International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews

Conceptualizing Contemporary Debate on Multiculturalism

Abinash Darnal

Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal, Rajarammohunpur, Siliguri, Darjeeling 734013, West Bengal, India E-mail: abhinash284@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The last decade of 20th century political theory rests upon the arguments and debate surrounding the two grand schools of thoughts namely, the liberal and the communitarian schools. The underlying principle of both the schools is so noble that there is hardly any such sphere in the society where we do not locate its impact. In this context, its impact on multiculturalism cannot be overlooked. This grand tradition in some way or the other, strives to re-approach the essence of multiculturalism by advancing own level of arguments, best to suit the requirements of the age. The present paper, therefore, attempts to delineate the contemporary theoretical debate on the question concerning multiculturalism, basically focusing on the liberal and communitarian stance on it.

KEYWORDS: Multiculturalism, Liberalism, Communitarianism, Equality, Differences

*Corresponding author:

Abinash Darnal

Research Scholar,

Department of Political Science,

University of North Bengal, Rajarammohunpur,

Siliguri, Darjeeling 734013,

West Bengal, India

E-mail: abhinash284@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The diversities involving race, ethnicity, religion, culture, nationality and gender are so far the prime subject matter of political theory in current epoch. These diversities many times culminate to political struggles. The demand for recognition, accommodation, adjustment, independence and special rights by non-recognized cultural groups are the main foundation of these struggles. The 19th century trend of nation-building, adoption of democratic values and decolonization showed the way for the rise of many new states and the migration of the people from one culture to another. Further the advent of globalization especially in last decade of 20th century has gradually put an end to mono-cultural realm of study.[i]

One of the major issues that dominate the current political discourse is the question concerning the claim of cultural diversity for the moral, legal and political protection which is made in the name of ethnic, religious, linguistic and national alliance.[ii] Such discourses on full of convergence and complexities in the contemporary society has been placed under the political term "*Multiculturalism*". The conventional form of 'citizenship-as-rights' with deep connection to the ideas of national integration has been challenged with the increase attention to cultural pluralism and group-differentiated rights. It is because the modern societies are characterized by the deep diversity and cultural heterogeneity. It is evident that the groups like the blacks, women, indigenous people, ethnic and religious minorities, gays and lesbians are still said to be under the clutch of marginalization and stigmatization, despite possession of common rights, only because of their different socio-cultural identity. Earlier, one would become victim of exclusion, marginalization, silencing and the like, if did not fulfill the so called conditions of normal citizenship. However, people are no longer willing to remain silence in the modern societies, merely because they differ in race, gender, culture, ability and sexual orientation. They have launched a movement with what Iris Marion Young calls of *'differentiated citizenship'* and other inclusive measures which recognizes their difference and identity. This movement have taken different forms, but with similar underlying idea such as, 'politics of difference', 'identity politics', 'politics of recognition' and 'multiculturalism'.[iii]

In conceptualizing multiculturalism, it is fundamental to understand the term 'culture'. The theorists of multiculturalism have assigned different meanings to culture and that in turn has placed the dynamic content of theory of multiculturalism. According to Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy, culture is "the way of life of the people, including their attitudes, beliefs, arts, science, modes of perception and the habit of their thoughts and activities. It means culture deals with how the people think and act in that light. The same notion of importance of culture in multiculturalism is defended

by Will Kymlicka as "well-integrated, well-bounded and largely self-generated entities, defined by a set of key attributes including a shared language, history and values".[iv] However, for multiculturalists' like Bikhu Parekh, culture is different from what has been advocated by Kymlicka. Parekh in his 'Rethinking Multiculturalism' viewed every culture as internally plural and reflects a continuing conversation between its different traditions and strands of thought. It grows out of conscious and unconscious interactions with each other. Hence, cultures are not the achievement of relevant communities alone, but also others who shapes their context to some of their belief and practices. So, for him, all cultures are multiculturally constituted.[v] Consequently, this underlying idea forms the basis for the mounting of multicultural outlook in modern social and political discourses.

