CHAPTER - III

CULTURAL CONFLICT AND MULTICULTURALISM:

ISSUES OF IDENTITIES

In the early post 1945 the geographical proximity act as an important role in the developments of migration flows. In the western states and towards Europe migration rates was at slope and they looked forward to recruit workers from abroad so that they assist them in the procedure of post-war reconstruction. Since 1945, Migration had importantly become wider cultural diversity in many sociocultural. In number of situations, migrated paths were determined by the inter links among European state as well as their former colonie. Therefore, in the late 1950s and 1960s labour immigrants into the UK came primarily from the Indian subcontinent and West Indies, whereas large number of immigrants in France came from Algeria, North African countries like Morocco and Tunisia. The deployment of the Gastarbeiter (guest workers) in West Germany was usually raised from Turkey, Ottoman or Yugoslavia.

Besides that since the 1970s large scale of immigration in the USA has mainly come from Bolivia, Mexico, Salvador and other Latin American countries. Furthermore it is estimate that in the USA the Latino (or Hispanic) communities were surpasses the count of African-Americans by 2010, and it was estimated that by 2050 a large group of people will be Latinos in the US population. Since mid-1990s there has been a mark able intensification in cross- border migration across the world, the impact of this seen as a 'hyper-mobile planet'. There has been two basic reasons for this: First, the number of migrants, refugees were grew very rapidly, it was estimated that it hiked by approx18 million in 1993. The continuous increase in the migrants lead a strong increase in war, political upheaval and cultural struggle or in the post-Cold War era, in areas ranging from North Africans countries to Bangladesh, Afghanistan and Indo-China. During 1989-91 the break- down of communism as well as new group of migrants in Eastern Europe sparked the series of ethical conflicts in former Yugoslavia.
Second, spike in economic globalization has raised the number of international migration in various ways. The disruption of economic opportunity pushed the migrants to move outside their country. Economic disparities, ecological, socio-political factors were the main reason of migration. Simultaneously, the place utility (pull factors) are those factors which attract the people for more jobs, economic opportunities in many industrialized countries tends to push the people to move into new locations where they work on low-status jobs at low work wages.

In the first decade of 2000, European Union and its member states, developing western countries had officially integrated multiculturalism into its public policy. This recognition of the findings clearly depicts that multi-religious; multi-ethnical as well as multi-cultural trend inside the modern societies has been completely irreversible. In short: in spite of the chronic and in certain cases rising hump of event like asylum and immigration, a rejoin to mono-cultural, supported the nation cultures, was no long term executable. Nevertheless, the precise factor has resulted multicultural politics boost the political agenda. This is the upcoming of world terror or the plunge of the so-called 'war on terror'.

The religious fundamentalism spread out very ghastly and especially militant Islam, in western countries has encouraged some to theories on whether Samuel Huntington's (1996) renowned encounter of civilizations' it was happened doesn’t merely among society even also inside them. While on the contrary the promoters of multi-culturalism had been contend that cultural realization as well as rights of minority ensures to hold politic extremism cornered, to help address these issues the opponents warned that multicultural politics may hide under a false appearance, political extremism, or legalized.

**Multiculturalism unity among diversity**

The term 'multiculturalism' had been multi dimensional which describe and define in a different sense but readily in both descriptive and normative way. The term when used in a descriptive it describe many ethnical cultural diversity among society which arose from the beingness inside the community of two or more groups whose practice plus beliefs bring into existence with different signified socialist individuality. In such context, Multi-culturalism was constantly engaged for
commune variety that arose through ethnic, racist, language plus cultural difference. This term also provide an assistance to depict the bureaucracy response in the context of communal diversity whether it was in the form institutional design or in the sort of public policy. Moreover, the public policies regarding multicultural, practically used for healthcare, education, houses and into the different prospects of cultural policies, were measure up through official acknowledgment with the various requirements of specific groups of culture also fulfills there want of equal opportunity between them.

In the variety of multiculturalism, it has determine the policies of political groups in countries like the Belgium, Netherland and, Switzerland as well as it had been utilize to the constitutional arrangements for Bosnia-Herzegovina and Northern Ireland Assembly. Multicultural institutional become a blueprint which gone farther than this by undertake to fashion to set up bureaucracy in that area of religion, ethic, plus among the different part of the society.

Normative multiculturalism term involve a affirmative endorsement. The communal diversity celebrated, particularly denotes to the right of distinct group of culture to recognition plus respect, and asserted for the welfare closely related to moral ethics of society as well as cultural diversity. Even so, multi-culturalism was a political abstract in its own right instead of large extent to ideological space. In place of progressive encompassing universe perspective that map out political, social, economical or religious imagination of the civilization, multi-culturalism was a particular environment within which arising valuable arguments on the balanced in civic unity arise, cultural diversity between modern societies were carry on.

Notwithstanding, characteristic of multiculturalists ideology could be sought out. The important theme inside multi-culturalism is pursuing:

- Post colonialism
- Identity and culture
- Minority rights
- Diversity.

**Post Colonialism**

The idea of multi-culturalism and post colonialism was given by post a colonial theory which was an outcome of the collapse among the early period of post-
1945 European empires. The emerged of Black Nationalism in the era of 1960s was the outcome of post colonialism. The post colonialism throughout the gauntlet among the imperial rule and knock over the culture attribute by setting up the legitimacy of non-western or by establishing ideas and traditions against politics. Postcolonialism had nevertheless interpreted a variety of forms. For example, political philosophy that given by Gandhi fused that Indian nationalism with self-sacrifice and ethics of non-violence was at last broken inward Hinduism.

The French revolutionary Martinique-born scholar Franz Fanon (1926-61), on the other hand, emphasized connection between the anti-colonial conflict and violence. Further his study depicts that the psychological dimension of colonial subjugation. Fanon (1967), says that decolonization was not merely a political procedure, it simply one through which a novel ‘species’ of man is bring into existence. Further he experienced and argued that the cathartic violence is enough powerful to bring about this psycho-political reformation. Edward stated that “Orientalism” ([1978]2003) is most of the time seen as the influential text of post colonialism. This developed a critique of Eurocentrism. Orientalism highlighting the extent, to which political hegemony or western cultural cover the rest of the world, but over the Orient is particular, had been maintained through expand the stereotypical fictions that minimize or put down the culture or people of the non-western countries. The state of diverse communities recognize by multiculturalism. Modern multiculturalists rarely sympathize with this form of crude cultural determinism in its uttermost form; this can be resulted as what has been called 'civilization’. Montesquieu (1689-1775), the father of cultural nationalism. “Herder” (1744-1803), depicts human beings as ethnically and culturally characterized creatures. Theorists of multiculturalism aggressively differ about which special rights would be given. Nonetheless, they do concord on definite fundamentals.

The reposition universalism to post culture is the effect of increase in value of multiculturalism. This concern with culture facilitates to make plain and comprehensible understanding regarding the stress within multiculturalism on, religion, language and ethnicity. Ethnicity is a complex term reason behind that it carries both cultural and racial overtones. The members of ethnic groups united by blood, it is a myth or belief that member of ethnic group are be connected by their common ancestors. More commonly, ethnicity is symbolized as cultural identity,
even though one that function at a profound and emotional scale of intensity. An ‘ethnic’ pertaining to sharing common, practices, traditions and values but more importantly it also gives a sense of common identity and specialty usually by bringing to focus on their descent and ancestry. There is no doubt that religion is playing a important for any cultural groups whether it is from non-western or Western countries. Indeed, in such cases, religion can sometimes become the defining feature of cultural identity, as has happened for some Muslim groups in western societies. However, as the “Quebesois” the group of community in Canada, similarly in the UK is “Welsh”, in France and Spain “Basques” and in Belgium “Flemish” maintenance of cultural distinctiveness has been closely linked to the preservation of their 'national' language. There is no doubt that Language is to be consider as an important factor of cultural identity because it helps to keep viable culture, traditional literature as well as it show a strong relationship among society and community. Moreover it is impossible to understand to each other in the world without language. It seems to be as a first step to get a better understanding about multiculturalism.

