

---

## UNIT 24 INDIVIDUALISM AND COMMUNITARIANISM

---

Gandhism (Dharma, Swaraj, Sarvodaya and Satyagraha)

### Structure

- 24.0 Objectives
- 24.1 Introduction
  - 24.1.1 Individualist Versus Communitarian Position
  - 24.1.2 Relevance in the Indian Context
- 24.2 Meaning and Development of Individualism
  - 24.2.1 Atomism and Methodological Individualism
  - 24.2.2 Views of Contractualists Including John Rawls
  - 24.2.3 Views of Utilitarians
- 24.3 The Individualist Conception of the Self
- 24.4 The Individualist Theory of the Nature and Functions of the State
  - 24.4.1 Functions of State and Government
- 24.5 Communitarianism: An Introduction
- 24.6 The Communitarian Critique of the Individualist Conception of the Self
  - 24.6.1 Two Main Limitations of Individualism
- 24.7 The Communitarian Critique of the Idea of State Neutrality
- 24.8 Let Us Sum Up
- 24.9 Some Useful References
- 24.10 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

---

### 24.0 OBJECTIVES

---

Our objective in this unit is to understand and assess one of the major ongoing debates in contemporary political theory; namely, the debate between liberal individualism and communitarianism. After studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Understand the individualistic theory of the nature and functions of state;
- Describe and assess the communitarian critique of liberal individualism;
- Compare the major theoretical positions of individualism and communitarianism; and
- Understand the relevance of this debate to contemporary political theory and practice.

---

### 24.1 INTRODUCTION

---

In this unit, you will be introduced to one of the central debates in contemporary political theory, namely, the debate between liberal individualism and communitarianism.

The debate between individualism and communitarianism developed and became central to political theory during the 1980s with the publication of Michael Sandel's *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (1982). In this book, Sandel develops one of the most forceful critiques of Rawlsian liberalism, the statement of which is found in John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* (1971). Since then, this debate has continued in one way or the other to inform a great deal of political theory. Infact, some of the major developments and concerns of contemporary political theory are based on arguments which emanate from this debate.

At the center of the debate between individualism and communitarianism is the question: should the just state be constructed from the standpoint of how to foster the well being of individuals or from the standpoint of how to realise an ideal community? Is political reality shaped by decisions and actions of individuals, defined as persons standing at a distance (or separate) from community bonds or is it shaped by social beings whose identity and behaviour is defined by social groups/communities to which they belong? In other words, is the basic unit of political analysis the individual or the community?

### 24.1.1 Individualist Versus Communitarian Position

In responding to this question, individualists and communitarians hold different and apparently conflicting positions. While the individualists see political reality as being shaped by decisions and actions of free and rights-bearing individuals, communitarians emphasize the relationship between the person and the community and see this relationship to be the basis of politics. This debate may then be characterised as one between those who favour individual rights and autonomy and those who emphasize the bonds of community in political life.

### 24.1.2 Relevance in the Indian Context

The debate between individualism and communitarianism is particularly relevant to the Indian context. The Indian Constitution deviates from the traditional liberal framework, which guarantees individual rights and ignores the rights of community membership. It endorses and accepts the twin ideals of individual autonomy and community membership. The Constitution contains both the guarantee of individual civil rights and liberties and the principle of equal respect for all communities. A study of the debate between individualism and communitarianism is, therefore, also important for understanding some of the questions and issues in contemporary Indian political theory and practice.

It would be helpful to note that there are different varieties of individualism and communitarianism. In this unit, we shall study some of the key arguments and themes contained in these theoretical positions.

We begin with an introduction to the meaning and origin of liberal individualism. We then go on to understand some of the main arguments of individualistic perspective, namely, the conception of self and understanding of the nature and functions of the state. This is followed by an introduction to the communitarian critique of liberal individualism. We, then, examine the positions held by communitarians on the conception of the person and the nature and functions of the state. The unit concludes by highlighting some of the main contributions and limitations of individualism and communitarianism.

