*. Van Gorcum: Amsterdam. 1997.
- MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass. 1987.
- Mahajan, Gurpreet and Sheth, D.L. (eds.). *Minority Identities and the Nation-State*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 1999.
- Mahajan, Gurpreet. *The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy*. Sage Publication: New Delhi. 2002.
- Modood, Tariq. *Multiculturalism: "A Civic Idea"*. Polity Press: Cambridge. 2007.
- Okin, Susan Moller. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?*. Princeton University Press: New Jersey. 1999.

- Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. Basic Books: New York. 1989.
- Raz, Joseph. *The Morality of Freedom*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1986.
- Rosenblum, Nancy. *Another Liberalism: Romanticism and the Reconstruction of Liberal Thought*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass. 1987.
- Tully, James. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1995.
- Willet, G. *Theorizing Multiculturalism: A Guide to Current Debate*. Blackwell: Oxford. 1998.
- Wolin, Sheldon. *Politics and Vision*. Little Brown: Boston. 1960.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey. 1990.

Journals

- Barry, Brian. "Liberalism and Multiculturalism," *Ethical Perspectives*, 4. 1997. pp. 3–14.
- Barry, Brian. "Self-Government Revisited," *Democracy and Power: Essays in Political Theory*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1991. pp. 156–86.
- Berkowitz, Peter. "Communitarian Criticisms and Liberal Lessons," A review of *Communitarianism and Its Critics* by Daniel A. Bell, *Looking Backward* by Derek Phillips, and *Liberals and Communitarians* by Stephen Mulhall and Adam Swift. *The Responsive Community*. 1995. pp. 54–64.
- Bhargava, Rajeev. "The Right to Culture," *Communalism in Indian History, Politics and Culture*. Edited by K. N. Panikkar. Manohar Publishers: New Delhi. 1991. pp. 165–71.
- Bramann, Jorn K. "Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason," *Educating Rita and Other Philosophical Movies*. Nightsun books: Maryland. 2009. <http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>. Retrieved on 10/5/2015.
- Donner, Wendy. "John Stuart Mill's Liberal Feminism," *Philosophical Studies*, 69. 1993. pp. 155–66.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking Recognition," *New Left Review*-3. May-June 2000. pp. 107–20.
- Fraser, Nancy. "Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation," *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Stanford University. 1996. pp. 3–67.
- Friedman, Marilyn. "Beyond Caring: The De-moralization of Gender," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. Supplementary Vol. 13. 1987. pp. 87–100.

- Geerts, Evelien. “An Analysis of Susan Moller Okin’s Problematic Approach to Multiculturalism. A Feminist Comprehensive Liberalism Gone Wrong,” *Contemporary Feminist Debates*. [http://www.academia.edu/403092/ An-Analysis-of-Susan-Moller-Okin’s-Problematic-Approach-to- Multiculturalism. A-Feminist-Comprehensive-Liberalism-Gone-Wrong](http://www.academia.edu/403092/An-Analysis-of-Susan-Moller-Okin’s-Problematic-Approach-to-Multiculturalism-A-Feminist-Comprehensive-Liberalism-Gone-Wrong)papers, retrieved on 04/10/2016.
- Gilman, Sandra. 1997. ‘Barbaric Rituals,’ *Boston Review*. October-November, pp. 33–34.
- Glazer, Nathan 1993. “Is Assimilation Dead,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. 530. No. 1. pp. 122–36.
- Gross, Elizabeth. “What is Feminist Theory?,” *Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory*. Edited by Carole Pateman and E. Gross. Northeastern University Press: Boston. 1986. pp. 125–143.
- Honig, Bonnie. “Complicating Culture,” *Boston Review*. Oct- Nov. 1997. pp. 30–32.
- Iordanou, George. “Kymlicka’s Multicultural Citizenship.” [http://www.iordanou.org/kymlickas-multicultural citizenship/wordpress](http://www.iordanou.org/kymlickas-multicultural-citizenship/wordpress), retrieved on 06/12/2016.
- Kukathas, Chandran. “Are There Any Cultural Rights?,” *Political Theory*. Vol. 20. No. 1. February 1992. pp. 105–139.
- Kukathas, Chandran. “Multiculturalism as Fairness: Will Kymlicka’s Multicultural Citizenship,” *The Journal of Political Philosophy*. Vol. 5 No. 4. 1997. pp. 406–427.
- Kukathas, Chandran. “Theoretical Foundations of Multiculturalism.” 1992. [http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/fall04/theoretical-foundation-of-multiculturalism /by/kukathas/_chandran.pdf](http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/fall04/theoretical-foundation-of-multiculturalism/by/kukathas/_chandran.pdf).,retrieved on:02/05/2016.
- Kymlicka, Will. “Liberal Individualism and Liberal Neutrality,” *Ethics*. 99/4. pp. 883–905.
- MacKinnon, Catherine. “Reflection on Sex Equality under the Law,” *Yale Law Journal*, 100. 1991. pp. 1281–328.
- Nicholson, Linda. “To Be or Not To Be: Charles Taylor and the Politics of Recognition,” *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory*. Vol. 3, Issue 1, 1996. pp. 1–16.
- Okin, Susan Moller. “Feminism and Multiculturalism: Some Tensions,” *Ethics*. Vol. 108. No. 4. The University of Chicago Press. July, 1998. pp. 661–684.
- Okin, Susan Moller. “Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?,” *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Edited by Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard and Martha C. Nussbaum. Princeton University Press: New Jersey. 1990. pp. 9–24.
- Okin, Susan Moller. “Mistress of Their Own Destiny: Group Rights, Gender, and Realistic Rights of Exit,” *Ethics*. Vol. 112. No. 2. January 2002. pp. 205–230.
- Okin, Susan. “Women and the Making of Sentimental Family,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 11/1. 1981. pp. 65–88.

- Parekh, Bhikhu. "Cultural Pluralism and the Limits of Diversity," *Alternative: Global, Local, Political*. Vol. 20. No. 4. Oct.-Dec. 1995. pp. 431–57.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. "Discourses on National Identity," *Political Studies*, Vol. 42. No. 3. 1994. pp. 492–04.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. "Superior People: The Narrowness of Liberalism from Mill to Rawls," *Times Literary Supplements*. 25 Feb. 1994. pp.11–13.
- Pateman, Carole. "Sublimation and Reification: Locke, Wolin and the Liberal Democratic Conception of the Political," *Politics and Society*, 5/4. 1975. pp. 441–67.
- Pateman, Carole. "The Disorder of Women': Women, Love and the Sense of Justice," *Ethics*. 91/1. 1980. pp. 20–34.
- Ramaswamy, Sushila. "The Incompleteness of the Multiculturalist Agenda: Overlooking the Need for a Shared Identity," *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 42. No. 37. Sep. 15 - 21, 2007. pp. 3790–3796.
- Raz, Joseph. "Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective," *Dissent*, Winter. Vol. 41. No. 1. January 1994. pp. 67–80.
- Robson, Richard. 2014. "In What Sense is Multiculturalism a Form of Communitarianism?," [http://www.RICHARD-ROBSON/Ideologies/multiculturalism/In What Sense is Multiculturalism a Form of Communitarianism?co.uk/?p=142](http://www.RICHARD-ROBSON/Ideologies/multiculturalism/In%20What%20Sense%20is%20Multiculturalism%20a%20Form%20of%20Communitarianism?co.uk/?p=142), retrieved on 01/12/2016.
- Rodrigues, Luis Cordeiro. "The Politics of Recognition," *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. ISSN 2161-0002. [http://www.iep.utm.edu/multiculturalism/the politics of recognition/](http://www.iep.utm.edu/multiculturalism/the%20politics%20of%20recognition/), retrieved on 09/24/2015.
- Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition," *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Edited by Amy Gutmann. Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1994.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship," *Ethics*. 99/2. 1989. pp. 250–74.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Together in Difference: Transforming the Logic of Group Political Conflict," *Principled Positions: Postmodernism and the Rediscovery of Values*. Edited by Judith Smith. Lawrence & Wishart: London. 1993. pp. 121–50.

