

Example question: To what extent is the history of socialism a betrayal of its core values?

Look at question and pick out question words:

To what extent = evaluation. Not a yes or no concept - must include arguments on both sides

Then look at the content:

History of socialism = the different key thinkers and the waves

What are you analysing?

Betrayal = requires evidence on both sides for and against its being a betrayal

What are you comparing?

Core values = must establish core values of socialism and then see whether they have been betrayed

Socialism

15 marks

How and why have socialists supported collectivism?

Why:

- Competition pits humans against one another
- Forces people to deny their social nature and breeds selfish traits
- Collective human endeavour is of greater moral and practical value than individual self striving
- We are social, cooperative, gregarious creatures
- We are reason guided and will naturally do what is best for society
- Human nature is shaped by our relationships and experiences
- Collectivism leads to relationships based on mutual respect, which in turn leads to social harmony
- We are motivated by moral incentive - individual fulfilment can only be achieved as part of a collective
- Capitalism rewards you materially for the work you do
- Desire to contribute to the common good rises out of sympathy for other humans
- What happens to an individual has an effect on the collective

How:

- Common ownership
- Redistribution and state intervention $\Rightarrow$ welfare
- Incentive for creating wealth is that it helps the common good
- Trade unions
- Importance of community (neo-revisionists)

Why have some socialists supported an evolutionary road to socialism?

How:

- Extension of the franchise to all adults, no matter their income

- Just or fair distribution of wealth in society
- Narrowing of inequalities while still allowing people to get what they deserve
- Broadened philosophy from fundamentalism: now concerned with gender and racial inequality, not just economic
- This is because they also need to attract the middle classes
- Mixed economy: relative economic equality will be achieved through public and private ownership
- Private required to generate wealth which will be progressively taxed
- Public: nationalise commanding heights in order to protect workers from exploitation and keep prices fair for consumers

Evolutionary:

- Capitalism begun to work for the working class with rising living standards and wages
- Bernstein: drew attention to the “steady advance of the working class” in *Evolutionary Socialism*
- Arrival of political democracy meant that revolution was no longer required
- Fabian Society: socialism will be brought about via education as it is morally superior to capitalism

Humanise capitalism:

- Only reliable way of generating wealth
- Impossible to fully abolish now that we have experienced it
- Creates incentive for people to work
- Can be used to ameliorate rather than aggravate class conflict
- Class is linked to income and status, so reducing income inequality will reduce class inequality
- There will always be exploitation, but it can be tamed through managerialism and trade unions

Why did Marx believe that capitalism is doomed to collapse, and how did he think this collapse would occur?

Why:

- Both Hegel and Marx see change as dialectic
- ie it will come about via internal conflict
- Historical materialism: economic conditions affect everything within society
- Our relationship to the means of production affects everything that we do
- Capitalism is doomed to fail because it contains internal contradictions: it requires its own antithesis, the proletariat, to function
- Marx saw the proletariat as the “gravedigger of capitalism”
- Conflict between these two opposing forces will lead to the next stage of history
- It is a struggle between the exploited and the exploiter
- Capitalism’s search for profit can only be satisfied through the extraction of surplus value from its workers
- Pays them less than their labour generates

- They also have a different view of class (linked to income and status) and so think that capitalism can be used to ameliorate class conflict
- V. different to fundamentalists, who believe that no state has a place in socialism

Para 3: Neo-revisionists

- Will bring about socialism through trickle down economics and communitarianism
- Trickle down economics: those who are rich will create jobs for and buy the goods of those who are poorer, thus sharing their wealth
- They focus much more on the individual and want to reward them for their efforts, so do not support economic collectivism
- However, still want to create minimum wage and support child benefits, so do care for the community and they support what binds it together
- V. different from fundamentalists - perhaps not even true socialism

To what extent is socialism defined by its rejection of capitalism?