Minority Rights

Minority rights among multiculturalism were a debatable question from the past society. The movement of preserving minority cultures is enhancing with multiculturalism. It is quite obvious that in multiculturalism approaches regarding the issues of minority rights very different. The cultural membership for individual value is focusing area. Moreover, when the special rights are encouraging, be they self-government rights or cultural rights for immigrants or for national minorities, they are seen as a fashion of comprises differences of belief, perceptions in the public domain. Within it, it is pretended that people had dual membership they are the members of cultural and political community. J Smith David (2003) in his study discusses the structure of post-communist state in the context of rising CoE and CSCE standard on minority rights. Further he expresses the meaning of multi-cultural integration. The progress of multi-culturalism had been gone side by side with a cheerful compliance to acknowledge rights of minority certainly called multi-cultural right. Will Kymlick (2002) in his study identified three kinds of minority rights: polytechnic rights, self-government right, and representation right. His study finding suggest that self-government rights belong what he called national minorities, owning a shared language.
Peoples who are territorially agreed with the meaningful way of life around the complete range of human activity are characterized by diversity in cultures. Examples would include the ‘Native’ in Americans, the Inuit’s in Canada, the ‘Maoris’ in New Zealand and the ‘aboriginal’ peoples in Australia. In that case the right to self-government should engage the devolution of political power, usually by means of federalism, to political units that are significantly controlled by the group of a national minority, the political rights are the rights that assist religious minorities and ethnical groups that had formulated by immigrated process, to show or keep their cultural peculiarity. This would, for instance, given the core for legitimate liberty, just like the exemption of Muslim and Jews from animal slaughtering laws, and the exculpation from school dress codes to Muslims girls. To redress the under-representation of minority ordisadvantaged groups special rights are given in education and in higher ranking positions in public and political life. Further Kymlicka justified that this is the only way to provide equal rights and opportunity to participate in different public domains which in turn ensure that public policy does not ignore the rights of all group or people, not specially those are belong to dominant groups. Indeed respect of such community and regard for minority rights is one of the assertion criteria.

Multiculturalism and Minority the term represent the demographic picture of a society. Multi-cultural right was different from the concept of traditional liberal rights, in which they interested with group of member over the individual. This highlights the point of degree to which multiculturalists support to collectivism over individualism. It was carrying out in two senses. First, every cultural group had different demands for identity such right were specific to the group from which they belong based on the specific characters of its religious, ethnic, tradition, status or living standard. For example, Sikhs are exempted from wearing crash helmets while riding motor and may be to wear occasional daggers, would be baseless for another group.

Second, rights of minority are 'special' in the manner when they give certain advantage to specific a particular group over other groups. This manifest the fact that, although multiculturalism may be a basic generalization that is accepted in all cultural groups as equal in their right granted by law to basic rights and recognition. The principal of formal equality had been violated by granting discriminatory rights to
certain groups to remunerate them over past injustice or present disadvantages. Therefore multi-cultural taken as a social injustice. To support positive discrimination it carries out typical statements in favour of multiculturalism. Minority rights are not the rights given to a individual person even these are the rights consider as collective rights given to all the citizens of the nation to symbolize the universality.

As per the international laws minority rights are given to immigrants, however there are a number of highly controversial issues are arising. Thus a controversial series of such issues are first reviewed the different needs of particular group address by the minority rights and number of times the hinder religious group face criticism into a community. However worn of veil by Muslim women, had drawn the issue in this respect and the protagonist of the right of Muslim women argued worn of veil in his culture is there basic critical identity had objectionable to it either because it show discrimination against women as they think worn the veil give them different cultural identity among other women’s and create discrimination. Therefore in spite of everything of their culture all the human and minority rights as given immigrants. Second, Significant debate had confined on all states the annoyed issue of 'offence' and the declared right not to be offended. This particularly treated as vexation religious groups, which regard definite opinion to be sacred, and therefore specially clustering of protection.

Third, both the member of majority groups and minority groups believe that it is a dirty foul they both criticized discrimination. In addition they want minority rights norms become basics in the public culture, through their own process of interpretation. On blaspheming against Islam an evident, for instance, in protest against author of “The Satanic Verses,” Salman Rushdie, blaspheming on Islam is a ridicule example of such beliefs on the group itself. In Denmark 2006 publishing of anti Islamic cartoon is an another shameful example if freedom of expression means there is no limit and objection then there is need to introduced laws banning expressions of religious.

Eventually, many multiculturalists had gone as far as to question whether people have the right to opt out from 'a culture', or to opt in. The incapable tension between individual rights and minority rights related to cultural holdings especially depend on religions, culture and ethnicity. Generally ethics of a family and their
social background instead of their own desire number of people’s doesn’t link up with religious or ethnic groups. The only lessons one can learn from this situation that solution need to be found by people themselves.

**Diversity**

Multi-culturalism was described by a steadfast refusal to connect diversity with instability or issues. All shapes of multi-culturalism were depending on the assumption that unity or diversity would be combining with each other: they were not opposing forces. Without any doubt surely, multi-culturalist debating on that cultural identity corroborate politic attribute of being firm. There are number of similarities between multiculturalism and nationalism as they share common grounds. Both draw attention to the capability of culture to generate social and political situations.

With patterns of cultural differences they look forward to bring down the political arrangement into line of structure. The theoretical and practical interest faces consequence of diversity. Notwithstanding, on the other nationalist think that successful and constant society are one in which nationality, in the mother wit it go with citizenship, shared cultural identity, the cultural diversity harmonious with political cohesion. With such opinion, the disaffirmation of identity in cultural effects in powerlessness or isolation, determine a breeding ground for the politics of dislike and extremism. People become complaint to participate in society just because they have a determined and safe identity rooted in their own culture. Multiculturalism goes profound than diversity by focusing on, understanding, respect and inclusiveness, and also by looking at unequal power in society.

Multi-culturalist believes that diversity is desirable and ought to be celebrated. It was believed by multiculturalists that diversity had it economic value to society at large. Cultural identity provides or gives strength to an individual apart from that it gives stronger sense of individuality at large. It can be taken in a particular manner of vigor or vibrancy among the group of a society where several of lifestyle exists like different tradition, various cultural practices, or beliefs. In this way, multi-culturalism goes parallel to ecologies, by interlink among diverse culture and various ethnics. Cultural diversity makes a benefit to society in various ways but in merely form that lead biodiversity benefits an ecosystem.
The cultural diversity promoting cultural exchange between various groups that linked with each other culture in different ways. The additional benefit of cultural diversity was that it boosts cultural tolerance as well as understanding among group of community, and therefore will- ingress to respect 'difference'. In this sense way diversity worked as an antidote to social polarization. It also highlighted the internal issues inside the multi-cultural itself. Similarly, multi-culturalist gives more forced on the different or specific character of cultural groups and on the need of individual identity which has to be firmly embedded in to cultural context. By enhancing exchange of cultural and mutual understanding, they risk blurring the contours of group identity or historical identity. With the passage of time people learn and understand more about one another culture, the configuration of their 'own' culture, arguably, become blurred.

