S.Y.B.A.
SEMESTER - III (CBCS)

PHILOSOPHY PAPER - II
SOCIAL POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

SUBJECT CODE: UAPHI301

Prof. Suhas Pednekar
Vice-Chancellor,
University of Mumbai,

Prof. Ravindra D. Kulkarni   **Prof. Prakash Mahanwar**
Pro Vice-Chancellor,   Director,
University of Mumbai,   IDOL, University of Mumbai,

Programme Co-ordinator	**:**	**Shri Anil Bankar** Associate Professor of History and Head Faculty of Arts, IDOL, University of Mumbai
Course Co-ordinator	**:**	**Dr. Narayan Shankar Gadade** Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Mumbai, Mumbai
Course Writer	**:**	**Prof. Rucha Pawar** Assistant Professor,
	:	**Dr. Viplov Dhone** Assistant Professor,
	:	**Dr. Biraj Mehata** Assistant Professor,
	:	**Dr. Dipesh Upadhyaya** Assistant Professor,

March 2022, Print - 1

Published by	:	Director, Institute of Distance and Open Learning , University of Mumbai, Vidyanagari, Mumbai - 400 098.

DTP Composed & Printed by	:	Mumbai University Press, Vidyanagari, Santacruz (E), Mumbai

CONTENTS

❖ ❖ ❖ ❖

S.Y.B.A.
SEMESTER III (CBCS)
PHILOSOPHY PAPER - II
SOCIAL POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

The overall objectives of the course are as follows:

1. To acquaint students with the basic philosophical questions and issues that are current in social and political philosophy.

2. To equip students with argumentative and analytical skills involved in philosophizing through these issues.

3. To encourage a spirit of rationality in philosophizing appreciating and respecting differing philosophical ideas and perspectives.

Unit 1 Family and Gender Issues (11 Lectures)
Perspectives on family & marriage : (i) Plato's perspective on marriage and family (ii) Bertrand Russell's perspective on marriage and family. Contemporary trends in family and marriage : (i) single parent families, (ii) live – in relationships, (iii) same-sex marriages. Gender as a construct: (i) Feminism (Simon de Beauvoir) and (ii)Masculinity.

Unit II Social Awareness (11 Lectures)
Economic discrimination : (i) Gandhi's notion of trusteeship and (ii) critique of capitalism; class discrimination: (i) Marx's theory of alienation (of proletariat) and (ii) class conflict-bourgeois and proletariat; racial Discrimination: (i) Frantz Fanon's psycho-analysis of racism and (iii) dialectics of recognition (Hegel); caste discrimination: (i) Ambedkar's account of the problem of caste discrimination and (ii) Ambedkar's response to it

Unit III Just War and Pacifism (11 Lectures)
Just War Theory: (i) Justice of War (jus ad bellum) (ii) Justice in war (jus in bello), (iii) Justice after war (jus post bellum); types of pacifism.

Unit IV Engaging Diversity (12 Lecture)
Philosophical perspective on multiculturalism: Bhikhu Parekh; critique of multiculturalism – Brian Berry; right of refugees and rights of immigrants – Michael Dummett; Orientalism – Post-colonial of the European representation of the Orient-Edward Said

Semester End Exam Evaluation (100 Marks)
1. There shall be five compulsory questions
2. First four questions shall correspond to the four units
3. Question 5 shall be Short Notes (one from each unit and attempt any 2 of 4)
4. All questions shall contain internal choice
5. Each question shall carry a maximum of 20 marks

I

References and reading list recommended for the course:

Unit I

Bertrand Russell *Marriage and Moral* Routledge Publications, 1985

Deborah satz "Feminist Perspectives on Reproduction and the Family" *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 2013 (on linehttps://plato. stanford. edu/entries/feminismfamily /)

Barrie Thorne "Feminist Rethinking of the Family : An Overview" *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions* ed. Barrie Thorne and Marilyn Yalom Longman : New York and London, 1982

Simone de Beauvoir "Introduction" The Second Sex (a new translation by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevalleir) Vintage : London, 2009

Jack Sawyes "On Male Liberation" in *Feminism and Mansculinities* ed. Peter Murphy OUP, Oxford 2004

Todd Reeser, Masculinities in Theory : *An Introduction* chapter 1

John Beynon, *Masculinities and Culture* chapter 1

Unit II

M.K.Gandhi. Trusteeship Navjeeven Publication, 1990.

K. Kriplani All men and brothers, Chapter – Poverty in the Midst of plenty – Navjeevan Publication 1960

Franz Fanon "The Fact of Blackness" Black skin white Masks – Grove Press 1967

John Elster, An *Introduction to Karl Marx* chapter 3 and 7

Kalr Marx and Friedrich Engles *A Manifesto of the Communist party* 1848 https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto. pdf

B.R.Ambedkar "Annihilation of Caste" in Dr. *Babasaheb Ambedkar*: *Writings and Speeches,* Vol. 1. Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1979

B.R. Ambedkar "On the way to Goregaon" in *The Essential Writings of B.R.Ambedkar* ed.

Valerian Rodgrigues OUP, Oxford: 2002

"Who were the Shudras?" in *The Essential Writings of B.R. Ambedkar* ed. Valerian Rodrigues OUP, Oxford: 2002

Unit III

Nicholas Fotion War and Ethics: a New Just War Theory (Continuum, 2007)

Colin Bird, *Introduction to Political Philosophy* chapter 10

Catriona McKinnon, *Issues in Political Theory*, Chapter 3

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (on line source) readings on war and pacificism.

Unit IV

Charles Taylor "The Politics of Recognition" in Colin Farrelly (ed) *Contemporary Political* Theory: A Reader (Sage Publishers, 2004)

Bhiku Parekh. "Equality of Difference" in Colin Farrelly (ed) *Contemporary Politicial Theory*:

A Reader (Sage Publishers, 2004)

Brian Berry, "Liberalism and Multiculturalism" in Ethics

George Crowder, *Theories of Multiculturalism: An Introduction*, Chapter 3

Bill Ashcroft and Pal Ahluwalia, *Edward said* (Routledge Critical Thinkers Series)Chapter 3.

Moustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin (ed.) *The Edward Said Reader* chapter 4.

Micheal Dummet Immigration and Refugees Routledge London and New York, 2001, (Chapter 15)

❖❖❖❖

1

FAMILY AND GENDER ISSUES

Unit Structure

1.0   OBJECTIVES

- To know Plato's perspective on marriage and family

- To aware Bertrand Russell's perspective on marriage and family.

- To study Contemporary trends in family and marriage

- To study the thoughts of Simon de Beauvoir's on feminism

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The relationship between families and gender continues to be the subject of dispute in the social sciences. The 'linguistic turn' in the study of gender relations has directed attention to the most general cultural determinants of the gender identity of family members. In this chapter we will study Plato and Bertrand Russell's perspective on marriage and family. Contemporary trends in family and marriage will also be studied. Feminism by Simon de Beauvoir and Masculinity is also needed to study in this concern.

1.2 PERSPECTIVESONFAMILY AND MARRIAGE

1.2.1 Plato's perspective on marriage and family:

Plato in his writings focuses a lot on the structure of the public and the political. Questions like how should the state function? How should people politically participate in the state? Who is capable of participating in the state? Are deliberated upon in great length. For topics that seem quite far removed from the private contexts of relationship, family and marriage, Plato had a lotto say about these.

For Plato, the best way to organize the state is to make it as just as possible. By that he essentially means the virtuous city. This city of virtue shall then account for individuals with virtue that equally uphold justice. To implement this, he suggests that people should work to maintain the state in certain ways: some must guard it, some must oversee its functioning, some account for the production of goods the city needs. According to Plato, "women and children "both must be shared amongst the Guardian class. This meant that marital partnerships and the progeny born from it were entirely assigned to the realm of the political. While marital relationships should not be personalized, they should be organized on the basis of certain eugenics. The children born from the marriages are to be raised by the state separately.

This blended the separation between private and the public, or the political, Plato conceptualizes family and marriage in such a manner in order to obliterate any vested private interests of people at large. This is so that people don't become selfish and just serve their own private interests, and work for the state instead.

Aristotle criticizes Plato on his account of marriage and family. According to him, marriage cannot be thought of in this manner. Moreover, he asserts that within marriage there are certain roles assigned to man and woman, both of which are equally important. The family is at the core of the state.

Gender as a construct

(Simon de beauvoir)

Feminist philosopher Simon de Beauvoir (1908-86) argued that the institution of marriage along with social norms, forge choices that can be disempowering for women relative to men. In Second Sex, Beauvoir exposes specific ways in which expectations in a marriage, that reinforces the ideal of an exclusive love relationship, are the primary means by which women are socialised into a femininity that lead women to focus on their attractiveness as spouses at the cost of their other aspirations.

Marriage is the "destiny traditionally offered to women by society" (de Beauvoir 1949 [1989],425). She views marriage as an unequal sexual and economic union that serves the interests of society and not their mutual happiness. Young women are encouraged by society to view marriage as the only means to integrate in a community.

While a married man finds self-fulfilment through the change and progress in his occupation and political life and finds his anchorage in the world at home. Marriage is thrusted upon woman for two reasons: (i) she must provide society with children; (ii) she is needed 'to satisfy a male's sexual needs and to take care of his home'. Marriage is therefore a transaction: in carrying out the above duties the married woman provides a service to her spouse and in return he is supposed to provide her gifts, a marriage settlement, and support her.

The concept of the Other is crucial to her analyses where Subject is the absolute human type: aman; and the Other is inessential: a woman who, when measured on the basis of criteria of this absolute human type, is considered inferior. The women's so-called inferiority is used to justify their patriarchal domination.

Beauvoir analyzed the ways in which the cultural assumptions frame women's experience of their bodies and alienate them from realizing their own bodies' possibilities. She presses up onus to interrogate the basis for these cultural assumptions. For eg, what is the basis for a cultural assumption: 'women are the weaker sex'. Is the criteria the upper body strength, or their body size? Why is women's longer lifespan than men not considered a criteria for defining strength? Such interrogation exposes the biases of the criteria to support women's weakness as a culturally accepted assumption. She attended to the ways in which the patriarchal structures in a society use such assumptions to justify hierarchical relation between men and women and deprive women of realizing their possibilities for their bodies. This deprivation is oppression.

Beauvoir provided the language to analyze such social constructions of femininity and a method to critique these constructions.

In Second Sex, Beauvoir writes, "One is not born but becomes a woman". Through this idea, she rejects the notion that to be born with female genital (biological sex) is to be born a woman, a gender that is a construct. She asks us to identify and set aside all our assumptions about our gender until and unless they have been validated by our experience.

Beauvoir argued for sexual equality in two ways: first, she exposed the ways in which masculine ideology exploits cultural assumptions to socialise women into femininity and justify the systems of inequality. Second, she identified the ways in which arguments for equality erased women's unique experience of their bodies and reinforced the idea that to gain equality with men, women must train and live like men.

The first makes her averse to risking herself for her own ideas and the second alienates her from her own sexuality.

Beavoir insisted that women and men treat each other as equals and that such treatment requires that their unique experience of their bodies (different from men) be validated. Equality is not a synonym for sameness. She argued for women's equality, while insisting on the reality of women's unique experiences of their bodies as different from men.

The idea of marriage as a procreative unit is at the centre of regulation of intimacy by the State. There are sizable number of people who don't fit this heteronormative (assumption of heterosexuality and gender difference as a norm and basis for institutions such as marriage)idea. Reports indicate that single parent households make up 7.5% of all households in India of which majority (4.5% or approximately 13 million households) are headed by women (Pandit2019).

Legal alternatives for recognising such non-normative families have formed an important part of the discourse concerning unmarried, live-in heterosexual partners as well as lgbtq+partnerships. In other countries, civil unions and registered partnerships are seen as alternatives to marriage. Considering a large number of individuals opting for a live-in partnership rather than marriage, certain countries have passed laws recognising them. Canada, Tasmania and Hawaii not only recognised conjugal, romantic relationships but also on-conjugal caring relationships involving an economic or emotional interdependency.

In countries that don't recognise same sex marriage, certain benefits of marriage such as legal recognition and social support, are denied to same-sex partners on the discriminatory basis of their sexual orientation. Several arguments for same-sex marriages invoke liberal principles of justice such as equality in treatment, opportunity and neutrality. If the function of marriage is legal recognition of "voluntary intimate" relationships, then exclusion of same-sex partners is unjustifiably discriminatory. Since 1990s, India saw same-sex couples document their intention to live together in the form of a registered life partnership deed and in some cases, in the form of friendship contracts such as Maitri Karar, which declared their status and rights as a couple. This alternative to marriage,

some argue, doesn't fulfill the benefit of providing legal and an indirect social recognition of a relationship as offered by a marriage.

A strong argument for same sex marriage against the normative idea of marriage as a procreative unit is that a liberal state should not choose among the various ways (in lines with justice) in which individuals may organise sex and intimacy. In India, there is a demand for equal rights for all existing partnerships with legal relevance for partners in each other's lives and freedom to design their relationships without marriage. Such queer people may find common ground with single parent families, live-in partners etc.

Some queer theorists (philosophers of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender oppression) argue that that extending a heteronormative social institution of marriage to same-sex partnerships will undermine various ways that queer partners design their relationships and further marginalize asexuals, aromantics, polyamorists, and those who choose to build their lives around friendships.

Some other arguments stemming from conservative State against same sex marriages is that society is not ready for its acceptance. However, this is absurd as this implies that marriages that are inter-caste or inter-religious, both a subject of controversy in a Brahmancal patriarchal society, should not be legalized.

On October 25th 2021, Solicitor General Tushar Mehta, in a hearing on legalising same-sexmarriages said that only marriages between "a biological man and a biological woman" are legal in India. This point of view of seeing the world in binaries deprives of their equal rights as cisheterosexual partners.

Independent researcher Vqueeram Aditya Sahai presses for the need to see the problems that institution of cis heterosexual marriages has given rise to, as it seems to be intimately tied to property, caste and patriarchy. As marriage has always been the domain of maintaining a caste based hegemony, there is a need to rethink how existing non-normative partnerships can obtain legal sanction without replicating the existing Brahmancal patriarchal structures.