2. EVOLUTION

The term 'multiculturalism' came into practice for the first time in Canada during 1960s and 1970s in order to describe the state policy towards the ethnic minorities. The expression entered the American and British discourses during 1980s and later adopted by Germany and France. The demand for political recognition by the cultural groups attracted largely, the anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists and philosophers respectively with their concerns for ethnicity as the cultural issue, group relationship and the question of justice and equality. The presence of such diverse literature has made the understanding of multiculturalism difficult, though not impossible. Keeping this in view, the contemporary debates on multiculturalism and identity politics mainly focus on how political theorist have theorized it, what are the founding principles of multiculturalism and whether it is an ideology or an outlook, and what are the challenges .[vi]

It has been argued that the first systematic theory of multiculturalism is developed by Will Kymlicka in his two major works: *Multicultural Citizenship (1955)* and *Liberalism, Community and Culture (1989)*.[vii] So far as the evolution of multiculturalism is concerned, Kymlicka identifies three waves. The first wave concerns the right-based theories of justice centering on the individual rights forwarded by political philosophers like John Rawls, Robert Nozick and Dworkin. In second wave these theories are challenged by communitarians like Michael Sandel, Walzer and Alasdair McIntyre in the 1980s and in the third wave during 1990s which is the decade of pluralism with its claim for the 'politics of difference' and multiculturalism, these pluralist theories have challenged the underlying assumption of liberalism and communitarianism.[viii]

Since many claims of multiculturalists position for the group rights appears to be coterminous with the liberal principles of individual autonomy and social equality, Kymlicka considers multiculturalism as an offshoot of liberalism. Kukathas has rightly maintained the core meaning of

multicultural movement claiming it as a rejection of any form of assimilation like 'melting pot', where minority must confirm to the dominated culture. Rather, its position is like a 'salad bowl', where each ethnic minority can maintain their distinctiveness.[ix]

Since the emergence of Multiculturalism as a new conception in political discourses, academicians have tried to look it from different positions. Projecting this, the present paper is an attempt to interrogate two grand, liberal and communitarian debate on Multiculturalism.

3. LIBERAL-COMMUNITARIAN STANCE ON MULTICULTURALISM

The two prominent types of liberalism on the basis of its preferences are labeled with liberal-orthodox concerns of Locke and liberal egalitarian of Rousseau. The former focuses on danger to liberty that come from the state power and thus advocates minimal role of the government. It insists that the state in liberal society can only interfere with the law that controls or harm others liberty. Any broader role of the state threatens people's freedom that may hinder the people's life and choices.

However, this very idea of liberals were threatened by the left- American, French and English liberals, whose basic assumptions were based on the idea that was first put forward by Rousseau. These philosophers include Rawls, Dworkin and T. H. Green, who argued that danger to liberty, comes from a society that is distributively unjust and unequal thus, those who were oppressed by poverty cannot be said to be free. The remedy for them lies not in the limited but an active role of the state that implements the will of the people who own it and which strives to end poverty and secures equal opportunities for all. Such society ensures that the people who develop within it have authentic preferences, whose satisfaction will realize their autonomy and creates not only democratic polity but a democratic social culture too.[x]

Since the 1980s, the new wave has emerged in the history of socio-political discourse, with the political theorist starting to criticize not only the liberal views but the entire liberal folks for being concerned with and only for the individuals. While the liberals encourages that each person is the self entity who can define and seek their own 'good' and choice within a political structure that defines what is 'right', the communitarians on the other side, advocates for the importance of a political structure for defining both what is 'right' and 'good' and for assisting the people to seek 'good' in that political structure.[xi] This is a new development that has been witnessed in the late twentieth century in a form of movement against liberalism's firm attachment to atomistic individualism. Communitarianism took a task of instilling the value of community and cohesion against the onslaught of relentless and possessive individualism. The four philosophers and their successive publications such as, Alasdair McIntyre's book *'After Virtue' (1981),* Michael Sandel's

'Liberalism and the Limits of Justice' (1982), Michael Walzer's *'Spheres of Justice' (1983),* and Charles Taylor's *'Philosophical Papers' (1985),* are noticeable for the emergence of this philosophical communitarian movement in social and political theory.[xii]

