

**Is Multiculturalism Antiquated? A Dialogic Debate on Negotiating
Liberalism, Finding Symmetry and Sustenance**

Sushma Trivedi

Associate Professor, Department of History,

Navyug Kanya Mahavidyalaya,

University of Lucknow, Lucknow, INDIA

E-mail: drsushmat2014@gmail.com

Ph.: 9648661962

Abstract

Multiculturalism might simply be understood as managing relations of different communities residing within national boundaries on one hand and relations between the states and the community on the other hand. But the rapidly changing socio-economic world has given it multivalent political meanings and expressions. Multicultural societies are faced with challenges posed on identity, religious beliefs, and cultural equations. In recent times in wake of some unfortunate happenings, multiculturalism as a political ideology has come under the scanner and some scholars even pronounced its death. Nevertheless, multicultural societies are as much a reality of the modern globalized world as are the interlinked economies. Today world stands at crossroads, ideologies like 'difference blind position', 'hands-off neutrality', and models like 'melting pot' and 'salad

bowl' have, if not failed then definitely proved insufficient to tackle the needs and aspirations of multicultural societies.

Multiculturalism is based on and nourished by the political philosophy of liberalism and liberal democracies are believed to be the fertile ground for its propagation. Therefore, this study destructures and deconstructs the principles of liberalism to present an insight into the efficacy and suitability of the classical form of liberalism for multicultural societies. It is emphasized that culture, the most crucial component of multiculturalism is pushed to the periphery in course of the practice of the fairness of justice and equal distribution of goods. Culture plays an important role in the formation of the identity of an individual and a group. Ignoring cultural differences also means undermining identity which manifests itself as somewhat liberal oppression and sometimes as denial of social justice.

It is concluded that in changed circumstances radical liberalism can become a source of conflict within the society rather than harmonizing differences. An alternative can be derived from within the liberal theories as thinkers like Rawls and Dworkin; not only acknowledge differences but also make slight provision for differential rights. A moderate broadening of the ideas can create a perfectly balanced model of liberalism for multicultural societies.

Keywords: Liberalism, Multiculturalism, Identity, Community, Social Justice.

Introduction

Multiculturalism in the contemporary world has become such a multidimensional phenomenon that it has become very difficult to define it and all the more difficult to confine it within a conceptual framework. The periphery of multicultural societies is expanding day by day, among hundred and ninety-three members of the United Nations Organization there are only twenty which are counted as culturally homogeneous states, amounting to about twenty percent of the total (Barber, 1996, p.135). This makes it

obvious that homogeneity is an exception and multiculturalism is a rule. This fact needs to be accepted rather than avoided, adopted rather than discarded and if accepted and adopted, it should be celebrated too. But the claim has been rendered an enigmatic affair because the field is congested with contesting ideologies and 'isms', having their specific notions of liberty rights, individual, justice, and the state. Multiculturalism, in general, is understood as a policy applied for managing the relations of different ethnic groups, respecting cultural distinctions, and propagating the idea of peaceful and harmonious coexistence. The idea originated with Horace Kellen in 1915, who described it in terms of cultural pluralism. Since then it has been open to debates, doubts, arguments, and counter-arguments at different levels. Out of this process, two rival groups have emerged, one group hails multiculturalism as a hope for all in culturally plural states (Zubrzycki, 1977; Maki, 1997) and the other, condemns it as a separatist tendency and as a cult, threatening unity (Schlesinger, 1993; Longers, 1997). Trans-Atlantic Council on Migration, Canada published a report in 2012, titled *Multiculturalism Success. Failure and Future*, authored by Will Kymlicka concludes that as a policy it has 'worked well' (Kymlicka, 2012).

Multiculturalism has entered a new phase where not only its fall is predicted, even its death and demise is proclaimed with wider consensus among thinkers, politicians, and policymakers (Baubock, 2002; Joppke, 2004). Skepticism regarding its relevance reached the level that both its critics and the champion seem to unanimously agree that the world is now in a 'post-multiculturalism' era (Vertovec, 2010; Crawley, 2019). Since the resurgence of the idea of national building, national identity, and normative culture in around 1995, multiculturalism has been already losing its vigor and has been repeatedly put under the scanner. Perhaps the World Trade Center attack by Al-Qaida terrorists in 2001 has been the turning point when the thought of futility and failure of multiculturalism as a policy was strongly felt not only in the United States of America but in the entire Western hemisphere. A spirit of backlash against fundamentalism,