1.2.2 Bertrand Russell's perspective on marriage and family

In his "Marriage and Morals" (1929), Russell proposes certain revolutionary ideas regarding the institutions of marriage, family and the like. Shortly after its publication the book received severe criticism for the views Russell held as they were deemed entirely controversial for the prevalent perspectives on marriage at the time. One of the major reasons why this book received such backlash was that it entirely overturned the ways in which the society held its beliefs regarding the ideas of marriage, sex, family. For the majority of the 20th century western European society, the institutions of marriage and family were entirely based on a traditional morality of the Victorian era. While this morality was

influenced by cultural factors, it was largely based on the religious morality of Catholic beliefs. For such an account of morality, marriage was a matter of religious sanction, while the purpose of sex was purely for procreation.

According to Russell, these views regarding these concepts no longer hold the significance that they did, this is mainly because of the changes that the society has undergone. Due to the shift in the dynamic of gender relations because of the gradual progress of women's emancipation movements. Moreover Russell also holds that these institutions are also subject to change through the advent of contraception, shift in perspectives regarding abortion, divorce, in fidelity etc. He thereby takes a different approach to the problems of the morality surrounding these issues. For all the changes in these social factors, Russell proposes that the morality and the structure of sexual ethics needs to revised in order to reflect these changes within society.

Hence he argues that mutual divorce should be accessible for people, the youth should have the opportunity of trial marriage. Russell was also a strong proponent of the emancipation of women in the spheres of marriage, family and the like.

1.5 SUMMERY

Plato conceptualizes family and marriage in such a manner in order to obliterate any vested private interests of people at large. This is so that people don't become selfish and just serve their own private interests, and work for the state instead. Aristotle criticizes Plato on his account of marriage and family. According to him, marriage cannot be thought of in this manner. Moreover, he asserts that within marriage there are certain roles assigned to man and woman, both of which are equally important. The family is at the core of the state.

Simon de Beauvoir argued that the institution of marriage along with social norms, forge choices that can be disempowering for women relative to men. Young women are encouraged by society to view marriage as the only means to integrate in a community. While a married man finds self-fulfilment through the change and progress in his occupation and political life and finds his anchorage in the world at home. Beauvoir writes, "One is not born but becomes a woman".

1.6 QUESTIONS

1. Explain Plato's thoughts on family
2. Explain Russell's thoughts on family
3. Write down the reasons and consequences of single parent family
4. Discuss the pros and cons of live-in-relationship
5. Write down the different perspectives on homosexuals

6. Write a detailed account of feminist currents

7. Explain Simon de Beauvoir's contribution to feminism

8. Write Short notes on:

- Women's Communism- Plato

- Single Parent Family

- Live-in-Relationship

- Same Sex Marriage

- Masculinity

- Indian Feminism

1.7 SUGGESTED READING

- Bertrand Russell Marriage and Morals Routledge Publications,1985

- Deborah Satz "Feminist Perspectives on Reproduction and the Family" Stanford

- Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2013 (on line https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminismfamily/)

- Barrie Thorne "Feminist Rethinking of the Family: An Overview" Rethinking the Family:

- Some Feminist Questions ed. Barrie Thorne and Marilyn Yalom Longman: New York and

- London, 1982

- Simone de Beauvoir "Introduction" The Second Sex (a new translation by Constance

- Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier) Vintage: London, 2009

- Jack Sawyer "On Male Liberation" in Feminism and Masculinities ed. Peter Murphy OUP,

- Oxford 2004

- Todd Reeser, Masculinities in Theory: An Introduction chapter 1

- John Beynon, Masculinities and Culture chapter 1

❖❖❖

2

TRUSTEESHIP, THE CORNERSTONE OF GANDHISM

2.0   OBJECTIVES

- To get understand the social issues of 20th century.

- Understanding economical equality and Gandhian notion of socialism via Gandhi's concept of Sarvodaya.

- Getting familiar with Marx's concept of alienation and the way for de-alienation.

- To know Ambedkar's notion of caste base exploitation through Annihilation of Caste.

- To know the racial discrimination through Fanon's philosophy.

2.1   INTRODUCTION

The 20th century is known for various emancipatory projects, revolutions, freedom struggles, human right movements and many other social and political movements.

All these movements, revolutions etc. were based on political philosophies of different philosophers. For instance, the communist revolutions of last century were based on the philosophy of Karl Marx. In this unit one is going to understand the different social – economical and political problems of 20th century philosophy and society and.

First and foremost, this chapter deals with Mahatma Gandhi and his concept of Sarvodaya which was an answer to Marx's communism on

hand and other hand a philosophical thought which deal with the economic inequality colonial India and how to get rid off this inequality.

Followed by Mahatma Gandhi, this unit deals with Karl Marx and his analysis of alienation of proletariat in capitalist society. Here first of all one will understand how Marx differs from Hegel and other Young Hegelians over the concept of alienation and then this unit explore the concept of alienation from Marx's early work.

Followed by Marx this unit engage with caste problem which is peculiar to Indian situation and tries to understand Ambedkar's account of caste base subjugation and humiliation.

Towards the end this unit moves to other apart of global south and explains the racial discrimination through philosophy of Fanon.

2.2 SARVODAYA – MAHATMA GANDHI.

If we believe Gandhi, we are all thieves. He suggested that "that we are thieves in a way. If I take anything that I do not need for my own immediate use, and keep it, I thieve it from somebody else". Therefore, ownership sans immediate usage is act of theft. If so, the things owned for immediate use shall be considered stolen property. Though it reminds of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's declaration that 'property is robbery' (often translated as theft). The problem with Prudhon's argument, as rightly pointed out by none other than Marx, is that it does not consider the fact that property has to preexist for it to be robbed. Gandhi, on the other hand, puts the focus on the ones who own more than what they can use. Elsewhere, he argued that use should be in accordance with need, not greed as the world has sufficient resources to meet everyone's needs but not even one person's greed. In other words, if your ownership is limited to what you use to satisfy your needs, you are not a thief. Here the problem is twofold: a) there are significant differences/possibilities in what we use b) there is no universal standard to determine legitimate need.

One may even argue that usage and needs are socially constructed, not just economically determined. For instance, one can see considerable differences in how workers commute to their workplace, by car, bicycle or by walk despite their similar economic standard. The need and usage may also be subjectively perceived. On might feel healthy enough to walk, another might prefer car fearing diseases. Gandhian conception of trusteeship requires that people should agree to limit their usage to a minimal conception of need (not more than what is required for what one's objective condition require for). And whatever one commands beyond this must be given away to people in need.

Gandhi recognized that trusteeship is not a tool for removing unequal needs. Thus he argued that "everybody should have enough for his or her needs. For instance. . .the elephant needs a thousand times more food than the ant, but that is not an indication of inequality. So the real meaning of economic equality was: "To each according to his need". That was the

definition of Marx. If a single man demanded as much as a man with wife and four children that would be a violation of economic equality." (Harijan, 31-3-1946, p. 63). Therefore, we can argue that large groups need more than small groups. However, in India, the reality is that the minority of Upper Castes hold much more than 85% of the Bahujan population. In the Gandhian spirit of trusteeship, the Upper Castes should renounce their excess wealth relative to their population share and hand over it over to the majority.

It requires a change in the self-perception of those who own more than what they can use to meet their needs (devoid of greed). That self-perception should be a product of admission of guilt of theft'. "Therefore whoever appropriates more than the minimum that is really necessary for him is guilty of theft" asserted Gandhi (Ashram Observances in Action, p, 58, Edn. 1955). This self-perception cannot be individualist in the context of India. Beyond individuals, members of Upper Castes who collectively own much more than the rest of the population should recognize, if they are true followers of Gandhi, their guilt in theft and take remedial action.

One can in fact argue that trusteeship is the most power idea in Gandhi, in fact most impactful too if implemented because it is doable only with the conversion of minds, with no himsa at all. Therefore, trusteeship is at the heart of Gandhian vision of ahimsa and must be prioritized as such.

2.3 MARX CONCEPT OF ALIENATION

Even though Marx was concerned with emancipation as a political process and not merely spiritual during the late 1830s, he developed this concept further in his *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* in the year 1844. This particular text deals with the nature of capital, estranged labour, communism and the critique of Hegel's philosophy in general. The conception of emancipation as described in the 1844 *Manuscripts* is related with estranged and private property, and this became the basis for Marx's later theories on capital and labour. Besides that, this concept deals with the universal formation of worker as an emancipator of society from private property. In this scheme of relationships between worker-capitalist-property, Marx emphasizes the mediatory function of capitalist production process, the abolition of which he considers necessary for the emancipation of not only workers, but humanity as such. However, he is not critical towards all sorts of mediations; rather he is critical towards only second order mediations i.e. private property, exchange and division of labour (Meszaros 2006, 79). Such mediations exist for a specific historic period and must necessarily fall off as their place in the relations of production becomes a shackle to the overall development of the means of production,

To understand the necessity of political emancipation of workers, one needs to understand the entire process of estranged labour which takes place in modern industrial production process. Before explaining the concept of estranged labour, we must explain the notion of labour. Labour

is the active property of a human being. It is the human being's activity through which the environment and the human body becomes developed and amenable to social use. Through the use of this active property over the immediate nature, human beings create those things which are useful for their existence (Marx1975, 287). Labour is thus the driving force behind life.

Human being, the 'worker' in particular, is dependent on the nature of the act of production. Through this productive mediation with the external material world, the worker realizes himself. The worker has to act upon nature and only through this act can the workers produce those things which are necessary for his/her physical existence. Therefore, the relation between worker and nature is active in its essence because workers can only perform the act of production in specific material conditions only, and by doing so, the worker transforms those material conditions (Marx1975, 325).

In the above process, nature provides two things to worker that is: a means of life and means of subsistence (Marx1975, 325). Means of life refers to the object on which labour can exercise itself, and this same object provides the means for physical subsistence. In the same process, worker becomes the slave of his/her object in two ways. Firstly he/she receives the object on which he/she can perform his/her labour; that means, he/she receives work. Secondly, through this work alone can he/she gain the things through which he/she can sustain his/her own subsistence. The worker sustains him/herself so that he/she may continue to produce. Subsistence for the sake of work is the purpose of a worker's life, and the worker is unable to enjoy freely the fruits of his labour.

The above process is the explanation for the alienation of labour; or the alienation of the worker from the product which he/she produces. However, this is just one aspect of alienation. There remains the second aspect of alienation and that is the act of production as alienated act, of productive activity as alienated activity. Alienation of activity refers to the condition where the product of the worker's activity is alien from him/her, then the act of production itself is active alienation (Marx1975, 326). That means the worker performs the activity as a necessity for his/her existence, and the activity stands against him/her as an independent entity which does not belongs to him/her (Marx1975, 327).This alienated labour is alienated activity, meant for the satisfaction of needs, not only of the worker but for society as a whole. This activity is alienated because worker performs this activity under the yoke of forced labour (Marx 1975, 326). Whereas the worker stays within the realm of necessity, only consuming enough to sustain his working life, a consuming population which has developed away from the worker freely enjoys the product made on this forced labour.

The third aspect of alienation is alienation from species-being. Human beings are ultimately commonly bound by their existence as a species innature. The human workers' practical creation and recreation of the

objective world, and the fashioning of inorganic nature lays the foundation for their survival as a species (Marx 1975, 328). Human beings, being conscious beings, perform their activity in a self-aware manner as life activity itself is an object of consciousness (Marx 1975, 328). In other words, humans are aware that they are alive, and that they must do certain things to preserve their lives – but even further, they are aware that they can commit acts which do not directly contribute to the fulfilment of their immediate needs. The very self-awareness of human activity opens a new dimension to human activity, through which humans are able to produce freely. As Marx puts it, when 'man' (Marx 1975, 329) performs his/her activity, this activity is a universal one; it outgrows the particularity of each individual's survival and is driven by the human being's recognition of him/herself as part of a species, and a member of society. Thus, at this point, the act of production takes place even when he/she is not under the pressure of having to complete physical and natural needs and he/she truly performs the act of production even when they are in total freedom or when they are free from such natural needs. It is this mutual sharing of labour that creates a material basis for the continued existence of human societies. Without a mechanism for the sharing of labour, a society cannot survive.

Estranged labour turns this species life of human beings into means of individualist life(Marx 1975, 328). Under the yoke of estranged labour, the worker performs the life activity for the satisfaction of individual needs, the needs which can satisfy his/her physical existence (Marx1975, 328). As Marx says,"…estranged labour therefore turns man's species being – both nature and his intellectual species power – into being alien to him and as means of his physical existence (Marx 1975,329)."

That is, estranged labour separates a human being from his/her body, from nature, from the spiritual and human essence (Marx 1975, 329). The alienation of species-being leads human beings to the alienation of 'man to man' (Marx 1975, 330). The relationship which one human being holds towards his/her labour, the product of that labour and himself/herself, the same relation he/she holds for another individual, his/her labour and product of labour (Marx 1975, 330).

When one says that the individual human being is estranged from species-being, it means that each individual is alienated from the others. So, it is to say that all humans are estranged from human essence (Marx 1975,330). The individual self-estrangement can be understood or realized only in the relation with another individual (Marx1975, 330).

With the explanation of this concept, Marx shows how and why the estrangement, or alienation, takes place. If the estranged labour and the individual's product are alien to him/her, which confronts in front of him/her as alien power, then the question emerges that: whom does it belongs to? The one who owns this product is the one who holds the power of my labour, labour activity and product. This "other" is none other than 'man' himself/herself, whose sustenance is ensured by the

workers' activity. Thus, "man" excludes the worker, and enjoys the pleasures born from workers tormented activity (Marx1975, 330).

The worker is thus not the master of his own self (Marx1975, 331). Marx compares this condition with religious self-estrangement. In religious self-estrangement, god, which is the fantastic creation of human self-estrangement, is alien from human himself/herself and appears as a hostile, powerful entity which determines the life of human beings. However, in the actual manifestation of this religious self-estrangement, humans get alienated from themselves via a mediator, i.e. a priest (Marx1975, 331). Similarly, the self-estrangement of the worker manifests itself through a mediator, the 'capitalist' (Marx 1975, 331).

This alienation is real not just because it takes placein the real world, but because the mediator and medium through which it takes place is practical in nature. So alienated labour not only produces the alienation from labour and productive activity, but also alienated relationships with other individuals. The capitalist is the individual to whom the worker confers his/her labour and life activity which does not belong to the worker anymore (Marx 1975, 331).

