GLOBALIZATION:

CONTENDING CLAIMS ON MORALITY

Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

MINAKSHI SINGH

CENTRE FOR PHILOSOPHY

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

NEW DELHI –110067

2012

CENTRE FOR PHILOSOPHY

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

NEW DELHI–110067

Date: 24 July 2012

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the dissertation titled GLOBALIZATION: CONTENDING CLAIMS ON MORALITY submitted by Minakshi Singh in partial fulfilment of the requirements for award of the degree of Master of Philosophy, is to the best of my knowledge an original work and has not been submitted so far in part or full for any other degree or diploma of any university and may be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Pro. R.P. Singh   Pro. R.P. Singh

(Chairperson)   (Supervisor)

Declaration

Date: 24 July 2012

I, Minakshi Singh, do hereby declare that the dissertation entitled GLOBALIZATION: CONTENDING CLAIMS ON MORALITY submitted by me for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy is an authentic work and has not been submitted for any other degree or diploma of this or any other institution or university to the best of my knowledge.

(Minakshi Singh)

Centre for Philosophy

School of Social Sciences

Jawaharlal Nehru University

New Delhi–110067

India

Dedicated to

S.K. Singh & Pooja Singh

Who have made possible whatever little I have achieved till now

Acknowledgements

Preface

I, in the present dissertation, shall discuss 'Globalization: Contending Claims on Morality'. Globalization was in the process of making for a long time, perhaps very long time. However, globalization as a technological and economic movement supported by political and moral ethos started during mid 70's in the developed countries in the last millennium and since 1990s, the world has moved towards globalization in a big way. Globalization has evolved out of the golden period of capitalism; i.e. 1940 to 1975. Globalization has challenged the Nation/State territorial sovereignty, the institutional autonomy, shrinking the concepts of space and time. With the collapse of Socialism in the Central and East European countries during 1990s of which people's Republic of China just managed to escape, the world has moved towards defining values of universalism set out in "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" and in setting development goals in the United Nations conferences on environment, population, social development, woman and human settlement.

In order to articulate globalization and contending claims on morality, I have proceeded with an analysis of processes and perspectives of globalization like; Universalization, Internationalization, Liberalization and Westernization. This is followed by the theories of morality like; Kantianism and Utilitarianism as private and public morality respectively and Libertarianism and Communitarianism as individualistic and collective morality. And finally I contend that every theory is equally important and we cannot say which theory is more relevant than other.

Along with morality, I have tried to analyze globalization in the context of identity, cultural diversity and multiculturalism. For the sake of this discussion I shall try to expound the role and importance of Indian moral values in the era of globalization. I shall take up the concept of *Puruṣārthas*: *Abhyudaya & Niḥśreyasa* (*Dharma*: righteousness, *Artha*: wealth, *Kama:* desire and *Moksha*: salvation or liberation), which is the centre of whole Indian moral values. In the end, I shall propose Indian pluralistic perspectives as a response to globalization. Unity in Diversity - *Ekam sat*

viprah bahudha vadanti, tolerance, *Sarva-Dharma-Sambhav* (Secularism), *Vishvaneedam (Vasudhaiv Kutumbkam),* etc. are the basic concepts which can facilitate the ethos of globalization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

I, in the present dissertation shall discuss 'Globalization: Contending Claims on Morality'. As a matter of fact, the present millennium is different from all earlier ones. We have scientific knowledge which is the most delicate and advanced, technology which is the most capable and sophisticated, the fifth generation micro-soft with knowledge and information; but do we have wisdom to make use of all these so that there is human face impressed on these achievements? One of the features of human history has been that people, resources, ideas and consciousness move from one place to another and in the wake of globalization these are moving all too fast and getting transformed gradually. The basic question arises what has been the role of values in such movements and transformations? Is our identity, moral conceptions of good and bad, right and wrong getting lost in the process of globalization? How can we give a response to globalization in the context of contending claims on moral values? These are some of the most basic questions that I wish to address in this study.

Globalization started during mid 70's in the developed countries in the last century and since 1990, the world has moved towards globalization in a big way. During the Pre-World War I period of 1870 to 1914, there was rapid integration of the economies in terms of trade flows, movement of capital and migration of people. The growth of globalization was mainly led by the technological forces in the fields of transport and communication. There were fewer barriers to flow of trade and people across the national boundaries. The pace of globalization, however, decelerated between the First and the Second World Wars and it has evolved out of the golden period of capitalism; i.e. 1940 to 1975.

Globalization is essentially a product of technological advancement. Philosophically, we cannot remain indifferent to it. We have to innovate. It is a broad mindset that believes that broad world structures are possible. One way of looking at globalization

is to look at the history of social and economic revolution and the emergence of state in relation to technological advancement and transformation. Globalization means media, rapid transmission of messages and symbols. It is a deregulation of domestic as well as external markets – goods and services. It appreciates the total capital market with the need to promote investment. This is done with Cyber Space and the internet. It can describe the expansion of economic activities across national boundaries. This later on is converted into trade and commerce, banking, rural institutions and so on.

As a matter of fact, the ancient world was finite in terms of its socio-economic conditions, scientific development, historical and cultural products. The modern world was infinite in terms of ideology, scientific and technological development, logo centrism, foundationalism, essentialism, and teleology, unified world-order, rationality, conceptions of morality and justice, etc. The postmodern world has again shrunk into finite propositions in terms of anti - foundationalism, anti-essentialism and anti-teleology, fragmentation, irrationality and plurality of ethnic identities, linguistic identities, etc. In the ancient world, different parts of the world, inhabited by different ethnic and linguistic groups had connectivity between them. There were numerous factors that there was contact, conflict and confluence of cultures and civilizations. The existential and spiritual features of culture get transformed into the material and instrumental features. The identity of culture is complex, plural and multilayered. Subtle relics of the human past underpin the visible parts of culture, ordinarily designated civilization. Comparative archaeologists and comparative philologists help us in discovering the vanished past marked by its ways of living, tools, utensils and other artifacts used by them. All these factors are interactive in character, paving the way to the emergence of new civilization and newer forms of culture. Even in the antiquity, the Indians, the Chinese, the Greeks lived with contact, though not much, with one another and in that sense there was pluralism. But each culture regarded its principles to be universally valid. It is in this process that we come across moral dilemmas. The need is to expose us to our own moral values in the wake of current development at the International scenario. It is urgent in view of the onslaught of Western Culture on our impressionistic minds, which creates a moral dilemma and leads to Cultural Amnesia. In this study I shall try to analyze this issue in terms of our own moral values.

Globalization has become an unavoidable concept in the social sciences in the interdisciplinary context, a core dictum in the prescriptions of academicians, management gurus, and a catch-phrase for journalists and politicians of every stripe. It is widely asserted that we live in an era in which the greater part of social life is determined by global processes, in which national cultures, national economies and national borders are dissolving. We live in an independent global political economy and we cannot avoid its impact on our all aspects of social and moral life. The world has become so close but some ethical and moral questions still remain begging answers. The question arises – Have our hearts united and have we become emotionally integrated? What is the importance of moral values for individuals, communities and nations? There are many ways to moral theories and we come across a dilemma over moral issues.

The purpose of morality is to make the world a better place to live. Moral values are rules for both individuals and community or organizations to make decisions regarding right and wrong of their actions. So, in the age of globalization, morality is very important for individual and nation. We should do whatever will bring the most benefit to all of humanity. We may feel instinctively that a certain conclusion to a problem is 'fair' or 'unfair', but what criteria do we use to make such judgments? There are different ethical theories that can be applied to a problem to elucidate our thinking, but even so the results may not fit with our moral intuition. When a choice is made, often the question is asked: "was it the right decision?" In the age of globalization there are sufficient moral grounds to justify or to reject certain choices, which I shall discuss in this study.

This study has been organized and presented into three chapters. In Chapter one, I shall develop the concept of globalization along with its processes and perspectives regarding what is globalization. How should it be conceptualized? For thousands of years, human beings have, of course, travelled – setting new lands, exploring the seas, building empires or searching for the means of subsistence. However, it is important to recall that it is only in the last five hundred years that they have travelled across the world, conquering and linking together the America and Oceania, Africa and Asia. The exploration of travel, migration, fighting, and economic interchange provided an enormous impetus to the transformation of the

form and shape of human communities; for the latter became increasingly enmeshed in networks and systems of interchange – a new era of regional and global movement of people, goods, information and microbes was established. Social, political and economic activities could stretch across communities, regions and continents; increasing proportions of human energy could be devoted to such activities, as flows of trade, investment and culture increased; organization and mechanisms of power and control (empires, colonization and large corporations) could search the world for advantage; and it became possible for all this to happen much more quickly, as new systems of transportation and communication emerged.

On the back of these developments, new economic, political and cultural infrastructures and organizations developed, making possible a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, and generating increased levels of activity across particular communities and, indeed, across the entire world. Today, we have a heightened perception of this; e-mail is sent across the planet in seconds; financial markets stretch across the globe; large multinational corporations dwarf the economies of many countries; jobs often depend on decisions in far-off places; supermarkets are stocked with goods from all over the world; drug-related crime is organized on a transnational basis and some of the most important threats to humankind – global warming, ozone depletion and pollution – escape the jurisdiction of particular states and societies. In short, from the 'age of discovery' to the new millennium, processes of change have been underway that have altered the relations and connections between peoples and communities – processes which have been captured by the term 'globalization'.

Globalization is by no means uniform, it always means different to different people. It may be defined as universalization, internationalization, liberalization and westernization. Globalization is a process of universalization because in these process goods, services, information, ideas etc. are crossing national boundaries and connecting the world on an unprecedented scale and with previously unimaginable speed. Globalization as internationalizations is the idea that we are moving beyond the era of growing ties between nations and are beginning to contemplate something beyond the existing conception of the nation-state. As liberalization, there is the reduction in barriers to the cross-border movement of goods, services, money, and

financial instruments. And as westernization, globalization is a modernization and process of homogenization that lead the world to become more western, or American. In the process of these several theories and process a question always arises – how to homogenize it? In this chapter I shall analyze this question along with these theories of globalization.

In Chapter two, I shall elaborate the normative theories of morality. Morality has been an exciting aspect of philosophy. It is a branch of philosophy that studies morals and values. Interest in ethics and ethical codes has been around for a long time. Centuries ago, Aristotle referred to character, which he called "ethos", as the most potent means of persuasion. He also identified elements of virtue as "justice, courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, and wisdom". In Roman times, the emperor Justinian was the first to incorporate ethics into the legal system and to establish schools to educate lawyers concerning ethics morality, and law. Napoleon established a code of thirty-six statutes based on the concept that all citizens, regardless of circumstances of birth or social stature, should be treated fairly and equally. Indeed, every civilization has recognized the need for establishing laws and codes to guide human relationship and behaviour. Ethics studies the differences between right and wrong, and through these studies philosophers have developed several theories. Some major normative ethical theories like; Kantianism, Utilitarianism and socio-political philosophical theories like; libertarianism and communitarianism are existing in the societies, which may consider the application of rules or the consequences of actions. But here, the problem is that - what is the role and importance of these moral theories in the age of globalization, how to conceptualize these theories in information society and these are how much compatible with globalized world. In this chapter I shall try to analyze the role, importance and compatibility of these theories in globalized world.

In Part- 1, I shall elaborate the theories of Kantianism and Utilitarianism. Moral theories still oscillate between Kantianism, in so far as individual moral life and principles are concerned and Utilitarianism in so far as public policy, decisions of the emerging democracies are concerned. For Kant, the end results were not important in determining whether an action was just or not. Motive was everything to him, and he had very strict views on how to judge the morality of an action. On the other hand,

the antithesis of the Kantianism is Utilitarianism. The fundamental imperative of utilitarianism is: Always act in the way that will produce the greatest overall amount of good in the world. In the system of Utilitarianism, the ends justify the means, and actions are judged on the results, not on the intentions or motives.

In Part- 2, I shall elaborate the theory of libertarianism and communitariansm as socio- political philosophical theories. Libertarianism is generally considered to be the group of political philosophies which emphasize freedom, liberty, and voluntary association. In political philosophy, the so-called "Liberal – Communitarian" debate was started in 1980s, which is continues to this day. Communitarians have sought to deflate the universal pretensions of liberal theory. This debate is emerging from the concept of Individualism and Collectivism. Individualism and collectivism are conflicting views with the nature of humans, society, and the relationship between them. Individualism determines that the individual is the primary unit of reality and the ultimate standard of value. This view does not deny that societies exist or that people benefit from living in them, but it sees society as a collection of individuals, not something over and above them. On the other hand, Collectivism is a tradition, ideology, or personal orientation that emphasizes the primacy of the group or community rather than each individual person. According to collectivism the group, the nation, the community, the proletariat, the race, etc. is the primary unit of reality and the ultimate standard of value. In the context of these concepts, I shall try to understand that- Is it possible for an individual to be strictly an individual and not a member of a community? Or only community is more important instead of individual? I shall try to show that there is an integral relationship between individual and the community. An insight into this issue comes from multiculturalism and Indian philosophy of morals.

In Chapter three, I shall discuss globalization in the context of culture, multiculturalism and *puruṣārthas*. I have divided it into two parts; namely; Part 1, I shall analyze culture and multiculturalism in the context of identities, which are either local or global. And the analysis of these identities can be found in multiculturalism. I shall also combine an analysis of local identity and globality with an assessment of some issue like; cultural diversity and multiculturalism. In globalization, one such imperative is that people will move and with them there will be a movement of

consciousness and value. There is a global worry on the process of globalization and the consequences that globalization will affect local cultures, local identities, the philosophical heritage and the very diversities that constitute the cultural matrix of human kind. The technology of globalization encourages and helps the formation of local cultures. This is an obvious fact. If we are on Cyber Space or on the Internet, we have teleconferencing. Even sitting in this hall, we can have dialogues with students and teachers in Europe and USA. But the question is – will this technology help preserve local identities? Can globalization do away with local culture, local identity, and community identity? The reality is, local culture survives in globalization. In the era of globalization, most of the countries do not able to avoid the impacts of westernization and they are losing own cultures. So, in this part I shall try to analyze the problem of local culture and local identity in globalized world.

After I have discussed those issues, I shall come to next part of this chapter for try to give a response of globalization by Indian moral value (*Puruṣārthas*) and Indian Pluralistic Perspective. In the era of globalization, it is very important to expose our own cultural identity along with our own moral values. And it is very necessary to conclude this problem with thinking of global perspective and take a position by local action with pluralistic perspective. And for this, we can look at Indian moral value system with Indian pluralistic perspective. Indian moral values are very important concept for our society. The Indian morality runs through three great ages. The first is the *Vedic* Age – the age of affirmation. The second is the age of the *Upaniṣhads* – the age of denial of the world and affirmation of the spirit. The third is the age of synthesis when the values of for the first from historical perspective, we come across a cognitive attempt to raise the world are re-affirmed in the light of the spirit. This was the age of the *Gitā*. In the *Upaniṣhads* alone, discuss and resolve moral dilemmas pertaining to aim and ends of human life; i. e., *puruṣārtha*. The solution that the *Upaniṣhads* provide is based on the eternal truths of *ātmanic* experience and revelation. The ethics of the *Upaniṣhads* can be studied within the status of Being, knowledge and Mysticism on the one hand and *Varnas*, *Āshramas* and *Puruṣārthas* on the other. This itself is a matter of debate how metaphysical issues like Brahman and Atman could be related to ethics on the one hand and to mysticism on the other. Taking man's consciousness at the centre, we have to take a bold decision that it is the

consciousness, which is at the centre of metaphysics, knowledge, mysticism and morality. It is on the basis of consciousness alone that the *Upaniṣhads* present a synthesis of the four. The four *puruṣārthas* can be broadly divided into two tier value systems; namely, *abhyudaya* consisting of dharma, *artha* and *kāma*, and *niḥśreyasa*, i.e. *moksha*. Ethics has perpetually been applied at every stage. Hence the *Upaniṣhadic* ethical quest is at the centre of Being, Knowledge, Mysticism, *puruṣārthas* and the *āshramas*.

The culture was built in order to support these things in life, in their right balance. Each is considered more important than the previous (*Moksha* is beyond *Dharma*, which is in turn higher than *Artha* and *Kāma*). Yet all four were considered important in the development of individual and society. "*Kanada* defines morality as that which gives prosperity (*Abhyudaya*) in this life and the highest success hereafter. (*Niḥśreyasa*)" This definition is laid down from the point of view of the individual but what is that which gives to an individual the success he tries for? It was accepted that for all but very few people, the achievement of *Kāma*, *Artha* and *Dharma* must come before the final quest for spiritual realisation. A person must enjoy in some measure what worldly life has to offer, pay off debts to society and do one's bit in maintaining a healthy communal life before turning away from the transient world and attaching ourselves to the Changeless Reality that lies veiled beyond material existence, which alone can give everlasting joy. In this part I shall try to find out the role and importance of *Puruṣārthas* in the age of globalization and try to give a response to globalization along with some other pluralistic perspective.

Except *Puruṣārthas*, there is some other pluralistic concept in Indian values system, according to which we think on global perspective. We have to maintain our cultural identity but at the same time we should emphasize the universal aspects of the culture. This dynamic equilibrium between the racial and universal aspects of culture has to be maintained. Mahatma Gandhi, the father of the nation, was right when he said that, we should keep our windows open so that the winds of change visit us from outside but we should refuse to be swept off our feet. The initial characteristics of Indian society are that it is diverse, liberal, democratic and pluralistic in regulating and restructuring the systems of Indian philosophy. Pluralism has been expressed in many ways in the later development of Indian philosophical system; such as in the

Vedanta philosophy, we go from one to many; in *Vallabha Vedānta*, we go from many to one; in *Sānkhya* and *Nyāya-Vaisesika* systems, we go from many to many and in Buddhism, we go from nothing, i.e. *svabhāva shunya* to many. The pluralistic nature of Indian society is manifested in various ethnic identities, community structure, linguistic identities, different nationalities, languages and so on. In search of our local identities, we have to go into the details of our tradition. In Indian value system, we can find many concepts which are talk about one world culture, unity, peace, etc. In the end of this study I shall propose some important concepts and by it, try to give a response to globalization.

The Vedic exhortation is *Ekam sat viprah bahudha vadanti* (Unity in Diversity). This has been the fundamental act of philosophizing and ethicising in India. The reality admits of alternative approaches in terms of thought construction and linguistic expressions. It is pluralistic in its expression. I shall develop another concepts like; Tolerance, *Vishvaneedam* (*Vasudhaiv Kutumbkam*), *Sarva-Dharma-Sambhav* (Secularism) etc., which are very important concepts for develop appropriate strategies and programs to visualize and actualize one world culture, unity and peace. This view point is conducive to the sustenance of globalization on the one hand and resolving the mutual disagreements in the contending claims of the morality on the other.

Chapter One

Globalization: Processes and Perspectives

In this chapter, I shall discuss the concept of globalization along with its several processes and perspectives like; Universalization, Liberalization, Internationalization and Westernization. In my attempt to articulate the processes and perspectives of globalization, I shall develop their philosophical foundation. The underline philosophical foundation behind the process of universalization and of liberalization, globalization lies in the formulation of universal concept or the universals in Greek philosophy and the enlightenment rationality of modern western philosophy.

It is application of these universals and liberal ideas that internationalization and so called the westernization can be vindicated. Likewise the perspectives of neo-liberals and reformists on the one hand and radicals and revolutionaries on the other are philosophically based on two fundamental ideologies namely, liberalism and Marxism.

Before to discuss the processes and perspectives of globalization, it is very important to know that – what is the meaning of globalization? And in order to characterize what globalization has been in recent times, it is important to understand its phases and how they are concatenated. Globalization is one of the most fashionable buzzwords of contemporary political, economical, sociological and academic debate. Globalization could be defined as a system for change to a new social order. This is how one could try to define globalization. Globalization is not one process, but series of processes, and types of movements happening today, all of them put together could be termed as globalization. It is a free movement of ideas, goods, services, capital, finance, etc. across national boundaries. Globalization is an umbrella term and has some dimensions. It can be related to every fields of daily life. Dimensions are as follows:
• Economics – related to globalization in trade, money, corporations, banking, capital,
• Political – science, governance, wars, peace, IGOS, NGOS, and regimes,

• Sociology-communities, conflict, classes, nations, agreements,

• Psychology-individuals as subjects and objects of global action,

• Anthropology- cultures overlapping, adapting, clashing, merging,

• Communications- information as knowledge and tools-internet,

• Geography- Everything provided it can be anchored in space.

Each of these social sciences looks at a special aspect of the whole system of interdependent parts that constitutes our world system. Basically, globalization has three dimensions. These are political, economic, and cultural aspects of globalism. Political dimension denotes that after the collapse of Soviet Union, the U.S.A. has become the superpower and the single authority of the new world order and security. On the other hand, economic dimension of the globalization denotes the economic sovereignty and domination of international capital globally. As the third dimension of globalization, cultural aspect denotes two unrelated results of this phenomenon: One of them is globalism of the consumer behaviours, such as consuming similar food, clothes, entertainment and similar products in any aspects of daily life. The second dimension is the micro-nationalism; too much freedom for citizens results in destruction of the unitary structures of independent states, such as Yugoslavia.[1]

Definitions of Globalization range from the very general, such as Martin Albrow's claim that "Globalization refers to all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society, global society"[2] or Roland Robertson's definition of globalization as ". . . the crystallization of the entire world as a single place"[3] are very specific. According to Mittelman:

> [G]lobalization . . . include[s] the spatial reorganization of production, the
> interpenetration of industries across borders, the spread of financial markets,
> the diffusion of identical   consumer goods to distant countries, massive
> transfers of population within the South as well as from the South and East to
> the West, resultant conflicts between immigrant and established communities

[1] Recep Yücel, Halil Elibol and Osman Dağdelen (2009). "Globalization and International Marketing Ethics Problems." *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics.* ISSN 1450-2887, Issue 26. Euro Journals Publishing, Inc. p. 94.

[2] Martin Albrow (1990). *Globalization and Society.* Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage. p.7.

[3] Roland Robertson (March, 1987). "Globalization and Societal Modernization." *Sociological Analysis* 47. p. 38.

in formerly tight-knit neighbourhoods, and emerging world-wide preference for democracy.[4]

Definitions of globalization also vary in emphasis from the economic and technological to the socio-cultural and political. Many scholars have attempted to define globalization from their own perspective. Anthony Giddens focuses on the sociological aspects of globalization. For him, one of the defining aspects of globalization is the disembedding or, "lifting out of social relations from local contexts of interaction."[5] He therefore defines globalization as,

> . . . the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. . .[6]

On the other hand, David Held explains that-

> Globalization is neither a singular condition nor a linear process. Rather, it is best thought of as a multidimensional phenomenon involving diverse domains of activity and interaction, including the economics, political, technological, military, legal, cultural and environmental.[7]

The official World Bank definition of globalization, as it should, focuses on economic integration brought about by trade and factor mobility. It has been defined as "freedom and ability of individuals and firms to initiative voluntary economic transaction with residents of other counties[8]". And The United Nations ESCWA says globalization is:

> . . . a widely-used term that can be defined in a number of different ways. When used in an economic context, it refers to the reduction and removal of barriers between national borders in order to facilitate the flow of goods, capital, services and labour... although considerable barriers remain to the flow of labour... Globalization is not a new phenomenon. It began towards the end of

---

[4] James H. Mittelman, ed. (1996). *Globalization: Critical Reflections.* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner. p. 2.

[5] Anthony Giddens (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press. p. 21.

[6] Ibid., p. 64.

[7] David Held (1998). Democracy and Globalization. pp. 11-27 in *Re-imagining Political Community*, Edited by D. Archibugi, D. Held, and M. Kohler. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

[8] B. Milanovic. (April, 2002). "Can We Discern the Effects of Globalization on Income Distribution?" *Evidence from Household Budget Surveys*, *World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper*: Washington, DC. No., 2876.

the nineteenth century, but it slowed down during the period from the start of the first World War until the third quarter of the twentieth century. This slowdown can be attributed to the inward-looking policies pursued by a number of countries in order to protect their respective industries... however, the pace of globalization picked up rapidly during the fourth quarter of the twentieth century. . . .[9]

To understand globalization in the world today, it is very important to know its historical origins. Globalization is a process that has been going on for the past many years, but it has significantly accelerated since the demolishing of the Soviet Union in 1991. Thomas L. Friedman divides the history of globalization into following three phases:

- Phase- I (1492–1800): Globalization shrank the world from a size large to a size medium and the dynamic force in that era was countries globalizing for resources and imperial conquest.
- Phase- II (1800–2000): Globalization shrank the world from a size medium to a size small, and it was spearheaded by companies globalizing for markets labour.
- Phase- III (2000–present): Globalization is shrinking the world from a size small to a size tiny and flattening the playing field at the same time. And while the dynamic force in Globalization.

Globalization phase I involved the globalization of countries, Globalization phase II involved the globalization of companies and Globalization phase III involves the globalization of individuals.[10]

The history of globalization is probably as old as the history of human civilization. It can be traced back to the Harappan civilization era. An early civilization in Mesopotamia came up with a token system that was seen as one of the

---

[9] Summary of the Annual Review of Developments in Globalization and Regional Integration in the Countries of the ESCWA Region by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, URL: http://www.escwa.un.org/information/publications/edit/upload/grid-02-2.pdf. Accessed on Jan.20, 2012.

[10] Thomas L Friedman (April 3, 2005). "It's a Flat World, After All." *New York Times Magazine*. pp. 2-3.

first forms of commodity money. Labour markets consist of workers, employers, wages, income, supply and demand. Labour markets have been around as long as commodity markets. Labour markets grew out of commodity markets because labour was needed to grow the crops and tend to the livestock. The growth of commodity and labour markets grew into a capital market where companies and governments handle longstanding funds. The process of this blending of markets in the economy took thousands of years to become what it is today.

The important structural changes in the world economy began in the later decades of the 19th century. During the Pre-World War I period of 1870 to 1914, there was rapid integration of the economies in terms of trade flows, movement of capital and migration of people. The growth of globalization was mainly led by the technological forces in the fields of transport and communication. There were fewer barriers to flow of trade and people across the national boundaries. The pace of globalization, however, decelerated between the First and the Second World War and it has evolved out of the golden period of capitalism; i.e. 1940 to 1975. Since World War II, Globalization was also driven by the global expansion of multinational corporations based in the United States and Europe, and worldwide exchange of new developments in science, technology and products, with most significant inventions of this time having their origins in the Western world. Development and growth of international transport and telecommunication played a decisive role in modern globalization.[11]

These institutions include the "General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade" (GATT) and its successor the "World Trade Organization" (WTO); the "International Monetary Fund" (IMF) and its twin sister international institutions, "World Bank "; and the "United Nations" (UN). All these institutions were created by voluntary agreement between individual nation-states, and their functions are enshrined in international treaties. These organizations have many important roles in creating international business ethical rules and regulations. Especially, The World Trade Organization is primarily responsible for policing the world trading system and making sure nation states adhere to the rules laid down in trade treaties signed by

---

[11] Olanike F. Deji (2012). *Gender and Rural Development: Advanced Studies*, Vol. 2. Berlin: LIT Verlog. p. 84.

WTO member states.[12] Now it has over 145 nations and the last member is the Republic of China. The WTO is also responsible for facilitating the establishment of additional multinational agreements between WTO member states. Since World War II, barriers to international trade and economics have been considerably lowered through international agreements — GATT. Particular initiatives carried out as a result of GATT and the World Trade Organization (WTO), for which GATT is the foundation, have included:[13]

- Promotion of free trade:
  - elimination of tariffs; creation of free trade zones with small or no tariffs
- Reduced transportation costs, especially resulting from development of containerization for ocean shipping.
- Reduction or elimination of capital controls
- Reduction, elimination, or harmonization of subsidies for local businesses
- Creation of subsidies for global corporations
- Harmonization of intellectual property laws across the majority of states, with more restrictions
- Supranational recognition of intellectual property restrictions (e.g. patents granted by China would be recognized in the United States).