especially in public forums emerged which indirectly targeted liberal multicultural policies. In this milieu of reaction, Vertovec published his iconic study entitled 'Towards post-multiculturalism? Changing community conditions and contexts of diversity (2010). Soon after this Middle-east witnessed a major political upheaval resulting in Arab spring, initiating a fresh wave of migrants pushing the borders of western countries, especially Europe. Subsequently, the policy of multiculturalism faced its toughest test in the manifestation of such occurrences as migration crisis (2015), Brexit (2016), and re-embracing of US President Roosevelt's call of 'America for Americans' by the Republic President Donald Trump exactly after a century. In some quarters, this was seen as refreshing the long history of 'Xenophobia' in the USA (Lee, 2019). The Recent withdrawal of American forces from Afghanistan, leaving the country in a precarious state enforces the question of whether the world view of politics has changed from Internationalism to Nationalism.

In wake of these circumstances, Vertovec's apprehensions over the fate of multiculturalism were received as prophesied words and interestingly his writing has become one of the most cited articles in the history of the International Social Science Journal (Crawley, 2019). Thus a 'Master Narrative' (Kymlicka, 2010) of the fall of multiculturalism was created and espoused by a section of thinkers and politicians. As regards politicians, German Chancellor Angela Merkel has been most vocal but inconsistent in her views about the state of multicultural policy. Her controversial statement made on 17th October 2010 about the "utter failure" of multiculturalism in Germany (Merkel, 2010) projected the country as a land of No Immigration whereas, under the same leadership, Germany opened her borders for one million immigrants in 2015. Although the German example does not pose serious implications universally as according to The Federal Statistical Office even in 2020 German demographic constitution included 26.7 percent immigrants out of which 65% were Europeans and only 22% were Asians with significant cultural differences(destatis.de), but it underlines a major error

in interpretation of terminology in wake of recent happenings. Anxiety over Islam has led to a misunderstanding of immigrants with Muslims and of multiculturalism with dealing with Islam. Consequent anti-immigrant feelings seem to have strengthened the narrative of post multiculturalism.

However, such disparaging characterization of multiculturalism might have been suggestive of rethinking at some levels but could not effect reversal or removal of the policy. Multiculturalism has ever been in a state of flux and it has survived over shifting grounds. Therefore, a new set of challenges may destabilize it momentarily but possibly cannot bring an abrupt end to it. Particularly in western liberal democracies accepting oppressive homogenization or forced assimilation is neither possible nor advisable. Even post-multiculturalism are not anti-multiculturalists and emphasize some modification rather than abandonment. De-securitization and human rights have been noticed as the two pivotal factors for the rise and growth of multiculturalism in the west (Kymlicka, 2010). These factors are the source of liberal content in the policy, ironically also the breeding ground for its harshest criticism. Besides these two factors, the deeply entangled economies and intense corporate presence further build resilience to the idea of homogenous nationhood. Seemingly, multiculturalism itself is not seen as a problem but the extent and degree of liberalism is a matter of concern. In Pieterse's view, the core problem of liberal multiculturalism is that it provides a solution for which there is no problem and a remedy for which there is no ailment (2005, p. 127). Liberalism or maybe radical liberalism inherent in multicultural policies is seen as a present and potential threat by receptive countries, cultures, and economies. The recent wave of Muslim immigrants in the west has accentuated these worries as they are generally considered conservative and resistant to basic voluntary assimilation in the host culture or with co-cultures in the society.

As a solution to the problem, securing borders by restraining permeability is hard to achieve, and curbing human rights is not rationally possible in the age of evolved civil societies in a democratic setup.

Some incidences in concurrent American policies effectively demonstrate the poignant consequences of such attempts. Donald Trump won presidential elections in 2017 rising the wave of his popularity based on his 'Mexico Wall' project to stop illegal immigration from Mexico. There were angry protests and demonstrations at the borders by the Mexicans. Particularly a massive protest took place on 18 February 2017, when thousands of Mexicans formed a human wall with a banner unscripted with "Nobody is illegal" (www.bbc.com,). On the other hand, Americans protested at the White House with a banner that read "We stand with immigrants and asylum seekers" On 19 February 2019 (www.Xinhuanet.com, Retrieved on 01.07.2020). Similarly, the killing of African-American George Floyd in police action in Minneapolis Town of Minnesota, the USA on May 25, 2020, led to public outrage of a magnitude that has not been witnessed in recent times. It evoked violent protests all across the United States and its ripple effect swiftly reached the shores of Europe. '#BlacklivesMatter Movement' founded in 2013 (Maraj et al. 2019) garnered unprecedented support from all sections of the population. Such occurrences reiterate that multiculturalism as an ideology is neither passé nor antiquated. Although the nature and implications of liberalism, the fundamental component of the idea of multiculturalism need to be reassessed to make it mutually inclusive of 'national aspirations' and ethno cultural differences of multicultural states.