Online Sources

- <http://www.philosophybasics.com> > By Branch/Doctrine > Politicalphilisophy.htm
- http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/fall04/theoretical-foundation-of-multiculturalism/by/kukathas_chandran.pdf
- <http://www.insidestory.org.au/the-contradictions-of-liberal-multiculturalism>
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/>
- <https://www.jstor.org/stable/liberal.multiculturalism.as.political.philosophy/will/kymlicka/41419014>

- journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/liberal/multiculturalism/10.1177/009059170528413
- onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/thefuture-of-liberal-multiculturalism/10.1111/1478.9302.12018/pdf
- <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/39064/limitsofliberalmulticulturalism.pdf?sequence=1>
- <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communitarianism>
- <https://www.cpsaacsp.ca/papers2004/challengingmulticulturalism/Dhamoon>
- www.jstor.org/stable/jthought./communitarianism_and_multiculturalism_in_the_academy/44.1-2.9
- www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/ethnicity/migrated/.../soundings48.A-Left-Communitarianism_What-about-Multiculturalism/pdf
- www.mdusche.de/media/publications/multiculturalism_communitarianism_liberalism/Michael/Dusche/file/Dusche06_4042.pdf
- https://www.marist.edu/liberalarts/philrel/.../TheChallengeofMulticulturalism_BeyondLiberalism%20Sultan%20MUPJ.pdf
- professormarkmercer.ca/commentary/097%20Multiculturalism_liberal-or-communitarian/.pdf
- www.weeklystandard.com/feminism-vs.-multiculturalism/the-weekly-standard/article/11815
- punzel.org/Ephemeris2014/A_Defence_of_Okin's_Femiinist_Critique_of_Multiculturalism_Group_Rights_in_turn_warrants_group_rights/Kim.pdf
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Susan_Moller_Okin
- researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10063/2497/thesis.pdf?sequence=2

Conclusion

Multiculturalism is the principle of the regulating different cultural communities in a state. It accepts different assumptions of different communities and considers them to be the justifiable means of achieving the goals of the community. It protects the independent existence of each cultural community and rejects competition between them. Basically, multiculturalism considers each culture as essential and equally important. It is a theory of the existence of cultures that opposes cultural relativity and supports cultural diversities. Cultural relativity means the hierarchical establishment of cultures and placing the cultures at various levels based on their merits and demerits. This cultural relativity is a sign of the fact that some cultures are good and bad. Multiculturalism opposes it. According to this principle a culture cannot be so bad that it is to be eliminated nor any culture can be so good that it is to be imposed on other communities. Cultures are not good or bad. They are different from each other, and multiculturalism is the supporter of these diversities. So multiculturalism is a concept, which believe in cultural equality and wants to protect their existence by providing equal opportunities.

Culture and diversity is the most operative terms of multiculturalism. Culture provides the context to understand the collective behavior of the people. Cultures are not something that is stagnant rather it is always moving. Provided the circumstances, it establishes multilateral communication. Every culture tends to accept external things at all time. Exposure to new and external elements sometimes leads to broadening up of our choices, likes and dislikes and at other times it also leads to enhancement in the quality content of our cultures without abandoning our own values.

The term culture has been comprehensively elaborated by many philosophers. For Rousseau, culture is medium which provides passage to social and political life of an

individual departing from the State of Nature. Rousseau accepts that there is harmony between nature and man in the state of nature. But, increase of population and the invention of private property are responsible for disturbing this harmony. In order to regulate property relations and settle other disputes, government and laws came into existence. People entered into a 'social contract' leading to the creation of civil society. Rousseau propounded the idea of 'general will' which stated that the sovereignty of the people is important and not the will of the sovereign.

Ruth Benedict explains culture in terms of patterns. She is of the view that it is impossible to compare two cultures as every carries with it its own values, so, it is impossible to evaluate other people by our own standards. She tries to show that no one culture is absolute. But her hierarchical approach can be noticed in the distinction of *Apollonian* and *Dionysian* which she brings in relation to explain the three tribal American cultures i.e. *Zuni*, *Dobu*, and *Kwakiutl*. With the help of these two categories (*Apollonian* and *Dionysian*), she compares cultures and establishes hierarchy among cultures.

Gadamer presents the humanist concept of culture (*Bildung*). *Bildung* is a process that helps in developing insight into other's concern and in changing the horizon. Gadamer explains both inter as well as intra cultural hierarchies among cultures and has explained the notion of 'fusion of horizons' in this regard. Through 'fusion of horizon' and '*Bildung*', Gadamer trying to create an atmosphere where the voice of others will be heard and one will develop the attitude to accept the other by giving him full recognition. Fusion takes place with the intervention of power. On the other hand, Sri Aurobindo elucidates culture as a way of life and focuses his attention on both intra as well as inter-cultural hierarchy. Intra cultural hierarchy inherent in Indian culture is discussed through the system of four *Varnas*, four *Āshrams*, and *Puruṣārthas* and two tier value systems. All these systems have helped the Indian culture in its approach to integration. Both Sri Aurobindo and Gadamer explain culture not as 'what we are' but 'what we ought to be' in terms of elevation.

The aspect of hierarchy is inherent in every culture either in explicit or implicit form. These philosophers have created an atmosphere where the notion of hierarchy has been discussed. In general words, hierarchy is related with the aspect of power. In hierarchy, one culture tries to dominate the other considering themselves as superior and the dominant class gets more privileges.

Cultural anthropology denies the superiority of culture. It means that no cultural group has any moral or reasonable right to exploit another cultural group on the name of its dominance. Each culture has its own viewpoint and solutions about the problems related to life. The basic view of a culture is based on traditional lifestyle, beliefs and goals. Some thinkers have considered culture as a unified organization of social, technical and philosophical structure. Cultural anthropology is against any kind of sovereignty. It supports different values of cultures. Culture is the method of special activities of a certain community. Therefore, according to anthropological approach, culture should be taken as a conjunction of these activities. It should be based on flexibility, harmony and perception. Culture is such a concept that is stable and also variable.

In Contemporary world, there are different cultures exist in society; and one definitely faces the problem of contact, conflict and confluence. So, the clash of different cultures, ethnics and identities is a well known fact and it needs a solution. And the solution which is available comes from multicultural perspective. Multiculturalism tries to overcome many conflicting situations. Multiculturalism gave the principle of a pluralistic society. A pluralistic society in which one is allowed to follow his own religion or culture and at the same time can live together with the people of different religion or culture. Multicultural society is that which opens its door for all.

There is cultural lineage to normative discourses in liberalism and communitarianism. The cultural lineage of such concepts like identity, equality, goodness, justice, dignity, harmony, etc. got re-evaluated in terms of individual identity, individual rights, equality, autonomy, etc. in liberalism on the one hand; and collective identity, community right, social goods, etc. in communitarianism on the other. Since there are plurality of cultures representing different versions of good life, values, and

convictions, it involves that plurality is the most operative term in the discourse on multiculturalism, liberalism, and communitarianism.

The basic concept of liberalism is that every individual should possess the right to take decisions about his fortune and career without any undue interference. John Locke's individualism raises the question of identity, not only individual identity but also *personal identity*. According to Locke, "personal identity is a matter of *psychological continuity, being foundationalist in method.*"¹ Basically, liberalism support individual identity. According to the concept of individual identity, individuals are autonomous creatures who take decision rationally. Through identity, Locke employed the concept of natural rights. He has accepted three rights as natural rights, such as; Right to Life, Right to Liberty, and Right to Property. Individual is born with these three natural rights. These rights were called natural because they did not depend for their validity on the recognition and enforcement by the state. Theory of natural rights is the basis for theory of Human Rights (1945).

Along with personal identity and individual right, liberty is the also a central concern of liberalism. John Stuart Mill, through his work 'On Liberty' provided a rational justification of the freedom of the individual. It offers a defense not merely against the state interference but also against the pressures of the society, public opinion and religious orthodoxy on the affairs of the individual. According to Mill liberty is the highest political ideal because the ultimate goal of human life is development of personality which is possible only in an atmosphere of liberty. The most important point made by Mill is that, "over himself, over his body and mind, the individual is sovereign."² He supports and encourages absolute freedom in the domain of thought, speech and expression. According to Mill man is free in so far as individual actions concerning his own self were concerned, and which did not prejudice his actions about others. But when his actions influence others man is bound by certain limitations. Mill has described the freedom of action as justified in the form of character and social development. While announcing the freedom of action, he emphasizes on the individual

¹ Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Chapter XXVII, Sec. 12.

² Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. p. 70.

differences and diversities. He is strongly against the dull and dead uniformity. Mill wishes for a state whose citizens are proud of their personality and their diversity, and in which a person respects himself and others. Mill believes that only spiritual progress can reach a person close to such ideals.

Immanuel Kant developed the liberal notions of individual rights, autonomy, dignity, freedom, tolerance, etc. in the context of enlightenment. The enlightenment is the age of science and rationality. According to Kant, Humanity is always autonomous, supreme and sovereign. For Kant, a moral person has to be *autonomous*.³ He asserts that “autonomy is the ability to live by one’s own laws.”⁴ According to this notion of autonomy, person is only bounded by his personal idea of right and wrong. His famous statement is “no one ought to be treated as a means of ends of the other. Each man is an end in itself”.⁵ This is Kant’s statement for respect for human dignity as an absolute principle, categorical imperative, the yardstick of all human actions as well as yardstick for state’s action or public policy. On this thought, is based the theory of human rights. It suggests that irrespective of caste, color, creed, sex or any other identity all human beings are supposed to enjoy certain human rights. Human dignity can’t be compromised. Kant’s formulation of the categorical imperative has certain implications so far as the private morality is concern. It attempts to elevate individuals to the level of autonomy and sovereignty. And at the same time it accepts the autonomy and sovereignty of other individuals. This is what is significant in the era of globalization and multiculturalism.

Communitarianism emerged as a reaction against neo-liberalism. The liberals consider the individual as the most important unit of the society whereas the communitarians consider the community as the most important unit of the society instead of the individual. Thinkers like John Rawls, and Dworkin support individualism, but they are encountered by scholars like Michael Sandel, Michael Walzer, and Charles Taylor who consider the community above the individual.

³ Bramann, Jorn K. “Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason.”
<http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>, retrieved on 10/5/2015.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. p. 91.

With the publication of Michael Sandal's book in the 1980s, a phase of debate started between liberalism and communitarianism. Sandel tried to evaluate the limitations of liberalism by criticizing of the ideas of the John Rawls. The main issue of debate between liberalism and communitarianism is that whether a person or a community is to be accepted as a basic entity for political analysis? The debate among them is primarily about who should be encouraged by a just state - personal freedom or welfare or the welfare of an ideal community? In this regard, liberalism and communitarianism reserve their own opinions, where the liberals give greater importance to individual freedom and authority while communitarians consider the relationship between the person and the community as the main basis of political analysis by giving priority to the community.

The concepts of identity and rights are regarded as individual centric in liberalism but the same concepts become collective and community centric in communitarianism. Communitarian objected to neo-liberal or libertarian view of nature of self. Classical liberalism gives individual priority at the expense of community. Classical liberals take atomistic view of individual. Communitarians believe that individual's existence is formed and shaped by his community. Instead of "unencumbered self" they talk of "situated self." A well-known communitarian Charles Taylor rejects atomistic concept of human being and talks about human self as a "situated self." According to liberals, individuals are self-sufficient outside the society and do not require community to develop its capacity of self-determination whereas communitarians like Charles Taylor argues for a 'social thesis,' "according to which true capacity of individual can only be exercised in certain kind of society."⁶

It is clear that the liberals give priority to freedom, authority and autonomy of people, while communitarians insist on community relations and social roles. Despite this conflict, it cannot be denied that these two ideologies have played a very important role in political and social thinking. Liberalism raised its voice against the dictatorship of religion and state and claimed for the rights and freedoms of the person. It opposed any kind of social classification and supported the dignity and autonomy of each individual. In order to overcome the shortcomings of liberalism its forms have been changing from

⁶ Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition." p. 255.

time to time and even today it is present before us as a relevant ideology. On the other hand, communitarianism also contributes significantly to the political and philosophical thinking of social values and community values. In today's pluralistic society, the importance of communitarian's concept related to community values and social identity has grown further. Attempts are being made by many thinkers in the current political philosophical thinking to emphasize on complementarity between liberalism and communitarianism. Some thinkers are remarkable in this regard. They try to focus on such a possibility which do not oppose the ideas of liberalism and also support the concepts presented by Communitarianism.

Both liberals and communitarians propagates the idea of human rights, but the difference lies in there conception of human rights. Basically, human right refers to those rights which belong to the person equally for being a human. Its purpose is to establish international moral values and legal norms which make all the people of the world politically, socially, economically and legally strong and capable. Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the greatest achievement of human history in 20th century. According to liberal tradition human rights are universal. On the contrary, according to communitarian philosophers human rights are not universal. In every culture and society, there are different sets of rights. This view believes that human beings are different in many ways. For example – man is different from women. Therefore there cannot be equal set of rights for them.

According to Will Kymlicka, the human rights cannot fully address the problems related to minority rights. Minorities suffer from discrimination of majorities even under the liberal societies and this discrimination is done without violating any human rights. He believes that liberalism should provide the importance and security to the cultural communities, which is the basis of the individual's decision. James Tully states that, discrimination with minority cultural communities is ignored by liberalism. So, under the liberal system, the constitution should promote intercultural discussions to deal with minority cultures, in which the representatives of cultures can keep their viewpoints properly.

Minority rights should be enforced with universal human rights. From this, the natural rights of the person will be safeguarded in context to his cultural community. Minority rights do not create any obstacles in implementation of human rights, rather support them. If human rights are framed keeping view of the local requirements then the chances of conflict between the two will end automatically. Thus minority rights will be helpful in implementation of human rights, which will be beneficial for the entire society.

The concepts of community, ethnicity, tradition, culture, and history do play major role in identity formation and development in detail. Through these concepts one can feel to belonging to particular group of people with distinct identity, with particular history, culture, and language. In the contemporary time, when our identity, culture, and life is being shaped by market economy, new forms of production, and developments in information technology, the role of human rights become more important. These changes have made different impacts to different countries, groups, and classes.

In common parlance, justice means righteousness or virtue. It is also identified with truth and morality and is considered a standard bearer of the good and bad rules of society and conduct of men and institutions. The theory of justice rendered by Rawls is known as 'justice as fairness'. In order to frame the process of justice Rawls renders that this whole process should be based on certain impartial rules. To ensure this impartiality Rawls believes that the while framing these rules, framers must not have any information as how they will be benefited from these rules. Rawls kept all such ignorance under 'veil of ignorance'. Rawls called the condition of individuals present in this veil of ignorance as 'original position'.

Michael Sandel has attacked Rawl's theory of justice. According to Sandal, man can be understood only in the context of his society and culture which he terms as "embeddedness." Positively he recommends that state should make such laws which are conducive for just society. Such laws can only break "deeper commonality" and shared "self-understanding." The communitarian thinks that the concept of good is not the result of individual logic and selection, whereas it is collectively formed by a community and individuals are connected with this community.

Justice is not limited to laws and legal procedures but the concept of justice in the modern era has become very widespread and its execution has started in many shapes. In fact, under the traditional perspective the main concern of justice was with the person's character, rather the main concern of modern approach is social justice. Social justice seeks to establish a system in which every person can independently develop his personality and can fulfill all his responsibilities at social level. Social justice protects the religion and culture and provides equal opportunity for self-esteem and development to all communities, downtrodden classes, tribes, homosexuals, women, minorities etc. of the society.

The most important aspect of social justice is cultural. Social beliefs, customs and traditions create dominance of a particular class in the society. Some communities become insignificant even prevailing in the society and their place becomes secondary. The existence of these communities cannot be protected without accepting their diversities. The identity politics has given strength to their demands and excluded communities are now started to demand their inclusion. Multiculturalism is a concept which accepts these demands. Multiculturalism establishes cultural equality and cultural rights of cultural communities to preserve diversities of different cultures of the society. So, it can be said that, the concept of multiculturalism creates the necessary conditions of social justice.

There are competing models of multiculturalism, each offering a different view of the proper balance between diversity and unity. The two main models of multiculturalism are - Liberal Multiculturalism and Communitarian Multiculturalism. In liberal multiculturalism, individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community. Multiculturalism recognizes the feature of difference in freedom, equality, dignity, etc. and considers these notions as culturally bound.

According to James Tully, cultural diversity is the basic feature of modern society and cultural interaction is embedded in the nature of the human beings. Joseph Raz argues that by giving importance to the cultures and giving them equality within the state multiculturalism ensures independence of the individual and promotes its autonomy.