Intro:

- Fundamentalists: fully reject capitalism and want to install classless communism, capitalism is divisive and unfair
- Revisionists: recognise that capitalism is unfair but so is classless communism, try to tame capitalism and use it to bring about relative equality
- Neo-revisionists: fully embrace capitalism, but believe that socialism can be achieved by trickle down economics

Para 1: Fundamentalists

- Want to overthrow state, destroy capitalism and bring about classless communism
- Economic crises > immiseration of the proletariat > revolutionary class consciousness > violent overthrow of the state > dictatorship of the proletariat > withering away of state > classless communism
- See capitalism as divisive (leads to class conflict), unfair (exploits the worker by extracting surplus value), and a breeder of acquisitiveness (materialism and consumerism convince us that we will achieve fulfilment via purchases)
- Classless communism will lead to social harmony, as individual fulfilment can only be achieved within a collective
- Working together with common ownership will encourage us to engage with the work we are doing and allow us to form relationships based on mutual respect

Para 2: Revisionists

- Support a mixed economy and want to bring about socialism via parliamentary methods
- Private sector needed in order to generate wealth which will then be progressively taxed and redistributed
- Public sector needed to protect the rights of workers and ensure that prices remain affordable
- Capitalism is the only reliable means of generating wealth

- Humans are morally, psychologically and intellectually flawed
- Since we are intellectually limited we like to have stability
- We need to know our place
- Burke: we should “love the little platoon in society to which we belong”
- Authority develops naturally
- Must be imposed from above
- Counters rootlessness and anomie (weakening of values associated with loneliness)

Noblesse oblige:

- We must recognise the obligations of our status so that society can function properly
- Believe that those born with privilege have a duty to society to look after those less fortunate
- Inequality of power leads to inequality of responsibilities (Disraeli)
- Helps to prevent resentment from inequality building up too much and leading to lack of order
- This hierarchy allows for stability and order
- Reform from above is better than revolution from below

How do traditional conservatives and the new right differ in their views of society?

Traditional:

- Society is organic and fragile
- Moral community held together by shared beliefs and values
- Humans cannot exist outside of society
- The whole is more important than individual parts
- Each level of society has a different role to play but they are not all equal
- Has been compared to the human body
- Whole society has a common interest of order and stability
- There is a natural hierarchy as we are not all morally equal
- This leads to a belief in authority

Neoconservative:

- Also believe in the organic society and the natural hierarchy
- Big advocates of tradition and continuity, so disapprove of radical change which would upset the balance of society
- We are morally and intellectually imperfect so we need to know our place
- Also support authority and law and order

Neoliberal:

- Society is atomistic
- Thatcher: “there is no such thing as society”
- Much more concerned with the individual
- We are all of equal moral worth
- Society is based on meritocracy
- Support social mobility on the basis of hard work and talent
- Do not think that this will destabilise society as it can withstand radical changes

- This is to expand territory which is unnatural anyway

Explain the link between anarchism and utopianism.

- Utopianism: style of political theorising that develops a critique of the existing order by constructing a perfect alternative
- Other ideologies accuse anarchism of being unrealistic and unachievable
- Want to create a society in which there is freedom and harmony without state regulation
- Believe this is possible due to their view of human nature
- Collectivists: we are social and cooperative creatures, bound through bonds of compassion
- We want to work together and have solidarity with one another
- The means of production should therefore be collectively owned
- We will achieve fulfilment through working in a collective, as we are motivated by moral incentive
- There is no need for the state to regulate our labour as we will naturally do what is best for society
- There is no need for the state to regulate our behaviour as social harmony will develop through our mutual respect for one another
- Anarcho communists societies: self sufficient, based on respect, means of production owned by the collective, direct democracy, voluntary
- Individualists: we are rational and reason guided creatures
- We make decisions based on past experience rather than on impulse or emotion
- We have internal restraint which stops us from being dictators
- We are self interested and motivated by personal gain
- The free market can provide us with all that is needed, both materially and in terms of self fulfilment
- There is no need for a state to regulate the free market or our behaviour because we will naturally make good decisions
- Property should be owned by sovereign individuals, who may choose to enter into mutually beneficial contracts
- Rothbard: no need for a state to protect people from one another, can use protection associations
- Competition would provide consumers with choice, and would mean they were getting the best possible service at the best possible prices

How and why has anarchism been linked to communism?

