Handling Moral Conflict: A Deliberative Way

Dr.Triranjan Raj
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science,
Ram Lal Anand College,
New Delhi

Abstract
Multiculturalism as a theoretical concept is an extension of communitarianism and emerged out of the liberal-communitarian debate. Multiculturalism emerged as a doctrine to defend minority rights in the context of communitarian critique of liberal individualism and how these minority rights fit into the broader issue of liberal-democratic theory. It is a theory to counter the dangerous tendencies which are inherent in the theory of liberalism and communitarianism. Liberal concept of justice was not enough to defend the sort of group specific rights that minorities need to protect themselves from assimilation and similarly communitarianism has a dangerous tendency to limit the freedom of individual to question and revise traditional way of life. In this paper I had tried to work out how multiculturalism as a doctrine emerged out of communitarianism and how composite culture which is an essential prerequisite of multicultural societies can be created. In this I had tried to show that Multiculturalism emerged as a doctrine to defend minority rights in the context of communitarian critique of liberal individualism and how these minority rights fit into the broader issue of liberal-democratic theory. In this paper I had also tried to chalk out significant differences in the concept of multiculturalism and communitarianism. In a multicultural society, the growth of composite culture is necessary for the formation and growth of national identity and for composite culture to easily develop in multicultural society I had recommended deliberative form of democracy.

Most of the modern societies are multicultural societies with each cultural community offering a conception of good life. Coexistence of different conceptions of good life creates a situation of moral conflict which is confined not only to public sphere but stretches over to private domain also. Different cultural groups often grudge that their view and concerns are often sidelined by representative bodies while formulating public polices, which eventually make them apathetic to state authorities and creates a problem of legitimacy. Like in France, the state in 2010 decided to ban all religious symbols in public which created lot of resentment in minority community. Similarly in India, The Muslim Women (protection of rights on Marriage)bill, 2019 banning and criminalizing triple talaq was passed by parliament as a social reform measure without having consultation with the members of concerned Muslim community. This spurred the debate in India that shouldn't the government have brought in this legislation after having wider consultation with the concerned community and does the state has the right to criminalize a civil act pertaining to marriage whereas no such provision exists for any other community.

Modern multicultural societies are faced with the dilemma how to reconcile this discontent and resolve the disputes arising out of such moral conflicts. There have been numerous instances in multicultural societies where people belonging to different religious groups have resented such legal legislations which encroach upon their religious beliefs. There is therefore a growing feeling that while formulating public policies different cultural groups should be consulted. In this article we have tried to show that Multiculturalism emerged as a doctrine to defend minority rights in the context of communitarian critique of liberal individualism and how these minority rights fit into the broader issue of liberal-democratic theory. Apart from this we have also tried to chalk out significant differences in the concept of multiculturalism and communitarianism.

Different Approaches to resolve moral conflicts in diverse societies

There are primarily two different approaches to resolve the moral conflict in diverse societies, namely "The liberal approach" and "The communitarian approach".[1]According to the 'liberal approach' there are some fundamental values in liberal societies such as freedom of expression, the physical moral integrity of the individual , and freedom of association which are inalienable and cannot be negotiated. The liberal societies should protect and respect such values and diversity which gives credence to good life. This approach advocates that diversity should not be pursued at the cost of individual freedoms. The liberal presupposes that the conception of good life is only good if it does not infringe on the liberty of others.

The communitarians on the contrary claim that liberalism is "inhospitable to difference"[2]. They equate liberal values and policies with some form of cultural and moral assimilation. Even when the communitarians do respect the Universal Human Rights, yet in their view such freedom needs to be balanced with other cultural values[3]. They are of the view that minority groups may be allowed to live according to their religious and cultural dictates, yet communal values should be given more importance than the individual ones. According to this approach the minority groups may be exempted from observing a particular piece of legislation as in the case of equality bill concerning adoption rights and in other circumstances they need to be granted special rights.

