CHAPTER-7

CONCLUSION

In modern societies liberalism is supposed to be the most suitable doctrine for accommodating and advancing individual differences but this principle does not hold true when it comes to handle ethnic or cultural differences. The classical liberal formula of separation of public and private realm and the location of culture within the private sphere leads to the failure of this approach. This happens because this approach fails to capture the significance of culture and ethnicity of individuals and groups. Taking this deficit of liberalism as their point of departure, critics have suggested alternative strategies for accommodating cultural diversity under the rubric of multiculturalism. Multiculturalism aims to facilitate greater inclusion and integration of marginalized groups in culturally diverse societies. However despite its inclusive tendencies multiculturalism is often criticized by many on the pretext that it is against the maintenance of unified national identity and it leads to segregation by undermining interpersonal trust and solidarity in culturally diverse societies. They also feel that multicultural policies are dangerous as they undermine the liberal principles of equality and impartiality. They believe that recognition of group specific rights means denying the equal treatment of the individual and argue that liberalism by
protecting the individual freedom of association offers the best possible strategy for accommodating cultural diversity.

Most of the critics of multiculturalism tend to associate multiculturalism with the essentialised i.e. fixed notion of culture. They are not interested in the question of where culture comes from and when it becomes the significant part of identity and under which circumstances it can be transformed. Multiculturalism or the politics of recognition is usually associated with political demand for special representation of marginalized groups and is understood as the existence of thick group rights based on essentialised and fixed conception of culture. But this is not the only way in which the multiculturalism can be defined. An anti-essential or constructivist approach of multiculturalism is another way in which multiculturalism can be defined. An anti-essential does not take identity as fixed and believes that it is continually negotiated and re-negotiated through interactive efforts.

First of all we have tried to establish the relationship between nationalism and multiculturalism as it is generally believed that both these doctrines are incompatible with each other. The relationship between nationalism and multiculturalism is complex. There are two dominant perceptions of nationalism which view nation as a concept in different perspective. One is the civic view of nation and the other is the ethnic view
of nation. The basic problem of today’s modern world is not with the incompatibility between multiculturalism and the ideology of nationalism but the basic approach toward the concept of nationalism which tries to view nation in either civic or ethnic terms. Both views exclude each other and each one presupposes that there is one good account of the nation.

The civic definition of the nation view, the nation is a sovereign state founded on the will of the people. According to civic nationalism individuals give themselves a state and the state makes up the nation. This view of the nation underlines the importance of willing individuals and gives an absolute priority to the individual over group. Civic nationalism in its classical modern form represents the pursuit towards attaining a unified culturally homogenous group housed within already existent specific political boundaries. Nation must have a measure of common culture and a civic ideology, a set of common understanding and aspiration, sentiments and ideas that bind the population together in their homeland. The common culture perceived over here is not the ethnic culture but the political culture. The distinguishing feature of ‘ethnic’ conception of the nation is its emphasis on the community of birth and native culture. In modern times Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson elaborated civic view of nationalism. Gellner focuses on civic society from the perspective of liberal pluralism.
Benedict Anderson recognizes the social construction of nation-states and presents them as "imagined communities". They recognize a cultural break between pre-modern and modern times. They view nations as political units that are products of industrialization and capitalism and finally they view nations as social constructions. According to them nationalism is a consequence of certain social conditions and these social conditions are product of modernity. The different reactions to modernity at different point in time have created difference in culture with in politics.

The modernist theory civic theory of nationalism underlies certain structural change, nations as political units and social constructions, and nations as products of modernity. Ernest Gellner believes that it is the type of culture that a population possesses that is important to whether a people are conducive or resistant to nationalism. But the nature of culture as perceived by modernist is different from ethnicists. According to modernist, civil society is required to instigate a 'civic' social order by essentializing the importance of industrialization and the break with pre-modern times; all the factors of pre-modern societies are not given value. Thus they are talking about modern 'high culture' which is not based on ethnicity but is determined by factors like literacy, levels of communication, social relationship etc. A perception of what culture is maintains the divide
between the modernists and the ethnicists and likewise of conceptions of
civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism.

According to modernist the nation is a social construction marked by
'high culture' and the state is a political construction whose task is to sustain
high culture via its educational infrastructure which makes use of high
culture a necessary and shared medium. The modernist civic nationalist view
nationalism as a product of modernization overlooks the persistence of
ethnic ties and cultural sentiments. Modernists in fact disagree on the issue
of connection between ethnic ties and cultural sentiments.

Ethnic nationalism refers to nationalism as determined by descent.
Attachments are inherited and not chosen, representing the exclusivist
element of nationalism. Nationality is not voluntary but by birth and native
culture, considered an inherent characteristic defined by descent as opposed
to choice. According to this view the nation precedes the state and it is very
often interpreted as some kind of collective entity that transcends each and
every individual. But in today's time there can be different nations within
the same state due to plurality of cultures. Now if his views are applied in
today's globalizing world where different cultures are coming together his
views will lead to fragmentation of state in different nations.
The key element of the ethnicist’s theory is ethnicity as the cultural basis of nationalism. Unlike the modernist, the ethnicists do however look to the past and see today’s nation as a part of a perpetual process of self-realization. They view the nation as rooted in ethnic groups and nations are the natural outcomes of the ethnic communities of the pre-modern stage. For ethnicists, ethnicity is the key to uniting a group of people and is the social glue of a nation.