Therefore, private property – or the legal recognition of the capitalists' right over resources – is a result of an external relationship of workers with nature, the capitalist and alienated labour (Marx 1975, 331.32).Considering this situation, Marxopines that the emancipation of society will be possible only through the emancipation of society from private property; that is, through the political emancipation of workers from private property(Marx 1975, 332). This emancipation is not just limited to the worker; it will be a universal human emancipation. This emancipation is universal because "the entire human servitude is involved in the relation of the worker to production, and all the relations of servitude are nothing but modifications and consequences of this relation" (Marx 1975, 333).

However, as Marx had earlier stated, a political emancipation will remain a partial emancipation. In its partial dimension, the workers political revolution/emancipation will break down the pillars of capitalist society – that is private property, division of labour, alienated labour. After this political emancipation alone can the workers strive for total human emancipation.

One would like to argue here that the homogeneity of proletariat is an outcome of the necessity of its survival in the capitalist system. It is a by-product of the tormenting and exploitative capitalist system whose working conditions evens the whole class of proletariat into a homogenous mass. It is an outcome of the overburden imposed by the production of uniform commodities. The homogeneity's an outcome of a shift in the mode of production, which for the first time in history, centralized work, the work process, the working conditions, the required tools, the environment and the uniform skilled human labour which produces uniform commodities.

In short, for Marx, it is capital and its mode, means, and relations of production along with the commodity they produce and the process in which it produces which together overthrow the plurality and differences of the old mode of production and give birth to the new homogeneous entity called proletariat. Therefore the universality of proletariat is historical and structural outcome of capitalism and not philosophical universality like Hegel's spirit. This homogeneity – of poverty and alienation – however provides the tragic basis for a revolutionary overcoming of the existing conditions as it contains within it the seed of universal human subjectivity.

Race and Caste

Fanon and Dr. Ambedkar

What does a man want?
What does a black man want?
At the risk of arousing the resentment of my coloured brothers, I will say that the black is not a man.

- Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*

Introduction

Race and caste are two categories which are fundamental to understanding the respective societies from which they originated – race in European societies and caste in South Asian ones. Etymologically, these two concepts and other similar concepts like nation and class all relate somehow to the notion of "type" or "category". In practice too, they work as ways of categorizing people, often on arbitrary bases. These concepts in turn generate further practices which at best serve to create communities within a society, and at worst manifest as discrimination, oppression, and exploitation.

Race evolved initially from the grouping together of people who spoke the same language, and later bled into the other nascent idea of nationalism. Linguistic and national racial identities gave way to a notion of biological race. The evolution of the concept of 'Aryan' provides a fine example for this – it began as a term for the people who spoke a language connected to the Indo-Aryan language family but by the 20th century, it had become a national and more importantly a biological category. It was not just that Jews were not equal to Aryans in Nazi Germany, they were believed to be unfit to be a part of the German nation itself. The other typical example of biological race can be seen in how the African people were separated from the European people. The emphasis while identifying each race was on their skin colour, and this would also become accepted nomenclature for each race – white, black, brown.

Caste is a social institution in South Asian society which is widely practiced, but yet escapes definition. On one hand, caste is synonymous with the Varna system, the four-fold class division that is sanctified in

Hinduism. The four Varnas - the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Shudras – are a rigid hierarchy based on hereditary division of labour in which the Brahmins are ritually granted the highest status, and the Shudras the lowest. On the other hand, caste is used interchangeably with *jaati*, which refers to smaller, usually endogamous, communities which may or may not identify with one of the Varnas. Nicholas Dirks argues that caste is neither a single category nor a single logic of categorization – it extended to and encompassed many aspects such as region, kinship, occupation, allegiance and so on (Dirks, 13). Yet, caste has been exceedingly important in structuring social and political life of the country for centuries. It has been especially cruel in the way it treats those it deems to be outside the Varna system – the outcaste people who are treated as untouchable by caste practicing communities. Caste practices have also been adopted by religions other than Hinduism, and it has provided the impetus to enforce strict rules of endogamy and inter-caste interaction. The breaking of such rules often comes with terrible punishments meted out by whole communities. Most importantly, caste has become the basis for a uniquely graded hierarchy in South Asian society, wherein each caste is oppressed by the caste immediately above, and oppresses the castes immediately below.

Today, it is widely accepted that the manner in which the category of 'race' has been applied historically has been socially constructed, with little basis in science. Yet, it cannot be denied that race operated in society, and served to keep a section of the people under chains. It was only when the hegemony of the idea of race was overcome that we could understand it to be a social construct. In a similar manner, caste is also "socially constructed", but as long as it is operative in society, its ill effects cannot be ignored.

Race and caste taken together provide many philosophical problems, separately as well as in relation to each other. To begin with, the lived experience of the victims of racial and caste discrimination and oppression form narratives with many common points. Both systems are also responsible for the continued exploitation of large communities' labour. At the same time, there are many divergences between race and caste as well, especially in the particularities of many of the acts of atrocities carried out against victims of either system, as well as in the ways in which these victims organize against the dominant racial or caste order.

In this chapter, we take up three texts which relate to the lived experience and analysis of race and caste. They are Frantz Fanon's 'Black Skin, White Masks', and Dr. B R Ambedkar's 'Annihilation of Caste' and 'On the Way to Goregaon'.

Black Skin, White Masks

Frantz Fanon's seminal work 'Black Skin, White Masks' is a unique venture in that it tries to study racial relations through the lens of psychoanalysis, a lens which was usually reserved for studying familial and sexual relationships till then. Fanon's experience as a colonial subject

enabled him to invert the knowledge he obtained through his European education and apply it to an object which was hitherto outside the purview of the subjects he dealt with – philosophy and psychoanalysis. Ontology itself, for Fanon, was inadequate in expression the condition of the Black person, as it did not consider the lived experience of the Black man. It was solely White men (and a few women) who wrote about Ontology, and therefore the subject was stained with their bias. To counter this bias, Fanon extensively discusses the peculiarities of the 'negro *state of being*'.

For Fanon, "civilizing" itself has become a disciplining category. He says, "The language spoken [in Antilles] officially is French; teachers keep a close watch over the children to make sure they do not use Creole … It would seem, then the problem is this: In the Antilles, as in Brittany, there is a dialect and there is the French language. But this is false, for the Bretons do consider themselves inferior to the French people. The Bretons have never been civilized by the white man." The difference between the colony of Antilles and the French region of Brittany is a political one, and it reflects deep down in the manner in which the respective dialects are treated as well. Fanon further makes observations on how language of the Black man and addressing the Black man are warped by racist and colonial preconceptions – how the White man infantilizes the Black man and speaks to him as an adult would to a child; how the White man uses language against the Black man in a "manner of classifying him, imprisoning him, primitivizing him, decivilizing him."

An educated Black man is expected to behave as a good Black man – as defined by the White man. So, the triadic relationship between language, culture and race (language as the road to culture, and culture as a marker of race) combine to keep the Black man suppressed, unsure of himself and servile. The response of the Black man to this consistent denigration and judgment against the White man's standards is to do what Fanon calls 'passing' – wherein a person of an oppressed race tries to behave as if he is from a dominant race so that he is accorded more respect. The most useful tool for this, according to Fanon, is to learn the dominant race's language (here, the White man's). Passing is a central concept in understanding how Fanon describes the relationships between the two races; it is the form of imitation through Black people serve the cause of preserving Whiteness. By affirming White ideals and conforming to them, Whiteness as such remains dominant and provides access to power for Whites, whereas only a few Black people manage to acquire a share of it.

Fanon goes on to find that Black men and women attempt to overcome the racial gap by taking White lovers. Drawing upon experience and theory, he argues that interracial love is often reflective of the lower status of Black people, who look up to their White partners as a gateway to a higher culture. However, their constant attempts at passing cannot hide their *fact of blackness*, and this fact returns to face the Black people now and again, causing great distress and loss of selfhood among them. The Black Desire for the White Other, as well as the White Desire for the Black Other therefore cannot always be a remedy for racial chasms. It is rather often a

theatre where racial domination plays out. Fanon's pessimistic assessment is that not even the most private interstices of racial lives are free from race.

The Chapter titled 'The so-called Dependency Complex of Colonized Peoples', written as a critique towards M. Mannoni's *Prospero and Caliban: Psychology of Colonization*, addresses arguments that blame the Black man for his ordeal – that he was colonized because he secretly wanted to be dominated or because he was incapable. Fanon here makes many parallels between the status of a Jew and that of a Negro, drawing upon Sartre. Both the Jew and the Black man are defined according to how the White man *needs* to see them; the denigration of the Jew and the Black are necessary components of the White man's identity, fictional images against which he defines himself. These fictional images emerging from the White man's self-deception is however sometimes accepted by Jews and Blacks themselves. They *internalize* the White man's notions about them, and perform what they have internalized, leading to a vicious cycle where the White man's fictional image ends up being proved true.

The Black man is consistently reminded that he is first and foremost Black, and not always human. He is alternatively portrayed as undeveloped, as being inferior, as being animalistic, as needing to be dominated and so on. From such conceptions flow stories about the Black man's virility, stupidity, bestiality and so on. White men "Otherize" Black men and invent convenient myths about them which allows them to preserve their status as the "Other" of Black men, thus grounding their identity.

By being depicted as inferior, says Fanon, Blacks themselves have developed a sense of inferiority. Fanon ends the book by calling upon a cross-race solidarity and an escape from the weight of the past of both races, but such an escape is only possible through social transformation. It is freedom and its practice which will emancipate the Blacks from the Whites, and it is the emancipation of Blacks which will allow the Whites to separate their identity from the Black identity. It is only then that Whites will cease to *need* the Black to define themselves against.

The abolition of existing racial relationships, which subjugate some races and dehumanize them, are the only way in which true freedom can be exercised, according to Fanon. In fact, the existence of these systems itself is a sign that freedom is being impinged on. Freedom of the individual is intrinsically bound to the systems under which the individual lives, more so in the case of oppressive systems such as race. We may as well extrapolate his findings to caste society.

Annihilation of Caste

Any discourse on caste would be incomplete without mentioning the contributions of Ambedkar. The life and work of Dr B R Ambedkar have been summed up by his biographer Dhananjay Keer as: "What did Ambedkar achieve for the untouchables? The story of the past life of the

scheduled caste Hindus was pitch dark …. It was for the first time in the history of the past 2500 years that the son of a better future arouse on their horizon". Ambedkar made the issue of untouchability a burning topic and gave it the attention it deserved locally and globally. He instilled the ideas of dignity and self-respect into the minds of 'the Untouchables' who were socially oppressed and economically exploited for many centuries in the country. Ambedkarism later became the liberation theology for not only dalits, but all the subaltern communities around the world. In the brahmanical Hindu society, theory of social justice for Dalits was an alien idea till Ambedkar propounded it. The basic ideas of Ambedkarism can be traced from *Annihilation of Caste* (1936), which was the undelivered speech he wrote to address a group of liberal Hindu caste-reformers ofJat Pat Todak Mandal in Lahore. After reviewing the speech, conference organizers revoked Ambedkar's invitation. He then self-published the work, and it became one of his most significant, widely read and discussed work.

Ambedkar starts his speech by pointing out the importance of social reform and the limitations of the national conference as well as the social conference to deal with the problem of caste. In order to eradicate the evils in the Hindu society, social conference was formed alongside the National Conference. While the National Congress was 'concerned with defining the weak points in the political organisation of the country', the social conference engaged 'in removing the weak points in the Social Organisation of the Hindu society'. Both of them later split into two hostile camps. The upper caste leadership in the National Conference argued that the political reform should proceed social reform, which later led to the dissolution of the social conference.

Ambedkar further gives instances to prove the plight of the Dalits. He says that under the Peshwa rule in the Maratha country, they were not even allowed to use the public streets as their shadows will pollute the upper caste Hindu. Ambedkar points out an instance at Kavitha in Gujarat, where the upper caste Hindus insisted the untouchables not to send their children to the common village school. By elaborating on the plight of the untouchables in India, he asks how India is fit for political freedom is if it does not allow the untouchables to use public wells, schools or streets. Moreover, the social conference, which was set up by the caste Hindus, was mostly concerned with the social issues related to the upper caste households (widow marriage, empowerment of women etc.) and were mostly uninterested in the problems of the lower caste. It neither stood up for reforming the Hindu society as a whole nor incorporated the idea of breaking the caste system as part of their social reform, which results in the fall of social reform party.

Ambedkar also points out instances from history to prove that 'political revolutions have always been preceded by social and religious revolutions' (132). The political revolution led by Chandragupta was preceded by the religious and social revolution of Buddha. The political revolution led by Shivaji was preceded by the religious and social reform

brought about by the saints of Maharashtra. The political revolution of the Sikhs was preceded by the religious and social revolution led by Guru Nanak. Ambedkar hence argues that social reform is necessary for gaining political independence from the British.

Ambedkar then criticises the socialists for considering political and social reforms as 'gigantic illusions'. Socialists believed in the economic interpretation of history and tried to fight economic inequality. The political and social inequalities of the country were sidelined. They did not recognise that social reformation was a fundamental step for the country if it was to be a democracy. Ambedkar propounded that man is not motivated by 'economic motives' alone. If we look in to the history of India, religion can also be identified as a source of power. The socialist tried to a place the European theory in India. In European society, property is the predominant source of power. They failed to identify religion and social status as sources of power and authority. As an individual is denounced in the Indian society based on his social status, economic equality alone can't bring about a change. Equalization of property will not bring in equality, due to the drastic differences in their social status (Ambedkar 133-34). Moreover the socialists were unable to integrate the untouchables in a class struggle against bourgeoisie. The untouchable consists of the major share of the proletariat, by Marxian terms, in the country, yet the untouchables would not join the socialists in the class struggle unless they know that after the revolution they would also be considered as equals. Ambedkar hence suggests the socialists to take up the issue of social reform by eliminating caste system.

Many upper caste Hindus including Gandhi defended caste system by pointing out that division of labour is necessary for a civilized society and considered the varna ashrama as an essential element of Indian society without which it would be unstable. Ambedkar counters the argument by saying that caste system is not merely division of labour, but it is also a division of labourers. Moreover, it is a hierarchy in which the divisions of labourers are graded one above the other. Ambedkar acknowledges that the caste system is a 'hierarchical division of the society', which is accompanied by the "unnatural division of labourers into watertight compartments" (137). Individuals are selected not on the basis of their natural aptitudes but on the basis of the social status of their parents. With the coming of industrial development the traditional industries gets dismantled. The orthodox Hindu society would not allow the individuals to take up occupations which not assigned to them by heredity; caste becomes a direct cause of much of the unemployment that we see in the country. Ambedkar calls caste 'a harmful institution' as it subordinates man's natural capabilities.