4. LIBERALS ON MULTICULTURALISM

Will Kymlicka is staunch adherent of the liberal multiculturalism. His interest in this area is influenced by the dissatisfaction of post-war liberals' assumption of provision of basic individual rights as a means to solve the problems of national minorities. According to him, the provision of human rights is unable to resolve the important questions of cultural minorities like language issues, whether the ethnic groups have a facility of educational institutions in their mother tongue or not, whether to reserve a homeland of indigenous people for their advantage or not, matter relating to what degree of cultural integration requires for those immigrants who were looking for citizenship. Unless these matters are supplemented by a theory of minority rights, the theory of human rights cannot address the most significant and the confronting issues of autonomy, language and naturalization. So that, it is a great blunder to keep minority rights under it. Hence his concern is to develop a liberal theory of minority rights that justifies 'how minority rights coexist with human rights and how minority rights are limited by principles of individual liberty, democracy, and social justice'.

The very contention of Kymlicka's theory of multiculturalism is the sketch of nationalism or liberal nationalism that he put forward. As per his views, the liberal tradition believes that the world is made up of separate states and this state has a history of recognizing the group differentiated rights. His account of this group differentiated rights has two dimensions. One is national minorities whose earlier self-governing, territorially concentrated cultures have been incorporated into larger state, such as American Indians and aboriginal communities in Canada. Other is the ethnic minorities who have immigrated to new society and are not interested to govern but wish to hold their ethnic identities and traditions.

Kymlicka distinguishes three types of minority or group differentiated rights: the first is self-government rights, polyethnic rights and the special representation rights. A self-government right means the allocation of power to the national minorities such as the indigenous people, and not for other cultural minorities who were immigrants to the country. These cultural minorities are however entitled with the polyethnic rights that provide financial and legal protection to them. The third variation is that, both the indigenous people and the immigrant minorities may be eligible for special representation rights that provide a scope for the minorities on the state bodies or institutions.[xiii]

The drive of liberal theory of multiculturalism is so far controversial. The controversies are not between who supports and does not support polarized liberal and the communitarian thesis. However, it is the debate among the liberals about the true meaning of liberalism. The debates revolves around the individual claim of liberalism, that endorses the basic liberal-democratic accord, but oppose the role of language, nationality and ethnic identities in the liberal-democratic societies and institutions and the groups claim of liberalism, that insist for public recognition and viewed the importance of the minority language, practices, identities and individual autonomy as necessary and consistent to the basic principles of liberal-democratic societies.[xiv]

Joseph Raz, next to the Kymlicka is the protagonist of group rights. Raz in his two important works: *The Morality of Freedom (1986)* and the *Public Domain: Essays in the Morality of Law and Politics (1994)* argues that the state should protect the cultural identity on the basis of moral pluralism. This will provide more choices to individuals and the enhancement of human potentialities. He asserts for the neutral role of state saying, "it is the goal of all political action to enable the individual to pursue valid conceptions of the good and to discourage evil or empty ones". Since a cultural group has a tendency to offer self-respect and a sense of dignity, the state should protect cultural group rights, if it is liberal. However, if the cultural group is illiberal, the state should not tolerate it, because it brings hurdle to the individual choices.[xv] It is evident from the fact that some forms of minority rights undermine individual autonomy rather than supporting it. It is found particularly in some conservative ethno-religious groups that demand the right to restrict freedom of its own members. For instance, an immigrant group might want to continue their traditional custom like arranged marriages, maintain traditional rules of divorce which hinders the women's freedom of choice. This results to the question of gender and sexuality. This very notion of illiberal customs are under the fire from feminists, who defines multiculturalism as a means of giving more power to the male members to have control over the women in the group, so that to maintain the traditional thesis of gender inequality. Kymlicka offers the duty for the liberal multiculturalists to discern the 'bad' minority rights that restricts individual rights, from the 'good' minority rights that can be seen as supplementing individual rights. In this regard, he proposes two kinds of rights that minority group may claim. The first is the right of the groups against its own members in order to protect the group from the inhuman impact of traditional norms and practices what he termed as *'internal protections'*. The second is the right of the group against the larger society to protect the group from the impact of external pressures like the economic and political decisions of the larger society, which he calls *'external protections'*. This entails, only some of the minority rights enhances the liberal values not all.[xvi]