The relationship between nationalism and multiculturalism is complex. It is generally believed that ethnic nationalism is exclusive because in ethnic nations people of different racial or ethnic groups cannot acquire citizenship no matter how long they have been living in the country. Whereas civic nationalism is inclusive in the sense that in civic nations like U.S.A the principle of open to anyone who lives in the territory is followed. Thus according to this belief civic nationalism being inclusive is compatible with multiculturalism whereas ethnic nationalism being exclusive is not compatible with multiculturalism. But both conceptions of nationalism be it ethnic or civic lead to national movement which in their own way induce a certain form of exclusion. The ethnic nationalism often leads to the exclusion of those minorities which are not part of their group. The same form of exclusion can also be traced in purely civic nationalism. Although
civic nationalism portray itself as an inclusive approach but it is generally associated with a refusal to recognize cultural diversity. Even if it offers a way to cope with cultural diversity but it does so by avoiding recognizing the existence of collective rights to those cultural communities. That is, they choose to ignore cultural diversity within societies which are intuitively multinational. However there are now a days many ‘nations’ without a state who want to gain political recognition and it becomes increasingly illusionary to think that they could accept being included into a multinational state without getting in return a minimal recognition of their specificity. In today’s culturally plural societies it becomes impossible to discard all these national movements as instances of ethnic nationalism. Both civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism pursue mutually exclusive forms of cultural homogeneity. Within civic nationalism cultural standardization is achieved via a particular level of communication and education. In ethnic nationalism cultural standardization is achieved through the ethnie and so the theoretical aim of ethnic nationalism is ethnic homogeneity.

The political, cultural and social pattern that can be noticed in contemporary times call for a new approach that would not be caught in the dichotomy between ethnic and civic nationalism. In order to end this ethnic-
civic nationalism dichotomy Michel Seymour in his work on ‘Redefining the Nation’ has placed a novel concept of “Conceptual Pluralism” in which he challenged the traditional concept of nation-state which is either ethnic or civic in nature.

Conceptual pluralism as a concept when applied to multicultural societies can end the dichotomy surrounding multiculturalism and nationalism. If the concept of conceptual pluralism is incorporated in multicultural societies then multiculturalism as a concept can be made compatible with the ideology of nationalism. Conceptual pluralism talks of socio-political nations instead of civic nations or ethnic nations. A socio-political nation is a political community composed of a national majority, national minorities and ethnic groups. All of them share a certain form of national consciousness on the same territory. While different citizens would develop different emotions toward their community, but what is expected out of them is a basic commitment to its integrity and well being of socio-political nation or what one might call patriotism or loyalty to a particular political community. Guided by such loyalty they might criticize their form of government, institution, policies, values, ethos and self understanding but their criticism should not provoke the charges of disloyalty so long they are committed to the values of the political community.
Commitment or belongingness is reciprocal in nature. A citizen cannot be committed to his political community unless it is also committed to him, and he cannot belong to it unless political community accepts him as one of it. The political community therefore cannot expect its members to develop a sense of belonging to it unless it in turn belongs to them. It must therefore value and cherish them all equally and reflect this in its structure, policies, conduct of public affairs. This involves granting those equal rights of citizenship, a decent standard of living and an opportunity to develop them and participate in it. Thus the people of different nations within a state cannot identify themselves with a political community unless they are provided with basic rights which can guarantee their cultural survival. In order to recognize the importance of cultural diversity the state should explore ways by which the state laws can be pluralized and different communities be allowed to govern them by their own institution and tradition. In a democratic society mutual respect in public sphere is very important because it expresses the equal standing of every person as an individual and citizen and it also enables democratic citizens to discuss their political differences in a productive way by first understanding one another perspective and then trying to find fair way of resolving their disagreement. If different cultures are only tolerating each other then they won’t engage
themselves in a dialogue process which is only possible when mutual trust is generated between them.

There is a definite relationship between pluralism and tolerance. In a pluralist structure one always talks of tolerance. It is generally seen that tolerance exists only up to a point up till where the authority of the dominant community and the symbols of its powers are readily accepted by others. Cultural tolerance is accepted to that point where the minority culture does not challenge the majority culture. The moment the minority culture raises the voice against the majority culture the issue of tolerance vanishes away. The dominant community asserts its supremacy by stamping its presence in public places and challenge to these symbols are taken as a sign of rebellion, to be strongly resisted. Thus what is actually required to convert pluralism into multiculturalism is to give a status of equality for all cultures and this status of equality can only be achieved if we generate mutual trust among the masses.

