CHAPTER – IV

COMMUNITARIAN OBJECTION AGAINST RAWLS’ LIBERAL SOCIETY

Introduction

The present chapter is basically concerned with the debate between communitarianism and liberalism with respect of individual rights and social justice. Its aim is to highlight the individual rights (both in public as well as in private life) protected by social justice. Although both the communitarianism and liberalism try to uphold the individual rights but their ways of approach are completely different from each other. On one hand communitarian believes that individual can enjoy his/her rights only insofar as he/she delivers the duties and responsibilities towards the state. Community welfare is the prime concern of the above group which cannot be neglected. Whereas liberalism believes that individual cannot sacrifice his/her rights for the good of the community. It is something against the spirit of humanity which cannot be promoted. As a rational being he/she cannot be treated as a mere means for the sake of others end. Communitarian has born certain resemblance with utilitarianism with regards to community welfare. Because both the group believes that individual has to sacrifice his/her particular interest for the attainment of greater good. Liberalism completely disagrees with this view and it gives special privileges to individual dignity. For them right is something natural to human beings and violation of human rights is not justified. But the problem with liberalism is that it neglects the whole community for the development of individual life and their responsibility towards the institutions of communities (family, society, country). Similarly communitarianism also neglects the rights of individual and overemphasizes the
growth of community. The gulf between these two groups remains unsolved because each one sticks to their own view and ignores the importance of others. Citizenship theory is the wise solution of the above problems which bridges the gap between these two groups. It acts as a mediator which looks after both the individual rights as well as community welfare. Citizenship theory believes that proper growth of the individual can only be conceived in the community which provides both the civic rights to individual and in return individual actively participates in societal activities and brings reformation wherever it is necessary. Before speaking more on citizenship theory which unites these two groups (communitarianism and liberalism), it is pertinent to present each one’s view separately. Let us start with communitarians views and discuss their criticisms against liberalism.

4.1 Communitarianism: Old and New

Communitarianism is derived from the term ‘community’ which refers to person with respect to social bonding and cultural tradition. For them individual existence cannot be conceived apart from society and he can realize their inner talents only with involvement of others. It severely criticizes the supremacy of individual autonomy and advocates the value of community. The purpose of communitarianism is to realize the individual that its all-round development can only be possible through sharing activities rather than in a solitary life. We can say the communitarianism finds its root from the defects of liberalism. Liberalism basically involves with two serious criticisms, namely, priority right and neutrality. Liberal thinkers like Kant and Rawls are very much strict towards the priority of individual right and they believe that it cannot be neglected for the sake of any mere good. The violation of human right means the denial of human dignity, so it cannot be promoted. Unlike liberalisms, communitarians argue it is the responsibility of the individual to work for the betterment of
society and it can be attained when each one works together as a part of the community. In return community should take care of their needs but it never promotes the idea of particular self-satisfaction like liberal thinkers.

Communitarianism is a wider concept and we can find many interpretations from the various thinkers. It is not possible to include the ideas of all, so in order to make it more precise presenting the views of those thinkers which is relevant to the above discussion. It will be a wise decision to start with Greek philosopher Aristotle whose writing (Ethics and Politics) was very much influenced by it. In *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle mentions that end of all human actions are to achieve happiness. Happiness cannot be pursued for the sake of any other end, it is an end in itself. But due to ignorance some time we consider pleasure as happiness which is momentary in nature. The true meaning of happiness can be realized only when individual comes out of the material enjoyment and develops his virtuous capacities. He mentions that in the Greek city state each citizen has to maintain a close relationship with fellow mate that means they help each other to fulfill their own aim. The prime aim of this union is to attain community good which can be possible where each member of the community is able to achieve their goals. Growth and reproduction are the common elements which individual shares with lower creature, but the presence of reason in human being gives him a higher status of virtuous citizen of the society.

We can find the similar discussion in the *Politics* also, where Aristotle describes the duties of virtuous citizen. As a member of community, he has to take part in every activity which will be beneficial to the community. It is impossible to vest all the duties on one shoulder, so duties are divided according to their abilities. Liberation of the community depends upon the abilities and efficiencies of citizens. It is the demand of the society to
develop the virtuous capacities so that the aim of society can be easily achieved. Capacities of individual vary from each other, so the duty of society is to respect each one’s capacities and mould it accordingly. Take the example of master and salve; ruler occupies a higher position due to its intellectual insight whereas slave possesses a lower status. Both the master and the salve depend upon each other for the fulfillment of their needs. Slave does all the physical work for the master, so that the master enjoys his status; likewise master provides him all the basic amenities so that the slave leads his life happily. Aristotle always believes that each work should be respected and the ruler should be well versed in all kinds of work. In the words of Aristotle, “Like other degree, ruler should learn the art of obeying because he who has never learned to obey cannot be a good commander.”

It is true up to some extent that qualities like endurance, honesty, truthfulness are the essential qualities in order to become a ruler. It happens only in a rare situation, where the ruler obeys others view not because he is weak or incapable but because he gives chance to others so present their ideas. Now the question comes what is the criterion for distributing power? The most appropriate and closest answer seems to be power, merit or freedom. But individually it creates a dangerous situation to the state where some will prosper where rest of them suffers a lot. Judicial function is the only solution of the above problem. The significance of election can be realized if it goes to the hands of efficient person who has deep knowledge in it and who works for the welfare of the community. In order to avoid a difficult situation Aristotle introduces a unique method which will bring safety and security to individual freedom and growth of society. In order to vindicate his statement he provides some of the best examples which will provide the usefulness of the community. For example, the guest of the function will give better remark about the quality and taste of the food rather

---

than cook. Thus, the motto of Aristotle philosophy is to work as a community. Community not only helps individual to be free from burdens but also be able to get perfections. It is not possible for individual to expert in all the works but when their particular efficiency united then the good of the community is possible.

