

Integration and Recognition of Cultural Identity of the Immigrants: A Liberal Approach to Citizenship Policy

Tahmina Yesmin Shova*

Abstract

Political aggression, social anomalies, and religious antagonism due to major-minor cultural differences in western democratic countries are the most controversial issues of recent time, which is closely related to the dispute of open and closed borders. Western immigration policies and nationalistic approaches are proceeded to marginalize immigrant's own inherited cultural identity either by forceful assigning of host country's major cultural practices or by excluding them due to their non-national cultural identity, which causes unfair discriminations and sufferings to them. However, this paper particularly focuses on the liberal ideas of John Rawls and Will Kymlicka to justify immigrant's cultural identity for sustaining in liberal multicultural states. The fact logically deduced from the assessment is that liberal principles of justice necessitate the acknowledgment of cultural identity of the migrated people since disregarding immigrant's cultural identity affects their autonomy and other kinds of fundamental social and political rights, and therefore, apposite accommodation of cultural identity of the immigrants is required for the equality and social harmony.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, Rawls, Kymlicka, immigrants, polyethnic rights, citizenship policy.

Introduction

It is acknowledged that most western democratic countries are now culturally diverged. However, the current world is confronting the turning propensity of western states towards nationalism once again. In the last two decades, newly added migration policies and requirements are showing this inclination and vulnerable position of the immigrant's distinct cultural identity (Elisa, 2017). Such migration policies intend to marginalize the immigrants either by ascribing cultural practices of the receiving country forcefully or by suppressing them due to their non-national cultural identity (Tae, 2013). Discrimination, inequality, and injustice to the immigrants are thus likely to come forward which

* Tahmina Yesmin Shova, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Dhaka, E-mail:tahminayshova@du.ac.bd

certainly penetrates liberal principles in a multicultural society. Consequently, the growing conflicts between host nation's cultural interests and immigrant's cultural interests have turned the questions of how migrant people should be treated or governed in a multicultural country, how to accommodate their cultural demands, and what would be the role of citizenship in promoting their cultural identity in the mainstream. In this paper, I particularly look forward to the liberal grounds to signify the cultural rights of the immigrants and argue for recognition of cultural identity is required by the liberal principles. Based on the normative method, I choose two liberal approaches which are John Rawls's liberal idea and Will Kymlicka's multicultural idea to examine the rational feasibility of conceptual and practical liberal ideas in the case of immigrant cultural identity. Rawls's given social liberalism is intensively normative whereas liberal multiculturalism practically concerns the politics of minority group rights. However, I intend to emphasize their basic concepts of individual autonomy and freedom concerning cultural rights to justify whether immigrants' cultural rights are essentially derived from liberal principles. If this can be seen as reasonable then the demand for public recognition and integration of the immigrant's citizenship would be justifiable as well.

Culture as human identity and the immigrants

Culture is one of the significant constituents of individual identity which consists of history, conventional beliefs, customs, language, geographical location, ethnicity, sexuality, religious beliefs, and moral code of conduct. Generally, culture holds both cognitive value and practical value. By cognitive value, culture denotes its strong relation to autonomy in shaping a precise way of understanding of good life, the value and meaning of choice, and the identity it forms (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 84-85). From the very birth time, every individual belongs to a particular cultural background that is primarily known to her as an un-chosen societal structure and as a part of ascribed status. Distinct cultural practices assist the individual to construct her distinct personality with a strong feeling of belonging to that cultural ground. However, cultural substances are not absolute, rather it frequently keeps changing following the context, time, implications of other cultures, and so on (Carens, 2012). A person can hold their own cultural identity even showing respect to other cultures as well. Therefore, culture considers as a subjectively rational choice that partially defines an individual's identity (Parvin & Chambers, 2012, p. 257).

Historically, immigration is one of the effective sources of cultural diversity and a good scheme to deal with global inequality and injustice (Kymlicka, 1995, p.13; 2002, p. 14). It opens avenues for economic, political, and cultural interaction among different states. People are

migrating to different countries holding their own cultural identity for various purposes including trade, tour, education, job, living, communal wars, political issues, and environmental catastrophe. Sometimes they stay for a short time and sometimes for a long time or permanently in the countries they entered. Therefore, today's most countries not only become culturally plural but interconnected and interdependent as well. However, being migrated into another country, an individual immediately starts to feel the social and civic responsibilities of the citizens towards government like other citizens; giving tax, for instance, on every purchasing product, enthusiastically participating in the national festivals, admiring the particular social code of conduct and so on (Helder & Lea, 2015). In return, it gradually becomes a reciprocal relationship between the government and immigrants allowing them to enjoy their basic social and political rights.