After the Second World War, when a small group of nations decided to combine their efforts in order " to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in the fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the humanity, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice … and respect for the obligations, ratification from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom",[14] the first bench mark achievement of humanity was the drafting of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948.

From the economical point of view, two important factors seem to underlie the

---

[12] C.W.L. Hill. (2004.) *Global Business Today*. 3rd edition. New York: Mc Graw Hill/Irwin. p. 9.

[13] Olanike F. Deji (2012). *Gender and Rural Development: Advanced Studies*, Vol. 2. Berlin: LIT Verlog. p. 85.

[14] *The Front Page, 1887–1992.* "The International Herald Tribune." 1992. p. 84.

trend toward globalization. The first is the decline in barriers to flow of goods, services and capital that has occurred since the end of World War II. The second factor is innovation of technology, particularly the dramatic developments in recent years in tele – communication, information processing, and transportation technologies. Innovation of modern technology and its application has changed the face of globalization in the 21st century; on the other hand, ideas of market economy and desire to integration with global economy are the core values of the GATT and WTO in the new international order.

During the 1920s and 30s, many nations erected formidable barriers to international trade and foreign direct investment. International trade occurs when a firm exports goods or services to consumers in another country. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) occurs when a firm invests resources in business activities outside its home country. Many of the barriers to international trade took the form of high tariffs on imports of manufactured goods. The typical aim of such tariffs was to protect domestic industries from foreign competition. Ultimately, this practice depressed world demand and contributed to the Great Depression of the 1930s. Having learned from this experience, the advanced industrial nations of the West committed themselves after World War II to removing barriers to the free flow of goods, services, and capital between nations.[15] This goal was protected and realized in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Under the agreements of GATT, nine rounds of negotiations among member states have worked to lower barriers to the flow of goods and services. The impacts of GATT agreements on average tariff rates for manufactured goods were formidable. When we analyzed the facts, average tariff rates have been fallen significantly since 1950, from average 30–40 percent to 3.9 percent in 2000.[16] In order to nullify this tariff rate, Regional free trade agreements have been created. Such as, European Free Trade Association (EFTA), North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA), Free Trade Area of the America (FTAA), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) are greater cooperation for the market economy and regional trades & economic integrations. The most successful regional economic cooperation is the EFTA. The Single European

---

[15] C. W. L. Hill (2004). *Global Business Today*. 3rd edition. New York: Mc Graw Hill/Irwin. p. 11.

[16] *World Investment Report 2001*. "United Nations." URL: http://www.unctad.org/wir/index.htm UN, 2001. Accessed on: March 12, 2012.

Act sought to create a true single market by abolishing administrative barriers to the free flow of trade and investment between EU's member states.[17] EFTA will be the role model of regional economic integration in the era of globalization.

In 20th century, Information Technology (IT) is a driving force in the process of globalization. Advancements in the early 1990s in computer hardware, software, and telecommunications have caused widespread improvements in access to information and economic potential. These advances have facilitated efficiency gains in all sectors of the economy. Information Technology becomes the medium of communication network that facilitates the expansion of products, ideas, and resources among nations and among people beyond the geographic location. Information Technology has been becoming the catalyst of greater impacts of globalization in the world community. IT is the effective tools of contemporary industrial societies. It helps the industrial products for larger accesses of market around the world.

Internet revolutions bring the access of information in the dining room which was used by scientist just ten years ago, or had even heard about, the Internet, the World Wide Web was not up and running and the browsers that help users navigate the web had not even been invented yet. Today, of course, the Internet and the Web have transformed commerce, creating entirely new ways for retailers and their customers to make transactions, for businesses to manage the flow of production inputs and market products, and for job seekers and job-recruiters to find each other. The news industry has also been dramatically transformed by the emergence of numerous Internet-enabled news-gathering and dissemination outlets. Websites, chat rooms, instant messaging systems, e-mail, electronic bulletin boards and other Internet-based communication systems have made it much easier for people with common interests to find each other, exchange information, and collaborate with each other.[18] Education at all levels is being transformed by communication, educational, and presentational

[17] D. Swann (1990). The Economics of the Common Market, 6th ed., London: Penguin Books in "Globalization and International Marketing Ethics Problems." By Recep Yücel, Halil Elibol and Osman Dağdelen. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics.* ISSN 1450-2887, Issue 26 (2009). EuroJournals Publishing, Inc. p. 96.

[18] *Globalization and Technology*. The Levin Institute: The State University of New York. URL: http://www.globalization101.org/uploads/file/Technology/tech2011.pdf. Accessed on March 15, 2012.

software and by Websites and other sources of information and analysis on the Internet.

Information technology brings world more closer than ever in the history of inventions and uses of technology. The uses of new information technology have significant impacts beyond the geographical space in the world. Mass media, internet, 5th generation micro-soft, cyber space, Wi-Fi networks, laptops, smart phones, tablet PCs etc. bring world events in our living room. The new global society or information society becomes increasingly reflexive and empathic. Now, the world has become a global village.

Now, I shall discuss the several processes of globalization. The well-known definition is that globalization is by no means uniform; it always means different things to different people. It can be defined as Universalization, Liberalization, Internationalization and Westernization.

1.1 Philosophical Background

Before universalization as a process of globalization started taking place, there was the concept of "universal" both in Greek and modern western philosophy. Plato developed the concept of universal in terms of ideas and pure forms. One of Plato's most brilliant dialogues, the *Theaetetus,* is an attempt to arrive at a satisfactory definition of the concept, and Plato's dualistic ontology – a real world of eternal Forms contrasted with a less real world of changing sensible particulars – rests on epistemological foundations. Plato drew a sharp distinction between knowledge, which is certain (*episteme*), and mere opinion (*doxa*), which is not certain. Opinions derive from the shifting world of sensation; knowledge derives from the world of timeless forms, or essences. In the *Republic* these concepts illustrate using the Metaphor of the sun, The Divided line and the Allegory of the Cave. In his dialogue *Theaetetus* Plato asks, through the mouth of Socrates: What is knowledge? He points out that knowledge cannot be reduced to sensory experience as sensations are unstable, individual and subject to constant change thereby contradicting the very

notion of knowledge always directed to the constant and the universal.[19] Sensuous knowledge has no other criterion but the man himself who thus becomes "the measure of all things" like in Protagoras. The only way out appears to be the conclusion that true knowledge can only be rational, i.e. obtainable by the mind and related to intelligible objects. In other words, the true objects of rational knowledge are not sensible things, but ideas that represent true being.

For Opinion and Belief Plato has give two sources- Imagination and Perception. But with imagination and perception we get only shadow, and this shadow is not real. And for knowledge Plato give another two sources- Understanding and Reason. Subsequently, for knowledge Plato describes the Dialectical method. The dialectical method consists, first, in the comprehension of scattered particulars into one idea, and second, in the division of the idea into species, that is, in the processes of generalization and classification. In this way alone can there be clear and consistent thinking; we pass from concept to concept, upward and downward, generalizing and particularizing, combining and dividing, synthesizing and analyzing, carving out concepts as a sculptor carves a beautiful figure out of a block of marble. Dialectic is this art of thinking in concepts; concepts, and not sensations or images, constitute the essential objects of thought.

In Plato's philosophy, we get three main features in his epistemology. These are:

- Knowledge as Recollection;
- Theory of Ideas/Forms;
- Tripartite Soul.

1. Platonic doctrine of recollection- The Platonic doctrine of recollection is the idea that we are born possessing all knowledge and our realization of that knowledge is contingent on our discovery of it. Whether the doctrine should be taken literally or not is a subject of debate. The soul is trapped in the body. The soul once lived in "Reality", but got trapped in the body. It once knew everything, but forgot it. The goal of recollection is to get back to true knowledge. To do this, one most overcome the

---

[19] A.S. Bogomolov (1985). *History of Ancient Philosophy*. Progress Publisher, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. p. 176.

body. This doctrine implies that nothing is ever learned, it is simply recalled or remembered. In short it says that all that we know already comes pre-loaded on birth and our senses enable us to identify and recognize the stratified information in our mind.

2. Theory of Forms/Ideas- The Theory of Forms typically refers to the belief expressed by Socrates in some of Plato's dialogues, that the material world as it seems to us is not the real world, but only an image or copy of the real world. Socrates spoke of forms in formulating a solution to the problem of universals. Plato mention that the forms are roughly speaking archetypes or abstract representations of the many types of things and properties we feel and see around us, which can only be perceived by reason; (that is, they are universals). In other words, Plato sometimes seems to recognize two worlds: the apparent world which is constantly changing, and an unchanging and unseen world of forms, which may perhaps be a cause of what is apparent.

3. Tripartite Soul- Plato ascribes immortality to the soul and in several of his dialogues offers arguments for immortality *(Rep. 10.608c)*. According to Plato soul has three types –

1. Wisdom (Reason),
2. Courage (Spirit) and
3. Tolerance (Appetite).

Reason is the noblest part; and for man to achieve harmony, tolerance and courage must be subjected to the firm control of reason. According to Plato these three kinds of people lived in the society.

Structure of Society	Role	Elements within Man	Virtues	End
Statesmen/Guardians	Philosopher	Rational judgment of good	Wisdom	Wisdom
Armed forces/Auxiliaries	Man of action	Spirit/Will	Courage	Gratification
Civilians/Artisans	Satisfaction of needs	Conflicting appetites	Temperance	Practical distinction

Plato's theory of knowledge is summarized in the famous figure of the divided line at the end of *Book VI* of the *Republic*. A vertical straight line is divided into four segments, each of which represents a level of knowledge; each of the four types of knowledge has its peculiar object and appropriate method of inquiry. The following table summarises the analogy of the divided line:

Segment	Types of Knowledge	Types of Object
DE (highest)	Philosophical knowledge (Noesis) (Rational Insight)	Forms, especially the form of the good
CD	Mathmatical knowledge (Dianoia)	Abstract mathmatical objects, such as number and lines
BC	Beliefs about physical things (Pistis), Including scientific knowledge	Physical things
AB (lowest)	Opinions (Illusion)	"Shadows" and things which do not really exist.

So, we can see that Plato gave epistemological bases and metaphysical foundation of universals. On the other hand, According to Aristotle, knowledge can be either *theoretical* pursued for its own sake, or *practical* instrumental in ruling society, or *creative* intended to bring material benefits and help realise the ideal of beauty.

The first philosophy as a science concerned with the primary principles and causes of being was expounded by Aristotle in a fundamental work that was later called *Metaphysics.* As we know, Plato understood mathematical objects or numbers as separable and in fact separated from matter and the material world. In contrast with his teacher, Aristotle conceived them as properties belonging to bodies but separable from them "by an effort of abstraction." Plato's doctrine was in fact the only rational explanation of the relationship between ideas and material objects, and Aristotle's departure from it was a challenge to one of the basic tenets of Platonism. According to Aristotle, the objects of the first philosophy have no existence outside the sensible

world; yet they do exist in it and can be thought of both as inseparable and as separate from bodies.[20]

Aristotle is the universally recognised founder of formal logic or the science of correct thinking which he called analytics. The function of logic is to describe the method of attaining knowledge. Aristotle considers it an important instrument for the acquisition of genuine knowledge, and holds that we should not precede to the study of the first philosophy of the science of essence of things, until we have familiarized ourselves with the principles of logical thought. It is an elaboration of the method employed in the pursuit of all knowledge and is therefore antecedent to all special inquires. Logic of Aristotle deals with inference, fallacies, division, definition and also induction. Aristotle regarded his logic as a tool or instrument of scientific research to be applied in every sphere of knowledge.

Other than this, Aristotle accepts some kind of categories. The famous Aristotelian theory of the categories, while included among his logical doctrines, is also a part of his metaphysics. The categories are the fundamental and indivisible concepts of thought; they are at the same time basic features of the real. It is impossible to think of any real and existent thing except as subsumed under one or more of the categories. The categories are different kinds of being, and not mere subjective concepts. By the categories, Aristotle means the most fundamental and universal predicates which can be affirmed of anything. Aristotle describes 10 categories- Substance, Quality, Relation, Space, Time, Situation, Possession, Action, Passion or Inactivity. Hence, the category of substance is the all-important, one and the others exist only in so for as they can be predicated of substance. Science, therefore, deals with the category of being, or essence, or substance, i.e., with the essential constitution of things and thus the transition is made from logic to metaphysics.

Aristotle starts with facts and never loses his sight from them. He accepts the four kinds of causes, namely, material, efficient, formal and final cause. The conclusion of Aristotle is that all the three causes, efficient, formal and final, are really one, and, Aristotle calls this as the Form of the thing. But the material cause cannot be reduced to any kind of cause. So ultimately there are only two things,

---

[20] A.S. Bogomolov (1985). *History of Ancient Philosophy*. Progress Publisher, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. p. 219.

namely, *Form and Matter* which can explain all movements, becoming and development in the whole world in man, organism and nature. According to Aristotle, matter without form does not exist, even when it is not non-being. But it has the potentiality of becoming anything. Similarly, form is the most important aspect of any existing thing. Hence, the form is the real thing about anything in the world. But form by itself is nothing or we can say that it does not exist. Hence, neither matter nor form by itself exists. What exists is formed matter, i.e., matter and form together inseparably. A form is the universal. For example, redness or greenness is a universal. But by itself it does not exist, what exists is a green leaf or green grass or green book. But greenness apart from the green things does not exist. Hence neither matter by itself without the forms exist, nor the form without matter exits. A universal is the 'Idea' of Plato. But Plato failed to see that a universal or an Idea by itself does not exist. No doubt we can *distinguish* them in our thought, but we cannot *separate* them in any actual state of affairs. This is a very important truth one grasp, according to Aristotle.

The notions of potential and actual being are closely linked by Aristotle with the notions of matter and form. Matter is conceived as potentiality since it is not what it can be. By contrast, form is identified with actuality. Describing their relationship, Aristotle expounds a peculiar dialectics of matter and form, potentiality and actuality. With the exception of "prime matter," no material can be conceived as absolutely unformed, but only as a compound of matter and form performing at one and the same time different functions in relations to other compounds. For example, the actuality of a child (form) is the potentiality of a man (matter), etc. Any change is thus the actualisation of potency.

Aristotle's first philosophy culminates in a concept of God, a natural corollary to his teleological conviction that nature makes nothing without a purpose and that everything in the world converges towards one goal. Positing God as the first principle and cause of the universe, the Stagirite calls him the "form of forms" when he speaks of the matter-form relationship, the "prime mover" or "unmoved mover"

when he describes motion and change, and the "thought of thought" when he refers to his activity.[21]

Modern western philosophy also gave rise to number of universals. Modern philosophy began with faith in the power of the human mind to attain knowledge. And for the best example of modern western philosophy, we can find out the period of German Idealism. German Idealism was a philosophical movement that emerged in Germany in the late 18th and 19th centuries. The term "German Idealism" refers to a phase of intellectual life that had its origin in the Enlightenment as modified by German conditions.

The work begun by the Renaissance was continued in the 16th and 17th centuries; the Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, and the political and social revolutions in England and in France were symptoms of the change. The great Continental systems and English empiricism, with their various off shoots, added fuel to the flame which had produced them; and the spirit of independent inquiry slowly but surely transformed the view of life. But the new ideas had to be popularized and disseminated over larger areas of mankind, and this task was performed during the 18th century, which has been called the century of the Enlightenment: it represents the culmination of the entire intellectual movement which we have been describing. It is an age in possession of principles and world-views; full of confidence in the power of the human mind to solve its problems, it seeks to understand and to render intelligible human life,- the State, religion, morality, language,- and the universe at large.

The enlightenment was an intellectual movement of second half of the 18th century which owed its origin to classical times and the Renaissance when humanism and rationalism were struggling to take the place of the dogma of the church. French philosopher Descartes with his 'rationalistic approach and habit of systematic doubt', Locke's empirically based political theory and Issac Newton's use of observation and experiment with his laws of motion and gravitation paved the way for the enlightenment in the 18th century when these ideas were further developed by in France and publicized all over Europe.[22] There were some basic ideas of the

---

[21] Bogomolov. A.S. (1985). *History of Ancient Philosophy*. Progress Publisher, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. p. 224.
[22] Robert C. Solomon & Kathleen M. Higgins, eds. (1995). *Routledge History of Philosophy*. Val. VI.

Enlightenment: reason, nature, happiness, progress, liberty, democracy, sovereignty, etc. Thus, the nineteenth century movement called German Idealism grew from the highly independent character of the Enlightenment in Germany. The main features of the movement were the mind-dependence of reality, the dominance of thought over sensation, universalized ethics, and natural teleology.

The conceptual framework of German Idealism was provided by Immanuel Kant who was the first to reconcile the conflicting empirical and rationalistic elements of the prevailing dogmatic philosophy. Kant's work purported to bridge the two dominant philosophical schools in the 18th century: 1) rationalism, which held that knowledge could be attained by reason alone *a priori* (prior to experience), and 2) empiricism, which held that knowledge could be arrived at only through the senses *a posteriori* (after experience). Kant's solution was to propose that while we could know particular facts about the world only via sensory experience, we could know the *form* they must take prior to any experience. That is, we cannot know *what* objects we will encounter, but we can know *how* we will encounter them. Kant called his mode of philosophizing "critical philosophy", in that it was supposedly less concerned with setting out positive doctrine than with critiquing the limits to the theories we *can* set out. In the opening few lines of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant says:

> Objects are given to us by means of sensibility, and it alone yields us intuitions; they are thought through the understanding, and from the understanding arise concepts. But all thought must, directly or indirectly, by way of certain characters, relate ultimately to intuitions, and therefore, with us, to sensibility, because in no other way can an object be given to us.[23]

Let us elaborate the nature and status of 'reason' within the general Kantian epistemological situation. As a matter of fact, Kant distinguishes 'reason' from 'understanding'. Reason is never in immediate relation to objects given in sensibility. It is understanding that holds sway in Kant's epistemology. Reason is concerned with the understanding and its judgments. The understanding throughout the use of categories and principles unifies the manifolds supplied by the sensibility. Reason

---

London: Routledge. p.382.

[23] Immanuel Kant (1973). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by N. K. Smith. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd. p. 65.

seeks to unify the concepts and judgments of understanding.[24] Whereas understanding is directly related to sensibility, reason relates itself to sensibility only indirectly through understanding. As understanding with the categories unifies perceptions, so understanding needs higher unity- the unity of reason in order to form a connected system. This is supplied to it by the ideas of reason-freedom of will, immortality of soul and the existence of God. These ideas have their use and value as the guides to the understanding. In Kant's terminology, the ideas of reason are 'regulative' rather than 'constitutive'.

In *Critique of Pure Reason,* Kant, on 'limitation' has to say in the following:

> I have therefore found it necessary to limit *knowledge*, in order to make room
> *faith.*[25]

The conclusion he presented, as above, he called "transcendental idealism." This distinguished it from earlier "idealism," such as George Berkeley's, which held that we can only directly know the ideas in our minds, not the objects that they represent. Kant said that there are things-in-themselves, *noumena*, that is, things that exist other than being merely sensations and ideas in our minds. Kant held in the *Critique of Pure Reason* that the world of appearances (phenomena) is empirically real and transcendentally ideal. Appearances, so far as they are thought as objects according to the unity of the categories, are called *phenomena.* But, if I postulate things which are mere objects of understanding and which, nevertheless, can be given as an intuition . . . . Such things would be called *noumena* (*intelligibilia*).[26] . . .the concept of *noumena* is necessary to prevent sensible intuition from being extended to things in themselves, and thus to limit the objective validity of sensible knowledge.[27] The order and regularly in the appearances, which we entitle nature, we ourselves introduce.[28]

The thing-in-itself is essentially unknowable, but the concept of a thing-in-itself is not self-contradictory, for we surely cannot maintain that the phenomenal

---

[24] R. P. Singh (2006). "Transcendental Philosophy as Limited Theory," published in *The Philosophical Heritage of Immanuel Kant.* Edited by R.P. Singh. New Delhi: Om publication. p. 21.

[25] Immanuel Kant (1973). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by N. K. Smith. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd. p.29.

[26] Ibid., p.249.

[27] Ibid., p. 310.

[28] Ibid., p. 125.

order is the only possible one. We can have sensible knowledge only of sensible things, not of things-in-themselves; the senses cannot presume to know everything the intellect thinks.[29] The concept of the thing-in-itself, or *noumenon,* as something not knowable by the senses, but as something capable of being known by intellectual intuition, is at least thinkable. It is a limiting *concept;* it says to the knowing mind: here is your limit, you can go no further, and here is where your jurisdiction ceases. You can know only phenomena; the non-phenomenal, the noumenal, the intelligible is beyond you.

The mind plays a central role in influencing the way that the world is experienced: we perceive phenomena through space and time, and the categories of the understanding. Kant proves that human mind possesses certain concepts of organization which are the basis of the 'origin' of human cognition. First, Kant formulates certain 'forms' in which sensibility is posited and ordered. Those forms themselves cannot be derived from sensibility and must therefore be '*apriori*'. Kant says,

> . . . there are two pure forms of sensible intuition, serving as principles of *apriori* knowledge, namely, space and time.[30]

He tries to show that space and time are a priori and that they cannot be derived from sensibility. In the latter, he states that though space and time cannot be derived from sensibility, yet every manifold of sensibility has to be received in the form of space and time. Kant regards space and time as unitary one, because he says very emphatically that we can represent one space and one time in which various spatial and temporal manifestations are received. But he, however, denies the concepts of absolute space and absolute time independent of the perceiving mind as held by Newton and Leibnitz.

Against the empiricists, Kant tries to show that universality and necessity are more than the products of sensible intuitions. In other words, universality and necessity are applicable to sensible intuitions without arising from them. And Kant

---

[29] Klaus Brinkmann, ed. (2007). *German Idealism: Critical Concepts in Philosophy.* Vol.III. London and New York: Routledge. p.50.

[30] Immanuel Kant (1973). *Critique of Pure Reason.* Translated by N. K. Smith. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd. p. 67.

tries to establish this point in the transcendental deduction of the categories of understanding. For Kant, categories are the original pure concepts of synthesis that the understanding contains within itself *apriori*. But without sensible intuitions, the *apriori* concepts are empty. At the same time; without the *apriori* concepts, sensibility is blind or "concepts without *percepts* are empty and *percepts* without concepts are blind." "Our knowledge", says Kant, "Springs from two fundamental sources of mind; the first is the capacity of receiving the representations, the second is the power of knowing an object through these representation."[31]

But how can categories, which are intellectual, be applied to *percepts*, to sensible phenomena? Pure concepts and sense *percepts* are absolutely dissimilar, or heterogeneous, according to Kant; how, then, can we get them together? In this context, says Kant, "Obviously there must be some third thing which is homogeneous on the one hand with the category, and on the other hand with the appearance, and which thus makes the application of the former to the latter possible. This mediating representation must be pure, that is, void of all empirical content, and yet at the same time, while it must in one respect be intellectual, it must in another be sensible. Such a representation is the transcendental schema."[32]

> And since time is both sensible and *apriori,* it has something in common both
> with the sensible manifold and with the pure category and, therefore, enables
> this mediation to be effected.[33]

Thus the concept of time as a transcendental schema leads to the application of the categories of understanding to the manifold of sensibility and hence our knowledge becomes universal and necessary. Consequently, the categories constitute the *apriori* basis of all our knowledge. And the knowledge which thus comes out is what Kant calls synthetic *apriori*. As synthetic, it amplifies the concept of subject in the predicate and as *apriori*, it expresses universality and necessity. What we require in knowledge is such applicative knowledge with the characteristics of universality and necessity. But knowledge as synthetic *apriori*, Kant warns, has a 'limit' i.e., it is

---

[31] Ibid., p.92.
[32] Ibid., p.181.
[33] A. C. Ewing (1970). *A Short Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. London: The University of Chicago Press Ltd. p. 145.

limited to the phenomenal world and it cannot penetrate into the noumenal world; i.e., the ideas of reason, like immortality of soul, freedom of will and existence of God.

The centrepiece of Kant's epistemology lies in the notion of 'transcendental unity of self - consciousness'. That notion is required as the non-perceptual source of universality and necessity in our cognition. Kant, here, while agreeing with Hume that these features cannot be found in experiences, refuses to along the lines of the latter to draw a skeptical conclusion. Kant, therefore, demonstrate that the 'transcendental consciousness' consists of the 'forms of intuition' (space and time) and forms of understanding' (the concepts) which are not static forms but forms of operation that exist only in the act of apprehending and comprehending sensibility. The forms of intuition synthesize the manifold of sensibility into spatio-temporal order.[34] By virtue of the categories, they are brought to the universal and necessary relations of cause and effect, substance, quality, limitation, etc. And this entire complex is unified in the 'transcendental consciousness', which relates all experience to the 'thinking ego', thereby giving experience the continuity of being 'my' experience. The 'transcendental consciousness' is the matrix, the ultimate source through which the order and regularity in the field of appearance is given.

In modern philosophy Kant brings a Copernican Revolution, in his epistemology. While the pre-Copernican astronomy – the Ptolemaic – had supposed that earth was the centre and the sun revolved around the earth, Copernicus tried an hypothesis that earth revolved and the sun remained at rest. The pre-Kantian epistemology is like the pre-Copernican astronomy. And like Copernicus, Kant changed the view of epistemology of his period. Kant introduced a radical change in the interpretation of the knowledge-situation. He puts mind or the understanding in the centre of the epistemological situation and said that it is not the object that determines the understanding but the understanding that determines the objects. Something that is expressed in the statement that *understanding makes nature.* Kant's basic contention behind Copernican hypothesis has a double significance. Against rationalism, Kant argues that it is not God but the transcendental consciousness that is

---

[34] R. P. Singh (2006). "Transcendental Philosophy as Limited Theory," published in *The Philosophical Heritage of Immanuel Kant.* Edited by R.P. Singh. New Delhi: Om publication. p. 22.

responsible for the unity of experience. And against empiricism, Kant argues that mind has not to conform to objects, rather objects have to confirm to mind. Against the theo-centric view of rationalism and against the cosmo-centric view of empiricism, Kant establishes an ego-centric view.

1.2 Globalization as Universalization

The ultimate aim of globalization is the creation of a single world market for labour, capital, goods, and services. As Universalization, globalization is a spreading of objects and experience to people worldwide. Ideas, images, crime, news, war, disease, people, information, pollution, goods and money, it is said, now all travel across the globe. The globalization phenomenon has been analyzed from a range of different perspectives: anthropological, economic, social, cultural, and political. Building on Kaplinski's definition,[35] we assume that "Globalization is a complex and multidimensional process that can be viewed through a variety of lenses. It is a process in which the barriers to cross-border flows are being reduced, not just for financial, economic and material flows, but also for the diffusion of knowledge, information, belief systems, ideas and values." Thus, new environmental conditions arise for those organizations and institutions that pursue influence and global acknowledgment, whether of a political, religious, cultural, or economic nature.

Globalization is the process whereby interconnections and interdependences in the many fields of human activities are gradually increasing. And the technological revolution in transport and communications has been a crucial factor for these interconnections and interdependence. Furthermore, globalization is the outcome of technological advances and of the natural curiosity of the human species, fuelled by increasingly cheap and sophisticated communication systems. The second half of the twentieth century has witnessed the advent of jet aircraft, computers and satellites. The synthesis of communications technology, which is concerned with the transmission of information, and computer technology which is concerned with the processing of information has created information technology, which is remarkable in

---

[35] Raphie Kaplinsky (2005). *Globalization, Poverty and Inequality*. Cambridge, UK : Polity Press. p. 12.

both reach and speed.[36] These technological developments have had a dramatic impact on reducing geographical barriers.