The fundamental objective of practising caste is to 'preserve purity of race and purity of blood'. The study of D.R. Bhandarkar proved that there is no race without a foreign element in it. Ambedkar extends this argument to say that "as a matter of fact caste systemcame into being long after the different races of India had commingled in blood and culture. To hold that

distinctions of castes are really distinctions of race, and to treat different castes as though they were so many different races, is a gross perversion of facts."There upper caste Hindus prohibits inter-caste marriage to preserve the racial purity. Ambedkar argues that the practise of caste system is unscientific and does not demarcate racial division.

Hindu society according to Ambedkar is merely a myth. Hindu society as such does not exist, instead it is only a collection of castes. The term Hindu itself is an alien name given by the Mohammedans to distinguish themselves from the natives. Each caste not only dines among itself and marries among itself, but each promotes its own distinctive dress. In Hindu society, identity of the individual is defined by his caste alone. Ambedkar also points out that the caste is anti-social as it is based on hate-factor. Every caste gets integrated due to the hatred towards another caste.

Ambedkar points out that the caste system is the reason why tribals still follow a savage state and leads the life of hereditary criminals. The upper caste Hindus made no attempt to civilize the aboriginals. The upper caste deliberately prevented the attempts of lower castes to rise to the cultural level of the higher castes. He gives example of Sonars caste from Maharashtra who tried to climb the 'cultural ladder'. The Sonar started to wear dhoti and use the word *namaskar* for salutation. The Brahmins who did not like this imitation, with the help of the authority of the Peshwas suppressed the imitation of the Sonars.

Ambedkar also argues that the missionary works of Hinduism ceased with the emergence of caste system. The converts do not have a place to fit in the social system. As Hinduism is a collection of castes, the question arises: to which caste does the convert go? Ambedkar calls caste a 'closed corporate'- which does not have a place for the convert to fit in. As long as the caste system exists, the Arya Samaj Shuddi movement will be futile and impudent. Caste system also deprives Hindus of trust, mutual help and fellow feeling. The unity and trust among the Muslims and Sikhs are because of the associated mode of living that they practise. There is a social cement that make them brothers. While the 'fellow feeling' is absent among the Hindus as individuals are divided into separate compartments.

Ambedkar then argues that caste system prevents all reforms. A reformer cannot work inside caste system. Anyone who broke the rules of caste system is excommunicated (which includes a complete cessation of social intercourse). Caste enjoys the autonomy to regulate its membership and punish dissenters with excommunication. For instance, when a caste Hindumarries a woman from a lower caste, he is excommunicated from the community for breaking caste rules. Caste system, by itself, is a homogenous body and will not accept heterogeneity.

Caste system also makes an individual narrow minded. The ideas of virtues and morality become caste bound. Ambedkar says: "There is no sympathy for the deserving. There is no appreciation of the meritorious. There is no charity to the needy. There is charity, but it begins with caste

and ends with caste. There is sympathy, but not for men of other castes"(148).

The alternative that Ambedkar propounds for the caste based Hindu society is a society based on the principles of *Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.* He equates democracy with fraternity. Ambedkar says: "Democracy is not merely a form of government. It is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint experience. It is essentially an attitude of respect and reverence towards fellow men"(149). In Ambedkar's ideal society, everyone has the freedom to select their own occupation.

Equality has been the most contentious part of the slogan of the French Revolution. Ambedkar admits that the idea of equality is an ideal concept as all men are not equal. Even though the idea of equality is a fiction, he accepts it as the governing principle. A man's power is dependent upon (1) physical heredity; (2) social inheritance or endowment in the form of parental care, education, accumulation of scientific knowledge, which includes everything that enables him to be more efficient than the savage; and finally, (3) on his own efforts. Men are undoubtedly unequal in all these three respects. The state should treat men equal in the third aspect but there are sections in the societies who are unequal in the first two aspects while compared to the privileges. Hence it is important to give incentive to people who are unequal based on physical heredity and social inheritance.

Ambedkar the points out the limitations of the Arya Samaj. Arya Samaj proponents support Chaturvarnya system (the ideal organisation of Hindu society into four varnas instead of thousands of sub-castes). The proponents of Arya Samaj argues that the system is based not on birth but on *guna* (worth). The flaw of Arya Samaj is that it labels men as Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. The names Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra are names which are associated with a definite and fixed notion of a hierarchy based on birth in the mind of every Hindu. People continue to identify it on the basis of birth as long as these categories are perpetuated. Ambedkar also points out that the system of Chaturvarnya social order is impracticable. He argues that a person will not vacate his status, which he got by birth, in caste hierarchy if he is proved unworthy. For instance, a brahmin will not lose his status, if he is not a scholar. Hence, in order to implement the Chaturvarya system, we have the break the caste system and reframe the society.

Ambedkar compares the Chaturvarnya ideal to the Platonic ideal. In his concept of ideal society, Plato distinguishes individuals into three: labourers, guardians and scholars. Ambedkar argues that the criticism on Plato's Republic is also applicable to Chaturvarya. Plato had no perception of the uniqueness of every individual. To him, there were types of faculties or powers in the individual constitution and considered each individual as forming a class of his own. Ambedkar also points out that it is unscientific to mark people into four definite classes. Ambedkar also point out that chaturvarnya system is not applicable to women. The

proponent of Arya Samaj is confused whether to define the position of women on the basis of their own capability or are they allowed to take the status of their husbands. If they are allowed to take the status of their husband after marriage it would refute the underlying principle of chaturvarnya.

Chaturvarya system would be the most vicious system for the shudras. Chaturvarya system is also a division of labour: Brahmins should cultivate knowledge, Kshatriyas should bear arms, Vaishyas should trade, and the Shudra should serve. Shudra does not have an independent role in a Chaturvarnya society and if the three other classes refused to support him, he is devoid of agency to act as well. This is actually the reason why there have not been any social revolutions in India. The lower caste Hindus where completely disabled for direct actions. The lower castes were devoid of arms and education and contempt to be subdued by the other three castes. Ambedkar prices the Maurya and where the greatest period in Indian history because at that period caste system was completely annihilated and shudra became the rulers of the country.

The caste system that is practised among the Hindus is different from that practised among the non-Hindus. The Muslims and the Sikhs believes in their religious identity over their caste identity. When a Hindu tries to break away from caste, his religion always come in his way as he does not have a religious identity outside his caste identity. Among the non-Hindus, caste is only a practice, not a sacred institution.

Ambedkar points out his ideas related to inter-dining and inter caste marriage. There were many castes which allows inter-dining but it was not effective in eliminating the caste system. The real remedy that Ambedkar points out to break the caste system is inter-marriage. Ambedkar suggest that caste is a notion and it is state of mind. For him destruction of caste 'means a notional change'.

Ambedkar further argues that Hindus practice caste not because they are inhuman but because they are deeply religious. He identifies the root of caste exploitation in the religious textbooks which the Hindu is considered a sacred. He goes beyond the temporary solution of inter-marriage to say that the real remedy is to destroy the belief in the sanctity of the *shastras*. Like Guru Nanak and Buddha, the Hindus should also deny their authority.

Ambedkar denies the claim that caste can be reformed from within. The Brahmin is the intellectual class in our country. In most societies, the intellectual class are the pioneers of social reformation. As Brahmins are the custodians of the caste system, they do not do away with the system as they are born privileged. Shastras follows "a spirit of compromise" by enabling the upper caste to regain their caste status back if they are polluted (Ambedkar 169). The 'the theory of *prayaschitta'* helps in maintaining the caste system, otherwise it would have led to the destruction of the caste notion itself.

Ambedkar sought a radical solution by replacing the existing religion's system of practice. In fact, Ambedkar was not always opposed to religion, rather he emphasised the importance of religion in society. He said that he was just opposing religion as rules, but not religion as principles. To replace the existing religious rule, a step toward the abolition of the caste system, Ambedkar wanted to bring a change in the practice of Hindu religion. He suggested the following in this regard:

1. There should be only one standard book of Hindu religion, acceptable to all Hindus and recognized by all Hindus.

2. Priesthood among Hindus should be abolished or at least cease to be hereditary.

3. No person who does not hold a 'sanad' (certification by the state) should be allowed to officiate as a priest.

4. A priest should be subject to the disciplinary action by the state regarding his morals, beliefs and worship, and should be bound to the ordinary law of the land as in the case of other ordinary citizens.

In Ambedkar's view, by the legalisation of priesthood it will certainly help to kill the Brahminism and will also help to kill caste. Ambedkar sought the help of state in eradicating the malice of Hinduism. Ambedkar in the end concludes by saying that Hindus cannot attain *swaraj* without being a casteless society.

On the Way to Goregaon

This short autobiographical account by Dr. B R Ambedkar was written in 1935-36 and was posthumously published as a collection of six accounts, *Waiting for a Visa* in 1990. He recollects his journey with his siblings from their residence in Satara to Goregaon, where his father worked as a cashier, in 1901, when the young Ambedkar was nine years old. He describes the difficulties they faced during their journey as they reached Masur, the nearest station to Goregaon, when their caste identity as the untouchable Mahars was revealed to the caste Hindu station master. In the absence of his father's peon to guide them to Goregaon, the children were demanded twice the rate for hiring the bullock carts that they had to ride by themselves with the cartman walking by their side, lest he got "polluted" by offering the Mahars his service. He initially tells them that the journey will only be three hours long. When the cart-man goes to the town in the middle of the journey to have his meal, the children wait for him without food as they cannot use the pool of water nearby, thick with mud, urine and excreta of the cows. The children get suspicious of the cartman,who now takes the reins (breaks the low of pollution) from their hands as they restart their journey, thinking that they might get looted or killed by him. He also shows indifference to the children's concerns throughout the journey even when they start crying, anxious and uncertain about what seems like a never-ending journey. As they reach the toll-collection site where they are told to spend the night before resuming the

journey next day, they are exhausted with hunger and distress. As advised by the cart man the children try to pass off as Muslims in front of the toll-collector to find access to drinking water, but in vain. Although they were relieved to have come to a place of safety, they could not sleep. "There was plenty of food with us. There was hunger burning within us; with all this we were to sleep without food; that was because we could get no water and we could get no water because we were untouchables."

Although they reach their destination safely on the next day, this event leaves an indelible impression on the nine-year old child. Ambedkar further talks about how the incident broadened his perspective on the experience of untouchability practices in public places, that was till then limited to the set of restrictions and discrimination he had faced in his school, such as the use of a separate piece of gunny cloth to squat on in the class room and the servant employed to clean the school would not touch the gunny cloth used by him, and to have a touchable person (peon) open the tap every time he had to drink water. In the absence of the peon, he could not drink water. He also recalls how, in their house, his sisters had to wash his clothes and give him a hair-cut because no washermen or barbers would offer any services to the untouchables. He concludes the account with a note on how the incident transformed him to critically look at caste-inequality and discrimination embedded in the everyday lived practices in the society. "The incident gave me a shock such as I never received before, and it made me think about untouchability which, before this incident happened, was with me a matter of course as it is with many touchables as well as the untouchables."

This autobiographical piece gives us an insight into how the experience of caste segregation can turn into a traumatic event. It seems to have stuck with Dr Ambedkar himself, and motivated him to set on a path of changing the world. It explores the

Major philosophical concepts

Recognition is an act in which a subject becomes aware of a certain object, another human or a certain dimension of another human. Recognition may seem like a mundane process, but philosophy of the past two centuries has been heavily reliant on the idea of recognition and its consequences, beginning from GWF Hegel. It is one of the fundamental aspects of human society, and its different enactments determine social relationships and conflicts to a large extent. The problem of race and caste is, at the final instance, a problem of recognition – it is the recognition of one as superior and the other as inferior that marks the entry into the oppressive systems of race and caste. Recognition permeates all social process, not just such evident ones. It structures the manner in which we relate to another – as a friend, a stranger, an acquaintance, a fellow national, a citizen, a spouse and so on. Each of these categories refers to specific recognition endowed by either a subject or an agency acting on behalf of the subject. Fanon relies heavily on the concept of recognition in his theorization of interracial relationships.

The **other** is a phenomenological concept developed by Edmund Husserl, Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir among others. The concept of the Other, alongside the concept of the Self, forms the basis for interpersonal relationships. It is a general form of all the particular objects we encounter beyond our own selves, and its most intriguing dimension is that of the Other human. The Other is not just an opposite of the Self, it is constitutive of the Self. It is in relation to the Other that we define our Selves. Recognition of an Other is thus an act which begins the process of Self-differentiation and self-definition.

Desire is a tendency of developed living beings, especially humans, to pursue something they *want*, over and beyond their necessities. In quotidian usage, it is a well understood concept, but there is little agreement among the theorists of desire of what it exactly is. We can group many activities as being motivated by desire, right from attraction towards other human beings to the desire to establish a certain utopian state of affairs. Especially since the birth of psychoanalysis, desire has become a fundamental category in understanding the basic questions of human existence.

Freedom/ Liberty are two concepts that are used interchangeably, and represent one of the most important ideas of modern society – the possibility of acting without constraint. Most modern societies take as granted the right of an individual to many freedoms, such as the freedom of mobility, expression and thought. Modern states are rigged to protect these basic freedoms, and they form an important part of much of world politics. Immanuel Kant, and later Isaiah Berlin, would differentiate two kinds of freedom, positive and negative. For Berlin, negative freedom denotes an absence of obstacle, whereas positive freedom refers to the ability to take initiative and accomplish something. Fanon's and Ambedkar's projects, with respect to race and caste, can be understood as a quest for negative freedom from the respective systems in the first place, eventually leading to the positive freedom for the subjects.

2.5 SUMMERY

Gandhi:

➢ Gandhi attempted to explain the act of acquisition or ownership around the concept of "need" and "greed". If one hoards anything beyond his/her immediate use, it shall hence to be considered as an act of 'theft'.

➢ Gandhi hence largely shifts the public act of ownership to private intentions and individual ethical consideration on what one decides to be his/her 'need'. One has freedom to determine one's 'needs' as there isn't any external agency or law that regulates the same.

➢ Distribution of excessive wealth is left on individual's will or philanthropy.

➢ The basic difficulty identified here is that there isn't any generally accepted norm on what should be rightly considered as "need" and the differences of lifestyle, preferences or habits of resource usage is also not taken into account

Marx:

➢ Marx envisaged emancipation as material and 'political process' rather than spiritual or transcendental. The emancipation of humanity lies in abolition of mediatory function capitalist production process. These mediations include division of labor and private property.