- Anarchists want to dissolve the state and replace it with classless communism and common ownership
- They both envisage a violent revolution in which the state will be overthrown, thus dissolving capitalism
- The society which anarchists envisage after the dissolution of the state is a communist one
- It will take place in small, self sufficient communities

- The state is a sovereign body that can do whatever it wants
- Even if people go into power with good intentions, eventually they will be corrupted and use the power to oppress others
- This is due to the plasticity of human nature and their tendency towards self interest
- Liberals believe that checks and balances on the state will prevent it from becoming too powerful
- This is unrealistic, as these checks and balances are a facade designed to conceal the true nature of the state
- People cannot withdraw their consent to be governed

Para 7: Private property vs common ownership

- Collectivists: the means of production should be owned in common
- We will all benefit from the fruits of our labour
- This is because we naturally want to work together and are motivated by moral incentive
- It will lead to social solidarity and relationships based on mutual respect
- Individualists: anything can be bought
- Extreme form of capitalism
- We are motivated by material incentive and personal gain
- Laissez faire economics: market is naturally guided to positive outcomes
- We will create peace and harmony with the freedom that the free market brings

"Anarchism is merely an extreme form of collectivist socialism." Discuss.

Intro:

- Collectivism: belief that collective endeavour is of greater moral and practical value than individual self striving
- Anarcho-collectivism takes socialist ideas (equality, cooperation, community, positive human nature) to their logical conclusion
- They too want to overthrow the state and install classless communism
- However they differ in certain aspects too, such as revisionist acceptance of the state,

Para 1: Anarcho individualism

- This can be immediately discounted
- Completely different view of human nature and values
- We are rational, self seeking, reason guided creatures
- We gain individual fulfilment through personal achievement
- Supreme value is liberty and the free market
- Can achieve happiness through the free market which needs no state regulation
- Peace and harmony will come about through laissez-faire economics

Para 2: Human nature

- We are social, cooperative, gregarious creatures, bound through bonds of compassion

- Darwinism: coined by Herbert Spencer, those who deserve to do well will naturally do well if there is no state intervention
- Inequality is natural, those who work hard will prosper, those who are lazy will suffer
- JS Mill: "over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign"

Developmental individualism:

- "Hand up rather than hand out"
- Claim it is still rooted in classical individualism but adapted to a changing society (with rising inequality and wealth-related resentment)
- Believe in qualified state intervention to allow individuals to help themselves
- State welfare is a means to an end rather than an end in itself
- Maslow's pyramid of needs: before we can achieve self-actualisation, we need material and physical security
- We cannot make the best of ourselves if we are simply abandoned by others

Distinguish between negative freedom and positive freedom.

Negative:

- Classical liberal view
- Based on human rationality
- We are able to make our own decisions and should not have to submit to the will of others
- Absence of restriction on individuals
- Only limit to freedom is when others are harmed
- The govt is a necessary evil, nightwatchman
- CL saw law as the main obstacle to freedom
- Hobbes: "Freedom is the silence of the laws"
- BUT: Locke's social contract states that we must give up some freedom to protect our natural rights
- Life without laws would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short" - Hobbes
- Economic freedom: total lack of govt intervention in the economy
- The market is led to positive outcomes via an invisible hand (Adam Smith)

Positive:

- Focused more on the freedom of choice and freedom for self development
- TH Green: social disadvantage / inequality is the enemy of freedom
- Free market capitalism prevents freedom
- State intervention can provide positive and empowering role for govt
- Believe in qualified state intervention to help individuals help themselves
- It is "not simply the freedom to starve in the gutter"
- Maslow's pyramid of needs: we cannot achieve self actualisation without first gaining material well being and security
- However, they still prefer individuals to make their own decisions and take on responsibility

How is liberalism linked to rationalism, and what are the implications of this link?

- Belief that humans are reason-guided creatures who base decisions on past experience rather than on emotion / impulse
- Arose at the time of the Enlightenment
- Rejection of divine right of kings and move towards more scientific and reason-based govt
- Opposition to paternalism - it is not necessary, as people know what is best for them, not the state
- Individuals should exercise their own free will based on rational judgement

Implications:

- Minimal state: "the state has no right to meddle in the core of men's souls" - Locke
- The state should only be there to protect natural rights and ensure that freedom can be maximised by giving people security
- Free market capitalism: people are able to make their own economic decisions
- They can manipulate the market for their needs without the need for state intervention, as they are rational enough to understand it
- Negative freedom: absence from laws
- We do not need loads of laws to protect us from ourselves and to help us to make the right decision
- We will naturally do the right and reasonable thing due to our rationality
- Individualism: the individual knows what is best
- We should be left alone to make our own decisions and can look after ourselves
- We are also motivated by intellectual incentive: at the top of the pyramid of needs is self actualisation
- "It is better to be a human dissatisfied than a pig satisfied" JS Mill

Distinguish between economic liberalism and social liberalism.