Thus if we have to make nationalism compatible with multiculturalism then we have to revise the concept of nationalism. The new concept of nationalism should not be caught in between the dichotomy of civic and ethnic nationalism but should be similar to the concept of 'Conceptual Pluralism' as propounded by Michel Seymour. Secondly
cultural inclusive policies need to be pursued by the state so that the feeling of belongingness to the nation can be created within minorities. Through this cultural inclusive policies and affirmative actions true national consciousness can be created. Just by bringing about institutional change real change is not going to happen because for this the change in the mindset of the people is imperative. The mindset of people can only be changed if we imbibe the concept of ‘Democratic Education’ which talks of generating mutual trust so that people learn the art of deliberation and whatever differences are there in the society can be sorted out through mutual dialogue process. Therefore in order to create a conducive environment for deliberation between different communities the concept of democratic education has to be incorporated in right spirit.

Secondly we have tried to work out how true legitimacy can be achieved in culturally plural societies. In this we have contended that Governance as a concept should be redefined so that true legitimacy can be attained in culturally plural societies. The World Bank and IMF talked about the basic tenets of good governance like transparency, accountability, efficiency and fairness in order to check the excessive concentration of state power. Thus the concept of good governance came as a response to the critics of World Bank policies in which they tried to show that they are
really bothered about addressing the social and economic problem faced by
different countries and will stress on pursuing those policies which will help
in reducing poverty and will lead to the real development of the society. But
in reality the World Bank advocated the concept of good governance in
which they wanted state to play an active role only for creating a conducive
environment for the market to flourish and wanted the state only to function
in a manner that would not intrude upon the efficient functioning of the
market forces.

It was only later that the term good governance was used to represent
the interest of all the groups in the society and stressed on the promotion of
social cohesion, integration and well being of its population. Like UNDP
views Governance as the exercise of political, economic and administrative
management of public affairs. It encompasses the mechanism, processes and
institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests,
mediate their differences and exercise their legal rights and obligations.
UNDP defines governance in terms of eight specific characteristics i.e.
participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive,
effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and the rule of law. UNDP
human Development Report 2002 elaborates the concept of ‘Democratic
Governance’. Like the concept of Good Governance, Democratic
Governance seeks efficient institutions, and a predictable economic and political environment necessary for economic growth and effective functioning of public services. But the concept of democratic governance concerns political freedom and human rights, and removal of discrimination as central objectives. A reform agenda would aim at building institutions and rules that are not just efficient but also fair, and that are developed through democratic process in which all people have a real political voice. Democratic Governance thus incorporates into the notion of good governance for development, democratic processes and institutions, and a concern with the securing of political and civil rights and freedom as human rights.

Democratic Governance embodies most fundamental of democratic principles: that people should rule themselves through the government they freely choose. In countries where human development is a priority, governance has to be democratized for development outcomes to be sustained. This means that Democratic Governance incorporates into the notion of good governance, democratic principles, norms and institutions. Democratic Governance seeks in common with good governance, efficient institutions and a predictable economic and political environment that makes economic growth possible and public service effective. However moving
beyond economic growth the human development requires political participation and economic freedom backed by a broader human right platform.

Democratic Governance differs from the concept of good governance in recognizing that political and civil freedom and participation have basic value as developmental ends in themselves and not just means of achieving socio-economic progress. Democratic Governance is built on the concept of human development in its full sense of the term, which is about expanding capacities people have, to be free and able to lead lives that they would choose to. Democratic Governance as a concept wants the political regime to guarantee civil and political freedom and also ensure participation of people and accountability of decision makers.

Although democratic governance talks of inclusive, responsiveness, participation and society free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class and gender but it defines all these in general terms. In this report democratic governance as a concept does not talk of those inclusive policies which can take into account the cultural diversity present in the society. It talks of state where there is no discrimination but it does not talk of the ways to include those marginalized cultural groups that have been discriminated for so long. It also talks of participation but does not talk about the ways and
means through which participation of different cultural groups can be secured in a culturally plural society. Thus in order to address these problems which are faced in different culturally plural society need to reexamine the concept of governance so that true legitimacy and participation can be ensured in these societies.

Democratic governance talks of strengthening democratic institutions by granting civil and political freedom and by ensuring participation of people but the real essence of democracy is legitimacy. Now legitimacy in a culturally plural society can only be achieved when a state pursues culturally inclusive policies instead of culturally exclusive policies. Although Democratic Governance is a right step forward in redefining governance as it stresses on granting political rights and participation. But when we talk of governance in a culturally plural society then we have to take into account how far the state has been able to accommodate the demands placed by different cultural groups. The main aim of Democratic Governance was all round human development of citizens. But real human development requires more than health, education, a decent standard of living and political freedom. People cultural identities must be recognized and accommodated by the state and people must be free to express these identities without being discriminated against in other aspects of their lives. In short cultural liberty
is a human right and as an important aspect of human development and thus worthy of state action and attention. Human development is the process of widening choices for people to do and be what they value in life. The earlier reports on governance have focused on expanding social, political and economic opportunities to expand these choices. They have also explored ways of equitable growth, expansion of social opportunities and deepening of democracy but missed out one of the very vital component needed for the real human development i.e. cultural liberty which is central for the capability of people to live as they would like. The advancement of cultural liberty must be a central aspect of governance and human development and this requires going beyond social, political and economic opportunities since they do not guarantee cultural liberty.