➢ Labor is driving force behind life though in capitalist set up the Worker is estranged from fruit of his/her own labor as the value realised through labour is kept to the maximum by the capitalist and worker is given only enough for physical sustenance.

➢ Act of production hence is also alienated from the worker which manages to provide worker only with 2 choices: to keep employing labor to sustain his/her life or to not work and end his/her life. Such act of production is hence cause of 'forced labor'.

➢ Worker is alienated from his own 'species-being' or human essence, which is the self-aware person who can work not just to fulfil the vital immediate needs or in other words, can work in total freedom, their natural/physical needs being satisfied.

➢ Worker is also alienated from other humans, as the other workers are now posed to him/her as competitors.

Franz Fanon:

➢ Fanon reflected deeply on the phenomenon of power relations through colonisation by white men over coloured humans i.e. on the basis of skin color or race.

➢ There are many modes employed to establish and continue such power relations. Inferiorizing local dialects and mother tongue of inhabitants is certainly one of the way to achieve so. Rendering culture of colonizer as superior causes internalisation and imitation from the colonized which again in turn helps in preserving the racial domination.

➢ What a Black Man is hence 'defined' by the White Man. Black Man is firstly Black and then not always Human as he is portrayed as animalistic, inferior, requiring to be dominated by superior.

➢ Fanon asserts cross-race solidarity via redefining identities or separating White to identify his superiority with Black's inferiority is the way for social transformation.

B.R. Ambedkar:

➤ Ambedkar strongly held that political freedom would have meaning only when we have dealt effectively in removing our social weaknesses.

➤ He also held that rectifying economic inequalities may not be enough as a human being also exists socio-religiously and there exists drastic differences in social status.

➤ Caste-system is such evil which needed immediate action. The varna-vyavastha, Ambedkar argued was not just division of labour, but of labourers wherein individuals are forced under a specific occupation on the basis of birth. Hence it demoralises human's natural capacities and talents.

➤ The caste system causes Hinduism as a religion which cannot accommodate a convert, cannot extend help to those belonging to other castes within the religion and is a system of deliberate oppression by higher castes over underprivileged castes.

➤ Ambedkar radically asserts that caste-system can be annihilated only when authority to scriptures which endows such evils are discarded and denied. Religion must admit rationality and should be based on principles rather than orthodox rituals.

2.6 QUESTIONS

1. Critically explain Marx concept of alienation.

2. Elaborate Ambedkar's account of caste discrimination.

3. Briefly discuss Fanon's critique of racial discrimination.

4. Write a short on Gandhi's concept of Sarvodaya.

2.7 SUGGESTED READING

• *Ambedkar, B. R. 'Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development'. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches, Vol. 1. Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1979, pp. 3-22. Edited by Frances W. Pritchett.*

• *Ambedkar, B. R. 'Annihilation of Caste'. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches, Vol. 3. Bombay: Education Department, Government of Maharashtra, 1979, pp. 3-22. Edited by Frances W. Pritchett*

• *Dirks, Nicholas B. Castes of Mind:* Colonialism and the Making of Modern India. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2001. Print. Turabian (6th ed.)

- *Encyclopedia of Race*, *Ethnicity*, and *Society*. Edited by: *Richard T*. *Schaefer*. Publisher:SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Gopal Guru & Sunder Sarukkai. *Experience, Caste, and the Everyday Social,* Oxford University Press (2020), New Delhi.

- Gilroy, Paul.*The Black Atlantic : Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Harvard University Press, 1993.

- https://www.mkgandhi.org/ebks/trusteeship.pdf

- *Marx Karl. Early Writing. Pelican, 1976, London*

- *Fanon Frantz, Black Skin White Masks. Grove Press, 2008 New York*

❖❖❖❖

JUST WAR AND PACIFISM

Unit Structure:

3.0   OBJECTIVES

- To be introduced to the philosophical position of just war debate

- To understand Micheal Walzer's theory of just and unjust war

- To critically engage the relevance of just war theory to international relations

- To understand the concept of pacifism and its types

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The just war doctrine is derivative from the work of Bishop Augustine of Hippo after the collapse of the Roman Empire. The doctrine provides criteria for the decision to go to war (jus ad bellum) and guidelines for conduct during war (jus in bello). The study of just war has greatly influenced Western political thought and international law. The doctrine generally includes the idea -

(1) That war must be a last resort

(2) That the decision to engage in war be must be made by a legitimate authority

(3) The intention of going on war must be just cause, causes like aggression or revenge are generally not be acceptable.

(4) The resulting peace must be a situation better that the situation before the war was fought. Once a war is declared moral principles are concerned with military means and the cost of war that is believed must be proportional to a moral goal and expected benefits.

3.2   MICHAEL WALZER: JUST AND UNJUST WARS

Michael Walzer believes that war is a moral enterprise. Contrary to the belief that law and morality are silent in times of war, the language used to describe wars (aggression, self defence, betrayal, shame, devotion, chastity, cruelty, ruthlessness, and massacre) is loaded with moral judgments. Realists defend the lack of morality in war by stating that cruelty results out of humanity in pressure. This description makes us believe that war strips away all civilized adornments from people and thus atrocities of war are beyond moral discourses. Walzer states that such a theory fails to realize that fundamental social and political transformation within a particular culture is what we share with our ancestors; thus even when world views and higher ideals have been abandoned in times of war, the notion about right conduct remains persistent. This gives coherence to political lives because the way one behaves with the contemporaries depends on the beliefs of what one has studied and inherited from the past. Thus morality cannot be separated in war.

Walzer divides moral reality of war into two parts. War is always judged twice, first with reference to the reasons for starting a war and second, the means with reference to the means they adopt. The first kind of judgment according to Walzer is that which can be judged as just or unjust while the second can be judged as being fought justly or unjustly; one is adjectival and the other is adverbial. According to Walzer, these grammatical distinctions are important because former makes judgments about aggression, self defense and justice of war while the latter makes judgments about the observance violation of the customary and positive rules of engagement. According to Walzer, the two are independent

because it is possible that a just war has been fought unjustly and that an unjust war is fought is accordance with just rules. For Walzer, this problem is central to the moral reality of war. Just war theory can be meaningfully divided into following parts:

Jus ad bellum, which concerns the justice of resorting to war in the first place

Jus in bello, which concerns the justice of conduct within war, after it has begun and

Jus post bellum, which concerns the justice of peace.

3.3 *JUS AD BELLUM*- RIGHT TO WAR AND *JUS IN BELLO*- JUSTICE DURING WARS

Walzer states that to begin a war is wrong because people are killed with every conceivable brutality. The cruelty is generally justified, as war is believed to be a condition that theoretically has no limits. It is believed that it is not possible to refine the condition of war without committing an absurdity. Walzer states that the adversaries resort to violence which in turn results in a reciprocal action and the acts of aggression keeps escalating to a point where every act can be called pre-emptive. Wars call for exertion of forces and increasing ruthlessness, in response, the opponent out of necessity does the same to match the cruelty whenever it can. Though there can be various degrees of war, all wars initiate criminal acts. Factors like who fights the war, what tactics are acceptable and when battles have to be broken off are decided by people and authorities; this helps in defining a situation as a war. In contemporary times, wars are generally fought between nation states where the government decides to fight and the people's choice to go on a war effectively disappears. Fighting becomes a legal obligation and a patriotic duty. This is because when an army is raised by voluntary enlistment or conscription, they are expected to adhere to the techniques of coercion and persuasion. The soldiers go on war not out of choice or constraint, but because they are political instruments who are expected to obey orders while the practice of war is shaped at a higher level. It is when citizen consent fails, acts of force or wars loose appeal and become the object of moral condemnation.

Wars have human as agents as well as victims. The agents are the ones who subject the victims to pain and death by their decisions and aggression. The soldiers of the war are made to believe that they are fighting against aggression and they develop higher ambition to defeat and punish to reduce the probability of future aggression; thus it becomes important to win. Thus the conviction that victory is morally important, plays an important part in the logic of war. War is not terrible because it is fought without restraint but because it drives the opposition to break all remaining restraint as they are forced to imitate and exceed the brutality of aggressor. Thus, according to Walzer, war is singularly the crime of those

who begin it, soldiers can never be blamed for anything as they only do that which brings victory closer.

Thirdly, Walzer draws out the rules of war. War is a legal condition which equally permits two or more groups to carry on a conflict by armed force. It is also a moral condition involving permissiveness at the level of armies and individual soldiers; thus it involves right to kill. These rules of war consist of two clusters of prohibitions. There are rules about when and how they can kill and the second concerns who they can kill. He states that when soldiers fight freely, choosing their enemies and designing their battles; the war cannot be considered a crime because military conduct is governed by rules of mutual consent. The soldiers are not responsible for the illegal war as they are merely agents of the state but they can be judged on their conduct in war. Since soldiers are not entirely without volition their conduct can be judged as morally good or bad depending on the performance of duties and obligations specified in the treaties and agreements between states.

War can only be distinguished from murder and massacre when restrictions on who can be killed are established on the battlefield. "The moral reality of war must specify the principle about the combat between the combatants. The non-combatants are the people who are not trained and prepared for war who cannot or donot fight women, children, old men, members of neutral tribes, cities, states and wounded or captured soldiers. They are not engaged in the business of war and so killing them is considered unchivalrous, dishonorable brutal and murderous." These rules are arbitrary and subject to revision as they are a product of cultural, religious, social norms and reciprocal arrangements that share the judgments of military conduct .According to Walzer, though the war convention has been debated criticized and revised over a period of many centuries, it remains an imperfect human artifact as it sets a programme for toleration of war; not abolition of war. War makes one cynical of restraint and also makes one indignant of the absence of restraint.

In war people are forced to either risk their lives or lose their rights. Given the tough choice different people respond in different ways, some surrender and some fight, depending on the moral and material condition of their state and army. In most cases they prefer fighting. Not only is fighting aggression, but also when aggression is unrestricted, it is morally and physically coercive. It is singular and undifferentiated crime because in all forms, it challenges rights that are worth dying for. These rights are territorial integrity and political sovereignty. Though they belong to the states they ultimately come from individual and thus when political rights are challenged the idea of human value and worth is challenged. the rights of the states rest on the consent of the members. Consent is not that which is exchanged among individuals or rights transformed from state to individual but it is like a contract. This contract is not a metaphor for a process of association and military, but an ongoing but an ongoing process where the state offers protection against encroachment. Thus wars fought to defend these rights are considered just.

Territorial integrity and political sovereignty can be defended in the same way.

3.4   WARS AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

Walzer states that aggression among states is more serious as there is no policing, which means that people of the international society must rely only on themselves. Policing powers are distributed among all the members and thus when they fail to stop aggression, those rights would be violated. When they fail to protect the basis of the society the state collapses into the state of war. Thus, it is important that the state fights to maintain its rights.

The victim of aggression fights in self defense and what she is protecting is not merely herself but also crimes against society as a whole. Other states can rightfully join the victim's resistance. Eventually the character of war on both sides resemble, except that the victim also aims punish the aggressor. Thus, a war cannot be just on both sides and sometimes it is just on neither sides. When states are fighting for territory or power and imperialist aims (to establish domination over another a third party); it is never a just war. Walzer articulates a theory of aggression, law and order in international society by means of what he calls the "legalist paradigm".

1) There exists an international society of independent states and the states are obliged to follow the policy of non- intervention. Rights of all people can be recognized by reconciling of dominant values of that society on which the survival and independence of separate political communities rest.

2) The international society has a law that establishes and secures the rights of the members, most importantly rights of territorial integrity and political sovereignty.

3) Any use of force or imminent threat of force by the state against political sovereignty and territorial integrity constitutes aggression and is a criminal activity.

4) Aggression justifies two kinds of violent response: a war of self-defense by the victim and war of law enforcement by victim and any member of the international society. Anyone can come to the aid of the victim and use necessary force against the aggressor.

5) Nothing but aggression inflicted and received can be a justification for war. The central purpose of the theory is to limit the occasions of war.

6) Once the aggressor state has been militarily repulsed, it can also be punished. This is usually the maxim and justification for fighting a war against a war, the maxim is to punish crime to prevent violence and punish aggression to prevent further war. Thus if states are members of the society, they must also be objects of punishments.

These propositions shape judgments when wars break out and thus wars fought in anticipation are also just wars. Further, Walzer states that individuals and states can rightfully defend themselves against violence that is imminent. He lays down regulations for wars fought in anticipation. Preventive wars are often justified as a means to maintain a balance of power amongst states. Acts that donot involve material damage,, does not include military preparation , small acts of violence may be subjected to restrain but may not be counted as acts threatening peace. Military alliances, mobilizations, troop movements, border incursions, naval blockades may be considered as acts of aggression depending on the extent of threat they pose. Sufficient threat includes a manifest intent to injure or active military preparation that intends to spread danger that can magnify the risk of war. Depending on the threat they face to future securities and intensification of the present dangers they can be judged as legitimate or illegitimate. Walzer prescribes that intervention of one state in the domestic affairs of other states can sometimes be justified, as in the following cases-

1) When a particular set of boundaries contain two or more political communities one of which is clearly engaged in a large scale military struggle for independence. That is, when a state fights for the issue of national liberation.

2) When the boundaries have already been crossed by armies of foreign power, even if the crossing had been invited by one of the parties of the civil war. That is, when the conflicting state should be fighting for counter intervention.

3) When the violation of human rights within a set of boundaries is so terrible that it makes survival of the citizens seem cynical irrelevant and there are cases of enslavement and massacre.

Thus, according to Walzer, any intervention in a civil war is justified as far as it acts as assistance to a legitimate government or it's kind a of counter intervention which is a response to covert military moves by the dissenting party. Intervention by another state can only be legitimate if the goal of the state is not to win war (but merely aid the legitimate government to win the war). The outcome of civil wars, according to Walzer should reflect not only the relative strength of the intervening states but its alignment with local forces. Humanitarian interventions are justified when they are a response to acts that shock the moral conscience of citizen people who have acquired morality through day to day activity.