Universal Phenomena, Uniform Model

Since the early nineteenth century, country-specific models have been in practice which has often proved inadequate to achieve desired goals. Further, the prevalence of identity politics and various social movements accentuate the need for an overarching uniform model of multiculturalism. Most of the models of multiculturalism and theories of liberalism, designed and formulated are Euro-centric or modeled according to the

ethnic and immigrant dynamics of North America. European multicultural policies revolve around the axis of Native – Immigrant and the American around the axis of Aborigines-American -Hyphenated Americans. It has been argued that the eastern notion of community and authority should be taken into cognizance (Etzioni, 2004). The east-west divide is the most crucial point missed in theorizing multiculturalism. While Orient/Occident dichotomy has been removed for a long, the thought persists that the two are culturally and ideologically mutually exclusive. Although there are differences in patterns borrowings are not only possible but could be conceptually enriching. Assimilation is not an issue in the east because there are not many differences in immigrant and recipient cultures, civilizational differences are not that sharp, the immigrants are not only benefits but benefactors too, because they exist almost on par with each other in terms of technological advancement and most supremely, these cultures are historically bound. Hence the constituent cultures in eastern multiculturalism are not cultures with sharp and cutting edges but have porous borderlines and an inherent understanding which probably only needs a harmonizing touch. On the contrary Western multiculturalism is marked by long-distance immigration, sharp racial differences, and contradictions in values, beliefs, and social morality of immigrant cultures. Nevertheless, eastern multiculturalism has some distinct features which can give a fresh perspective to hitherto applied models. These can be listed as no forced assimilation, no isolation of cultures, and no acceptance with vengeance. Asian multicultural states follow a simplistic strategy of treating all constituent cultures at par and preserving cultures. In these societies, cultures participate in Nation building. Considering these points, a broad-based universally applicable model with scope and provision for addressing the secondary needs of nations could be articulated.

Liberalism: Theory on the Ground

The issue of structure, constitution, and nature of political and social institutions in multicultural societies assumes critical importance as these are the instruments for the

dissemination of rights, justice, and governance. It is almost agreed upon that liberal democracy is the most suited political system for states comprising culturally plural demographic patterns. Articulating a precise definition of Liberalism in the present-day situation is an arduous task owing to the plurality of Liberalism itself. It has undergone many transformations through time and has manifested in a variety of forms such as classical, egalitarian, social, pragmatic, etc. justifying Shackler's observation that Liberalism has become an "all-purpose word" (1989(1998),p.3). As an idea Liberalism has a dynamic history, while Leo Strauss is inclined to trace it from ancient Athens; Kant, Locke, Mill, and Spencer are considered as architects of the edifice of Modern Liberalism. Historians of Liberalism generally agree upon rationality, equality, freedom, and progress as its core values, although the emphasis on different values may differ from thinker to thinker. Political theorists encapsulate these values in a single compound upheld as 'justice'. Equality and freedom distributed through the instrument of justice could be perceived as an ideal system for multicultural states. However, equality has emerged as an almost non-negotiable value of Liberalism from twentieth-century discourses and continues its primacy in conceptual interpretations. Initially, liberal assumptions were formulated for purely domestic governance, to manage and administer social interactions and protect the rights of individuals. Later Internationalization of the idea not only impacted its domestic implications but also took center stage in International relations concerning peace and economics. In the context of multiculturalism, two components of liberalism acquire special importance and are also marked as fields of contestation: A. Role of state or government B. Treatment of Individual.

Classical liberalism conservatively perceives the state, having the function of organizing and devising a framework of rules and orders within which individuals have the freedom to pursue their own goals. Thus, envisions a limited role for the state with the assumption that each institution should be guided by its rationality. Its fundamental