In order to pursue culturally inclusive policies the state need to recognize cultural differences in their constitution, laws and institutions. They also need to formulate policies to ensure that the interest of minorities are not ignored or overridden by the majority or by the dominant group. Thus redressing the cultural exclusion of minorities and other marginalized groups requires more than providing for their civil and political freedom through instruments of majoritarian democracy and equitable socio-economic policies. It requires explicit multicultural policies to ensure
cultural recognition. Thus the concept of governance in a culturally plural society must emphasize on the legitimacy of the state which can only be achieved if the state pursue culturally inclusive policies.

Most of the governance reports including, Governance for Sustainable Human Development, 1997, UNDP characterizes participation as the core feature of good governance. But just stressing on participation as the core value does not mean much for cultural plural societies because in these societies the state is not just supposed to ensure participation but also has to evolve a system in which people of diverse groups can freely participate. Many historically marginalized groups are still excluded from real political power and so they often feel alienated from the state. In some case the exclusion is due to lack of democracy or the denial of political rights. In such societies democratization would be the first step to ensure participation. However, sometimes more is required because even when members of minorities have equal political rights in democracy, they may be consistently underrepresented or outvoted. In such a situation they consider central government alien and oppressive. Thus in order to address this problem the state needs to evolve a multicultural conception of democracy.

Several emerging models of multicultural democracies provide effective mechanism for power sharing between culturally diverse groups.
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These kinds of power sharing arrangements are crucial for securing the rights of diverse cultural groups and minorities. There are two broad categories of democratic arrangements in which diverse groups and minorities can share power with in political processes and state institutions. The first involves sharing power territorially through federalism and its various forms. Federal arrangement involves establishing territorial subunits within a state for minorities to exercise considerable autonomy. This form of power sharing arrangement is relevant where minorities are territorially concentrated and where they have a tradition of self-government that they are unwilling to surrender.

The second category of arrangement involves power-sharing through consociations, using a series of instruments to ensure the participation of culturally diverse groups dispersed throughout the country. These arrangements address claims made by groups that are not territorially concentrated or do not demand autonomy or self-rule. Consociations are based on the principle of proportionality. Achieving proportionality requires specific mechanism and policies. Electoral arrangement such as proportional representation can better reflect group composition. Both federal and consociational types of power-sharing arrangements are common around the world. Thus the concept of good governance should not merely talk of
participation as its core value but should also emphasize on the ways and means through which real participation from different sections of society can be secure in a culturally plural society.

The concept of representative bureaucracy is considered a mean to manage diversity in government and it is only after the incorporation of this principle the governance as a concept will become relevant in culturally plural societies. Representative bureaucracy is the most viable concept to handle diversity in cultural plural societies because what is required in these types of societies is responsive bureaucracies which can formulate and execute policy keeping in mind the interest of different sections of the society. Thus a bureaucracy will be more responsive to public interests if its personal reflect the public served in characteristics such as race, ethnicity and gender. This idea forms the rationale for the theory of representative bureaucracy. The central tenet of the theory of representative bureaucracy is that passive representation, or the extent to which a bureaucracy employs people of diverse social backgrounds, leads to active representation, or the pursuit of policies reflecting the interests and desires of those people. The argument is premised on the belief that such attributes led to certain early socialization experiences that in turn give rise to attitudes, values and beliefs
that ultimately help to shape the behavior and decisions of individual bureaucrats.

Governance as a concept should also be redefined so that it remains a relevant concept in culturally plural societies. Governance is all about responsiveness of a state toward its citizens which means that a well governed state is a state which is responsive to the societal problems. Now since most of the societies are confronted with the problem which arises in their state due to the presence of different diverse groups it becomes imperative to include cultural diversity as a relevant category with in the discourse of good governance. In such a situation governance should not be defined in just economic terms because the real test for the legitimacy of a particular state which is the core value of good governance lies in how a particular state handles its cultural diversity. The real legitimacy with in a culturally plural society can only be achieved if the state pursues culturally inclusive policies instead of culturally exclusive policies. Secondly the state should adopt a constitutional structure in which due representation of different minorities can be secured. The state also needs to recognize cultural differences in their constitution, laws and institutions. They also need to formulate policies to ensure that the interest of minorities are not ignored or overridden by the majority or by the dominant group. Thus
redressing the cultural exclusion of minorities and other marginalized groups requires more than providing for their civil and political freedom through instruments of majoritarian democracy and equitable socio-economic policies which is the main concern of all governance reports till today.