Anthony Giddens recently identified the communications media as "the leading influence in the globalization of society over the past 20 or 30 years".[37] And a 2001 report by the Institute for National Strategic Studies stated that "Globalization would not be occurring in its present form were it not for the business application of the knowledge revolution – for example, computers, e-mail, satellites, and other innovations."[38] Today we cannot isolate engineering and technology from the world of business and commerce, law and contracts, culture and religion, language and literacy, well being and wealth. We are all under pressure to seek competitive advantage at a local, regional, national and international level to maintain status, earn income, live life and sustain future generations. Thus it is imperative that engineers and technologists understand human factors, economics, culture and societies to become creative and innovative in the 21st century.

Recent advances in our ability to communicate and process information in digital form - a series of developments sometimes described as an "IT revolution" - are reshaping the economies and social lives of many countries around the world. Information Technology is a key term of globalization as a process of universalization. Currently, Internet, Mass media, 5th generation micro-soft, cyber space, 3G services, Wi-Fi networks etc. are the best example, in that it increasingly involves everything and everyone all over the world. Advances in IT are producing many changes in our society. These changes have produced many benefits. Science, technology, the way of living and thinking are not limited to a particular country but have become transnational with satellites in the orbit for purposes of information and imagery. The world has become closer. We today have the view of the earth, its geography, people and resources from the sky above and it presents a marvellous sight of harmony and unity in a miniscule manner. The telecommunication and

---

[36] Satya Dev Gupta, ed. (1997). *The Political Economy of Globalization.* USA: Kluwer Academic Publishers. p. 20.

[37] Sheila L. Croucher (2004). *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity in a Changing World.* USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC. p. 14.

[38] Flanagan, Stephen, Ellen L. Frost, and Richard L. Kugler (2001.) *Challenges of the Global Century: Report of the Project on Globalization and National Security.* Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press. p. 8.

electronic media with high speed and transport make it possible to reach out to any person anywhere in the world to alleviate his distress or to rejoice in his victories.

One of the features of globalization is that people, resources, knowledge, ideas and along with these the moral values move from one place to another. Roland Robertson accepts globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole. Robertson notes in his definition, globalization processes also involve the subjective plane of human consciousness. Hence, we cannot avoid that globalization also refers to people becoming increasingly conscious of growing manifestations of social interdependence and the enormous acceleration of social interactions. Globalization has the twin function to perform, viz. to enhance people's sensitivity to their moral values and to perform their attitudes to other values. Roland Robertson argues that globalization is "the relationship between the universal and the particular."[39] This relationship is analysed in the contemporary context of "a massive, twofold process involving the interpenetration of the Universalization of particularism and the particularization of universalism". The universalization of particularism entails 'the idea of the universal being given global human concreteness'[40] through 'increasingly fine-grained modes of identity presentation.' Particularization of universalism, on the other hand, involves 'the search for *global* fundamentals' where movements and individuals look for 'the meaning of the world as a whole.'[41]

1.3 Globalization as Liberalization

As Liberalization, globalization means a free movement of goods, services, capital and finance across national boundaries. It is a deregulation of domestic as well as external markets – goods and services. It appreciates the total capital market with the need to promote investment. Origin of globalization involves economic factors with trade and finance liberalization; trade linked technology and political and moral situations helping it. It is a broad mindset that believes those world structures is

---

[39] Roland Robertson (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage. p. 97.
[40] Ibid., pp. 100–102.
[41] Ibid., p. 178.

possible. One of the most important developments over the past three decades has been the spread of liberal economic ideas and policies throughout the world. These policies have affected the lives of millions of people, yet our most sophisticated political economy models do not adequately capture influences on these policy choices.[42] Liberalization refers to relaxation of previous government restrictions usually in areas of social and economic policies. Thus, when government liberalizes trade it means it has removed the tariff, subsidies and other restrictions on the flow of goods and services between countries. According to Friedman, globalization is:

> The inexorable integration of markets, nation states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before- in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than before, the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every country in the world.[43]

On the other hand, a great number of economists assert that globalization, as an on-going historical process that reached its apex toward the end of the 20th century. This process leads to the increasing integration of the production of goods, services, ideas, culture, communication and environmental pollution on a world-wide scale, imparting locality of populations and labour. The globalization of economic activity and the governance issues it raises are often thought to have appeared only after the Second World War, and particularly during the 1960s.[44] The post- 1960 era saw the emergence of MNC activity on the one hand the rapid growth of international trade on the other. Subsequently, the expansion of international securities investment and blank lending began in earnest as capital and particularly money markets rapidly internationalized, adding to the complexity of international economic relations and heralding what is often thought to be the genuine globalization of an integrated and interdependent world economy.

---

[42] Beth A. Simmons and Zachary Elkins (Feb, 2004). "The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, Issue 01. p. 178.

[43] Thomas L. Friedman (1999). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization.* New York: Anchor Books. p 9.

[44] Recep Yücel, Halil Elibol and Osman Dağdelen (2009). "Globalization and International Marketing Ethics Problems." *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics.* ISSN 1450-2887, Issue 26. EuroJournals Publishing, Inc. p. 94.

Although the post-Second World War multilateral institutions promoted 'an internationalist, market-oriented order', at the time, they allowed for 'mechanisms, safeguards and escape clauses through which states would not be forced to sacrificed domestic social policies in order to maintain international equillibria.[45] However, the final decades of the last century witnessed a fundamental change in the principles under which the international monetary and trade regimes mentioned above operated. Embedded liberalism was replaced by what Robert Cox has called the internationalizing of the state' whereby '*national* policies and practices have been adjusted to the exigencies of the world economy of international production.'[46] In other words, the previous policies that had been pursued for over three decades, i.e. state intervention in the economy, the mixture of public and private enterprises, and the welfare state were shunned in favour of the purported self-regulating mechanism of the free market, an economy directed by market prices and nothing but market prices.[47]

At the conclusion of World War II, several international institutions were created to manage the world economy and prevent another Great Depression. These institutions include the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (now called the World Bank), and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which was expanded and institutionalized into the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995 in the Post Cold war era. These institutions have not only persisted for over five decades, but they have also expanded their mandates, changed their missions, and increased their membership. These institutions are promoting market economy approach as a development model. They have, however, become highly contested. As Stiglitz notes, "International bureaucrats-the faceless symbols of the world economic order—are under attack everywhere. . . .Virtually every major meeting of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization is now the scene of conflict and turmoil."[48]

---

[45] J. Kirshner (1999). "Capital Mobility and the Crisis of Embedded Liberalism." *Review of International Political Economy,* Vol. 6, No.3. p. 319.

[46] R. W. Cox (1987). *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History.* New York: Columbia University Press. p. 259.

[47] K. Polanyi (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economical Origins of our Time.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press. p.43.

[48] Joseph E. Stiglitz (2003). *Globalization and its discontents.* New York: W. W. Norton. p. 3.

Most developed countries are in order to remain globally competitive, have pursued the path of economic liberalization: partial or full privatization of government institutions and assets, greater labor-market flexibility, lower tax rates for businesses, less restriction on domestic and foreign capital, open markets, etc. British Prime Minister Tony Blair wrote that: "Success will go to those companies and countries which are swift to adapt, slow to complain, open and willing to change. The task of modern governments is to ensure that our countries can rise to this challenge."[49] Many analysts identify market economy as the centre of globalization and consider as a primary indicators of global interconnectedness. For example, in 1997, the European Commission defined globalization as "the process by which markets and production in different countries are becoming increasingly interdependent due to the dynamics of trade in goods and services and flows of capital and technology".[50] More recently, a report by the Institute for National Strategic Studies defined globalization as follows: " Anchored in economic dynamics, it is a process of growing cross- border flows in many areas that are drawing countries and regions closer together, creating networks of expanded ties."[51]

In 2000 the IMF identified four basic aspects of globalization:[52]

- Trade and transactions: Developing countries increased their share of world trade, from 19 percent in 1971 to 29 percent in 1999. But there is great variation among the major regions. For instance, the newly industrialized economies (NIEs) of Asia prospered, while African countries as a whole performed poorly. The makeup of a country's exports are an important indicator for success. Manufactured goods exports soared, dominated by developed countries and NIEs. Commodity exports, such as food and raw materials were often produced by developing countries: commodities' share of total exports declined over the period.

---

[49] Tony Blair (2005). "Europe is Falling Behind." *Newsweek*. URL: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_kmnew/is_200511/ai_n16073679. Accessed on Dec. 24, 2011.

[50] David Held, ed. (2000.) *A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Poltics.* London: Routledge. p. 92.

[51] Stephen J. Flanagan, Ellen L. Frost, and Richard L. Kugler. (2001.) *Challenges of the Global Century: Report of the Project on Globalization and National Security.* Washington, D.C.: National Defence University Press. p. 5.

[52] IMF Team (2000). *Globalization: Threats or Opportunity*. IMF Publications. URL: http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm. Accessed on Jan.14, 2012.

- Capital and investment movements: Private capital flows to developing countries soared during the 1990s, replacing "aid" or development assistance which fell significantly after the early 1980s. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) became the most important category. Both portfolio investment and bank credit rose but they have been more volatile, falling sharply in the wake of the financial crisis of the late 1990s.

- Migration and movement of people: In the period between 1965–90, the proportion of the labor forces migrating approximately doubled. Most migration occurred between developing countries and Least Developed Countries (LDCs). The flow of migrants to advanced economic countries was claimed to provide a means through which global wages converge. They noted the potential for skills to be transferred back to developing countries as wages in those a countries rise.

- Dissemination of knowledge (and technology): Information and technology exchange is an integral aspect of globalization. Technological innovations (or technological transfer) benefit most the developing and Least Developing countries (LDCs), as for example the advent of mobile phones.

In the world currency market more than $1.6 trillion is now exchanged each day and about 1/5 of the goods and services produced each year are traded; hence offering several opportunities for individual countries to achieve higher growth rates. Most often, it refers to economics: the global distribution of the production of goods and services, through reduction of barriers to international trade such as tariffs, export fees, and import quotas. Globalization accompanied and allegedly contributed to economic growth in developed and developing countries through increased specialization and the principle of comparative advantage.

1.4 Globalization as Internationalization

As Internationalization, globalization increases interaction and interdependence between countries and/or inhabitants of different countries. Peter Dicken, in *Globalshift,* stressed economic flows and defined globalization as "a shift in

traditional patterns of international production, investment, and trade".   Keniche
Ohmae, on the other hand, saw the reduction of barriers to commercial and financial
flows as the chief factor. For him, globalization meant "the absence of borders and
barriers to trade among nations".[53]

Globalization has challenged the Nation/State territorial sovereignty, the institutional
autonomy, shrinking the concepts of space and time. With the collapse of socialism in
the Central and East European countries during 1990s of which People's Republic of
China just managed to escape, the world has moved towards defining values of
universalism set out in "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" and in setting
development goals in the United Nations conferences on environment, population,
social development, women and human settlement. It can describe the expansion of
economic activities across ethnicity and identity, values and practices and even
beyond national boundaries. This later on is converted into trade and commerce,
banking, rural institutions and so on. All these are necessary beyond the State because
globalization means Global Banking, trade and commerce, Global migration of
population, etc. All these require certain rules, institutions and the infrastructures,
which can go beyond Nation/State. So we have organizations like WTO, GATT, new
definitions of the UNO and other UNO funded organizations. With these institutional
mechanisms, global reality is regulated and managed.

International organizations or associations that are engaged in some sort of
global governance are not new, but have expanded significantly in both number and
charge in recent years. In 1909, there were only thirty-seven international
governmental organizations (IGOs) and by 1989 there were three hundred. Similarly,
in the middle of the nineteenth century there were two or three conferences or
congresses per year sponsored by IGOs; today, there are more than 4,000 held each
year.[54] The World Trade Organization (WTO), created in 1995, is a recent and
marked example of the degree to which individual states are willing to commit
themselves to comply with international law. Under WTO rules, a Trade Policy
Review Body monitors member governments' commercial activities. Any alleged

[53] Afonso Fleury and Tereza Leme Fleury (2011). *Brazilian Multinationals: Competences for Internationalization.* UK: Cambridge University Press. p. 16.
[54] David Held (1998). "Democracy and Globalization." p. 20 in *Re- imaging Political Community*, Edited by D. Archibugi, D. Held, and M. Kohler. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

violations of WTO regulations are reviewed by a panel of experts, whose decisions are binding, and the consensus principle that prevailed under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) has been replaced by one of majority rule. Nonetheless, there has been no shortage of states around the world lining up for membership in the WTO.[55]

Internationalization is a phenomenon specifically connected with the agents, i.e., the social actors that take part in the globalization process. They can be private-sector enterprises or government-owned companies, governmental and supra-governmental institutions, and non-governmental organizations. In recent decades, the internationalization of capital has been the hallmark of globalization. Starting in the late 1950s, the growth of the European market boosted the opportunities for moving money across borders. The emergence of this mostly unregulated pool of capital paralleled, and is strongly related to, another important phenomenon: The increasing mobility of production and the rise of multinational corporations (MNCs) as crucial economic and political actors. With more and more opportunities to evade domestic controls, owners of capital and MNCs became empowered. Local politicians were bound to choose economic policies in accordance with capitalists' preferences to discourage capital and production from moving to more friendly environments. This is the famous "exit option".[56]

Under a condition of internationalization, then, when considering the web of contemporary economic activity, although the importance of multinational companies is acknowledged, the main referent object remains the nation-state. In a globalized economy, the main referent object for analysis shifts from the nation-state to the transnational companies and their global network of interlinked production, marketing and sales. Those arguing the latter case point to the fact that transnational companies' share of world trade stands at two- thirds of total world trade, with intra-firm trade alone constituting approximately one-third of total world trade. Globalists view these companies as transnational in nature, representing 'genuine footloose capital, without specific national identification and with an internationalized management, and at least

---

[55] Jan A. Scholte (2000). *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press. p. 149.
[56] Covadonga Meseguer (2009). *Learning, Policy Making, and Market Reforms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 142.

potentially willing to locate and relocate anywhere in the globe to obtain either the most secure or the highest returns.

Globalization reduced the importance of nation states. Sub-state and supra-state institutions such as the European Union, the WTO, the G8 or the International Criminal Court, replace national functions with international agreement. Some observers attribute the relative decline in US power to globalization, particularly due to the country's high trade deficit. The led to a global power shift towards Asian states, particularly China which unleashed market forces and achieved tremendous growth rates. As of 2011, China was on track to overtake the United States by 2025.

1.5 Globalization as Westernization

As Westernization, globalization is a process of homogenization that leads the world to become more western. In globalization, one such imperative is that people will move and with them there will be a movement of consciousness, value and culture. The existential and spiritual features of culture get transformed into the material and instrumental features. Westernization or Americanization related to a period of high political American clout and of significant growth of America's shops, markets and object being brought into other countries. The very fact that Europeans appeared on the scene put a hard stress on the world views and value systems of many traditional societies. And the following conscious attempts to westernize the colonized societies have led, in most cases, to the disappearance or marginalization of the native cultures. So globalization, a much more diversified phenomenon, relates to a multilateral political world and to the increase of objects, markets and so on into others countries.[57] The Harvard Economics professor Amartya Sen's 2002 discussion of "How to Judge Globalism", here is an extract of a longer article from American Prospect:

> The confounding of globalization with Westernization is not only a historical,
> it also distracts attention from the many potential benefits of global
> integration. Globalization is a historical process that has offered an abundance

---

[57] Olanike F. Deji (2012). *Gender and Rural Development: Advanced Studies*, Vol. 2. Berlin: LIT Verlog. p. 100.

of opportunities and rewards in the past and continues to do so today. The very existence of potentially large benefits makes the question of fairness in sharing the benefits of globalization so critically important.

The central issue of contention is not globalization itself, nor is it the use of the market as an institution, but the inequity in the overall balance of institutional arrangements–which produces very unequal sharing of the benefits of globalization. The question is not just whether the poor, too, gain something from globalization, but whether they get a fair share and a fair opportunity. There is an urgent need for reforming institutional arrangements– in addition to national ones–in order to overcome both the errors of omission and those of commission that tend to give the poor across the world such limited opportunities. Globalization deserves a reasoned defense, but it also needs reform.[58]

We experienced in the past few decades in various countries "in the process of modernization" is a reaction to "western culture", a reaction which has led each group toward the search of its "cultural identity" or of its own "values"; and since it was not possible to identify what they wished to identify in the existing state of affairs, they looked backwards and tried to find, in order to resurrect it what they felt or assumed, to be their own, i.e., the world-view, the conception of man and the conception of what is valuable preventing in each of these groups before their industrialization efforts began or before their encounter with "Western culture" to which they reacted.[59] Such a resurrection has already occurred, as the gradual spread of fundamentalism in some of such countries in different parts of the world shows. As Arjun Appadurai explains: "The central problem of today's global interactions is the tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization."[60] Few will deny the reality of the increased cultural flows outlined earlier, or, specifically, that advances in communications and transportation technology have led to a rapid and intensified exchange of ideas, information, cultural symbols, lifestyle preferences, and

---

[58] Francesca (2006). *Globalization vs Westernization and the good vs the bad.* Global Village. URL: http://www.driversofchange.com/global village/micro-and-macro $$$.

[59] William Sweet (2008). "The Dialogue of Cultural Traditions: A Global Perspective." *Volume 39 of Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change: Culture and Values.* Washindton, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy. p. 215.

[60] Arjun Appadurai (1990). "Disjunctive and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 7. p. 295.

modes of behaviour. The debate arises over whether the outcome of this interchange is the convergence and uniformity of a Western-imposed and commodity-driven world culture, or, a more dialectical, multilateral, reflexive process of negotiating the local meaning and significance of global cultural symbols.[61]

When we think of the globalization of culture, we tend to think of the consumption of cultural goods produced in the West and the effects of these goods on the values and practices of non-Western consumers. The literature on the globalization of culture also tends to focus on how Western markets for non-Western cultural goods affect patterns of cultural production in the non-Western world. Globalization was predominantly driven by the outward flow of culture and economic activity from the United States and was better understood as Americanization. The focus is on a global culture industry that has people worldwide, from Johannesburg, Rio de Janeiro, and Paris to Bangkok, Los Angeles, and Cairo, from townships, favelas, and barrios to upscale apartments, office complexes, shopping malls, and villas wearing Levi's, watching MTV, drinking Coca-Cola, smoking Marlboro cigarettes, and visiting, or dreaming of visiting, a Disney theme park. From this perspective, cultural globalization represents nothing more than a form of cultural imperialism. Cultural flows are profoundly imbalanced, and what is sometimes described as global culture is really Western, or American, culture. Furthermore, the far-reaching distribution and dominance of commodified Western culture is said to work to the advantage of the United States and other Western nations while threatening more vulnerable cultures.[62] As John Tomlinson writes:

> The globalized culture that is currently emerging is not a global culture in any utopian sense. It is not a culture that has arisen out of the mutual experiences and needs of all of humanity. It does not draw equally on the world's diverse cultural traditions. It is neither inclusive, balanced, nor, in the best sense, synthesizing. Rather, globalized culture is the installation, world-wide, of one particular culture born out is one particular, privileged historical experience. It

---

[61] Sheila L. Croucher (2004). *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity in a Changing World.* USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC. pp. 24–25.

[62] Herbert I. Schiller (1991). "Not Yet the Post-Imperalist Era." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* Vol. 8, No. 1. p. 14.

is, in short, simply the global expression of Western culture.[63]

Globalization's contribution to the alienation of individuals from their traditions may be modest compared to the impact of modernity itself. For another aspect of westernization, we can see the impact of western music and English language, which is dominant a local or traditional music and local language. Music flowed outward from the west as well. Anglo-American pop music spread across the world through MTV. Dependency Theory explained that the world was an integrated, international system. Musically, this translated into the loss of local musical identity. Whereas, on the other hand, English has become the Latin of the contemporary world, such a position; one can say in the light of historical experience, has always been precarious. Whether English will be unanimously accepted as the one unifying, international language of the globe.

As we have seen, globalization is a multi-dimensional process; it applies to the whole range of social relations-cultural, economic, political and technological. The stretching of social and economic relations, the intensification of communication and other linkages, the interpenetration of economic and social practices and the emergence of global infrastructure are the main characteristics of processes of globalization.

One can say that globalization is a contested and controversial subject. There are different perspectives of globalization, which have involved in the formulation and implementation of the policies towards globalization. On the one hand, according to the Neoliberal perspective, globalization is the inevitable result of technological and economic changes which created the need for the opening of markets, free trade and free movement of capital, (though not labor), privatizations, flexible labor markets, as well as for the drastic restriction of the welfare state and the economic role of the state generally. Supporters of this perspective maintain that globalization is beneficial to everybody, as well as to the environment, because it supposedly allows healthy competition to develop and, consequently, it leads to improvements in efficiency and the spreading not only of knowledge, but also of the benefits of growth, through what they call the 'trickle-down effect'. Whereas, on the other hand, Social-

---

[63] Tomilnson, John. (1999). "Globalized Culture: The Triumph of the West?" p. 23 in *Culture and Global Change*, edited by T. Skelton and T. Allenn. London: Routledge.

liberals, which include the centre-left governments in Europe and Australasia, adopt the present globalization with some minor qualifications, which amount to little more than a 'globalization with a human face'. There are several versions of this approach but the common element in all these versions is that they all adopt the thesis that globalization is both a new and an irreversible phenomenon (i.e. a systemic phenomenon) and, consequently, they explore ways of making it more 'humane'.[64] The explicit —or sometimes implicit— assumption social-liberals make is that any return to some form of statism, like the one characterizing advanced market economies up to the mid seventies, is impossible.

Unlike neo and social liberals, according to reformist left, globalization is due to exogenous changes in economic policy and, as such, is reversible even within the system of the market economy. Therefore, the reformist Left includes all those who either suggest various reforms to improve the functioning of the internationalized market economy (e.g. eliminating its 'corporate' character, abolishing the neoliberal deregulation of markets and so on), or simply raise a variety of criticisms against it without proposing any alternative form of social organization, adopting a postmodern rejection of universalism or just taking the present system of the market economy and representative 'democracy' for granted. In this sense, the reformist Left on globalization includes post- Marxists, socialdemocrats and others in the broad Left (Pierre Bourdieu, Immanuel Wallerstein, Noam Chomsky, Samir Amin, John Gray, Leo Panitch among them) who take a negative, but a reformist, stand towards globalization.[65]

As a matter of fact, definition of globalization has different processes and perspectives. Hence, the social processes that make up globalization have been analyzed and explained by various commentators in different, often contradictory ways. Scholars not only hold different views with regard to proper definitions of globalization, they also disagree on its scale, causation, chronology, impact, trajectories and policy outcomes. This notion of 'multidimensionality' appears as an important attribute of globalization in our own definition; still it requires further elaboration. The ancient Buddhist parable of the blind scholars and their encounter

---

[64] Takis Fotopoulos (2001). "Globalization, the reformist Left and the Anti- Globalization 'Movement'." *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 7, No. 2. pp. 239–40.
[65] Ibid., p. 242.

with the elephant helps to illustrate the nature of the controversy over the various dimensions of globalization. Since the blind scholars did not know what the elephant looked like, they resolved to obtain a mental picture, and thus the knowledge they desired, by touching the animal. Feeling its trunk, one blind man argued that the elephant was like a lively snake. Another man, rubbing along its enormous leg, likened the animal to a rough column of massive proportions. The third person took hold of its tail and insisted that the elephant resembled a large, flexible brush. The fourth man felt its sharp tusks and declared it to be like a great spear. Each of the blind scholars held firmly to his own idea of what constituted an elephant. Since their scholarly reputation was riding on the veracity of their respective findings, the blind men eventually ended up arguing over the true nature of the elephant.[66]

The ongoing academic, political and economical debates over which dimension contains the essence of globalization represents a postmodern version of the parable of the blind men and the elephant.

The new millennium has new markets- foreign exchange, capital markets linked globally; new tools- Internet, Cyber Space; new model of economic institutions- W.T.O., IMF, etc.; new rules- multilateral agreements on Free trade, services, intellectual property rights, patenting rights, backed by strong enforcement mechanisms and binding on National Governments, reducing the scope of national policies. Globalization of markets, technology, ideas and community solidarity are enhancing the lives of the people everywhere expanding their choices.

Process of globalization is the advancement of all aspects of human activities. Globalization is not historical idea but it is the part of emerging process of integration of world community in the 21st century. State can certainly and strongly find and frame rules and institutions for governance to provide enough space for local identities, communities and environmental resources to ensure globalization. Redefining such values in the adopting of Human Rights Declaration and setting Millennium Development Goals on Environment, education, Population, Social development, etc.; Globalization should be with regard for pluralistic value systems

---

[66] Manfred B. Steger (2003). *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 13–14.

without violation of human rights, marginalizing local identities. The reward of globalization should go towards creating equity between nations. Misuse of technology must be prevented in the larger interest of global society. We should not exploit nature in our blind race of progress. Through motorization, urbanization and industrialization, we have polluted air, water, food, and land! The depletion of the ozone layer, deforestation, global warming and indiscriminate use of pesticides has upset the very delicate ecological balance, creating all kinds of unforeseen repercussions. Technology has to be used as a strategy to command future; such as conserving exhaustive resources, avoiding wastage and misuse of resources and substituting flow of resources with fund resources. We have to develop globality of consciousness. Technology is to be used for promoting sustainable economic development by meeting the needs of the present without compromising the requirements of our future generations.

Chapter Two

Contending Theories of Morality in the Era of Globalization

In this chapter, I shall discuss the several normative theories of Morality. There are several types of normative ethical theories including Deontology such as Kantianism, Utilitarianism, Libertarianism and communitarian ethics. I have organized my presentation into two parts; namely, Part – 1, I shall discuss the two major normative ethical theories like; Kantianism as a private morality and Utilitarianism as a public morality. Part – 2, I shall analyze socio-political ethical theories like; Libertarianism as an individualistic morality and Communitariansm as a collective morality.

Moral philosophy is a philosophical inquiry about norms or values, about ideas of right and wrong, good and bad, what should and what should not be done. It is the philosophical discussion of right and wrong, good and bad, considered as general ideas and as applied in the private life of individuals. In our daily conversation, we used the words like; good, bad, right, wrong, ought etc. and generally we hear such statement as: It is a good thing to help another person, he ought not to have done this, he is a good man, he is a bad person or it is always right to speak the truth etc. This is the type of words and questions with which ethics deals. Morality was originally derived from the Latin word *'mores'* meaning customs, and so may be appropriately used for human's customary ways of judging human conduct, and that is what we are describing in this positive science.[1] As a human being we naturally want to know the truth about things, and ethics aims at finding out the truth about the rightness and wrongness of human conduct. Morality is the differentiation of decisions, intentions, and actions between those that are good (or right) and those that are bad (or wrong). Morality deals with the standards by which we judge human actions to be right or wrong.

---

[1] William Lillie (1966). *Introduction of Ethics*. University Paperbacks: London. p. 9.

In the grounds of morality, one fundamental question is still remain throughout the history of moral philosophy that – why be moral? This question has been around a long time. 'Why be moral?' was basically the question *Thrasymachus* put to *Socrates*. In the *Republic* (Book - II), Plato has the character Glaucon pose a challenge to Socrates. They have been discussing the question "What is Justice?" Socrates has refuted Thrasymachus who insisted that "*Justice is the interest of the stronger*" or *might is right*."[2] Now, young Glaucon continues the issue by questioning how genuine any human being's commitment to justice actually is. The story he tells acts as a thought-experiment. The question at issue being: do humans naturally tend to justice or injustice?

In the Ring of Gyges, from the *Republic*, Book II[3] -

They say that to do injustice is, by nature, good; to suffer injustice, evil; but that the evil is greater than the good. And so when men have both done and suffered injustice and have had experience of both, not being able to avoid the one and obtain the other, they think that they had better agree among themselves to have neither; hence there arise laws and mutual covenants; and that which is ordained by law is termed by them lawful and just. This they affirm to be the origin and nature of justice; --it is a mean or compromise, between the best of all, which is to do injustice and not be punished, and the worst of all, which is to suffer injustice without the power of retaliation; and justice, being at a middle point between the two, is tolerated not as a good, but as the lesser evil, and honoured by reason of the inability of men to do injustice. Such is the received account, Socrates, of the nature and origin of justice.