Generally, immigrants refer to those who are not a homogenous ethnic or cultural group but are groups of people and ethnicities, differentiated among themselves externally by cultures such as languages, religions, and nationalities, just to name a few markers of differences, and also internally by the degree of assimilation, integration, and generation. Immigrant discrimination and deprivation of cultural rights are historically evident (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 13-14). And these things are now widespread happening in western democratic countries since, other than native-birth reasons, cultural differences count as the strongest reason for exclusion (Elisa, 2017). Migrated people confront several challenges due to the distinct cultural interests in the receiving country. For instance, the problems of Muslim women's religious wearing '*hijab*' in school and public places, Sikh's tradition to wear '*turban*' in the public sphere, available access to food according to the religious permit, the opportunity of getting a basic education in particular cultural language, public holidays for distinct cultural festivals, etc (Kymlicka, 2000, p. 330; Parvin & Chambers, 2012, p. 256; Barbera, 2015, p. 7). Like Norway, Germany, Denmark, France, Finland has included compulsory Finnish or Swedish language requirements over the immigrants for obtaining Finnish citizenship. This sort of restriction is also depriving them of political rights like education, employment, etc. (see Kymlicka, 1995, p. 15-16). Being trapped in between their own inherited culture and national culture, immigrants commence representing a complex cultural identity in most cases. Many think that such complex affairs compel a person to transform and represent an intersectional cultural identity to be a member of one umbrella (Barbera, 2015, p. 1-3). In any case, holding own culture in another political territory is much more challenging than assimilating or integrate into that cultural environment.

The fact admits by many state governments that public acknowledgment is required for practicing particular cultural activities in

a true sense. Countries like the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, France, Sweden, Malaysia, USA, etc. are well-known as liberal multicultural, though they conceive distinguish forms of multiculturalism, welcoming people from different countries of origin and culture. Noticeable public policies have been taken by these authorized bodies following the cultural identity crisis. For example, the Canadian government has publicly given rights to Sikh members to wear their cultural dress 'turban' in job sectors. In Britain, Sweden, Belgium, Portugal, and some other countries, local food providers are supplying 'halal' meats in supermarkets for Muslim believers. The French government has granted the law of wearing 'burkah' for Muslim women; even students can wear their cultural attire in school (Merle, 1998). However, ongoing controversies on immigrant's cultural identity regulate us in another direction. When an immigrant's cultural identity associates with their citizenship, the issue becomes more, politically and morally, exigent. Questions of concern become are: how to treat those individuals or groups who want to hold their own cultural identity or more than one cultural identity? How to promote public policy to accommodate and protect their cultural identity? What to do, if an individual's cultural interests conflict with other's interests?

Theoretically, liberalism and multiculturalism rest on opposite views in the case of immigrants' cultural rights: the former is of 'politics of indifference' or 'difference blind', and the latter is of 'politics of difference'. Liberalism justifies equality and freedom of all individuals irrespective of any specific cultural status. An equal right of all is the ultimate matter, not the specific cultural identity. Culture is a private issue and only a matter of conscience. However, like conditions, this core norm allows the immigrants the space to hold their own cultural identity, which calls for assimilation of all differences. Following the liberal idea, if the universal citizenship concept gets confirmed then immigrants' certain social and political rights should be ensured under the same value. This kind of confirmation allocates them to feel a sense of belongingness to a new nation and sustain their own cultural identity (Tae, 2013).

Other hand, multiculturalism takes into account of group-rights of the minorities and views culture in first order on the premise that cultural rights facilitate other kinds of fundamental rights. And instead of a neutral position, minorities are seen as a significant responsibility of the government (Tae, 2013). One of the crucial arguments placed by them is culture is a crucial and valuable resource since it can shape our judgemental thoughts and affect our free choice. Cultural disadvantages make inequality and, therefore, its specific value consideration is essential. Assimilation can be a demand for majority people but not of the minority of immigrants groups. Immigrants can suffer from the deprivation of their cultural rights (Kasper, 2011).