tenets dictate that the government or political society is nothing but the consent of any number of freemen (Locke 1690(1963)). It propagates a 'color-blind constitution' in the political sphere and 'impartial universal culture' in the social sphere, with no consideration for difference, distinctions, and peculiarities. In its abstract form classical liberalism as prescribed by pioneers Rawls and Dworkin is seemingly the ultimate glorification of 'Man and his rights' but practically even liberal democracies, comprising to some extent a homogenous population, find it difficult to implicate. Hence, adopting liberalism as the political mechanism is easier but espousing liberal principles in their ideal form is much difficult for multicultural states. By the close of the twentieth century, the questions were being raised and protestations resonated from different quarters taking shape of political and social movements. A sharp debate perpetuated between liberals on one side and a host of ideologies such as Communitarians, Marxists, radical feminists, Utilitarians, Consequentialists, Culturalists, etc. on the other side. Interestingly most of these thoughts developed in reaction to various principles of liberalism itself and mostly addressed the needs of multicultural societies. Most recent writings on liberalism express concern over threats to liberalism at the opening of the twenty-first century by "illiberal forces"(Fawcett, 2018). Critics go to the extent of connecting liberalism with Fascism and Marxism (Goldberg, 2007), the two creeds always held as anathema by the west. Such synonymies are drawn to indicate the element of 'radicalism' in liberal implications. Surely liberalism is facing a crisis because voices of concern are also being raised from within the intellectual community of liberals. But these are not threats but challenges that could be mitigated with the identification of sites of contestation and ideological interventions.

Individual, Culture, and Community

The individual is the centripetal force in liberal thought. Though this primacy of the individual in liberalism is out rightly rejected by the radical critics because to them liberal conception of the individual is neither empirically accurate nor conceptually

coherent, cannot be a valued starting point (Ramsay, 1997, p. 27). Individual viewed in all his totality is the basic unit and nucleus of all social, political, and economic institutions and also a primary concern for all of these. Though rival ideologies find it difficult to endorse the exalted ideal of individual presented by classical thinkers such as Locke, Kant, and Hobbes and enthusiastically upheld by modern liberals as Rawls and Dworkin, forming the kernel of their political propositions. Individual, as perceived by liberals, is an antecedently individuated self who is the bearer of some inalienable rights, having been conferred on him by nature and not by any human agency. These inalienable rights, for Locke, are the rights to life, liberty, and property and Kant's right to intrinsic dignity and equal worth.

Individuals are conceived as rational autonomous beings who exist as 'ends in themselves and they choose their ends and goals autonomously and before society. For Rawls individual is a moral person whose preference is for conditions that enable him to frame a mode of life that expresses his nature as a free and equal rational being (Rawls, 1971, p. 561). Thus, the individual of liberals is given priority over society and is conceived as independent of society. Men are distinct individuals first and then they form relationships with others.

Liberal perception of the individual has been subjected to severe criticism and fiercely autonomous individual is treated as anathema by the ideologies pitched against liberalism. Labeled variously as 'atomistic', 'asocial' and 'abstract', the most valued icon of liberalism has been hammered constantly, from Marx to MacIntyre, the most spirited criticism has been made by Sandel, who finds not one, not two but many reasons to reject this idea of individual who is so detrimental and regardless for communal life. He feels that a self so thoroughly independent rules out any conception of the good in a constructive sense, out any possibility of public life and inter-subject or 'intra subjective' forms of self-understanding (Sandel, 1998, p. 62). Even more, it is liberalism that tends to dissolve traditional human ties and impoverish social and cultural relationships

(MacIntyre, 1994, p. 143). It is understood that liberal individual enters and opts out of the relationships at their own will and to fulfill their own goals and interest. An individual projected as such would not be compatible with specific needs, agendas, and aspirations of a multicultural society. Group identity, cultural membership, and differential rights are crucial for sustainable peace in the state's constituent of diverse cultures and ethnicities.

At a glance, liberal ideas may show disregard towards group or community as against the individual. But the individual does not thrive in a social vacuum. The rights he claims have a social context and are claimed concerning others. The radical liberals may choose to describe society and social groups as abstract objects or theoretical constructions (Hayek, 1955, p. 37-38) Rawls shows his faith in just social institutions. His individual is a free and equal rational being as fully as circumstances permit (Rawls, 1971, p. 561) and allowed the unimpeded pursuit of his path, provided it does not interfere with the right of others. Thus these individuals who have mutual respect and concern for each other which could naturally develop in bonds and associations are social beings. How important social associations or cultural linkages are is hinted at in the principle of distributive justice of Rawls who speaks of the primary goods, among them the fifth is bases of self 'respect'. These bases of self-respect are deeply embedded in cultural contexts. It is proposed that as a historical reservoir culture is an important factor in shaping identity (Pratt, 2005, p. 72). The chief components of identity such as morality, rationale, values, and beliefs are drawn from one's own culture. Culture has a strong influence on an individual's behavioral pattern, choices, and preferences regarding his group associations. Cultural perspective based empirical studies by sociologists and psychologists have shown that culture-centric personal identities have the potential to anchor immigrants during their transition towards society (Schwartz et. al, 2000) because cultural inheritance gives a person a sense of belonging, it is a source of his emotional security and personal strength.