Managing cultural diversity require explicit multicultural policies to ensure cultural recognition. Thirdly, the concept of governance should widen the scope of participation which is another core value of Good Governance. But just stressing on participation as the core value does not mean much for cultural plural societies because in these societies the state is not just supposed to ensure participation but also has to evolve a system in which people of diverse groups can freely participate. So governance as a concept should also stress on evolving an effective power-sharing model through which different cultural groups can resolve their differences. Lastly, in order to have a real democratic and legitimate decision making process the concept of governance should also stress on the concept of representative bureaucracy so that all groups can easily participate in the public policy decision making process. Thus we can say that the concept of good governance includes the ways state handles it cultural diversity. It also include the state makes the decision-making process inclusive and set up
institutions to empower the weaker section of society including minority
cultural groups.

Thirdly we have tried to work out different models of cultural
globalization and whether this cultural globalization is leading to cultural
homogenization or furthering cultural fragmentation and intercultural
conflict. Globalization at cultural level describes the increasing pervasive
influence of western consumption culture, diffused through new
entertainment and other media, such as television, pop music, cinema and
tourism, so that people everywhere starts to exhibit identical lifestyle and
tastes and also similar attitudes with the growth of universal concepts of self
and personal identity.

In public discourse on the cultural consequences of globalization two
powerful scenarios dominate. The first impact is that of cultural
homogenization and the other is in which globalization has diversified
cultures by giving birth to new hybrid cultures. Under the rubric of
“cosmopolitanism”, Jeremy Waldron celebrates the hybridization of cultural
identities that result from the globalization of trade. A central component of
globalization is the liberalization of trade, which has broken down the
national barriers to consumer markets. As a result, consumer goods from
countries other than one’s own are available worldwide. Developing
countries have increased exposure to American popular music and Hollywood movies. Mobility, access to information and increased consumption makes possible a globalized approach to personal identity that is often called cosmopolitan. Cosmopolitans believe that individuals living in a globalized world naturally use the globe rather than a single culture as a source of their relationship, information and goods that enable them to create a life and identity for themselves.

But we should also keep in mind that diversity does not always imply the welcoming of difference. Another form of diversity brought about by economic globalization is increased polarization between different groups. Exposure to other cultures can strengthen one’s commitment to one’s culture. Rather than melding into a global identity, boundaries between cultures can become more pronounced. This form of diversification is a response opposite of the cosmopolitan response to increased exposure. In this interpretation of the diversity resulting from globalization, diversity comes in the form of conflict. For Huntington, the increased interaction caused by economic globalization intensifies awareness not only for commonalities but also of differences between civilizations. This consciousness leads to hostility by westners against people from distant civilization and in favour of people from more proximate ones. In this
chapter we have tried to explore different theoretical models of cultural globalization through which one can understand the dissemination of different forms of global culture. Secondly how universal human rights can exist in a culturally diverse world and third, how linguistic diversity can be maintained and promoted in this era of globalization. Apart from this we have to find out the need for multicultural policies in this era of globalization.

The best known model of cultural globalization is cultural imperialistic theory. This model focuses upon the roles of governments and of multinational and transnational corporations in the dissemination of different forms of global culture. According to this theory the global culture is disseminated from rich powerful countries that are located at the centre of the world cultural system to poorer and less developed countries on the periphery of the system. The concept of cultural imperialism implies a negative evaluation of the behavior and intentions of advanced countries toward other advanced countries and toward poorer countries.

The second model of cultural globalization is cultural flow or network model. In contrast to cultural imperialism theory in which the source of cultural influence is western civilization while non-western and less developed countries are viewed as being on the periphery- as the receiver of
cultural influences- the cultural flow of network model offers an alternate conception of the transmission process, as a set of influences that are not necessarily in the same place or flowing in the same direction. Receivers may also be originators. In this model, cultural globalization corresponds to a network with no clearly defined centre or periphery. Globalization as an aggregation of cultural flows or networks is a less coherent and unitary process than cultural imperialism and one in which cultural influences move in many different directions. This model believes that cultural imperialism with political motives has been replaced by media imperialism based on global capitalism. This model tries to highlight two important contradictory trends operating in the phenomenon of cultural globalization. On one hand small number of media conglomerates based in few countries like the United States, Germany France and Great Britain have continually extending their control over the television, film, music and publishing industries and by doing so have influences and controlled certain types of global culture. On the other hand, there is emergence of different regional producers who by producing and marketing their own media provide support for a network model of cultural globalization. Regions exhibits sub-networks of denser connections within the global network but are also linked less strongly to other areas. The number of producers of media content and of countries
producing such content is steadily increasing which ultimately is contributing to the diversification of global culture. Thus the network model views globalization as a process that is increasing international dialogue, empowering minorities, and building progressive solidarity.