#### Check Your Progress 1

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What is the fundamental difference between Individualism and Communitarianism?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- 2) How is the debate between Individualism and Communitarianism relevant to the Indian Context?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 24.2 MEANING AND DEVELOPMENT OF INDIVIDUALISM

---

Individualism is one of the several theories of relationship between the citizen and the state and of the proper scope of state activities. Other theories of this relationship, which oppose the theory of individualism are socialism, sarvodaya, fascism and communitarianism, which we will study later in this unit. What distinguishes individualism from these other theories is its emphasis on the individual as the primary unit in political and social theory.

Some of the main advocates of individualism have been Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Herbert Spencer and more recently, F.A. Hayek and Robert Nozick. In India, Mahadeo Govind Ranade and the Swatantra Party mainly supported the individualistic view.

### 24.2.1 Atomism and Methodological Individualism

The concept of individualism is one of the main features of liberal political thought, the other features being universalism, egalitarianism, secularism and the separation between the public and the private. The idea of individualism covers a wide variety of ideas, attitudes and doctrines. At the heart of these ideas and doctrines is the systematic according of primacy to the individual over any social group, community or collective. The individual is regarded as an end in itself while political, economic and social institutions are considered as a mere means to that end. This idea of individualism is called 'Atomism' - a view of society constituted by individuals for fulfillment of ends, which are primarily individualistic and which exist antecedently or prior to any particular form of social life. Individualism also refers to the doctrine about the centrality of individual to any political theory or social explanation. This doctrine is called 'Methodological Individualism' - a doctrine that asserts that no explanation in social science or history can be fundamental unless based upon facts and features of individuals, their properties, goals, beliefs and actions. In other words, social wholes or the aggregate pattern of behavior must always be explained in terms of the individual.

More importantly, the theory of individualism relates to the principle of laissez-faire - a French phrase that means 'leave alone' or 'allow (us) to do'. The principle of laissez faire is a principle of economic individualism and is a part of the broader theory of relationship between the state and the citizen. It was the battle cry of tradesmen, moneylenders and small manufacturers of 18<sup>th</sup> century France and England, who felt constrained by the controls and regulations of the mercantilist state. The mercantilist state was characterised by a great deal of state intervention in the economy. In contrast, economic laissez-faire stood for the policy of non-intervention or minimal intervention by state in the economic sphere. The economy, it was felt,

should be left to operate in accordance with the demand and supply mechanism of the market. Laissez-faire or economic individualism, in other words, stands for limited government and free trade.

**24.2.2 Views of Contractualists including John Rawls**

Individualism is essentially a modern phenomenon that began to take shape in the 17<sup>th</sup> century in the writings of Hobbes and Locke. Since the times of Hobbes and Locke, liberal political theory has made it its primary purpose to explore the relationship between the individual and the state. According to most liberal political theories, all individuals have inalienable rights. Government derives its powers from the consent of those who are to be governed. This consent is expressed by and established on the basis of a social contract between the governed and those who govern. The distinctive feature of the individualistic position, however, is the claim that the parties to the social contract are essentially people acting as individuals, and not as representatives of a cultural or collective group. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau spoke of a number of men establishing the state through a social contract and were explicit about eliminating associations and groups intermediate between the individual and the state. Infact, Rousseau maintained that if the General Will is to be truly expressed, it is essential that there are no subsidiary groups within the state. The most recent major exponent of the contractarian point of view, John Rawls, likewise assumes that the parties in the ‘Original Position’ who work out the principles of justice are individuals who speak for themselves. Moreover, the justice that they speak of is only for individuals. While Rawls does show some concern for social classes, he does not raise the question of whether community/groups should be considered as entities with claims to justice.

**24.2.3 Views of Utilitarians**

Emphasis on the individual is not confined to the social contract perspective in liberal political thought. In speaking of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, utilitarians such as Jeremy Bentham and J.S.Mill also had individuals in mind. In fact, in his work *On Liberty*, Mill emphasized the liberty of the individual and the need of the state to stay out of private concerns. Similarly, those who speak of the consent of the governed usually take it as an obvious assumption that the consent is to come from individuals. Further, the theories of democracy which deal with the concept of one man-one vote, one vote-one value and majority rule clearly have individuals in mind.