The notion of Citizenship and its entitlements

Citizenship typically defines as the entitlement of membership in a political community and certain social and political rights of the citizens which resulted in an equal share of benefits and burdens of the territory (Tae, 2013). Normatively, the concept of 'citizenship' is based on a well-known social contract idea. And practically, it refers to the reciprocal relationship between individuals and government. The social contract doctrine primarily assumes the rational agreement between two major parties. On the one hand, individuals accept a person or group of persons as the supreme authority on the condition that the authority will ensure and protect all basic rights. On the other hand, the governing body ensures the responsibility towards the individuals on the commitment that they will give their full power to the body and owe their all decisions. Thus, one group recognizes as citizens and the other as government. Modern political philosophers Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean Jack Rousseau have distinctively shown in their classic social contract theories that how citizens and government become morally and politically connected; what makes them obliged to each other.

Entitlements that citizenship promotes have been focused on two grounds: 'territorial and legal economy' and 'symbolic economy' (Simonsen, 2017). The first kind of category observes citizenship in terms of assigned rights and duties upon individuals, what is called the 'rights-based citizenship' idea. 'Rights-based citizenship' idea interprets an individual's entitlement of certain rights and duties which gives her special permission to contribute or participate in major public decisions. Thus, 'Rights-based citizenship' seeks national membership, 'citizenship in a nation-state is inevitably bound up with nationhood and national identity, membership of the state with membership of the nation' (Brubaker, 1992, p.182). Similarly, Wimmer asserts that 'by granting or withholding citizenship from immigrants, states are not so much acting to protect their territorial borders; rather they are managing the boundaries of national membership' (Wimmer, 2013; cited in Simonsen, 2017, p. 3).

The dispute of identity crisis becomes more intense when non-national group acknowledgment demands public acknowledgment of their own cultural identity instead of private allocation which calls for citizenship rights. Liberal multiculturalists explore the meaning of immigrants' citizenship in the feelings of national belongingness. Advocates of this view figure out what lacks immigrants in a host country is the feeling of belongingness to the new nation. What sort of things count as subjective and what of objective is essential to justify an immigrant's necessity of citizenship. One of the common but popular arguments is that immigrant peoples do significant contributions to the economic and political sectors of the host nation. They share the burdens and benefits like the other native people do (Helder & Lea, 2015; Seglow, 2005).

Citizenship Policy, Integration, and Recognition

The value of citizenship depends on the citizenship policy of the state as issues discussed in citizenship policy ultimately fall in the category of identity politics whether it refers to territorial rights or national belonging urges. The citizenship policy of a state demonstrates its governing outlook towards its citizens; how the government is entitling the civic, social, and political rights of the citizens and how far citizens are exercising these privileges. Therefore, a fair citizenship policy can ensure the precise allotment of entitlements that an individual holds to be a citizen. However, though there are relevant debates on the grounds of citizenship policy all I want to discuss here is how the lack of cultural identity recognition affects the citizenship rights of migrant individuals. This given citizenship is controversial because it is tied up with the notions of recognition and integration of the immigrant's cultural identity.

However, there are many kinds of multi-cultural societies. According to Stuart Hall, "The USA, Canada, Britain, France, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, New Zealand, Indonesia, South Africa, and Nigeria all qualify. They are 'multicultural in significantly different ways" (Hall, 2000, p. 210). Similarly, there are existing differences among multi-cultural states and Western liberal democracies in terms of their policies of citizenship, immigration, integration, and multiculturalism (see Fleras and Elliott, 2002; Kymlicka, 1995. 2011). Liberal's and multiculturalists' understandings of the concepts of integration and recognition in terms of immigrants are noteworthy (Tae, 2013). Traditional liberalists endorse the notion of 'assimilation of the minority groups' since they consider culture as a private matter and not worth institutional assessment. However, Kymlicka rejects this kind of scheme which omits minorities and immigrant's distinct cultural identities. Rather he argues that public access to cultural rights is essential for the protection of autonomy and freedom. Cultural values must be publicly recognized as it develops individual's autonomous character (Parvin & Chambers, 2012, p. 258-59).

Liberal multiculturalists' account has mostly preferred the notion of 'integration' for the migrated peoples. This perspective defines 'integration' as a fair means of accommodation of plurality and exercise of particular cultural practices in one territory, whereas 'recognition' means distinct authorized institutional power to made social and political decisions. For migrant groups, many liberals have tried to explain the 'integration' concept from a subjective and objective point of view (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 353-54). Integration becomes objective when it talks about the incorporation of immigrations with the native fellow citizens but its relation to subjective feelings remains personal. However, many liberal multiculturalists like Kymlicka often address the term

'recognition' in a specific manner for the minority groups who, differ from immigrants, have reasonable grounds for claiming institutionalized recognition of their societal cultural identity (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 349-35; Merle, 1998).

