

Philosophy and Progress

Volumes XLV-XLVI
January-June, July-December, 2009



Dev Center for Philosophical Studies
University of Dhaka

Philosophy and Progress

Published in 2010

© All rights reserved

Editor
Galib A. Khan

Associate Editor
Nayeema Haque

The Publisher and the Editorial Board do not bear any responsibility for the views expressed by the contributors.

Price : Taka 100.00
US\$ 5.00



Dev Center for Philosophical Studies
University of Dhaka

CONTENTS

Yet Another Problem with Confirmation Nicholas Griffin	1
The Status of Women in Christianity: An Ethical Consideration Md. Akhtar Ali	5
Deep Ecology and Buddhist Ecosophy Santosh Kumar Pal	35
Interconnectedness: Ecological and Ontological Realities Jasim Uddin	45
The Bauls and the Mystics Farhanaz Rabbani	57
Social Harmony, Multiculturalism and Cultural Relativism Golam Azam	67
Paradigm Shift in Journalism Education in Bangladesh: Addressing Globalization, Privatization and Market Demand Mofizur Rhaman	87
The Determinants of Workers' Remittances: A Case of Bangladesh Mossammat Umme Habiba	113

Philosophy and Progress

Philosophy and Progress is published twice a year, in June and December by Dev Centre for Philosophical Studies which was established to fulfill the dream of Shaheed Dr. Govinda Chandra Dev, former Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy, University of Dhaka.

Manuscripts for publication should be sent to the Editor, Philosophy and Progress, Dev Centre for Philosophy Studies, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000.

9. Jenks, Kathleen. *Rabi'a al-'Adawiyya, an 8th Century Islamic Saint from Iraq*
<http://www.mythlinks.org/NearEast-3monotheisms-Islam-Rabia.html> Retrieved July 27, 2009
10. Smith, Margaret. *The Way of the Mystics: The Early Christian Mystics and the Rise of the Sufis*, NY: Oxford University Press, 1978.
11. The New Testament, King James 2 Corinthians, 12, 2-3
<http://www.newadvent.org/bible/2co012.htm>
 Retrieved June 28, 2009
12. Pasternak, Velvet. *Song in Hassidic Life, The Heridic Anthology*, translated by L.I. Newman, spitz S. Scribner, 1934
13. Shiloah, Annon. On Jewish and Muslim musicians of the Mediterranean <http://www.umbc.edu/eol/3/shiloah/index.html>
 Retrieved November 25, 2002

Social Harmony, Multiculturalism and Cultural Relativism

Golam Azam*

01. The Conception of Relativism

Relativism is a familiar concept to most of the academic personnel. It is just qualitatively opposite to absolutism which holds that the standard of justifying any action must be absolute, unchangeable universal. Relative judgments are to be contrasted with the absolute judgment. 'A judgment is absolute if its truth (or falsity) is dependent only on facts about the object the judgment concerns and not facts about the context beyond it'.¹ It can be exemplified by uttering two statements. Let's look when someone says, not that 'it is relatively cold today' but that 'the ambient temperature is currently 4° Celsius'. The first is a relative judgment whereas the second is the absolute judgment. As the first assertion is true depending on the temperature of preceding days but the second judgment depends nothing except on today's temperature. Relative judgments are more or less comparative by nature. Factual relative judgments are different from psychological or moral relative judgment. There may different types of relativism. Of them the two are major. Those are epistemic *relativism* and *moral relativism*. Epistemic relativism holds that knowledge of any type is relative to some other proposition. It claims that all knowledge is true (or false) relative to some standard and this standard can not itself be relative. There may arise so many questions about epistemic relativism but the aim of the paper is not to deal with the epistemic relativism. In its broad sense epistemic relativism includes also moral relativism because moral judgments are also judgments of knowledge. The moral relativist on the other hand claims that moral judgments are

* Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Dhaka

true (or false) relative to some standard or frame work and this standard or framework is not itself uniquely justified. It is not necessarily factual. The standard of moral relativism may either the feelings of the subject or existing social laws, practice, social values (i.e. culture because the term culture encompasses our tradition, belief, and practice). So we can say that the source of the standard of moral relativism is our feelings and our culture. On the basis of the sources of standard we can divide moral relativism into two categories e.g. subjective relativism or subjectivism and cultural relativism. There might be other types of moral relativism such as moral-requirement relativism, descriptive relativism, meta-ethical relativism and so. But our focus in this paper goes upon cultural relativism. It holds that "...cultures set the standards of moral truth."² "The very core of cultural relativism is the social discipline that comes of respect for differences- of mutual respect. Emphasis on the worth of many ways of life, not none, is an affirmation of the values in each other",³ said Malville Herskovits.

Different cultures have different moral practices of different moral codes- is the essence of cultural relativism. It also holds that there can be no universal ethical principles or rules. The tradition of each culture moulds its ethical code and hence a certain action is justified as true and good in that society. There is no independent moral code. Moral codes are culture dependent and therefore an action within a definite cultural framework can neither be called as true nor false.

According to Rachels,
 "Cultural relativists (my italic and parenthesis) claim the following:

1. Different societies have different moral codes.
2. There is no objective standard that can be used to judge one societal code better than another.
3. The moral code of our own society has no special status; it is merely one among many.

4. There is no "universal truth" in ethics - that is, there are no moral truths that hold for all people at all times.
5. The moral code of a society determines what is right within that society; that is if the moral code of a society says that a certain action is right then that action is right, at least within that society.
6. It is mere arrogance for us to try to judge the conduct of other peoples. We should adopt an attitude of tolerance towards the practices of other cultures."⁴

Cultural relativism proceeds to moral relativism. It is because culture is one of the fundamental sources of morality. According to the view possessed by moral relativists, the moral code of one's culture is the touchstone of moral truth and falsity when it comes to the question of right and wrong. This implies that if two cultures differ in their moral codes, actions that are right for the members of one of the two cultures may be wrong for members of the other. "Moral relativism makes right or wrong depend ultimately on the moral code of a culture".⁵ The widely shared moral norms of a culture represents the widely shared basic moral norms of individuals who are the members of the culture and the set of basic moral norms represents the ultimate touchstone of rightness and wrongness for the culture in question. Typical moral norm might include, e.g. lying is wrong, intentionally killing a person is wrong etc. . The importance of cultural relativism includes all these things. It is because relativism accepts co-existence of diversity of cultures and hence diversity of morality. What is particular interest here is the thesis that there are sometimes deep-going, fundamental conflicts in moral belief across the culture----- conflicts at the level of basic moral norms.

Cultural Relativism (CR) emphasizes upon the autonomy and paternalism of an individual as well as community. In a society with cultural pluralism, the dominating culture

some time bound the minority to abide by the direction adopted by them though that might go contrary to the basic cultural teaching of the minority group. It's one type of paternalistic attitude of the dominating group over the others. It hampers the dignity of one's culture which sometimes becomes difficult to accept. There might be different kinds of paternalism e.g. legal paternalism, cultural paternalism, economic paternalism etc. I am talking about solely cultural paternalism which is connected to political paternalism also. It is one of the opinions that cultural paternalism is an offshoot of political paternalism. Cultural and political paternalism are closely interrelated. They are interrelated in the sense that by cultural paternalism, one's right to perform their own culture is encountered. The demand of cultural relativism is that if one's culture does not harm the dignity etc. of other people, the domination culture shouldn't interrupt in their practice. Another important aspect in cultural relativism is the autonomy of the minority group. The domination group, in a multicultural society, does not signify the autonomy of the minority as if the people of minority group are the innate subordinate to them. In this respect the expectation of CR is that the people of dominating culture should create laws and environment so that the autonomy of the minority is secured.

The question is whether CR matters or not. I think it matters. Because there may be numerous social issues where there are cultural gaps and conflicts. The source of culture may be our tradition, religion, and also education etc. Sometime cultural practices might discontinue the harmony of the society e.g. genital mutation of women in different societies, the problem of abortion etc. are considered as threat for the harmony of the society because different culture maintains different opinion regarding these social issues. Moreover, the oppression and the tyranny, dominance by the larger culture are also factors for social unrest. Hence I think if every person or

each society practices its own culture disvaluing other's culture, the social harmony of a multicultural society faces trouble.