However, Chandran Kukathas has three direct confrontations against the Kymlicka's liberal multiculturalists position. In his first objection, it is found that 'group rights could not be defended successfully from the standpoint of liberal equality. The reason is that groups are not made up of equal persons and not all members of a group are unequal to all those outside it'. His second objection is against the Kymlicka's suggestion of cultural minorities having different basic rights. For Kukathas, there are some basic rights from which the specific rights are derived and these basic rights should be the same for all people. Hence, Kymlicka's position is invalid. His third confrontation emerged from their two different view of liberalism. Liberal society for Kymlicka is one in which equality and individual autonomy are taken into accounted and in contrast, for Kukathas, liberal society means a 'society in which different ways of life can coexist, even if some of those ways of life do not value equality and autonomy'.[xvii]

5. LIBERAL EGALITARIAN CRITIQUE OF MULTICULTURALISM

The differences can be seen among the liberals in understanding the meaning of multiculturalism. Same is evident from the view of Brian Barry, a liberal egalitarian critic of multiculturalism. Barry, in his book *'Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism'* covered the larger section in critiquing the vision of multiculturalism. His main target against multiculturalists is the way they use the culture. For him, multiculturalism abuses the use of culture. Barry raises an objection for recognizing the value of culture, because culture many times justifies the inhuman and unjust historical practices, such as slavery, human slaughtering in the context of Orthodox Jews culture, animal sacrifices and old traditional superstitious customs.[xviii]

Barry is the staunch critic of the diversity-promoting camp of liberalism. He is the proponent figure of 'Enlightenment liberalism', which emphasizes the importance of individual autonomy and for him multiculturalism is inconsistent with such liberal values. He is against underlying principles of 'Reformation liberalism', which values the diversity and the importance of differences among the individuals and groups as the emblem of the worth life. Barry is against the three major arguments of Reformation liberalism. To the first argument that liberal theory values respect for the persons and this means the respect for the cultures in which one belongs, Barry in contrast argues that the illiberal culture many times violates the requirement of equal treatment and respect. His *second* objection is against the notion that liberalism values diversity by increasing the level of alternatives to individual choices. Here Barry responds that a liberal gives more priority to individuality rather than diversity. The *third* argument of Reformist is that liberalism attaches greater importance to the public and private division and committed to lesser intervention in the private domain of individual. Barry

reacted, since the inception; liberalism is against the parental authority and parental sanctity. It is committed to protect individuals from the groups to which they belong.[xix]

Conversely, Barry's entire criticism against multiculturalism was labeled as controversial by James Tully. Barry argued that the idea of recognition overlook the issues of distribution. Concentration on the question of recognition undermines the cohesion which is fundamental for the struggle of redistribution. The minorities are the sufferer of marginalization, misrecognition, exclusion, and dispossession, loss of community control, ethnic cleansing, direct and indirect discrimination, and unreasonable assimilation as because of their low social and economic conditions. In reply, Tully argues that these are the cases that multiculturalists are taking into consideration and brought into the wider focus of audience. The members of the minorities are struggling for the equal social and economic treatment but not in the cost of their identity related differences that are critical for them. Or if they would not do so, minorities have to surrender their identity issues with the triumph of majority identity imposing over them in the name of national identity. The struggle that the multiculturalists are confronting covers both the issue of recognition and distribution question, because these two are interrelated to each other. They are working to build up a way out through which both of the recognition and the distribution related issues get justice. Similarly, Barry labeled liberals and non-liberal multiculturalists like, Rawls, Taylor and James Tully as 'anti- Enlightenment' defenders of particularism and relativism, whereas himself as a defender of universalism and non-relativism. The very idea has misrepresented the whole corresponding approaches by understanding the freedom of individual expression, the linguistic rights, religious and ethnic minorities, the right of self-determination as the universal and non-relative as a civil and political rights of first and social and economic rights of second-generation human rights and also the third-generation cultural rights as the universal rights to protect minorities from the tyranny of democratic majorities is Enlightment foundation. Tully blamed that, Barry has mistaken by not studying equality and culture together which end result is controversial.[xx]