From the foregoing discussion it is apparent that the communitarian and liberal approaches to cultural diversity presents a contrasting picture especially whether people should have distinct legal status based on their membership of a particular group. Liberal individualists however favours state neutrality in so far as claims of good life are concerned. The liberal individualists are of the view that since the affiliation of an individual to ethnic or religious group is purely a voluntary choice, no exemption should be granted to religious or ethnic membership. [4]

Communitarians on the contrary put emphasis on the cultural tradition that sustain the communities. Communitarians challenge the neutrality of laws and believes that the rules framed under liberal regimes cannot claim to be neutral even if due procedures are followed because of inherent majoritarian biases in the system. They view constitutional framework either c protective of the cultural tradition or corrosive. There is common thread among communitarians about the fact that society is composed not only of distinct individuals but also of ethnic or cultural groups. Communitarians therefore are not in favour of the idea of unencumbered self which believes in

individual ability to choose one ends as far as their relations with others in the society is concerned. communitarian believe that individual personality is created by the cultural environment in which he or she develops, and it is within this cultural environment their personal choices, attributes and behaviour gets shaped up. So, it is very difficult for an individual to decide on cultural matters in an unbiased fashion as advocated by liberal thinkers like Rawls.[5]

Communitarians thus are not in favour of neutrality of state. Even though both communitarian and liberals talk of common good, but their conception of common good is quite different. The liberals believe that the concept of common good can be adjusted according to the preference and conception of individuals in the society. On the other hand, the communitarians are of the view that good life lies only in the community way of life. The individual's concept of good life is subordinate to the community conception of good. The liberal society gives precedence to the individual and in the communitarian society the community values are given precedence to individual preferences. Therefore, the communitarian advocates conformation to the community way of life.[6]

The liberal believes in the dictum "Self prior to end"[7]. They are of the view that an individual is capable of understanding the social situation according to the dictates of his reason. They subscribe to the Kantian view of self. The communitarians on the other hand do not favour unencumbered view of self and believes that individual self cannot exist without social practices. According to Charles Taylor liberal view of self is empty and the idea of complete freedom is self defeating. "True freedom must be situated"[8]. Since the community values are one which set goals for us in life. The true meaning of freedom here means that we are free to achieve the goals discerned from the community way of life. According to him that freedom will make no sense in which we are challenging a situation which sets goals for us. He believes that communal values should be taken as "authoritative horizons"[9] "which set goals for us"[10]. Whereas liberals believe that Nothing is set and the individual has the ability to judge the worth of cultural values and can either affirm or reject them. Similarly another communitarian Michael Sandel also believes that self is not prior to end but rather constituted by its ends and we cannot distinguish 'me' from 'my end'.[11] Sandel like other communitarians does not believe in the concept of 'unencumbered self' because he believes that an unencumbered self has certain perception in his mind about his end when he says my ambition, my aim etc.

Communitarians criticize liberals on the account of their neglecting the social conditions required for the effective fulfilment of individual interests which in itself gets created in a cultural environment. According to liberals individuals are self-sufficient outside the society and does not require community to develop its capacity of self-determination whereas communitarians like Taylor argues for a 'Social Thesis' according to which true capacity of individual can only be exercised in a society which provides individual a culturally secure environment. The difference between the communitarians and the liberals lies in the importance of social thesis is also realized by liberals like Rawls and Dworkin. The real issue of conflict between the two is that whether the state support is needed to secure the range of offers in cultural structure so that the individuals can choose from them which are best for them. Both liberal and communitarians aim to provide individuals with range of options from which he can make autonomous choices. Whereas to liberals different options are secure in cultural market place without state assistance. While communitarians believe that cultural structure is secure under state assistance. Thus the dispute is

"not between perfectionism and neutrality but is between social perfectionism and state perfectionism". [12]

Multiculturalism as a theoretical concept is an extension of communitarians and emerged out of the liberal-communitarian debate. Multiculturalism emerged as a doctrine to defend minority rights in the context of communitarian critique of liberal individualism and how these minority rights fit into the broader issue of liberal-democratic theory. [13] It is a theory to counter the dangerous tendencies which are inherent in the theory of liberalism and communitarianism. Liberal concept of justice was not enough to defend the sort of group specific rights that minorities need to protect themselves from assimilation and similarly communitarianism has a dangerous tendency to limit the freedom of individual to question and revise traditional way of life.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MULTICULTURALISM AND COMMUNITARIANISM