As seen above, individualism has guided much of modern liberal political thought. However, the theory of individualism is not universally accepted or is free of criticism. Political theory today is deeply divided about the relationship between the state and the citizen as well as about the proper scope of state activities. In the next section, we will examine some of the major assumptions about liberal individualism, which have come under attack from communitarianism.

**Check Your Progress 2**

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What do you understand by ‘Atomism’ and ‘Methodological Individualism’?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2) Discuss the views of contractualists on Individualism.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

### 24.3 THE INDIVIDUALIST CONCEPTION OF THE SELF

---

Central to the theory of individualism is its conception or understanding of the self. Infact, individualism builds its understanding of relations between the state and the citizen as well as the proper scope of state activities on the basis of its conception of the self. In this section, we will study the individualist conception of the self or person.

In the individualist view, people are free, rational and capable of self-determination. People are rational in that they are the best judges of their interest. They are capable of self-determination; that is, they are capable of determining their own conception of good life. A person's conception of good life is his set of beliefs and values about how he should lead his life and about what makes life worthwhile. People are free in the sense that they possess the ability as well as the right to question their participation in existing social practices and to opt out of them, should these practices no longer remain worthwhile. Individuals, in other words, are free to question and reject or revise any particular social relation. We, as individuals, have the ability to detach ourselves or step back from any particular social practice and question whether we want to continue pursuing it or not. No particular task or end is set for us by society; no end is exempt from a possible revision or rejection by the self. A person's goals, aims and ends are always things that he chooses to attach himself to and therefore, detach himself from, when they are no longer worthy of such attachment. A person is, thus, related to his ends, goals by an exercise of will. Rawls expresses this argument in the following phrase: 'the self is prior to the ends, which are affirmed by it'.

In the individualist view then, individual freedom of choice is needed precisely to find out what is valuable in life, to form, examine and revise our beliefs and values. People must have necessary resources and liberties needed to live their lives in accordance with their beliefs and values without being penalised (thus civil and personal liberties). They must also have cultural conditions necessary to acquire an awareness of different views about the good life and to acquire an ability to examine these views intelligently (thus concern for education and the freedom of expression).

On the basis of the conception of the individual as free, rational and capable of self-determination, individualists develop their theory about the relationship between the citizen and the state and of the nature and functions of the state.

#### Check Your Progress 3

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.  
ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

- 1) Discuss the individualist conception of the self.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 24.4 THE INDIVIDUALIST THEORY OF THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE

---

The individualist theory of the nature and functions of the state is based on its conception of the self as free, rational and self-determining. According to individualism, since individuals are free, rational and capable of self-determination, their interests are better promoted by letting them choose for themselves what sort of life they want to lead. Individual interests are harmed by attempts by the state to enforce a particular view of good life. In the individualist view, the conception of the self as free, rational and self-determining necessarily requires a conception of the state as neutral and minimalist. The primary value in the political order for individualism must, then, be the neutrality of the state. Infact, a distinctive feature of liberal individualism is its emphasis on the state as a neutral and minimal political authority.

A neutral state may be defined as a state, which does not favour, protect, promote or contrarily, discriminate against or penalise any particular individual conception of good. Rather, such a state provides a neutral framework within which different and potentially conflicting conceptions of good can be pursued. It is committed to tolerating different views and conceptions of good life held by its citizens. In other words, the neutral state does not enforce a particular conception of good life. Instead it stays out of the peoples’ decisions regarding the best way to lead their lives, thereby leaving each individual free (to an extent possible) to pursue his/her own conception of good or way of life.