**Politics and Multiculturalism**

Cross-cutting political orientation is an example of multiculturalism that attracts the range of different political customs and encompasses a diversity of ideological stances. The member of the society was free to pursue their various ends, and that the polity is capable to accommodate all in peace full manner. This does not mean that political organization should not be feisty to conflicts over power among different groups. For example, politics have to produce definite t power-sharing arrangements between religious or ethnic group of multi-culturalism. The advancement of a political aim claims that to accommodate cultural diversity with civic coherence. Indeed, Multiculturalists differ with positively indorsing cultural diversity, and about how the best come out from civic cohesion. The members of political society were free and ready to pursue their various ends, and it is easily accommodate to polity. There are fence models of multi-culturalism, each proffer a different view of the appropriate balance between unity and diversity. The three main models of multiculturalism are the following:

- liberal multiculturalism
- pluralist multiculturalism
- Cosmopolitan multiculturalism.
Liberal multiculturalism

The relation between multiculturalism and liberalism is quite complex and in many ways it was uncertain. The cherished value of multiculturalism threatens by bigot views rival political traditions in greater extent it was discussed earlier in this chapter. By the post1970s, the issues of cultural diversity had taken very seriously by liberal thinkers as well as formulated a shape of liberal multiculturalism. They are committed to preserve the freedom of choice and relation to select the moral arena in their tradition, particularly in that issue those are close in relation to their religious or cultural custom. This had impart to the idea that liberalism is ‘neutral’ in relation to the religious, cultural and moral other choices that make by citizens. In that signify ‘Liberalism’ is to consider as a 'difference-blind': it consider such factors like ethnicity, culture, religion, gender as well as racism actually some time irrelevant, because the evaluation of morality among people was usually individual. Nevertheless, acceptance was not morally impersonal, in order to it only furnish a limited endorsement of diversity among cultural.

The 'deep diversity' cannot accommodate by Liberals. For example, progressive multiculturalism perhaps unwilling to support practices such as forced marriages, female circumcision, female dress codes and possibly arranged marriages, still number of groups were concerned and may be argue that these was important to the maintenance of their cultural diversity. In precise, toleration widen only to social practices, opinions, values and culture that were themselves tolerant; as follow thoughts and actions that are harmonious with personal freedom as well as with autonomy. Therefore the individual's rights, as well as especially his or her freedom of choice essentially come before the cultural rights of the radical.

The second characteristic of liberal multi-culturalism was that it draws an essential distinction between 'public' and 'private' life. It sees the former must be describe by at least bedrock of shared civic in which people ought to be free to share or express their religious, cultural, and language diversity while on the contrary the latter commitment as a kingdom of freedom that later on become their personal matter of privacy. This can be understand as that so-called 'hyphenated nationality' which operates in The USA, through which people view themselves as German-Americans, African-Americans, and Polish-Americans onward. In this tradition,
inclusion, rather than diversity, is emphasized in the public sphere. The command over English and the knowledge of US politics are the stipulation to attain the US citizenship.

The third and final distinct feature of liberal multi-culturalism was that it regarded as a liberalist democracy as it shared with legitimate political system of rule. The admirable quality of liberal democracy is that it solely ensures that the settlement Government is totally depend consent of the people as well as it gives guarantees for acceptance and personal freedom. Therefore Liberal multiculturalists were oppose calls for example, the acceptance of shari’n law was the big reason behind the establishment of an Islamic as well as they may be ready to forbid groups if they in turn, were braced to tolerate and regard the various communities culture.

**Pluralist Multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism is a structure of a political organism which responds to religious and cultural diversity. As we see there are diversity among culture and traditions together. This recognizes multiculturalism as an ideological policy. Multiculturalism usually in the favour of equality and generally contend that in a democracy equal status must be given to the all cultural communities. When smaller groups within the large society preserve their specific identities, their practice, and values are accepted by diverse culture furnish they were accordant with the laws as well as with values of the large society consider as Pluralism. Pluralism was not a modern phenomenon it provides foundations for a politics of differentiate than doe’s liberalism. For liberals, as had been seen, diversity is support but only when it is constructed within a hypothetical description of a complex toleration and subjective autonomy. Berlin’s (1969) stance connotes a form of live-and-let- live multiculturalism and what had been called the politics of indifference. Nevertheless, as Berlin opinion remained a progressive to the extent as he think that only within a society pluralism be contained, liberty of individual get valued, but he failed to establish how liberal and ill-liberal cultural notion can co-exist in harmonious manner inside the corresponding groups.

Bhikhu Parekh (2005) was finding the reasons why pluralism was overtaken by multiculturalism. In Parekh's perspective, for several centuries it was proven that cultural diversity exits from long era in different communities, they followed and respect the culture of one another within the same society like ancient empires of
Egypt, Persia and Rome were culturally diverse. Cultural plurality had been become a hallmark for number of societies. The co-occurrent of diverse communities and cultures inside the same social group to plural social group, but the presence of multiculturalism does not affect or bespeak. Further he stated that there is a need to go beyond the fact of interaction as well as co-presence of equality between communities and bring up the issue of group equality among communities.

A class of democratic society like legal Pluralism, political and social consider as Pluralism and on the similar side multiculturalism taken as complementary component they both assist to discover the culture roots. Contemporary of pluralism were entirely formed on the diverse patterns. The secular and non-religious foundations generally created on the basis of Pluralism. The concept that pluralism is the affirmation and adoption of diversity is often used in different ways in a comprehensive range of issues. Thus, the concept of pluralism was used both in a evaluative as well as descriptive ways.

**Cosmopolitan multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism was a concept which deals with different modes of diverse culture. It would be consider as mono-culturalism. It concern with united categories of deviation as well as had an attitude to essentialism them by the nation state cultural fabric of ethnic differences. The ethnic ‘culture” which was isolated, identified and constant through the institutionalized lens of multi-cultural were no category of origin, they were the product of the regulation of social expression and fabrication constitutional in the nation state mechanism of delegacy, division of resources and definition of justice.

In respect of social theory: “cosmopolitan multiculturalism” is a belief that adverts to “objective” conditions and procedure on the macro as well as micro level. In spite of that whether you want it, hate it ,see it, refuse it or not; no matter if you are a Islamic, Christian, an atheist, or a Muslim an outmoded neoliberal capitalist, or an old-fashion communist if you were a neo-nationalist or a supporter of racism , of black or white color living in the beginning of the 21st century in the stipulation of human cosmopolitan multiculturalism. What this means in words of subjective position and practices of individuals, cultures, groups, countries was a completely open essential issue.
Multiculturalism and cosmopolitan could be seen as completely different, still as an odds, ideological culture. However cosmopolitanism give emphasis on that people should accept the global consciousness which accentuate that national borders are not bound the ethical responsibility, on the contrary multiculturalism seems to be particularize moralistic sensibilities, concentrate on the particular needs and involvement of a various cultural community. This position observe variety on the ground of what other culture can acquire from one’s culture this was a aspect for personal self development that was taken up by a world of wider cultural ethnics.

**Multiculturalism in the twenty-first century**

Twentieth-century’s culturalism some time consider as modern multiculturalism. The advancement of cultural and social mobility characterized the modern multiculturalism. The rise in migrants and the interaction among cultures of different countries resulted number of community group lost their ethical values and the quality of being compatible also adopt the multi-cultural character. This state of affairs yields the problem of ensuring the constancy of communities in the context of ethical and cultural diversity. By the post 1960, in Canada for the first time the concept of multiculturalism come forward and widely circulated in the part of Europe. Further, multi-culturalism it may be turn out to be the ideology of the 21st century.