In a similar fashion Rousseau, the social contract theorist conceives of a contract which is possible only with presence of whole community rather than single individual. It is the community which helps the individual to build their own identity and at the same he can claim his rights only insofar as he delivers their responsibilities in a proper way. But all this can be possible if he renounce all of his rights to the governing body which takes the decision for the betterment of community. Individual is not complete in itself, so he has to depend upon others for the sake of his self-preservation which will provide safety and security to his life as well as properties. Rousseau is always trying to form a social organization which binds all the people into one unit, so that they can forget their own self-interest and work for the good of the community. Each individual’s freedom and strength are considered as the main pillar of the union which aim is to maintain stability and orderliness. Like every principle has certain rules, contact also follows the same order. Here the rule is equally applicable to all of it members, so there is no chance of superiority or inferiority. The essence of contract is that we have to renounce all our rights to the sovereign authority who will take all the decisions for the benefits of their subjects. Rousseau argues that man can more in a communal life rather than a solitary life. The famous assertion of Rousseau suggests that although individual is born as a free being but the responsibilities of society has limited his surroundings where he never seeks his own self-interest. As a citizen of community he should takes care of the need of others that means basically a reciprocal relation which is necessary for the growth of community. Individual’s growth can only be conceived with the presence of community
where he gets proper scope to develop his talents. Apart from community individual is a stupid being that lacks the imaginative attitude which is harmful both for community as well as for individual. Society is the measuring scale of individual talents whose job is to find out the noble beings. The general will of Rousseau represents a unique model of community whose sole interest is to attain collective good. Sometimes people are unable to differentiate between general will and will of all because both are looking similar. But there is huge difference between the two, general will defines the will of universal members, whereas will of all is concerned with the will of a particular individual. Civil liberties are the possession of active members of the society who stayed in a communal life and work for its betterment.

In the nineteenth century Hegel also abandoned the view of classical liberals’ (Locke and Kant) approach of pre-social being whose claim is prior to the social good. He never supports the idea of forming a voluntary contract which individual makes according to his convenience. Individual for him is a socially embedded being and he is trying to place him within certain historical tradition where he can minimize his needs according to the demands of community by adopting self-reflective method. Individual finds his personal fulfillment within the realm of social practices where he can share mutual relationship with others. Hegel always believes that liberal values like freedom of conscience, equal opportunities and individual rights cannot be neglected but its true meaning can be realized within the community. Denying the negative liberty which is free from coercion and compulsion, Hegel promotes positive liberty. He believes real meaning of freedom which can be attained if it is mixed with individual responsibilities towards the development of community. Hegelian Moralitat (Morality) portrays the abstraction of individual being from the society and gives special privileges to individual good over community interest. Ethical life (Sittlichkit) is the synthesis of community welfare and individual goods. Unlike morality, ethical life gives
priority to community but at the same time maintains a balance in between them. Being a part of community individual can gain their own identity and develops his own self-reflection capacities.

Hegel in his book *Philosophy of Rights* mentions three forms of rights, namely, abstract right, morality and ethical life. Individual rights and duties are discussed separately from state and society in both the spheres (abstract right and morality). But in the sphere of ethical life the separation is transformed into a mutual relationship between individual and state. Like Aristotle, He believes that there is a part whole relationship between individual and state. For him state is a whole which is prior to individual interest and individual can gain their own identity being a part of whole. The so called part-whole relationship is complementary to each other, that existence of one cannot be conceived without the presence of the other. Thus he says “if individual find their self-consciousness and self-identity in the community, the ideals of community are also actualized only through the action and inner disposition of specific individuals.”² He always takes society as an organism of which individual is a part but individual cannot be treated as a mere means for the betterment of the community rather they are the end in themselves and also the end of social organisms.

New communitarianism highlights the importance of shared practices and understanding which is necessary for the growth of every society. Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, and Michael Sandel are coming under the group of new communitarianism; each one tries to refute the idea of liberal individualism and promotes the value of community in their own way. Communitarianism mostly attacks Rawls’ theory of justice which they think is too abstract in nature because it absolutely neglects the role of community for the development of human being. Sandel explicates two types of primacy given by deontological
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liberalism, namely-moral primacy and foundation primacy. Moral primacy asserts that sacrificing individual rights for the fulfillment of political and social good cannot be justified. Foundational primacy suggests that individual occupies a privileged position by virtue of being human. Priority of individual rights is not bounded by any social good rather its principles are independently derived. Coercive impositions destroy the purpose of work because the people who are involved in it show lack of interest in it. It is unjust to force someone to contribute his labour for the social welfare without his interest.

Rawls is following the foot step of predecessor Kant, for whom individual rights are categorically prior to social good. Individual possesses a unique capacity of free will which helps him to take the decision freely. It not only differentiates human being from lower creature but also provides dignity to the individual as a self-reflecting being. Deontologist claims that individual is not simply a purposive being whose aim is to attain the end rather its self-reflective capacity presupposed that end. About foundational primacy to justice, Rawls says that “we should therefore reverse the relation between the right and the good proposed by teleological doctrines and view the right as prior.”\(^3\) Thus, he states that as an autonomous being, individual has all the rights to decide his goal which is not supposed to be guided by social norms and society is to be structured in such a way so that he can easily fulfill his aim.

Alasdair MacIntyre strongly criticizes liberal approach of antecedently individual self which is free from social boundaries and acknowledges the role of tradition and social practices. Tradition plays a vital role in the all-round development of individual being where he is able to realize the true meaning of his life. Within the part of society and accepting its principles we can rectify our activities which are far better than solitary life. Our life is

collection of narratives where we have played several roles according to the demands of the characters. Narrative is a set of stories which we have collected from various cultural groups, scriptures of a different tradition that defines the character of particular individual. Within the tradition we can find out two types of narratives that individual’s own way of presenting his characters in his life and other ways describing charters that he played in his life. Social practices purify our actions and help us to attain good life which demands to practise the characters suggested by tradition for the welfare of the whole community. Good life in the words of MacIntyre: “the good life consists of attaining the goods that are internal to the social practices in which I am a character, and the virtues are disposition that both sustain these practices and my ability to act within them.”