6. COMMUNITARIANS ON MULTICULTURALISM

The last decade of 20th century political theory rests upon the arguments and debate surrounding the two grand liberal-communitarian schools of thought. Central to their debate revolves around the question of individual freedom and the states' responsibility. For liberals, individual should be free to choose their own way of life and should be free from the any of inherited status. Liberal insists that the individual is prior to the community. It is because for them, community matters only when it works for the well being of the individuals who compose it. The community is

no longer allowed to preserve those practices, if individuals of the community find no worthy in maintaining the existing cultural practices.

Communitarians are strictly against the liberal idea of 'autonomous individual'. Rather they view people as 'embedded' in the social relationships. The embedded selves do not decide their own way of life but inherit a way of life which defines their good. They viewed individuals as a product of social practices, rather than viewing group practices as the product of individual choices. One cannot find their worth detached from the community life. It is untenable to sacrifice the interest of community over the interests of its individual. In response, communitarians maintained that, a well structured community can maintain a balance between the individual choices and communal way of life. Hence, the liberal who cherishes individual autonomy is opposed to multiculturalism and has no place in multicultural school. Communitarians viewed multiculturalism as a proper means to protect communities from the influence of liberal individualists. The defenders of minority rights were in agreement that the liberals' commitment to moral individualism and individual self-sufficiency are inconsistent with the very foundation of multiculturalism. The liberal conception of self is dangerous for both the majorities as well as minorities. It is evident that, the evolution of communitarianism itself shapes the way for the form of multiculturalism. It is because of this, the defenders of multiculturalism school accept communitarianism as a potential philosophical foundation for minority rights.[xxi]

7. CRITIQUE OF LIBERAL MULTICULTURALISM

Generally, communitarianism evolves as a movement against liberals' overview. Jean Hampton in his book *"Liberalism, Communitarianism and Postliberal Theory*", explained five areas where the communitarians have disagreements with the liberals. While the liberals give importance to the political values such as freedom and equality, the communitarians give importance to the *'value of community'*. Secondly, liberals are committed to the idea of limited role of the state in the individual choices and limit its responsibility to enhance the freedom and equality of the people. In contrast, communitarians believe that the fundamental function of the state is to ensure the good health and well-being of the community life that may nourish the human perfection. Thirdly, communitarian ridicules the liberal's notion of autonomous individual who are independent of the cultural traditions and social roles. In response, communitarian believes that, for the good of the humanity, the state must apply its authority to encourage wellbeing of cultural traditions. Fourthly, if one society is to be legitimate, that political society must be justified to the individuals who live within it. However, communitarian finds state to be responsive and justifiable not to the individual citizens but to the society as a whole of which they are the constituents. Lastly, communitarian has

an objection for placing excessive importance to the role of *reason* as a tool of governing in the liberal state. They accused liberal's reliance on reason as insignificant for the human life, because the conception of reason is disconnected from the social traditions, goals, aspirations and belief system of socially embedded people. The conception of good life and social harmony comes through the discourse that is attached to the social practices which is nurtured by the culture of the community.[xxii] In this backdrop, this paper entails to delineate the position of liberals and communitarians in the question of multiculturalism.

Charles Taylor, in his book *'Politics of Recognition' (1994),* fired the theory of liberal multiculturalism. For him, liberalism is incompetent in giving required recognition to the cultures. It recognizes individual as the possessor and bearer of same and equal rights and dignity as equal citizens. But what makes cultural groups indifferent to this liberal notion is that they want recognition not of their sameness and similarities but for their distinctiveness. This leads to the growth of *politics of difference*, as a new philosophical alternative to liberalism.