Rawls himself acknowledges the role of culture in his theory when he counts 'bases of self-respect among the primary goods. It seems that his absolute commitment towards equal liberty did not allow him to elaborate upon it. The state may protect an individual's right to equality, provide him an equal opportunity but the bases of self-respect cannot be created by the state or public emphasis. The liberals realized that among factors culture assumes greater importance in multicultural societies, formulation of state policies, and principles of governance. A separate school of thought has emerged labeled as liberal culturalism which is devoted to the cause of cultural protection and raises its voice against "hands-off neutrality" (Carus, 2000) and liberal commitment to impartiality (Young, 1990, p. 37). In liberal democracies, it might be possible to avoid cultural issues and differences and mask them with normalizing policies but in multicultural societies, they are central to any political and social debate. Kahn has developed a theory of "Cultural cognition" to deal with the problem and has come up with the strategy of "Expressive over determination". It is suggested that law should be infused with as many diverse and cultural meanings as it can bear (Ibid, p. 1172). This emphasizes the need for recognition and due allowance to be made for cultures at the state level. It has also been expressed as the value of cultural membership (Kymlicka, 1989) and is strongly advocated that it be treated among the primary goods over which all the citizens have equal rights because it is not just crucial to the pursuit of chosen ends, but also the very sense that we are capable of pursuing them efficiently. (Ibid, p. 176)

Freedom of choice, cultural freedom and integration is always the ultimate goal of multicultural societies. The integrating process could be more effective if a choice of identity and cultural freedom (Sen, 1999) are media part of liberties to which an individual is entitled. Values and beliefs influence an individual's decisions he or she makes in life. Rawls's principle of justice acknowledges this and he claims that we should have the social conditions needed to intelligently decide for ourselves what is valuable in life. If we thought that our goals in life weren't worth pursuing then there would be no

point in our activities (Rawls, 1971, p. 178). It is also agreed by Rawls that these social conditions include the guarantees of personal freedom to make such a choice and because of this, he gives liberty primacy over other material benefits. Rawls's theory also outlines the process of how an individual chooses his values and beliefs and this is important. For making choice we examine definite ideas and forms of life that have been developed and tested by innumerable individuals, sometimes for generations (Rawls, 1971, p. 563-64). So far so good, liberals accepted the role of social condition for enabling an individual to make his choice of values and way of life. More important is the affirmation that though the choice is made by an individual the choices are tested and created by numerous individuals. The range of options is determined by our cultural heritage (Kymlicka, 1989, p. 165).

Liberty vs. Differential Rights

Liberalism, despite valuing the cultural context shows not much concern for cultural membership this is because their principles are located in the ideal of a homogeneous, monocultural society. Not taking into consideration the plurality of cultures in a society, cultural freedom has no real sense and freedom of choice also becomes a one-dimensional option.

Rawlsian liberalism duly acknowledges the role of family and society in shaping a man. According to the principle of individuation that a man's interests, values, and aspirations stem out of his family and society. Liberals miss an important link between family and society that is culture and in multicultural societies, there is a plurality of culture. Even when the role of cultural context is found important in the context of individual liberty and their choice of values and beliefs no legitimacy is granted to unequal division of liberty because to Rawls the system of equal liberties, is absolute (1970, p. 506n). Hence, it has been found incompatible with minority rights by Kymlicka who argues that cultural membership is important for an individual and it should be an important criterion of distributive justice (1989, p.162-63). Charles Taylor the most vocal

critic of 'difference blind liberalism' finds liberal position to be inhospitable to difference. Emphasizing the relationship between self-respect and cultural membership, Kymlicka's strategy proposes that cultural membership be counted among the primary goods whose equal distribution is the basic concern of their liberal theory of justice (1989, p. 166). Though Kymlicka is generous enough to think that this is not a 'formational flaw' in liberalism because Rawls's and Dworkin's theories are based in the milieu of nation-states with a single cultural community in perceptive.