MacIntyre views of virtues are very much influenced by predecessor Aristotle who believes individual roles are fixed prior to his birth, and his duty is to occupy the position assigned by the societies. Individual loses its identity and fails to achieve his ultimate goal when he makes distance from the characters that prescribed by the society for his virtuous disposition. As a purposive being each individual has an ultimate goal which can be attained through the virtue of excellence which guides his conduct and it demands mutual cooperation. Virtuous conduct cannot be conceived outside the realm of political community and development of individual as well as the community can be possible only insofar as its members work together. MacIntyre in his book After Virtue mentions that,

> For what constitutes the good for man is a complete human life lived at its best, and the exercise of the virtues is a necessary and central part of such a life, not a mere preparatory exercise to achieve such a life. We thus cannot
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4 Markate Daly. Communitarianism: A New Public Ethics, p.121.
characterize the good for man adequately without already having made reference to the virtues.\(^5\)

Community helps human being to develop different virtues such as friendship, brotherhood, courage, temperance which is considered as the necessary instrument for the growth of human being, so that he can easily be able to attain the ultimate goal of community. The reconstruction of Aristotle’s virtue is the novelty of MacIntyre modern morality which can be defined in two ways: first of all, he shows his disagreement with Aristotle’s teleological being which is heavily relied upon his metaphysical biology. Unlike Aristotle, MacIntyre believes that human nature is independent of upon metaphysical speculation. Secondly, MacIntyre describes that community is being constructed through social practices, human nature and tradition without presupposing entirely utopian social and political changes.\(^6\)

Now it is necessary to present three ingredients of community separately. To the words of MacIntyre:

\[
\ldots\text{any coherent and complex form of socially established co-operative human activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realised in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the end and goods involved, are systematically extended.}\(^7\)
\]

We all know that practice makes a man perfect, but simply engaging in any activities cannot be considered as practice. For example, collecting various books is not a practice rather reading the book is a practice which enlightens our thoughts. MacIntyre believes that internal

---


\(^7\) Alasdair MacIntyre. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, p.175.
good totally depends upon practices and hard work and it cannot be possible in other ways. External goods like fame, money, power we can get in participating other works but analytical skill, logical reasoning, communication skill can be achieved through reading practices. According to MacIntyre, virtuous activities are those acts which are related with internal good, and then only it is leveled as practice. Virtue in the words of MacIntyre, “a virtue is an acquired human quality the possession and exercise of which tends to enable us to achieve those goods which are internal to practices and the lack of which effectively prevents us from achieving any such goods.”

Thus, he suggests that individual can fulfill his goal only through shared practices and obeying the pre-determined commands of society. Practices that individual does in order to fulfill his demands sometimes conflict with each other that destroy the virtuous characters of individual nature. MacIntyre suggests the narrative units of life who helps individual to make his more systematic and orderly. Our life is a collection of stories where we are the artists which play different roles according to the demands of characters assigned to us. Every action is based upon three basic things, namely, intention, desire, and goal. Within these settings of action we have the both long term and short relationships with our fellow mate, family members and other creatures of the world including nature. Because each characters has certain responsibilities towards other for the maintenance of healthy relationship. But we need to identify which relationship is more important for us and which is having a less value in our life, so that we can act accordingly. Like our future, our characters are also predetermined and we do not have the capacity to change it. There is a purpose behind this type of constrained life which is provided by the narrative characters of our life and it does not have to depend on metaphysical biology like Aristotle did in his theories. Thus he says:
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8 Ibid., p.178.
We live out our lives, both individually and in our relationships with each other, in the light of certain conceptions of a possible shared future, a future in which certain possibilities beckon us forward and other repel us, some seen already foreclosed and other perhaps inevitable. There is no present which is not informed by some image of some future, and an image of the future which always presents itself in the form of a telos – or of a variety of ends or goals – towards which we are either moving or falling to move in the present. Unpredictability and teleology therefore coexist as part of our lives; like characters in a fictional narratives we do not know what will happen next, but nonetheless our lives have a certain form which projects itself toward our future…If the narratives of our individual lives is to continue intelligibly – and either type of narratives may lapse into unintelligibility – it is always the case both that there are constraints on how the story can continue and that within those constraints there are indefinitely many ways in which it can continue.9

MacIntyre points out that it is the narrative of human life which brings reformation in human character. So that he is able to take a rational decision which was previously stuck with conflicting demands. It helps him to differentiate in between the primary and secondary goal of life and suggests the proper guidance to pursue it accordingly. What is the ultimate quest of human life? The ultimate answer for the above quest is thirst for good life which is derived from social practices. Good life means the life we are spending with others in the form of sharing nature, fellow-feeling, mutual cooperation. And the most important thing is the constraints which guides our life and makes its systematic; otherwise it becomes chaotic and purposeless.

9 Ibid., pp.200-01.
The good life of human being can be possible only in the community rather than in a separated life which is free from all sorts of restrictions provided by community. MacIntyre believes that individual quest is not based upon what is already present rather “it is in the course of the quest and only through encountering and coping with the various particular harms, dangers, temptations and distractions which provide any quest with its episodes and incidents that the goal of the quest is finally to be understood.”\textsuperscript{10} By dealing with the all the problems we can be able to manipulate the things and our reasoning ability is also developed through adopting various methods in order to attain the goal. So we can say that it is an educative quest which enlightens the thoughts of character of person who involves in it.