Now that those who practice justice do so involuntarily and because they have not the power to be unjust will best appear if we imagine something of this kind: having given both to the just and the unjust power to do what they will, let us watch and see whither desire will lead them; then we shall discover in the very act the just and unjust man to be proceeding along the same road, following their interest, which all natures deem to be their good, and are only diverted into the path of justice by the force of law. The liberty which we are supposing may be most completely given to them in the

---

[2] A.S. Bogomolov (1985). *History of Ancient Philosophy*. Progress Publisher, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. p. 53.

[3] Plato. *Republic*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 47–48.

form of such a power as is said to have been possessed by Gyges the ancestor of Croesus the Lydian. According to the tradition, Gyges was a shepherd in the service of the king of Lydia; there was a great storm, and an earthquake made an opening in the earth at the place where he was feeding his flock. Amazed at the sight, he descended into the opening, where, among other marvels, he beheld a hollow brazen horse, having doors, at which he stooping and looking in saw a dead body of stature, as appeared to him, more than human, and having nothing on but a gold ring; this he took from the finger of the dead and re ascended. Now the shepherds met together, according to custom, that they might send their monthly report about the flocks to the king; into their assembly he came having the ring on his finger, and as he was sitting among them he chanced to turn the collect of the ring inside his hand, when instantly he became invisible to the rest of the company and they began to speak of him as if he were no longer present. He was astonished at this, and again touching the ring he turned the collect [decorative front of the ring] outwards and reappeared; he made several trials of the ring, and always with the same result-when he turned the collect inwards he became invisible, when outwards he reappeared. Whereupon he contrived to be chosen one of the messengers who were sent to the court; where as soon as he arrived he seduced the queen, and with her help conspired against the king and slew him, and took the kingdom. Suppose now that there were two such magic rings, and the just put on one of them and the unjust the other; no man can be imagined to be of such an iron nature that he would stand fast in justice. No man would keep his hands off what was not his own when he could safely take what he liked out of the market, or go into houses and lie with any one at his pleasure, or kill or release from prison whom he would, and in all respects be like a God among men. Then the actions of the just would be as the actions of the unjust; they would both come at last to the same point. And this we may truly affirm to be a great proof that a man is just, not willingly or because he thinks that justice is any good to him individually, but of necessity, for wherever anyone thinks that he can safely be unjust, there he is unjust. For all men believe in their hearts that injustice is far more profitable to the individual than justice, and he who argues as I have been supposing, will say that they are right. If you could imagine any one obtaining this power of becoming invisible, and never doing any wrong or touching what was another's, he would be thought by the lookers-on to be a

most wretched idiot, although they would praise him to one another's faces, and keep up appearances with one another from a fear that they too might suffer injustice.

This story remains important to us today because it concerns what we can expect humans to do with power over others. In politics, we give power to others, hoping that they will do what is right. If Plato's allegory of the ring is right, then we had better watch out. Anyone who gains power without accountability is liable to use it unjustly. This particularly significant right now as the U.S. and U. K. governments are increasing the secrecy of their actions and gaining increased power over public information such as news. Secrecy is a form of invisibility, and for the purposes of power, as effective as a magic ring. The question "What is Justice?" remains as crucial today as it did 2,400 years ago.[4]

The question has been arises about morality that – Is moral philosophy a theoretical or a practical inquiry? One can say that, certainly it is not practical in any simple sense. Moral philosophy cannot, and does not try to, tell us what we ought to do. We must decide that for ourselves. In spite of, moral philosophy is not purely theoretical. The enquiry arises from a problem of real life. If we have come to doubt moral beliefs which we previously took for granted, and if we therefore ask whether there are good reasons for or against acceptance, we seriously want to know what we should believe about right or wrong. To ask, in the face of conflicting codes of conduct, whether there is good reason to accept one and reject the rest, is virtually to ask which, if any, is really right. If we succeeded in showing that one was really right, that would come pretty close to showing how we ought to behave.[5] Moral philosophy is not in fact able to give a conclusive answer to that inquiry. In other words, it cannot fully achieve its primary aim of critically evaluating normative assumptions. But even partial achievement can be of practical use. Moral philosophy also makes definite progress in its secondary aim of clarifying concepts, and this often helps individuals to make their own decisions on the more practical questions.

The term morality can be used either – descriptively or normatively. In its descriptive sense, morality refers to personal or cultural values, codes of conduct or

---

[4] Plato. *Republic-* Book II. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Taken from, http:// www.Ethics of Plato/Republic/why be a moral? Accessed on, March 15, 2012.

[5] D. D. Raphael (1981). *Moral Philosophy.* Oxford University Press. p. 9.

social mores. It does not connote objective claims of right or wrong, but only refers to that which is considered right or wrong. When morality is used simply to refer to a code of conduct put forward by any actual group, including a society, whether it is distinguished from etiquette, law, and religion, then it is being used in a descriptive sense. On the other hand, in its normative sense, morality refers to whatever (if anything) is *actually* right or wrong, which may be independent of the values or mores held by any particular peoples or cultures. When morality is used in its universal normative sense, it need not have either of the two formal features that are essential to moralities referred to by the original descriptive sense: that it be a code of conduct that is put forward by a society and that it be accepted as a guide to behaviour by the members of that society.[6] Indeed, it is possible that morality in the normative sense has never been put forward by any particular society, by any group at all, or even by any individual that holds that moral rules should never be violated for non-moral reasons.

We may define morality as the normative science of the conduct of human beings living in societies – a science which judges this conduct to be right or wrong, to be good or bad, or in some similar way. Moral values are rules both individuals and community or organizations use to make decisions regarding right and wrong. For thousands of years, humans have struggled with the idea of morality of their actions. There are some normative ethical theories (Utilitarianism, Deontological, Communitarianism) exists in societies, which may consider the application of rules or the consequences of actions. Let us see how the argument goes for each of these theories.

2.1 Private (Kantianism) Morality and Public (Utilitarianism) Morality

What is the right decision? What is the standard of morals? Which actions are right and which are wrong? What we ought to do? In the history of morality, one answer to these questions is given by Kantianism and another is given by Utilitarianism. For

---

[6] Bernard Gert. "The Definition of Morality." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2011 Edition)*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta.
URL:http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/morality-definition.

Kant, the end results were not important in determining whether an action was just or not. Motive was everything to him, and he had very strict views on how to judge the morality of an action. On the other hand, the antithesis of the Kant is utilitarianism. In the system of utilitarianism, the ends justify the means, and actions are judge on the results, not on the intentions or motives. The principle of utilitarianism is that, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number". According to Kant any action cannot be moral unless the motives are moral. Doing the right thing for the right reaction is very important issue in a Kantian. For Kant, a person's actions are based on their intentions. And because of this notion of Kant, its theory is known as a private morality. On the other hand, the basic philosophy of Utilitarianism, the idea of the greatest good for the greatest amount, is one of the basic building blocks of the democratic system. If a person lives on the principles of Utilitarianism, they disregard the motives involved in an action. Utilitarians try to separate the action from the actor, and look at the bigger picture over the individual. And because of this intention, utilitarianism is known as the public morality.

First, we must understand the principles behind these two theories. In the history of moral philosophy, the first known moral theory was stated by Kant, who considered that moral philosophy should say something about the ultimate end of human endeavour, the Highest Good, and its relationship to the moral life. In the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant argued that this Highest Good for Humanity is complete moral virtue together with complete happiness, the former being the condition of our deserving the latter. Kant believed that certain types of actions (including murder, theft, and lying) were absolutely prohibited, even in cases where the action would bring about more happiness than the alternative. For Kantians, there are two questions that we must ask ourselves whenever we decide to act: (i) Can I rationally will that *everyone* act as I propose to act? If the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. (ii) Does my action respect the goals of human beings rather than merely using them for my own purposes? Again, if the answer is no, then we must not perform the action.

Kant's theory is an example of a deontological moral theory. According to Kant, the rightness or wrongness of actions does not depend on their consequences but on whether they fulfil our duty. Kant's ethical system represents universal categorical

imperative rules of ethics. Kant assumes that Categorical Imperative is a supreme principle of morality. It determines what our moral duties are. Kant distinguished the Categorical Imperative from Hypothetical Imperatives. A hypothetical imperative has the form: 'Do *X* if. . .' or 'you ought to do *X* if . . .' These imperatives command conditionally on your having a relevant desire. For example, if you want to be healthy, take plenty of exercise; 'if you want a level of surface, use a plane'. The categorical imperative does not depend on an 'if'; the action prescribed is not simply a means to an end. These command unconditionally. For instance, the moral injunction 'Be kind to others' does not mean 'Be kind to others if you want to avoid making enemies of them'; kindness is prescribed for its own sake and not for the sake of some further (self-interested) end.   A categorical imperative denotes an absolute, unconditional requirement that allows no exceptions, and is both required and justified as an end in itself, not as a means to some other end; the opposite of a hypothetical 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 out of it or claim that it does not apply to you.[7] Kant believed that an action can only be morally worthy if it is performed in accordance with the categorical imperative, meaning that it is performed out of a sense of duty to the moral law. For a maxim to be in line with the categorical imperative, Kant proposed that it must be universally applicable to all autonomous beings.

In Kant's *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, he gave three formulations of the categorical imperative, i.e. of the fundamental principal of moral action. The first concerns the *form* of the categorical imperative; the second concerns its *content*; and the third links these together. –

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."[8] 'Kant rejected the idea that ethics could be determined by the status quo but should instead be determined by

---

[7] Robert Johnson. "Kant's Moral Philosophy." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2012 Edition)*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. URL:
http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/kant-moral.

[8] Immanuel Kant (2002). *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and Translated by Allen W. Wood. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. p. 19.

reason and logic, requiring that they can be universalised.'[9] Kant's Formula of Universal Law requires that one's actions are based only on maxims that would be accepted as universal law. In Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals, 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."[10]

This means that 'the principle behind any action should be applicable in any situation'.[11] 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.[12]

2. Formula of Humanity as an Ends in Itself - 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 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.[13] Kant says that, - "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."[14]

This formulation states that we should never act in such a way that we treat Humanity, whether in ourselves or in others, as a means only but always as an end in itself. This is often seen as introducing the idea of "respect" for persons, for whatever it is that is essential to our Humanity. Kant was clearly right that this and the other formulations bring the Categorical Imperative 'closer to intuition' than the Universal Law formula. Intuitively, there seems something wrong with treating human beings as mere instruments with no value beyond this.

---

[9] Erich Loewy (1989). *Textbook of Medical Ethics*. USA: Springer. p. 18.
[10] Thomas E Hill (2009). *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*. UK: John Wiley & Sons. p. 19.
[11] John Hare (1997). *The Moral Gap: Kantian Ethics, Human Limits, and God's Assistance*. Oxford University Press. p. 8.
[12] Thom Brooks (2012). *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. UK: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 74–5.
[13] Allen Wood (2008). *Kantian Ethics*. Cambridge University Press. p. 75.
[14] Immanuel Kant. (2002). *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and Translated by Allen W. Wood. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. p. 19.

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."[15] 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. This principle requires people to recognise the right of other people to act autonomously and means that, as moral laws must be universalizable, what is required of one person is required of all.[16]

Kant states that the above concept of every rational will as a will that must regard itself as enacting laws binding all rational wills is closely connected to another concept, that of a "systematic union of different rational beings under common laws, or Kingdom of Ends."[17] 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."[18] It combines the others in that (i) it requires that we conform our actions to the maxims of a legislator of laws (ii) that this lawgiver lays down universal laws, binding all rational wills including our own, and (iii) that those laws are of 'a merely possible kingdom' each of whose members equally possesses this status as legislator of universal laws, and hence must be treated always as an end in itself.[19] The intuitive idea behind this formulation is that our fundamental moral obligation is to act only on principles which could earn acceptance by a community of fully rational agents each of whom have an equal share in legislating these principles for their community.

On the other words, the concept of the "Kingdom of Ends", suggests that actions should be performed as if the maxims would provide laws for a possible "Kingdom of Ends". According to the principle, people have an obligation to act upon principles

---

[15] Ibid., p. 19.
[16] Roger Sullivan (1989). *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 165.
[17] Immanuel Kant (2002). *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and Translated by Allen W. Wood. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. p. 19.
[18] Ibid., p. 19.
[19] Robert Johnson. "Kant's Moral Philosophy." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2012 Edition)*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. URL:http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/kant-moral.

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.[20]

Kant says that we determine internally what is wrong or right. Through autonomy (self law), you use yourself as a guide. The individual determines her/his own behaviour, rather than someone else dictating how you are supposed to behave or act. Doing the right thing for the right reason is a very important issue to a Kant. Kantian morality is not consequential, which means that actions are based on the motive/will of the person, and not on the consequences that come from the behaviour. For Kant, there is only one reason to do the right thing, and that is just because it is right. In other words, a person's actions are based on their intentions. Kant's analysis of intentions begins with the thought that the only thing good without qualification is a 'good will'. Kant says that,

> Nothing in the world – indeed nothing even beyond the world – can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a good will. Intelligence, wit, judgement, and the other talents of the mind, however they may be named, or courage, resoluteness, and perseverance as qualities of temperament, are doubtless in many respects good and desirable. But they can become extremely bad and harmful if the will, which is to make use of these gifts of nature and which in its special constitution is called character, is not good. Power, riches, honour, even health, general well-being, and the contentment with one's condition which is called happiness, make for pride and even arrogance if there is not a good will to correct their influence on the mind and on its principles of action so as to make it universally conformable to its end. It need hardly be mentioned that the sight of a being adorned with no feature of a pure and good will, yet enjoying uninterrupted prosperity [i.e. anyone like Faust] can never give pleasure to a rational impartial observer. Thus the god will seems to constitute the indispensable condition even of worthiness to be happy.[21]

---

[20] John Atwell (1986). *Ends and Principles in Kant's Moral Thought*. USA: Springer. p. 152.
[21] Immanuel Kant (1785, 1959). *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals.* Translated by Lewis White Beck. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing. p. 9.

This means that people should do good things, not as a means to an end, but just because it is good in and of itself. The idea of a good will is closer to the idea of a 'good person', or, more archaically, a 'person of good will'. But what exactly is good? According to Kant, there are two types of good: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic good means that it is good in and of itself. And good will is the only intrinsic good. Everything else besides goodness is not intrinsically good because there is the potential to use them (i.e. intelligence, money, power...) for a bad purpose. Kant used the terms "will" and "motivation" interchangeably. Will means that we have the ability to choose good, based on reason. This use of the term 'will' early on in analyzing ordinary moral thought in fact prefigures later and more technical discussions concerning the nature of rational agency. Nevertheless, this idea of a good will is an important commonsense touchstone to which he returns throughout his works. The basic idea is that what makes a good person good is his possession of a will that is in a certain way 'determined' by, or makes its decisions on the basis of, the moral law. The idea of a good will is supposed to be the idea of one who only makes decisions that she holds to be morally worthy, taking moral considerations in themselves to be conclusive reasons for guiding her behaviour. This sort of disposition or character is something we all highly value. Kant believes we value it without limitation or qualification.

In Kant's terms, a good will is a will whose decisions are wholly determined by moral demands or as he often refers to this, by the Moral Law. Human beings view this Law as a constraint on their desires, and hence a will in which the Moral Law is decisive is motivated by the thought of *duty*. A *holy* or *divine* will, if it exists, though good, would not be good because it is motivated by thoughts of duty. A holy will would be entirely free from desires that might operate independently of morality. It is the presence of desires that *could* operate independently of moral demands that makes goodness in human beings a constraint, an essential element of the idea of 'duty'. So in analyzing unqualified goodness as it occurs in imperfectly rational creatures such as ourselves, we are investigating the idea of being motivated by the thought that we are constrained to act in certain ways that we *might* not want to, or the thought that we have moral duties. According to Kant, a morally good life does not consist merely in acting in accordance with moral right and wrong, but doing so because of an explicit

commitment to moral right and wrong.[22] Those who do not steal because they never have the chance or inclination to, or because they are fearful of punishment, are to be contrasted with those who never steal because it is wrong to steal. This is what is meant by saying that they do their duty for duty's sake. And according to Kant, acting on this reason exceeds in value acting in the same way for any other reason. He says that, -

> To be kind where one can is duty, and there are, moreover many persons so sympathetically constituted that without any motive of vanity or selfishness they find an inner satisfaction in spreading joy, and rejoice in the contentment of others which they have made possible. But I say that, however dutiful and amiable it may be, that kind of action has no true moral worth.[23]

Now if the moral life is the life of duty for duty's sake, and the best form of human life is the moral life, we are led rather swiftly to the somewhat unpalatable conclusion that many happy and attractive human lives fall far short of the most admirable kind of life, and may even realize nothing of it at all.

Unlike Kantianism, another theory which is rule in moral philosophy are; utilitarianism. Utilitarianism has developed in 19th century England, particularly in the writings of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. Utilitarianism greatly influenced liberal legislation in England and the United State in the twentieth century and is probably the basic moral philosophy of most nonreligious humanists today. The basic question a utilitarian asks in determining the moral status of an action is 'Will this action produce greater overall human well-being?' for the utilitarian, human well-being is the only good, although some utilitarians also include the well-being of animals. Utilitarians also consider everyone's well-being to be of equal value.[24] One can say that, utilitarianism is a midway between egoism and altruism. On the one hand, the egoist is concerned only with her own happiness, whereas, on the other hand, the altruist is concerned only with the happiness of others. And for the

---

[22] Tom Bailey (2011). "Analysing the Good Will: Kant's Argument in the First Section of the Groundwork." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 18, No. 4. p. 641.

[23] Immanuel Kant (1785, 1959). *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Lewis White Beck. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing. p. 14.

[24] C. E. Harris (2002). *Applying Moral Theories.* USA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning. p. 119.

utilitarian, her own well-being is neither more nor less important than well-being of anyone else.

Utilitarianism is one of the most strong and persuasive thought of moral philosophy. Utilitarianism is a modern form of the Hedonistic ethical theory which teaches that the end of human conduct is happiness, and that consequently the discriminating norm which distinguishes conduct into right and wrong is pleasure and pain. According to utilitarianism, an action is right if it is useful for promoting happiness. Happiness, the theory explains, is a sum of pleasures. Pleasure is good and pain or displeasures is bad. Actions are right if they produce what is good and remove or prevent what is bad; that is to say, if they produce happiness or pleasure and if they remove or prevent unhappiness or pain. Utilitarianism of all varieties says that right actions are useful actions, good as means; that rightness is in fact a kind of efficiency, but restricted to efficiency for good ends. Right acts are acts which are useful, efficient, for good purpose or ends.

Utilitarianism is generally held two types of theory like; Classical Utilitarianism and Ideal Utilitarianism. Classical utilitarianism says that the only purpose which counts is the production of pleasure or happiness and the removal or prevention of pain or unhappiness; it is the only purpose which counts because pleasure and pain are the only things good and bad as ends, good and bad in themselves. Classical utilitarianism is often called Hedonistic Utilitarianism (from *hedone*, the Greek word for pleasure) because it holds that pleasure is good as an end. Hedonistic utilitarianism agrees that virtues, love, knowledge, and beauty are good, but it denies that their goodness is independent of the goodness of pleasure. It says that they are good either because they are enjoyable (pleasant) or because they are a means to pleasure. The form of utilitarianism which says that other things besides pleasure (virtue, love, knowledge, beauty) are good as ends is called Ideal Utilitarianism.[25] Both forms are called utilitarian because they both maintain that the only reason for an act to be right is its utility, its usefulness for producing results which are good in themselves.

---

[25] David Daiches Raphael (1981). *Moral Philosophy*. Oxford University Press. p. 35.

Jeremy Bentham was a first remarkable philosopher of classical utilitarianism. Bentham was influenced both by Hobbes, whose fundamental ethical axiom is that right conduct is that which promotes our own welfare; and the social code of morals depends for its justification on whether or not it serves the wellbeing of those who observe it. And another by Hume, whose preoccupations was to find any religious source or sanction of morality. In his *Inquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* he writes, "In all determinations of morality, this circumstance of public utility is ever principally in view; and wherever disputes arise, either in philosophy or common life, concerning the bounds of duty, the question cannot, by any means, be decided with greater certainty, than by ascertaining, on any side, the true interests of mankind.[26] Bentham famously held that humans were ruled by two sovereign masters – pleasures and pain. In the opening of his *Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789), he says that:

> Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do as well as what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of cause and effect are linked to their throne. They govern us in all we do, every effort we can make to throw off their subjection will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In a word man may pretend to abjure their empire; but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The principle of utility recognizes this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hand of reason and law.[27]

Accordingly, the way to construct successful social institutions, i.e. institutions with which people can live contentedly, is to ensure that they are productive of as much pleasure and as little pain as possible for those who live under them. Thus expressed this is, of course, a social or political doctrine rather than an ethical one. However, we can easily extend the same sort of thinking to human actions and hold that the right action for an individual to perform on any occasion is that which will produce the

---

[26] David Hume (2002). "An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals." In J.B. Schneewind *Moral Philosophy from Montaigne to Kant.* Cambridge University Press. p. 552.

[27] J. Bentham (1789, 1960). *A Fragment of Government and Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.* Edited by Wilfred Harrison. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. p. 125.

greatest pleasure and the least pain to those affected by it. Bentham himself meant it to encompass both. He goes on to say:

> The principle of utility is the foundation of the present work. . . . By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: . . . I say of every action whatsoever; and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government.[28]

By utility he meant not, 'usefulness without regard to pleasantness'

> . . . but rather that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good or happiness, (all this in the present case comes to the same thing) or (what comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness. . . .[29]

Bentham assumes that utility is the measure of virtue. For Bentham the trait is morally good, right, virtuous in view of the consequences it produces, the pleasure or utility it generates, which could be completely independent of what our responses are to the trait. According to Bentham, people may not respond to the actions good qualities- perhaps they don't perceive the good effects. But as long as there are these good effects which are, on balance, better than the effects of any alternative course of action, then the action is the right one. Bentham was a social reformer. He felt that people often had responses to certain actions- of pleasure or disgust- that did not reflect anything morally significant at all. Indeed, in his discussions of homosexuality, for example, he explicitly notes that 'antipathy' is not sufficient reason to legislate against a practice:

> The circumstances from which this antipathy may have taken its rise may be worth enquiring to…. One is the physical antipathy to the offence…. The act is to the highest degree odious and disgusting, that is, not to the man who does it,

---

[28] J. Bentham (1789, 1960). *A Fragment of Government and Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.* Edited by Wilfred Harrison. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. p. 125.
[29] Ibid. p 126.

for he does it only because it gives him pleasure, but to one who thinks [?] of it. Be it so, but what is that to him?[30]

Therefore, we can extend the principle of utility to include not just actions, but whole lives. It thus becomes a general view of the morally good life according to which the best human life will be one spent in maximizing the happiness and minimizing the pain in the world.

One of Bentham's contributions to the theory of utilitarianism was the elaboration of a 'hedonic calculus', a system of distinguishing and measuring different kinds of pleasures and pain so that the relative weights of the consequences of different courses of action could be compared. In this way, he thought, he had provided a rational method of decision making for legislators, courts and individuals, one which would replace the rationally unfounded prejudices and the utterly whimsical processes from which, in Bentham's view, political, judicial and administrative decisions usually emerge.[31]

From a philosophical point of view some of Bentham's thinking is rather primitive. The man who gave the doctrine greater philosophical sophistication was John Stuart Mill. Mill was disagreed with some of Bentham's claims- particularly on the nature of 'happiness.' Bentham, recall, had held that there were no qualitative differences between pleasures, only quantitative ones. This left him open to a variety of criticisms. First, Bentham's Hedonism was too egalitarian. Simple-minded pleasures, sensual pleasures, were just as good, at least intrinsically, than more sophisticated and complex pleasures. Second, Bentham's view that there were no qualitative differences in pleasures also left him open to the complaint that on his view human pleasures were of no more value than animal pleasures and, third, committed him to the corollary that the moral status of animals, tied to their sentience, was the same as that of humans. While harming a puppy and harming a person are both bad, however, most people had the view that harming the person was

---

[30] J. Bentham (1978). [OAO] "Offences Against Oneself." Louis Compton (ed.), *The Journal of Homosexuality*, 3(4): 389-406, 4(1): p. 94.

[31] Gordon Graham (2004). *Eight Theories of Ethics.* London and NewYork: Routledge. p. 132.

worse.[32]Mill sought changes to the theory that could accommodate those sorts of intuitions.

According to Mill, intellectual pleasures are of a higher, better, sort than the ones that are merely sensual, and that we share with animals. Mill argues that human beings have capacities that animals do not have and that, when we are aware of those capacities, we cannot regard anything as happiness unless it includes them. In particular, we must give "pleasures of the intellect, of the feeling and imagination, and of the moral sentiments a much higher value as pleasures than those of mere sensation."[33] Mill believes we can confirm the judgment that these pleasures have a higher value than the pleasures of food and sex, for example, simply by asking those who have experienced both kinds of pleasure which they prefer. Would you really want to exchange places with a person who has had all of his physical desires satisfied but who has no close personal relationships, no intellectual or artistic interests, and no goals other than pleasure? Mill believes that it is better to be a dissatisfied Socrates than a satisfied fool.[34]

Mill expressly commends a divorce between the common and the philosophical uses of 'utility'. In *Utilitarianism*, he says that:

> A passing remark is all needs be given to the ignorant blunder of supposing that those who stand up for utility as the test of right and wrong, use the term in that restricted and merely colloquial sense in which utility is opposed to pleasure.[35]

This is, he says, a 'perverted' use of the term 'utility', and one which has unfairly discredited the 'theory of utility', which he restates in the following way.

> The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, utility, or the Greatest Happiness Principle . . . . that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By

---

[32] Julia Driver. "The History of Utilitarianism," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2009 Edition)*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. URL: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2009/entries/utilitarianism-history.

[33] J. S. Mill (1957). *Utilitarianism*. New York: Liberal Arts Press. p. 10.

[34] C. E. Harris (2002). *Applying Moral Theories*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning: USA. p. 120.

[35] J. S. Mill (1871, 1998). *Utilitarianism*. Edited by Roger Crisp. New York: Oxford University Press. p. 54.

happiness is intended pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the privation of pleasure.[36]

Mill also argued that the principle could be proven, using another rather notorious argument:

> The utilitarian doctrine is, that happiness is desirable, and the only thing desirable, as an end; all other things being only desirable as means to that end. What ought to be required of this doctrine – what conditions is it requisite that the doctrine should fulfill – to make good its claim to be believed?
>
> The only proof capable of being given that an object is visible, is that people actually see it. The only proof that a sound is audible, is that people hear it: and so of other sources of experience. In like manner, I apprehend, the sole evidence it is possible to produce that anything is desirable, is that people do actually desire it. If the end which the utilitarian doctrine proposes to itself were not, in theory and in practice, acknowledged to be an end, nothing could ever convince any person that it was so. No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness. This, however, being a fact, we have not only all the proof which the case admits of, but all which it is possible to require, that happiness is a good: that each person's happiness is a good to that person, and the general happiness, therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons.[37]

G. E. Moore (1873-1958) criticized this as fallacious. He argued that it rested on an obvious ambiguity:

> Mill has made as naïve and artless a use of the naturalistic fallacy as anybody could desire. "Good", he tells us, means "desirable", and you can only find out what is desirable by seeking to find out what is actually desired…. The fact is that "desirable" does not mean "able to be desired" as "visible" means "able to be seen." The desirable means simply what *ought* to be desired or deserves to

---

[36] Ibid., p. 55.
[37] Ibid., p. 81.

be desired; just as the detestable means not what can be but what ought to be detested . . . .[38]

However, Mill was offering this as an alternative to Bentham's view which had been itself criticized as a 'swine morality,' locating the good in pleasure in a kind of indiscriminate way. The distinctions he makes strike many as intuitively plausible ones. Bentham, however, can accommodate many of the same intuitions within his system. This is because he notes that there are a variety of parameters along which we quantitatively measure pleasure — intensity and duration are just two of those. His complete list is the following: *intensity, duration, certainty or uncertainty, propinquity or remoteness, fecundity, purity,* and *extent.* Thus, what Mill calls the intellectual pleasures will score more highly than the sensual ones along several parameters, and this could give us reason to prefer those pleasures — but it is a quantitative not a qualitative reason, on Bentham's view. When a student decides to study for an exam rather than go to a party, for example, she is making the best decision even though she is sacrificing short term pleasure. That's because studying for the exam, Bentham could argue, scores higher in terms of the long term pleasures doing well in school lead to, as well as the fecundity of the pleasure in leading to yet other pleasures.[39] However, Bentham will have to concede that the very happy oyster that lives a very long time could, in principle, have a better life than a normal human.