One of the important features of globalization had a significant rise in geographical, particularly cross-border and mobility. Moreover, number of societies has, as a effect, adopted the multiculturalism as irreversible fact of life. Nevertheless, not only are the comparatively homogeneous countries a receding memory in numerous parts of the world, but constant effort to reconstruct it –through various modes. For example, rigorous immigration controls, enforced acculturation and forced for repatriation-increasingly come out or to be politically notional. In our period the leading ideological issue for succeeding generations, may thus to be the search for the ideas in which people with different cultural and moral values as well as from diverse religious traditions was find a way of living together without civil discord and violence.

The ideology of multi-culturalism was doesn’t generally to addresses this question, but it generally provides solutions, even find the ways to stop violence.
among communities. On the contrary, multiculturalism may establish as once-fashionable idea whose restriction, even dangers, were rapidly exposed. In this view, towards moral pluralism and culturalism in modern societies multiculturalism is to be result of undeniable trends. However, its long-term growth was more questionable. Multicultural solutions possibly worse than the diseases they commence to undertake. At this point of view the fault of multi-culturalism was that beliefs which indorse diverseness among group would be suffering together as a accumulation of mutual respect as well as unbigated cultural group. Else, it may endorse detachment as well as direct to ‘ghettoization’, such group turn increasingly inward-looking or trying to safe guard their own cultural and traditional values. Thus, multi-culturalism gives knowledge to people about to focus on what divides them instead of what unites them. In the twenty-first century it was bound to witness a recede from multi-culturalism that seeks by a non-viable means of directing the undoubted dispute of diversity. Notwithstanding, multiculturalism will replace by what?

**Contemporary Liberal and Communitarian perspective**

We consider diverse tradition and culture in the context of multiculturalism. The impertinence of culture in formation human beings and determine the nature as well as content of better life and had a slight appreciation of the resources and value of cultural diversity. Liberal theory connotes an “un-encumbered self” isolated from existing previously before social forms, as illustrate by an abstract of “Possessive-individualism”. The great philosopher C.B. Macpherson (1962) was coined this term ‘possessive-individualism’ in his study “The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism” to explain the premises of modern liberal theory. On the contrary pluralist critic choose the radical culturalist perspective of human beings as well as understand them as entirely establish by their culture. However, communitarianism approaches the concept of ‘self settlement’, as recognized by social practices, roles and situations. Although liberalism focused on ‘freedom’, ‘liberty’, ‘rights’ of individual whereas communitarianism insists on ‘social identity’, shared values because they believe to safe guard their moral standards.

In recent years various theories offered by several philosophers on cultural and moral diversity. I shall examine thoughts of Charles Taylor and Will Kymlicka to examine how they finish their task and what was their results. Although liberalism
mainly out-come of the ideas of John Locke, Jeremy Bnetham, Adam Smith, communitarianism was inspired by the thought of J.J.Rousseau, Aristotle, T.H. Green and G.W.F. Hegel. On the other side present proponent of liberalism were F.A. Hayek, Isaiah Berlin, and Milton Frimen. I would like to take the above mention two writers because their views among others affect me differently as they there theory give different liberal principles and focused on different types of diversity.

Charles Taylor in his study “Philosophical Papers” (1985), communitarianism philosopher and great spokesman, has recall MacIntyr’s assault on the liberal excogitation of human beings as independent selector. He rejected the concept of ‘Atomistic’ which give stress on personal ‘will’ as well as does not consider the ramification of the human charisma. Taylor insists that the literal development was the right of human being and it must be given them on priority basis in their society. Many feminist writers agree with that and religious thinkers also insist that a genuine community group can- not be surviving without granted them liberal freedom. The communitarianism neither proven their statement nor given any strong ethical base they had no mechanism to assure their principles.

Will Kymlicka, in his study “Liberalism, Community and Culture “(1989) as well as in another study “Multicultural Citizenship: a Liberal Theory of Minority Rights” (1985) particularly deal with the issues of liberal reaction to cultural diverseness. However liberalism define by various author in different ways Kymlicka started with basic principles In his view human being had an important desire to live their life in better way. There were two reasons behind that: First, they live their life optimistically that give value to their life. Second, they had the attributes to oppose to things and may later on take their beliefs as mistaken; they were not bounded to give justification to anyone. Kymlicka think that liberal theory was essential for self-reliance. He believed those individuals purely are the moral factor and the carrier of obligations as well as rights. But he used the term ‘culture’ marginal sense. He taken it as intergenerational community more or less institutionally accomplished. He stated that liberals not only their individual rights should be protected but also there is need to safe guard the country culture too. If a community occurs to be culturally undiversified, its entire citizen enjoys the welfare of a constant community. The problem arose when majority of multicultural community enjoy its cultural rights but minorities does not. Theory of multicultural society by Kymlicka’s intention to
furnish a set of principles for evaluates and modulates the relations among various cultural communities within society. As we had seen, Kymlicka’s liberalism was formulated in terms of different element that human being was very optimistic in their life and that it ends as well as labour should be bone up.

Broadly speaking, communitarians had attacked the liberal way of idea on the ground that they are to concern for the individual liberty and an insufficient grateful of the thought in which entropic demand a position in a well mannered society in order to expand. On the other side liberals think that every person should specify and search his own good inside a social organization. They consider that government should endeavour to make a well functioning society under those every citizen a live better life and take a part in democratic work. Nevertheless, like liberals, communitarians as well support to democratic political system.

**ROLE OF MULTICULTURALSIM IN SOCIAL JUSTICE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO CULTURAL MEMBERSHIP**

In philosophy, multiculturalism is taken as a perspective that differences in cultural would be valued and boost. The concept of multiculturalism describe as way of forthcoming cultural diversity inside a society. Inherent multiculturalism was the notion that members of various cultures live peacefully side by side each other acculturations were not necessary, nor possibly even coveted. To counterpoind with multiculturalism was the ‘melting pot’ position, according to which cultural deviation for instance differences in language, religion, or various customs immingle into some other to form a new integral. Exponent of multiculturalism were in the favour of people to keep features of their different cultures with them. Multiculturalism was promoted by liberal philosopher as a framework of defense of cultural right holding its root in the universal rights of individual. According to liberal point of view multiculturalism target was to promote the identity of ethnic and cultural plurality. Yet plurality was deliberate as a plurality of culture as closed groups. This view point had been criticized to support existing differences y using culture as a way to seek the solution to political and social inequalities.

There were multiple meanings of and ideas on multiculturalism (*Fleras 1999 and Elliott, 2002*). “Bhiku Parekh’s” give some differences on multicultural society as a fact of cultural diversity and multiculturalism as a normative response to that fact
A set of normative reaction, one that fewer would linked with multiculturalism, was limited acceptation of, disrespect for, or intolerance of those of a culture and background from different culture, probably directing to exception and conflict. On the contrary, multiculturalism was a social reply to diversity which includes on minimum norms of acceptance of and tolerance of others. Multiculturalism presumptively means that intergroup relations, interpersonal social and institutions, maybe even social structures, had some consistence with these norms. In advance any society which practices multiculturalism must found the direction for individuals of all backgrounds to involve in social relationship so that there was not any systematic exclusion or extended conflict exists.