About virtuous disposition MacIntyre says:

The Virtues are therefore to be understood as those dispositions which not only sustain practices and enable us to achieve the goods internal to them, but which will also sustain us in the relevant quest for the good by enabling us to overcome the harms, dangers, temptations and distractions which we encounter, and which will furnish us with increasing self-knowledge and increasing knowledge of the good.\textsuperscript{11}

That means he understood virtue as a form of dispositional activities which help individual to overcome all sorts of distractions which obstruct the path of human development. Virtuous conduct removes the layers of selfish activities from the individual deeds and develops the capacity of self-introspections which is necessary for the attainment of good life.

\textsuperscript{10} Markate Daly, \textit{Communitarianism: A New Public Ethics}, p.123.  
\textsuperscript{11} Alasdair MacIntyre. \textit{After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory}, p.204.
MacIntyre raises an important distinction between moral goodness and political goodness. In the former case each individual differs from other with respect to their particular goal, whereas the latter goodness removes distance between the individual and brings all members into one unified group where they work together to attain their desired aim. Moral goodness is concerned with each individual’s particular need which he/she can attain through the various role he plays (son/daughter, cousin/uncle, citizen of particular city etc.). Each group sets its own goodness and the people who are part of this group possess the same amount of goodness which unifies the relations that previously due to particular interest. Highlighting the importance of tradition MacIntyre points out that:

But it is not just that different individuals live in different social circumstances; it is also that we all approach our circumstances as bearers of a particular social identity. I am someone’s son or daughter, someone else’s cousin or uncle; I am a citizen of this or that city, a member of this of that guild or profession; I belong to this tribe, that clan, this nation. Hence what is good for me has to be what is good for one who inhabits these roles. As such I inherit from the past of my family, my city, my tribe, my nation, a variety of debts, inheritances, rightful expectation and obligations. These constitute the given of life, my moral starting-point. This in part is what gives my life its moral particularity.¹²

He advocates that tradition is one of the strongest pillars of social identity which consists of share practices and individual understanding. Tradition is not limited within a particular group or generation rather it is extended over the generation to generation and at the meanwhile it shapes our social practices. There are various types of tradition namely – social, political,

¹² Ibid., pp.204-05.
cultural, and religious or moral and the common notions behind this tradition that the individual who inhabits within the tradition have to obey the constrained and at the same time evaluate the norms if it is harmful for the mankind. It is not something a static which can be fixed for all the periods, we can change its norms according to the demands of the situations. MacIntyre discussed three main tools (narratives, practice and tradition) of community life but apart from that community is empty without shared understanding. The value of social good can be realized only through shared understanding which is based upon the principles and commands of the institutions. According to MacIntyre, society is considered as just “if it acts in accordance with the shared understanding of its members as embodied in its characteristics practices and institutions.” But for the libertarians especially Rawls keeps the individual good separated from the community. Rawls commits a mistake in emphasizing a burden free self which seems to irrelevant and subjective in nature. Both Sandel and MacIntyre are dissatisfied with the Rawlsian approach of subjective person but their way of criticizing is different. Sandel points out that liberal commitment to moral subjectivism lack the scope of community value, whereas for MacIntyre liberals are incapable to understand the significance of community which provides identity to individual. Again he accuses Rawls for endorsing original position in order to maintain equality which is justified because it compels its members to forget their original nature. MacIntyre highlights priority of Rawls individual rights in his own words:

For...Rawls a society is composed of individuals, each with his or her own interest, who then have to come together and formulate common rules of life...Individuals are thus...primary and society secondary, and the

identification of individual interest is prior to, an independent of, the construction of any moral and social bonds between them.\textsuperscript{14}

Thus, MacIntyre does not support the liberal concept of neutrality and constrained free individual self that signifies individual good rather he believes that community is the better place for individual development. Individual can get better nourishment within the community where he is able to adjust with others and at the same time learns the ability of cooperation which is necessary for the achievement both the individual good and political good.

Charles Taylor is one of the prominent figures of communitarianism which not only appreciates the liberalism for some of its well deserving aspects but also highlights shortcoming that ruins the status of liberal tradition. Unlike from his contemporaries he believes dignity of human being should be respected like liberals who believes that individuals should be treated as an end in itself rather than a mere means for others. Unlike liberal, Taylor believes that each human being is self-interpreting being and his identity is liked up with the community where he is attached and derives his own conception of good by being part of it. Another noteworthy feature of Taylor’s theory is the moral intuitions which are necessary for the developing the articulation capacity and it demands the conversation with other fellow being which is present in the community. He basically divides moral intuition into three parts\textsuperscript{15} namely:

1. Our relations to other human beings – our sense of their worth and dignity, of what we owe to them

\textsuperscript{14} Alasdair MacIntyre. \textit{After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory}, pp.232-33.
\textsuperscript{15} Stephen Mulhall and Adam Swift. \textit{Liberals and Communitarians}, p.104.
2. Our conceptions of the good life for human being in general – our sense of what a full or flourishing human life consists in

3. Our sense of our own dignity or status – of the characteristics by which we command or fail to command the respect of others

These three tools of moral intuition describes the ontological and political status of human being and it suggests that individual existence cannot be defined without the involvement of others. He believes the good of the human life which is linked with community good where he has to sacrifice his particular interest for the attainment of higher good. Human action needs proper evaluation through which development and articulation can be possible. Individual alone cannot make his own identity, so that he needs other means, the family, tribe, society that he belongs and the character he plays guides his action and suggests him to do valuable and worthy actions. The significance of life can be realized only when we are linked up the community character which provides evaluative frame work for judging our action, otherwise we lose our direction.