But later liberals, with full cognition of cultural differences, not only stick to their difference blind position but also defend it in various ways. The liberals disagree among themselves about the response of political institutions towards cultural diversity not only traditional culture but all cultures. Still, there is a consensus on the point that public policies should not be designed to meet out special treatment to members of groups based on characters used by their culture as it would be a serious infringement of the principle of equal liberty. They object to the 'culturalization' of principles of liberty and in turn of justice. It is felt that liberal institutions are not safe in the states where maintenance of traditional culture is accepted as part of the political agenda (Brian, 2001, p. 66). Their defense is based upon the liberal conviction that cultures are simply not the entities towards whom rights can properly be ascribed. It is pointed out that "Cultures are not moral entities to which we can owe obligations of fairness (Peter James). Some radical suggestions are put forward by liberals to deal with differences in modern democracies, such as the "Hands off neutrality approach" (Carens, 2000, p. 6). It claims that managing diversity should be neither business nor obligation of the state and it should be as neutral as possible without making any public affirmation of cultural diversity. This view ushers in the debate into a new arena that is culturalism; with a derivation that there should be multiculturalism without cultures" (Phillips, 2007). Liberals also resort to the strategy of harmonizing difference by the assumption that differences do not exist is proposed as a fair way of accommodating them (Berry, 2001, p. 68). This reiterates the difference blind

position of liberals. However, by acknowledging difference with equal rights is not a solution for cultural membership. The liberal notion of equality before the law so far from resting on the assumption that differences do not exist is proposed as the fairest way of accommodating them. (Ibid.)

Liberals making spaces for differences explain that if we seek to deal fairly with cultural diversity, it is not cultures that will be the ultimate objects of our concern but the people who bear them (Peter Jones, in Berry. 2001, p. 57).

Rights and Rightful Bearers

It seems obvious that in the politics of difference the liberal stand is not as against difference but as the demand of the right of representation of culture as to collective rights to be invested into the community. Ultimately it concludes into the rhetoric of individual vs. collective rights and in a broader spectrum, in liberalism vs. communitarianism. Liberals feel that granting collective rights to cultures may disturb the equilibrium of liberty in society and will undermine the autonomy of an individual. From their point of view if cultural survival is elevated to the status of an end itself, the humans bearing them become mere spheres, to be maximized as instruments of a Goal (Berry, 2001, p. 67). The communitarian critiques argue in favor of collectivism by arguing that Rawlsian rules of justice may not be fulfilled in practice in the absence of pre-existing communal solidarity (Santal, 1998) and they believe that liberalism tends to dissolve traditional humanities and impoverish social and cultural relationships (Maclyntre, 1994, p. 143). The communitarian proposition is that social solidarity and mutually concerned relationship are the pre-condition for the implication of Rawlsian justice. Some feel that this communitarian approach demarcates a limited space for justice whereas, they feel justice is important and has to go much beyond the domain of communal affection. It should not be the only but one of the many considerations. It is argued that liberal justice is insufficient because it cannot address legitimate justice-based demands that arise from group-based identity claims.

It seems that communitarian critique of liberalism in the sphere of justice is not that substantive and liberals have been able to counter it effectively by pointing out that though social affection and solidarity are not the thrust of liberal justice but they certainly do not come in the way of it because they say the individual of liberalism is neither atomistic nor asocial. After all, he is rational. Certainly, it is not only for social affection or solidarity that the principle of justice could be tempered with as it has a much wider horizon and implication, multiculturalists need to seek some other grounds to validate their claim for community-based rights and group-based identities.

An interesting criticism of Rawlsian theory of justice is made by sociologist Robert Nozick, which multiculturalism should take not as criticism but as an addendum to the liberal causally based justice. He has proposed the theory of entitlement of just distribution (Nozick, 1974). It is explained in three points, i.e., the principle of justice in acquisition, the principle of justice in transfer, and the principle of justice in the rectification of injustice. Since the entitlement theory has a historical dimension, its third clause becomes very poignant for multicultural societies. Nozick believes that justice should be a pervading phenomenon and the past should also be taken into consideration while meeting out the claims of justice. It is said that if historically reviewed reveals that goods were acquired and transferred to successors legitimately, then the resulting distribution is just if not then unjust, and then it is to be seen whether the injustice, were rectified, if yes then distribution is just if not they unjust. The most striking feature of the theory, in a multicultural context, is that it emphasizes that even if the parties meted out injustice may not be present, as the black slave, their descendants might be compensated. If this distribution of goods is seen not in the material sense but the sense of self-respect, recognition, and representation then its historical review aspect makes it most pertinent for pluralist societies. Multicultural societies are essentially historical formations, as such, broad generalization does not do justification to the people having different cultural and social affiliations.