According to Kymlicka, the biggest issue with liberal states is that how they make themselves fair in the context of minority cultures. In response to this, Kymlicka says that for the protection of minority cultures, they should be given special rights or group-differentiated rights by liberal states. According to Kymlicka, the principle of human rights should be established by linking them with the rights of minority cultures. Kymlicka stress on multicultural citizenship and considers it more broad and sensitive than universal citizenship. He advocates “mirror representation.” One of the main criteria for success of democracy is the position of the minorities in relation to their representation. Therefore, existence of such rights is very significant for a strong democracy. In liberal multiculturalism, while acknowledging the diversity of different cultures, the arguments were given to provide the universal equality rights to the citizens of all cultures. In this way, it accepts the theory of intellectual parallelism between different ethnic communities.

In the contrary of liberal multiculturalism, communitarian multiculturalism emphasizes the primacy of the group or community rather than each individual person. In communitarian multiculturalism, individual’s rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community. It represents the special right through which the ‘rights and identity’ of the cultural community is recognized. It demands from the social system about the solution for the identity crisis. The communitarian condemns the viewpoint of liberals about how to adjust diversity in a pluralistic society where people from different cultures, communities and religions live in. Charles Taylor has offered an alternative theory in his “The Politics of Recognition” by rejecting as “inadequate the liberal theory of multiculturalism.” Taylor has rejected the policy of Kymlicka about securing the cultural diversities on the basis of differences. According to Taylor, cultural communities need protection because these communities provide identity to their members. Political recognition of the cultural communities is essential. Not giving recognition to someone is a moral evil in itself. Taylor says that misrecognition of a person or community may prove to be fatal for it. Taylor suggests that if cultural equality is accepted at the place of cultural neutrality then it will be more useful for multicultural society.

It cannot be denied that the politics of recognition is significant for the establishment and development of multiculturalism. Social commitments of cultural communities can be enhanced by providing them a reasonable position in the public domain. Identity has a great role in securing equality of cultural communities and their existence. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to say that multiculturalism transformed itself into politics of recognition to enrich its subject matter. The question of the equality of cultures and cultural communities arises only after identifying cultural communities. Hence identity and multiculturalism can be accepted as complementary to each other.

Thus, in multiculturalism, there is interface between liberalism and communitarianism. In liberalism, there is acceptance of freedom and recognition of the other at the level of individuals only whereas at the level of multiculturalism individual's rights are elevated to the level of collective rights of the cultural community and in this way multiculturalism also includes communitarian approach.

Feminist thinkers try to publicize the inefficiency of multiculturalism through their criticism. Feminists mainly criticize multiculturalism on the ground that it favors in securing diversities and doing justice with them within a national state, but does not pay attention to the discrimination being faced by women within a culture, nor does accept their natural structure on the basis of equality. If seen it theoretically, feminists' demand for equality has not been rejected by multiculturalism. It is not the problem that the multiculturalism wants to avoid providing safeguards to feminists' cultural diversity. Rather the problem is that multiculturalism also wants to protect such cultural practices, which promote gender discrimination. Time and again multiculturalism does not oppose the cultural practices which adversely affect women's status. Feminists say that multiculturalism should mainly focus on non-differentiation instead of diversities.

Hence many allegations have been made against multiculturalism in context to feminist approach. Multiculturalist theorists have tried to answer some of these allegations, but their answers could not satisfy the feminists. In spite of the arguments, these questions become more assertive and come before us as to what should be done

against the cultural beliefs which are the main causes for women's oppression. Universal values have to be established to remove the contradictions arise in context to cultural beliefs and these values must be beyond caste, sex, gender, etc. In reality, the main problem is that multiculturalists do not accept demand for limitation of cultural rights. It cannot be denied that if multiculturalism has to give a meaningful answer to these allegations then it will have to change its classical shape. A positive multiculturalism is an option. There is no problem to provide autonomy and cultural rights to cultural communities. But it is very important to keep in mind that if a cultural belief or practice is against plural social system and social coordination, then such belief or practice should definitely be restricted. Positive multiculturalism is based on this concept.

Culture is a way of life in which the members of a cultural community related to it follow the values and beliefs collectively. We cannot imagine any society without any culture. Generally, in most of the societies have many cultures that live together in the society amicably. The society in which more than one culture exists is called multicultural society. But being multicultural does not have to be multiculturalist. Multiculturalism is a positive theory. If the state provides equal facilities, equal protection and equal opportunities for development to different cultures existed in society, then that state will be multiculturalist and such a society will be considered organized on the basis of multiculturalism. It is the responsibility of society to develop such beliefs so that majority cultural communities should not exploit minority cultural communities. The society should create such an environment in which the minorities can develop their own cultural beliefs and values.

Cultural diversity is now a fact of life in today's "global village". There are more than six thousand communities and as many languages in today's world. It naturally leads to the diversity of vision, practice, belief, values, etc. The concept of diversity and multiculturalism are relevant in this reference as most of the countries are following these ideas. The benefit of cultural diversity is that each culture encompasses within its ambit whole lot of experiences and beliefs that has been shaping the behaviors and values of those who are adherents of that culture. On the basis of it, one culture gains from its

comparison with other cultures by identifying good and unique traits in them; it makes them more rich and unique.

Multiculturalism is related to the concept of equality among different cultural communities. In every society there are different types of people who have different beliefs. The person gets knowledge of good or bad from his social experience. This experience basically comes from its cultural community. Auspicious tradition of a community can be inauspicious to another community. Different communities have their values and beliefs. Generally these beliefs are only different, but in some special contexts, these beliefs are also contradictory to each other. In such a situation, these diversities need to be united for social support. The principle of organization of diversities is multiculturalism. But how do these diversities be regularized? How to protect their freedom? How do the relations between different communities be controlled? How to establish equality and up to what extent? These are some of the questions, which differ among the thoughts of multiculturalists. Due to these differences, various types and forms of multiculturalism have emerged. But in all types and forms one common concept exists that multiculturalism accepts the concept of cultural diversities, it supports cultural equality and is against cultural relativism. This objective is of all forms of multiculturalism. So this is the fundamental principle of multiculturalism.

A collaborative relation exists in social justice and multiculturalism. Both of these concepts also contradict on some issues. Inclusion and cultural equality is essential for social justice. Multiculturalism facilitates the incorporation of equality in cultures. Due to diversities in cultures some communities do not get the benefit of support of the society. Multiculturalism addresses this problem by identifying these communities in the public domain. But by preventing interferences in cultural rights, multiculturalism creates a barrier for cultural reforms. Social Justice wants to remove culture-based inequalities but multiculturalism does not allow it. Multiculturalism considers the cultures rich and democratic within. According to this concept culture changes from inside and no external power is required for it. Therefore, multiculturalism also ends this emotional barrier of social justice.

Thus, “different but equals,” this is the hallmark of multiculturalism. It is useful for establishing social justice. It has a significant contribution in broadening public participation in democratic governance. By ending the mistreatment being done with minority cultures, it creates a sense of attachment in them towards society and the state. Multiculturalism in this sense helps in building nation. Due to its aim of confirming the democratic spirit, speeding up the process of inclusion and terminating the exclusion, it becomes associates of social justice.

Thus, inclusion of cultural communities on one hand will promote the democracy by enhancing public participation and on the other hand by providing real identity to marginalized people encourages their participation in public domain. This will be a convenient situation for democracy and social justice both.