02. The Conception of Multiculturalism / Cultural Pluralism

Present world is a global world. People are being migrated from one country to another country of different culture and social tradition. Sometimes the migrants mix up themselves with the new culture prevailing in the society. But in most cases people try to preserve their own culture and at the same time demand for the recognition of their identity, and accommodation of their cultural differences. This is often phrased as the challenge of multiculturalism.⁶ Multiculturalism is also identified with equal weight as cultural pluralism.

Multiculturalism can be portrayed both from the communitarian and liberal point of views. Multiculturalism, from the Communitarianism point of view, emphasizes upon the right and recognition of a certain community. It seems to involve people mobilizing as members of cultural communities, and seeking some form of group rights to recognize and protect their community. It does not emphasize upon the individual as it is done by the liberals because, 'communitarians view individuals as the product of social practices.'⁷ Communitarians also believe that multiculturalism might be an appropriate mechanism of protecting from eroding effects of individual autonomy, and of affirming the value of community. In this way we observe that multiculturalism gradually becomes a political agendum among the political scientists. The basic cause behind it may be the demand of the minority group to protect their rights and the recognition and proper valuation of their culture. People are people of certain group because of their practiced culture. So community based culture—right movement becomes popular in the last century especially in liberal democratic countries.

Liberals on the other hand snatches the idea for preserving the right of the individual. They hold that individual person must have the right and autonomy to choose his own culture etc. irrespective of any community. Among liberals Joseph Raz insists that

“...the autonomy of the individuals--- their ability to make good choices among good lives--- is intimately tied up with access to their culture, with the prosperity and Flourishing of their culture, and with the respect accorded with the culture of others. Multiculturalism helps ensure this cultural flourishing and mutual respect.”⁸

There are also other liberals whose view is different, though consistent, from the view of Raz in some respects. They call it the position of liberal culturalist. They tend to say that the compelling demand of multiculturalism such as preservation of culture and identity etc. are fully consistent with the liberal principles of freedom and equality, and which justify granting special rights to minorities. Although as a political theory liberalism accepts the notion of multiculturalism as one of their primary agenda whether directly or indirectly. According to liberals, the issue of minority rights (the fundamental claim of communitarian culturalism) are consistent with liberal culturalism if they protect the right of the individuals within the group and if they promote the relations of equality (non-dominance) between groups.

However, multiculturalism is anti-individualistic. It is anti-individualistic in the sense that it expects each person to agree with the perceptions, thoughts, and judgments of his group in order for his own perceptions, thoughts, and judgments to be legitimate. A multiculturalist believes that a person's thoughts are either the collectively constructed thoughts of his racial, ethnic, or sexual group or are the thoughts foisted upon him by the dominants. Multiculturalists assign each rational and autonomous individual into a group based on the group's specific, absolute, and non-debatable dissemblances from other groups. Moreover, multiculturalism attempts to replace

individual rights with collectivism by assuming that a man's identity and value are derived solely from biology, and that what is important is not what a person does as an individual, but rather what some members of his biological group currently do or did years ago. It follows that collective guilt replaces individual responsibility—a person must assume the responsibility for acts committed by his ancestors and pay for these acts ad infinitum.

So we find that both liberalism and Communitarianism emphasize upon the right of minority, the autonomy of the group as well as individuals, and also the paternalism of each group. But the challenge or the question immediately arises regarding the role of dominating culture and the ruler. How to make reconciliation among different contrary and contradictory cultural beliefs i.e. what might be the mechanism of solving such crucial and sophisticated issues. Is the government of a liberal country morally obliged to solve this problem? All these issue will be discussed in the next section after the view of John Rawls and others.

02.1 The Basic Problems or Challenges of Multiculturalism/ Cultural Pluralism

The challenges of a multicultural society are numerous. Among those I would like to discuss a few that I categorize as most important though some other researcher(s) may categorize other five or more/less as most important. The challenges are discussed below.