Recognition of immigrants' distinct cultural identity and their integration with other nationalities through citizenship policy is crucial. Because, in migration, "identity formation is a relational (and oppositional) process, recognition is an element that often appears in opposition to other groups or persons" (Barbera, 2015, p. 2). It is not about only showing respect to the moral worth of the individuals but it provides immigrants with the opportunity to put their own choices into action. Without cultural recognition, giving citizenship to non-national persons means recognition as a citizen without independent choice to a life plan, and thus, they cannot enjoy the citizenship rights to the fullest. One might argue that immigrants can enjoy their citizenship rights despite being migrated into another cultural identity (Merle, 1998). Perhaps, I think, the significant questions here are whether this integration is happening with the consent of the immigrants or not and do immigrants have the right to ask for public recognition if they want to uphold their own cultural identity.

Liberal Accounts of Immigrant's Cultural Rights

Two dominant liberal camps have understood immigrant's cultural identity and citizenship differently. The first group consists of communitarian, nationalistic, and cosmopolitan believers, though opposite to each other, which put restrictions on the demand of recognition of the migrated groups. The communitarian vision strongly defends absolute state sovereignty and territorial boundary in which any kind of admission requires the sole consent of state authority (Seglow, 2005). However, after 1980, nationalism and cosmopolitanism approaches come forward refuting communitarian arguments to provide new ethical directions to the rights of immigrants. Nationalism or democratic associational group (a group of liberalists) advocates for national individual's authority, and therefore, insists on the close border, to some extent, for the sake of individual authority and their membership in a political community (Zapata-Barrero & Pecoud, 2012). P. Meilaender (2001) and Brian Barry (2001) have implicit immigrant's citizenship based on democratic associational arguments wherein an individual's authority in a certain political community gets precedence over state sovereignty since a particular political community is a pre-requisite of the liberal idea.

Insofar, this kind of liberal interpretation is less sensitive to the value of pluralism and limits the universal outlook of the liberal idea which is not the real character of liberalism. Its prescribed restrictions on

immigrants contravene the liberal principles and demoralize the equality and rights of freedom of the person. That is why some thinkers try to amalgamate these approaches from a broader sense developing many considerable arguments against absolute state sovereignty (Carens, 1987). Jonathan Seglow (2005) upholds a cosmopolitan idea that synthesizes 'global redistributive justice' with the 'value of democratic association' for an open border. He argues that an individual's right to free movement endorses the right to immigrate to other states. Beyond the bubbles, some thinkers move towards the 'mandatory citizenship for immigrants' claiming that the way the state has a mandatory obligation to give citizenship to the long-term residence, immigrants compulsorily have to be accepted in the same way (Helder & Lea, 2015). However, what significantly lacks in this camp is the cognitive justifications of how this idea is coherent with the liberal principles and why it is not unfair to the immigrants.

The second group, which consists of social liberals and multicultural advocates, has endowed some answers to these questions. Liberal multiculturalism conveys the value of cultural pluralism or politics of difference and mostly accommodates the challenges of a multicultural society. It understands the liberal principles as every person is equally free to choose her life plan from their best rational understandings in terms of cultural rights. Joseph Raz (1998), Bhikhu Parekh (2000), and many further developed this idea after 1980 (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 334-36). Individual's cultural identity should be protected for the sake of individual's autonomy which depicts one's right of free choice, and thus, a liberal state should protect and accommodate each person's freedom and relevant contents that can help to construct their autonomous character (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 84-85). Emphasizing on 'group-differentiate cultural rights', liberal multiculturalists' idea extends the core liberal notion of "all individual is free and morally equal" to the issues of minority's cultural rights in a comprehensive way. The argument of liberal multiculturalism thus follows:

- i) Every autonomous individual are entitled to some basic rights like freedom of choice, movement, and expression
- ii) This identity of individuals developed on a certain background e.g. culture
- iii) With this identity, they can enter into any territory for their reasonable needs
- iv) If the government of a particular liberal territory excludes them forcefully or don't accommodate them with basic social and political rights, it would be unfair to their autonomy and basic rights
- v) Therefore, such acts would be considered as contradict the liberal idea of a democratic state