Both Multiculturalism and Communitarianism locate individual within a community and believes that an individual's identity is shaped by its community membership. They believe that it is this cultural membership which gives meaning to individual lives. Multiculturalists and communitarians begins with a critique of liberalism as they both question the liberal view that the world consists of discrete individuals and these separate atomized selves enter into relationship voluntarily, for the sake of realizing some specific goals. The liberals while defining the individualistic conception of self neglects the fact that individual identity is constituted by various community attachment which are so close to him. They believe that politics should not be concerned solely with securing the conditions for individuals to exercise their powers of autonomous choice but also securing their cultural choices as they are equally crucial for his sense of well-being and respect. There cultural options are integral to his personality as many have been picked up by him during his upbringing. [14]

This idea that individuals are situated in specific communities and that they approach that individual identity is socially constructed is endorsed both by multiculturalists and communitarians. However, even both situate the individual in the community but still one can differentiate between the two. First, although both Communitarianism and multiculturalism see individual as being constituted by their communities and individuals are defined by the shared community goals, but communitarians believe that the individual cannot distance himself from these goals and cannot choose among them which goals he wants to accept or reject. Individuals must endorse the moral ideas and the conception of good life as perceived by the community. They are expected to affirm these goals and values above anything else as they don't have the right to revise or redefine those community values or goals. [15]

As opposed to this version of communitarians, multiculturalists consciously dissociate themselves from this idea of a constituted self. They accept the view that individual personality is shaped within a cultural community but at the same time they accept the possibility of shared practices and collective goals being revised. According to Kymlicka, 'it is not easy or enjoyable to revise our deepest ends, but it is possible and regrettable necessity'. With changing times human experiences and circumstances also gets changed and in this changed scenario one may realize that our earlier beliefs are not valid anymore and we need to revisit and redefine them with

changing times and needs. There is no mechanism though which one can anticipate in advance at what time these demands for reconsideration will arise.[16]

Although both multiculturalism and communitarians talks of the importance of culture in a society, but there is a very significant difference between the two. Communitarians define culture in essentialist sense whereas multiculturalists believe in constructed notion of culture. The essentialist approach claims that everything has a real essence that is unique, irreducible and unchanging. Culture and ethnicity, according to them are fixed features of individuals. The critics of this theory says that it produces a false description of culture as culture is neither static nor uniform and evolves with changes with changing times and place. They even fail to recognize that there exists diversity within one cultural community itself as within the same community values are defined and interpreted differently. Multiculturalism on the other hand presents there case in constructivist terms instead of essentialist terms. Constructivist claims that cultural essence in itself gets created with passage of time and is a historical creation. They do not believe in the existence of free essence and whatever appears natural or given has actually emerged over a period of time through social interaction. They believe that identity is not fixed and it is continually negotiated and renegotiated through interactive efforts. "A constructivist approach reveals that neither identity nor culture has an essence and both are subject to constant changes". [17]

COMPOSITE CULTURE: AN ESSENTIAL PREREQUISITE FOR MULTICULTURAL SOCIETIES

The prime concern of any state is to ensure and protect its national unity now since most of the societies in contemporary times are multicultural it becomes essential for these states to develop and sustain composite culture. Composite culture does not necessarily mean amalgamation of religious, ethnic and linguistic identities but merely stresses on the recognition of those identities. For such composite culture to develop the state need to pursue such kind of policies which are inclusive in nature and through which it allows different identities to flourish. It's very difficult to imagine a heterogeneous society flourishing without developing a composite culture which is representative of all the diverse communities residing within a state.

In this age of globalization nearly all societies are becoming multicultural as each society is marked by the presence of diverse cultures who holds different views regarding family, good life etc. Now in this situation the basic question arises that how should state handle diversity and how should it deal with culturally different communities which are different from the majority? In this type of challenging situation the societies generally tend to adopt two different ways to handle cultural diversity. First is the Assimilationist Path and the other is the Multiculturalists Path. In the Assimilationist path the state wants such diverse groups to mold themselves to a common pre-existing culture which is invariably the dominant culture. The second alternative is that of multiculturalism which recognizes cultural pluralism. Multiculturalists accept and respect cultural distinctiveness of diverse groups and also give equal importance to them in public domain. They believe that in the present day globalizing world, no culture howsoever dominant should be imposed on others. They also believe that no culture in the world can develop in isolation and the only way cultures evolve and sustain is through continued dialogue with other cultures. Every culture has a different vision of good life and offers something valuable to the mankind. Now it is only through an interactive process between different cultures the whole

mankind can draws benefits from other cultures. It is through this interaction only society learns to emerge out of moral conflicts and it is through this process cultures throw-out the world actually evolves. Even though ever culture has something valuable to offer but still multiculturalists are of the opinion that no single culture should claim privileged position and should foster cultural diversity so that multicultural ethos can develop in society. [18]