1. To ensure the autonomy of the individual and the group. As stated above, it is one of the fundamental desires of individual as well the cultural group. People want to be uninterrupted in exercising their autonomy until and unless it goes against humanity. Gerald Dworkin rightly characterizes an autonomous person as follows: “A person is morally autonomous if and only if he refuses to accept others as moral authorities, i.e. he does not accept without independent consideration the judgment of others as to what is morally correct.”⁹

Therefore it is one of the challenges of Multiculturalism to ensure the autonomy of every people irrespective of culture in the society.

2. To do justice to the minorities. The concept of justice means political and cultural justice in this respect. It's the challenge of multiculturalism to promote justice i.e. to ensure the enjoyment of basic human rights of the minorities. It should be noted that only due to cultural differences none should be reluctant from his/her due rights.
3. To ensure social security of the minority. It happens in a pluralistic society that the minority feel unsecured by the dominating people. So it is the responsibility of the government of a multicultural society to ensure social security for the minority.
4. To mobilize the people to practice toleration as much as possible. It's the social responsibility of a government of a multicultural society that it must propagate among the people the significance and importance of cultural diversity in society as well as why it is necessary to show due respect to other's culture. The mechanism of doing it is the main focus of the paper and detail of it will be discussed in the next section.
5. To enact the minority group with main trend of the society. Though it is very difficult to bring people of a different culture to the main cultural trend of the land. I think it is not necessary. What is necessary is to bring people with a unique political system. It's a critical task because, for example, it's like an umbrella under which there are people of different religion, culture and habit but they share their values with each other and believe on a particular system of politics. The mechanism of doing this is the vital issue in a multicultural society. Some functional approach, proposed by different philosophers, will be discussed in the next section.

Conflict(s) between ideas and cultures arises when the aforementioned factors are dishonoured. People feel embarrassed when their cultural identity becomes extinct. Political decision of a society is very important in this respect. The following section discusses how to handle the issues with the people of different cultures. If it is not possible to come to a point of equilibrium, the conflict between cultures will continue unendingly.

II

In this section the possible solution for the harmony in a multicultural society and the mechanism of doing that proposed by different philosophers has been discussed. The views of John Rawls, Habermas, Bohman and Kukathas will be focused.

A) Rawls' Conception of Public Reason

Rawls holds that in a democratic society of cultural pluralism there may be deep political conflict. Conflicts become deep when they challenge the basic framework of moral assumption and political procedure in a society. Deep conflicts create inter group dilemmas e.g. liberal dilemma (each/all) and communitarian dilemma (unity /plurality). To overcome these conflicts Rawls proposes his theory of public Reason. He says: 'in a democratic society public reason is the reason of equal citizens who, as a collective body, exercise final political and coercive power over one another in enacting laws and in amending their constitution. *The value of public reason not only include the appropriate use of the fundamental concepts of justice, inference, and evidence, but also the virtues of reasonableness and fairness.*'¹⁰

He distinguishes public reason from non public reason. For him, nonpublic reasons comprise the many reasons of civil society and belong to the background culture, in contrast, with the public political culture. This public reason is of two types, singular and plural. Rawls advocates singular public reason. He says, "there are many nonpublic reason and but only one public reason."¹¹ And this singular public reason is based on "common human reason" which includes the capacity and procedures of reason, such as drawing inferences, weighing

evidence, and balancing competing considerations¹². Plural public reason is just opposite to singular public reason.

In *Political Liberalism* Rawls also discusses two more feature very closely connected with the concept of public reason namely "the conception of Overlapping Consensus" and the "method of Avoidance". His "Overlapping Consensus" is, by nature, pluralistic and public. A consensus is overlapping simply because different and even opposing comprehensive moral doctrines may be reasonable in a public sense. Everyone may be able to agree with the public basis for political deliberation in light of moral values that they recognize in their own society. It is "not a compromise compelled by the circumstances". Some basic problems can be solved between conflicting cultures but there still remain some conflicts of principles about disputed issues unsolved. But, as Joshua Cohen says, every one appeals to "nothing but the truth but not to the whole truth" which indicates that through Overlapping Consensus we can not solve the most crucial conflicts of culture.