Two grounds are of most importance to this doctrine: firstly, the interconnectedness between autonomy and cultural rights; and, secondly, the equal social and political rights to the minority groups. Following the first ground, liberal multiculturalists argue that an individual's autonomy and cultural identity are deeply interconnected. Joseph Raz narrates culture as "the network of values and norms which provides the context in which we make autonomous choices" (cited in Parvin & Chambers, 2012, p. 58). Since, a person's autonomy is primarily concerned with the choice of his way to live life, each right of individual's promote their autonomy and enable them with the opportunity to understand and decide their way of living (Carens, 1992). Likely, Adam and David Miller have also contended that 'each right has a ground in the interest people have in autonomy' (Adam, 2013). Thus, any infliction on cultural identity will be considered as disrespect to autonomy. Perhaps, the second ground is broadly discussed later in Kymlicka's idea. Hence, John Rawls's and Will Kymlicka's liberal views are very remarkable to enlighten the rationale of immigrant's cultural rights.

John Rawls is undoubtedly one of the most influential moral philosophers of the 20th century of the liberal tradition, defending individual freedom and equality. In Rawlsian liberalism, every person is equally considered as an autonomous and rational agent. Under the influence of Immanuel Kant, Rawls believes these qualities are sturdy enough to dignify an individual's judgment in choosing the right option or life plan. As discussed in *A Theory of Justice* (1971), Rawls' theory of justice as fairness describes a society of free citizens holding equal basic rights and cooperating within an egalitarian economic system and is based upon two principles: "First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive scheme of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar scheme of liberties for others. Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all" (Rawls, 1971, p. 52). For Rawls, these principles primarily apply to the basic structure of society and govern the assignment of rights and duties, and thus regulate the distribution of social and economic advantages. By the term basic structure, Rawls refers to those major social institutions of society such as legal protection of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, competitive markets, private property in the means of production, and the monogamous family which not only distribute fundamental rights and duties but also determine the division of advantages from social cooperation (Rawls, 1971, p. 6).

Rawls develops his theory of justice based on a methodology and hypothetical game of thinking of non-discriminatory and egalitarian

justice based on individual's freedom and rights what he calls, "veil of ignorance", the original position, to nullify the effects of specific contingencies which put men at odds and tempt them to exploit social and natural circumstances to their advantage. According to Rawls, the veil of ignorance situates the representatives of free and equal citizens fairly with respect to one another; no party can press for agreement on principles that will at random favor the particular citizen they represent, because no party knows the specific attributes of the citizen they represent. The situation of the parties thus embodies reasonable conditions, within which the parties can make a rational agreement. Each party tries to agree to principles that will be best for the citizen they represent (i.e., that will maximize that citizen's share of primary goods). Since the parties are fairly situated, the agreement they reach will be fair to all actual citizens (see Rawls, 1971, p. 118-143).

Perhaps, the noteworthy part of his hypothetical game of 'veil of ignorance is that it connects many a significant thing; e.g. culture. Rational agents conditionally would be unaware of so many things behind the veil including their cultural status (see Rawls, 1971, p.136-149). Individuals in that position would not be enthusiastic to stake their own cultural identity to be affected or dominated by the cultural practices of others. They would be agreed on those principles which possibly can hold the value of an individual's cultural status irrespective of any context like other identities. However, Rawls's awareness of natural and social inequality among individuals can be understood as a reasonable justification for the cultural rights of the immigrants. His 'difference principle' has been a breakthrough for dealing with the differences and inequalities among individuals. Rawls concerns that disadvantaged people are subject to special treatment since they are entitled to the same moral worth. Along with individual's basic rights, distribution of primary goods, promoting special treatment, and accommodating public policy for protecting disadvantaged people have been the salient attention of his given principles of justice (see Rawls 1971, p. 60-83). For Rawls, culture is one of the primary social goods which individuals can freely choose from their equal option or freedom of choice.

In respect, both in *A Theory of Justice* (1971) and *Law of the People* (1999), Rawls has highlighted the importance of an individual's belongings to a political community. He stresses the preservation of precise territory since it is an asset to take care of by the citizens of that state. But what remains the main concern in his both texts is the equal rights and freedom of each person; the central liberal gist. This main spirit of Rawls's liberal idea would not let the nationalistic argument be sustained rather the idea of equal freedom and liberty endorses a normative basis for the positive and equal treatment of immigrants in a

receiving country. In the main, liberal principles of justice by their nature are obliged to ensure immigrant's cultural identity through assimilation.