Bibliography & Webliography

Books

- Ajani, Malik. *Citizenship, the Self and the Other: Critical Discussions on Citizenship and How to Approach Religious and Cultural Difference*. Cambridge University Press: UK. 2015.
- Albert, Weale. *Political Theory and Social Policy*. Macmillan: London. 1982.
- Atwell, John. *Ends and Principles in Kant's Moral Thought*. Springer: USA. 1986.
- Aurobindo, Sri. *Foundations of Indian Culture*. Sri Aurobindo Library Inc: New York. 1953.
- Axford, Barrie and Browning, Gary K. *Politics: An Introduction*. Routledge: London. 1997.
- Baehr, P. R. *Human Rights: Universality in Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan: UK. 2001.
- Barry, Brian. *Culture & Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. 2002.
- Beitz Charles. *Political Equality*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ. 1989.
- Bell, Daniel A. *Communitarianism and Its Critics*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1993.
- Benedict, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited: London. 1935.
- Bhargava, Rajeev and Acharya, Ashok (eds.). *Political Theory: An Introduction*. Pearson Publication: India. 2009.
- Bhargava, Rajeev, Bagchi, Amiya Kumar and Sudarshan R. (eds.). *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 2007.
- Brennan, Troyen A. *Just Doctoring: Medical Ethics in the Liberal State*. University of California Press: California. 1992.
- *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣhad*. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume. The Thirteen Principal Upanishads. Shivalik Prkashan: Delhi. 2004.
- Brooks, Thom. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. John Wiley & Sons: UK. 2012.
- Davis, Rick. *Political Pragmatism and the Liberal-Communitarian Debate*. Washington State University: USA. 2012.
- Deb, Kushal (ed.). *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Rawat Publications: New Delhi. 2002.
- Deji, Olanike F. *Gender and Rural Development*. Vol.-1. LIT Verlag: Munster. 2011.
- Desai, Murali. *The Paradigm of International Social Development: Ideologies, Development systems and Policy Approaches*. Routledge: New York. 2014.
- Dhiman, O.P. *Understanding Human Rights: An Overview*. Kalpaz Publication: Delhi. 2011.
- Donnelly, Jack. *Universal Human Rights: In Theory and Practice*. Motilal (UK) Books of India: UK. 2005.
- Dworkin, Ronald. *A Matter of Principle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1985.

- Eagleton, Terry. *The Idea of Culture*. Blackwell: Oxford. 2000.
- Forst, Ranier. *Contexts of Justice: Political Philosophy Beyond Liberalism and Communitarianism*. Translated by M. M. Farrell. University of California Press: London. 2002.
- Frohnen, Bruce. *The New Communitarianism and the Crisis of Modern Liberalism*. University Press of Kansas: Lawrence. 1996.
- Gadamer, H. G. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Weinsheimer Joel and G. Donald Marshall. Continuum: New York. 2004.
- Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. Basic Books: New York. 1973.
- Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass. 1982.
- Glazer, Nathan. *Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy*. Basic Books: New York. 1975.
- Graham, Gordon. *Eight Theories of Ethics*. Routledge: London and New York. 2004.
- Gregor, Mary (Trans. and ed.). *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1996.
- Gutmann, A. (ed.). *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1994.
- Hare, John. *The Moral Gap: Kantian Ethics, Human Limits, and God's Assistance*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1997.
- Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan Press: New York. 2012.
- Hill, Thomas E. *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*. John Wiley & Sons: UK. 2009.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited and introduction by Edwin Curley. Hackett Publishing Company Inc.: Indiana. 1994.
- Iyer, Krishna. *Justice and Beyond*. Deep and Deep Publication: New Delhi. 1982.
- Jaggard, Alison. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Rawman and Allanheld: Totowa, NJ. 1983.
- Jogdand, P.G., Bansode, P.P., and Meshram, N.G. (eds.). *Globalization and Social Justice*. Rawat Publications: Jaipur. 2008.
- Johari, J. C. *Contemporary Political Theory: New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. Sterling Publisher Private Limited: New Delhi. 2006.
- John, Rawls. *Political Liberalism*. Columbia University Press: New York. 1993.
- Joseph, M. Palmisana (ed.). *World of Sociology*. Vol. 1. Gala Group: New York. 2001.
- Kane, P. V. *History of Dharmasastra*. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute: Poona. 1941.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by N. K. Smith. The MacMillan Press Ltd.: London. 1973.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and Translated by Allen W. Wood. Yale University Press: New Haven and London. 2002.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Kant: Political Writings*. Edited by H. S. Reiss. Cambridge University Press: New York. 1970.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Practical Philosophy*. Edited and translated by Mary J. Gregory. Cambridge University Press: New York. 1996.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Moral Law: Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by H. J. Paton. Psychology Press: Oxford. 1991.
- Kaufmann, Walter. *From Shakespeare to Existentialism: An Original Study*. Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1980.
- Kelly, Paul (ed.). *Multiculturalism reconsidered: 'Culture and equality' and its critic*. Polity Press: Cambridge. 2002.
- Kroeber, A.L. and Kluckhohn, Clyde. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology: Cambridge Mass. 1952.
- Kukathas, Chandran. *The Fraternal Conceit: Individualist versus Collectivist Ideas of Community*. Centre for Independent Studies: St. Leonard's. 1991.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy- An Introduction*. Oxford University Press: New York. 2002.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1989.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1995.
- Kymlicka, Will. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*. Oxford University Press: New York. 2001.
- Kymlicka, Will. *States, Nations and Cultures*. Van Gorcum: Amsterdam. 1997.
- Lane, J. E. and Errson, S. *Culture and Politics: A Comparative Approach*. 2005.
- Laski, Harold J. *The Rise of European Liberalism (Works of Horald J. Laski): An Essay in Interpretation*. Vol. 8. Rutledge: New York. 2014.
- Linge, D. (ed.). *Hans – George Gadamer: Philosophical Hermeneutics*. University of California Press: Berkley. 2008.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by P. Nidditch. Clarendon Press: Oxford. 1975.
- Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by Thomas P. Pearson. The Liberal Arts Press: New York. 1952.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited and introduction by Peter Laslett. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2003.
- Loewy, Erich. *Textbook of Medical Ethics*. Springer: USA. 1989.
- Losonsky, Michael. *Enlightenment and Action from Descartes to Kant: Passionate Thought*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2001.
- MacIntyre, Alisdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Duckworth: London. 1981.
- MacKinnon, Catherine. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass. 1987.
- Mahajan, Gurpreet and Sheth, D.L. (eds.). *Minority Identities and the Nation-State*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 1999.
- Mahajan, Gurpreet. *The Multicultural Path: Issues of Diversity and Discrimination in Democracy*. Sage Publication: New Delhi. 2002.
- Malinowski, B. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1969.
- *Manusmrti*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series: Banaras.

- Mao, Xavier Pfokrehe. *Virtue and Morality*. Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.: New Delhi. 2011.
- Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government*. J. M. Dent & Sons: London. 1910.
- Mill, J.S. *On Liberty and Other Essays*. Edited by John Gray. Oxford Worlds Classics: Oxford. 1998.
- Modood, Tariq. *Multiculturalism: "A Civic Idea"*. Polity Press: Cambridge. 2007.
- Mulhal, Stephen and Swift, Adam. *Liberals and Communitarians*. Wiley: 1992.
- Murphy, Michael. *Multiculturalism: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge: New York. 2012.
- Okin, Susan Moller. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?*. Princeton University Press: New Jersey. 1999.
- Okin, Susan Moller. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. Basic Books: New York. 1989.
- Olson, Mancur. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Harvard University Press: Massachusetts. 1971.
- Olssen, Mark. *Liberalism, Neoliberalism, Social Democracy: Thin Communitarian Perspectives on Political Philosophy and Education*. Routledge: New York. 2010.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. *Contemporary Political Thinkers*. Martin Robertson: Oxford. 1982.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Palgrave: New York. 2000.
- Plato. *Republic*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1994.
- Ramaswamy, Sushila. *Political Theory: Ideas and Concept*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd.: Delhi. 2010.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. 1971.
- Raz, Joseph. *The Morality of Freedom*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1986.
- *R̥g Veda*. Translated by R. C. Zaehner. Hinduism: Oxford. 1962.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*. Edited and translated by John, B. Thomson. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1981.
- Risser, J. *Hermeneutics and the voice of the other: Re-reading Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics*. State University of New York Press: New York. 1997.
- Rosenblum, Nancy. *Another Liberalism: Romanticism and the Reconstruction of Liberal Thought*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass. 1987.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality. Part Two: The Basic Political Writings*. Hackett Publishing Company: Indianapolis, IN. 1754.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Basic Political Writings*. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing Company: Indiana. 1987.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. Translated by Christopher Betts. Oxford: New York. 1994.
- S. Radhakrishnan. *Eastern Religious and Western Thought*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi. 1940.
- Sabine, George Holland. *A History of Political Theory*. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt.: New Delhi. 1973.
- Sandel, Michael. *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982.