Economic:

- Adam Smith - Wealth of Nations, 1776
- Free market capitalism, laissez faire attitude
- Individuals should be free to pursue their own self interest
- People should be rewarded in line with their talents and with their level of contribution
- Govt therefore should not interfere in the economy
- Market is guided of its own accord to positive outcomes by an invisible hand (lower price ⇒ more people buy)
- "It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the baker or the brewer that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own self interest"

Social:

- Liberals see a divide between the public and private spheres
- The individual should have total freedom in the private sphere
- We are rational and reason guided creatures

- It is particularly important to radical feminists as the SYSTEM of oppression
- This means that it operates on all levels
- Society is a reflection of the unequal gender power structures at home
- Eg. women have lack of access to education ⇒ lack of access to jobs ⇒ lack of women in power ⇒ system does not change in favour of women

On what grounds have radical feminists claimed “the personal is political”?

- Patriarchy has yet to be overthrown because liberal feminists have only addressed it in the public sphere
- “Patriarchy’s chief institution is the family”
- “Politics occurs wherever there are power structured relationships” - Millett
- Power structured relationship is wherever one group of people dominates another
- In the home, man dominates woman in terms of decision making, economically and sexually
- Therefore there are power structured relationships in the private sphere
- Public / private divide has been used by the patriarchy as a tool to undermine women
- What happens in the private sphere directly affects the public sphere
- Roles of women come about via conditioning
- From an early age boy and girls are expected to conform to very specific gender roles
- This takes place in the home but also in art, literature, toys, and the economy
- This should be challenged via “consciousness-raising”
- When we destroy patriarchy at its root the public sphere will follow

Why is the distinction between sex and gender crucial to feminist analysis?

What is it:

- Gender divisions in society are natural, as women’s roles come from their ability to bear children etc (according to anti-feminists)
- Sex = biological makeup
- It is natural and unalterable
- Gender = the social construct of the role which society has created for men and women
- Therefore it is not necessarily natural and it can be altered
- These gender roles are based on stereotypes of masculinity and femininity
- Man dominates, works, disciplines the children
- Woman is submissive, stays at home, cooks, cleans
- Humans are androgynous: they have both masculine and feminine characteristics
- This is because we are all produced from a male and a female
- It stands to reason that we would gain characteristics from both

Why it is important:

- Sex differences are biological facts but have no social, political or economic importance
- Women may be mothers but do not need to accept mothering responsibilities

- Gender equality makes women male-identified and take on male characteristics
- Equality is too narrow and forces women to be something they are not

How and why have feminists been critical of “the public / private divide”?

- Traditionally politics has been in the public sphere and has not been considered in the private sphere
- Liberal feminists believe this: the private sphere is the realm of the individual
- The individual must be given as much possible freedom and the state should not become active in the private sphere
- Radicals: politics occurs where there are power structured relationships
- In the home the man dominates his wife and children
- The public private divide has been used as a tool by the patriarchy to undermine women
- The roots of the patriarchy are in the private sphere as we are conditioned from a young age to fulfil gender roles
- This prevents women from accessing the public sphere
- The state needs to become active in the private sphere eg. free nurseries
- Socialists: public / private divide supports the capitalist society
- Men see it as their role to go out and work and they have to work hard due to their moral obligation to their family
- The man can therefore be exploited
- If the economy does well the women, who have been in the private sphere, provide a reserve army of labour
- Women can be employed and discarded as and when they are required

Explain the difference between androgyny and essentialism.