Assimilationist model talks of creating a uniform national culture whereas multiculturalists want diverse culture to co-exist in the society. Now by this do we mean to suggest that multicultalists want's different cultural communities to live separately in their own defined areas within the same country and if this is not the case then how does the state ensure that different communities cohabit by developing mutual trust. If we go by the traditional definition of nation-state, each ethnic community has distinct cultural identity and each of them have a separate state marked by a uniform national culture now if we go by this logic then multicultural states do not have any national culture as there are different cultural communities residing in the same territory. Fortunately this is not the case as within multicultural societies like india different cultural communities coexist and even though each one of them follow different cultural practices but still they have a common national culture which is representative of all the cultural communities which are residing. In multicultural states like India people belonging to different cultural communities cohabit without losing their own distinct identity or getting assimilated in the pre-dominant culture. "They not only interact and influence each other and undergo changes, but, interacting on an equal basis, they also create something new, i.e., a common, distinctive pluralist national composite culture." [19] The composite culture in multicultural societies develop through mutual interaction among different communities. The composite culture has essence of different cultural communities as different cultural values gets represented through it but this does not mean politically and economically dominant community have more share in it . So the share value of different cultural communities in composite is not dependent of the position which cultural community members hold in society. The composite culture is constitutive of values of different cultural communities and the identity of each cultural group is mutually respected by all communities. In this each cultural community is given the freedom to maintain and sustain their distinctiveness while at the same time these cultural communities keep on evolving through continuous interaction with each other so the new composite culture and contribution cultures both develop and evolve simultaneously. In such a scenario the past of all contributing culture is considered as a common heritage of the society and every cultural community respects this common heritage. [20]

Multiculturalism does not mean coalescing of diverse cultures leading to a composite culture. It endeavors to facilitate different participative cultures to maintain their distinct identities at the same time ensure equality and impartiality. The biggest obstacle in the emergence of composite culture and in turn multiculturalism is the prevalent notion of nation-state. Firstly because the nation-state implies mono-culturalism, which denies voice and recognition to the weak minorities and in such states only majority has a say in most of the policy matters. Secondly, the nation-state ineluctably linked citizenship and nationality; which means that citizenship is conferred only to those who are members of a nation whereas multiculturalism requires the decoupling of citizenship from nationality and ethnicity. The idea of citizenship based on cultural uniformity goes against the very notion of multiculturalism and multicultural citizenship. [21]

Thirdly, the idea uniform culture in a situation marked by the presence of diverse cultures creates conflicts and it is due to this convergence the minorities started fighting against this homogenizing tendencies. [22] Thus in multicultural society's nation-state as an ideal ought to be abandoned. In order to develop mutual trust between different communities so that a composite culture can evolve in a multicultural society we need to abandon the concept of nation-state and use the term national state as advocated by T.K Oomnen. He suggests that "the designation national state should refer to such state which consciously nurture cultural diversity and hence endorse cultural pluralism as a value." [23] It is with this emergence of national state the people from different communities will start identifying themselves as a part of state, a state in which they have equal voice in which their cultural believes are respected and represented. It is only within this state that mutual respect between different communities will generate and a fruitful dialectic process will start which will ultimately lead to the development of composite culture.

Even in the pre-modern societies there were different cultural communities and these societies had different views about how to arrange their individual and collective lives. But in pre-modern societies there were no such thing as composite culture because minority communities in these societies used to lead self-contained lives and had limited interaction with other communities. They accepted their subordinate status and did not equally participate in the affairs of the state. But in the contemporary multicultural societies different cultural communities demand freedom of self-expression and resist the hegemonic dominant community attempt to impose their on them. Now these communities do not want themselves to remain on the margins of the society and wants to participate as equals in the conduct of collective affairs.