Since Mill's time the only writer who has introduced any modification into strictly Utilitarian thought is Henry Sidgwick. He acknowledges that the pleasure-and-pain standard is incapable of serving universally as the criterion of morality; but believes it to be valuable as an instrument for the correction of the received moral code. In his *Method of Ethics*, he has studiously avoided all metaphysical and epistemological questions, and, on the whole, this has been most fortunate for his treatment of ethics. On Sidgwick's view, utilitarianism is the more basic theory. A simple reliance on intuition, for example, cannot resolve fundamental conflicts between values, or rules, such as Truth and Justice that may conflict. In Sidgwick's words ". . . we require some higher principle to decide the issue . . . ." That will be

---

[38] G. E. Moore (1903, 1988). *Principia Ethica.* Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books. pp. 66–7.
[39] Julia Driver (Summer 2009 Edition). "The History of Utilitarianism." Edited by N. Zalta. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*
URL:http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2009/entries/utilitarianism-history.

utilitarianism. Further, the rules which seem to be a fundamental part of common sense morality are often vague and under described, and applying them will actually require appeal to something theoretically more basic- again, utilitarianism.[40] Yet further, absolute interpretations of rules seem highly counter-intuitive, and yet we need some justification for any exceptions- provided, again, by utilitarianism. Sidgwick provides a compelling case for the theoretical primacy of utilitarianism.

Sidgwick's view was developed out of and in response to those of Bentham and Mill. His *Methods* offer an engagement with the theory as it had been presented before him, and was an exploration of it and the main alternatives as well as a defence. Sidgwick was also concerned with clarifying fundamental features of the theory, and in this respect his account has been enormously influential to later writers, not only to utilitarians and consequentialists, generally, but to intuitionists as well. Sidgwick's thorough and penetrating discussion of the theory raised many of the concerns that have been developed by recent moral philosophers.[41] One extremely controversial feature of Sidgwick's views relates to his rejection of a publicity requirement for moral theory. He writes:

> Thus, the Utilitarian conclusion, carefully stated, would seem to be this; that the opinion that secrecy may render an action right which would not otherwise be so should itself be kept comparatively secret; and similarly it seems expedient that the doctrine that esoteric morality is expedient should itself be kept esoteric. Or, if this concealment be difficult to maintain, it may be desirable that Common Sense should repudiate the doctrines which it is expedient to confine to an enlightened few. And thus a Utilitarian may reasonably desire, on Utilitarian principles, that some of his conclusions should be rejected by mankind generally; or even that the vulgar should keep aloof from his system as a whole, in so far as the inevitable indefiniteness and complexity of its calculations render it likely to lead to bad results in their hands.[42]

---

[40] Ernest Albee (1901). "An Examination of Professor Sidgwick's Proof of Utilitarianism." *Philosophical Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3. Duke University Press. p. 253.

[41] William Lillie (1966). *Introduction of Ethics*. London: University Paperbacks. p. 178.

[42] Henry Sidgwick (1963). *The Methods Of Ethics*. London: Macmillan & Co Ltd. p. 490.

Sidgwick raised issues that run much deeper to our basic understanding of utilitarianism. For example, the way earlier utilitarians characterized the principle of utility left open serious indeterminacies. The major one rests on the distinction between total and average utility. He raised the issue in the context of population growth and increasing utility levels by increasing numbers of people (or sentient beings):

> Assuming, then, that the average happiness of human beings is a positive quantity, it seems clear that, supposing the average happiness enjoyed remains undiminished, Utilitarianism directs us to make the number enjoying it as great as possible. But if we foresee as possible that an increase in numbers will be accompanied by a decrease in average happiness or *vice versa*, a point arises which has not only never been formally noticed, but which seems to have been substantially overlooked by many Utilitarians. For if we take Utilitarianism to prescribe, as the ultimate end of action, happiness on the whole, and not any individual's happiness, unless considered as an element of the whole, it would follow that, if the additional population enjoy on the whole positive happiness, we ought to weigh the amount of happiness gained by the extra number against the amount lost by the remainder.[43]

For Sidgwick, the conclusion on this issue is not to simply strive to greater average utility, but to increase population to the point where we maximize the product of the number of persons who are currently alive and the amount of average happiness. So it seems to be a hybrid, total-average view.

Act and Rule Utilitarianism:

One of the most frequently discussed issues in utilitarian theory is the distinction between act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism. Act utilitarianism judges the morality of an action by whether the action itself produces the most utility, or at least as much utility as any other action. On the other hand, Rule utilitarianism judges the morality of an action by whether the moral rule presupposed by the action, if generally followed, would produce the most utility, or at least much utility as any other rule. In other words, Act utilitarianism states that, when faced with a choice, we must first consider the likely consequences of potential actions and, from that, choose

---

[43] Ibid., p. 415.

to do what we believe generates the most pleasure for particular situations. Many objectors to Act utilitarianism contend, with the support of examples, that we are morally obliged to do certain actions even though there are other actions do certain action even more though there are other actions open to us with more favourable consequences.[44] The rule utilitarian, on the other hand, begins by looking at potential rules of action, and determines whether there is a rule that should be followed and what would happen if the rule were to be constantly followed. If adherence to the rule produces more happiness than otherwise, it is a rule that morally must be followed at all times. The distinction between act and rule utilitarianism is therefore based on a difference about the proper object of consequential calculation- specific to a case or generalized to rules. Rule utilitarianism has been criticized for advocating general rules that, in some specific circumstances, clearly decrease happiness if followed. Never to kill another human being may seem to be a good rule, but it could make self-defence against malevolent aggressors very difficult. Rule utilitarians add, however, that there are general exception rules that allow the breaking of other rules if such rule-breaking increases happiness, one example being self-defence. For Rule utilitarianism, the rightness or wrongness of particular acts can be determined by reference to a set of rules having some utilitarian defence, justification, or derivation.[45] Critics argue that this reduces rule utilitarianism to act utilitarianism and makes rules meaningless. Rule utilitarians retort that rules in the legal system (i.e., laws) that regulate such situations are not meaningless. Self-defence is legally justified, while murder is not. Mill claims that:

> The moral rules which forbid mankind to hurt one another (in which we must never forget to include wrongful interference with each other's freedom) are more vital to human well – being than any maxims, however important, which only point out the best mode of managing some department of human affairs.[46]

It is the importance of the rules of justice for the happiness of us all, according to mill, that commonly gives rise to a feeling of outrage when any one of them is broken. But

---

[44] Bourch A. Brody (1967). "The equivalence of act and rule utilitarianism." *Philosophical Studies.* Vol. 18, No. 6. p. 81.

[45] David Lyons (1965), *Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism.* New Yark: Oxford University Press. p. 11.

[46] Mill, J. S. (1871, 1998). *Utilitarianism.* Edited by Roger Crisp. New York: Oxford University Press. p. 103.

though we have this very strong and special feeling about justice and rights, upon reflection we can see –

> That justice is a name for certain for moral requirements, which, regarded collectively, stand higher in the scale of social utility, and are therefore of more paramount obligation, than any others; though particular cases may occur in which some other social duty is so important, as to overrule any one of the general maxims of justice.[47]

However, within rule utilitarianism there is a distinction between the strictness and absolutism of this particular branch of utilitarianism. *Strong Rule* Utilitarianism is an absolutist theory, which frames strict rules that apply for all people and all time and may never be broken. John Stuart Mill proposed *Weak Rule* utilitarianism, which posits that, although rules should be framed on previous examples that benefit society, it is possible, under specific circumstances, to do what produces the greatest happiness and break that rule. An example would be the Gestapo asking where your Jewish neighbours were; a strong rule utilitarian might say the "Do not lie" rule must never be broken, whereas a weak rule utilitarian would argue that to lie would produce the most happiness. It has been argued that rule utilitarianism collapses into act utilitarianism, because for any given rule, in the case where breaking the rule produces more utility, the rule can be refined by the addition of a sub-rule that handles cases like the exception'.[48] This process holds for 'all cases of exceptions, and so the 'rules' have as many 'sub-rules' as there are exceptional cases, which, in the end, makes an agent seek out whatever outcome produces the maximum utility.

After analyzing both theories, one can say that, both theorise are equally important for individual and society. Every theory has its own importance, so we cannot say which theory is more important than other. Utilitarianism is important because it proposed that the greatest useful goodness for the greatest number of people should be our guiding principle when making ethical decisions. The central insight of Utilitarianism, that one ought to promote happiness and prevent unhappiness whenever possible, seems undeniable. On the other hand, Kantianism is

---

[47] Ibid., p. 106.
[48] David Lyons (1965), *Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism*. New York: Oxford University Press. p. 12.

also important because 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.

For both theories, the question of living the "good life" is an intricate part of the belief system. For the Utilitarians, living a life that benefited as many people as possible, in essence, a life that caused the greatest widespread good results would be considered a life of virtue. For Kant, the only moral action is one that is done entirely because of obligation. He also makes the distinction between motives, saying that an action can be "in accord with duty" and still be immoral. An example of this would be if a person owes money to a friend. If they pay back the money simply because they owe it, then Kant would say their action was moral. But if they paid the money back because they felt it would give them the opportunity of borrowing more later on, or that their friendship would be negatively affected, Kant would regard their action as immoral. This is a sharp contrast to a Utilitarian view of the same situation. A Utilitarian would argue that either way, the money was paid back. The lender received what they wanted, and the borrower, whatever his motives, kept his friend and did what was promised.

To sum, up we can say that, as with all principal systems of beliefs, the end that both theory seek is a virtuous life. A Utilitarian aspect could be more appropriate for one situation; while a Kantian perspective might be better for another. If one keeps a working knowledge of both philosophies, one can look at life with a broader view, and not get too firmly entrenched in one set of beliefs. That way, it is possible to face each day with an open mind, and truly live a life of virtue.

2.2 Individualistic (Libertarianism) Morality and Collective (Communitarianism) Morality

After analyzing Utilitarianism and Kantianism, we can now move to another two ethical theories, which is also known as socio-political philosophical theories like; Liberalism as an individualistic morality and Communitariansm as a collective

morality. In political philosophy, the so-called "Liberal – Communitarian" debate was started in 1980s, which is continues to this day. According to this debate, libertarians tend to ignore community or assign it secondary status as a derivative, the result of an aggregation of individual choices, transactions, or other such deliberate and voluntary acts. On the other hand, communitarians, have argued that life within a community, with its special traditions and culture, can provide its members with preferences that can legitimately over-ride the supposedly universal moral obligations generated by abstract notions of justice.

Liberalism emerged in the struggle against monarchy and hereditary privilege, and in the struggle to defuse the religious violence that followed the Reformation. One can find precursors in the 16th century (e.g. Castellio), but the movement really began to gather steam in the late 17th century—for instance, as a result of John Locke's influential writings. Libertarianism is generally considered to be the group of political philosophies which emphasize freedom, liberty, and voluntary association. On the other hand, 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. In communitarian thought, this idea has sought to recall that in real life man is not an autonomous subject; that, in shaping his identity, the contacts established with others come decisively into play, so that one's approach to his own life cannot be conceived of as emerging unhindered from a pure, original individuality.

The perspectives of, and conflict between, individual needs and rights and group needs and rights have been conceptualised in the discipline of philosophy as Libertarianism versus Communitarianism. Now it is very important to understand the key terms of Liberalism and Communitarianism, separately.

Etymologically, libertarianism comes from the French word *libertaire*. The use of the word "libertarian" to describe a set of political positions can be tracked to the French cognate, *libertaire*, which was coined in 1857 by French anarchist Joseph Déjacque. Hence libertarian has been used by some as a synonym for left anarchism since the 1890s.[49] During the 18th century, classical liberal ideas developed in Europe

---

[49] Max Nettlau (1996). *A Short History of Anarchism*. London: Freedom Press. p. 162.

and North America. Libertarians of various schools were influenced by classical liberal ideas. The term *libertarian* in a metaphysical or philosophical sense was first used by late-Enlightenment free-thinkers to refer to those who believed in free will, as opposed to determinism. In 1793, William Godwin wrote *Political Justice*, which some consider to be the first expression of anarchism. Godwin opposed revolutionary action and saw a minimal state as a present "necessary evil" that would become increasingly irrelevant and powerless by the gradual spread of knowledge.[50]

The writings of John Locke became influential during this time. Locke's political theory was founded on social contract theory. Unlike Thomas Hobbes, Locke believed that human nature is characterised by reason and tolerance. Like Hobbes, Locke believed that human nature allowed men to be selfish. This is apparent with the introduction of currency. In a natural state all people were equal and independent, and everyone had a natural right to defend his "Life, health, Liberty, or Possessions."[51] This became the basis for the phrase in the American Declaration of Independence: "*Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.*"

Rawls's A Theory of Justice, (1971) has been largely responsible for placing a form of liberalism, one devoted to both the protection of individual liberty and the securing of the social and economic bases of equality. Other libertarians are John Locke, Adam Smith, Immanuel Kant, Baron de Montesquieu, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Stuart Mill. And Well-known recent liberal philosophers are Isaiah Berlin, John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin, Will Kymlicka, Martha Nussbaum. Libertarianism assumes that the basic moral concepts are individual human rights and that the rights to be respected are non-interference rights. These generally fall under the heading of rights to life, to liberty or to property. For libertarianism, the only proper limit to one person's enjoyment of these rights is his or her duty to respect the similar rights of others. Libertarianism include individualism, the idea the individual persons, rather than the community, should be regarded as the basic unit of social analysis; self-ownership, the view that individuals should be free to decide what is best for themselves so long as they respect this same freedom in others; free markets, the view

---

[50] Robert B. Everhart (1982). *The Public School Monopoly: A Critical Analysis of Education and the State in American Society*. Pacific Institute for Public Policy Research. p. 115.

[51] John Locke (1690). *Second Treatise of Government* (http:/ / www. gutenberg. org/ files/ 7370/ 7370-h/ 7370-h. htm). (10th edition). *Project Gutenberg*. Accessed on 25 March 2012.

that government intervention in market exchanges should be minimized in the interest of freedom and economic prosperity; and the minimal state, the view that the coercive influence of government should be severely restricted so as to ensure that the self-ownership of individual persons is maximized.

Libertarian philosophies can be divided on three principal questions: whether the morality of actions are determined consequentially or deontologically, whether or not private property is legitimate, and whether or not the state is legitimate.

1. Consequentialist or deontological distinction- In regard to supportive of private property, libertarianism has two different ethical doctrines. One has been called consequentialist libertarianism and the other deontological libertarianism. Consequentialist libertarians argue that a free market and strong private property rights bring about beneficial consequences, such as wealth creation or efficiency.[52] Deontological libertarians argue that there are moral rules one ought not violate regardless of the consequences. Deontological libertarians describe aggression and coercion as examples.[53] Consequentialist libertarians generally support the State. There are also hybrid forms that combine deontological and consequentialist reasoning.

2. Propertarian or non- propertarian distinction- Propertarian libertarian philosophies define liberty as non-aggression, or the state in which no person or group aggresses against any other person or group, where aggression is defined as the violation of private property.[54] This philosophy, implicitly, recognizes as the sole source of legitimate authority private property. Propertarian libertarians hold that an order of private property is the only one that is both ethical and leads to the best possible outcomes. They generally support the free-market, and are not opposed to any concentration of power (monopolies) provided it is brought about through non-coercive means. Non-propertarian libertarian philosophies hold that liberty is the absence of any form authority and argue that a society based on freedom and equality can be achieved through abolishing authoritarian institutions that control certain

---

[52] Jonathan Wolff (Oct. 22, 2006). "Libertarianism, Utility and Economic Competition." Vol. 92:1605. *Virginia Law Review.*

[53] Murray N. Rothbard (1989). *For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto.* New York: Collier Books. p. 338.

[54] Ibid., p. 340.

means of production and subordinate the majority to an owning class or political and economic elite. Implicitly, it rejects any authority of private property and thus holds that it is not legitimate for someone to claim private ownership of any resources to the detriment of others.[55] Libertarian socialism is a group of political philosophies that promote a non-hierarchical, non-bureaucratic, stateless society without private property in the means of production. The term libertarian socialism is also used to differentiate this philosophy from state socialism or as a synonym for anarchism.[56] Libertarian socialists generally place their hopes in decentralized means of direct democracy such as libertarian municipalism, citizens' assemblies, trade unions and workers' councils.[57]

3. Statist or anarchistic distinction- Libertarians differ on the degree up to which the state can be reduced. Some favour the existence of states and see them as necessary while others favour stateless societies and view the state as being undesirable, unnecessary, and harmful.[58] Supporters of government argue that having defenced and courts controlled by the market is an inherent miscarriage of justice because it turns justice into a commodity, thereby conflating justice with economic power. Detractors argue that having defence and courts controlled by the state is both immoral and an inefficient means of achieving both justice and security. Libertarian socialists hold that liberty is incompatible with state action based on a class struggle analysis of the state.[59]

One can say that, Libertarianism as Individualism is a tradition, ideology, or personal outlook that emphasizes the primacy of the individual and his or her rights, independence, and relationships with other individuals. In essence, he is stating the somewhat obvious, that individualism determines that the individual is the primary unit of reality and the ultimate standard of value. This view does not deny that societies exist or that people benefit from living in them, but it sees society as a collection of individuals, not something over and above them.

---

[55] Peter Vallentyne and Hillel Steiner, ed. (2000). *Left-libertarianism and its critics: the Contemporary Debate.* New York: Palgrave (St. Martin's Press). p. 393.
[56] Noam Chomsky (2004). *Language and Politics.* Edited by Carlos Peregrín Otero. UK: A.K. Press. p. 739.
[57] Rudolf Rocker (2004). *Anarcho-Syndicalism: Theory and Practice.* Oakland, California: A.K. Press. p. 65.
[58] R. Johnston (2000). *The Dictionary of Human Geography.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers. p. 24.
[59] Lewis Call (2002). *Postmodern anarchism.* Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books. p. 67.

In the contrary of libertarians, communitarianism began in the upper reaches of Anglo-American academia in the form of a critical reaction to John Rawls' landmark 1971 book *A Theory of Justice* (Rawls 1971). Criticisms of communitarianism focused primarily 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.[60] The Well-known recent communitarians are Charles Taylor, Michael Sandel, Alasdair MacIntyre, Michael Walzer, Daniel Bell, Amitai Etzioni.

Communitarianism, can offer a more compelling vision of the self, a richer account of politics, and a better understanding of the common good. communitarianism's superiority as a moral and political theory stems from the fact that it reflects our deepest shared understandings about the role that constitutive communities play in a well-lived life. Communitarians emphasize that human beings are not fundamentally autonomous or unencumbered selves but first of all social beings embedded in practices and beliefs that we do not make but which rather, in a sense, make us by constituting our identities and forming the frameworks within which we come to understand ourselves and know and care about others. From this 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 (though they often fail to reflect on the provenance of *this* concern), 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.[61]

Communitarianism comes in different degrees of strength. At the strongest end it argues that community should replace justice; on this view justice is a remedial virtue that is needed only to handle cases where community is absent. A less strong version of communitarianism argues that the shared understandings of a community are the

---

[60] *The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibility*, Vol. 5. Centre for Policy Research (US). 1994. p. 54.

[61] "Communitarian Criticisms and Liberal Lessons" (1995). 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*. pp. 54-64.

source of principles of justice; there is no ahistorical, transcultural source of norms of justice. Finally, a weaker version of communitarianism argues that community should play a greater role in principles of justice—that is, there should be more focus on common good, less on individual rights. Communitarians in their writings often claim to be arguing against liberalism. But are they really? So far as we know all the communitarians listed above accept liberalism's core commitments of constitutionalism, freedom of religion in some form, freedom of expression in some form, etc. So really they are arguing for a particular, communitarian form of liberalism, one that, in the debate between more expansive and less expansive interpretations of basic rights, leans toward the less expansive side.[62] For instance, communitarians will allow for more community control of zoning laws, of school policy, of funding for arts and cultural activities, etc. than many other liberals are comfortable with allowing.

One can say that, communitarianism as Collectivism is a tradition, ideology, or personal orientation that emphasizes the primacy of the group or community rather than each individual person. The group, the nation, the community, the proletariat, the race, etc., is the primary unit of reality and the ultimate standard of value. At any rate, communitarian reflections still serve as a corrective to the dominant liberal discourse which places individual autonomy above all else. For although liberal thought in recent years has indeed echoed the observations of communitarian-style thinkers, in practice the liberal worldview continues in the direction of supporting a few minimal ethical guidelines in the public square - tolerance and human rights - and relegating substantive differences to private life.[63]

The attributes associated with libertarianism as individualism are independence, autonomy, self-reliance, uniqueness, achievement orientation, and competition. Individualists are portrayed as having control over and taking responsibility for their actions. Communitarianism as collectivism, in turn, is associated with a sense of duty toward one's group, interdependence with others, a desire for social harmony, and conformity with group norms. In this view, behaviour

---

[62] http://www.the liberal-communitarian debate.org/communitarianism, accessed on: Feb.12, 2012.
[63] Ana Marta González (2003). *"Ethics in Global Business and in a Plural Society."* Journal of Business Ethics . Vol. 44, No. 1. Netherlands: Springer. p. 2.

and attitudes of collectivists are determined by norms or demands of the in group such as extended family or close-knit community. The variability of individualism and collectivism, however, should not only be studied at the cross-cultural or interindividual level: People may be individualist and collectivist at the same time. Individualist and collectivist attitudes can also be activated as a function of social contexts and social relations. Individualist relations are common with some people or in particular situations, for example, in business relations, whereas with others the relationship is collectivist, for instance, with family members. Individuals may be characterized by specific combinations of individualist and collectivist attitudes. Some people may be high on individualism and low on collectivism or vice versa. Others, in turn, can be high or low on both.[64]

In this world, there are many people go out of their way to make themselves more unique and more of an individual, as well as people who will do anything to just be a part of a crowd or a community. Is it possible for an individual to be strictly an individual and not a member of a community, or visa versa? Although everyone is their own person, and has their own unique personality, thoughts, and beliefs, we are all a part of a community, whether that means the town we live in, the common interests we share with others, or the family we were born into. A community is defined as a body of people that live believing the same interests and beliefs as others while sharing the same common interests. Communities are more than just a bunch of people who live in the same area; they share common interests with each other, allowing them to have similarities.

To sum up we can say that, 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 it is very important to have some liberty, freedom, justice etc. but community is also very important for get these values.

---

[64] Eva G. T. Green (2005). "Variation of Individualism and Collectivism and Between 20 Countries: A Typological Analysis." *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 3. Sage Publication. p. 322.

Chapter Three

Globalization: Culture, Multiculturalism and *Puruşārthas*

As a matter of fact, globalization has been defined as the process through which goods and services, capital, people, information and ideas flow across borders and lead to greater integration of economies and societies. It has made substantial advances in recent decades and is viewed by many as an inescapable feature of the world today. Undoubtedly, in the present era, we can see that on the one hand, the significant potential benefits of globalization, but on the other hand many people have been experiencing the negative effects of the process of globalization. Towards the end of the last century, there have been some protest movements against globalization on new world economic, political, cultural, technological, religious order, and the way the pros and cons of a new global world have been assessed. I shall therefore in this chapter focus on the cultural dimension of globalization, giving special attention to the impact of globalization on multiculturalism and *puruşārthas*.

Besides the increasingly unequal distribution of wealth, the loss of cultural heritage and identity is often cited as one of the negative side effects of Globalization. Globalization has always had a great impact on cultural diversity and cultural identity. Free flows of information, rapid progress in technology of transportation and communication and cheaper travelling have made the world "Global Village." Declining costs have changed individual and societies tastes for greater integration. The prevailing debate regarding the effect of Globalization on local cultures and local identities are significant today more than ever. The reason for this importance lies in the preservation of the traditional cultures and values that are carefully being sewn into the entanglements of globalization. The spread of capital across foreign lands has given a new importance for the hierarchy of order in a country to succumb to radical changes in technology and infrastructure: country, nation, community, subcultures,

and the individual. In this respect, the rapid spread of technology and capital in the late twentieth century has now provided a visual look at the pending clash between tradition and globalization. In a world that is arguably dominated by the mass prospect of capital gain and industrial expansion, the significance of "local culture" and "local identity" have been given a new importance.

Globalization has negative and positive impacts on cultural identity. The main side effect of globalization impact on cultural identity is the spread of multinational corporations. This encourages consumer culture and standardizes products and values. Culture has almost become a one-way operating manner of business. Cultural goods and services produced by rich and powerful countries have invaded all of worlds markets, and left with difficulties undeveloped countries which are not able to stand up the competition. The natural result is that these countries are unable to enter areas of influence occupied by multinational companies of developed ones and local products are replaced by mass products.

However globalization influences cultural identity also in a good way. Far from destroying, it has the most significant force in creating and proliferating cultural identity. Identity is seen here as the strong power of local culture that offers resistance to the centrifugal force of capitalist globalization. Cultural flows occur differently and may originate in many places. Diversity has itself become a global value, promoted through the international organizations and movements. Local tradition tends to interpenetrate global norms or global or practices according to their believes and value. Another good impact of globalization on cultural identity is that human rights are universal and guaranteed by law. For example Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations. It is the aggregation of lots of individual choices. The idea of free market and democracy provides a wide variety of perspectives, encourages students to think and learn more deeply in order to live better lives. One can say that globalization effects cultural identity in a good way because of spread of technology and Internet. These two factors promote local culture. Science and technology make the world globalized and globalization reflects somewhat of the theory of convergence, but in deeper sense, it promotes cultural identity. With the development of science and technology, people

are closer than before. They become much more concerned about their cultural identity. They are constantly searching for their cultural roots and defending them.

At the same time, we cannot avoid the negative aspect of globalization. It is fair to say that globalization is killing the local identity. In this globalization era, the local identity is demolishing and another new "globalized" identity is created. In this new identity, somehow it is dominated by Western culture. With the internet connect, the distance between people is getting smaller; the collision of different cultures is getting stronger. However, in this combination of cultures, people will tend to choose one priority to follow, and in this process some parts of the local identity are killed. Empirically, Western countries underwent significant economic and social changes during the second half of the 20th century, transitioning from a feudal to an industrial, and finally to a knowledge-based society. It is therefore fair to say that increased economic prosperity and technological progress had an immense influence on societal structures, ways of life, work, family, and gender roles.

There is a feeling that local identities may not be 'real identities' but only 'virtual reality'. The Internet and Cyber Space have a different language. By computerization and digital system of Cyber processes, one can create such realities, which do not happen in real life. This, which does not happen in real life but by simple amalgamation of parameters, which are pre, structured and defined, you can create a 'virtual reality'. Thus technology can help in fostering local identities. People who are in minority at one place can search for like-minded people throughout the globe. This way they can all come together through teleconferencing, without physical movement from one place to another. So globalization technologically does not prevent local identities.