Cultural Freedom and Identity Construct

This discussion on justice leads to another very relevant issue in the contemporary globalized world in general and multicultural societies in particular, which has often evaded attention or has been rather ignored. This is a choice of identity or cultural freedom. This has been realized not by the ideologues clamoring for the rights of minorities but by the liberals who are supposed to be opposing and curtailing it. Charles Taylor, the most prominent exponent of the defense of difference puts it this way, "If we are concerned with identity, then what is more legitimate than one's aspiration that it never be lost?" (Taylor, 1990). Sandel puts it even more pointedly when he says that "Community describes just what they have as citizens but also what they are (1998, p. 150) that further explains that culture is a constituent of their identity which they discover not choose. This type of cultural enforcement is objected to by the liberals because their stand, as they claim, is not against the objective of cultural loyalties but against coercion of those who do not share the same objective (Berry, 2001, p. 66).

Indeed this aspect of liberty and justice in the specific sense of multicultural societies needs serious deliberation. In this era of globalization when cultural boundaries are blurring fast, social norms are being redefined and ethnic boundaries are becoming porous, keeping people in captivity of culture needs to be questioned in keeping in mind its practical applications in the present scenario. Many of the problems plaguing the contemporary world have their roots in the peculiar situation which youth is faced with. In the name of preservation of culture and distinctiveness, they are pressured to accept involuntary association with the norms, ideas, and a way of life whose rationale they find difficult to comprehend. This leads to deviational behavior, which in turn, leads to loss of identity rather than strengthening the identity. Their day-to-day lives are guided by universally applicable phenomenon such as the use of technology, scientific method, and international dressing, music, and cuisine. Essentializing cultural identities (Waltzer,

2004) results in dichotomizing identities making people more confused than focused, more bewildered than proud.

This essentializing factor in identity formation calls for rethinking and revision to enrich multiculturalism and to create grounds for the proper distribution of liberty and justice. Isaiah Berlin while defining his negative freedom, treats essentializing as coercion and comments "coercion implies the deliberate interference of other human beings within the area in which I could otherwise act (1968, p. 122)". Restriction on fulfillment of chosen ends is seen as putting a constraint on one's freedom. Liberals are opposed to identities, based on culture and social ties as they do not emanate from the voluntary choice of agents (Cohen, 2000, p. 250). The freedom of choice of identity and the voluntarily involved in it assumes greater importance in multicultural societies. It has the potential to resolve many problems related to difference by gradually blunting the sharp edges of cultural divisions. A multicultural society provides an array of choices for individuals what is required is cultural freedom to enable people to make their choices unhindered. If a person embraces an identity with full consciousness and understanding, he can value it more and is more committed to it. The choice of identity should be seen as different from the processes of assimilation and acculturate but rather be seen as shifting involvement (Mirschman, 1982). It is a linear movement that does not entail value judgment on one or the other culture.

The choice of identity may not be mistaken with the post-modernist view of culture, which rests upon the belief that all sorts of boundaries, cultural or others are hampering and are stumbling blocks for the unrestricted growth of humans. They hail transgression of cultural boundaries as a symbol of creativity and progress. The choice of identity does not mean separation or alienation from culture but affiliating to an alternative culture. Berlin has faintly hinted at this idea in his social theory in form of 'alterability and avoidably' of social arrangement (1968, p. 123). Cultural affinity is significant because they provide a sense of rootedness and provide a point of reference

(2006, p. 150). Cultural oscillations in pluralistic societies may not be feared as erosion of culture or effacement of distinctions but could be an enriching experience for cultures. George Kateb has aptly remarked that individualism redefines human bonds; it does not foolishly try to eliminate them (1989, p. 926).

Conclusion

It may be concluded that liberalism as an ideology may be evaluated in two different phases the standard liberalism of Rawls and Dworkin and the Radical liberalism of Hayek and others. Radical liberalism in multicultural states may need much curbing, taming, and trimming to accommodate cultural plurality but this is inherent in the Rawlsian form of liberalism which only requires to be reinterpreted and selective addition and deduction to make it perfectly suitable for multicultural states to protect their social and political peace equilibrium. Complemented with Nozick's entitlement theory with its notion of historical justice will actively do justice to the multicultural society. This type of multiculturalism seems to be a better option as it entails a representational voice of all communities of people. If the liberal principle of autonomy of an individual in choosing his goals is adopted and nurtured in a proper way it could be a much better alternative for assimilation and acculturation which is ambiguously coercive. Because what we need is rights regarding society, not a difference effacing society.

References

- [1] Angela Merkel: *German Multiculturalism has 'utterly failed'*, the guardian.com/world/2010/oct17/angela-merkel-german-multiculturalism-failed
- [2] Barry, B. (2001). *Culture and Equality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [3] Baubock, R. (2002). Farewell to Multiculturalism? Sharing values of identity in societies of immigration. *Journal of International Migration and Immigration*, 3(1), pp. 1-16.