While the previous models focus on the creators and organizations that are disseminating global cultures, reception theory concentrates on the responses of the audience and publics. On the one hand, reception theory is concerned with the responses of audiences and public to specific cultural products. On the other hand, it has implications for the long-term effects of cultural products on national and cultural identity. Theories of globalization have stressed two major consequences of globalization, homogenization of cultures and hybridization of cultures. The first concept suggests that all national cultures will absorb a homogeneous global culture and will become increasingly similar while the second concept suggests that national culture will assimilate aspects of many other cultures and become more diverse. In contrast to these theories reception theory provides an approach which views the audience as being capable of interpreting media texts in different ways. Members of the audience may or may not interpret texts in terms of dominant ideologies as the producers of the texts intended.
Two powerful scenarios dominate the public discourse about the cultural consequences of globalization. The one very common scenario represents globalization as cultural homogenization. In this scenario the culturally distinct societies of the world are being overrun by globally available goods, media, ideas and institutions. As these commodities and ideas are mostly of western origin, globalization is perceived as westernization in disguise. The other scenario is that of cultural fragmentation and intercultural conflict. Nowadays globalization is a overwhelming world trend. Advocates of anti-globalization view globalization as homogenization. In fact globalization is not simply homogenization; on the contrary, it enhances cultural identity. First, people are not mere objects of cultural influences, but subjects who can reject or integrate culture. Besides, with the development of science and technology, people are closer than before. The sense of ‘togetherness’ brought with globalization is not at all conflict with diversity. In the new era of globalization, people became much more concerned about their uniqueness and particularity of their own culture. Cultural identity provides the global significance of local knowledge and the sense of self, community and nation.

Cultural globalization is a highly dialectic process, in which globalization and localization, homogenization and fragmentation,
centralization and decentralization, conflict and resolution are not excluding opposites, but inseparable sides of the same coin. Cultural change is not only a story of loss and destruction, but also of gain and creativity: As a result of increasing interconnection old forms of diversity does vanish, but at the same time a new cultural diversity comes into existence. Certain concepts and structures of the modern world are being diffused globally. Different worldviews and lifestyles come in touch with one another and can lead to an increase in stereotypes and conflicts. At the same time these different lifestyles and orientations mix, leading to a blend of ideas, goods and institutions. As a result of the increasing cultural contact a number of traditional practices, whole ways of life and worldviews disappear. At the same time globalization leads to the emergence of new cultural forms- a process where cultural traditions mix and create new practices and worldviews.

It is generally believed that there is conflict between universal human right doctrine and cultural relativism as Cultural relativism is the assertion that human values, far from being universal, vary a great deal according to different cultural perspectives. It is the idea that each culture or ethnic group is to be evaluated on the basis of its own values and norms of behavior and not on the basis of those of another culture or ethnic group but the ones who
highlight this conflict ignores the fact that Universal human rights emerge with sufficient flexibility to respect and protect cultural diversity and integrity. The flexibility of human rights to be relevant to diverse cultures is facilitated by the establishment of minimum standards and the incorporation of cultural rights. The instruments establish minimum standards for economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights. Within this framework, States have maximum room for cultural variation without diluting or compromising the minimum standards of human rights established by law. These minimum standards are in fact quite high, requiring from the State a very high level of performance in the field of human rights. Human rights which relate to cultural diversity and integrity encompass a wide range of protections, including: the right to cultural participation; the right to enjoy the arts; conservation, development and diffusion of culture; protection of cultural heritage; freedom for creative activity; protection of persons belonging to ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities; freedom of assembly and association; the right to education; freedom of thought, conscience or religion; freedom of opinion and expression; and the principle of non-discrimination.

Every human being has the right to culture, including the right to enjoy and develop cultural life and identity. Cultural rights, however, are not
unlimited. The right to culture is limited at the point at which it infringes on another human right. No right can be used at the expense or destruction of another, in accordance with international law. This means that cultural rights cannot be invoked or interpreted in such a way as to justify any act leading to the denial or violation of other human rights and fundamental freedoms. As such, claiming cultural relativism as an excuse to violate or deny human rights is an abuse of the right to culture. It is imperative to have universal rights because it is through these rights only different inhumane practices can be abolished. There are legitimate, substantive limitations on cultural practices, even on well-entrenched traditions.

The argument of cultural relativism frequently includes or leads to the assertion that traditional culture is sufficient to protect human dignity, and therefore universal human rights are unnecessary. Traditional culture is not a substitute for human rights; it is a cultural context in which human rights must be established, integrated, promoted and protected. Human rights must be approached in a way that is meaningful and relevant in diverse cultural contexts. Rather than limit human rights to suit a given culture, why not draw on traditional cultural values to reinforce the application and relevance of universal human rights? There is an increased need to emphasize the common, core values shared by all cultures: the value of life, social order
and protection from arbitrary rule. These basic values are embodied in human rights. Traditional cultures should be approached and recognized as partners to promote greater respect for and observance of human rights. Drawing on compatible practices and common values from traditional cultures would enhance and advance human rights promotion and protection. This approach not only encourages greater tolerance, mutual respect and understanding, but also fosters more effective international cooperation for human rights.