But the problem might arise regarding the issues which are radical. No party is ready to leave their cultural heredity. After long dialogue and comprehensive discussion if it seems that the concerned issues can not be resolved then, Rawls suggests to avoid those issue(s) although those might have close or significant importance for the harmony of the society. This is named by Rawls as the method of avoidance. The method suggests that conflicts about which no public reason/agreement is possible might be left to some pragmatic device such as a "gag rule" or other pre-commitments. It's a very pragmatic and wise decision to avoid the un-soluble conflicts. It is because our empirical and historical knowledge let us know that most of the major conflicts in the world happened due to non compromise, intolerance, radical attitude and disrespect to other culture and religion. In most cases the conflicting problems are metaphysical by nature or we can say more abstract belief towards some non existing phenomenon. That's why I think, though it's difficult but wise, to say "well, I don't

know or I am reluctant of it" is a very nice way to minimize the conflict. Do and let other do (maintain) their culture. It is to be noted that in all case the persons concerned should be careful about the **nonmaleficence** principle¹³.

B) Bohman's Concern of the Problem

James Bohman is well known for his rational effort to solve such problem in political arena. His notions can be segmented into two, 1. Dynamism and plurality of public reason and 2. The notion of moral compromise.

Dynamism and Plurality of Public Reason

Bohman's notion of Dynamism and Plurality of Public Reason¹⁴ tries to resolve the limitation of Rawls public reason. Bohman proposes that deep conflicts can be resolved publicly only if political liberalism is revised in two ways: if the political conception of justice is made more dynamic and if public reason is made plural not singular. He claims that both features are absent not only in Rawls but also in all other related Kantian treatments of the public use of reason.¹⁵

1. Singular public reason: public reason is singular if it represents itself as a single norm of public deliberation. According to/ in the light of this norm agents come to agree upon some decision for the same publicly accessible reasons.

2. Plural public reason: public reason is plural if a single norm of reasonableness is not presupposed in deliberation; in the light of this norm agents can come to an agreement with each other for different publicly accessible reasons. "This sort of agreement is exhibited in granting differential rights to minority groups,.... public reason is plural here because it does not presuppose a single public or important point of view.

If public reason is dynamic then all the existing parties in the society can exchange their views to resolve the alarming moral problems in the society. Bohman also prescribes his own mechanism to minimize and resolve the conflicts between

cultures. Jorgen Habermas also supports the position of Bohman in this regard i.e. the principle of moral compromise. **The Proposal of Moral Compromise:**

Compromise means coming to an acceptable solution between conflicting parties. It might involve trade-offs and balances of interests, making concession of one's own for equal ones by others. When this type of compromise is backed by the moral reasoning, the parties have only the option to reach to a common human reason, at a minimum moral level. Notable that to be compromise there has to be conflict. There might be different types of compromise e.g., economic, political etc. but for a compromise to constitute a moral both the conflict and the resolution have to be moral, for both parties, while still being a compromise.¹⁶ The notion of moral compromise can better be understood through the following table¹⁷.

Table 1-Moral Compromise		
'Compromise'	Conflict	Resolution
	1. conflict between party X advocating policy A and party Y advocating policy B	2. X and Y accept some C, intermediate between A & B. 3. Neither party accepts B purely for strategic, balance-of-power reasons. 4. neither party changes its beliefs so as to come to A/B; each party's support for C remains conditional on the other party continuing to advocate A/B.
'Moral'	5. X supports A and Y supports B for what each takes to be good moral reason, that is to say based on what it takes to be true principles, ideals or beliefs, rather than personal wants, desires, or interests	6. X and Y accept the resolution C based on what each takes to be the balanced of moral reasons.