Thus, Taylor says individual completely relies on moral orientation which is the source of its identification. If someone asks about our identity we can answer it by saying we are son/daughter of so and so, we belong to this family that defines our identity, apart from that we are in state of identity crisis. About individual identity Taylor says: “the identity of the human self is bound up with and partially constituted by that self’s sense of the meaning or significance of the objects and situations he encounters in his life.”\textsuperscript{16} Liberals make its agent free from responsibilities towards society but it puts individual into serious trouble because when we think that there is no rules, regulation then we commit the mistakes and ruins our

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p.107.
life. Excessive freedom has the ability to destroy human life, so we should always follow the Aristotle’s method of golden mean which maintain a balance in between excess and deficiency. Individual should act in such a manner that is helpful to both the community as well as individual itself. Taylor finds that both the individual self and the community are interlinked with each other in the sense that community provides the method through which he makes his own identity and the co-operative activities he learns from the community which helps him to attain the good of the whole human being. Rejecting the notion of predetermined nature of human being which is fixed prior to individual birth Taylor argues that as a self - interpreting being he can modify his behavior for the betterment of the community of which he is a part and takes requisite step so that identity is not violated and good of the community can be attained. In the words of Taylor:

We are not selves in the way that we are organisms, or we don’t have selves in the ways we have hearts and livers. We are living beings with these organs quite independently of our self-understandings or interpretations, or the meanings things have for us. But we are only selves insofar as we move in a certain space of questions, as we seek and find an orientation to the good.17

The success of the community depends upon the self-interpreting being and individual self is incomplete without others, so both self, others and the community are related with each other. It seems like a chain of success where each one depends upon the other for his identification. He expicates the above relationship in two ways: first of all, self-interpretation can be possible through the medium of language which is a product of society. Secondly, individual is able to interpret things and modify it, if others are involved with the course of discourse

that modifies his character and mould it accordingly. Conversation is possible through language which brings closer to me and my fellow mates. Our particular interests are minimized in the community and it removes all the differences which individual has during the level of individual good and our egotistic attitude transformed into universal feeling where we are far away from all the narrow feelings like anger, hatred, jealousy, self-satisfaction. Emphasizing the role conversation, Taylor points out that:

One cannot be a self of one’s own. I am a self only in relation to certain interlocutors: in one way in relation to those conversation partners who were essential to my achieving self-definition; in another in relation to those who are now crucial to my continuing grasp of languages of self-understanding – and, of course, these classes may overlap. A self exists only within what I call ‘web of interlocution.’  

Thus, we can say that individual identity is a mixture of both moral and political matters. Human growth cannot be possible apart from community, it is mandatory for them to associate with the community and follows its advices and makes the life more systematic and orderly. We can find humanitarian approach in Taylor’s theory that supports the dignity of human status and it should be respected by the society. But he never forgets to promote the good of the community which is based upon individual deeds. For him right and duties possess an equal importance, so it is not permissible to ignore one for the promotion of others. Without good of the community individual right is empty in content and so it is relevant to do the duty for the welfare of the community, then only he can claim his rights. It is the community where he develops the power of articulation and self-reflection through conversation. Summarizing his account of good Taylor says:
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18 Ibid., p.36.
Where ‘good’ means the primary goal of a consequentialist theory, where the right is decided simply by its instrumental significance for this end, then we ought indeed to insist that the right can be primary to the good. But where we use ‘good’ in the sense of this discussion, where it means whatever is marked out as higher by a qualitative distinction, then we could say that the reverse is the case, that, in a sense the good is always primary to the right… the good is what, in its articulation, gives the point of the rules which define the right. 19

Taylor also acknowledges the value of community for the identification of individual selves like MacIntyre and also believes that human character is surrounded with a story that defines its nature also reforms its character and is elevated into the higher level where everyone works as a whole group and claim their right according to their ability. Like MacIntyre, Taylor explicates the importance of narrative which provides meaning to human life. As a self-interpreting being each human being has the ability to develop its capacities but he needs a medium of language which provides the ways to communicate his ideas with others and community helps to improve his qualities. But liberalism fails to acknowledge the role of community and simply sticks on to constrained free individual life.

Michael Sandel, another prominent representative of communitarianism’s explicates two types of primacy given by deontological liberalism, namely, moral primacy and foundation primacy. Moral primacy asserts that sacrificing individual rights for the fulfillment of political and social good cannot be justified. Foundational primacy suggests that individual occupies a privileged position by virtue of being human. Priority of individual rights is not bounded by any social good rather its principles are independently derived. Coercive impositions destroy the purpose of work because the people who are involved in it show lack

19 Ibid., p.89.
of interest in it. It is unjust to force someone to contribute his labour for the social welfare without his interest. Rawls is following the foot step of predecessor Kant, for whom individual rights are categorically prior to social good. Individual possesses a unique capacity of free will which helps him to take him to take the decision freely. It not only differentiates human being from lower creature but also provides dignity to the individual as a self-reflecting being. Deontologist claims that individual is not simply a purposive being whose aim is to attain the end rather its self-reflective capacity presupposed that end. About foundational primacy to justice, Rawls says that “we should…reverse the relation between the right and the good proposed by teleological doctrines and view the right as prior.”

Thus, he states that as an autonomous being, individual has all the rights to decide his goal which is not supposed to be guided by social norms and society is to be structured in such a way so that he can easily fulfill his aim.

Michael Sandel is not satisfied with the claim of Rawl that individual self is prior to end, rather he says self is related to its end. He argues that “self is not prior to, but rather constituted by its end-we cannot distinguish me from my end’. Our selves are at least partly constituted by end that we do not choose but rather discover by virtue of our being embedded in some share social context.’

Individual cannot simply make their own identity through the exercise of freedom of will rather it is possible to share convention which is provided by state. Within the community he is able to realize the notion of common good by following the rules structured by state. In the words of Sandel, “politics of common good, by expressing these shared constitutive ends, enables us to know a good in common that we cannot know alone.”