Multiculturalism was generally used to point out a particular social and cultural school of thoughts which was adopted by the liberal as well as all determined policy of cultural merger. The aspect of multiculturalism was not new for society and thus it was not a new approach for academic purpose but it got a new phenomenon in the period of colonization. The development in the field of international trade, new emerging policies for developed and developing nations imperial and the revolutionary changes in the means of transport gave birth to advance multicultural society. In the early twentieth century the issues of ethnic dispute, cultural crisis, and religious riots had been substituted with the cultural harmoniousness, embracing with of ethnical diversity and the adoption of religious differentiate of mid 20 century. Many scholars from various discipline’s like social-sciences, sociology, polity, cultural studies, psychology and literary criticism play an important role in defining and try to give better understanding for the term multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism were closely linked with “the politics of difference,” “identity”, and “the politics of identification,” they commonly share the responsibility to appreciate disrespect identity and different dominant forms of communication as well as representation that regulate specific groups of people. Multiculturalism does not claim the identity only and culture as in some cases critics of multiculturalism viewed. It was a matter of political powers and economic interests as well as it raise the demand for remediate political and economic disadvantage those people suffer as the impact of their marginalized group identities. Multiculturalists take it as a granted that it’s “culture” and “cultural groups” that were to be accepted and make to fit. Thus multicultural make it as part of wide range of claim including nationality, ethnicity,
religion, language, and race. Culture was a contested and open-ended concept, and all such different categories had been included by or with the concept of culture. For cultural accommodation language and religion were at the heart of various claims by immigrant. Minority nations made it as a key claim for their self-government rights. Racism had a limited role in multicultural discussion. Multiculturalism or Antiracism was a distinct but related idea: the former highlighted “achievements, cultural life, cultural expression,” on the other side the latter highlights “exploitation and resistance”.

For better understanding on cultural membership it need to be illuminate their together problems on social inequality and moral order also in which manner groups understand or represent relationship of believe, social responsibility and hierarchy. However some scholars refuse the idea of the culture war as well as regain posture in multiculturalism. Many times, these studies give emphasis on centralizing similarities in ethnic, value and culture. For example, in responses of James Davidson Hunter’s (1991) thesis culture wars, take data on General Social Survey and determine that conservatives and liberals having a common values as well as attitudes on a scope of political problems and social issues, with the exclusion of issues of gender, and reproduction. Due to such events multiculturalism had been seek as the root cause of ethnic conflicts and strife. Researchers had taken the issue of multiculturalism as a challenge to liberal democratic system.

In social life of man culture form an important component. It regularize is behave and ready him for a group of community. A life without culture cannot imagine as culture regulates the nature of people and satisfies their important needs. A culture had provided a new vision to individual by render them a set of rules of cooperation. Values shared among group typically seen as an important prospect of culture. The common processes for deriving share cultural values by examine individual’s value on priorities at the cultural level. In social groups and culture shared values act as fulfill a purpose. They generally taken as a guidelines those control the behavior of their members in that way the collective life were organized and individual interact with others easily without any hesitation. Therefore culture determine the individual’s by telling them what was right or wrong by setting their boundaries and limits in an appropriate manner which desire. Thus they had taken as an issue of morality. Recently number of approaches of measuring cultural values had
been introduced and categorized in value taxonomy. At individual level values were
gestate as motivational target serving as directive principles in lives of individual’s.

The controversy bring forth by the interaction of culture was a contemplation
of the complexity of the phenomenon of culture itself. As a manifestation the
culture was taken as creative nature of man and it was a pluralistic. Further it was not
divided in national, Ethnic or civilized form, but also consider as a classical, folk and
combine cultures and also include various sub-cultures. To give an account of
multiculturalism with social justice had been a bone of contention. When studying
multiculturalism, organization and individual generally understand and consider
some, but not all, prospect of justice. Some take multiculturalism to be a dynamical
process, whereas people from various background worked together to make a
comprehensive society.

How multiculturalism promote Social justice in cultural identity

The concept of social justice was a revolutionary that gives a meaning and
importance to life and makes the rule of law dynamical. Social justice was not a blind
concept. It seeks to provide justice and fairness to all the citizen of the nation without
any discrimination. Thus social justice term was taken as a blanket term which
includes both social and economic justice. The concepts of social justice were a living
concept in multiculturalism and provide core to the rule of law as well as importance
to the ideal with cultural membership. According to Rousseau of the first Civil
Society where the difference and inequality, in course of time, became shocking
repellent that need for social justice was a natural call of humanity in comprehensive.
In the remark of philosophers, men were described as a social animal. When the civil
society formulated into an administrative social unit, the rules of conduct take on a
political sanction and a breach of them was create to culpable through the legislative
authority.

There were a long history of discussion on social theory and political
practices, with great emphasis on analytical thinking of social justice with
disagreement with regard to exact meaning and significance of the concept.
Moreover, whatever the view constitutes by social justice each of us is likely to have.
Such personal concepts likely include some belief of the meaning of impartiality and
candor in distributing resources and chances as well as interpretation of natural justice
with respect to social pattern and mutual interaction. Notwithstanding the extended analytic thinking of and use of the term “social justice,” some social science disciplines comprise narrow explicit discussion of the conception. In appraisal critique of literature on social justice as well as ethnic minorities, Pierre Joseph Ulysse notes a “virtual absence of the concept of social justice in the field of social science research on ethnic minorities” (Ulysse, 1999, 63). Simultaneously he contends that the sector of community “makes it the driving force behind actions in the field and daily struggles on behalf of the excluded categories” (Ulysse, 1999, 63). The shortfall of the research works on the discussion and various interpretations probably the reason behind the strong disagreement among authors about the connection between multiculturalism and social justice.

In the 20 century, social justice had been a central prescriptive element of social welfare and social work, while its definition was often ambiguous. Thus in present world this ambiguity endure conventional social welfare institutions had been established justice as an ethic and curricular self asserting field. The important source of such ambiguity exist in the struggle among views of fairness which concentrate on the issues of status and economic class and those that underline differentiate in ethnicity, gender, racism which are now united under the one label “multiculturalism”. Multicultural and Social justice awareness are inextricably associate. Sleeter (1996: 239) defines social justice as "taking as view which allows one to take social action in contrast to social structural inequality plus it has been treated as a better understanding of oppressiveness and inequality which give permission at greater extent into ways of eradicating them,". The “social justice framework” involves access to various resources, involvement in critical debate making procedure, and regard for human rights and the other different dimensions of individuality, cultural identity. These rights specifically concentrate on individuals, accordant with the “person-in-environment” epitome that had been dominated social work for a century. In the present discussion hence, social justice was assumed to be accordant with multiculturalism and within the balancing of individual cultural identity responsibilities and rights. Multiculturalism promoted social justice through the cooperation and work toward similar goals.

The concept of justice in multicultural with respect of individual cultural identity itself remains disputed one, as it was accepted from a various of political
situations, and interlinked with wider arguments about the roles of the country, state, the individual. Although the government stated that social justice is achieved best means of approach which gives them exclusive rights when individual are able to contend in culture community. Current arguments on justice also expose the tension with other all embracing political goals of economic competitiveness. Thus, concepts of justice in multiculturalism were closely linked with other key aspects such as rights to citizens. The individual values people attain were the impact of their individual cultural strength. In include the degree at which person identify as a member of their cultural society. Stated differently, it involve the central cultural membership has in defining who they are and the significance of individual as a members of their culture. It seems logically to presume that strength of cultural identity had better interaction with culture to influence the individualistic as well as collectivistic values of people. Cultural identity is the one of important social identity one should have. Social identities are those parts of an "individual's self-concept which derives from their knowledge of membership in a social community together with the ethnic and affectional significance linked to that membership.

**Cultural identity and Social Justice**

Culture had a great power to affect individual and person value framework. Culture is a set of ethics; values and traditional beliefs that are shared and inherited in a society. Culture was also reflect the whole way of life and thinking forms, artifacts and speech action that was transmitted from one generation to another generation. Even so, it depended on the human being capability for learning, understanding and transmitting knowledge to consecutive generation. In brief culture consider as total sum of beliefs, customs, artifacts, rituals, and values. Many philosophers distinguish between material and non material cultural membership. The former one made up out of art forms, material goods, trade and commerce. In the latter were let in beliefs, ethic, myths and other legend forms of traditions. It has basically three different forms like, first, normative which include social control in which people generally follow ethic norms. Second the expressive system which includes cultural expression of group. Third a place for individual member of community interpret the meaningfully world that is called civilization. Thus culture provides individuals and groups the essence of unity among community. A power full cultural identity is important for individual mental health and well-being. Having a strong
sense of their own cultural history and traditions helps ones to build an optimistic cultural identity for them, which provide them common sense of adherent and self-pride and support their overall well-being.