For the proper development of composite culture in multicultural societies these societies need to have a constitutional democracy is imperative. It is within a democratic society people are allowed to express their discontentment and it enable its citizens to put pressure on the government to redress injustice. Democracy is open to the danger of majority rule and in order to check its misuse certain group-differentiated rights should be granted to different communities and these rights should be constitutionally guaranteed. It is also of utmost importance in a multicultural society that laws should explicitly ban all forms of discrimination and place their enforcement in the charge of an impartial and effective body to which all communities enjoy full access. [24]

Although it is right to believe that no society can be held together for long without a common national culture but it is wrong to say that multicultural societies lack a common national culture. Most of the people who believe that multicultural societies do not have a common national culture believes that a common national culture can only develop in a homogeneous society and fails to appreciate that a shared culture need not unified and homogeneous. The multicultural societies could have a composite culture which could be internally diversified and multiculturally constituted. This culture develops through a process of mutual interaction amongst different cultural communities residing within a state and this very composite culture carries traces of all of them. Unlike the homogeneous culture as pre-supposed by nation-state theorists a culture need to be created under certain favorable conditions. [25]

Composite culture cannot develop in those societies where different communities are forced to assimilate into the dominant culture. Their forcible assimilation provokes resistance and does not work in the short and long run. Forceful assimilation also violates the basic values of liberal societies and by doing so the mutual trust which is the basic prerequisite for the

development of composite culture will never develop within society. The only way to develop a composite culture is through free dialogue between different communities which will only happen when different minority communities are given space for self-expression and the state encourages a dialogue process between different communities.[26] For emergence of composite culture all cultural communities should interact with each other as equal partners and they should stop leading a self-contained life and should openly engage themselves with other communities. Generally different minority communities tend to lead a self-contained life because they want to protect themselves from the assimilationist pressure of the dominant culture or due to economic or other disadvantages which forces them to lead a self-contained life which in turn cuts them from the mainstream. A well considered public policy should address these disadvantages and find a way of integrating marginalized groups. Since composite culture is essential for the success and stability of multicultural society, public institutions have a duty to create an environment in which different cultural communities can interact as equals and enjoy equal access to power and other resources. One of the another prerequisite for the development of composite culture in multicultural society is the incorporation of 'Democratic Education' as a principle in our educational structure so that the children from their early age are taught how to be in dialogue with others.

DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY A WAY TO HANDLE MORAL CONFLICT

Each and every multicultural state should have a composite culture which is representative of all its constitution member cultures. For this composite culture to develop different cohabiting culture need to engage themselves in dialogue for which one requires a particular model of democracy.

The sought model of democracy must have two essential features, first, it should recognize cultural pluralism and secondly it should provide for a conducive environment in which open dialogue between different communities can take place as equal partners.

It should recognize that cultural and ethnic identities and groups are not fixed but fluid and open to change. Only in this way can an anti-essentialist account of multiculturalism be conceptualized. At the centre of this approach is a dynamic concept of recognition. All these prerequisite can be very well found in the deliberative model of democracy. The biggest problem before multicultural societies is that of legitimacy. The basic reason behind this legitimacy crisis is that people are losing faith in the government and the way government is formulating its policies. One of the major allegation leveled by most of community members in a multicultural setup is that there views and concerns were not taken in account when most of the policies are formulated by the government, which directly or indirectly have implication on their livelihood. In such a scenario the concept of deliberative democracy offers a very viable solution to this whole problem of legitimacy as is stresses on arriving at decisions after fair deliberation among free and equal partners and in case of multicultural societies, community members. Deliberative democracy stresses on enhancing the capacity of the state so that opportunities can be created for members of different community to participate in the collective decision making process. [27] Here, the collective decision-making should not be defined in narrower procedural terms but should be seen as an exercise were both formal and informal discussion is carried at with all stakeholders before arriving at any decision. These types of decisions will have wider acceptability among the

masses as wide spread discussion and deliberation happened before matter were decided plus it will help state in overcome the legitimacy crisis. In this way deliberative democracy offers more than just a theory of decision-making. Deliberative democracy provides the most suited governance model for culturally plural societies as it "can offer compelling answers to the challenges posed by multiculturalist's demands". [28]

For peaceful coexistence in multicultural societies, communities should learn to engage themselves in dialogue, in the absence of which multicultural societies will repeatedly witness cultural and communal clashes between different communities. It is only through dialogue and deliberation identity can be created and recreated and its is through this process moral conflicts arising out of conflicting cultures can be resolved . in order to have a constructive debate between different communities, multicultural societies should have a deliberative model of democracy based on three essential features. "(i) dialogical and inter-subjective mutuality, (ii) transformative potential of public deliberation and (iii) the ability to revise the decisions". [29]