- [4] Baubock, R. (2003) Public culture in societies of immigration. In Faist, Th. & Peters, B. (Eds.) *Identity and Integration. Migrants in Western Europe*. Ashgate: Avebury, pp. 37-57.
- [5] Berlin, I. (1969). *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [6] Barber, B., R. (1996). Multiculturalism between Individuality and community. Chasm or Bridge. In Sarat, A. & Dana R., V. (Eds). *Liberal Modernism and Democratic Individuality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 133-146.
- [7] Carens, J., H. (2000). *Culture, Citizenship, and Community: A Contextual Exploration of Justice as Evenhandedness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Cohen, A.J. (2000). Liberalism, Communitarianism, and Asocialism. *The Journal of Value Inquiry*. 34, (3/4), pp. 249-261.
- [9] Crawley, Heaven (2019). Making Sense of diversity in a "post-multicultural world"; a commentary on Vertovec (2010). *International Social Science Journal*, pp. 227-28.
- [10] Dworkin, R. (1977). *Taking Rights Seriously*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [11] Etzioni, A. (1997). *The Spirit of Community*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- [12] Etzioni, A. (2000). *From Empire to Community: A New Approach to International Relation*. London: Macmillan.
- [13] German Federal Statistical Office (1st October 2010) *Migration and Integration*, http://www.destatis.de/EN/Themes/Society-Environment/Population/Migration-Integration/_note.html
- [14] Hayek, F.A. (1955). *The Counter-Revolution of Science*. London: McMillan.
- [15] Hollinger, D. (2006). *Post-ethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- [16] *Hundreds Protest outside White House over Trump's border wall emergency*, http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2019-02/19/c_1378_32132.htm
- [17] Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and Policy. *British Journal of Sociology*. 55(2), pp. 237-257.

- [18] Kahan, D.M. & Braman, D. (2006). Cultural Cognition and Public Policy. *Yale Law & Policy Review*, Vol. 24, p. 147.
- [19] Kateb, G. (1992). *The Inner Ocean: Individual and Democratic Culture*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- [20] Kymlicka, W. (2010). The Rise and fall of multiculturalism? New debates on inclusion and accommodation in diverse societies. *International Social Science Journal*, 61, pp. 97-112.
- [21] Kymlicka, W. (1989). *Liberalism, Community, and culture*. Sheffield:s Clarendon Press.
- [22] Lee, E. (2019). *America for Americans. A History of Xenophobia in the United States*. New York: Basic Books.
- [23] Maraj, L.M., Prasad, P. & Roundtree, S.V (2019). #BlackLivesMatter: past, present and future. *Prose Studies*, 40, pp. 1-2, 1-14. DOI: 10.1080/01440357.2019.
- [24] MacIntyre, A. (1988). *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* London: Duck Worth.
- [25] Mitchell, T., M., and Lonogres, J.F. (1997). Is Pluralistic Multicultural Approach to Practice Preferable. In Diane de Anda (Ed.) *Controversial Issues in Multiculturalism*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [26] Moore, M. (2009). Liberalism, Communitarians and Politics of Identity. In Christians, T. & Christmas, J. (Eds.). *Contemporary Debates In Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Willey Blackwell, pp. 322-342.
- [27] Nozick, R. (1974), *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- [28] Nye, M. (2001). *Multiculturalism and Minority Religion in Britain*. Richmond: Curzon Press.
- [29] Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism, Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. McMillan International: Basingstoke.
- [30] Pieterse, J.N. (2005). The Human Development Report and Cultural Liberty: Tough Liberalism. *Development and Change*. 36(6), pp. 1267-1273.
- [31] Ramsay, M. (1997). *What's wrong with Liberation*. London: Leicester University Press.

- [32] Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. London: Clarendon Press.
- [33] Rawls, J. (1993). *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- [34] Sandel, M. (1998). *Liberalism and Limits of Justice*. (2ndEd.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [35] Schlesinger, A.M. (1998). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- [36] Schwartz, S., J. Montgomery. & Briones, E. (2006). The Role of Identity in Acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, Empirical Questions, and Applied recommendation, *Human Development*, 49, pp. 1-30.
- [37] Sen, A. (1999). *Reason Before Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [38] Taylor, C. (1990). *Sources of the Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [39] Vertovec, S. (2010). Towards Post-multiculturalism? Changing Community, Conditions, and Contexts of Diversity. *International Social Science Journal*, 61, pp. 83-95.
- [40] Young, I.M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.