3.5 *JUS POST BELLUM-* JUSTICE, WAR AND PEACE

Another criteria for a just war is that it is morally urgent to win and it is important that a soldier who dies in a just war does not die in vain. A war that seeks to afford political independence, communal liberty and human life is justified and if death occurs for these purposes it is morally comprehensible as being just. This is the end or the goal of winning the

war. Thus, the limits set to just war are- that once the battle has been won, the fighting should stop, the soldiers need not be forced to kill or die anymore. Wars can only be fought if a universal moral principle guides it to preservation of peace and survival of democracy. To achieve this and total victory is necessary. A total victory would involve unconditional surrender of the hostile country. Aggression in war can also be justified as soldiers fight and kills a member of the enemy army to defend his homeland. It cannot be called a murder or a criminal activity as the soldier acts in self defense. Only when they attack innocent victims, wounded disarmed people or non combatants can they be condemned for murder. As far as they fight in accordance with rules of war they cannot be condemned. A legitimate act of war is one that does not violate the rights of people against whom it is directed and such acts such as murder and rape are not justified as acts of aggression.

In the war, the soldiers who are also civilians who lose their rights on property, life, private hopes and they gain war rights. All others retain their rights and the states remain committed to defend their rights and all the states remain committed to defend their rights. They defend by following the rules of conduct of war and threatening to punish military leaders or individual soldiers who violate them. Thus even an aggressor state can rightly punish war criminals, enemy soldiers for raping and killing civilians. Thus the rules of war apply with equal force to aggressors and their adversaries. Thus mutual submission was moral equality of soldiers and rights of civilians. This forms the basis of restraint in international law as they enforce the law that army of warring states can only violate territorial integrity and political sovereignty of the aggressor state, but it's soldiers cannot violate the violate the life and liberty of enemy civilians, though sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.

Walzer comments on two war conventions and shows that they are unfair. The first one states that once at war the soldier can become a subject of attack at any time (unless he is wounded or captured). Walzer criticizes this convention by stating that it is not the case that soldiers are committed to the business of fighting all the time; very often they are forced to fight, its not their chosen occupation, they neglect or resist war whenever they can and thus regain their right to live. The second principle of war convention is that non combatants cannot be attacked at anytime. This is unfair because most of the times non combatants are endangered not because they are attacked purposefully, but because of their proximities to the battle. All that can be done is that every care must be taken to see that the civilians are not harmed and how the destruction can be prevented can only be judged by the soldiers present at that time in the war. Walzer believes that the killing of the non-combatants cannot be considered unjust if any good was intended and the enforceable evil was reduced as far as possible. Unintended deaths under legitimate military operations are justified if soldiers minimize the dangers they expose. They plan strategies where the number of innocent people threatened is relatively small. In cases where huge number of civilians have been put to

danger one must investigate how the civilians have reached the warring zone in the first place and who put them in there. According to Walzer, more people have died in sieges and blockades than in "…the modernist infernos of Hamburg, Dresden, Tokyo, Hiroshima, Nagasaki taken together…"

Seiges, according to Walzer, is the oldest form of total war. When armies seek civilian shelter and fight from behind the battlement or from within the buildings of the city, the civilians get exposed to the same risk as the soldiers. In fact the civilians are at a greater risk than the soldiers as the soldiers fight from protected positions but the civilians don't fight at all, so they are either killed by the enemy or because of starvation (because they are forced to share their resources with the soldiers. Walzer blames political and military leaders of the city who refused to surrender or the civilians who agreed to risk the dangers of the war for their deaths. The issue becomes more difficult under conditions when the whole country is subjected to conditions of an invading army decides to systematically destroy food and crop supplies; the idea is to make the provisioning of the enemy army impossible. The civilians are thus hurt by the army that destroys food as well as seizes what remains of itself. In the case of blockades; the army that attacks intend military deactivation, the civilians are pushed in the front line and thus they have to take responsibility for their deaths. Since the struggles generally claim sovereignty over population and territory they claim responsibility for putting citizens at risk.

Against guerilla warfare (that involves concealment and camouflage), Walzer maintains that preparing in ambush behind moral and political cover rather than natural cover is not justified in war. Example- an ambush prepared under the protective coloration of national surrender is unlawful because it erodes the moral and legal understanding upon which surrender rests. A surrender is an explicit agreement and exchange where the individual soldier promises to stop fighting in exchange for benevolent quarantine for the duration of the war; and in exchange, government promises that its citizens will stop fighting in exchange of the ordinary public life. Yet, if the citizens attack, out of a moral commitment they feel towards their homeland such an act defeats all purpose of national surrender restoration of state machinery and peace and security of the state. Thus, their ambush is considered a criminal activity, resistance to it is legitimate and punishment of that resistance is also legitimate.

Guerrilla warfare, thus, is subversive not merely with reference to the occupation or to their government but with reference to the war convention itself. Also in guerrilla warfare the warriors don't themselves kill the citizens they invite the enemies to do it. Since, they donot adopt a single identity they make it impossible for enemies to differentiate between combatants and non-combatants. It is then characterized as people's war (as no armies are defending them) and the people involved are peasants, workers, labourers in the city, intellectuals, students and businessmen. Thus, when the enemy army attacks them, they cannot be

unjustly condemned as barbarians and murderers. According to Walzer, guerrilla leaders and publicists are able to convince the moral quality of their goals because they do not aim to mobilize all people, they operate in small groups and wait for the enemy to attack to mobilize the rest. They kill people who are high rank officials and believed to be collaborators, they do not take people as hostages and thus, they seem to be defending people's cause. They do not fight for people but among people and their bases are villages they are connected to their everyday life in a direct way. They are protected by the civilians and with their support they do acquire war rights and can be subjected to benevolent quarantine customarily offered to prisoners of war (unless they are guilty of sabotage or assassination). The civilians acquire war rights if they are willing to separate themselves from the guerrilla fighters and deny them material support. Since war against them systematically involves killing citizens and destroying society and culture, the guerilla wars cannot and should not be won. Guerilla warfare is to be distinguished from terrorism. The word terrorism is used to describe revolutionary violence the purpose is to destroy the morale of the nation, undercut the its solidarity and kill randomly. They aim to spread fear and intensify the feeling over a period of time until citizens feel themselves fatally exposed and force their government to negotiate for safety. It is a way of avoiding engagement with the enemy army. It is an indirect approach to affirm a totalitarian form of war and politics. It shatters the war conventions and political codes. Terrorism cannot thus be justified under any circumstances. The political defense of terrorism is that it is only way the oppressed can be liberated. They fail to make the moral distinction between random killing and revolution. He criticizes Sartre for justifying terrorism in Algeria. According to Sartre, killing an oppressor liberates both oppressor and oppressed as only when the slave confronts the master and kills him does he also create himself as a free being. Walzer considers this argument as absurd as liberation cannot come by killing or by vicarious experience of watching the oppressor die. Nor can acts of killing innocent children be justified as an armed struggle to restore dignity and self- respect. Terrorism is an act of hatred, fear and lust for domination, a revolution is characterized by restraint and self-control. The revolutionary soldiers assert their freedom when they obey the moral law and their political code is closely linked to psychological liberation.

Reprisals is another doctrine of war convention that legitimates action and are undertaken in response to crimes previously committed by the enemy. They are believed to be necessary sometimes because they are a means of preventing war from becoming entirely barbaric. Reprisals aim to satisfy the war convention of deterrence. Since retribution (punishing) of guilty individuals is not always possible the state in wartime will try to prevent further criminal activities by killing and punishing innocent people. It is thus a one sided law enforcement of deterrence without retribution. Through such acts the unjust have been defended on the grounds that no other means was available to check criminal activities of opponents. Further, the claim that all acts of reprisals are limited to

countering previous crimes and not with reference to crimes they wish to deter. According to Walzer, any act of violence that merely aims at deterrence without retribution and law enforcements cannot be justified.

3.6   CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The just war theory argues that a country can justifiably go on war for two reasons. It can do so in self defence against aggression or in response to serious unamendable human rights violation. Any war that directly targets non -combatants or fails to adhere to internationally established conventions cannot be called a just war. The problem with the theory is that it fails to address and respond to the changing economic, political and technological changes that influence peace initiatives: globalization being the primary challenge. The theory is inadequate as it fails to recognize the changing nature of nation states, organized crimes by states, non state terrorism and lacks an inclusive approach to understand human rights.

3.7   TYPES OF PACIFISM

Pacifism is a commitment to peace and opposition to violence, death and war. Intentional killing of innocent (sometimes not innocent too) people is generally considered morally unacceptable. Responding to the just war tradition accounts; a case is generally made that none of the wars can be counted as "just" by the parameters laid down, thus all wars are morally unacceptable. Thus, wars are considered morally wrong, moral purity demands non killing as the highest virtue, debates around pacifism surround the question of degree of violence to be resisted and what degree of force is not permissible while resisting, punishing or preventing violence.

3.8   ABSOLUTE PACIFISM: VIRTUE ETHICS
PERSPECTIVE

Seneca, the Roman Stoic thinker in his work <u>Anger, Mercy and Revenge</u> explains that war is mass scale slaughter of humans that deserves universal rejection. While small crimes are condemned and subjected to severe ethical and legal scrutiny; cruelties inflicted by nations during wars are considered admirable. While acts of cruelty for individuals remain forbidden, soldiers are trained to kill innocent people especially if they are considered enemies. Such an act should ideally be despised. The destructiveness of war is not limited to humans, it destroys nature too. Emotions such as anger, revenge, hatred, greed that lead rulers to war are harmful, instead virtue demands that rulers should display mercy even to those who have done them wrong. Seneca thus offers moral arguments, grounded in virtue, for thinking that rulers should restrain themselves from going to war. In addition, Seneca offers practical reasons against going to war as well. He points to the fact that war is often counterproductive to securing a lasting peace. War is wrong because it is not only incompatible with the virtuous life but it is also not productive of what people and their

leaders most seek, a just and lasting peace. Seneca traces the slaughter of innocents in war to the drive for vengeance. Both anger and vengeance are detrimental to the flourishing of a virtuous life of leaders as well as people. Hence, Seneca here provides one of the most significant groundings for pacifism, concerning respect for life and practice of virtue as the highest goal of human fulfilment.

3.9 CONTINGENT PACIFISM AND RAWLS' JUST WAR PACIFISM FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Contingent pacifism is generally understood as rejection of particular wars (not all wars), particular military systems. It admits of need of war in certain circumstances (while rejecting wars in certain other different circumstances). Larry May in her book <u>Contingent Pacifism</u> outlines five arguments (closely following the just wars argument) for contingent or conditional pacifism. The first argument is an epistemic argument, since there is always an uncertainty about the justice of war, contingent pacifist depend on the present circumstances and judge wars only of their times (not all wars). Secondly, conditional pacifism is also in support of corrective measures needed to justify the loss of lives of those who fight the war. This approach aims to correct that belief that that ethical concerns are not applicable to soldiers who forfeit their right to life. The third argument is derived from arguments advanced by international legal theorists concerning international human rights not only of non - combatants but also of combatants much neglected in international humanitarian law. The fourth approach concerns the idea of a just war as a means to end violence. The fifth argument, conscience-based argument suggests that military services need not be mandatory and the state should make allowances and exempt those who are conscientiously opposed to wars. Alternative service arrangements can be devised for those who oppose military service.

A version of contingent pacifism, also called as just war pacifism can be read in Rawls' theory of international justice that regulate the relation between societies and their governments. This is the law of nations later called Law of the Peoples. According to Rawls, nations have duties of justice, mutual respect and mutual aid towards each other and the law of nations defines the nature and scope of these duties. It also addresses the question of how liberal people are to relate to non-liberal people who may not be based on standards of well- ordered constitutional democracy. Values of freedom, independence, observing treaties, duty of non-intervention, wars waged for self-defence or in defence of the people unjustly attacked, honouring human rights, observing just restrictions in waging war, such as not attacking non combatants and coming to assistance of people living in unfavourable condictions form the core principles of international war.

Apart from these principles certain other principles such as forming and regulating federation of peoples, standards of fairness of trade and other co operative arrangements, mutual assistance for people in times

of famines and other natural calamities and duties of developed liberal societies to assist other nations. According to Rawls, any decent and liberal society would value these principles but there would have to be limits on the extent of toleration and co-operation towards non liberal societies. Rawls contends that the liberal societies should not tolerate dictatorial, tyrannical, and other outlaw regimes that violate human rights and do not act for the good of all their members. Rawls defines human rights as expressing "…a minimum standard of well ordered political institutions for all peoples who belong, as members in good standing, to a just political society of peoples". They set limit to a government internal autonomy so that no government can claim sovereignty as a defence against its violation of human rights. Secondly, it specifies reasons for war and its misconduct towards enemies. War can only be waged against another government in self- defence or to protect the human rights of other people(s) when violated by their own or another government. Wars cannot be justly waged for the sake of maintaining military superiority, balance of power, access to economic resources or to gain additional territory. All these involve unjust violations of a person's political autonomy. Also within war the human rights of enemy non-combatants is to be respected; non-combatants are not be targeted for attack and measures must be taken to protect them and their private property from injury. Thus, human rights are regarded as the minimal freedom, power and protection that any person/ nation needs for the most basic development of self and state. Thus, Rawls theory of justice and it's significance in international relations creates circumstances of permissible violence in the form of an appeal concerning self-defence, redress of past injustice, need to defend human rights and valorizing nationhood as conducive to important political goods, such as equality. These conditions encourage the notion of a justifiable war and a version of contingent pacifism.

3.10 TRANSFORMATIONAL PACIFISM AND ACTIVE NON VIOLENCE: GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE

Transformational pacifism aims at moral, psychological and social transformation as an alternative to violence and war. Gandhi's non-violence and pursuit of truth as a struggle against oppressive British rule as well as aspiration of self-rule is a version of the same.

Gandhi emphasized that true freedom cannot be attained by violence and acquisition of authority of the few. *Swaraj*, self rule for Gandhi was to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority. Thus, in Gandhi's view a truly democratic and non-violent society would not need the armed forces. It would have no aggressive war plans/preparations for its neighbours. If the country was attacked, it should rely on non-violent resistance. And if that failed and resulted in its conquest, one should rely on *satyagraha* (relentless pursuit of truth), through non violent resistance and non-cooperation, to render the new government ineffective. Gandhi explains *satyagraha* as holding on to truth, truth force synonymous with spiritual soul force. A *satyagrahi* is a

person who is in relentless pursuit of truth and holds a determination to reach it. The goal of *satyagraha* is to realize oneness with the universe, inspired by the Advaitin metaphysical principle oneness described as "…friendship with the world and combine greatest love with greatest opposition to wrong…". Thus, *satyagraha* does not permit the use of violence, since absolute truth is not known to anyone, one is not competent in punishing or inflicting violence on the other. *Ahimsa*, non violence, understood as love for all, thus, forms the core value of the pursuit of truth. Gandhi carried his search for non-violence into the realm of the human mind itself, and asked how one should relate to one's thoughts, beliefs, and feelings in a truly non- violent manner. It was important to co-ordinate and harmonize one's ideas, but to systematize them into a neat and logically coherent theory was to do violence both to the inherently fluid world of experience and to the inescapably tentative process of thinking itself. It was necessary to hold firm beliefs and pass judgments on individuals and situations, but one needed to ensure that these did not do violence to the ambiguities of the subject matter or to other ways of looking at it. Distinguishing it from cowardice, Gandhi explains that the latter is the spirit of fearlessness and immeasurable strength. Fighting evil does not require physical strength, it requires indomitable will and unflinching faith in one own strengths and cause. Non violence is also different from passive resistance, the latter does not exclude use of physical violence and is a weapon of the weak. Non violence on the other hand does not permit violence in any form and is the weapon of strong willed.