To understand national identity and cultural identity as well as its role in alleviate social justice we need to understand first Miller’s account of what a nation is? Succeeding Benedict Anderson, Miller asserted that creation of the nation was not prejudice simply on objective features. Instead the existence of a nation depends on a group of community of such people those share their belief that the “members be owned by together” and had an “Aim to continue their life in joint”. Life in common doesn’t mean share-out a geographical location that co-nationals physical occupy together except also show a shared national culture. On Miller’s point of view shared national culture embraced and interiorize by people of the nation as they take national culture as their own. The conception of cultural identity mention to familiar and cultural attributes of a person’s identity, as well as how others comprehend him or her, therefore, factors those were salient to a person’s identity both as comprehend by the individual and how others comprehend the person’s identity. Justice was also about the non-material elements of life these comprise critically few dimensions of respect and dignity between different community, individuals and groups. There were number of elements that can influence whether people from individualistic or collectivistic culture keep individual-level individualistic and collectivistic values. The most significant factor is whether people identify strongly and weakly with being members of their cultures. People who strongly find out with their culture should keep individual values that are accordant with cultural level and value, although people who doesn’t strongly identified with their culture values probably keep some individual value that are inconsistent with cultural level or values.

The phrasal “justice as fairness” had arouse up the idea that to deal with people fairly it was a need to regard people in abstract terms taking into relationship of general human interests instead of particular locality and identities. This concept of fairness was closely linked with the opinion that liberal states had better to be neutral between competing concepts of the good. Individuals were free to make their own choices in the context of what they taken as valuable as well as important. Such tasks of the political community were provided a framework under the situation in which they can create such choices under equal circumstances, not to assist and
undermine any specific choice. The cultural values were predominant in a culture identity such values that individual learned, yet individual ethnic structure had been different from cultural value forms. On this account, fairness needs hands off approach to culture and identity out of respect freedom of individual and equality. The state does not business supporting any specific cultural identity. There was one more concept on justice as fairness, even so, which was derived from the statement that to deal with people fairly we need to treat them concretely. In such way justice owes a great deal to the work of feminist theorists who had emphasized the moral importance of paying attention to the existent and the specific.

Justice was all about the non-material elements of culture it provide a life with dignity to individual in his her cultural community with equal rights to live among different groups of society. According to Miller, the different opinion of different persons on social justice was not to be taken as perplexed manner especially with the moral of a society in which everyone regarded one another equally. Multiculturalism was not a debatable issue in the context of justice to individual even it deals as an ideal in itself but it had some where distributive significance. This complementary ‘acknowledgement’ or ‘relations of esteem’ facet of social justice had been strongly argued in present days by e.g. Young (1990). For her, in cultural identity social justice taken as distributive problem has to be set inside a cultural context and relational in specific ‘the evacuation of institutionalized social control and oppressiveness’. Miller argues and determines that there was little existential evidence encouraging the view that different conceptions or principles of social justice was the outcome of cultural differences. Although the way of principles practices may vary. The essential point is that in cultural membership social justice cannot be blind issue of individual in any case, even in an area which has yet to be explored. We do know that the accomplishment of equally socially simply resultant, in terms of fulfill desire and so on, in clear noticeable manner variable shape called multicultural country to another. To some extent this was a reflection of the structural restraint under which government worked, in condition, for example of the historical developments of formal political constitution and informal political settlement, were equally important.

Conclusion

Finally, when we think about justice and fairness in terms of multiculturalism conceptually, we had to acknowledge that we can no longer think over such concept.
It is necessary to consider how the social justices play an important role in providing dignity to individual in their cultural individualism. The impact of economic groups which had no commitment to peculiar political entities affects this approach. Miller’s and earlier writers explicit that justice in multiculturalism was possible to define as social justice under the context of a individual identity in community which all applicable actors should be identified and further to engage politically with the arguments about justice. According to many commentators, globalization has been generated as increasing division; in terms of income and wealth respectively between or within all nation states and now there is a need to react by thinking on how social justice can be understood at individual level. In such context two more different scenarios may be advanced to protecting the claims of social justice. One is that every nation state can proceed to debate on the merits of justice, the other that a individual community and its institutions emerges come out which can constituted the new frame work of community. In place of, those attentive with issues of fairness between state as well as region could select not to pull back inside such a closed community but take it as advantage of economic, political, and social or environment based argument for global social justice.

The present research observed the degree of justice that strengthens the cultural identity of individual with multiculturalism to regularize individual stage of justice and respect for their cultural values. The facts stated from the studies show that culture interactionism with power of cultural identity to influence individual-level of justice and respect to their values. All such interaction personal effects that go forth in the present study were accordant with prospect based on cultural identity. To provide Strength to cultural identity in one way of differentiating people who behave in ways that are consistent with the general cultural-level tendencies. Both individual and cultural level values may affect the communication in the different situation as the both values were not necessarily continue, they must be taken into consideration for better understanding of communication among different cultures. The study suggests that individuals' strength of cultural identity interacts with their cultural background to influence their individualistic and collectivistic values.

Instead of rising issues and concern over scholarly articles, social welfare still obstructed several outdate premise on the relationship between justice and multiculturalism in terms of power and resources.
While there is general refuse given on the “melting pot,” it is not clear what substitute concept will give the social glue to bind together a progressively refractory multicultural society. Nor is it clear which rule of social justice can go outside “feel good” rhetorical, demographic “mosaics” or cultural “salads” as well as form meaningful policies which apart the importance of differences without stereotyping them. A “human rights framework” appears to give some commitment as a bridgeable concept, but it, too, had been challenged because of potential cultural biases. Except the meaning of both social justice and multiculturalism is give a new definition in various ways that stimulate them more compatible, the possibility of their accomplishment will decrease under the rising and necessary pressure of environmental, economic, and physical insecurities in the years ahead. For better understanding various cultural identities were categories the present issues and possible solutions to such problems. It is very important for scholars to identify the multidimensionality of their own identity so that they aware with issue, privilege related to their cultural identity. Accordingly it studied Miller’s opinion to be less rigorous in the banning of specific identities from the public arena. His view was even so ineffective to guarantee the substantial ability for internal minorities to contend national culture or identity. On account miller theory of liberal nationalism entirely , but there is a need that one could tell a different story than he does about cultural identity role in social justice deliberateness and the epistemological position that best facilitates social justice.

**ISSUE OF IDENTITIES IN A GIVEN MILIEU**

In starting with, it is essential to discuss some of the canonical concepts used in various theories by great philosophers on the history of culture, what was the background of the culture and how an individual got its cultural identity. Many research scholars determine the importance of cultural identity in present milieu with special concern on the issues facing by them in their surroundings. The concept of identity, whether it is social, cultural, personal or some other is a burning issue for every individual because everyone of us somehow concerned or linked with such questions of who we are? The study on understanding cultural identity started with the Cross (1978) theory of achromatic. He explained that our thinking included identity was a influence of positive and negative experiences in our social life, particularly for marginalize individual, identity can alleviated and settle by
concession; [II] it was easily adoptable for identity to include greater degree of functioning instead of challenging life experiences; [III] the social expression of the history of slavery, racism, segregation and the negative political history of state can negatively influence cultural identity of progress with race associated trauma or stress on several generations. Such concept taken culture as a united phenomenon which permits that there could be as many as various perspectives inside each collective as there was individual. Further Hofstede depict that the term culture was used for tribes and ethnic groups or nations and for organization. With the changing the level of accumulation studied the nature of culture can be changed and it can be taken as a term applied to sexual orientation, generations, gender (Hofstede, 2001). As per the inherent nature of culture, cultural identity appraisal cannot be depending on ethnicity alone, as well as cultural significance of a specific group.