Individual self as a subject of possession is simultaneously related to it and makes a distance

---

22 Ibid., p.183.
from it. Relationship of self to its end can be defined in the way that individual possessing certain characteristic and ambition like properties which belongs to him only. But the self is distanced from the self in the sense that individual identity is independent of above possession. If something will happen to my properties then my identities is affected from it, it remains same as it was before. To put it in the words of Rawls:

One consequence of this distance is to put the self beyond the reach of experience, to make it invulnerable, to fix its identity once and for all. No commitment could grip me so deeply that I could not understand myself without it. No transformation of life purposes and plans could be so unsettling as to disrupt the contours of my identity. No project could be so essential that turning away from it would call into question the person I am. Given my independence from the value I have, I can always stand apart from them; my public identity as a moral person ‘is not affected by changes over time’ in my conception of the good.  

The purpose of Rawls is to exclude individual self from social commitments, so that easily makes out their own choices. But he might have forgotten the fact that the individual can get various possibilities for his all-round development by being part of a community. Unlike Rawls, Sandel suggests community provides the ground for inter-subjective relationship where individuals have a common goal and each one influences the other. Within the community he can identifies his goal and delivers his responsibilities as an active member of the community. Although liberalism acknowledges need of organized society which decides the good of the individual but the violation of human rights for the implementation of principle of justice cannot be promoted. Liberalism believes that principles of justice should

---

be based upon individual autonomy which guides their decision to choose a particular conception which suits them.

In the original position Rawls provides a very little idea about communitarianism which impels person to mutually disinterest towards each other interest. Force plays a dominant role in Rawls’ community where individuals mutually related with each other not because of social bond but because they cannot satisfy their demands individually. It is true that antecedently individuated self is unable to develop its own, so that he takes the help from community which constitutes his identity. Liberalism is incapable to perceive the growth of human excellence because it separates individual from society which broadens the areas of human beings. There seems to be a huge difference between communal ideas of practical reasoning as self-discovery with the liberal view of practical reasoning as judgment.\textsuperscript{24} Refuting the ideas of liberalism, communitarianism points out individual is not supposed to choose his end by a mere choice rather they should the rediscover it in the community. The relationship of individual with its end can be possible through two dimensions namely: voluntary and cognitive. The voluntary dimension refers to the relation of self to its end as a willing subject whose job is to elevate the distance between subject and object and at the same time maintains the relation in between them. Unlike voluntary dimensions, cognitive dimensions deals with self and its end as a knowing subject which is not taken the command what is already present rather properly revalued its principles and modified whenever it is necessary.

Thus, Sandel observes that Rawls is incapable to place individual good apart from society. Rawls individual good excludes the possibility of sharing which he learns from communal good and at the same time separate individual from society which is the perfect

platform for individual development. Community is responsible for individual identity where he not only concerned about his own comfort but also care for others interest. Individual identity cannot be conceived apart from his family, tribe, class and community. Within the family he plays the various roles and delivers his responsibility towards the growth of the family and whenever his personal interest comes in between his own personal interest and communal good, he prefers to renounce his personal good for the attainment of higher good (communal good). Likewise as a member of society he actively participates in communal activities and revises its conventional rules if it fails to provide due of its individuals. By doing we are able to identify our goal which is nothing but the part of the community and gets the idea how to achieve it. In one sense Rawls acknowledges the value of reciprocal relation which is necessary for mutual growth but the next moments he conceives of priority of independently individual self from social commitments. Rawls views seems to be incoherent with each other, for the sake of equality he forces its members to work together as unity and helps each other and compels him to forget his original nature. But Sandel points out the absoluteness of individual freedom present in Rawls theory which prevents individual to realize the communal good. Lexican priority of individual rights in Rawls theory describes to sacrifice communal good which destroy the purpose of bringing its entire member into equal forum. Similarly using individual as a means for the betterment of community and sacrificing his life is regarded as unjust act. So we should maintain a balance where both the extreme situation can be properly checked.

In Rawls’ theory individual autonomy occupies a higher position whereas social good is subordinate to individual rights. Right is a political concept and it is always linked up with duties and responsibilities because rational being possesses the capacity of self – refection which is the unique quality of human being and it differentiates us from lower creature whose
goal is limited to the world of material pleasure. It is true that as an autonomous and rational being we are free to take the decision which is helpful for us but if it is mixed with responsibilities then only our actions are judged as good or bad. But liberals priority of individual right absolutely neglects the human duty that he can do only when he is a part of any organization or institution. From the safety point of view it is necessary that individual should go together with the community because he is not capable enough to defend himself from the external threats. From the above observations made by communitarians we can say they are not happy about the liberal approach of asocial individual life which is full of confusion, fear and undeveloped one. Political goodness is the prime concern for communitarians but individual development is a part of this whole community which depends upon on it.

4.2 Rawls’ Responses to Communitarian Objections

Refuting all the claims made by communitarians Rawls explicates that justice as fairness is based upon both moral and political doctrines. In order to vindicate his statement he describes three basic features of political justice which is as follows:

First of all, it is a moral conception worked out for a specific subject, namely, the basic structure of a constitutional democratic regime; second, that accepting the political conception does not presuppose accepting any particular comprehensive religious, philosophical or moral doctrine; rather, the political conception presents itself as a reasonable conception for the basic structure alone; third, it is formulated not in terms of any comprehensive doctrine but in
terms of certain fundamental ideas viewed as latent in the public political culture of a democratic society.\textsuperscript{25}

These three features of justice explicitly elaborate the basic structure as a subject matter of justice. Rawls introduces one unique thought experiment process which is appropriate to maintain stability and creates fair atmospheres and it is known as original position. It demands from its members to forget their nature, so they can travel in a same boat. The original position model is not simply a moral or normative concept but also a political that is applied to co-operative members of society provided members are free and equal. He claims that conception of justice is only applicable to the basic structure of society rather than any other comprehensive moral claim. It should be framed within the realm of shared understanding that reinterprets our ideas adopting intuitive methods.