Androgyny:

- Sex differences between men and women are relatively minor and therefore cannot explain gender or personality differences
- Human nature is thought to be androgynous
- Humans all have masculine and feminine characteristics
- We come from both a man and a woman
- Sex differences are biological facts of life but have no social, economic or political importance
- The goal of feminism is to establish genderless personhood
- We should judge people on merit rather than sex / gender
- Gender can be altered or even demolished as it has no biological basis
- There is potential for social change through the demolition of gender

Essentialism:

- Difference feminists: there are profound and inescapable differences between men and women
- Essentialism: belief that biological factors are crucial in determining psychological and behavioural traits

- This respect and freedom will spread to other areas of the public sphere
- Radicals: we need to realise that we do not need to be treated this way
- We will rise up via consciousness-raising
- However both have the basic goal of equality
- They may disagree about how to get there but they want the same thing

Para 3: Public private divide vs focus on private sphere

- Radicals: "the personal is political"
- See the family as patriarchy's chief institution
- Children are conditioned into gender roles from a young age
- These roles are based on stereotypes of masculinity and femininity which are portrayed in all media
- We must start in the private sphere in order to attack patriarchy at its roots
- Liberals: legal and political equality is required in the public sphere
- Our gender is an accident of birth therefore we should not be discriminated for it
- Equality in the private sphere is not the place of the state
- The state should be passive in the private sphere
- We should have the choice of whether to enter the public sphere or not

Para 4: Distinction between sex and gender

- There are biological differences between men and women which are natural and unalterable
- However gender has been imposed on men and women by society
- We all have masculine and feminine characteristics
- These genders have been based on stereotypes of masculinity and femininity
- They can even be demitted or altered as biology has no social or political importance
- This highlights the extent to which women have been unfairly discriminated against
- We should aim for "genderless personhood"

Para 5: Reform vs revolution

- Liberals: wanted equal access to existing structures
- Once legal and political equality has been established social equality will naturally follow
- Everyone should be given equality of opportunity in the existing public sphere
- Radicals: liberals did not go far enough
- Patriarchal structures begin in the family and continue in the public sphere
- We must revolutionise these patriarchal structures
- Equality of opportunity is insufficient
- This is not opposed, but simply a natural extension of liberal feminism

Para 6: Narrow vs broad

- Radical feminists accuse liberal feminists of only focusing on white middle class women
- Legal and political equality in the public sphere is only helpful for those who can access the public sphere

What is it:

- Kenneth Boulding: spaceship earth
- Earth's resources are finite and therefore cannot be re-energised
- Currently we are using them in a "reckless, violent and exploitative" way
- We should use them in a way that ensures they will be there for future generations
- Capacity of a system to maintain its health and continue to exist over a period of time

Criticisms:

- Oppose consumerism and materialism
- You cannot achieve happiness through material consumption
- Happiness is always linked to wealth by capitalism
- But wealth cannot give us individual fulfilment
- Capitalism, even sustainable, puts short term economic growth over long term environmental protection
- We should seek to be outwardly poor but inwardly rich
- All species have equal right to the earth
- We should not assume that our interests are of overriding importance
- The natural world has intrinsic value
- It should be protected for its own sake not just to promote our interests
- Land ethic: it is simply the right thing to do to preserve the beauty, integrity and stability of the natural world
- Sustainability is still anthropocentric

Why and how have ecologists criticised materialism and consumerism?

- In our capitalist society there is a psycho-cultural phenomenon whereby it is assumed that the more you have, the happier you are
- This undermines our emotional wellbeing
- We are persuaded through advertising and capitalism that to be happy we need more
- In modern day Western world, it is always possible to acquire more, therefore we will never be happy
- Works not through the satisfaction of desires but rather the creation of new ones
- Ecologists place greater focus in being than having (German psychoanalyst Erich Fromm called this a "having state of mind")
- Shared experiences rather than possessions lead to personal development and happiness
- We can therefore be outwardly poor but inwardly rich
- Consumer society is also the basis for environmental damage
- We place short term economic considerations ahead of long term environmental ones
- Nature is made into a commodity or resource
- We should avoid situations which have unknown consequences for the natural world
- Schumacher: "Man is now clever enough to survive without wisdom"

Explain the key ideas of eco-anarchism.

- Murray Bookchin saw a clear correspondence between ecology and anarchism
- Ecological balance rather than a state is the best basis for a stable and happy society
- Stateless society: humans are moulded by their experiences and relationships
- In a stateless society harmony will develop between humans due to mutual respect just as harmony develops spontaneously within nature
- Ecosystems require no external control and arise naturally
- We are a part of that ecosystem, and therefore do not require a govt to police us
- Both society and ecosystems are governed by the principles of balance and diversity
- Decentralised societies: communities or villages
- Self-sufficient and close to nature
- Dependent on nature due to their isolation
- Leads to understanding of ecology and a more intelligent and loving use of the natural world
- Anarchists: progress is only possible when govt and all forms of political authority are overthrown
- It removes hierarchy in society and therefore the natural world
- It will also remove the corrupting influence and consumerism
- However some ecologists would say that the govt can be a tool through which collective action can be organised
- Removal of authority may give free reign to industrialisation

How and why have ecologists shown a concern about future generations?