Firstly, deliberative approach emphasizes "the inter-subjective formation of individual identities through confrontation and interaction with other(s)."[30] Deliberative approach does not start with liberal preconceived notion of human nature according to which "human beings begin their history endowed with a certain set of properties". [31] The deliberative theory believes that human identity gets evolved over a period of time through dialogue and also that there is nothing integral or essential to any cultural values. Cultural values are always in a state of flux and evolve while they are in continuous interaction with other cultures and people identity also acquires a defined shape in this process thus "a deliberative approach begins from a notion of interrelationship and its significance for identity-building. The notion of recognition is embedded in the process of identity constitution. As such, it requires **'mutuality'** which goes far beyond the familiar plea for toleration. The dialogical notion of recognition requires reciprocal action in the process of identity constitution". [32] In deliberative democracy communities with divergent value system can openly engage in dialogue with each other if they drop there preconceived notion about other culture and believes. This will only come about if they develop and realize the fact that cultures evolve over a period of time while interacting with other cultures only. With this notion of culture, dialogue between them on controversial issues can easily start. Secondly dialogue between them will only succeed when there exists mutual trust between communities which is very different from mere tolerance. In most of the modern culturally plural liberal societies people cohabit with each other with a feeling that they have to tolerate others cultural believes. But this feeling of tolerance does not create in their mind respect for other culture because they think that their culture is superior to others cultures and since they don't have any choice so they have to tolerate them. In the absence of mutual trust and mutual respect for each other's cultural values there emerges certain situation where the community refuses to tolerate the other and clashes erupt. So in order to avoid these clashes first thing which needs to be done is to create trust in place of tolerance because it is through this only respect for other culture will emanate and once this happens communities with divergent belief system will engage in dialogue for peaceful resolution of conflicts. So dialogue and deliberation will succeed only when there is feeling of mutual respect backed by the feeling of peaceful coexistence.

Secondly, "The deliberative approach is claimed to be **'transformative'**, as it requires engagement in public dialogue, which subsequently leads to change in the judgments, preferences and attitudes of the deliberating individuals". [33] Dialogue and deliberation play a pivotal role in transformation and reconciliation. It is through dialogue the vision of other as enemy can be changed and different communities can learn to coexist in a peaceful manner. It is this feeling of peaceful coexistence that will force communities to revisit and revise their own belief system with respect to others and will facilitate in transforming their preferences and attitude toward others value system. Further, it is through public debates and questioning of perception of self and others transformation can be brought out. Transformation through public discussion and deliberations will yield favorable results only when antagonistic identities and there narratives are given due recognition and respect. In the absence of which people will merely participate in debates and discussion with closed mind thinking that there version is the final and there is not point giving any rational thought to others opinion. Discussion can only lead to transformation if parties are ready to listen to others narrative and also willing to revise their opinion about them. So "Deliberative democracy can facilitate identity transformation through mutual, dialogical and inter-subjective interaction. With the help of collective deliberation, the national identity can be transformed in a way that reflects the cultural plurality in a given society". [34]

The third essential feature of deliberative democracy is **'revisability'**. This concept is based on the premise that no solution to moral conflicts can claim finality in a situation marked intra-group plurality. Cultural conflicts don't get resolved completely even when attempt for resolution of conflicts are successful. This can be attributed to the fact that within every community there will be a section of people who will challenge the whole process of resolution or part of the resolution. So in deliberative democracy people have to accept this fact dialogue and deliberation of critical issues is an ongoing process and no resolution can claim finality. So even if resolution has been worked out on a particular issue, community members should be prepared to revisit the whole issue again and should not even hesitate from revising there earlier decision. "From a deliberative perspective, every resolution adopted in a multicultural society must be open to further democratic dissent and renegotiation. Ideally, any proposed resolution should rest as much as possible on the discussion and agreement of those affected by it. The proposed resolutions should be seen as ongoing provisional agreements open to revision and correction". [35]