**Nineteenth-Century Definition**

In the nineteenth century, the term culture was generally taken synonym for Western civilization. The anthropologist Sir Edward B. Tylor (1999) generalized the thought that all societies go through development phase started with savagery advancing to barbarism and combining in Western “civilization.” It’s was easy to say that such definition include Western cultures which considered superior. Both Western cultures, beginning with Eastern cultures, and ancient Greece, most notably China, believed that their own way of life was superior.

**Twentieth century Definition**

Cultures are not synonymous with countries. A culture doesn’t respected political boundaries. Some border cities like Tijuana, Juárez, El Paso, and San Diego can develop cultures that in some way were not like Mexico or the United States. The totality of that group’s patterns, thought, experiences of behavior and its concepts, values, and assumptions about life that guide behavior and how they were involve with contact each other culture. Hofstede (1991) categorized these factors of culture into four categories rituals, symbols, values and heroes. Symbols refer to verbal and nonverbal language. Rituals were the social activities inside a culture. Values were the emotions not open for discussion within a culture about what is good or bad. Heroes are the real or imaginary people who work for the people voluntary.
Cultural identity adverts to the feeling belong to a definite culture that was assign to the fostering of an individual in the given culture. Cultural identity provides an individual the sense of belonging or belonging towards their culture. In recent studies on culture depicts that cultural identification had taken a new face. Many cultural identifiers can be used to find out the culture of an individual. These identifiers include, gender, religious beliefs, nationality, language, location, history, and ethnicity. Culture plays an important role in forming the identity of an individual. The efforts taken by people to preserve their cultural identities can bring about emotion of intense dislike and separation in the society.

**The Concept of Identity**

Identity as a concept was considered as both abstract and deep in its core. The aspect of deepness was the element that find out identity like a centre of an individual on other hand the essence can ne neither seek nor stated at once because it lie on the different arena. The scene aspect of identity was simply a part of the self hence it takes long time to discover one’s self in full if possible at all. The content of identity is constitutional in objects yet its form presentment based on relational assessment. The term Identity comes from Latin language “identitas” or “idem” which means ‘the same’. The term 'identity' had two dynamical though not inevitably diametrical opposite intension. The etymological level of 'identity' can be follow and explicate as that aspect with which one identified. Further there were two basic definitions given by English Collins dictionary (2000) as:

1. Identification of oneself, e.g. “As moving to London destroyed his Welsh identity.”

2. A synonym to the following concepts: distinctiveness, individuality, particularity, personality, self, selfhood, singularity, uniqueness.

According to these definition identities of one -self was act accomplishment and later one implicit more stress on the capability of individual was unique for one another. Although these meanings were interlinked as they assist to each other. There was no doubt that the nature of identity and culture identity was merely complexes as individual identity can be easily recognized. The three-fold nature of showing identity point that if the entire thing was based so much on experience, then there is no single truth which, in its turn, substance that there cannot be a single true definition of
individual identity. Huntington (1997) stated that identity was defined untidily in common objective facts such as religion, language, customs and history as well s by the subjective self identification of individual. Hence the procedure of defining one’s identity needs an individual to accept a flexible opinion simply as per some theories that an identity in itself was smooth and flexible and unstable. And last but not least, Parekh (2008-09) human being belong and that they belong to a distinguish species, define them as well as decide how they should live or deal with them as human being. Therefore the question of identity was complex. It was easier to identify aspects of identity than in reality define identity.

Construction of identity

How identity is constructed and it was constructed at all? Whether identity is constructed or not, is not an easy question to answer. As a matter of fact there was a theory for identity constitution which connote that identity was socially constructed through development in a person’s whole life. Kelly (1955) was, perhaps the first scholar to suggest that identity, in its self constructed. Whether a person identity was established with the procedure and it was the out of socialization within the society. The shaping of identity takes place between socialization which include comparisons with others by differences and similarity. The establishment of identity could take place inside the co-recurrence of various elements or influences. The elements that take place, accordant to Erikson (1968) was an individual biological characteristics, their psychological demands, interests, and defaces, and the cultural surroundings to which a person were exposed. The formations of one’s sense of ego identity were the impact of all such factors. To highlighting the cultural identity in milieu as Erikson depicts it, it was very important. He constantly mentioned that once integrated together with the other two factors, cultural milieu or environment which provide a person with a sense of “bodily self” (Erikson in Kroger 2000:9). Furthermore accordant to Erikson, the expression of a ‘bodily self” was not merely some greater degree of awareness. In a nutshell it was not clear that whether identity had structure in it or not. Where the identity consist structure it was incorporate different elements that establish forms and shape it.
Culture and Identity

Culture identity is essential to preserve history and to provide a self esteem to a individual, it also give a place to person in their community to which they belong. It is important to discuss what culture is and to clear the aspects that identity and culture were similar in the character they posses. The concept of culture and identity are reciprocal to one another thus establishing a reciprocal and reaction between the both concepts. The term culture was defined by many authors from various possible points of view. Gonzalez and Tanno (1998) were used to be 164 various definitions of the word ‘culture’ in 1952, and, since then, the number had been increased. The reason behind the rising number of definitions on culture was the angle of stress from which culture is defined that is very different. As an example, Willmott and Novitz (1990:5), culture “is not simply music, art and literature it is the total collection of behavioral pattern, ethnic, value as well as belief that characterize a specific group of people.” Writer adopt that the distinctiveness in the behavior was essential, and it was an individual reflects the distinctiveness of the culture they possess. The study of culture and identity include debates on essential issues like relationship of the individual to the large group, the level of degree of liberty that a person have in their community and society in their daily life, degree of self consciousness individual had in respect of the way they behave and the control over the wider social framework into which one can born had over our life.

Culture is the term coined by a complex history. It driven from the Latin word for ‘cultivate’ as well as in this sense it go through into English in about the 15 century as a word to expressed cultivating, tending, husbanding . In the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries the terms assume the intension of educating, cultivating, and improving the mind set. The root of the idea of culture as group ‘advanced’ artistic shapes, the product of extended ‘cultivation’. From this belief of improvement there gradualness derivable the idea of culture as an abstract process of human knowledge or the products of that process culture here was a human faculty it was what made human. Notwithstanding, these Gordian wholes were seen as ordered on a ladder in which some people were more advanced culturally and ‘civilized’ in compare of others. Culture was the way of life of a grouping people, social life bechance to be organized in a specific way. Identity means knowing who you are. Culture and
identity are often interlinked but they should not be taken as precisely as the similar concept.

According to various scholars, identity was a concept that can be change constantly with having no peculiar stable element. It was interesting to know about the dual nature of identity that culture in itself can be consider from the same two reciprocally opposing position, thus culture can be consider as being static and it can be seen constantly changing aspect. Lustig and Koester (1993:41) see culture as “a learned set of shared perceptions about religion, values, beliefs, and norms.” Here the word ‘learned set’ pointing the static nature of ‘culture’ which was attained and not so much edited throughout a person’s life. For example, the ever-changing nature of culture was similar to the thoughts expressed by Parekh (2008) in terms of plurality of a person’s identity, because Parekh seeks identity as a non-monolithic entity. Turn back to the relationship between culture and identity in common sense, Friedman (1996) endorses the view, that culture as such and one’s personal identities are mutually connected. There were number of comparisons on ‘culture’ as a ‘human nature’ because as per the author, “human biology needs an input of a cultural program in order for the human organism to be able to function”.