Why:

- Conventional moral thinking is anthropocentric and puts humans at the centre of the natural world
- Ecologists challenge industrialism and the need to constantly expand markets
- Kenneth Boulding: spaceship earth
- Earth is a closed system whose resources are finite. It is not able to re-energise itself
- This is proven by the fact that it displays entropy
- Our constant depletion of the earth's resources will lead to the tragedy of the commons
- The global commons will eventually be destroyed due to individuals, states and businesses putting self interest before environmental protection

How:

- Enlightened anthropocentrism
- We have a responsibility to use the resources of the earth in a sustainable manner so they will be available for future generations
- Futurity: we should judge actions on their potential future impacts
- This is known as ecological stewardship
- We are merely here to look after the earth for the next generation; it is not our to plunder
- Cross-generational justice: we must ensure that future generations have at least the same standard of living as us

Intro:

- All ecologists recognise that capitalism is to blame for ecological damage
- Shallow ecologists do not fully reject it
- It can be used as a tool for ecological protection
- Socialist ecologists, however, want to completely overthrow it
- Deep ecologists fully reject it and see sustainability as insufficient

Para 1: Zero growth

- Happiness cannot come from material consumerism
- Capitalism convinces us of this
- However in reality growth is not required for human fulfilment
- We can achieve happiness through being rather than having
- This was championed by Erich Fromm who called it a "having state of mind"

Para 2: Sustainability

- The act of using resources in a gradual and responsible way
- With ecologism this comes in the form of balancing environmental protection with economic growth
- If capitalists want to make a long term profit they should use the world's resources sustainably
- This is also due to futurity: we should judge actions on their possible future impacts
- Cross generational justice: we must ensure that future generations must have at least the same standard of living as us

Para 3: Intrinsic value

- The world arises naturally and does not need human intervention
- We are therefore not above it and cannot use it simply to gain profit
- We should not turn the earth into a commodity
- Private property gives us a feeling of superiority over the earth
- Land ethic: we should preserve the beauty, integrity and stability of the natural world simply because it is the right thing to do

Para 4: Instrumental value

- Shallow ecologists only want sustainability for future generations
- They see the world as there for us to exploit, but we should do it gradually, only for the benefit of our children
- The world only has value in that it can help us to make a profit

Para 5: Biocentric equality

- All animals have equal moral worth and have moral entitlements due to their being "non-human persons"
- They therefore deserve the same treatment as humans
- They can feel pain and we should do all we can to help them avoid that
- Peter Singer: all animals can suffer, not just humans
- Human interests should not be more important than animal lives

- Shared values and a common culture are essential for a stable society
- Human beings are drawn to people similar to themselves
- A fear of foreigners is therefore natural and unavoidable
- Multicultural societies are therefore naturally flawed and fractured
- Advocate restrictions on immigration in order to prevent the fracturing of society
- Immigrants are a drain on resources of govt
- May disrupt the traditions that people have with their new culture and new values
- Demeans the culture of the majority group by associating it with racism or colonialism
- Perpetrates a new set of cultural injustices

On what grounds have multiculturalists supported minority rights?

- Associated and attributed to Kymlicka

Self-governing rights:

- Given to indigenous national groups
- Usually concentrated in one area and share common language and way of life
- Federalism and devolution
- Members of the community are allowed to control their own unit and make their own legislation
- These groups have been subordinated and dispossessed via colonisation
- They did not choose to give up their culture or way of life
- They did not consent to have a new state imposed on them
- They should therefore not be forced to adopt the values of the colonisers and be free to live within their own culture
- They are often concentrated populations so this is practical

Polyethnic rights:

- Rights held by specific ethnic or religious groups
- Developed as a result of immigration
- Enable specific groups to express their own cultural distinctiveness
- Eg. Muslims in the UK being allowed time off work to pray
- Guarantees individual freedom and personal autonomy
- Individual self-respect is intrinsically bound up with cultural membership
- MacIntyre and Sandel: individuals find their identity within their specific cultural community
- Allows for greater freedom
- Liberal multiculturalism: argue that minority rights are individual rights

Representation rights:

- Attempt to redress the underrepresentation of ethnic minorities
- An organisation will actively try to recruit marginalised groups
- State is inevitably aligned with the dominant culture

- The denial of cultural recognition results in isolation and powerlessness
- Do not just believe that diversity is possible but should be celebrated
- Identity politics - we should recognise the differences between groups and allow them to express themselves
- They see the value of a society in which there is vigour and vibrancy caused by many different cultural groups
- Draws parallels with ecology: links between diversity and systemic health
- Cultural exchange between groups promotes toleration and understanding
- Fosters willingness to respect difference
- It is the antidote to social polarisation and prejudice

In what sense is multiculturalism a form of communitarianism?

- Communitarianism is a philosophical critique of liberal universalism
- Reflects emphasis less on what everyone shares and more on what is distinctive about the groups to which they belong
- This is known as particularism
- View of human nature: identity links the personal to the social, and sees the individual as embedded in a particular cultural and social context
- People cannot be understood outside of society
- They are intrinsically shaped by the social, cultural and other structures in which they live and develop
- MacIntyre and Sandel: the idea of the abstract individual is a recipe for rootless atomism
- Only groups and communities can give people a true sense of identity and moral purpose
- Holds that the community demands unrestricted freedom and social equality
- It is the only way that people can achieve self-actualisation

Why have some multiculturalists criticised liberalism?

Liberal universalism:

- Idea that everyone has the same identity regardless of background
- Multiculturalists advance a political critique of this
- This identity is constructed along the line of the dominant groups in society
- White, wealthy, straight men
- This then marginalises other groups because it expects them to just take on the values of the dominant groups
- Thus erasing their history and culture
- Identity politics: statement of intent that celebrates the differences between different groups
- Acknowledges they have different values and different ways of living

Politics of rights:

- Liberals think that all we need is legal and political equality
- Universal citizenship: everyone should be the same in the eyes of the law

- 3 x types: liberal, pluralist, cosmopolitan
- All wish to challenge ethnic and cultural marginalisation
- More of a means to an end than an end in itself
- Liberal: commitment to toleration and freedom in the private sphere
- Pluralist: all ways of life are morally equal
- Cosmopolitan: celebrate diversity due to what cultures can learn from one another

Para 1: Liberal

- Commitment to toleration and freedom of choice in the private moral sphere
- People should have freedom of choice in relation to cultural and religious matters
- Liberalism is morally neutral
- Rawls: liberalism allows people to live a good life, not the right life
- Difference-blind: treats culture, race, gender as irrelevant and judges people as morally autonomous individuals
- Toleration only extends to views and practices that are themselves tolerant
- Do not approve of forced marriages, female circumcision etc
- They are incompatible with personal freedom and autonomy
- Liberals cannot accommodate deep diversity
- The rights of the individual must come before the rights of the group
- Distinction between public and private life
- In the private sphere people should be freed to express their cultural or religious identity as they see fit
- In the public sphere people should be unified by a hedge of shared civic allegiances
- Hyphenated nationality: people have dual allegiances, to their country of origin and their country of residence
- France: muslim girls are forbidden from wearing the hijab in public schools
- Regards liberal democracy as the sole political system that is legitimate
- Entitles that the govt is based on the consent of the people
- Would oppose the installation of a govt based on sharia law
- Groups are only afforded toleration and respect when they give the same to others
- Pretty much just liberalism but adapted to a multicultural society - does not go further than liberalism really

Para 2: Pluralist

- Isaiah Berlin: endorsed value pluralism
- People are bound to disagree about ultimate ends of life
- It is not possible to demonstrate the moral superiority of one life over another
- Liberals absolutise liberalism
- Only tolerate diversity within a framework of personal autonomy, amounting to "shallow diversity"
- Western beliefs such as toleration, consent and democracy have no greater moral authority than liberal beliefs
- Has been called the politics of indifference
- Clearly at odds with liberalism: pluralists excuse beliefs that may put the individual's autonomy at risk