In a multicultural society the concept of deliberative democracy can only yield fruitful results if communities believe that no set of values or particular perspective are correct or valid in absolute. Under this there should be willingness on the part of community members to participate in a public discussion even if it involves self-introspection. Secondly there should be willingness on the part of cultural communities to justify their cultural claims. Dialogue and deliberation play a pivotal role in transformation, reconciliation and conflict resolution. It is through dialogue the vision of other as your adversary can be changed and different communities can learn to coexist in a peaceful manner. It is this feeling of peaceful coexistence that will force communities to revisit and revise their own belief system with respect to others and will facilitate in transforming their preferences and attitude toward others value system. Multicultural societies should see democracy as the ongoing process where collective deliberation can take place on essential issues and should reject any attempt to place a priori constrains upon those issues on which one can

publicly deliberate. This kind of public deliberation will not only inform citizens but will also develop their critical abilities which are essential for resolving crucial moral conflicts. The role of deliberative exercise should not be to arrive at decisions immediately after the deliberation. It should be taken as an educative program which will initiate a discourse within the community itself so that the change can be internalized by the community rather than superficially accepting the decisions. Deliberative democracy should not be taken as a decision-making process but should be taken as a mean to bring about desired change in the society.

REFERENCES

1. Kymlicka,Will, **Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction,** Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, p.336.
2. Taylor, Charles, "The Politics of Recognition", in Amy Gutmann (Ed), **Multiculturalism**, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1994, pp.252-73.
3. Parekh, Bhikhu, "Dangers of Liberalism", in Paul Kelly E.d, **Multiculturalism Reconsidered: Culture and Equality and its Critics,** Polity Press, Cambridge, 2002, p.147
4. Kymlicka,Will, **Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction,** op.cit, pp.220-22.
5. Ibid, pp.212-27.
6. Ibid, pp.212-27.
7. Ibid, pp.212-27.
8. Taylor, Charles, **Hegel and Modern Society,** Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979, p.157.
9. Ibid, pp.157-59.
10. Ibid, pp.157-59.
11. Sandel, Michael, **Liberalism and the Limits of Justice,** Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982, pp.55-59.
12. Kymlicka,Will, **Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction,** op.cit, pp.244-60.
13. Ibid, pp.336-45.
14. Mahajan, Gurpreet, **The Multicultural Path,** Sage Publication, New Delhi, 2002, pp. 46-52.
15. Ibid, pp. 46-52.
16. Ibid, pp. 46-52.
17. Ayirtman, Selen, **Recognition Through Deliberation: Towards Deliberative Accommodation of Cultural Diversity,** Australasian political Studies Association Annual Conference, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, 24-26 September 2007.
18. Mahajan, Sucheta, "Problematizing Multiculturalism" , in Bipin Chandra and Sucheta Mahajan (Ed), **Composite Culture in a Multicultural society,** Pearson Longman, India, 2007, pp. vii-ix.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.

21. Parekh, Bhikhu, " Composite Culture and Multicultural Society", in Bipin Chandra and Sucheta Mahajan (Ed), **Composite Culture in a Multicultural society,** op.cit, pp. 4-8.
22. Ibid, pp. 4-8.
23. Oommen,T.K, "Multiculturalism in Twentieth-Century India, in Bipin Chandra and Sucheta Mahajan (Ed), **Composite Culture in a Multicultural society,** op.cit, p. 222.
24. Parekh, Bhikhu, "Composite Culture and Multicultural Society", in Bipin Chandra and Sucheta Mahajan (Ed), **Composite Culture in a Multicultural society,** op.cit, pp. 4-8.
25. Ibid, pp.2-8.
26. Ibid, pp.2-8.
27. McBride, Cillian, **Deliberative Democracy and the Politics of Recognition,** Political Studies, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2005,Vol 53, pp 497-99.
28. Benhabib,Seyla, **The Claim of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era,** Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2002,p.106.
29. Ayirtman, Selen, Recognition **Through Deliberation: Towards Deliberative Accommodation of Cultural Diversity,** op.cit.
30. Benhabib,Seyla, **The Claim of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era**, op.cit, p.50.
31. Parekh, Bhikhu, **Rethinking Multiculturalism,** Macmillan, London, 2000, p.118.
32. Ayirtman, Selen, **Recognition Through Deliberation: Towards Deliberative Accommodation of Cultural Diversity,** op.cit.
33. Young, Iris Morion, **Inclusion and Democracy,** Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000,pp 21-26.
34. Ayirtman, Selen, **Recognition Through Deliberation: Towards Deliberative Accommodation of Cultural Diversity,** op.cit.
35. Ibid.