One can say that a global process must have roots, a place, origin, locality; even trans national firms must develop local connections for their businesses. Roland Robertson proposes that instead of focusing on the global and the local as opposing forces, we employ the term "*glocalization*" to capture the dialectical and contingent interchange between local cultures and global trends. Globalization is developing its

own local cultural traits and dimensions. Robertson calls this process "*glocalization.*"[1] Glocalization is an historical process whereby localities develop direct economic and cultural relationships to the global system through information technologies, bypassing and subverting traditional power hierarchies like national governments and markets. In contrast, "globalization" is often used as a term to suggest the historical processes leading to a more one-way relationship between the "global" realm inhabited by multinational corporations, the entertainment industry, CNN, the Web, etc. and a subjugated "local" realm where the identity-affirming senses of place, neighbourhood, town, locale, ethnicity, etc. survive (if just barely) against the global onslaught of global capitalism, media, and network identities.

Through Glocalization, a more modern way of subjecting the local with the global industry, the imminent diffusion of the local with global appears clear. The significance of the terms "local identity" and "local culture" have been given such grave emphasis nowadays because of the driving influence of Glocalization. This slow market influence has caused a self - reflexive awareness for those who are gravely affected by the changes in both culture and identity.

3.1 Culture and Multiculturalism: Local Identity and Globality

Multi-culturalism is a phenomenon, which has emerged essentially as a result of the expansions of the process of globalization. It finds relatively sharper focus in the developed world. We confronted it in Europe, and recently in the United States of America. Not inter-cultural interaction or dialogue but cultural separation or even opposition are ideological nuances of multi-culturalism. Here, cultural identity is made as an alternative issue and not co-existence. Multi-culturalism arises when due to the processes of capitalist development and forces of globalization persons and communities are dawn from many 'other cultures' as migrant workers. These migrants find a space in the market-economy of the developed countries such as Germany, France and north-European countries also because of their aging population

---

[1] Sheila L. Croucher (2004). *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity in a Changing World.* USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC. p. 26.

and structural shifts in the nature of employment. Ironically, in the process of emigration to 'other cultures', the level of inter-cultural communication even breeds inter-cultural prejudices and conflicts. This sharpens the cultural identity and cultural exclusiveness both of the migrant communities as well as of the host communities. Multi-cultural ideology is a product of this process of cultural contradictions. In some ways, it rejects the process of cultural globalization and the realities of inter-cultural interaction among cultural communities at the global scale.

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. As such multiculturalism involves a study of human life within historical and cultural framework, culturally derived system of meaning and significance. Most importantly, multiculturalism proposes to study diversity of cultural in terms civil and democratic rights, property and settlement, marriage and inheritance and above all citizenship so that people belonging to each cultural community could be recognized as valid participants in the civil society and hence there is a possible fusion of cultural horizon.

The term multiculturalism first came to be used in the 1960's. It was used to counter the term "Biculturalism". Multiculturalism basically addressed the rights of the French and English peoples. The immigrants since 1900 weren't getting fair rights and the Natives and the e French speaking Canadians were extremely frustrated. They were being ignored by English speaking people who were controlling Canada. This caused by split of lower and upper Canada. People started complaining that they weren't getting paid the same amount or treated the same way as the other Canadians. In 1967 the racial and ethnic barriers started being removed. And finally to restore peace in 1971 (after Canada became independent), Canada became the first country in the world to adopt the multicultural policy based on cultural pluralism. Canadians were accepted as a mosaic of people, meaning people from all different nations were equal. The US however used a melting pot technique, people aren't allowed to keep their own nationalities but rather give them up and become Americans. Thought the emergence of the multicultural discourse was at first in Canada, it gradually went to Australia and then in the U.S.A., U.K., Germany, Spain and even France has the

strongest bastion of the nation state, which takes no official note of its citizens' ethnicity, culture and religion and does not record these in its decennial census. Bhikhu Parekh suggests three central insights to multiculturalism: "first, 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. Second, different cultures represent different systems of meaning and visions of the good life. Third, every culture is internally plural and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. This does not mean that it is devoid of coherence and identity, but that its identity is plural; fluid and open."[2]

As a matter of fact, "multiculturalism was in the process of making for a long time, perhaps very long time. Rightly understood, the emergence of the multiculturalism society is not sudden. History knows no hiatus in its course. The periodization of history under the labels of ancient, medieval, modern and postmodern has a liberal element of academic arbitrariness. Today the world is one; the Chinese, the Indians, the Europeans or the Americans mingle in academia and in the market place. The philosophically excursion into the emergence of multiculturalism society requires us to undertake an exploration of many human horizons, proximate and distant, contemporaneous and historical. What is more, humans being essentially *Dasein*, projective in character, the fuller implications of emergence can be better understood if we look forward, more intensely and imaginatively, to the future which slowly, at times not so slowly, are coming up. Modern science and technology has played the most important role in bringing the people so close to one another."[3]

Culture is one of the most operative terms of multiculturalism. Culture (Latin *cultura* stemming from *colere*, meaning 'to cultivate') refers to the cultivation of human mind in terms of customs and traditions, values and virtues, language and literature, art and architecture, music and dance, and above all, an integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief, and behaviour that depends upon the capacity for symbolic

---

[2] Bhikhu Parekh, *What is multiculturalism?* www.india- seminar. Com/1999parekh htm. Accessed on 08.31.2009.

[3] R. P. Singh (2011). "Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons" in *World of Philosophy: A Harmony*. Edited by C.K. Chapple. Rohtak: Shanti Prakashan. p. 185.

thought and social learning, the set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterize a community. In 1952, A.L. Kroeber and Klyde Kluchohn[4] have given 164 definitions of cultural aspects of human beings comprising of the content and the intent of culture, its universalistic character, the hierarchical status and the pluralistic features. The universalistic features are based on the distinction between humans and the animals- the former can create symbols, typologies, conventions, belief systems, reason, subjectivity and emancipation. Humans can even create symbols not understandable by means of five senses. There may be negotiation aspects of culture particularly in the context of hierarchies of cultures- central/marginal, mainstream/subaltern, literate/illiterate, west/east, and so on. Raymond Williams in Culture and Society 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. Sri Aurobindo[5] in Foundations of Indian Culture vindicates *Sadhana, Vidya* and *Kala* as three interrelated aspects of Indian culture. Indian culture is a culture of knowledge *para vidya* and *apara vidya* of *Abhyudaya* and *Niḥśreyasa*, of dialogue, of spirituality Ishavasyamidamsarvam, of Amritasyaputrah, of Yoga, of Global family and so on.[6]

A culture could possibly be evaluated in three ways- "Cognitive, Connotive 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. Connotive 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 we can say that culture consists of the aspects of religion/dharma, spirituality, philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, and archaeology and so on."[7]

---

[4] A. L. Kroeber & Klyde Kluchohn (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concept and Definitions.* Cambridge Mass: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology.

[5] Sri Aurobindo (1953). *Foundations of Indian Culture*. New York: Sri Aurobindo Library Inc. p. 59.

[6] For details, one may consult Harbhadra, *Sad-Darshna-Samuccaya*. Edited by L. Sauli. Culcutta, Asiatic Society, 1986.

[7] R. P. Singh (2011). "Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons" in *World of Philosophy: A Harmony*. Edited by C.K. Chapple. Rohtak: Shanti Prakashan. p. 190.

With science and its methodology, there can be an attempt to evaluate culture in terms of the content and the intent of culture, the universalistic character of culture, the hierarchical status of culture and the pluralistic features of culture. Since different cultures represent different systems of meaning and visions of the good life, each realizes a limited range of human capacities and emotions and grasps only a part of the totality of human existence. Suppose I say that 'Everybody has freedom to live a good quality of Life'. Now we split this statement into two parts-'Everybody has freedom' and 'to live a good quality of life'. So far as the first part is concerned, there is no contestation but the second part is extremely contested. One may ask the question-is Christianity or Islam or Hinduism or Buddhism, etc. a good quality of life? Or is capitalism or socialism a good quality of life? Or is liberalism, conservatism, or nationalism a good quality of life? To answer this question, one culture needs other cultures to help it understand itself better, expand its intellectual and moral horizon, stretch its imagination, save it from narcissism to guard it against the obvious temptation to absolutize itself, and so on. This does not mean that one cannot lead a good life within one's own culture, but rather that, other things being equal, one's way of life is likely to be richer if one also enjoys access to others, and that a culturally self-contained life is virtually impossible for most human beings live in the modern globalizes and interdependent world. From a pluralist perspective, no political doctrine or ideology can represent the full truth of human life. Each of them- be it liberalism, conservatism, socialism or nationalism – is embedded in a particular culture, represents a particular vision of the good life, and is necessarily narrow and partial. Liberalism, for example, is an inspiring doctrine stressing such great values as human dignity, autonomy, liberty, critical thought and equality. However, they can be defined in several different ways, of which the liberal is only one and not always the most coherent.[8]

The term multiculturalism generally refers to an applied ideology of racial, cultural and ethnic diversity within the demographics of a specified place, usually at the scale of an organization such as a school, business, neighbourhood, city or nation. Some countries have official, or de jure policies of multiculturalism aimed at recognizing, celebrating and maintaining the different cultures or cultural identities

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 191-92.

within that society to promote social cohesion. In this context, multiculturalism advocates a society that extends equitable status to distinct cultural and religious groups, with no one culture predominating. Cultural pluralism is a term used when small groups within a larger society maintain their unique cultural identities. One of the most notable cultural pluralisms is the caste system, which is related to Hinduism and also the example of Lebanon where 18 different religious communities co-exist on a land of 10,452 kms. In a pluralist culture, unique groups not only co-exist side by side, but also consider qualities of other groups as traits worth having in the dominant culture. The current contemporary art world in the 21st century is an example of cultural pluralism. For another example, a community centre in the United States may offer classes in Indian yoga, Chinese calligraphy, and Latin salsa dancing. That community may also have one or more synagogues, mosques, mandirs, gurudwaras, and/or Buddhist temples, as well as several churches of various Christian denominations. The existence of such institutions and practices are possible if the cultural communities responsible for them are protected by law and/or accepted by the larger society in a pluralist culture. We may propose four ways to deal with the notion of plurality. We may propose four ways to deal with the notion of plurality. The first could be the Vedic exhortation of *Ekam sat vipra bahudha vadanti*. This has been the fundamental act of philosophizing in India. The reality admits of alternative approaches in terms of thought constructions and linguistic expressions. It is pluralistic in its expression. The initial characteristics of Indian society are that it is diverse, liberal, democratic and pluralistic in regulating and restricting the systems of Indian philosophy. Pluralism has been expressed in many ways in the later development of Indian philosophical systems; such as in the Vedanta philosophy, we go from one to many; in *Vallabha Vedānta*, we go from many to one; in *Sānkhya* and *Nyāya-Vasesika* systems, we go from many to many and in Buddhism, we go from nothing, i.e. *svabhāva shunya* to many. The pluralistic nature of Indian society is manifested in various ethnic identities, community structure, linguistic identities, different nationalities, languages and so on.

Globalization carries the seeds of its own subversion. Multicultural paradigm of globalization hinges around the issues of encapsulated religious consciousness. This is an attempt to treat religion and culture as self-enclosing and self-delimiting

phenomena contributing to the ideology of separateness and exclusiveness, with a negative value-load and an emotional-load in the perception of the "outsiders". We will not call it fundamentalism because fundamentalism in common usage is treated with a pejorative value-load. Indeed, fundamentalism with its original sense means adherence to the norms of the revealed tradition. It does imply conflict with other revealed traditions of other religions. Fundamentalism movements first began in Christianity, and then it travelled towards Islam and other religions. But if one is truly a fundamentalist, then one's fundamentalism must not encroach on others' fundamentalism. None of the religions teach hatred towards other religions. If one is truly orthodox to one's own religion, he should not hate other religions, which results in conflicts. Problem arises when religion begins to encompass culture. Religion does not mirror to totality of culture. Hence, cultures have the space for interaction and co-sharing of ways of life, values and beliefs. Cultural homogenisation may not be a possibility, but as different cultures come into contact; the scope of cultural transactions, exchange of cultural styles, traits and value-orientations are enlarged. There is enough empirical support to substantiate this proposition. This process does not in fact erase the cultural self-consciousness and identities, but it often reinforces identities. This is true in respect of 'local cultures' as well as for the national or regional cultural patterns.

In the context of multi-culturalism, identity is a very important concept. Can globalization do away with local culture, local identity, and community identity? Looking at India, we can say that at the village level, the traditional social identity has weakened and most villages have become political communities. But the local culture survives. The social community-the activity which villagers used to undertake as a community-has eroded. Solidarity of castes has emerged as a political identity like *dalit* caste, backward caste, etc. This is a new solidarity, which has a linear structure and cuts across village community. So a political community has emerged. Is it because of globalization? No, it is not. Globalization has nothing to do with the loss of community of the older types. It is purely political. The politics has created a new economic space, educational space and so on. So we can say that structures are changing but identities are still the same. Eventually what happens after 50 or 70 years we cannot predict. The way identities were lost in Europe particularly in terms

of cultural practices such as folk dance, folk dress, etc., which one can now find mainly in the museums, gives a disappointing indication. But folk culture in India has been a living experience, though it has undergone certain changes. It has not changed completely the way it has happened in Europe. Already market has intervened into it; it has taken over certain aspects of the folk culture and has brought it into the global market for profit. This is already happening in several parts of India. This does raise question of cultural resilience and identity? However, because of the plurality and diversity of communities in India, which inhabits about 4634 communities, with about 500 languages, the local cultural identities have a way to survive. The ideology of multi- culturalism, therefore, fails to define the true significance of globalization by carrying the notion of identity to narrow exclusiveness or even opposition to the 'other culture'. Globalization may on the other hand sharpen identities, but it does also bring about inter-cultural sharing.

With regard to the concept of culture, multiculturalism or cultural diversity I have set out that culture is the whole way of life of people, from birth to the grave, from morning to night, and even during sleep, has today become an obviously inevitable. Judging from the way the texture of cultural diversity is recognized and especially the way globalization influences culture, without doubt culture is and will always be different but equal. Every culture is valuable and worthy of non-interference. In this sense this paper has elaborated on the relocation of cultural studies with increasing attention being paid to the globalization of culture and critical practices concerning cultures. Modern societies are multicultural in themselves, encompassing a multitude of varying ways of life and lifestyles of people. Today most people's identities, not just Western intellectuals are shaped by more than a single culture. Not only societies, but people are multicultural. The concept of globalization on the other hand, assumes that cultures are becoming the same as the world. Globalization is a concept of uniformization, preferable following the Western model. Globalization in this article seems to promote not separation, but exchange and interaction of different cultures.

3.2 Indian Response to Globalization – Pluralistic Perspective:

Puruṣārthas – Abhyudaya & Niḥśreyasa

As a matter of fact, local cultures and local identities has been survives in this globalized world, so now it is very important to expose our own cultural identity along with our own moral values. And it is very necessary to conclude this problem with thinking of global perspective and take a position by local action with pluralistic perspective. And for this, we can look at Indian moral value system. In this part I shall try to give a response of globalization by Indian moral value (*Puruṣārthas*) and Indian Pluralistic Perspective. Indian moral values are very important concept for our society. Indian moral values represent a synthesis on many strains. It contains the best features of many traditions of other lands. Indian values in general have been essentially dynamic, experiential and reflective with the result that they have permitted and encouraged multifaceted ways of devotion, worship approaches to the understanding of world and reality. Spirituality has played vital role in directing and diffusing the goals of Indian moral value system. Indian values have recognized spirituality not only as the supreme occupation of man but also as his all-integrating occupation. Since the beginning of Vedas the seers and *Rishis* had innovated the experiential and reflective method of gaining knowledge and establishment of way of life. Indian moral values comprises not only the sublime Hymns of the Vedas and the transcendental meditation of the Upanishads to facilitate salvation for human beings but also of a very large body of practical wisdom contained in the *Panchatantra*, *Hitopadesh* and *Kautilya's Artha Sastra* to assist us in our earthly existence by attaining wealth and power.

I have analyzed, in Chapter two, the position of western ethical theories and we can see that in the west, the first sense of 'morality' carries with it, more or less, essentially a sense of social references. Outside a society there is no question of morality or moral point of view. The question of morality involves a necessary reference to some others in respect of whom one has to adopt a moral point of view or has to behave either in a morally good manner or bad manner. But, in India the matter has been different. Morality may be both social and personal and sometimes the latter

has been more emphasized. Morality as an institution of life has been recognized here from the very early age of the Vedas. Rather it has been recognized as the most basic element in human life. But then it has not necessarily been recognized as a social enterprise in the sense of being an instrument of the society to help guide the people living in a society. It is rather engrained in the very stuff or being of the universe. Man has simply to adopt it from there.

The Vedic cosmic principle of *Ṛta* is the foundation of morality. It gives the first indication to man for adopting a moral point of view. The *Ṛta* amongst other things implies that there is an eternal moral order involved in the very constitution of the universe and therefore man has to adopt a moral point of view. "It represents the sublime moral order which is inviolable. The inviolability of *Ṛta* makes it superior to gods and cosmic ethics on the one hand and individual human beings on the other, because *Ṛta* works throughout the cosmos inevitably and justly. This fact implies that even in the case of individual actions *Ṛta*, the eternal moral law, is responsible for the apportionment of reward and punishment. Although the Vedic literature does not propound the doctrine of Karma in a clear-cut fashion, yet it can be said that the action of *Ṛta* anticipates the doctrine of Karma".[9] Thus morality as an institution of life or the moral point of view does not have its origin from a kind of social contract or from any such contingent agency. It is not a social enterprise or an instrument of the society for the guidance of individual conduct. It has in a sense a divine origin.

The Vedic distinction between *Ṛju* (straight) and *Vṛjan* (crooked) and the *Upaniṣadic* distinction between *Śreyaḥ* (desirable) and *Preyaḥ* (pleasurable) have much to do with the origin of the sense of right and wrong and hence of morality or the moral point of view in India. The *Rig-Veda* contains a large number of passages illustrating the distinction between right and wrong, as straight and crooked, one of which may be cited here because of its poetic beauty:

> The turbid darkness vanished, bright the sky shone, upward the light of Dawn,
> the heavenly, hastened, unto his fields on high the Sun ascended. The ways of
> mortals straight and crooked, seeing.[10]

---

[9] Leela Devi (1993). *Ethics.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. p. 4.
[10] Rig Veda, 4.1.17. Translated by R.T.H. Griffith (1999). *The Hymns of the Rig-Veda.* Vol. 1. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publisher Pvt. pp. 418–19.

The Upaniṣhadic distinction between the desirable and the pleasurable is as follows:

> The desirable (*Śreyaḥ*) is one thing, and the pleasurable (*Preyaḥ*) quite another.
>
> Both these, of different aim, bind a person.
>
> Of these two, well is it for him who takes the desirable.
>
> He fails of his aim who chooses the pleasurable."[11]

With this, we can now take up the moral insights from the *Upaniṣhads*. The ethics of the *Upaniṣhads* can be studied within the status of Being, Knowledge and Mysticism on the one hand and *Varnas, Āshrams*, and *Purushārthas* on the other. This itself is a matter of debate how metaphysical issues like *Brahman* and *Ātman* could be related to ethics on the one hand and to mysticism on the other. Taking man's consciousness at the centre, we have to take a bold decision that it is the consciousness, which is at the centre of metaphysics, knowledge, mysticism and morality. It is on the basis of consciousness alone that the *Upaniṣhads* present a synthesis of the four. Metaphysics without ethical backbone might only result in pure abstraction in as much as a mystic without ethical orientation might be a hideous creature who is a blot on spiritual evolution of man. In the same way ethics without metaphysics and mysticism will be unintelligible and without any goals. It would therefore be totally fruitless to develop the metaphysical problems reached in the *Upaniṣhads* without the final mystical realization in the *Upaniṣhads*. At the same time *Upaniṣhads* ethics is deeply rooted in the *Varnas, Purushārthas,* and the *Āshramas.* The four *Purushārthas* can be broadly divided into two tier value systems; namely, *abhyudaya* consisting of *dharma, artha and kāma,* and *nihshreyas*, i.e. *moksha*. Ethics is perpetually been applied at every stage. Similarly the four *āshrams* have the ethical orientation at every stage. They are *Brahmacharya* (student life), *Grihastha* (the householder's life, earning livelihood and wealth, fulfilling sexual desires and reproducing children), *Vanprastha* (the hermit's life with gradual detachments), and *Sanyas* (renunciation from family and worldly things). Hence the *Upaniṣhads* ethical quest is at the centre of Being, Knowledge, Mysticism, *Puruṣārthas* and the *āshramas.[12]*

---

[11] Katha Upnishad, 2.1. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume (2004). *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads.* Delhi: Shivalik Prkashan. p. 346.

[12] Robert E. Hume (2002). *The Thirteen Principle Upanishads*. Oxford University Press. p. 297.

I shall now take a look at the concept of *puruṣārthas,* which is governing Indian Moral Philosophy. In order for an individual to realize their supreme Self, they need to identify the reasons and objectives why they came into being on this earth plane, and fulfil them. The ancient seers clearly articulated the objectives of humankind as "*Puruṣārthas"*. The term *'Puruṣārtha'* consists of two words, viz., Purusha and Artha. 'Purusha' means person or self. 'Artha' means aim or goal of human life. The concept of *Puruṣārtha* basically indicates different values to be realized in human life through human efforts. The four chief aims or *puruṣārthas* are:

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

Accordingly, dharma and *moksha* are spiritual values, and the other two are secular (defective) values. Of the two spiritual values, *dharma* is instrumental and *moksha* is intrinsic; and of the two secular values, *artha* is instrumental and *kāma* is intrinsic.

The idea of *Puruṣārtha* has played a very vital role in the history of Indian thought. The term *'Puruṣārtha'* literally signifies "what is sought by men", so that it may be taken as equivalent to a human end or purpose. We know that a man, like other living beings, act instinctively; but he can also do so deliberately. This means he can consciously set before himself ends, and work for them. It is this conscious pursuit that transforms them into *puruṣārthas*. Thus even the ends which man shares with other animal, like food and rest, may become *puruṣārtha* provided they are sought knowingly. We may thus define a *Puruṣārtha* as an end which is consciously sought to be accomplished either for its own sake or for the sake of utilizing it as a means to the accomplishment of further end or goal. The question is that if life has intrinsic value and therefore to be alive is the ultimate goal, what shall we make of the traditional answer that the *puruṣārthas* are the goals of life? What does it mean? How do we know that the *puruṣārthas* constitute the goals of life? One way of knowing this is to see whether life would be life without any one of these goals. The idea is not that life would not be life without the *puruṣārthas* but that life would not be meaningful life without the *puruṣārthas*. If life would not be meaningful without any

of these then these are certainly to be treated as goals.[13] But before examining the question of whether life makes sense without the *puruṣārthas*, we need to clarify the technical terms we use. What is the traditional understanding of the *puruṣārthas*? How the terms and concepts of *puruṣārthas* are traditionally interpreted?

In Hinduism, *puruṣārtha* (Sanskrit *puruṣārtha*: "that which is sought by man; human purpose aim, or end") refers a goal, end or aim of human existence. It has been rendered into English in several ways: Value of life, goal of life, aim of existence, meaning of life, etc. The literal meaning of the classical expression *puruṣārtha* is 'any object of human striving, human effort'. And, when used adverbially, *puruṣārtha* conveys the nuance 'for the sake of man'. 'on account of man'.[14] Even etymologically '*Puruṣārtha'* means that which is aimed at or desired. It could be anything that we desire to have (*upadeya*) or to avoid (*heya*).[15] Though it means things we desire to have or to avoid, in classical discussions on *puruṣārthas* the accent usually falls on the things we desire to have. Another etymology for the word *Puruṣārtha* can be "*Purushasya Arthaha iti Puruṣārtha*". In all evolution only man has been given the power to decide, choose, or even alter or create. Only man can change his destiny with his own actions and free will. Destiny or *Prarabdha* is nothing but past actions that decide ones present and any action in the present has its effect on the future. There is a flow of actions and consequences and one leads to the other. This is what '*Puruṣārtha*' signifies. Today's *Puruṣārtha* is tomorrow's *Prarabdha*. It is this that separates us humans from the rest of the animal kingdom. The rest of the animal kingdom is driven purely by instinct while man has a choice to decide as to what his response should be. This not only makes man superior in terms of the thoughts but also in terms of actions. Man has been given the intellect which helps us decide on actions to be taken and also reflect on past deeds. *Puruṣārtha* is a free will offered to humans to better or build on past actions. This gives us the opportunity to make our future a brighter and better one.

---

[13] For *Kāma*, *Artha*, and *Dharma* as "Brahmanic Householder Values." Flood (1996:17). Quoted from, http://www.wikipedia/org/purushartha. Accessed on March 23, 2012.

[14] M. Monier-Williams (1970). *A Sanskrit - English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. p. 637.

[15] Dharmottara, *Nyayabindhu-Tika* (1975). Edited & Translated by Srinivasa Sastri.
   Meerut: Sahitya Bhandara. p. 22

Without any purpose human life would be meaningless. One needs to have an end or purpose in life towards which our actions can be directed. Man cannot simply take birth on earth and start working for his salvation right away by means of just dharma alone. If that is so man would never realize why he would have to seek liberation in the first place. As he passes through the rigors of life and experiences the problem of human suffering, he learns to appreciate the value of liberation. He becomes sincere in his quest for salvation. So we have the four goals, instead of just one, whose pursuit provides us with an opportunity to learn important lessons and move forward on the spiritual path. What the *puruṣārthas* characterize is not a life of self-negation, but of balance, complexity, richness, opportunities and moderation in a cosmic drama of immense proportions in which man ultimately envisions and experiences his true grandeur and fulfils the very purpose of his creation. Every individual should achieve these four objectives with detachment, without any expectation and as a sacrificial offering to God in the ritual of human life. They have to be pursued selflessly for a higher and greater cause. Depending upon the attitude and the manner in which we pursue them, they either set us free or entangle us deeper with the allurements of human life.

One thing that becomes clear when we look at the concept of *puruṣārtha* is this: It is considered only in the context of the doctrine of four *puruṣārthas*. *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma*, and *Moksha* are the aims or goals of human life which man ought to strive for attaining it throughout his life, and in all births. The four *puruṣārthas* are really the objectives of God, of the Supreme Self, the qualities of God. And since an individual person is a reflection of God, is a part of God, it is the rightful pursuit of a person to fulfil these four *puruṣārthas*. In fact, it is both your individual and soul purpose. An individual can realize him or herself by balancing and fulfilling these four objectives. These four objectives are not independent of each other and should not be viewed in a stand-alone manner. They define and refine the other objectives and allow the other objectives to define and refine itself. The activity of fulfilling one objective should also support the fulfilment of the other objectives. By maintaining a balance between the definition and fulfilment of the four *puruṣārthas*, a symbiotic evolution of the individual self takes place.

The four *puruṣārthas* can be broadly divided into *trivarga* meant for our *Abhyudaya* (prosperity), and the question of *moksha* which is said to be our *Niḥśreyasa* (salvation). Now, I shall discuss to a brief description of the four concepts.

Dharma

The first of the goals is *dharma*, which literally means 'to uphold what is correct', what we may call today 'morality'. *Dharma* is a difficult term to translate into English. Since the same word is used in many eastern religions, it means many things to many people and eludes a true definition. It has been variously translated as duty, faith, religion, righteousness, sacred law, justice, ethics, morality and so on. The precise translation of the term depends on the context. For example, we can translate dharma as 'justice' in cases where something that was unlawfully taken away is to be regained. Thus, in the epic *Mahābhārata*, it is justice for the *Pāṇḍavas* to regain their kingdom, which was illegally taken from them by their cousins, the *Kauravas*. There is also *dharma* as 'individual duty', according to a person's social and economic status in society. This could be compared to a certain extent with the Kantian idea of duty (duty for duty's sake). Then there is general *dharma* which applies to society as a whole, a guide in moral and social issues. According to one school of Hinduism, *dharma* is an obligatory duty as prescribed by the *Vedas* to be performed by an individual in accordance with the rules prescribed for the caste to which he or she belongs. God is an upholder of *dharma* because he performs His duties even though they are not obligatory and He is without desire or preference.