On the other hand, who revised and extended Rawls's liberal idea to the notion of group rights is the renowned political philosopher Will Kymlicka. As shown by Will Kymlicka in his most authoritative and celebrated work, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Rawls' theory of justice provides a starting point for the critique of existing multiculturalism from minorities' point of view, it is not enough to justify the recognition of any individual and collective cultural rights of minority groups (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 85-92). According to Kymlicka, the modern world is divided into "societal cultures", which are associated with national groups (Kymlicka, 1995, p.75). Individual freedom, which is central to the liberal tradition, is not only intimately tied up with membership in these societal cultures, but dependent on the presence of societal culture. Therefore, it matters that minorities have access to their own social culture, providing "meaningful ways of life across a full range of human activities", including social, educational, religious, recreational, and economic life. As such, linking individual freedom with cultural membership, Kymlicka offered an entirely new liberal framework for considering the cultural rights of minorities in a manner consistent with liberalism; however, he did not have unqualified support for immigrant culture or cultural rights.

For Kymlicka, all Western democracies are either multinational or poly-ethnic, or both in which there are two kinds of minorities: national minority and poly-ethnic groups or immigrants. The first was, for example, First Nations or Quebecois in Canada, the groups who present at the founding of the country and have prior history, societal cultures, and self-government. These groups Kymlicka argue, given their history and societal culture, deserve special group differentiated rights including the rights to self-government and special representation (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 27-33). On the other hand, immigrants or poly-ethnic groups lacking societal culture may be granted polyethnic rights which facilitate their assimilation into the majority culture while encouraging the maintenance of some aspects of ethnic particularity (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 78-9). On the ground of historical evidence, Kymlicka has figured out how the motivation, demand, and desire of national minorities and immigrants are qualitatively different, for what he uses the term 'recognition for the former groups and 'integration' for the latter groups (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 351).

For Kymlicka, national minority groups are "formed complete and functioning societies in their historic homeland before being incorporated into a larger state" (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 349). They primarily stipulate on

the acquaintance of 'institutionally complete society' which means the recognition of a separate 'parallel society' with 'self-governing powers' before integration (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 15). These groups have several qualitative aspects that differentiate them from the immigrants such as traditional territory, regional autonomy, and distinct societal cultures, self-government social and political powers that never allowed them to be detached from their sole demand of 'nationhood' (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 351). However, to show how individuals are being disrespected and discriminated against despite having standard social-economic status in the western country Kymlicka differentiates the value of cultural status from social-economic status and claim for special treatment of the national minorities. He further argues that promoting policies to accommodate cultural differences does not affect the rights of majority groups rather not promoting such policies hamper an individual's culturally distinct identity (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 351-52).

On the other side, immigrants are those who "wish to integrate into the larger society and to be accepted as full members of it. While they often seek greater recognition of their ethnic identity, their aim is not to become a separate and self-governing nation alongside the larger society, but to modify the institutions and laws of the mainstream society to make them more accommodating of cultural differences" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 10-11). They purposively and voluntarily decided on migration to become citizens and to be integrated into the larger society accepting certain conditions which entirely take away their rights to claim separate societal cultures or to have special treatment. Unlike refugees, who show involuntary migration in another country, an individual's choice of immigration necessarily embraces three aspects: it is a voluntary choice of the individuals, it capitulate one's cultural rights, and it is primarily motivated to integration. Individual's voluntary choice of migration separates them from their societal cultures and left them only with the option of integration into the host national culture, and therefore, Kymlicka does not see any qualitative differences between immigrants and national people (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 25).

Kymlicka rightly assumed the importance of discussing the cultural rights of immigrants since recognition of cultural identity was never apart from their motivation, which immigrants historically exhibited again and again. He has witnessed how the new migration policies are forcing the immigrants towards involuntary integration and to induce national cultural practices of the host country (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 18). Unfair and coercive migration requirements over the immigrant minorities that Kymlicka strongly holds impose unnecessary costs on them, and therefore, western democratic states have the obligations to minimize any