The process of reaching any compromise is the same i.e. the give-and-take of discussion and debate. It is by virtue of this process that moral compromise is compromise rather than coercion. The table says that any compromise can not be identified as moral compromise. The stand-point behind which there must be some moral ground to be considered as moral compromise. Such as two conflicting parties may develop equilibrium where each party finds its interest. This point is important because without reaching at such point no compromise can be attained by any parties. There is the point of sacrificing some form of interest in this process. Usually people are not ready, as it is not considered wise, to sacrifice the essence of their culture or to be integrated with the dominating culture because the spokesman of concerned culture is devoted to his own culture and he loves his culture as he loves himself. In this respect fairness and mechanism of building up moral compromise are at question.

Bohman thinks that 'Moral compromises are fair if they meet two main criteria: they take into account political inequality and they make possible continued participation of all groups in a common deliberative framework'¹⁸ he also explains that what is important or necessary in case of deep conflict is a genuinely moral compromise in which plural public reason is exercised. Moral compromise is a strategy, not the end and it is by nature different from the strategy of bargaining or trade-off. The structure of moral compromise is dialogical and as so it requires forum from conflicting cultures or a neutral for the public deliberation. Moral compromise has to maintain at least two standards namely, fairness and impartiality. In the process of moral compromise impartiality is maintained when the parties do not usually modify their conflicting interpretations of the framework and recognize the moral values and standards of others as part of this process. Moral compromise is a type of

shared consensus because parties of different cultural identity has to share with the values or ideals or practices of other's culture with due respect. Rawls' public reason and the principle of moral compromise, though seems alike, are not the same thing. One fundamental difference is that Rawls' public reason is very much political than moral compromise. Of course there is a hard debate on it but this paper is not devoted for that discussion.

C) Kukathas' Proposal of Cultural Toleration:

Kukathas in his article "Cultural Toleration" proposes an alternative view to solve the conflict between cultures. He thinks toleration is important arguing that it checks and counters moral certitude; 'if we are convinced beyond doubt of the correctness of beliefs or about the immorality of the practices of others, there is less reason to tolerate those whose beliefs and practices differ from our own'. But *if there is any possibility of doubt or uncertainty about the correctness and reliability of our judgment, then there is some reason to tolerate*. This is the one of vital points towards which Kukathas tries to draw our attention. Our empirical observation, in most cases, predicts that practices in most cultures come from religious teachings and religious morale and there is uncertainty in religious beliefs. That is why people changes their religious beliefs and tries to find out the one which seems to him more rational and acceptable. Moreover, from time to time unknown cultural practices are changing, though not necessarily, the spirit of practice. There might be several options of the statement mentioned above (italic). Say A maintains some beliefs C and considers those as true and predicts as certain though not empirically, and B maintains some beliefs D and considers (and predicts) those beliefs as true and certain. Here, neither A nor B is certain about the truth of their belief(s). It is because none of them has empirical

proof(s) for his beliefs. Therefore, it is rational for both to hypothesize that other's belief might be true as well. In this regard the question of tolerance becomes relevant. Kukathas tries to propose tolerance as an alternative ideal for cultural pluralistic society. Tolerance possesses an instrumental value. It is a means to some other ends. Probably tolerance is valuable because it enables true beliefs to prevail over the false ones—given sufficient time.

Kukathas tries to explain that toleration, in its real and teleological/consequential sense, is closely related to reason. Toleration and reason are interrelated in a very different way. It is not the fact that the existence of one depends on other. Kukathas holds that as long as toleration prevails in the pluralistic society and no one tries to compel or manipulate the other to live differently, reason also prevails. He also clarifies the relation carefully by uttering that toleration is not important because it promotes reason rather it is important because 'if toleration is forsaken then so is reason. A stance of toleration upholds or honours reason since it forswears the use of force in favour of persuasion ... what is important ... is not that reason be promoted but that it be honoured.' So we find from Kukathas' analysis that the relation between reason and toleration bears a significant role, though in a quite different way, to preserve harmony in a pluralistic society. This extraordinary approach makes the relation between these two more enthusiastic. Kukathas strongly tends to conclude that "... stability and social unity ... can only be bought at the cost of toleration. It is because articulating a political conception of justice, and presenting it as the first principle governing conduct the public realm, subordinates toleration, entrenches a particular comprehensive moral conception, and excludes certain moral ideals as unacceptable. Given this choice between social unity and greater tolerance, I would argue that we should opt for greater toleration."¹⁹

Tolerance is a mechanism to come to a social harmony. It is quite possible that so many objections might be there against the point of Kukathas but I humbly want to say that the essay does not permit to go through detail on Kukathas. But, of course, I think that toleration is important and it is difficult to maintain harmony in a pluralistic society without practicing toleration.