Etymologically, *dharma* means that which maintains the universe in due order. The word *dharma* is derived from the Sanskrit verbal root '*dhr-dharati*', which means 'upholds' or 'supports'. So *dharma* is that which upholds the universe from within. And this *dharma* again in its broadest sense represents in the Indian tradition the moral law of the universe which regulates or governs the moral life of man. There is a belief in every Indian that it is the dharma or the moral law (or, in brief, morality) which upholds or sustains the universe.

The concept of *Dharma* can be taken either in its wider sense or in its narrower sense. In its narrower sense, *Dharma* denotes one's obligations by virtue of

his status in society (*varna*), in his life-history (*āsrama*) and in being simply a member of the human species (*samanya*). Whereas, in its wider sense, *Dharma* functions like an omnibus term: That is, it denotes the essence of a thing, custom, ritual, legal system, religion, morality, etc. In a wider sense, *dharma* is a binding force, which upholds and regulates this entire creation just as the gravitational force controls and holds the entire material universe as one piece. It is the divine constitution that defines our roles and responsibilities, our social and moral order, our purpose and goals and the rewards and punishments that are appropriate for our actions. It is the law of God that is sacred, inviolable and pervasive. It is responsible for order, regularity, harmony, control, predictability and accountability. In the context of human life, *dharma* consists of all that an individual undertakes in harmony with divine injunctions and his own sense of morality and justice. However to comprehend the true nature of *dharma* is not an easy task. The world is enveloped in illusion as our human minds are. What we see in the world and learn from it may not be true and reliable. What we consider as right and wrong or *dharma* and *adharma* may not stand the test of truth. Hence to practice *dharma* we are advised to rely upon the scriptures and follow the injunctions contained therein.

The sources of dharma are the *sruti* (the *Vedas*), *smrti* (the *Dharamsastra*), scriptures such as the *Bhagavadgita*, *sadacar* (the conduct of virtuous men) and *atmatusti* (self satisfaction). In ancient India dharmashastras (law books) played an important role in guiding people on the path of dharma. Since the time of Vedas, we can see the various definitions of dharma: For example, let us take the *purvamimamsa* school of philosophy. The *Mimamsa-sutra* begins with an enquiry regarding the nature of dharma. The famous Mimamsa definition in this regard as given by *Jaimini* is as follows – *"codana laksano artho dharmah."* [16] According to *Sabara's* and *Kumarila's* interpretation, the good that is called *dharma* means the Vedic sacrifices that lead to good results – the attainment of Heaven and the like.[17] It means that whatever is indicated by the Vedic injunctions (or enjoined by the Vedas) and leads to the good is dharma. '*Codana*' refers here to the injunctive text, '*Laksano*' is that by which something is indicated. Thus '*codana laksano*' means what is indicated by the

---

[16] *Mimamsa Sutras of Jainism.* Trans. Ganganath Jha. Edited by B. D. Basu. Sacred Books of the Hindus Series, Vol. X, Part I.22. Allahabad: Panini Office.

[17] S. N. Dasgupta (1966). *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. IV. London: Cambridge University Press. p. 2.

injunctive text. 'Artha' means something conductive to good. Thus the entire sutra means 'that which is indicated by the injunctive text and which leads to the good is dharma'. Manu has brought out the implication of this classical definition by saying "Vedo khilam Dharma-mulam"[18] Another important definition of dharma we find in the Indian tradition is of the Vaisesikas: 'yato abhyudayanihsreyasasiddhih sa dharmah.' Dharma is that through which both (material) prosperity and highest good are achieved. Whatever is conductive to worldly prosperity as well as to highest good is dharma, according to the Vaisesikas.

According to the usual division of Indian thought, dharma has divided into three periods - Vedic, Classical and Modern.

- In the Vedic Literature - The word for dharma in the vedic literature is Ṛta meaning first the cosmic order, then the field of sacrifice (Yajna)[19] and finally the sphere of human conduct.
- In the Classical Period - Like its vedic antecedent Ṛta, dharma became an all embracing concept during the classical period. Dharma came to be regarded as the expression of the highest law which is the ultimate reality - Brahman. And therefore dharma is equated with satyam (truth). Thus, we see that the parting advice of the Guru to his disciples was: 'Satyam Vada, Dharmam Cara'.[20]

In the classical period, it is very important to mention the doctrine of Dhamma (the word for dharma in Pali), which is taught by Buddha and the Jainism's notion of dharma. Buddha summed up dharma in the Four Noble Truths, which is called Ariya Satyas. They are: (a) Life is permeated by Dukkha (suffering); (b) The origin of suffering lies in craving; (c) The cessation of suffering is possible through the cessation of craving; and (d) the way to do it is the noble eightfold path (Ariya astangika marga). In Jainism, dharma means something very different and technical. Dharma means the condition of motion, just as the medium of water that supports the fish to move. Similarly, dharma is

---

[18] Manusmrti, 2.6. (1979). Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Banaras.
[19] Rig Veda 1.24.8, Translated by R. C. Zaehner (1962). Oxford: Hinduism. p. 39.
[20] Tait up. 1.11. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume (2004). The Thirteen Principal Upanishads. Delhi: Shivalik Prkashan.

the condition of the movement of the soul or a material thing. So, the Jains use dharma in a technical sense and not in its ordinary moral sense of merit or duty.

- In the Modern Period – In modern period, the Indian concept of dharma has taken place of ethics, morality, virtue, spirituality, truth, good conduct and so on. Some scholars like Kangle has translated dharma as 'law'. Some others like Shama Shastri has translated it as 'sacred law'. In the modern period, on the one hand, we find that the equality of truth and the ultimate reality is point that Gandhi also was convinced of. And on the other hand, in modern India dharma means religion and Dharma and religion are treated almost interchangeably. "The whole religio-philosophical and didactic literature of India lays great stress on the necessity of maintaining dharma for spiritual realization or God-experience. All the various systems of Indian thought emphasize the observance of dharma as a conditio sine qua non of internal purification leading to eternal bliss or '*Niḥśreyasa*' ".[21]

After the considered the meaning of dharma, it is very important to know that – what is the ultimate criterion of *dharma*? Man is a social being, and for this being it is necessary to frame some ground rules in the spirit of live & let live. That's the spirit behind *Dharma*. It makes us sensitive to others, makes us care for others, it brings necessary magnanimity to look at others as part of one whole. It helps us to expand our family, brings about a holistic vision. The moment we see the whole world as one great whole, we also become sensitive to a supreme intelligence, who has not only created this beautiful world & cosmos, but is also running the show. As no effect is possible without a cause, we infer the existence of a creator when we see this beautiful creation. If creation is so beautiful, how will the creator be. *Dharma* thus wakes us up to the existence of God. *Dharma* does not make us afraid of God, but rather shows that he is someone who deserves our greatest love & reverence. We are his creation, act as per his dictates, will live as long as he likes and will leave when he so wishes. We cannot influence his wishes but should know his ways & means and live accordingly, in a spirit of surrender & love.

---

[21] Kattackal, Jacob. (1982). '*Dharma the Great Goal of Life*', *Jeevadhara*. Vol. XII, No. 67, p. 29.

The basic spirit of science is to conquer nature while *dharma* motivates us to respect it and live in tune with it. Science, even though says that there can be no effect without a cause yet does not accept any intelligent cause of the creation. They prefer to say it was all an accident, a big bang that started this whole process. *Dharma* on the other hand says in the presence of a creator, and plan out our lives accordingly by keeping him into account, always. We look upon the whole creation as a great, grand orchestra which is already presenting a beautiful music; we have just joined the orchestra and should be sensitive to the harmony and tune ourselves to it. Just as only that person can enjoy the music who becomes sensitive to it, so also only that person can enjoy the holistic living who sees a basic harmony & order around. The benefits of turning our attention on God, being sensitive to his ways & means, the order & harmony etc. are so great that even if God was not there we would have loved to invent him. But as he is very much there so the question also does not arise. When we accept the existence of someone who is an embodiment of knowledge, power, love, compassion & holistic vision, then anyone who loves & reveres such a being will not only be free from various self imposed problems, but will also start being an embodiment of all what God represents. The train is already moving we unload ourselves and live life fully, without worries. Acceptance of God is the essence of Dharma. This not only helps us become a better person here but also helps us to attain our *Artha* & *Kāma* in a better way too. Not only has this but acceptance of God prepared us for our real goal of life, called *Moksha*.

Artha

Having examined the concept of dharma we now go on to consider *artha*, the second *puruṣārtha*. What does *artha*, signify? As referred to in our general discussion of *puruṣārthas*, *artha* signifies two things which are so natural to human nature. One is the desire for material goods; and the other, the exercise of power or authority. But in the broader sense we find that *artha* is a very elastic term and a highly relative value. 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. Lives that are strained and starved cannot be religious except in a rudimentary way. Economic insecurity and individual freedom do not go together.[22]

In one of the old Sanskrit lexicons, 'artha' is said to mean-meaning, money, a thing, and possessions. *Artha* also means the attainment of riches and worldly prosperity, advantage, profit and wealth. *Artha*, is a powerful urge in human nature. Acquisition of means for the material well-being, therefore, is a legitimate social and moral purpose. According to Kautilya, *artha* has pre-eminence in so far as it makes the other *puruṣārthas* possible: *Artha* (material well-being) is the first-chief of the three - *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma*, because dharma and *kāma* are rooted in *artha*.

Artha is one of the most important pillars of the *puruṣārthas*. 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.

Manu insists that *artha*, *kāma* and dharma are necessary for our happiness. But, at the same time he lays down that the pursuit of the first two should not be 'detrimental to *dharma*' (dharma-varjita). Manu's position seems to be this:

> Some say *dharma* and *artha* are best; others, *kāma* and *artha*; others, *dharma* only; yet others, *artha* only. But the final truth is that *abhyudaya* (prosperily) consists in, and achievable by, all three together.[23]

According to The *Bhagavata-purana:* Though *artha* is not an end in itself, but is basically meant to take care of man's needs, some of us are 'blinded by the glamour of wealth'. *Artha* should be 'subservient to dharma', says the *Bhagavata purana*.

In general way we can say that, *Artha* is the pursuit of material wealth, which brings material comforts to a person. People sometimes believe that the path of spiritual growth and pursuit of material wealth are mutually exclusive, or even that a spiritual seeker needs to be in poverty. But that is not true. If we look at the Universe, it is a reflection of abundance. Nature is abundant in everything; poverty is nothing but a state of consciousness. If abundance is the quality of the Divine, how is pursuit

---

[22] S. Radhakrishnan (1940). *Eastern Religious and Western Thought.* Oxford University Press. p. 353.
[23] Manusmrti, 2.224; 4.176.

of abundance in contrast with the pursuit of the Divine? If one is in poverty, in a state of constantly worrying about how to support and feed, if that is what the focus is on, how can one pursue spirituality? Only when there are no worries is one able to focus their attention to the goal of union with the Divine. The important thing to remember is not to be attached to the possession or attainment of wealth. It can be either transcended or sought with detachment, and with awareness. When done in this state of mind, the pursuit of wealth is not different from the pursuit of the Divine, because one sees abundance or wealth as a form of the Divine. And in this state of detachment, one recognizes when one has attained their financial objectives, and hence the desire to pursue automatically dies away, paving the way for *Moksha*.

Kāma

Kāma is the third *puruṣārtha*, which is ordinarily termed as pleasure. The word *Kāma* is generally associated with worldly desires and sensual pleasures. But, when it is considered as the *Puruṣārtha – as* one of the purposes of life – it relates to the yearning for God and not to mundane desires. From a grammatical point of view, the word *kāma* is masculine in gender. And etymologically speaking, *kāma* consists of the primary suffix **-ma-** and the base ka which occurs in Latin ca-rus (meaning 'dear') and in Anglo-Saxon hore (new English whore).The feminine form kam-a and the neuter one kamam are also attested, meaning 'object of desire'. And finally the adverbial use of kamam means 'according *to* desire', 'freely', 'preferably', etc. Thus, the Indo-Aryan root kam- means 'to desire, love'.[24] In order to get to know more of our understanding of Kama, we would better glance through our literary traditions.

- Both in *Rigveda* and *Atharvaveda kāma* is introduced in the creation hymn: 'Thereafter rose desire in the beginning'.[25] Thus, the Vedas depict the origin of

[24] K. Luke (1982). *Artha and Kama in the traditions of India*, Jeevadhara, No. 67, Kottayam. pp. 13–14.

[25] Rig Veda. 10.129.4. Translated by R.T.H. Griffith (1999). *The Hymns of the Rig-Veda.* Vol. 1. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publisher Pvt.

things as an act of begetting.[26] Also, we find in the *Atharwa* Veda a philosophical hymn in which *kāma* emerges as a god to whom people pray.[27]

- The definition of pleasure in *Kamasutra* is the following: "*Kāma* is the enjoyment of the appropriate objects by the five senses of hearing, feeling, seeing, tasting and smelling, assisted by the mind together with the soul."[28] In one sense, both are highly related since the sexual urge is heightened by the activity of all the five senses. The urge to enjoy pleasures and satisfy desires, is the most powerful and as an incentive to individual progress, most effective.

- According to the *Bhagavadgita,* desire leads delusion and bondage to the cycle of births and deaths. The way out of suffering is to become detached from the sense objects through such practices as yoga and meditation and perform desire less actions as a sacrificial offering to God with a sense of duty, accepting God as the doer and without hankering after the fruit of one's actions.

- According to *Manusmriti* man performs sacrifices because of the desire for rewards, with the expectation that his actions will bear fruit. Not a single act of him here on earth appears ever to be done by a man free from desire. So he who performs his prescribed duties out of desire in the right manner will obtain the fulfilment of all the desires and reach the deathless state or even beyond. As we can see the right way to fulfil one's desire is by performing one's obligatory duties in the right manner but not by neglecting them so that the way of the dharma also becomes the way of fulfilment of desires.

Hinduism consider that Sex can be either a means to liberation and happiness in life or a great hindrance and cause of suffering depending upon how we approach it. In any case ultimately one has to overcome it to achieve salvation. It can be done either by abstaining from it or by indulging in it. The former is the way of the Vedanta and the latter the way of the *Tantras*. One is the way of suppression and the other the way of expression through detachment and understanding in which sexual energy is sublimated and transformed into a higher form of energy. It is just the way you learn

[26] W. D. Whitney (1971). Atharva - Veda Samhita, 2 Vols, Harvard Oriental Series 7–8, Repr., Delhi. pp. 521-25.

[27] Atharva Veda, 9.2; Also cf. M. Bloomfield (1968). *Hymns of the Atharva – Veda.* The Sacred Book of the East 42, Repr. Delhi. pp. 20–23 (text), 391–95 (commentary).

[28] P. V. Kane (1941). *History of Dharmasastra.* Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. p. 9.

to handle fire. In both cases the difficulties are way too many and so are the risks. Sexual desire is the ultimate of all desires and unless it is overcome one is not free from the taints of *maya.*

In Hinduism there is permission for sexual activity up to a limit, so long as it is not in conflict with the principles of dharma and used for the purposes of procreation, perpetuation of family and social order, within the boundaries established by tradition, social norms and scriptures. Sexual activity is part of obligatory duty and not to be misused for enjoyment as it would lead to attachment, delusion and one's downfall. Sexual relationship outside marriage is not permitted except in special circumstances as laid down in the *Dharmashastras*. Marriage is a sacred institution in which both the husband and wife join their energies and destinies to promote each other's liberation by performing their respective obligatory duties, which only married couple, can perform. Through the bonds of marriage they also bind their respective karmas.

One can say that, *Kāma* is fulfilling one's desires. Desires are in various forms -- to be wealthy, powerful, sexual needs, recognition, service, etc. The *Kāma puruṣārtha* advocates that one's desires in this lifetime need to be fulfilled, albeit in a state of awareness and without harming anyone in the process. For a person to evolve spiritually and to reach the ultimate destination, the barrier of desires needs to be crossed. This can be done either by fulfilling the desires, or by sublimating or transcending them. Suppressing of desires is certainly not recommended because it is like a fully coiled spring that is held down by force, it can erupt unpredictably causing undesirable consequences. As one becomes aware of their desires and one goes about fulfilling them in awareness and without judgement, one soon reaches the stage of being able to sublimate them. The Divine, the Universe, lends a big hand in the process.

Moksha

Let us now look at the fourth *puruṣārthas*; *moksha*, which is said to be our *niḥśreyasa* (salvation). It is the state of Self-realisation in which there is no change and there is no movement. *Moksha* means liberation; it is the ultimate destination of this human birth.

It is the stage of inner realization that the individual self is the same as the Supreme Self. It is the experience of the cosmos within one's self. Etymologically *moksha* means to get 'rid off' or 'release'. Also it is commonly understood as liberation. In Bhagavad-Gita, *moksha* is mentioned as the supreme tranquillity and the highest bliss. It is delight in the self, contentment with the self, self-satisfaction and self-fulfilment. It is the highest end of life, attainable only by the individual himself, with the help and guidance of dharma. *Moksha* as the last end signifies that its attainment is impossible without first fulfilling the obligations of the other three.

The pursuit of dharma regulates the life of a human being and keeps him on the righteous path. The pursuit of *artha* and *kāma* enrich his experience and impart to him valuable lesson. The pursuit of *moksha* or salvation liberates him and leads him to the world Brahman. The pursuit of dharma usually begins in the early age when one is initiated into religious studies. The pursuit of *artha* and *kāma* begins in most cases after one becomes a householder. The pursuit of *moksha* however is the most important of all aims and can begin at any time. The other aims are preparatory for this final aim. However, in most cases, though not correctly, *moksha* becomes an important pursuit in the old age during *vanaprastha* or the age of retirement. *Moksha* is both a *puruṣārtha* and a *paramartha* (transcendental aim), which is important not only for men but also for the divine beings.

In the Vedas, idea about *Moksha* is hardly clear. Heaven, a place of eternal pleasure and rejoice, is the highest good of life. It is in the *Upaniṣhads* that we first get an idea about *Moksha*. Here sometimes *Moksha* is understood as an identity of self with the Brahman, the ultimate reality, and sometimes as likeness of the self with God. The *Brhadaranyaka Upaniṣhad* describes the state of *Moksha* 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."[29] *Gaudapada* in his *Karika* on *Mandukya Upaniṣhad* gives an account of *Moksha* which is more thoroughly a state of absorption into the universal nature of *Brahman:* "As on the destruction of the jar

---

[29] Brh. Up. VI.3.21. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume (2004). *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads.* Delhi: Shivalik Prkashan.

etc. the ether enclosed in the jar etc. merges with the *akasa*, even so the individual merges into the universal spirit."[30] But the *Mandukya* itself says at another place that by liberation the soul attains likeness with the Divine.[31] It is due to these two trends present in the *Upaniṣhads* that *Samkara* and *Ramanuj* interpret *moksha* differently, the former as identity of self with Brahman and the latter as communion with God. The *Gitā* also seems to emphasize equivalence (*sadharmya*) with God as the nature of *Moksha*, and not identity with God. However, the *Gitā* describes *Moksha* variously at various places – as emancipation, as eternal state, as the highest rest, as the entering into God, as contact with God, as rest in *Brahman,* as transformation into the Divine existence, as transmutation into Godhead and so on.

Moksha actually means absence of moha or delusion. Delusion is caused by the inter play of the triple *gunas*, the activity of the senses, attachment with and desire for sense objects. A person achieves liberation when he increases the quality of *sattva*, suppressing rajas and *tamas* and overcomes his desire for sense objects by detachment, self control, surrender to god and offering of one's actions to God. There are many paths to salvation and all of them lead to God. The main paths are the path of knowledge, of action, of devotion and of renunciation. Each path has its own advantages and disadvantages. Whatever may be the path, the help and guidance of a guru is indispensable to one's spiritual journey. A guru is God in human form whose his chief purpose is to remove the darkness hidden in the hearts and minds of his disciples and help them find their true selves.

It is a state of non-action. It is not that on death *moksha* is attained. Being the ultimate value of man's social existence, the *puruṣārtha* of *moksha* is an end in itself. Beyond that, man has nothing to attain. It is the stage where man's cravings cease and along with that ceases the need for attainment and fulfilment. It is realization and living of the truth namely *Aham Brahma Asmi* and *Tat Tvam Asi*. In other words it is waking up of human consciousness at the highest level of reality i.e., *paramarthik satta*. The liberated person neither acts nor causes others to act. He may work for the good of humanity without moral obligation. But he has no duties to perform. It is total

---

[30] Mandukya Up. III.1.40. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume (2004). *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads.* Delhi: Shivalik Prkashan.

[31] Mandukya Up. III.1.3. Translated by Robert Ernest Hume (2004). *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads.* Delhi: Shivalik Prkashan.

destruction of egoism. We can call *moksha* as a sublime goal. It can be known through mystical experience. Many saints like have talked about it and ultimately we all have to aim at it and only then we will be able to come out of the cycle of birth and death.

Finally one can say that, the purpose of *puruṣārthas* is to ensure that people would not neglect their obligatory duties in their deluded state by becoming obsessed with particular desires that may lead to moral and social decadence and destruction of family values. The four *Puruṣārthas* are responsible for balance in human life. They make life a rewarding and enriching experience. They cater to the spiritual and material aspirations of human beings and lead them in the right direction on the path of liberation.

The order of the *Dharma, Artha, Kāma* and *Moksha* corresponds to the human nature. Each is considered more important than the previous (*moksha* is beyond dharma, which is in turn higher than *artha* and *kāma*). Yet all four were considered important in the development of individual and society. An understanding and balance of the *Puruṣārthas* is important to our individual and collective life as we move forward into the future. The way that the world is currently moving in is towards the blind imitation of Western society – where the tendencies to pursue the values of *Kāma* and *Artha* at the expense of any sense of Dharma is very high, and is even endangering our planet. For example, economic gain without sense of the necessity of maintaining the cosmic order is what has led to the world's environmental crisis. Life without a concept of Dharma has not created any lasting sense of happiness in the people who live like this. One only needs to point at the huge increase in psychological problems in the lives of people in the West to demonstrate this. On an individual level, pursuing *Kāma* and *Artha* alone can never truly lead to a feeling of lasting satisfaction, because it is their nature to multiply their desire the more they are indulged in. Yet when permeated with the idea of *Dharma*, their pursuit is transformed into something noble, beautiful and of a more enduring value. Yet what is Dharma? Most of us are not familiar with the term and what it practically means. We need to rediscover our understanding of *Dharma* on multiple levels (individual, social, national) and what it means to live by *Dharma*.

The pursuing of *Moksha* or inner spiritual endeavour is still alive in some sections of Hindu society (and in fact has even been rediscovered by the West, through an influx of many Hindu and Buddhist teachers into the west, some of whom have vast followings). But the quest for *Moksha* and its value as the highest goal of human life is not understood amongst most Hindus, nor widely taught. The tendency amongst spiritual aspirants to have a disdain and lack of meaningful involvement in society still exists. This needs to be redressed. As Sri Aurobindo once said we can't take the best minds out of society and then still expect society to flourish.

After the analyzing of Purusharthas, I shall propose some another important concepts of Indian pluralistic perspective and by it, try to give a response to globalization. The real strength of Indian heritage lies in basic unity, vigour and the ability to contain an amazing diversity within itself. Another notable characteristic of Indian heritage is that it has always been based on moral and religious values; on these values the outlook shows an amazing similarity, almost throughout the country. Absorption and assimilation have been responsible for the lasting qualities of Indian pluralism; the diversities seem to disappear in course of time, leaving behind the basic beliefs very much intact. Mahatma Gandhi's view that veneration for other faiths is a part of our own system holds well because of the recognition that each religion has truth and honesty as its basis. Most people have a wide, universal outlook. All these factors account for the unity in diversity that is an outstanding feature of Indian pluralism.

> "Samãni va akutih samãnã hridayãni vah samãnam astu vo mano yathã vah susahãsati".

> "One be the aim of all your activities.
> Alike be your desires and intentions
> May a sense of unity be your guide"

With such exhortations the *rishis* of the *Vedas* and subsequent scriptures imparted their teachings to people. The vedic literature e.g. the *Purusha Sukta* and the *Isha Upanishad*, while preaching unity, brotherhood, mutual understanding etc. give much importance to the fact that Atman is the same as Brahman. Thus if man comes to respect his neighbour as consisting of the same divine essence as himself, there will

surely be unity, brotherhood, mutual understanding, without the chaos of wars and conflicts which are the cause of the disintegration of society. A man is one who thinks and acts sensibly, one who is noble (*Arya*) and makes the world noble by showing deep respect and love to the others and remembering that Brahman is in all.

Unity in diversity is the prime teaching of Indian pluralism. Hinduism has said: *Ekam sat viprah bahudha vadanti*, that is, "God is one and wise men talk in numerous ways about him. Only when men understand this Truth and unite their efforts can there be peace and harmony. Unity in diversity is a concept of "unity without uniformity and diversity without fragmentation" that shifts focus from unity based on a mere tolerance of physical, cultural, linguistic, social, religious, political, ideological and/or psychological differences towards a more complex unity based on an understanding that difference enriches human interactions. In recognising unity in diversity, Indian pluralism does not reject the diversity. For it, the one is in many and the many are one.

For exploring the concept of unity in diversity, it is very important to accept the notion of Tolerance. Tolerance and sacrifice are the essential foundations of Indian pluralism. Indian pluralism considers that *"Madhava seva is maanava seva"* i.e "Service to man is service to God." To tolerate is to bear with patience the existence of others. It is to put up with the views and actions of other people. It consists in permitting other persons to express their views freely and implement them into activity. Tolerance is essentially a state of mind. For these is the positive action of non- interference in activity of other persons. Toleration is not in that sense possible among birds and animals. Tolerance can be between one person and another person, as between husband and wife, mother and child among friends. It may be between one individual and group, group and another group, community and community, race and race class and class.

Traditionally, tolerance of all faiths is a part of Indian heritage. This attitude is enshrined in the popular Sanskrit phrase of *"Sarva Dharma Sambhav"* - equal respect to all religions. A common tenet of Indian pluralism is *"Sarva Dharma Sambhava"*, which literally means that all *Dharmas* (truths) are equal to or harmonious with each other. In recent times this statement has been taken as meaning "all religions are the

same"- that all religions are merely different paths to God or the same spiritual goal. One's choice in religion is merely incidental and makes no real difference in the spiritual direction of one's life. Any path is as good as any other. The important thing is to follow a path. Whether one is Hindu, Buddhist, Christian, Muslim, or of another religious belief is not important, whether one goes to a temple, church or mosque, it is all the same. Whether one prays to Jesus or Allah or meditates upon Buddha or Atman the results cannot be ultimately different. All religions are equally valid ways of knowing God or truth. The outer difference between religions are merely incidental while their inner core is one, the knowledge of the Divine or supreme reality. Therefore members of all religious groups should live happily together, recognizing that there is no real conflict in what they believe in but only superficial variations of name and form.

According to Indian Pluralism God is the father of all man. And as the children of one God, all men are brothers *"Vasudhaiva kutumbakam"*. We are all made of the five elements, we all have a soul, thus there is no difference! And for God, only the colour of the heart matters, not that of the skin. Indian pluralism suggests that: *"Sangacchadhvam samvadadhvam samvomanãnsi jãnatãn"* - "Let us come together; let us talk together; let us live with one mind." It is not in other words preaching unity among mankind and also suggesting that one should live to the ideal of *"vasudhaiva kutumbakam"* - the whole world is one family. It is a philosophy that tries to foster an understanding that the whole of humanity is one family. It is a social philosophy emanating from a spiritual understanding that the whole of humanity is made of one life energy. If the *Parmatma* is one how then an *Atma* can be different? If *Atma* is different how then can it ultimately be dissolved in the *Parmatma*? If the whole ocean is one how then a drop of the ocean be different from the ocean? It is a Sanskrit phrase meaning that the whole earth is one family. The first word is made up of three Sanskrit words - Vasudha, Eva and Kutumbakam. Vasudha means the earth, Eva means emphasizing and Kutumbakam means family. It means that the whole earth is just one family.