**Why Identity is Important in Present Scenario**

Cultural identity is constituted when a group of people persistently follows the same sets of social norms as well as behavior as similar to earlier generations. Cultural identity of an individual’s was influence by elements such as, educational level, ancestry, social, class, family, profession, language and political opinions. People who attain strong sense culture identity are more probably to find a sense of security or belonging. As per social report people with an intense and definite cultural identity generally show positive result in terms of health and education. They are more interlinked social networks, and they are depend on such sources for support, as they have a great sense of trust with such people those connected with them on these networks. Number of people taken culture with a variety of subcultures as well as cultural identity themselves can alter over time as the beliefs and behavior of groups changes. Utilizing cultural identity to build barricade between various subcultures can result to intolerance and censure from society. Identity is who we are, how we understand our self. Identity give a sense of life to individual make them capable feel the sense of coherence and direction. It was the outcome on continuous conscious and
unconscious interacting between the society and community and our self understanding. An individual grow with a clear vision of unchangeable concept that who we are and how we live our life structurally and guide our life without any barricade those stop oneself form getting aware of it.

The Indian civilization was plural or involved various currents of moral as well as philosophical views wander from polytheism to atheism and from primitive materialism to the greater degree of idealism. Instead of their occasional fights and periods of intolerance, these bodies of ideas savor significant freedom of aspect, involved in a critical dialogue or borrowed ideas of others to make a different and internally differentiated complex culture. Although it is essential to understand the important of identity which comprised of share religious, language, ideas, biases and ways of seen the world in present milieu. Therefore our identity was the impact of socially constructed and biological attributes which attain from generation to generation. But it’s important to know that from where do these values, ethnic or ideologies come from and why they are important for anyone. Still the answer was not clear, but in number of cases we have learned that these ethnic, values we got from our surroundings like from our family, schools, organization etc.

They all are play an important role in making forms, norms and our values, they define us who we are and give us an identity which creates a different attitude. Our race, gender, sexuality, culture, religion, ethnicity, and class play a crucial role in determining whether we had economic, social and political strength. The role our identities play in the way we experience and fall strength it’s important to understand the possible barriers and oppressiveness that few groups experience over others. In globalized milieu a person’s over view construct the identity. A comprehensive view was a set of suppositions about the human being existence. It can be treated as the inter link of pre-suppositions by which one can understand, judge or evaluate as well as consider the reality. It works as a lens through which one can see the world. The education we get, the surrounding in which we grow, and the culture we live, or the literature we study all are influenced by movies and media we draw and go so forth. Hence the sameness of society creates similar social life and provides similar or unique identity to group and to an individual in their life which further lead towards similar cultural identity.
Problem faced by Identity in present surroundings

Cultural identity requires respondent which were identified the aspects concerned in the present issue. It helps in narrowing down the core values included and where the distrait was located (Ibrahim, 1999, Castillo, 1997, Dana, 1998). Culture commonly come forth as a very strong element in human distress, because number of life’s essential dilemmas were focused on an individual demand to do something and the restraints commonly come from learned cultural identity, religious, and internalized perquisite and oppressiveness (Caughy, Lohrfi nk, Nettles, O’Campo, Brody et al., 2006 & Chen & Bargh, 1997). Moreover, we cannot presume that identity was always the issue, exploration of the centre values, as they affected such domain help in creating a fuller understanding of the individual cultural identity and especially on various variables that had not been traditionally consider to pint of view (Castillo, 1997, Dana, 1998). Frable (1997) brief that the multi-dimensionality of identity was overlooked in counseling as well psychotherapy because the facts of identity had been studied in a fragmented manner in the psychology literature.

To incorporate the identity prospect in this discussion it was essential to identify that cultural, ethnic, religious along with the other elements discuses here i.e., class, gender identity, age, sexual orientation and life stage, ability-disability continuum, educational status, religion, and the geographic location one comes from, given the context can be a resource of perquisite or oppressiveness. Some aspects of identity elevate from social values, assumptions and beliefs, or they fall down the other aspects of group and individual identity or provide opportunities for the better life. It was necessary to critically determine the meaning of all such categories given individual socio-political history or earned and unearned. There are basically two prospective which was considering in identity they are uniqueness and sameness. The uniqueness makes the person different from others on the basis of some different and unique qualities and sameness is features of a person which contain the similar characteristics with others.

In the early period 1950, the interest of scholars reflected in the concept of identity and personality. The relationship between culture and identity was the object of research in earlier study and present studies too. In the very face work of (Erik Erikson’s 1950) on “Ego Identity” was one of the best-known theories of person identity in psychology which was also used in the philosophical research too.
Erikson's theory depicts that the affect of social experience in personality as well as analyze the psychological condition that determine the accommodation of human personality (Erikson, 1950). Later the study of personality was replaced by identity and come in anthropology as a winder term (Meijl, 2008). Identity brings up mainly to a rational sense of self and the emotions of being the same. It makes the sense of how one is viewed or identified by the others. So, identity was well adjustable personalities that come-forth from the similar or from the uniqueness. In another word, it was an identification of self by self and other. In the process globalizing the mixing up of culture was the concept and scope of identification is modified, broadens, refined and elaborated. With the advancement of capitalism, especially since the end of nineteenth century, a greater number of people's participate and involve in larger social system and interact in greater degree of level with cultural diversities and communicate with different varsities of technology and language which had been establish cultural complexity. Thus there was a great discussion or debate on whether the present scenario of cultural inflow or global consciousness increase and decrease the sameness between the people around the universe. The most controversial issue for the interpretation was tension between cultural heterogenization and cultural homogenization. Homogenization was generally understood as a procedure which leads towards uniformity. They explain it as an imperialism of cultural and advance form of colonialism. On the contrary, practitioners had been stress about dis-appearance of cultural fluctuation and cultural heterogenization.

**Conclusion**

The identity of individual community and group was categorized by oneself and others, which was categorized by the theoretical concept of ‘us’ and ‘them’. Categorization of ‘us’ and ‘them’ were depending on one’s identity on the level of degree of sameness and uniqueness so on. Culture was not a new concept and also it was not studied by scholar’s recently even studies on culture and multicultural and work on multiculturalism was an old and very important concept specially in philosophical study as it was study and research by great authors like Parekh, Kmalyika, millers and so on. In the present environment various concept of culture were linked by earlier studies and try to find out the new out comes on such topic to enhance the perspectives of research in particular study. As we study earlier identity
was exist from the period of history and with the passage of time it divide among different form inside the community and groups. The identities provide individual a different and unique identity to a person which makes them different from others in group of community. Identity establish by combination of different religious view, values, cultures with essential concept of similarity and uniqueness in social and cultural norms and behaviors which lead them toward cultural identity. Identity was formed through the interaction among social inflows of knowledge, activities and so forth. In the cognitive process of interaction, the social as well cultural convention of social reality can be come out, reformed, even become more powerful and wider. Engage in such daily life routines created social ordination with remold social or cultural norms as well as values social and cultural pattern and shapes which were consider as the identity of an individual in a community.

It was difficult for scholars to identify and categories critical aspects of identity with present problem and with the probable solutions. It is equally essential for therapists to find out the cultural identity of their own community. It was very important to be aware of their own identity, their problems, issues and their privilege and oppressiveness; if not understood or self-addressed these will come up as unguided missiles. The outcome of cultural mixing can come along in different form i.e., pluralism; diasporic identity; and so forth. In addition, identity was the united reflection of one’s perception on social reality.
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