- Sharma, Lokesh (ed.). *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Terms in Anthropology, Sociology and Allied Disciplines*. Penman Publisher: New Delhi. 2003.
- Taylor, Charles. *Hegel and Modern Society*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1979.
- Taylor, Charles. *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge. 1992.
- *The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibility*. Vol. 5. Centre for Policy Research: US. 1994.
- Trachtenberg, Zev. M. *Making Citizens – Rousseau’s Political Theory of Culture*. Routledge University Press: London. 2003.
- Trotman, James C. *Multiculturalism: Roots and Realities*. Indiana University Press: Bloomington. 2002.
- Tully, James. *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1995.
- Vaughn, Karen Iversen. *John Locke: Economist and Social Scientist*. The Athlone Press: London. 1980.
- Vermani, R. C. *An Introduction to Political Theory and Thought*. Gitanjali Publishing House. 2008.
- Vitikainen, Annamari. *The Limits of Liberal Multiculturalism: Towards an Individuated Approach to Cultural Diversity*. Palgrave Macmillan: London. 2015.
- Walzer, Michael. *Spheres of Justice: A Defence of Pluralism and Equality*. Blackwell: Oxford. 1983.
- Whitney, W. D. *Atharva - Veda Samhita*. Vol. II. Harvard Oriental Series: New Delhi. 1973.
- Willet, G. *Theorizing Multiculturalism: A Guide to Current Debate*. Blackwell: Oxford. 1998.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. Penguin Publishing: New York. 1961.
- Wolin, Sheldon. *Politics and Vision*. Little Brown: Boston. 1960.
- Wood, Allen. *Kantian Ethics*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 2008.
- Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey. 1990.

Journals

- Adoo, A. “Africa: Democracy without Human Rights,” *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol. 15. No. 4. 1993. pp. 703–15.
- Ahamad, S. Waseem and Ali, M. Ashraf. “Social Justice and The Constitution of India,” *Indian Journal of Political Science*. Vol. LXVII. No.4. Oct. Dec. 2006. Indian Political Science Association. pp. 767–82,
- Armstrong, Chris. “Complex Equality: Beyond Equality and Difference,” *Feminist Theory*. Vol. 3(1). Sage Publications: London. 2002. pp. 67–82.
- Asch, Michael. “Consociation and the Resolution of Aboriginal Political Rights,” *Culture*. Vol. 10. No. 1. pp. 93–102.

- Bader, Veit. "Citizenship and Exclusion: Radical Democracy, Community and Justice," *Political Theory*. Vol. 23. No. 2. 1995. pp. 211–46.
- Barry, Brian. "Liberalism and Multiculturalism," *Ethical Perspectives*, 4. 1997. pp. 3–14.
- Barry, Brian. "Self-Government Revisited," *Democracy and Power: Essays in Political Theory*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1991. pp. 156–186.
- Bertram, Christopher, "Jean Jacques Rousseau," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. . Edited by Edward N. Zalta.
<https://www.plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/rousseau>, retrieved on 22/09/2014.
- Bhargava, Rajeev. "The Right to Culture," *Communalism in Indian History, Politics and Culture*. Edited by K. N. Panikkar. Manohar Publishers: New Delhi. 1991. pp. 165–171.
- Bramann, Jorn K. "Kant: Self-Determination in the Age of Reason," *Educating Rita and Other Philosophical Movies*. Nightsun books: Maryland. 2009.
<http://faculty.frostburg.edu/philosophy/forum/kant/works.htm>, retrieved on 10/5/2015.
- Christie, K. "Regime Security and Human Rights in Southern Asia," *Political Studies (Special Issue: Politics and Human Rights)*. Vol. 43. 1995. pp. 204–218.
- Clark, Jeff. "Philosophy, Understanding and the Consultation: A Fusion of Horizons," *British Journal of General Practice*. 2008. pp 58–60.
www.ncbi.nlm.gov/pms/articles, retrieved on 07/13/2015.
- "Communitarian Criticisms and Liberal Lessons." A review of *Communitarianism and Its Critics* by Daniel A. Bell, *Looking Backward* by Derek Phillips, and *Liberals and Communitarians* by Stephen Mulhall and Adam Swift. *The Responsive Community*. 1995. pp. 54–64.
- Donner, Wendy. "John Stuart Mill's Liberal Feminism," *Philosophical Studies*, 69. 1993. pp. 155–66.
- Dorn, James A. "Equality, Justice, and Freedom: A Constitutional Perspective," *Libertarianism*. <http://www.libertarianism.org/publications/essays/equality-justice-freedom-constitutional-perspective>, retrieved on 06/15/2016.
- Duncan, Stewart, "Thomas Hobbes," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta.
<https://www.plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/hobbes>, retrieved on 09/24/2014.
- Dunning, William Archibald. "The Political Philosophy of John Locke," *Political Science Quarterly* .Vol. 20. No.2. Published by: The Academy of Political Science. 1905. pp. 223–45.
- Dworkin, Ronald. "What is Equality: Part II: Equality of Resources," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. Vol. 10. No. 4. pp. 283–345.
- England, John T. "Pluralism and Education: Its Meaning and Method," *In Department of Education ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services*. Michigan: Michigan State University: Michigan. December-1992. No. ED347494.3. pp. 1–8. <http://www.ericdigests.org/pluralism-and-education-its->

meaning-and-method/1991-2/method.htm=December 1992=No. ED347494.3, retrieved on 07/12/2015.

- Errnest Barker’s Views on Theory of Justice,” *Encyclopaedia of Political Science*, <http://www.politicalsciencenotes.com/theories-of-justice/errnest-barkers-views-on-theory-justice-3/753>, retrieved on: 02/03/2016.
- Fieser, James. *Great Issues in Philosophy*. www.utm.edu/staff/jfieser/120/2008/chapter/Political_Liberalism_and_Property/=02, retrieved on
- Fraser, Nancy. “Rethinking Recognition,” *New Left Review*-3. May-June 2000. pp. 107–120.
- Fraser, Nancy. “Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation,” *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. Stanford University. 1996. pp. 3–67.
- Friedman, Marilyn. “Beyond Caring: The De-moralization of Gender,” *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. Supplementary Vol. 13. 1987. pp. 87–100.
- Geerts, Evelien. “An Analysis of Susan Moller Okin’s Problematic Approach to Multiculturalism. A Feminist Comprehensive Liberalism Gone Wrong,” *Contemporary Feminist Debates*. <http://www.acedemia.edu/403092/An-Analysis-of-Susan-Moller-Okin’s-Problematic-Approach-to-Multiculturalism.A-Feminist-Comprehensive-Liberalism-Gone-Wrong/papers>, retrieved on 04/10/2016.
- Gilman, Sandra. 1997. ‘Barbaric Rituals,’ *Boston Review*. October-November, pp. 33–34.
- Glazer, Nathan 1993. “Is Assimilation Dead,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. 530. No. 1. pp. 122–36.
- Gross, Elizabeth. “What is Feminist Theory?,” *Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory*. Edited by Carole Pateman and E. Gross. Northeastern University Press: Boston. 1986. pp. 125–143.
- Honig, Bonnie. “Complicating Culture,” *Boston Review*. Oct– Nov. 1997. pp. 30–32.
- Hooker, Richard. “The European Enlightenment: Jacques Rousseau”. Washington State University. 2005. www.richardhooker.com/sites/wolrdcultures/ENLIGHTENMENT/ROUSSEAU, retrieved on 09/13/2015.
- *Human Rights Today – A United Nations Priority*. New York: Department of Public Information, UN. 1998.
- Iordanou, George. “Kymlicka’s Multicultural Citizenship.” <http://www.iordanou.org/kymlickas-multicultural-citizenship/wordpress>, retrieved on 06/12/2016.
- Jeff, J.S. Black. *Rousseau's Critique of Science: A Commentary on the Discourse on the Sciences and the Arts*. Lexington Books. 2009. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php/Rousseau/title=theDiscourse_on_the_Art_and_Sciences&oldid=787802504, retrieved on 09/22/2015.
- Kant, Immanuel. “An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?,” *What is Enlightenment? : Eighteen-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Question*. Edited by J. Schmidt. University of California Press: California. 1996.

