

The Integration for All

*By Metin USTA
The Student of Political Science
At Istanbul Bilgi University*

In the era of globalization, there are several problems for societies. The distribution of wealth, lack of communication between different communities, human rights issue is some of them. In that sense, the lack of integration within the domestic societies and between cultures cytolyses these problems.

As an egalitarian liberal, Michael Walzer suggests the distributive justice as a correct line. In order understand what does the distributive justice mean, we should firstly look at the egalitarian liberalism. Typical liberal egalitarian conceptualizations of civil society result in versions of the sphere concept. Civil society is thought to pick out dense networks of social exchange outside the political sphere. Ideally, civil society is a realm in which citizens pursue their comprehensive ends and develop the principles, practices, and virtues conducive to democratic government. Sensing the tension present in these two aims, some liberal egalitarians argue that civil society requires the influence and regulation of a strong central government in order to keep the political culture.¹

Recognizing the pluralistic nature of society and personal relationships, Walzer proceeds to describe a system of distributive justice that he characterizes as "egalitarianism that is consistent with liberty." In that sense, there are six propositions his theory of "social goods," which consists of distributive justice.

1. The meaning and value of all goods (money, power, love, and so forth) are socially created and vary from one society to the next. Social goods do not include privately valued goods, such as sunsets or mountain air.

¹ Mark N. Jensen, "The Concepts and Conceptions of Civil Society," *Journal of Civil Society*, 2:1, p.51

2. People create self-identities by the way they create, possess, and employ these social goods.
3. There is no one good or set of goods that are primary, universally accepted, or most important; even the possible range of necessities is very wide.
4. The meanings of goods determine their movement; thus, all distributions are just or unjust relative to the social meanings of the goods at stake.
5. The social meanings of goods are historical in character; thus, the extent to which distributions are considered just or unjust changes over time.
6. Every social good or set of goods occupies a distributive "sphere," which is characterized by a particular set of rules or understandings that govern the way in which these goods are divided, shared, or exchanged. These distributive spheres should, in Walzer's view, be autonomous -for example, "money is inappropriate in the sphere of ecclesiastical office; it is an intrusion from another sphere"

The political problem faced by modern pluralistic society is that "there are standards for every social good and every distributive sphere in every particular society; and these standards are often violated, the goods usurped, the spheres invaded, by powerful men and women."

Walzer also rejects three traditional methods of distribution: free exchange, desert, and need. In his regime of complex equality, allocation of goods will be achieved according to the principles of "different goods to different companies of men and women for different reasons and in accordance with different procedures"² Walzer puts forward three "general

² Linda S. Mullenix, "Review: The Limits of Complex Equality," *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 97, No.7 (May, 1984), pp.1803-1805

principles” of communal provision, in the context of “a society like our own”, i.e. the American welfare state. These principles may be cited as follows:

1. Every political community must attend to the needs of its members as they collectively understand those needs;
2. The goods that are distributed must be distributed in proportion to need;
3. The distribution must recognize and uphold the underlying equality of equal membership.³

Walzer also argues that individual agreement is indeed an important source of today’s institutions, and individual rights of our freedoms. In that sense, we should aim, not at the freedom of the solitary individual but at what can best be called institutional integrity. Individuals should be free, indeed, in all sorts of ways, but we don't set them free by separating them from their fellows.⁴

On the cultural bases, he argues that a society which has assimilation capacity is the thick culture, such as the American Culture since it is able to assimilate immigrants into a melting pot system within an American Nation. In America, they indeed established a national culture in their own image, into which the rest of domestic groups have been pressured to assimilate. The culture of European Nation States is or was much thicker than the American one since the assimilative pressure even stronger and there is less room for alternative versions of thickness.⁵

³ Robert J. Van Der Veen, “The Adjudicating Citizen: On Equal Membership of Walzer’s Theory of Justice,” *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol.29, No.2, (Apr., 1999), p.242

⁴ Michael Walzer, “Liberalism and the Art of Separation,” *Political Theory*, Vol.12, No.3, (Aug., 1984), p.325

⁵ Michael Walzer, “Nation States and Immigrant Societies,” in (ed.) *Can liberal Pluralism be Exported? : Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe*, by Will Kymlicka and Magda Oplaski, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), p.151

In thin cultures, there are more rooms for immigrants and other minority groups to live their own culture. However, the culture depend son the language and if there is a linguistic assimilation, there is no more difference between thin or thick culture. Despite they do not use their own linguistic features; the most successful groups in the USA to sustain their cultures are ethnic-religious combinations.

Living Together:

In the political sphere of nation state, minority and immigrant groups are taken as a threaten figures for the political and social stability of the host country. In that sense, governments and political elites choose an easy way to illustrate their failure and they use those groups as scapegoating figure in order to manipulate their society. I n other words, as Alain Touraine argues there are two different ways for nation state in order to solve the integration problems. The first one is the assimilation which is facilitated both by a unitary and integrative education system and by mass consumerism. Assimilation has been the dominant solution only in these countries with a high level of immigration form countries that are actually close to the host country.⁶

The alternative solution is to give immigrant populations a separate status or to organize it into homogenous and self-governing communities. The example of this situation is Turks in Germany. The advantage of this method is that the community can act as an intermediary between the individuals and the country has entered. This can also eliminate the possibility of existence marginalized and excluded groups. The disadvantage is that it makes inter-communitarian clashes much more likely. As a result, none of them can create a wider solution. Since assimilation dissolve particular cultures into a unitary national community

⁶ Alain Touraine, "Mutli-Cultural Society," *Can We Live Together? : Equality and Difference*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), p.189

identified with a universal; the multicultural solution respects the plurality of cultures but does not establish any communication between them.⁷

The first solutions does not lead to a multicultural society, but is does allow us to arrive at a peaceful combination of economic involvement and cultural autonomy. The second solution leads to disintegration in two senses. Becoming part of host society implies the adoption of a way of life that pressures skills and an income that immigrants do not possess. The integration can and must be applied to all, not to immigrants alone.⁸

The real choice is between an awareness of ethnicity combined with social integration and an awareness of discrimination that leads to violence. A multicultural society can only exist if no majority ascribes a universal value to its own way of life. As an alternative way, cultural democracy can be a solution if we recognize the diversity of cultures, but also the existence of cultural domination. If these values divorce, the two aspects of multiculturalist conception of society become distorted.⁹

⁷ Ibid. p.190.

⁸ Ibid. pp.191-192

⁹ Ibid. p.195.

Bibliography:

- Doty, R.L. “Immigration and the Politics of Security,” *Security Studies*, Vol.8, No.2-3, pp71-93.
- Jensen, Mark N. “The Concepts and Conceptions of Civil Society,” *Journal of Civil Society*, 2:1, pp.39-56
- Kymlicka, Will and Magda Oplaski, *Can liberal Pluralism be Exported? : Western Political Theory and Ethnic Relations in Eastern Europe*, by (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- Kymlicka, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996)
- Mullenix, Linda S. “Review: The Limits of Complex Equality,” *Harvard Law Review*, Vol. 97, No.7 (May, 1984), pp.1801-1811
- Touraine, Alain. *Can We Live Together? : Equality and Difference*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000)
- Van Der Veen, Robert J. “The Adjudicating Citizen: On Equal Membership of Walzer’s Theory of Justice,” *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol.29, No.2, (Apr., 1999), pp.225-258
- Walzer, Michael. “Liberalism and the Art of Separation,” *Political Theory*, Vol.12, No.3, (Aug., 1984), pp.315-330