Taylor rejected Kymlicka's effort of granting differential rights for the individuals for enabling them to pursue their cultural ends. This notion of scheme is good for only those who were compelled to remain under the pressure of dominant culture, and has no use for the future generation of cultural groups.[xxiii]

Liberalisms neutral assumption is simply a reflection of the interest of dominant culture. Pointing to its neutrality stand, Taylor argued that government have an active role to play both in recognizing the values of various cultural traditions within the society and in formulating the policies like language laws, system of education that help to preserve and strengthen their cultures. For instance, if government overlooked the education of the children, then the situation would arise in which the dominant culture would be controlling on what is to be taught to all the children. Hence for communitarians, a just society ought to be concerned to create and enforce policies that allow members of all cultural communities to feel at home in that society. To make one to feel in that way, the state must recognize that the people are culturally different and develop legal policies that give respect for those cultural differences.[xxiv]

The central issue that dominated the debate between liberalism and the communitarianism is the question of 'self' which has deep connection over almost other issues too. The conception of self as an abstract individual, unattached and unencumbered to the surroundings is under the severe criticism from the communitarians. Michael Sandel in his *'Liberalism and the Limits of Justice' (1982),* covers the wide part concerning the problem of construction of *self* by the liberals. Sandel argues, community and the surrounding are the constituent element of the self and one cannot be

worth from its detachment. For him, community is not just a group of people in which they are the citizens but rather community shows what they are and their relationship to other members of the community.

Communitarians' accepts *self* as dependent to the community, tradition and culture. In the word of Alasdair McIntyre, self's who are separated from the polis are not human being, but wild animal as man is a man only because of his social connections. Taylor also believes in a similar view and advocates that self cannot be self without reference to those who surrounds it. The realization of being a member of particular identity is not possible without family, city, people, nation and party. One needs to play those roles that purports for the good of community.

Referring to the Rawlsian *original position,* Sandel accuses Rawls for manufacturing the unencumbered self or the detach self. Rawls provides the list of the things from which one should detach in the original position such as ones place in the society, class, status, fortune, abilities, intelligence, strength, conception of good, economic position and others. Sandel blamed Rawls for attempting to construct man of rootless origin. If we try to detach or free ourselves from the social role than one may lose their identity of being the member of a family, community, state etc. For communitarians, this view of abstract and unencumbered individual is neither possible nor desirable for good life.[xxv] In the words of Jean Hampton, Sandel is struck by the disconnected, disembodied nature of people in the original position. Rawls and many other liberals in the past have understand human beings as independently of all desires, activities, ideas, roles and pursuits which are the major constituent of human lives in an actual society.[xxvi] Rather this assumption of liberal gives birth to mono-cultural society and discredit the notion of multiculturalism.

Michael Sandel's another objection to the liberals is their *'priority of right over the good'.* This conception is concerned with the right and freedom of choice to the individual underestimating the own value for the society as a whole. For him, individual right has its worthiness only when it serves a good purpose for the whole society. The value of good should be prior to the right. However, priority of individual rights over the good is purporting to sacrifice the general societal good. Liberals whole defense of rights priority devalued the purpose for which the rights are entitled. Rather it tries to give more emphasis on means than the ends. This teleological explanation of rights is hostile to Sandel's conception of good over the right.[xxvii]

The idea of independent self interest liberal individual is countered also by another communitarian thinker, Alasdair McIntyre. He argued that individual flourish only by the 'practices' that helps them to develop themselves in the perfection of virtues. It is the form of socially established cooperative human activity, through which internal social capital of the individual get

enhanced and nourished to help the human power to achieve Excellency. Thus, it is the role of the state to develop and protect those practices that encourages the human excellence. For McIntyre, the liberal notion of autonomous, socially disconnected beings would result into social disintegration. To him, only the practices of social significance can help a being to be worthy. Hence, as the name itself suggests, the communitarians are more concerned with community and its different values. Individual can develop their identity, talents and pursuits in life only by being the constituent of certain community.[xxviii]