- Kant, Immanuel. “What is Enlightenment,” *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Edited by Lawrence E. Cahoon Blackwell Publisher: UK. 1996.
- Korfmacher, Carsten, “Personal Identity,” www.iep.utm/personal-identity/, retrieved on: 02/09/2016.
- Kraut, Richard. “Aristotle’s Ethics,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://aristotleethics/stanford-encyclopedia-of-philosophy>, retrieved on: 09/20/2014.
- Kukathas, Chandran. “Are There Any Cultural Rights?,” *Political Theory*. Vol. 20. No. 1. February 1992. pp. 105–39.
- Kukathas, Chandran. “Multiculturalism as Fairness: Will Kymlicka’s Multicultural Citizenship,” *The Journal of Political Philosophy*. Vol. 5 No. 4. 1997. pp. 406–27.
- Kukathas, Chandran. “Theoretical Foundations of Multiculturalism.” 1992. http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/fall04/theoretical-foundation-of-multiculturalism/by/kukathas_chandran.pdf, retrieved on:02/05/2016.
- Kymlicka, Will. “Liberal Individualism and Liberal Neutrality,” *Ethics*. 99/4. pp. 883–905.
- Lane, Melissa. “Ancient Political Philosophy,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/ancient-political>, retrieved on 21/02/2014.
- MacCormick. “Justice: An Unoriginal Position,” *Legal Right and Social Democracy*. Clarendon Press: UK. 1984. pp. 84–102.
- MacKinnon, Catherine. “Reflection on Sex Equality under the Law,” *Yale Law Journal*, 100. 1991. pp. 1281–328.
- Mill, J. S. “On Liberty”, *Online Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy*. http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/Cavalier/80130/part1/sect4/texts/Mill_OnLiberty.html, retrieved on 11/02/2014.
- Morsink, J. “Cultural Genocide, the Universal Declaration and Minority Rights,” *Human Rights Quarterly*. Vol. 21, No. 4. 1999. pp. 1009–1060.
- Neoliberalism”. *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Neoliberalism&oldid=789449410>, retrieved on 03/15/2016.
- Nicholson, Linda. “To Be or Not To Be: Charles Taylor and the Politics of Recognition,” *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory*. Vol. 3, Issue 1, 1996. pp. 1–16.
- Okin, Susan Moller. “Feminism and Multiculturalism: Some Tensions,” *Ethics*. Vol. 108. No. 4. The University of Chicago Press. July, 1998. pp. 661–84.
- Okin, Susan Moller. “Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?,” *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Edited by Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard and Martha C. Nussbaum. Princeton University Press: New Jersey. 1990. pp. 9–24.
- Okin, Susan Moller. “Mistress of Their Own Destiny: Group Rights, Gender, and Realistic Rights of Exit,” *Ethics*. Vol. 112. No. 2. January 2002. pp. 205–30.
- Okin, Susan. “Women and the Making of Sentimental Family,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 11/1. 1981. pp. 65–88.

- Paksoy, Hasan Bülent, “Identities: How Governed, Who Pays?,” Lubbock: Texas, 2nd Ed. 2006. http://www.eumed.net/malaga_entelequia/identity/entelequia/com, retrieved on 09/12/2014.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Political Theory: Traditions in Political Philosophy,” *A New Handbook of Political Science*. Edited by Robert Goodwin and Hans-Dieter Klingeman. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1997. pp. 503-518.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Dialogue between Cultures,” *Democracy, Nationalism and Multiculturalism*. Edited by Ramon Maiz and Ferran Requejo. Frank Cass: London. 2005.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Cultural Pluralism and the Limits of Diversity,” *Alternative: Global, Local, Political*. Vol. 20. No. 4. Oct.-Dec. 1995. pp. 431–57.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Dangers of Liberalism,” *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: Culture and Equality and its Critics*. Edited by Paul Kelly. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2002.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Decolonizing Liberalism,” *The End of ‘Isms’? Reflections on the Fate of Ideological Politics after Communism’s Collapse*. Edited by Aleksanders Shiromas. Blackwell: Oxford. 1994. pp. 85–103.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Discourses on National Identity,” *Political Studies*, Vol. 42. No. 3. 1994. pp. 492–504.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Equality in Multicultural Society,” *Equality*. Edited by Jane Franklin. Institute for Public Policy Research: London. 1997. pp. 123–156.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. “Superior People: The Narrowness of Liberalism from Mill to Rawls,” *Times Literary Supplements*. 25 Feb. 1994. pp.11–13.
- Pateman, Carole. “Sublimation and Reification: Locke, Wolin and the Liberal Democratic Conception of the Political,” *Politics and Society*, 5/4. 1975. pp. 441–67.
- Pateman, Carole. “The Disorder of Women’: Women, Love and the Sense of Justice,” *Ethics*. 91/1. 1980. pp. 20–34.
- Pogge, T. “The International Significance off Human Rights,” *Journal of Ethics*. 4. 2000. pp. 45–69.
- Pye, L.W. “Political Culture,” *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 12. Edited by D. L. Sills. Macmillan: New York. 1968.
- Ramaswamy, Sushila. “The Incompleteness of the Multiculturalist Agenda: Overlooking the Need for a Shared Identity,” *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 42. No. 37. Sep. 15 - 21, 2007. pp. 3790–3796.
- Rawls, John. “Fairness to Goodness,” *Philosophical Review*, 84. 1975. pp. 536–54.
- Rawls, John. “Social Unity and Primary Goods,” *Utilitarianism and Beyond*. Edited by Amartya Sen and B. Williams. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982. pp. 159–85.
- Raz, Joseph. “Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective,” *Dissent*, Winter. Vol. 41. No. 1. January 1994. pp. 67–80.
- Rees, Dilys Karen. “Gadamer’s Philosophical Hermeneutics: The Vantage Points and the Horizon in Reader’s responses to an American Literature Text.” www.readingmatrix.com/artcles/rees/article, retrieved on 03/23/2015.
- *Revlon Human Rights: International Bill of Human Rights*. Fact Sheet No. 2. Centre of Human Rights: New York, UN. 1996.

- Robert Johnson. "Kant's Moral Philosophy." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/kant-moral>.
- Robson, Richard. 2014. "In What Sense is Multiculturalism a Form of Communitarianism?" [http://www.RICHARD-ROBSON/Ideologies/multiculturalism/In What Sense is Multiculturalism a Form of Communitarianism?co.uk/?p=142](http://www.RICHARD-ROBSON/Ideologies/multiculturalism/In%20What%20Sense%20is%20Multiculturalism%20a%20Form%20of%20Communitarianism?co.uk/?p=142), retrieved on 01/12/2016.
- Rodrigues, Luis Cordeiro. "The Politics Of Recognition," *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. ISSN 2161-0002. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/multiculturalism/the-politics-of-recognition/>, retrieved on 09/24/2015.
- Sampaio, Rui. "The Hermeneutic Conception of Culture." <http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Cult/CultSamp.htm>, retrieved on 05/17/2014.
- Sethumadhavan, T. N. "Upanishads the Science of Freedom from Bondage." <http://www.esamskriti.com/essay-chapters/Upanishads-The-Science-of-Freedom-from-Bondage-2.aspx>, retrieved on 05/20/2014.
- Singh, R. P. "Human Rights in the Wake of Globalization: Kantian Perspective," *The Philosophical Heritage of Immanuel Kant*. Edited by R. P. Singh. 2006. pp. 103–24.
- Singh, R.P. "Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons," *World of Philosophy: A Harmony*. Edited by C. K. Chapple. 2011. pp. 184–99.
- Smith, D.G. "Liberalism," *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 9. Edited by David E. Sills. Macmillan and Free Press: New York. 1968.
- Tang, J. T. H. "Human Rights in the Asia Pacific Region: Competing Perspectives, International Discord and the Way Ahead," *Human Rights and International Relations in the Asia Pacific*. Edited by J.T.H. Tang. Pinter: London. 1995. pp. 1–19.
- Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition," *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Edited by Amy Gutmann. Princeton University Press: Princeton. 1994.
- Tuckness, Alex, "Locke's Political Philosophy," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/locke-political>, retrieved on 02/10/2016.
- Turner, J. C. "Towards a Cognitive Redefinition of the Social Group," *Social Identity and Intergroup Relation*. Edited by H. Tajfel. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge. 1982.
- Turner, Terence. "Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What Is Anthropology That Multiculturalists Should Be Mindful of It?," *Cultural Anthropology*. Vol. 8. No. 4. American Anthropological Association: Wiley. Nov. 1993. pp. 411–429.
- Tutui, Viorel. "Between the "Spheres of Justice" and the "Right to Citizenship": The Limits of the Communitarian Theory of Michael Walzer," *Meta: Research In Hermeneutics, Phenomenology, And Practical Philosophy*. Vol. 3. No. 1. June 2011. pp. 130–40. ISSN 2067-3655.
- Upadhyay, A. K. "Multiculturalism and the Crisis of Democratic Governance," *The Indian Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 63. No. 4. Indian Political Science Association. December 2002. pp. 261–79.