While resolving the dilemma between “universal values” and “cultural diversity”, we must ensure that three fundamental principles are taken into account. First, the definition of universal values should, fundamentally, meet the need to respond to universal problems that affect all cultures, within the context of globalization. However these universal values must not automatically replace the system of values that belong to different cultures and civilization, although they can question and enrich them. Secondly, universal values must be defined not on the basis of a particular code of values that may to a greater or lesser extent incorporate particularities and elements from other cultures but on the basis of true and in-depth intercultural dialogue, in which no value system unilaterally lays down the rules and the scope of the dialogue. Lastly, alongside the definition of
universal values, it is both necessary and highly educational to disseminate the value systems of other social cultures and rationales, with all their strong and weak points, as a way to raise awareness of the profoundly pluralistic nature of humankind's different system of values and beliefs.

Economic globalization confronts individuals belonging to minority cultures with pressure to make English their primary language in order to avail the economic fruits of globalization. Many immigrants and indigenous minorities in United States and Canada often feel that they are forced to choose between economic advancement and the cultural identity with which their language is closely connected. Making some people choose between economic advancement and the use of their own language is an unfair choice. One account as to why the choice is unfair is that it denies the existence of a choice. On this account of the unfairness experienced by members of linguistic minorities due to economic globalization there is need for the state regulations to correct such anomalies. In order to save different indigenous languages certain laws need to be framed which will ensure the survival of these languages. Like the state in order to promote different languages should grant those institutions certain subsidies or incentives that use these languages in their institutions as official language. The state should on its own reserve certain sectors where only indigenous languages will be
used. The state can also grant special aid to those schools which promote these languages. By doing so the state will make indigenous languages economically viable which earlier on were economically less viable. These steps will in turn curtail the assimilationist trend which happened due to lack of economic viability of indigenous languages.

Lastly we have tried to work out how multiculturalism as a doctrine emerged out of communitarianism and how composite culture which is an essential prerequisite of multicultural societies can be created. Multiculturalism as a theoretical concept is an extension of communitarianism and emerged out of the liberal-communitarian debate. Multiculturalism emerged as a doctrine to defend minority rights in the context of communitarian critique of liberal individualism and how these minority rights fit into the broader issue of liberal-democratic theory. It is a theory to counter the dangerous tendencies which are inherent in the theory of liberalism and communitarianism. Liberal concept of justice was not enough to defend the sort of group specific rights that minorities need to protect themselves from assimilation and similarly communitarianism has a dangerous tendency to limit the freedom of individual to question and revise traditional way of life.
Although both multiculturalism and communitarians talk of the importance of culture in a society but there is a very significant difference between them. Communitarians define culture in essentialist sense whereas multiculturalists believe in constructed notion of culture. The essentialist approach claims that everything has a real essence that is unique, irreducible and unchanging. Essentialists regard culture and ethnicity as the fixed features of individuals. Critics of essentialism argue that it produces a false description of culture by defining them not only as static in time and place but also as uniform. Essentialism falls short in addressing intra-cultural diversity and therefore fails to offer a suitable framework of politics of difference. Multiculturalism on the other hand takes anti-essentialist perspective on culture and identity as presented by the constructivists. Constructivist claims that essence itself is a historical creation. They refuse the existence of free essence and argue that whatever appears as natural or given has actually emerged socially as a result of discursive practices. According to them identity is not fixed and it is continually negotiated and renegotiated through interactive efforts. A constructivist approach reveals that neither identity nor culture has an essence and both are subject to constant changes.
In a multicultural society, the growth of composite culture is necessary for the formation and growth of national identity and national unity. Once the multiculturally constituted composite culture is widely accepted, it forms the pillar of nationhood. It is with the development of this kind of composite culture only the cultural diversity will nurture national unity. Composite culture does not mean the merger of religious, ethnic and linguistic identities. Composite living means the recognition of those identities. A composite society allows and nurtures those identities to flourish. You cannot have plural nationhood without composite living being embedded in it. Composite culture does not mean imposition of uniformity or homogenization. Multiculturalism does not mean the blending of cultures leading to a composite culture; it means cultures should be facilitated to preserve their distinctiveness and the people who belong to different cultures should be ensured equality. In order to ensure the development of composite culture in multicultural societies these societies need to have a constitutional democracy because it is within a democratic society people are allowed to express their discontentment and it enable its citizens to put pressure on the government to redress injustice. Democracy is open to the danger of majority rule and in order to check its misuse certain group-differentiated
rights should be granted to different communities and these rights should be constitutionally guaranteed.

Although it is right to believe that no society can be held together for long without a common culture but it is wrong to say that multicultural societies lack a common culture. Most of the people who believe that multicultural societies do not have a common culture believes that a common culture can only develop in a homogeneous society and fails to appreciate that a shared culture need not unified and homogeneous. The multicultural societies could have a composite culture which could be internally diversified and multiculturally constituted. This culture is borne out of interaction between different cultural communities that compose a multicultural society and carries the traces of them all. Unlike the homogeneous culture as pre-supposed by nation-state theorists a culture need to be created under certain favorable conditions.