Similarly, Michael Walzer targeted the methodology employed by the liberals for the issue concerning distributive justice. He is against the distribution of social goods to all by not considering the value and importance of those goods for particular group and culture. Such social goods for Walzer are security and welfare, money and commodities, offices, hard work, free time, education, love and kinship, recognition, political power and many others. The universal meaning of social goods is not of any use. Hence, Walzer's approach is *particularist/ particularistic* instead of *Universalist /universalistic.* For him, 'different social goods ought to be distributed for different reasons, in accordance with different procedures, by different agents and all these differences is derived from different understandings of the social goods themselves- the inevitable product of historical and cultural particularism'. It is because, goods before being distributed, needs to be created and conceived with different conception like, naming of the goods and giving a meaning. By this, Walzer wants to shift attention towards creation and conception from distribution. According to him, each community creates its own social goods that differ from society to society. He rejects the idea of single meaning of 'primary goods' which are applicable to all moral and material worlds. By citing the example of food, he argued that even the food has different meanings in different societies. For some, bread is the staff of life, for some the body of Christ, the symbol of Sabbath, the means of hospitality and so on. The meaning and the value of different goods differ from culture to culture.[xxix]

8. CONCLUSION

Beyond liberal-communitarian debate, there are manifold other such level of discourses on multiculturalism, with varying degree of understanding and approaches. The paper makes an attempt to establish that even within the same tradition and position; there lie a frequent agreement and disagreement, however, not undermining the significance of the concept. It implies that though they vary among themselves in the approach of understanding the true meaning of multiculturalism, they establish its importance in the social facet considering the need of their respective time.

In due courses, multiculturalism achieves significance of movement with different forms but with similar fundamental ideas such as, 'politics of difference', 'identity politics', 'politics of

recognition' and the like. This argument in the contemporary period, therefore, tries to institute the importance of multi-culture centric discussions, with whatsoever differences they have in their approaches.

REFERENCES

1. Deshpande M, Vinod, M.J. Contemporary Political Theory: Multicultualism. Delhi: Phi Learning Pvt. Ltd; 2013.

2. Kymlicka W. Nationalism and Multiculturalism. In G. Gaus & C. Kukathas, eds. Handbook of Political Theory. New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications Ltd; 2004.

3. Kymlicka W. Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction: Multiculturalism. UK: Oxford University Press, 2001;327-329.

4. Op.cit. 1

5. Parekh B. (n.d.). What is Multiculturalism? Retrieved from //www.india.seminar.com. Assessed October 9,2018.

6. Op.cit.4: 361-363

7. Op.cit:2

8. Kymlicka W. *Interpreting Group Rights: The Good Society.* Spring; 1996.

9. Op.Cit:5

10. Hampton J. Political Philosophy: Nationalism, Citizenship and Culture. Delhi: Oxford University Press; 1998.

11. Hampton J. Political Philosophy: Liberalism, Communitarianism and Postliberal Theory. Delhi: Oxford University Press. 1998; 182.

12. Dagger R. Communitrianism and Republicanism. In G. F. Kukathas, Handbook of Political Theory. New Delhi: SAGE Publications. 2001; 171.

13. Op.cit.2; 251-252.

14. Op.Cit.3; 338-339.

15. Op.Cit.1; 366-367.

16. Op.Cit.13; 341-343.

17. Op.Cit.15; 368.

18. Ferrelly C. Introduction to Contemporary Political Theory: Multiculturalism. Delhi: SAGE Publications Ltd. 2001; 131-132.

19. Op.Cit.2; 257.

20. Tully J. The Illiberal Liberal: Brian Barry's Polemical Attack on Multiculturalism. In P. Kelly, Multiculturalism Reconsidered. Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc. 2001; 105-111.

21. Op.Cit.14; 336-337

22. Op.Cit.11; 784-785

23. Op.Cit.2; 225

24. Op.Cit.10

25. Op.Cit.1; 256-258

26. Op.Cit.10, 183

27. Op.Cit.1; 259-260

28. Op.Cit.10; 182-183

29. Ferrelly C. Introduction to Contemporary Political Theory: Communitarianism. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd; 2001.