- Upadhyay, A. K. "Multiculturalism as Political Concern," *CEPSR*. Vol. 9. No. 31. Spring. 2008. pp. 6–18.
- Waldren, Jeremy. "Cultural Identity and Civic Responsibility," *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*. Edited by Will Kymlicka and Norman Wayne. New York: Oxford University: New York. 2000.
- Wren, Thomas. "The Strange Career of the Concept of Culture." <http://thomaswren.sites.luc.edu/philosophy423/wren1.htm>, retrieved on 11/08/2014.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship," *Ethics*. 99/2. 1989. pp. 250–74.
- Young, Iris Marion. "Together in Difference: Transforming the Logic of Group Political Conflict," *Principled Positions: Postmodernism and the Rediscovery of Values*. Edited by Judith Smith. Lawrence & Wishart: London. 1993. pp. 121–150.

Online Sources

- www.nios.ac.in/media/documents/secichcour/english/indian_culture_and_heritage/understandingculture, retrieved on 15/03/2015.
- <https://www.tamu.edu/faculty/choudhury/culture.html>
- dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/culture
- <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jean-Jacques-Rousseau>
- [www.sparknotes.com > ... > Jean-Jacques Rousseau \(1712–1778](http://www.sparknotes.com/.../Jean-Jacques-Rousseau-(1712-1778))
- anthrotheory.wikia.com/wiki/Ruth_Benedict/anthropology_theory_project
- [http://www.rb/Ruth_Benedict_&_the_Anthropological_Concept_of_Culture/livinganthropologically.com > Cultural Anthropology.](http://www.rb/Ruth_Benedict_&_the_Anthropological_Concept_of_Culture/livinganthropologically.com/Cultural_Anthropology)
- <http://www.criticallegalthinking.com/2016/06/17/hans-georg-gadamer-hermeneutics/>
- http://www.jrnl/Hans-Georg_Gadamer's_philosophical_hermeneutics:_Concepts_of_metajournal.org/articles_pdf/286-303-regan-meta8-tehno.pdf
- www.aurosociety.org/sri-aurobindo-mother/index.asp
- [http://www.safic./Sri_Aurobindo_Foundation_for_Indian_Culture_\(SAFIC\)_-Activities/.aurosociety.org/activities/](http://www.safic./Sri_Aurobindo_Foundation_for_Indian_Culture_(SAFIC)_-Activities/.aurosociety.org/activities/)
- www.aurosociety.org/focus-area/indian-culture.aspx
- rationalwiki.org/wiki/Multiculturalism/origin-of/
- <https://www.britannica.com/topic/multiculturalism/sociology>
- www.india-seminar.com/1999/484/484%20parekh.htm/bhikhu_parekh-what_is_multiculturalism
- www.southeast-europe.org/pdf/04/DKE_04_A_E_Berkes-Lilla_Kantor-Judit.the-development-and-meaning-of-multiculturalism.pdf
- www.Img.pf.bw.schdule.de/faecher/english/files/meltingbowl.doc, retrieved on 05/14/2015.
- <http://www.jstor.org>.
- <http://www.liberalism.wiki/online.com>
- <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberalism>
- <https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism>
- study.com/academy/lesson/liberalism-history-ideology-and-influence.html

- <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/02/the-origin...liberalism/283780/>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_liberalism
- <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/liberalism>
- https://web.stanford.edu/group/scie/Career/individualism/Wisdom/indi_com.htm
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Locke
- https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Locke/Biography_Treatises_Works_and_Facts
- Oll.libertyfund.org/people/online-libraryofliberty/john-locke
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Stuart_Mill
- [www.sparknotes.com > ... > Philosophy Study Guides > John Stuart Mill \(1806–1873\)](http://www.sparknotes.com > ... > Philosophy Study Guides > John Stuart Mill (1806–1873))
- www.iep.utm.edu/milljs/
- <https://www.biography.com/people/john-stuart-mill-9408210>
- <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John-Stuart-Mil>
- [The Project Gutenberg eBook of On Liberty, by John Stuart Mill.](http://The Project Gutenberg eBook of On Liberty, by John Stuart Mill)
<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/34901/34901-h/34901-h.htm>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Kant
- <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Immanuel-Kant>
- germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?Immanuel_Kant/document_id=3589
- www.csus.edu/indiv/g/gaskilld/ethics/kantian%20ethics.htm
- <https://www.biography.com/people/immanuel-kant-9360144>
- www.philosophybasics.com/BY-INDIVIDUAL-PHILOSOPHER/philosophers_kant.html
- www.iep.utm.edu/kantmeta/kANT:Metaphysics/Internet_Encyclopedia_Of_Philosophy.htm
- <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communitarianism>
- [“Definition of Justice”. www.merriam-webster.com.](http://www.merriam-webster.com)
- <https://www.slideshare.net/dragon888/individualism-communitarianism>
- www.postsustainabilityinstitute.org/individualism-vs-communitarianism.html
- www.shareyouressays.com/.../difference-between-individualism-and-communitarians
- link.springer.com/article/individualism,communitarianism,consensus/10.1023/A:1011925405156
- <https://www.amazon.com/Communitarianism-Individualism-Oxford-Readings.../0198780281>
- www://en.wikipedia.org/Community/wiki/Communitas
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/>
- study.com/.../lesson/what-is-personal-identity-definition-philosophy-development.htm
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minority_rights_and_human_rights
- www://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html
- http://www.youthforhumanrights.org/WHAT_ARE_HUMAN_RIGHTS?-Human_Rights_Definition.htm
- www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/MinorityRights_en.pdf
- <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/human-rights/what-are-human-rights/pdf>

- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Theory_of_Justice
- www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/what-is-justice/VicJSchol/2014/12.pdf
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_good
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_dilemma
- <https://www.tutor2u.net/.../unit-1-micro-differences-between-merit-and-public-goods>
- <http://www.philosophybasics.com › By Branch/Doctrine › Politicalphilisophy.htm>
- http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/pboettke/workshop/fall04/theoretical-foundation-of-multiculturalism/by/kukathas_chandran.pdf
- <http://www.insidestory.org.au/the-contradictions-of-liberal-multiculturalism>
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/>
- <https://www.jstor.org/stable/liberal.multiculturalism.as.political.philosophy/will/kymlicka/41419014>
- journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/liberal/multiculturalism/10.1177/009059170528413
- onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/the-future-of-liberal-multiculturalism/10.1111/1478.9302.12018/pdf
- <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/39064/limitsof-liberal-multiculturalism.pdf?sequence=1>
- <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communitarianism>
- <https://www.cpsa-acsp.ca/papers2004/challenging-multiculturalism/Dhamoon.pdf>
- www.jstor.org/stable/jthought./communitarianism_and_multiculturalism_in_the_academy/44.1-2.9
- www.bristol.ac.uk/media-library/sites/ethnicity/migrated/.../soundings48.A-Left-Communitarianism_What-about-Multiculturalism/pdf
- www.mdusche.de/media/publications/multiculturalism_communitarianism_liberalism/Michael/Dusche/file/Dusche06_4042.pdf
- https://www.marist.edu/liberalarts/philrel/.../TheChallengeofMulticulturalism_BeyondLiberalism%20Sultan%20MUPJ.pdf
- professormarkmercer.ca/commentary/097%20Multiculturalism_liberal-or-communitarian/.pdf
- www.weeklystandard.com/feminism-vs.-multiculturalism/the-weekly-standard/article/11815
- punzel.org/Ephemeris2014/A_Defence_of_Okin's_Femiinist_Critique_of_Multiculturalism_Group_Rights_in_turn_warrants_group_rights/Kim.pdf
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Susan_Moller_Okin/researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10063/2497/thesis.pdf?sequence=2