3.11 PACIFISM AND COSMOPOLITANISM: KANTIAN DEONTOLOGICAL ETHICS

Deontological ethics perspective to pacifism is closely related to absolute pacifism. Deontological approaches to morality focus on duty, rights and means (rather than ends). Kant's categorical imperative is formulated as follows:

- Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.

- Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end.

- Thus the third practical principle follows (from the first two) as the ultimate condition of their harmony with practical reason: the idea of the will of every rational being as a universally legislating will.

  The second formulation of the categorical imperative supports the claims against wars, in wars people are treated as means and does not respect them as ends in themselves. In Towards Perpetual Peace, Kant outlines a plan to avoid wars and establish peace. In the preliminary articles, he states six prohibitive measures to ensure peace.

1) No conclusion to peace shall be considered valid if it leaves scope for future hostilities.

2) In the name of a peace treaty (and otherwise), no state shall be acquired by another state by inheritance, exchange, purchase or gift. This is because each state is an identity by its own that cannot be eliminated by manipulation of another.

3) Standing armies have to abolished, for they constantly threaten other states with war by the fact that they are always prepared for it.

4) Kant said that no national debt must be contracted in connection with external affairs of the state. The credit system is used by the powerful and could become an instrument of aggression as the increasing debt can only be settled when industry and trade receive a stimulus benefiting the powerful, creating conditions conducive for war.

5) No state can forcibly interfere in the constitution and governing of another state as it makes the autonomy of other states insecure.

6) No act of aggression or hostility can make future peace impossible, such as employment of assassins, prisoners, breach of agreement and instigation to treason. This is because such actions will make peace impossible and hostilities in war may lead to extermination. These are prohibitive laws.

He then draws out the positive role of the states through the three definitive articles of peace. Kant states that since the state of nature is that which constantly threatens with hostilities, a state of peace needs to be formally instituted for suspension of hostilities This is a civil state that is republican in nature and founded upon three principles. "First the principle of *freedom* to all members of the society (as men), second the principle of *dependence* of everyone upon a single legislation (as subjects) and lastly principle of legal *equality* for everyone (as citizens)". This body alone can establish what is peaceful and right because a war can be declared only on the basis of the consent of the people. People will inevitably not be keen to start wars, as they would want to refrain from the evils of fighting, incurring expenditure for war and bearing debts.

The second article states that the federation of free states is to be instituted where "each nation, for the sake of its own security, can and ought to demand of others that they should enter… into a constitution, similar to the civil one...". This is a federation of peoples which is different from an international state. The idea of an international state involves a relation between superior and inferior, but the federation of states is one whole single nation that involves no relation between the legislature and any state obeying laws. It is also not like a peace treaty that eliminates one war: it is an arrangement to end all wars. It does not aim to acquire power like a state but it aims to preserve and secure the freedom of each state in itself. It is thus impossible to conceive of peace without a union of civil society, a free federation where nations place their

confidence in rights instituted to maintain peace. International right become meaningful if it is instituted by a federation of this kind. It does not include the right to go to war since the latter is not based on universally valid external laws, but on one-sided maxims backed by physical force. It would only result in human beings believing that it is perfectly just to go to war and to find peace only in the grave. Kant believed that unless people give up their lawlessness and submit themselves to coercive public laws of an international state that embraces all life, there cannot be peace.

The third definitive article of peace states that cosmopolitan right is limited to conditions of universal hospitality: "…*hospitality* is the right of the stranger not to be treated with hostility when he arrives on someone else's territory". One need not be turned away with hostility or into circumstances causing one's death as long as one behaves peacefully. They may only claim the right to stay as all human beings are entitled to present themselves in a society of others by virtue of their right to communal possessions of the earth's surface. This right to resort is justified as no one has more rights than others for the earth's surface.

3.12 WAR, PACIFISM AND FEMINISM:CARE ETHICS PERSPECTIVES

Feminist perspectives have generally been neglected in discussions of war, justice and pacifism, though there is a close connection as both are committed to establishing peace and a non- violent society (though some forms of pacifism is committed to minimal violence). Carol Gilligan in her book <u>In a Different Voice</u> argued that justice ethics is abstract and retributive in nature, it has generally dominated all political philosophical theories (as seen in discussions above). Alternatively, she suggests care ethics, it is a relational approach to morality and favours values of particularity, interconnectedness, dynamic nature of relationships that are not necessarily freely chosen. The care perspective argues that values like "autonomy" (generally associated with men) and "vulnerability" (generally associated with women and children) are constructed through the constitution of dominant, unequal and oppressive social relations, norms and discourses. The ethic of care, exposes threats and exclusions caused by structures of domination, oppression, paternalism and patriarchy that open possibility of future violence. Fiona Robinson in her book The Ethics of Care: Feminist Approach to Human Security, explains that The feminist care lens, thus, becomes important for the following reasons-

Firstly, the care perspective lays a great deal of importance on the recognition and acceptance of values such as dependence and vulnerability (not justice) in determining specific social political contexts, moral and political responsibilities. Thus, it suggests that dealing with violence requires one to pay attention those people who are rendered vulnerable by such acts and address the care needs that arise from them. This is in contrast to peace initiatives that lay emphasis on punishments and compensations after war that least acknowledge the experience of loss and

pain due to wars. Secondly, the focus of care ethics on relationality, allows for the possibility of seeing relations as constantly shifting, thus differences and disagreements are not necessarily obstacles rather productive of new identities and responsibility. Such an approach resists violent tendencies of violence caused by assimilation, often resulting in wars. Recognition of difference thus becomes a fundamental position for creating a politics of peace and resolution. Thirdly, as stated by Iris Murdroch states in her book, Existentialists and Mystics: Writings on Philosophy, morality is not just about action; it can also be about learning how to wait, be patient, trust, and listen. "The ethics of care provides the basis for this approach to international relations that rejects the idea of peacebuilding as immediate progress towards peace; rather, care ethics displays a commitment to a slow process of listening to needs, building trust, and rebuilding relations and institutions for the long-term well-being of societies". Thus, it stresses on the need for long term moral frameworks for building of non-violent society. Thus, care ethics does not build a blueprint or a normative theory of global peace and justice in traditional sense, it provides critical methods and tools for exploring moral relations to construct inclusive global politics.

3.13   BROAD QUESTIONS

1. Explain the justifications of war provided by MichealWalzer in his theory of just and unjust wars?

2. Discuss Walzer's account of *Jus ad bellum*(Right to War) and *Jus in* bello (Justice during Wars).

3. Explain the relevance of the just war theory for international societies.

4. Write an exposition on Walzer's theory of *Jus post* bellum (Justice after wars) and its implications on prospects of peace.

5. What is pacifism? Explain in detail it's different types.

6. Write a note on transformational pacifism and non violence from Gandhian Perspective.

7. Elaborate pacifism and cosmopolitanism from the Kantian deontological ethical perspective.

8. Explain the feminist care ethics perspective as a critique of the different notions of pacifism.

3.14 SUGGESTED READINGS

- Aron, Raymond. <u>Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations</u>. Trans. Richard Howard and Annette Baker Fox. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson. 1962

- Dunne, Tim. <u>Issues in World Politics</u>. Ed. Brian White, Richard Little and Michael Smith. London: Palgrave Mcmillan, 2005.

- Gandhi, Mohandas K.<u>Non-Violence in Peace and War 1942–1949</u>, New York: Garland Press. 1972.

- Lazar, Seth and Helen Frowe. *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics in War*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2018

- Pugh, Michael. "Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Intervention." <u>Issues in World Politics</u>. Ed. Brian White, Richard Little and Michael Smith. London: Palgrave Mcmillan 2005.

- Tuck, Richard. <u>The Rights of War and Peace: Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant.</u>New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- Walzer, Michael. <u>Just and Unjust Wars</u>. 4th Edition. New York: Basic Books, 2006.
  --<u>Arguing About War</u>. London: Yale University Press, 2004.

❖❖❖❖

4

ENGAGING DIVERSITY

Unit Structure

4.0 Objectives

4.1   Introduction

4.2 Philosophical perspective on multiculturalism

      4.2.1 Bhikkhu Parekh's multiculturalism

      4.2.2 Problems of immigrant culture

      4.2.3 Critique of Multiculturalism - Brian Barry

4.3 Rights of Refugees and Rights of Immigrants – Michael Dummett

4.4   Orientalism-Postcolonial critique of the European representation of the Orient- Edward Said

4.5   Summery

4.6   Questions

4.7   Suggested reading

4.0   OBJECTIVES

- To respect and appreciate cultural diversity

- To promote the understanding of unique cultural and ethnic heritage

- To facilitate acquisition of the attitudes, skills, and knowledge to function in various cultures

- To understand Bhikkhu Parekh's viewson multiculturalism

- To know Michael Dummett's thoughts on Rights of Refugees and Rights of Immigrants

- To understand Edward Said's doctrine of Orientalism

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In a globally interconnected world, it is ethically and practically crucial to develop an awareness and understanding of differences. By gaining knowledge about diversity and public scholarship, your understanding of the social contexts that frame our communication and collaboration with one another will be extended, and your ability to respond to cultural challenges enhanced. In this chapter we will study the concept of multiculturalism particularly multiculturalism of Bhikkhu Parekh, it's critique by Brian Barry, Michael Dummett's thoughts on Rights of Refugees and Rights of Immigrants and concept of orientalism with special reference to Edward Said.

4.2 PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE ON MULTICULTURALISM

The doctrine of multiculturalism not only recognizes different cultural groups as well as other types of people within a society, but states that none of them should be considered superior or inferior.

Today, multicultural societies coexist in many countries of the world, with people from many cultures, as well as groups that draw themselves apart from others.

The doctrine of multiculturalism inspires multiculturalism in any community and develops a sense of mutual respect.

There are two levels of implementation for multiculturalism.

1. Tolerance within different cultures of the country

2. Equal civil recognition

For example, in India, people of all castes, religions and creeds are given equal status in the province.

The term multicultural was first used in the United States in the late nineteenth century to refer to the legitimate part of the Judeo-American and Irish communities.

(After the Europeans came to America after the fifteenth century, a multicultural community was formed there)

If a country has multicultural communities living together but the spirit of multiculturalism is not developing, then that country will be shattered. Yugoslavia is a case in point. Lacking a sense of multiculturalism, Yugoslavia split into seven.

Bhikkhu Parekh

Bhikkhu Parekh was born in Gujarat in 1935. After graduating from the University of Mumbai, he did research at the London School of

Economics. Bhikkhu Parekh held important positions. He was the Chancellor of Vadodara University. Future of Multi Ethnic UK

4.2.1 Bhikkhu Parekh's multiculturalism

Bhikkhu Parekh presents three characteristics of culture.

1. Every human being is culturally bound to his culture. Man is identified by his culture.

2. No culture is completely good or completely bad. Each culture should have its own independent development opportunity. Because culture is an integral part of one's life

3. Every culture must be inherently democratic. At the same time, every culture should be ready for proper improvement and change.

For any culture to survive, it needs to be inclusive, democratic and reformist.

According to Bhiku Parikh, multiculturalism is nothing more than the harmony of these three traits.

4.2.2.Problems of immigrant culture

Migration causes some problems when one culture merges with another. Parik says the state should take steps to address such issues.

1. Give equal importance to all cultural groups.

2. Immigrants should adapt to the culture of the country they are going to.

3. Therefore there should be separate culture for individual sector and private sector. So there should be a different culture for the public sector. For example, everyone should follow the policy of the nation regarding equal citizenship code.

Problems arising in a multicultural society

Dominance of the majority culture: The effect of the cultural domination debate is seen at different levels. For example, when deciding what the language of a nation should be, the language of the majority becomes the national language, and the influence of cultural hegemony is evident when making a law. It becomes easier to legislate according to the culture in which there are more people in Parliament.

Conflicts arise in cultural groups over the superiority-inferiority of culture. To solve this, Bhikkhu Parikh formulates a dialectical theory. According to this theory, inter-cultural dialogue is brought about through culture. Only communication can solve problems. Communication is the key to success. Everyone should try to overcome the problems in their culture by recognizing and acknowledging them. No problem in our culture, this language is a hindrance to intercultural communication. So, by generously acknowledging

the problems in one's own culture, one should create harmony and harmony among oneself. Controversy arises from a radical role. Therefore, one should leave such attitude and be ready for change with an open mind. Problems within the culture can also be solved in this way. For example, in a culture where women are subjected to indiscriminate atrocities, such culture should be changed by its members. Without it, cultural destruction is inevitable. Every culture has to give up the problematic part of its culture. This principle can be applied to all minorities. This is not limited to immigrants. It is also useful for minorities.

If a culture distinguishes itself from other cultures, then the communication between it and other cultures ends. The reason why a culture thus neutralizes itself is because of the skepticism in their minds. Theythink that if we mix with others, our culture will be destroyed and it will not have an independent identity or it will be polluted.

It must be acknowledged that no culture is perfect. We can learn something from the culture of others. Culture is also a medium of learning. Bhikkhu Parekh has something to say here that you should have the generosity to accept good thoughts coming from anyone.

According to Bhiku Parikh, multiculturalism cannot be created in a country by simply granting equal citizenship to all minorities, immigrants, but it requires the acceptance of every culture by the society, respect and esteem of every culture. If there is a feeling in a culture that we are different from here, then it cannot be called multiculturalism. If the majority is pursuing their own goals, it is natural for such sentiments to arise. It is said that the Negro community in the United States as well as the Muslim community in India and the Asian and Caribbean communities in England saw this trend. This sentiment is an obstacle to building a multicultural nation.