Michael sandle is opposed to the idea of Rawls conception of person and its lack of communitarian value hinders the growth of individual. Denying all the claims Rawls says his theory is not limited to the single individual rather it is made for all the citizens who can use it for the betterment of the society. Conception of person in his own words:

\begin{quote}
…we adopt a conception of the person framed as part of, and restricted to, an explicitly political conception of justice. In this sense the conception of person is a political one. As I stressed in the previous section, persons can accept this conception of themselves as citizens and use it when discussing questions of political justice without being committed in other parts of their
\end{quote}

life to comprehensive moral ideals often associated with liberalism, for example, the ideals of autonomy and individuality.\textsuperscript{26}

Rawls points out when people considered themselves as a citizen of well-ordered society then they can mould their interest in such a way which is beneficial for the whole mankind. The interest of individual varies from organizations to organization, as in political organization he works selflessly for the attainment of political good, by doing so he can fulfill his aim which is the part of the political good. But in other political organization like, in the case of moral autonomy plays dominant role which gives priority to individual rights, and in the name of religion most of heinous acts are practised. Autonomy plays a prominent role in both political and non-political organization. On the one hand, citizen of political organizations not only revise the pre-established rules and reformulate it but also accumulate those conception of good for the betterment of society. On the other hand, particular individual like father (success of his children’s), Catholic (maintain one uniform rule for all the members) and an artists (poetry and paintings) are having different interest which depends on their nature and ability. We can find variation in Rawls’s theory like priority of individual rights that he claims to be moral claim but now he has shifted his attention from to political claim. It gives us impression that he might have realized the fact that society and individual are complementary to each other. So, it is better to the claim the recognition of individual right within the realm of embedded social structure and shared understanding. Rawls abandoned the claim made by the communitarian that justice is a political concept not a metaphysical claim which refers to essence of human beings.

Michael Sandel is not satisfied with the concept of Rawls’ original position which creates a gap between society and individual, and the use of freedom for the individual self-satisfaction which is free from social responsibilities. Defending his arguments, Rawls claims that original position is basically concerned about individual self-reflective capacities which sometimes clashes with values or end of human beings. Rawls believes that as a rational citizen of well-ordered society individual should not accept things what is already present rather revised its structures and reframed it because he believes in the capacity of individuals. He acknowledges the role of society for the growth of individuals and separation of individual from its end loses its identity and meaningfulness of life. The political conception of justice creates a boundary for all the citizens where his particular interest is minimized and they are mutually disinterested towards each other aim. The demands and goal of society should always occupy a higher position then only comes individual interest which he can claim being part of active citizens of society. But Rawls believes that society should take the responsibility for the preservation of individual good and distribution of good is regarded as just only sofar as privileged group peoples help the disadvantages one (mentally, physically, economically) to overcome out of their crisis. Rawls in his article Social Unity and Primary Goods explicates the primary need for the individual life. According to Rawls:
Primary goods are things generally required, or needed, by citizens as free and equal moral persons who seek to advance...conceptions of the good. It is the conception of citizens as such persons, and as normal co-operating members of society over a complete life, which determine what they require. Since the notion of need is always relative to some conception of persons, and of their role and status, the requirements or needs of citizens as free and equal moral persons are different from the needs of (e.g.) patients and students...

Individual and its need always work simultaneously but the principle of justice as a political concept determines the criteria of primary good as free and equal person. And the distribution of good depends on the needs of individual but Rawls never neglects the merit of individual. Meritorious people are awarded with extra increments, so as to maintain a harmonious and well balanced life which is included with duties and restrictions. Charles Taylor highlights the identity crisis that arises in the liberal philosophy due to the overemphasis of individual freedom. He says if there are no restrictions and responsibilities for individuals then they link up meaningless jobs which destroy the significance of their life. Possession of more power and money ruin the character of individual, and in order to satisfy his thrust sometimes involves in antisocial activities which corrupt his whole life.

Thus, constraints and boundaries are necessary which show our limitations. Like liberal philosophers, Taylor admits that individual is self-interpreting being whose dignity should be respected. Political liberalism of Rawls accepts the importance of society for human existence that provides a shape to individual identity. Rawls believes that principle should be publicly justifiable and its conditions are equally applicable to all the members in a clearer

---

manner. To put it in his words: “Justice as fairness must be public not only in the sense that it builds upon ideas latent in public political culture and so its principles can be mutually acknowledged by all citizens, but also in the sense that its very justification can be mutually recognized.”

Thus, Rawls political liberalism is more of a communitarian doctrine which asserts the distinction between political and non-political good. The following distinction is based upon shared nature, individual recognition through community and the value of good life. Mutual cooperation and the strong conviction towards the fulfillment of community goal presuppose the communitarian values in Rawls’ theory. As he says:

…in the well-ordered society of justice as fairness citizens share a common aim, and one that has a high priority: namely, the aim of political justice, that is, the aim of ensuring that political and social institutions are just, and of giving justice to persons generally, as what citizens need for themselves and want for another. It is not true, then, that on a liberal view citizens have no fundamental common aims. Nor is it true that the aim of political justice is not an important part of their identity (using the term ‘identity’, as is now often done, to include the basic aims and projects by reference to which we characterize the kind of person we very much want to be). But this common aim of political justice must not be mistaken for (what I have called) a conception of the good.