The concept originates in the *Maha Upanishad* (Chapter 6, Verse 72): *"ayam bandhurayam neti ganana laghuchetasam udaracharitanam tu vasudhaiva kutumbakam"*- Only small men discriminate saying: One is a relative; the other is a

stranger. For those who live magnanimously the entire world constitutes but a family. This concept is also mentioned in *Hitopadesha* (1.3.71): *Udāracharitānām tu vasudhaiva kutumbakam*', meaning, 'This is my own relative and that is a stranger' – is the calculation of the narrow-minded; for the magnanimous-hearts, however, the entire earth is but one family. It is a cosmic organization. And it is an organization by the people, of the people and for the people.

The moment there is a gap in the feeling of oneness in the society it may give rise to injustice and depletion of peace in the society and the same may have many other repercussions. Laws have been made in many countries against discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, or sex, but why is it that they are partially successful? The answer is simple. Here minds, society, the country, the whole world are corrupted with many prejudices. However, the moment we respect others as our own kins, having the same Divine spark and the same Divine nature, all hatred will vanish and we will live as one family.

Moreover, integration is something that has to come from the heart. True integration can only come from a spiritual understanding of the oneness of all life and to achieve this, the feeling of separateness must go. The feeling of brotherhood must emanate from the heart, it cannot be imposed from the outside. We have to feel that the other person is none other than ourselves in disguise, and with such a spirit, no doubt there will be peace, unity, harmony in the world. Unless our mental horizon and perception is broad we cannot achieve success in life. Due to our ignorance we are trying to establish the superiority of our own race and religion. The cause of today's dangerous situation is the ignorance of mankind. It is by understanding the spirit of *"Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam"* that world peace can be ushered in this world.

According to the Indian Vedic traditions God has gifted intelligence to man. Let us make full use of this intelligence in uniting the mankind. The earth is the garden of God. Let us not spoil it. Let us not annoy God by destroying what he had built with love. But, today the world is on the verge of total destruction. Every country in the world, in the name of peace and self defence, has accumulated weapons of mass destruction. But through such weapons peace cannot come in this world. In this dangerous situation respect for all religions and *"Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam"* can

usher peace in this world. A modern adage of the 21st century that the whole Network of the people of the world can become their Net-Worth. Let us take a quantum leap towards that Quantum Consciousness. You and Me together is We. We mean the whole world. We all mean *"Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam"*. We are all inter-connected with that common thread called Consciousness. Indian pluralism prays and works for the welfare and prosperity of everyone transcending national, ethnic and religious prejudices. As one of its prayers says:

Sarve bhavantu sukhinah:

"May all be happy."

To sum up we can say that the pluralistic perspective proposed in Indian philosophy of morals in the context of Purusharthas can help individuals and society come together in globalized era. People will cherish the diversity of human solidarity and have a sense of rootedness in the community and will encourage a creative dialogue between different cultures and there contending moral claims. People can negotiate a space where in different and contending moral claims can find there due recognitions and globalization will help us to develop this process.

Conclusion

Globalization has indeed made an important impact on philosophical and moral issues, cultural and religious domains, political and economic institutions and above all on multiculturalism. We have come a long way from the relatively simple story of globalization that was set out at the beginning of the study. As we have seen, globalization is a contested and controversial subject. In the first chapter we have, therefore, set out to introduce to the main features by which globalization may be characterized. In our discussion on globalization with contending claims on morality we have presented that the processes and perspectives of globalization have affected the philosophical moral discourses. The four processes of globalization namely; universalization, liberalization, internationalization and westernization are deeply rooted in the philosophical and moral domains. We have discussed that universalization is a process that has to be traced from the universals in Plato and Aristotle on the one hand and enlightenment rationality of the 19th century in Europe. Likewise liberalization is also a derivative of philosophical notion of liberty, which was developed by the libertarians like Mill and others. These two concepts have opened the gates to internationalization and westernization.

These processes have led to the emergence of the information technology, the dominance of services as mode of production (instead of commodities), the shrinking space-time boundaries for communication and social discourses, the massive trend of migration, travel and tourism and cultural fusion, give and take of styles of life and cultural products are manifestation of a new social movement, which we may call globalization. The process of globalisation entails that there is interconnection of sovereign nations through trade and capital flows; harmonization of economy rules that govern relationship among these sovereign nation; creating structures to support and facilitate interdependent and creating a global market place.

Globalization has affected the material conditions for hundreds of millions of people. Globalization means liberalization and free movement of goods, services, capital and finance across national boundaries. In the world currency market more than $ 1.6 trillion is now exchanged each day and about 1/5 of the goods and services produced each year are traded; hence offering several opportunities for individual countries to achieve higher growth rates. In the last one decade, there have been several discussions on the implications with its positive and negative factors that globalization is going to have on development process particularly in developing and under developed countries. In these countries, development is defined as a 'composite reality'; it is not economic development but also cultural development, philosophical development, development of morals, ethos and value. On the other hand, globalization has some negative factors. In the last one decade, there have been several discussions on the positive and negative factors of globalization. The negative factors of globalization are at two different levels. It threatens the interests of the powerful and the weak nations. This is the dilemma of globalization. It is generally criticized in terms of Economic Darwinism implying survival of the fittest. Globalization is also the coming together of rich entrepreneurs of the whole world with the belief or rather make-belief that they do not need the poor.

Globalization hurts the weak and the poor nations equally. This is the dilemma of globalization. They are hurt because they have no 'say' or 'share' in the process of globalization. There are many developing countries where political system is not conducive for encountering globalization. So there are examples of barring Disk Antenna, Transponders, Satellites, etc. And this is a very hopeless task. Many countries have tried it. But they have failed. So this is a losing game. The poorer countries which are not at all prepared to face globalization; they face problems in different ways. In such countries market is always restrained. If large number of people is illiterate and below the poverty line and have no access to new jobs and new way of understanding global situation, then they are out of market. So globalization, which brings market, creates this problem for the weaker people.

But, it's also fact that globalization is moving us together in various ways. In the age of globalization, the uses of information technology bring world events in our living room. The world has become a global village. So, in that time, it is very

important to know that – what we should be thinking ethically? How can we morally integrate to each other? It is very important to understand that, which moral theory is more compatible in the era of globalization. As we have seen in chapter two, there are several types of normative ethical theories existing in societies. These theories are equally important for individual, community and nations. We cannot say which theory is better than other. Utilitarianism in so far as public policy, decisions of the emerging democracies are concerned, and Kantianism, in so far as individual moral life and principles are concerned. Both theories, as with all principal systems of beliefs, the end that both seek is a virtuous life. A Utilitarian aspect could be more appropriate for one situation; while a Kantian perspective might be better for another. If one keeps a working knowledge of both philosophies, one can look at life with a broader view, and not get too firmly entrenched in one set of beliefs. That way, it is possible to face each day with an open mind, and truly live a life of virtue.

We can sum up these theories in this way that people should be charitable to the extent that they feel comfortable doing so. In this manner, the rights of individuals are respected (satisfying Kantians), whereas the global utility is increased (satisfying Utilitarians). By following this rule, we are able to meet the requirements of both groups, while imposing upon neither. Therefore, we are able to achieve Utilitarian goals through Kantian means. And, interestingly enough, Utilitarianism is a goal oriented philosophy, whereas Kantianism is a methodological theory.

Libertarianism and Communitariansm are the other socio-political philosophical theories, which are exists in societies. The liberal-communitarian debate is a very important debate in political philosophy. According to this debate, libertarianism determines that the individual is the primary unit of reality and the ultimate standard of value. On the other hand, Communitarianism is a tradition, ideology, or personal orientation that emphasizes the primacy of the group or community rather than each individual person. In the context of these concepts, it is very important to understand that- 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 it is very important to have some liberty, freedom, justice etc. but community is also very important for get these values.

We will do anything to just be a part of a crowd or a community. Although everyone is his/her own person, and has his/her own unique personality, thoughts, and beliefs, we are all a part of a community, whether that means the town we live in, the common interests we share with others, or the family we were born into. But nowadays, societies all around the world are becoming more and more individualists, what is causing problems that can affect the whole world. This is basically happening because every single member of every society is only looking after themselves instead of the group, they are only trying to progress individually, but most of these individuals forget that to really achieve the top you need help, and that help comes from other individuals. Individualism and Institutions, both are very important. The one should not reduce to the other.

Individual's morals develop and nurture throughout a life span. Within these morals are values and ethics that guide the integrity and character of people. However, when an individual choose to act in a manner inconsistent to his or her value system everyone suffers. Values provide the basis for judgments about what is important for the organization to succeed in its core business. Values are rules both individuals and organizations use to make decisions regarding right and wrong. For politics, finance, business, and other institution or organization, moral responsibilities are very necessary.

With the morality, culture is more important for individual and society. From the ancient period morality is related to tradition and culture. But in the age of globalization like morality, culture is also dominating from technology, finance and westernization. The reality is, local culture survives in globalization. In the era of globalization, most of the countries do not able to avoid the impacts of westernization and they are losing own cultures. Globalization has the twin function to perform, viz. to enhance people's sensitivity to their moral values and to transform their attitudes to other values. Globalization of technology, trade and commerce and the optimization of these factors may not be of much help unless we re-vitalize local identities. In fact, globalization, by its very process, enhances people's sensitivity to their local identities. There is the view that globalization triggers on the one hand massive movement of people, resources and values from one part of the globe to another part.

The impact of globalization on the culture is immense and diverse. It has affected the cultural aspect of people in different ways. Multicultural nature of our society has been ignored. Most countries have been failing to recognize the enriching value of diverse cultures. Cultural diversity is now a fact of life in today's "global village". We now live in a world in which markets, media, law, corporations, labour, scientific research and advocacy groups are international, multinational, and multicultural. Many people are suspicious of this new world order, fearing that it is being built on the triumphs of one or another people or culture or class. Certainly the process of globalization disrupts fragile societies and disrupts traditional identities. On the other hand, globalization does not necessarily mean homogeneity. Indeed, in some respects globalization fosters and allows for differences.

So, in that time the need is to expose us to our own cultural traditions in the wake of current development at the International scenario. And for this, we can find our own Indian moral value system along with Indian pluralistic perspective and tried to give a response to globalization. Indian moral values - *Puruṣārthas* are very important concept for our individual and society. We have seen that *dharma* in its connotation is very broad and indeterminate and may be taken as the very foundation of everything. It is a *puruṣārtha* which permeates and pervades both *kāma* and *artha* in the sense that one is to follow and aim at *kāma* and *artha* only under the regulation and guidance of dharma. Only such *kāma* and *artha* are to be pursued which are permitted by dharma, i.e., which are in conformity with the *dharmika* prescriptions. *Dharma* maintains the social fabric, its stability and harmony. By providing a set of norms it helps society move in a disciplined and harmonious manner. So, for the smooth working of the social fabric as well as for preparing oneself for higher pursuits, the observance of the norms set by *dharma* is necessary. *Kāma* under *puruṣārthas*, the Indian thinkers have recognised the need for human beings to aim at the satisfaction of animal appetites. For proper and well-rounded development of man satisfaction of such appetites may be legitimate. *Artha* is a *puruṣārtha* both in the sense that people actually aim at it, and also in the sense that under certain legitimate bounds they ought to aim at it. And *moksha* is man's highest goal, because after this he gets rid of continuous transmigration. He becomes then established as an eternal spiritual reality in perfect peace and equanimity.

The understanding of *Puruṣārtha* (*Abhyudaya* and *Niḥśreyasa*) is very important to our individual and collective life as we move forward into the future in globalized world. "The way that the world is currently moving in is towards the blind imitation of Western society – where the tendencies to pursue the values of *kāma* and *artha* at the expense of any sense of Dharma is very high, and is even endangering our planet." We need to rediscover our understanding of *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Moksha* on multiple levels (individual, social, national). A man's life should be guided by four ends: duty (*dharma*), fulfilment of worldly purposes (*artha*), happiness (*kāma*), and salvation (*moksha*). Each of these ends has a definite value, and if possible, should not be neglected. Desire for happiness may not be the highest of impulses in us, but it need not be rooted out. "All health, sane views of life make provision for the thirst for happiness in man. It is the raw material of a higher life and hence must not be entirely ignored."

One thing is for sure, the concept of the *Puruṣārthas* (*abhyudaya- dharma, artha, kāma* and *niḥśreyasa - moksha*), the Four Great Aims of Human Endeavour, and the harmonisation of these aims, is something that is of value as long as society exists. A study of them and application of them today offer many possibilities through which we can create a grander, more beautiful and more meaningful existence in the age of globalization.

Except *puruṣārthas*, some another Indian pluralistic concept is also very important for response to globalization. We should adopt positive and affirmative approach to unity and peace. Our efforts should not just be confined to the removal of conflicts and controversies but one should rather take concrete steps for emotional integration and unity of the world. We generally work on the level of importing technology. Science, technology and inventions all are part of civilization. Culture is inward looking whereas civilization is outward looking. The superstructures of civilization are imposing but the fabric of culture is subtle and the warp and weft of culture are thoughts, attitudes, values and ideals. A country can lack in civilization but may be rich in culture. We have to reach to the inner being of the people in different countries and should try to enrich their inner world with glowing ideas and noble thoughts.

In pluralistic perspective, we can find the concept like; Divine Consciousness and Unity in Diversity: the diversity of the world is for its colour and glory. It should not create any mental block and artificial barriers. The universe is essentially one and there is *"Sat-Chit-Anand"* – Truth- Consciousness and bliss pervading the entire universe, it is this divine feeling that leads to the realization of unity in diversity. *"Ekam sat viprah bahudha vadanti."* He is one and wise men talk in numerous ways about him. For exploring the concept of unity in diversity, it is very important to accept the notion of Tolerance. Tolerance and sacrifice are the essential foundations of Indian pluralism and very important for community and nations. It consists in permitting other persons to express their views freely and implement them into activity. Traditionally, tolerance of all faiths is a part of Indian heritage. This attitude is enshrined in the popular Sanskrit phrase of *"Sarva Dharma Sambhav"* - equal respect to all religions. The concept of *"Sarva-Dharma-Sambhav"* (Secularism) is another cardinal attribute of one world culture, which is unfortunately portrayed as one opposed to religion. We should remember that one can be religious without adhering to any religion. Indian Pluralism suggests that: "Let us come together; let us talk together; let us live with one mind." It is not in other words preaching unity among mankind and also suggesting that one should live to the ideal of *"vasudhaiva kutumbakam"* - the whole world is one family. *Vasudhaiva kutumbkam* is a philosophy that tries to foster an understanding that the whole of humanity is one family. Peace and harmony in the world will come through brotherhood and love. With true enlightenment a person rises above the level of boundaries of race, religion, language or nation. And through such weapons peace cannot come in this world. In this dangerous situation respect for all religions and *"Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam"* can usher peace in this world.

The one world culture is for *"Sarvajanhitay, Sarvjan-sukhay"* – the welfare of all and the happiness of all. This task is stupendous and difficult but we have to take the first step. We have to invoke the Divine Powers for making one world culture a reality and pray with the Vedic seer

"Aa no bhadra: kratwo yantu vishwatah"

Let noble thoughts come to us from every side.

This is the ethos of the globalized world.

117

Bibliography

Books

- Albrow, Martiin. *Globalization and Society.* Newbury Park, Calif: Sage, 1990.

- Atwell, John. *Ends and Principles in Kant's Moral Thought.* USA: Springer, 1986.

- Baier, Kurt. *The Moral Point of View.* New York: Random House, 1965.

- Bentham, J. *A Fragment of Government and Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation.* Edited by Wilfred Harrison. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960.

- Bhagwati, J. *Protectionism.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

- Bloomfield, M. *Hymns of the Atharva-Veda.* The Sacred Book of the East 42, Repr. Delhi, 1968.

- Bogomolov, A.S. *History of Ancient Philosophy.* Progress Publisher, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1985.

- Brinkmann, Klaus (ed.). *German Idealism: Critical Concepts in Philosophy,* Vol. III. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

- Brooks, Thom. *Hegel's Philosophy of Right.* UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

- Call, Lewis. *Postmodern Anarchism.* Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2002.

- Chomsky, Noam. *Language and Politics.* Edited by Carlos Peregrín Otero. UK: A.K. Press, 2004.

- Cooper, L. (ed.). *The Rhetoric of Aristotle.* New York: Appleton Century Crofts Inc., 1960.

- Cox, R. W. (1987). *Production, Power and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.

- Croucher, L. Sheila (2004). *Globalization and Belonging.* USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC., 2004.

- Dasgupta, S.N. *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. IV. London: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

- Deji, Olanike F. *Gender and Rural Development: Advanced Studies*, Vol. 2. Berlin: LIT Verlog, 2012.

- Devi, Leela. *Ethics.* Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1993.

- Dharmottara. *Nyayabindhu-Tika* (Hindi Version). Edited and Translated by Srinivasa Sastri. Meerut: Sahitya Bhandara, 1975.

- Edwards, Paul (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* New York: The Macmillan Company & the Free Press, 1967.

- Everhart, Robert B. *The Public School Monopoly: A Critical Analysis of Education and the State in American Society.* Pacific Institute for Public Policy Research, 1982.

- Ewa, Czerwiriska (ed.). *Values and Norms in the Age of Globalization.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007.

- Ewing, A.C. *A Short Commentary to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason.* London: The University of Chicago Press Ltd., 1970.

- Frankena, W. K. *The Concept of Morality.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jercy: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970.

- Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization.* New York: Anchor Books, 1999.

- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

- Graham, Gordon. *Eight Theories of Ethics.* London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

- Griffith, R. T. H. *The Hymns of the Rig-Veda,* Vol. 1. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publisher Pvt., 1999.

- Gupta, Satya Dev (ed.). *The Political Economy of Globalization.* USA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.

- Hare, John. *The Moral Gap: Kantian Ethics, Human Limits, and God's Assistance*. Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Harris, C.E. *Applying Moral Theories.* USA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2002.

- Held, David. *A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics and Politics.* London: Routledge, 2000.

- Hill, C.W.L. Hill. *Global Business Today*. 3rd edition. New York: Mc Graw Hill/Irwin, 2004.

- Hill, Thomas. *The Blackwell Guide to Kant's Ethics*. USA: John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

- Hobbes, T. *Leviathan.* Edited by J. Plamenatz. London: Fontana, 1962.

- Hume, Robert E. *The Thirteen Principals Upanishads.* Oxford University Press, 2002.

- John, Eade (ed.). *Living the Global City: Globalization as a Local Process.* London: Routledge, 1997.

- Johnston, R. *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

- Johnston, R. *The Dictionary of Human Geography*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

- Kane, P. V. *History of Dharmasastra*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941.

- Kangle, R.P. (trans.). *The Kautilya Arthasastra.* Bombay: University of Bombay, 1972.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason.* Translated by N.K. Smith. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1973.

- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals.* Edited and Translated by Allen W. Wood. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002.

- Kaplinsky, Raphie. *Globalization, Poverty and Inequality.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2005.

- Kroeber, A.L., & Klyde Kluchohn. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concept and Definitions.* Cambridge Mass: Peabody Museum of American Archaeology, 1952.

- Kroeber, A.L., & Klyde Kluchohn. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concept and Definitions.* Cambridge Mass. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology, 1952.

- Lillie, William. *Introduction of Ethics*. London: University Paperbacks, 1966.

- Loewy, Erich. *Textbook of Medical Ethics*. USA: Springer, 1989.

- Macintyre, Alasdair. *A Short History of Ethics.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1967.

- Maganlal, Buch A. *The Principles of Hindu Ethics.* New Delhi: Bhartiya Kala Prakashan, 2003.

- Manusmrti. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Banaras, 1979.

- Meseguer, Covadonga. *Learning, Policy Making, and Market Reforms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Metcalfe, S. *Building a Speech*, 5th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003.

- Mill, J. S. *Utilitarianism.* Edited by Roger Crisp. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Mittal, Manu (ed.). *Cultures and Societies in Transition.* India: Shipra Publication Ltd., 2008.

- Mittelman, H. James. *Whither Globalization?* London: Routledge, 2004.

- Mittelman, James H. (ed.). (1996). *Globalization: Critical Reflections.* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

- Modelski, George and R. William Thompson (eds.). *Globalization as Evolutionary Process – Modeling Global Change.* London: Routledge, 2001.

- Moore, G. E. *Principia Ethica.* Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1988.

- Nettlau, Max (trans.). *A Short History of Anarchism*. London: Freedom Press, 1996.

- Paton, H.J. *The Moral Law: Kant's Groundwork of Metaphysics of Morals.* London: Hutchinson University Library, 1969.

- Polanyi, K. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economical Origins of Our Time.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1944.

- Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage, 1992.

- Rocker, Rudolf. *Anarcho-Syndicalism: Theory and Practice.* Oakland, California: A.K. Press, 2004.

- Rojek, Chris. *Cultural Studies.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

- Rothbard, Murray N. *For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto.* New York: Collier Books, 1989.

- Scholte, Jan A. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

- Sen, Amartya & Bernard Williams (eds.). *Utilitarianism and Beyond.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

- Sidgwick, Henry. *The Methods of Ethics.* London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1963.

- Singer, Peter. *One World: The Ethics of Globalization.* India: Orient Longman Pvt. Ltd., 2004.

- Singh, R. P. (ed.). *The Philosophical Heritage of Immanuel Kant.* New Delhi: Om publication, 2006.

- Soloman, Robert C. & Kathleen M. Higgins (eds.). *Routledge History of Philosophy.* Vol. VI. London: Routledge, 1995.

- Sri Aurobindo. *Foundations of Indian Culture.* New York: Sri Aurobindo Library Inc., 1953.

- Stiglitz, Joseph E. *Globalization and its Discontents.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2002.

- Sullivan, Roger. *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

- Sweet, William. *The Dialogue of Cultural Traditions: A Global Perspective.* Volume 39 of *Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Change: Culture and*

Values. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2008.

- Trigg, Roger. *Morality Matters.* USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2005.

- Vallentyne, Peter and Hillel Steiner, (eds.). *Left-libertarianism and its critics: the Contemporary Debate.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

- Whitney, W. D. *Atharva-Veda Samhita,* Vol II. Harvard Oriental Series 7–8, Repr., Delhi, 1971.

- Williams, M. Monier. *A Sanskrit - English Dictionary.* Oxford University Press, 1970.

- Wood, Allen. *Kantian Ethics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Articles

- 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. "Communitarian Criticisms and Liberal Lessons." *The Responsive Community*, Fall 1995: 54-64.

- Albee, Ernest. "An Examination of Professor Sidgwick's Proof of Utilitarianism." *Philosophical Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3, Duke University Press, 1901: 251–60.

- Appadurai, Arjun. "Disjunctive and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 7, 1990: 295–310.

- B. Milanovic. "Can We Discern the Effects of Globalization on Income Distribution?" *Evidence from Household Budget Surveys, World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper*: Washington, D.C. No. 2876, April, 2002.

- Bailey, Tom. "Analysing the Good Will: Kant's Argument in the First Section of the Groundwork." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 2011: 635–62.

- Brody, Bourch A. "The Equivalence of Act and Rule Utilitarianism." *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, Vol. 18, No. 6, Dec., 1967: 81–87.

- Flanagan, Stephen, Ellen L. Frost, and Richard L. Kugler. (2001.) "Challenges of the Global Century: Report of the Project on Globalization and National Security." Washington, D.C.: National Defence University Press.

- Fotopoulos, Takis. "Globalization, the Reformist Left and the Anti-Globalization 'Movement'." *Democracy & Nature: The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy,* Vol. 7, No. 2, July 2001: 233–80.

- Friedman, Thomas L. "It's a Flat World, After All." *New York Times Magazine*, April 3, 2005.

- Gonzalez, Ana Marta. "Ethics in Global Business and in a Plural Society." *Journal of Business Ethics,* Netherlands: Springer, 2003: 23–36.

- Green, Eva G. T. "Variation of Individualism and Collectivism and Between 20 Countries: A Typological Analysis." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 3, Sage Publication, 2005: 321–39.

- Kirsher, j. Keynes. "Capital Mobility and the Crisis of Embedded Liberalism." *Review of International Political Economy,* Vol. 6, No. 3, Sep. 1999: 317–22.

- Recep Yücel, Halil Elibol, and Osman Dağdelen. "Globalization and International Marketing Ethics Problems." *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics.* ISSN 1450-2887, Issue 26. Euro Journals Publishing, Inc., 2009: 93–104

- Robertson, Roland "Globalization and Societal Modernization." *Sociological Analysis* 47, 1987: 35–42.

- Schiller, Herbert I. "Not Yet the Post-Imperalist Era." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1991: 13–28.

- Simmons, Beth A. and Zachary Elkins. "The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, Issue 01, 2004: 171–89.

- Singh, R. P. "Understanding Diversity/Plurality in Multiculturalism: Fusion of Cultural Horizons" in *World of Philosophy: A Harmony.* Edited by C.K. Chapple. Rohtak: Shanti Prakashan, 2011: 184–99.

- *The Front Page, 1887–1992.* The International Herald Tribune, 1992.

- Wolff, Jonathan. "Libertarianism, Utility, and Economic Competition" Vol. 92, *Virginia Law Review*, Oct. 22, 2006: 1605–23.

Online Articles

- Bhikhu Parekh, "What is Multiculturalism?" www.india-seminar. com/1999parekh htm. Accessed on 31/08/2009.

- Blair, Tony. "Europe is Falling Behind." *Newsweek*, 2005. URL: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_kmnew/is_200511/ai_n16073679. Accessed on 24/12/2011.

- Driver, Julia. "The History of Utilitarianism." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Summer 2009 edition. URL: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2009/entries/utilitarianism-history. Accessed on 24/12/2011

- Flood. "*Kāma, Artha,* and *Dharma* as 'Brahmanic Householder Values'." 1996:17. URL: http://www.wikipedia/org/purushartha. Accessed on 23/01/2012.

- Gert, Bernard. "The Definition of Morality." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Summer, 2011.URL:http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2011/entries/morality-definition. Accessed on 23/2/2012.

- "Globalization and Technology." The Levin Institute: The State University of New York. URL: http://www.globalization101.org/uploads/file/Technology/tech2011.pdf. Accessed on 15/03/2012.

- IMF Team (2000). *Globalization: Threats or Opportunity*. IMF Publications. URL: http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm. Accessed on Jan.14, 2012.

- Johnson, Robert. "Kant's Moral Philosophy." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Summer 2012edition.URL: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/kant-moral. Accessed on 12/02/2012.

- Locke, John (1690). "Second Treatise of Government" (10th edition). Project Gutenberg. URL: http:/ / www. gutenberg. org/ files/ 7370/ 7370-h/ 7370-h. Htm. Accessed on 25/02/2012.

- "Summary of the Annual Review of Developments in Globalization and Regional Integration in the Countries of the ESCWA Region by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia," URL: http://www.escwa.un.org/information/publications/edit/upload/grid-02-2.pdf. Accessed on 20/01/2012.

- "World Investment Report 2001." United Nations. URL: http://www.unctad.org/wir/index.htm UN, 2001. Accessed on: 12/03/2012.

Internet Sources

- http:// www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/define.

- http://www.imf.org/economic liberalization/2000

- http://www.Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.com

- http://www. Jstor.org

- http://www.Oxford Journals.com

- http://www.globalization.html

- http://www.Journal of Business Ethics

- http://www.the archieve of hindu philosophy/Purusharthas.org.