D) Possibility of Universal Moral Values:

As a solution of cultural conflict philosophers also propose to adopt or find out universal moral principles. Some eastern thinkers like Buddhist thinkers in general seek a universal moral principle to ensure cultural peace in the society. Some Kantian philosophers refer to Kant's concept of perpetual peace and his recommendation for universality of moral laws. There are also virtue ethicists who recommend for virtue ethical theories as the universal principle of morality. In this respect I think none of the prescriptions can result a good ending. It is because we need to understand that cultural practices have a long tradition and it is almost impossible to manage the people to alter their culture consciously. If any cultural society need to come to a consensus hypothesis, the people of that culture has to sacrifice the vital rules of their culture. The mechanism of reaching at such universal hypothesis can not be but the mechanisms stated above i.e. intercultural dialogue, public reason, cultural compromise and also tolerance. It is also claimed that many cultures has some practices and principles in common and hence it is possible to deduce common universal moral principle applicable to every society. In this regard, I must confess the inherent tendency of cultural practices and also that it may be universal in nature. For example, there are societies the cultures of which endorse eating of the dead body of their father to show due respect to him and there are societies the culture of which would never

permit such action as a way to show respect to their parents; they might have another code to show respect to their departed parents. Here the practices are different but the inherent tendency of each culture is same i.e. to show respect to their late parents. From this example though we can get universal tendency of cultural action, we can not deduce any cultural principle and we can not impose one practice over the other. So cultural practice, the source of cultural principle can not be unique or universal.

III

I would support the solution presented by Habermas and Bohman than the solution proposed by John Rawls. It's because of two fundamental reasons, a) the acceptability and applicability of the principle in every land of the world and b) the strong prerequisite of the principle. The proposals of Bohman and Habermas do not have such obstacles to be supported. Let me start with the second limitation of Rawls' proposal. The principle pre-requisites a liberal democratic society whose basic structure is well organized and most of the people are better off. In the present world scenario we can not constrain our principle within one particular land. We have to keep it in our mind that not every country in the world is a democratic country, not even liberal. For example in middle east the countries do not practice democracy as a political ideology and if the conflicts are intended to settle according to the principle proposed by Rawls, then not ultimate result can be gained, no equilibrium can be found. It is because the ruling party or the majority group may not allow the minority to come and get benefited from the discussion as like as it was happened in Canada several years ago. So the point is that Rawls' proposal can not be applied everywhere in the world successfully. On the other hand, the notion of tolerance and compromise demand slowly to accept/to recognize the culture

of the opposite group in a more satisfactory way and it's the mechanism that can be applied in every sphere of the world. It's because, it asks both the parties to sacrifice as much as possible subject to maintain their basic cultural norms. It demands a mutual understanding over the years. We can take an example from our country. Bangladesh is a small, poor, quasi-liberal country of third world. The notion 'third world' indicates that it has numerous claimants over its scarce resources. As a result one can predict a picture of oppression and tyranny of one group over the other to get resources. In that case the minorities would become the main target. But in Bangladesh, 85% people are by born Muslim and there are Hindus, Buddhists, and people of other religions e.g. tribes etc. Fortunately there is no such deep conflict or tyranny among these religions though people of every religion practice their own culture. There are some common cultures and also difference. Still there is peace in the society because the people of different culture practice tolerance and they sacrifice as much as possible towards others to accomplish their religious and cultural activities. It means also that in societies like Bangladesh people believe in cultural relativism as well as conflict free accommodation of plurality of cultures and it's possible. There might be silly misunderstandings among the persons of different cultures which can be solved through clarifications and discussion and in Bangladesh people face such common silly misunderstandings in several times but it did not breakdown the basic structure of the country. I believe that Mill's Harm principle can be enacted to solve the challenge of multiculturalism. And the problem of autonomy and paternalism can also be minimized if we consider the hypothesis that 'some paternalism is needed for enjoying autonomy'—a thesis propagated by May Thorseth. Basic moral norms beneficence, justice and Nonmaleficence can be