kind of sufferings and discriminations towards them that relate to integration. Moreover, immigrant's association and contributions to the minority communities and larger society cannot be ignored which significantly develop a ground for the demand of "fair terms of integration" such as accommodation of their native language, institutional recognition, and respect to their cultural identity, and also entail certain responsibilities of the basic institutions regarding this (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 354-55). Thus, Kymlicka proposed 'polyethnic rights' which are "intended to help ethnic groups and religious minorities express their cultural particularity and pride without hampering their success in the economic and political institutions of the dominant society and these rights are usually intended to promote integration into the larger society, not self-government" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 31). Immigrants or 'polyethnic groups' thus can demand distinct cultural identity for not to be discriminated against and disadvantaged without asking for separate 'parallel society' and 'self-governing powers'. The scopes and rights Kymlicka defend the immigrants are limited to "maintain some of their old customs regarding food, dress, recreation, religion, and to associate with each other to maintain these practices" (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 354).

Some Observations

I believe, the liberal idea does not teach us to be liberal only about our own cultural identity rather inspires us to be liberal in promoting the same space for others. Among all the discussions, Kymlicka has posited some elaborate arguments for immigrant's cultural rights. But his idea confronts some criticisms and limitations. Bhikhu Parekh puts an opposite way of considering Kymlicka's idea that it 'makes little sense to say that one's culture is confined to one's country (Parekh, 2000, p. 103). Choice of immigration, refuting Kymlicka's arguments, is not equal to cultural alienation. Distinct ethnic origins indicate distinctness of culture and not all the cultural aspects contain in institutionalization and thus strengthen immigrants' distinct ethnicity (Kasper, 2011). Kymlicka's proposed polyethnic rights are a 'second-level concern' that has no impact on the major institutional policy. Immigrant's contributions to the host country and in other cultural organizations constitute some categories of minority rights (Merle, 1998). Moreover, immigrants' active participation in the state sphere and their contributions to the cultural and ethnic projects imply their cultural rights in citizenship in minority groups. "Continues immigration strengthens the character of an ethnic group" and, therefore, voluntary choice of immigration cannot be acceptable ground for the sacrifice of their cultural recognition or special treatment (Tae, 2013, p. 401).

At present, immigrants are showing their reluctance to integrate and seeking recognition and permanent citizenship (Mehmet, 2014). With

their autonomous and free nature, they can place their demand for the public recognition of cultural identity irrespective of any context. Lawfully, minorities have equal citizenship rights. "Recognition and protection of the rights of minorities is indubitably an effective model of accommodating the interests of minority groups, such as immigrants in society" (Elisa, 2017, p.125). In many cases, these arguments also compatible to refute the conservative thought of western liberal states like to say that the value of cultural identity is not reducible to the idea of special treatment. But many hold that disregarding their distinct identity affects the life opportunities of the immigrants who share both the benefits and burdens of the host nation (Seglow, 2005; Helder & Lea, 2015). Instead, whatever can penetrate individual autonomy is worth dismissed or rectification; a liberal idea entitled with that right. Ignoring the present context, Kymlicka only stands on the claim that voluntary migration is the result of rational choice which cannot place any claim for rectification.

Usually, immigrants find themselves in another state "without a history and an image". Faced with an unknown universe of meanings, migrants feel lost, alone, and without reference points and "as much as they strive to become integrate, migrants remain strangers" (Barbera, 2015, P. 3). The lack of recognition highly affects immigrant's choice of good life and exercise of fundamental rights. So, public policy for promoting this without harming other's identities is thus always welcoming. The value of cultural identity should not be undermined at any cost and it should not conflict with the value of other's cultures as well. Hence, citizenship policy can be effective means for the recognition and integration of immigrant's cultural identity.

Concluding Remarks

Today's migration policies are making individuals' basic rights unfairly conditional. The policy that restricts immigrant's cultural identity is ultimately degrading the ownership value of people. In the above discussion, I have tried to frame the essentiality of individual cultural identity recognition through liberal citizenship policy. A commonsensical fact is that if the culture does not play any vital role in edifying an individual's identity then why people not willing to leave their own culture or to accept other cultures or why such conflicts increasing day today. Rawls's liberal theory and liberal multiculturalists' approach comprehensively show an inevitable connection between an individual's rational choice and cultural identity, though with some limitations. Furthermore, liberal multiculturalists' stress on public policy makes the practical feasibility of recognition and integration of immigrants' cultural identity. Therefore, the grounds that endorse the rights of immigrants

similarly foster the significant role of citizenship policy in this regard. The importance of cultural identity needs to be informed by the public policy which is required for liberal governance, and so as, the state has a moral obligation to extend citizenship rights to the migrant peoples. I firmly believe that their proposed liberal ways, more or less, to promote and accommodate an individual's cultural identity can demonstrate us a way to reduce today's identity crisis of the immigrants in a receiving country.