Demands for unity and diversity of multicultural communities should be combined in such a way that political unity can be established even in the absence of cultural unity. From this, citizens should have loyalty towards the society, but also respect for other cultures. Bhiku Parekh says that all minorities should get their cultural rights.

4.2.3 Critique of Multiculturalism - Brian Barry :

The first point that Brian Berry makes, is that multiculturalism must always be considered in terms of Community.

We live in a society and this society has its identity as one group which we call as nation.

when we say one nation it means that everything has to be equal for all members of that nation. this is called as egalitarian policy. this means that if no discrimination will be made on the basis of caste, class, creed, colour and gender, no special rights or privileges will be given for the same, everyone belonging to the same nation will have equal opportunity in

every aspect of progress that the nation makes. on the flip side this also means that dress, manners, customs, festivals, holidays and whatever that is traditionally and culturally relevant to a particular group will not be a part of national agenda. Tradition, culture and religion are private matters and are to be strictly kept within the boundaries of the family. Second is the judicial system there will be a uniform Civil Code accepted all over the nation uniformly law system would be based on social sciences and not on religious customs. immigrants can be a part of the nation if they are ready to give up there cultural identity and accept the national identity. a dialogue between cultures however constructive can never resolve differences. there are going to be a traditions which will be in absolute contrast to another. the best way to solve this is to have one uniform judicial system and culture must be made insignificant. the best state would be that in which all its citizens have one national identity and no cultural diversity.

Criticism:

Brian Berry ignores that each individual is a product of a particular culture. it is culture that gives identity to a person #### his perception develops both personality and character. if cultural identity is destroyed an individual will be without a face and a voice.

A person occupying the top political office would make laws for the nation. which would always be an unconscious product of his own culture, Of his upbringing. As the top most people change so will the laws.

4.3. RIGHTS OF REFUGEES AND RIGHTS OF IMMIGRANTS – MICHAEL DUMMETT :

Professor Dummet's incisive reflection on the plight of refugees bring forth the urgency of the need to challenge the anti immigrants ethos past developing across the world. Published as a part of an aptly named series 'thinking in action', this book is a timely reminder of the resist underpinnings of some of the policies of the state on immigration. in no uncertain terms this little gem of a book show how the clarity of a philosopher's arguments can remove the cobwebs of muddled thinking that often of skewer a proper understanding of political and social problems. it informs us, stimulated us and inspires us to act on behalf of some of the most ill treated of all peoples: the much maligned asylum seekers.

The book takes some of the principles that ought to govern attitudes to immigrants and refugees. These include the right to be a first class citizen and its complement that no state or to take race, religion or language as essential to its identity. the first principle enjoins upon the state the duty of protection of all citizens and the responsibility of ensure that no citizen is persecuted, oppressed or discriminated against. everyone has a right, argues Dummett, to live in a country in which he can fully identify himself with the state under whose sovereignty that country falls. the question of whether he lives under such a state "is ultimately decided by whether that individual feels that he belongs. " this is a stringent criterion and it rests the burden of

proof of non persecution and non discrimination upon the state of which the individual may flee to a safer country. the second principle prohibits the use by a state of race, religion or language as essential to the identity of its citizens because otherwise it will risk reducing some of those living under its jurisdiction to 2nd class citizens. this general principle is a useful tool with which to challenge the home Secretary, David blunkett's present policy of continuing to press for making proficiency in English a test of British citizenship.

   With due regard to the rights of those already living in the host country Dummett grants that there ought to be 'a right not to be submerged.' it is important not to misread this important point. several examples from across the world where oppressive regimes attempted to submerge existing populations with mass intake of people from other countries show how colonial authorities made a bid to submerge local populations. in Malaya and fizzy in East Timor and Tibet, the government systematically tried to obliterate minorities. given that such a danger of being submerged may be true and present in some places, we need to make a considered judgment about its existence in particular host country in the light of facts about migration. Britain, however, does not face such a danger.

The general point that emerges and is worth reflection is that while any country has the right to limit immigration, if it's indigenous population has the serious danger of being rapidly overwhelmed, gradual influx is not a threat. balancing a consideration for the legitimate fears of the citizens of the host country with the needs of the refugees is the next step. underscoring the right of every human being to refugee from persecution, which is an accepted ground for asylum according to the 1951 Geneva Convention, Dummett provides a bold interpretation. he argues that all conditions That deny someone the ability to live where is in minimal conditions For a decent human life ought to be grounds For claiming refuge elsewhere.

His powerful argument is based on the premise that to refuse help to others suffering from or threatened by injustice is to collaborate with that Injustice, and so incorrect part of the responsibility for it. Thus, he supports a presumption in favour of freedom of entry that is each state ought to admit refugees unless it can give valid reasons for refusal.

Very few reasons for refusal are valid. contrary to popular perception, shamelessly laced with racist propaganda, demographic profiles show that the EU needs 53 Lac people of working age from outside to compensate for the changing Ratio of working to elderly populations. the current ratio of working to elderly population of 4:1 will fall to 2:1 by 2050 Jeopardizing the welfare system based on calculations of the ratio 5:1. so there is actually a need for an intake of working people.

Countering yet another common misperception that Britain take to many refugees, Dummett reminds us that countries that have taken most refugees are Pakistan, Ethiopia and Sudan. he also highlights the appalling rate of acceptances says of asylum applications (%) by the UK in 1996:

	From Sri Lanka	Zaire	Somalia
UK	0.2	1	0.4
Canada	82	76	81

If the same international criteria are used, clearly these variations between the UK and there of a difference in the subjective judgment of immigrations officials.

As many readers will concur from personal experiences of friends and family, even brief visits are often turned down. in 1997, 30% of would be visitors from Ghana were refused entry in the UK compared to 0.18% from Australia. However, a U turn is possible, just as it was for Canada. like Australia, with its white Australia policy, Canada too had racist immigration policies before 1970s.

Britain also attempts to use the device Dummet taptly describes as 'the most morally squalid' of all devices of discouraging refugees by inciting prejudice against them. this attitude is manifest in the constant labeling of asylum seekers as 'bogus' or merely, 'economic migrants.' the books traces how deeply rooted in the history of British racism are today's attitudes two asylum seekers.

Professor Dummet's arguments pave the way for demanding radical changes in the institutions that govern and control the movement of people fleeing from persecution. this little book deserves wide reading by the general public, as well as campaigners for human rights, specifically the supporters of the rights of refugees and asylum seekers. academics, not persuaded to pick it up on the merits of its impeccable logical reasoning and laudable political motivations, might consider drawing inspiration on how to write on an urgent practical issue of public interest lucidly, succinctly, persuasively and courageously.

4.4 ORIENTALISM-POSTCOLONIAL CRITIQUE OF THE EUROPEAN REPRESENTATION OF THE ORIENT-EDWARD SAID

Orientalism: Orientalism is the attitude of Western thinkers towards the people of the East. Orientalists are Western thinkers who study the language, history, literature, ideology and social life of the people of the region, which includes Asia, North Africa and India. Thus it is important to know the concepts of Orient, Orientalist and Orientalism while understanding Orientalism.

It is sometimes misunderstood that those who live in the Orient are Orientalists, but that is not the case. Those who study the East, despite living in the West, are called Orientalists. People living in the west are called oxidants. Oxidant is the opposite of Orient.

In the early days of colonialism, when the United States was nowhere in the US world, and the British and French colonies were in Asia, they had adopted an imperialist policy. The British had more colonies than France. It is said that these people came there without any knowledge of the colony, but they thought that wherever we went, we would gain knowledge by studying books in their native language, their literature, history, philosophy, language etc. The colonists studied the literature of the East and after studying it they realized that we are superior in all respects, our history is superior. These thinkers, the Orientalists, then described them in their own way. In this, he mainly considered his own history as superior. They described the people of the East as rude, savage, cobra-playing, monkey-playing, undeveloped, and described the Westerners as superior and developed.

After the end of World War I, however, the study of Orientalism spread from Europe to the USA. He studied in many departments of social sciences. The United States, however, tried to make Orient a reality. The views of British and French thinkers began to be treated.

Edward W. Said:

Edward Said, an Arab Christian scholar, formulated the doctrine of Orientalism. Born in 1935, Said received his early education in Egypt. But then he went to America. He later became a lecturer in the US. He later became a professor at Columbia University. He studied the literature, culture and social life of the East and the West. He was a very studious person. In 1978 he authored a book, Orientalism. But their layout was different. He says that Orientalism is the structure of Western thinkers. That is, Western thinkers who are known as Orientalists have consciously described the history, culture, literature, folklore, etc. of the East in their own way. In it, he has mainly described them as uneducated, rude, undeveloped and in comparison, he has considered himself as well-educated, developed and civilized. It shows his attitude of proving his superiority and despising others. According to Said, it is true that Westerners studied the East, but their views on the East were not based on any definite theoretical basis. These thoughts are unjust and arbitrary. It is written with the prejudice that the people of the East are uneducated and rude.

According to Said, Orientalists began to imitate Eastern art in the eighteenth century. Through poems, pictures, music, stories, etc., he created a picture of the East in the minds of the people. He created the image as he read it. But according to Said, reading does not reveal the whole truth. On partial knowledge, they created an image of the East, that these people are like that. Like the books he read in the nineteenth century, he translated these books into English for the world. Just as they had partial knowledge, their motives were not pure. They wanted to prove their superiority by underestimating the people of the East. They wanted to cover up the atrocities and injustices being inflicted on them by showing that we have come here to develop these uncivilized, uneducated,

undeveloped people as civilized, educated and developed. At the same time, they wanted to dominate the East.

While these people from the East are making unrealistic depictions, the people from the East live naked, play with snakes and monkeys, the women here do belly dance. Describing Central Asia, the Muslims here trade in oil and how they are extremists, oppressors of women, keep many women as concubines.

Said, however, challenges this and says that this policy is a conspiracy of Orientalists. They want to prove their superiority and support their own colonial policy. Once it is proven that these Westerners are superior, then it is self-evident that they are worthy of domination. From the nineteenth century onwards, French and British colonialists dominated the East. After World War II, however, the United States replaced them.

In 1978, Edward Said's book Orientalism was published. In this book, Edward Said has given his above views on Orientalism. In it, he says, colonialism was not just about ruling, it was about trying to show how Western nations are superior to the East.

This book is divided into three parts: 1. Scope of Orientalism

2.Orientalistic structure and restructure 3. Orientalism now

According to Said, the book is a realistic political approach. The first section describes how the westerners ruled over the eastern nations and what the eastern conditions were like at that time.

The second section deals with the manner in which Westerners imposed their views on the people of the East, how they colonized in the name of reform under the guise of trade, Orientalist writings on the East.

The third section analyses modern Orientalism. Also discussed is British and French Orientalism. In this book, Said discusses racism along with Orientalism. Westerners used to discriminate (black-white) with Easterners. Always pretending to be a liberal and supporting violence. Said says that colonialism came to an end but colonial thinking remained the same. It did not end when the United Nations came to power. The colonialists left but left their thoughts in the minds of the people. Orientalist writers did not make a real vision of the East. The good things of the nations that were ruled by the West are not consciously shown. It just showed that we ruled and tried to uplift these people. In this book, Said has exposed them. In the end, Said says, we can better organize our history and culture. No one knows you better than you do. So the people of the East should write on their own. According to Said, the East has its own beauty.

4.5 SUMMERY

The doctrine of multiculturalism inspires multiculturalism in any community and develops a sense of mutual respect. Tolerance and equal civil recognition is essential in multiculturalism. If a country has multicultural communities living together but the spirit of multiculturalism is not developing, then that country will be shattered. According to Bhiku Parikh, for any culture to survive, it needs to be inclusive, democratic and reformist. According to Bhiku Parikh, multiculturalism requires the acceptance of every culture by the society, respect and esteem of every culture. It must be acknowledged that no culture is perfect. We can learn something from the culture of others. Culture is also a medium of learning. While criticizing multiculturalism, Brian Barry says, a dialogue between cultures however constructive can never resolve differences. there are going to be a traditions which will be in absolute contrast to another. To have one uniform judicial system and culture must be made insignificant, is the solution. All citizens of the state have one national identity and no cultural diversity.

Prof. M. Dummett supports a presumption in favour of freedom of entry that is each state ought to admit refugees unless it can give valid reasons for refusal. Very few reasons for refusal are valid. Professor Dummet's arguments pave the way for demanding radical changes in the institutions that govern and control the movement of people fleeing from persecution.

Orientalism is the attitude of Western thinkers towards the people of the East. Those who study the East, despite living in the West, are called Orientalists. The Orientalists, then described them in their own way. In this, They mainly considered their own history as superior and the people of the East inferior. According to Edward Said, it is true that Westerners studied the East, but their views on the East were not based on any definite theoretical basis. These thoughts are unjust and arbitrary. It is written with the prejudice that the people of the East are uneducated and rude. Once it is proven that these Westerners are superior, then it is self-evident that they are worthy of domination. Orientalist writers did not make a real vision of the East. The good things of the nations that were ruled by the West are not consciously shown. It just showed that we ruled and tried to uplift these people. So Said suggests, the people of the East should write on their own.

4.6   QUESTIONS

1. Explain Bhikkhuparekh's view on multiculturalism.

2. How Brian Barry criticize multiculturalism?

3. Explain the thoughts of Edward Said about Orientalist in brief.

4. Briefly elaborate Michael Dummett's thought about Rights of Refugees and Rights of Immigrants.

5. Write short notes on:

- Multiculturalism

- Orientalism

- Rights of Immigrants

4.7 SUGGESTED READING

- Charles Taylor "The Politics of Recognition" in Colin Farrelly (ed) Contemporary Political

- Theory: A Reader (Sage Publishers, 2004)

- Bhiku Parekh. "Equality of Difference" in Colin Farrelly (ed) Contemporary Political Theory:

- A Reader (Sage Publishers, 2004)

- Brian Barry, "Liberalism and Multiculturalism" in Ethics

- George Crowder, Theories of Multiculturalism: AnIntroduction, chapter 3

- Bill Ashcroft and Pal Ahluwalia, Edward said (Routledge Critical Thinkers Series) chapter 3.

- Moustafa Bayoumi and Andrew Rubin (ed.) The Edward Said Reader chapter 4.

- Michael Dummett Immigration and Refugees Routledge London and New York, 2001 (chapters 1-5)

❖❖❖❖