Composite culture cannot develop in those societies where different communities are forced to assimilate into the dominant culture. Their forcible assimilation provokes resistance and does not work in the short and long run. Forceful assimilation also violates the basic values of liberal societies and by doing so the mutual trust which is the basic prerequisite for the development of composite culture will never develop within society. The
only way to develop a composite culture is through free dialogue between different communities which will only happen when different minority communities are given space for self-expression and the state encourages a dialogue process between different communities. The emergence of composite culture requires that different cultural communities should interact freely and as equals. They should not lead a self-contained life or avoid contacts with others. Generally different minority communities tend to lead a self-contained life because they want to protect themselves from the Assimilationist pressure of the dominant culture or due to economic or other disadvantages which forces them to lead a self-contained life which in turn cuts them from the mainstream. A well considered public policy should address these disadvantages and find a way of integrating marginalized groups. Since composite culture is essential for the success and stability of multicultural society, public institutions have a duty to create an environment in which different cultural communities can interact as equals and enjoy equal access to power and other resources. One of the another prerequisite for the development of composite culture in multicultural society is the incorporation of ‘Democratic Education’ as a principle in our educational structure so that the children from their early age are taught how to be in dialogue with others.
If culture and identity are dialogically constructed, their recognition requires a particular model of democracy and deliberative democracy in a setup which accepts the constructed notion of culture. Deliberative democracy has those characteristics which are suitable for multicultural societies like (i) dialogical and inter-subjective mutuality, (ii) transformative potential of public deliberation and (iii) the ability to revise the decisions. These three features merit attention in the face of cultural diversity; especially concerning recognition of cultural identities that are subject to constant change. The major concern of deliberative democrats is to do away with the fixed notion of preferences and to replace them with a learning process through which people come to terms with the range of issues they need to understand. Deliberative democrats contend that no set of values or particular perspective can claim to be correct or valid by themselves but are valid only in so far as they are justified. Most of the theories of deliberative democracy talks of principle of reciprocity and the principle of impartiality. Although the principle of reciprocity which requires grater emphasis to be placed on those settings which encourage the people to adopt “a multi-perspectival mode of forming defending and thereby refining our preferences” goes very well with the concept of multiculturalism. But the second principle of impartiality as advocated by most of deliberative
democrats runs counter to the basic ethos of multiculturalism. Being impartial means being open to reason and assessing all point of views before deciding what is right or just. The Impartialist accepts only those claims and principles which can be defended from larger social standpoint. Impartialist reasoning is argument designed to abstract from power relations and to test the force of better argument. The Impartialist thesis of deliberative democrats is incapable of resolving the root cause of conflict in multicultural societies i.e. moral conflict because impartiality is incapable of indicating how to handle moral conflict such as that posed by whether or not abortion should be legalized or the extent of teaching of religion in schools. These issues cannot be resolved by mere appeals to the facts.

The Impartialist thesis of deliberative democrats is against the principles of multiculturalism as it falsely reduces multiplicity of possible standpoints in the world to one viewpoint which all rational subjects can adopt. But multiculturalism wants to promote a politics of inclusion that nurtures the ideal of a heterogeneous public in which the participants are not supposed to surrender their social and cultural identity at the price of inclusion. Instead, it seeks the recognition and effective representation of diverse social groups in public life. The role of deliberative democracy should not be to arrive at decisions immediately after the deliberation. It
should be taken as an educative program which will initiate a discourse within the community itself so that the change can be internalized by the community rather than superficially accepting the decisions. Deliberative democracy should not be taken as a decision-making process but should be taken as a mean to bring about desired change in the society.

In multicultural societies minority communities also have a moral responsibility i.e. to initiate a process of internal democratization because they too are asking for special rights in the name of democracy. Thus if they expect rights to protect their difference then they must allow space for expression of internal difference. Most of the contemporary multiculturalists talk of diverse communities within the nation-state and consider these communities as homogenous. If multiculturalism as a concept has to withstand its critics then multiculturalists will have to explore the difference and heterogeneity that exist within the community. They will have to challenge the basic assumption about the homogeneity of the community. At present most statements on multiculturalism suggests that minority cultural communities need to be protected because individual value these membership and identities. This is the reason they demand certain special rights for their communities. But over here we need to understand that culture and identities are not static and they keep on changing with changing
time. This change within culture and identities happens when different cultures come in contact with each other. In this whole affair the role of state should only be that of a facilitator who will not impose any cultural values or favor any cultural values but will only see to it that proper civic discourse is talking place within different communities. The task of the state is to provide external protection to different communities so that no culture can impose its values on others and ensure that if there has to be a change then it should be from within. It is also the task of the state to see that those groups who are demanding special community rights are internally democratic or not and while giving them special rights certain rights should be given to those persons within the community who do not want to abide by certain community values so that the community cannot impose their values over them. Just preserving different cultures is not the sole purpose of multiculturalism. The basic purpose of multiculturalism is to create a diverse society in which the individuals have a choice to choose between different cultural patterns so that new cultural patterns can emerge and this is only possible when individuals within the community who do not want to comply by group norms are given certain special rights. Thus in multicultural societies the sections within particular culture should be given freedom to
choice which values they want to endorse then only multiculturalism as a concept can attain true legitimacy.