References

- Adam Hosein (2013). Immigration and freedom of Movement. *Ethics & Global Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 25-37.
- Barry, Brian (2001). *Culture & Equality*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Barry and Robert E. Goodin (1992). *Free movement: Ethical Issues in the Transnational Migration of People and Money*, The Pennsylvania State Press, University Park, PA.
- Barbera MariaCaterina La (2015). *Identity and Migration in Europe: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (ed.), Springer International Publishing, Switzerland.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Carens, H. Joseph (1987). The Case for Open Borders. *The Review of Politics*, Cambridge University Press, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 250- 273.
- Carens, H. Joseph (1992). Migration and Morality: A Liberal Egalitarian Perspective. Eds. Brian
- Elisa Ortega Velazquez (2017). Minority rights for immigrants: From multiculturalism to civic participation. *Mexican Review Law*, Vol. X, No. 1, pp. 103-126.
- Fleras, A., & Elliott, J. L. (2002). *Engaging diversity: multiculturalism in Canada*. Nelson Thomson Learning, Toronto.
- Hall, S. (2000). Conclusion: The Multicultural Question. In Hesse. B (ed.). *Un/settled Multiculturalisms. Diaspora, Entanglements, Transruptions*, Zed Books, London, pp. 209-241.
- Helder De Schutter & Lea Ypi (2015). The British Academy Brian Barry

Essay: Mandatory Citizenship for Immigrants. *British Journal of Political Science*, Cambridge University Press, Issue, 45, pp. 235-251.

Jean-Christophe Merle (1998). Cultural Minority Rights and the Rights of the Majority in the Liberal State. *Ratio Juris*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, UK, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 259-77.

Jonathan Seglow (2005). The Ethics of Immigration. *Political Studies Review*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, UK, Vol. 3, pp. 317-334.

Kasper Lipper-Rasmussen (2011). Immigrants, Multiculturalism, and Expensive Cultural Tastes: Quong on Luck Egalitarianism and Cultural Minority Rights. *The Ethics Forum*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 176-192.

Kymlicka, Will (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Kymlicka, Will (2002). *CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY: AN INTRODUCTION* (Second edition). Oxford University Press, New York.

Kymlicka, W. (2011). Multicultural citizenship within multinational states. *Ethnicities*, Issue. 11(3), pp. 281-302.

Mehmet Evkuran (2014). Migration, Cultural Interaction, and Multiculturalism in Global World. *Hitit University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, Year 7, Issue 1, pp. 8-19.

Meilaender, p. (2001). *Towards a Theory of Immigration*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Miller, David (2005). Immigration: The Case for Limits. Eds. Andrew Cohen and Christopher Heath Wellman, *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 193-206.

Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Macmillan press ltd, London.

Parvin, Phil & Chambers, Clare (2012). *POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY: A complete introduction*. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc. US.

Raz, Joseph (1998). Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective. *Ratio Juris*, Issue. 11/3, pp. 193-205.

Rawls, John (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Mass, Belk nap Press of

Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Rawls, John (1999). *The Law of Peoples*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Robert Nozick (1974). *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Basic Books, New York.

Schutter, De Helder & Ypi, Lea (2015). The British Academy Brian Barry Prize Essay: Mandatory Citizenship for Immigrants. *British Journal of Political Science*, Cambridge University Press, No. 45, pp. 235-251.

Simonsen, Bakkaer Kristina (2017). Does citizenship always further immigrant's feeling of belonging to the host nation? A study of policies and public attitudes in 14 western democracies. *Comparative Migration Studies*, Springer open, Issue. 5:3, pp. 1-17.

Tae Eun Min (2013). Liberals, Kymlicka and Asian Immigrants' Assimilation. *The Korean Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 395-415.

Verkuyten, M. & Yildiz, A. (2007). National (dis)identification and ethnic and religious identity: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, Issue. 33(10), p. 1448-1462.

Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of Justice*. Basic Books, New York.

Wimmer, A. (2013). *Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Zapata-Barrero, Richard & Pecoud, Antoine (2012). Introduction: New Perspectives on the Ethics of International Migration. *American Behavioral Scientist*, SAGE Publication.