practiced in every culture so that the mind of the people of respective culture be set up to be non harmful or less harmful for other culture. So we can say that in a multicultural society the harmony among different culture can be established if the demand of each culture is met at an acceptable level. This, then, is the interconnectedness between the concepts of social harmony, multiculturalism and cultural relativism.

References

1. Neil Levy.2002. *Moral Relativism: A Short Introduction*, One world Publications. Oxford. UK , p. 15
2. *Ibid*, p.16
3. Quoted by Neil, *Ibid*, p.14
4. James Rachels (1995), *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill Inc, Singapore. P.18
5. Timmons, Mark, *Moral Theory: An Introduction*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, USA,2002, p. 38
6. Kymlicka, W., *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 10
7. Kymlicka, W, *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002, p. 337
8. *Ibid*, p. 339
9. Quoted in May Thorseth, Multicultural conflict – between autonomy and paternalism,
10. Rawls, J *Political Liberalism*, Colombia University Press, 1993 p. 139
11. *Ibid*, p. 220
12. Bohman J, 1995. Public Reason and Cultural Pluralism, in *Political Theory* V-23 –No-2 pp253-279 sage Publication
13. The principle of nonmaleficence is considered by some rule-deontological and rule-utilitarian theorists to be the foundation of social morality. It is part of the principle of beneficence which involves positive acts of preventing harm, removing harm and promoting good. For more of the conception of nonmaleficence,

- see, William Frankena, 1973. *Ethics*. N.J. prentice-Hall, and Tom Beauchamp, 1989, *Principles of Bio-Medical Ethics*, p. 194 New York, Oxford University Press.
14. Bohman James, "Public Reason and Cultural Pluralism" in *Political Theory* vol. 23 2, May 1995 pp. 253-279
15. Bohman, *Ibid*, p. 255
16. Andrew Lister (2007), "Public Reason and Moral Compromise" in *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* Volume-37, Number-1, March 2007, p. 1-34
17. Compare, *Ibid*, p. 17
18. Bohman, *Ibid*, p. 273
19. Kukathas, Chandran (1997), Cultural Toleration in Ian Shapiro and Will Kymlicka (eds.), *Ethnicity and Group Rights*, New York UP, p.85-86

Paradigm Shift in Journalism Education in Bangladesh: Addressing Globalization, Privatization and Market Demand

Moffzur Rhaman*

Journalism/Communication/Media¹ is a technology driven discipline and profession. The mode of professional practices, the pedagogies and curricula of the studies have to be changed over the time to harmonize the impacts of new technology to the media markets, professions, and academic institutions. This also needs to be done in the light of the particular socio-economic goals of a particular society in a particular time. Education and profession contribute to each other. Education of any kind is run at universities, institutes and schools to produce the future leaders of the profession on one hand and to meet the market demand for trained human resources of the respective field on the other. However, to maximize the benefit of the use of media/communication/journalism for holistic development as outlined by the mainstream western and west centric eastern scholars and satisfy the market needs the system of media educations needs, to be taken into account that mainly includes the curricula, pedagogy of and infrastructure required for the discipline.

Well designed journalism education with appropriate curricula, required infrastructure and suitable pedagogical approach is considered as an institutional mechanism for developing appropriate human resources who would be fit in

* Associate Professor, Department of Mass Communication and Journalism, University of Dhaka

¹ As journalism education is run having different titles in Bangladesh such as Journalism, Communication, Media studies, and suggests to the same area of academic activity, I will use these terms/titles as alternative to each other in this paper.