---


Rawlsian justice provides the guidelines for stability of well-ordered society where citizen’s particular goods are unified with common good of society. Each one shares a common goal i.e., political good which is prior to particular good of the individual. Well-ordered society of Rawls seems to be organic whole and individual is a part of it and he can satisfy his interest within the constraints of society. Social contractualists Hobbes also emphasizes the cooperative form of life for the maintenance of social stability that gives benefit only to group of association rather than single individual. Unlike Hobbes, Rawls points out the justice as a political concept is equally applicable to all members in a similar manner, here everyone interest should be taken into account. Conflicting interests of individual should not be a hurdles for the attainment of higher goal of society, he has to accept the things voluntarily for the betterment of whole mankind which others also accept it. Intrinsic and extrinsic value of society can be realized when given priority to social good, for this individual has to adopt the reciprocal method.

4.3 Reconciliation between Communitarianism and Liberalism

The gulf between communitarianism and liberalism can be solved with the help of citizenship theory. Citizenship theory brings harmony between these groups by providing the basic rights to individuals and realizing them the value of community in their lives. This theory acts as a mediator connects individual with the community through which both the individual and universal goods can be easily attained. As an entitlement rights, citizenship theory was popular during the Post-World war period. T. H. Marshall in his book *Citizenship and Social Class* defines the basic nature of citizens that a citizen is one who can take part in every activities of society freely with equal respects. And the best way to includes them in the society is to ensure their lives and property and provide them basic rights. Marshall classified
his rights into three major heads, namely, civil rights arose in eighteenth century, political rights which arose in nineteenth century and the social rights (e.g. public education, health care and unemployment insurance, and old age pension) which have established in the twentieth century. Marshall believes that proper advancement of citizenships theory is possible only in liberal welfare state which used these above mentioned rights for the welfare whole humankind. The most interesting method adopted by the liberal welfare state is method of reciprocity which creates a unique bond between one individual with other. Here citizens enjoy equal amount of rights and are treated as free members which is necessary to act for the welfare of society. Because the act is done out of force and compulsion it cannot bring happiness to the citizens of society. And their status has been degraded if these rights are violated, as a result they will lose their identity in the society.

Liberalisms is criticized of being partial towards the promotion of individual rights and gives less importance to the responsibilities and obligation of individual for the development of communal life. Responsibilities and obligations determine the rights of individual. Participation in public activities changes the direction of individual’s life and gives him a motive through which the meaning of life can be fulfilled. By doing so he/she can fulfill his/her obligation towards other and able to develop virtuous activities which cannot be possible in liberal society where individual’s interests are separated from public interests. In this context William Galston suggests that responsible citizens should be endowed with four types of civic virtues, namely, (1) general virtues (courage and law abidingness), (2) social virtues (independence and open minded ness), (3) economic virtue (capacity to delay self-gratification, adaptability to economic and technological change), and (4) political virtue (capacity to discern and respect the rights of others, willingness to demand only what can be

paid for; ability to evaluate the performance of those in office, willingness to engage in public discourse.\textsuperscript{31} Thus, it proves that citizens play a major role for the maintenance of healthy and developed state. Using the power of right to vote, citizens nominate the suitable representatives who look after the welfare of all. Most of the time representatives misused their power against weaker section of people. Citizen’s role is to take active step against those traitors and modify their behavior through virtuous activities. Citizens can be more benefitted through open and free discussion where they can get the liberty to express their ideas in the public forum. But simple participation does not bring any vital changes, so they must have the ability to reformulate the structure of social rules if it is not helpful for welfare of common mass. Participation can be more fruitful only when we give chance to others to express their ideas, discuss with them and solve their problems.

Thus, from the observation we can come into the conclusion that both the communitarian and liberal realize the value of society in the individual life. Nowhere it is mentioned that individual is prior to society, so its existence can be conceived with the society. It is the society which provides him the status of self-reflecting being whose decisions are guided by his rational conduct. In this context it is necessary to incorporate the views of Sri Aurobindo, one of the leading well know figure of contemporary Indian philosophy. His integral philosophy gives equal importance to both man and society. Extreme situation is always being dangerous and it has the ability to destroy the social harmony. So, in order to keep this thing in mind he rejects both the views of individualism and collectivism. Rather he believes that “both man and society have equal status in the scheme of evolution for they are

the expression of Supreme Reality (sat-cit-ânanda).”32 Society plays a vital role for shaping the individual’s identity and also extends the support for their development. Thus, in a true sense we can say it is desirable for the individual to be related with the society, which simply plays the role of instrument for the construction of individual’s bright future. In the words of Sri Aurobindo: “state, society or any other social or political organizations are only instruments through which an individual realizes the ultimate reality. Also, it is only through the individual development the progress of any society or humankind in general is visualized.”33

Within the society individual plays different characters through which he/she is able to learn the quality of sharing and cooperation. Mutual cooperation is considered as the strongest pillar of social goodness without which it is impossible to attain it. Societies have all responsibility to take care of individual interest and bring out the best ability of it and mould it accordingly, so that meaning of life is fulfilled. Amartya Sen acknowledges the creative part of Rawls that provides a prior status to individual liberty, but at the same time he criticizes Rawls for ignoring individual responsibilities towards the society. Social evaluation can be done on the basis of individual capabilities that he/she performs in the betterment of the society. Sen suggests that substantive freedom (otherwise known as positive freedom) is related with the higher capabilities of individuals which initiate them to do certain qualitative work. It is regarded as a constructive key factor for the enhancement of individuals’ character. Sen writes that: “in its constitutive role freedom enables us to realize the importance of positive or substantive freedom in enriching human life by exercising individuals’ capabilities to avoid the deprivations such as starvation, undernourishment, escapable morbidity,

premature mortality, and other freedoms associated with literates and numerates.”34 Sen’s positive freedom gives importance to the economic development of the society that ultimately leads to social development. As a possessor of higher capabilities each individual should take the responsibilities for the betterment of the society to which he/she belongs and helps each other’s to attain their goal. The dignity of human being as a rational being should be respected and society should provide all the opportunity for the development of their sinner talents. Significant role of justice for the protection of individual rights both in the private and public domain is the prime concern of the next chapter.