### 24.4.1 Functions of State and Government

What, according to individualism, are the legitimate functions of state and government? In the individualistic view, people have their natural or pre-political freedom. Government arises out of the consent of the governed. State is not a natural entity; rather, it is an artificial but necessary construct. State, infact, is defined as a necessary evil. Since it is a necessary evil, the government that rules the least is considered the best. The functions and role of state are, therefore, limited to guarantee and protection of individual rights and freedom. In other words, the role of state is minimal and limited to the maintenance of law and order and the provision of security to its citizens, beyond which they should be left free. The state should interfere in the liberty of citizens only to prevent one individual from unnecessarily interfering in the liberty of others.

The understanding of the state as neutral and minimalist corresponds to the principle of laissez-faire discussed above, which argues for leaving the individual free from excessive and unjustifiable state intervention and control. In the individualist view, a state that defines its duties beyond that of security and the protection of individual rights restricts freedom and the self-determination of its citizens.



Individualism, thus, sees an inverse relation between the expansion of state activities and the enlargement of the sphere of individual rights and freedom.

The individualist conception of self, its understanding of relationship between the state and the citizen and the proper scope of state activities have been criticised by a number of theoretical perspectives, some of which are fascism, sarvodaya, communism and feminism. However the most profound critique of the individualist perspective is found in the theory of communitarianism. Below, we examine the communitarian critique of individualism.

#### Check Your Progress 4

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Discuss the role/functions of the state in the individualist theory.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

### 24.5 COMMUNITARIANISM: AN INTRODUCTION

---

Since the 1980s, the theory of liberal individualism has found its most distinctive and rigorous challenge and critique in what has been labelled as communitarianism. As mentioned above, the term *communitarian* was first elicited by Michael Sandel in his work *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (1982) in which he developed a critique of the liberal individualist foundations of John Rawls’s theory of liberal justice. Some of the other communitarian critics of liberal individualism are Alisdair MacIntyre, Michael Walzer and Charles Taylor. These communitarian thinkers are highly inspired by Hegel and Rousseau.

Communitarians are first and foremost concerned with community. Two or more people constitute a community when they share a common conception of good and see this good as partly constitutive of their identity or selves. Such a “constitutive community” may be a close friendship, family relationship, neighbourhood or even a comprehensive political community.

Communitarians insist that each of us as individuals develops our identity, talents and pursuit in life only in the context of a community. We are by nature social beings. Since the community determines and shapes the individual nature, political life must start with a concern for the community, and not the individual. In other words, the locus of philosophical concern in reflecting on the ideal and the just state must be the community and not the individual.

The main fault of liberal individualism according to communitarian thinkers, is then that it is mistakenly and irreparably individualistic. The liberal conception of the relationship between the individual and the state is, according to communitarianism, unduly limited as well as misrepresentative of the true nature of society. In the communitarian view, it is not enough to think in terms of a two-level relationship; with the individual at one level and the state at the other. Groups and communities occupy

an intermediate position between the individual and the state and should be included among the kinds of rights-and duty-bearing units whose inter-relationships are explored. According to communitarians, by emphasising rights and freedom of individuals over society, liberal individualism neglects the importance of community membership and identity to social and political life. It ignores the extent to which the society/community in which people live shapes who they are and the values they have.

Although communitarian critics focus on different aspects of liberal individualism, it is possible to identify some of the main themes and arguments, such as the critique of the liberal-individualist conception of self and its understanding of the nature and functions of the state. Below, we will study the communitarian critique of liberal individualism with reference to these arguments.

**Check Your Progress 5**

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.
- ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What is Communitarianism? Explain.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

**24.6 THE COMMUNITARIAN CRITIQUE OF THE INDIVIDUALIST CONCEPTION OF THE SELF**

---

A great deal of communitarian thought has presented itself in terms of an explicit reference to and a rejection of the individualistic conception of self. The general shape of this communitarian claim is that individualistic political theory takes us (as individuals) to be too distant/separate from our social ends and conceptions of the good in a way that simply fails to correspond to the way in which we actually relate to these ends.

**24.6.1 Two Main Limitations of Individualism**

Communitarians point to two main limitations of the liberal individualist understanding of the self as detached and separate from social ends: first, it devalues, discounts and downgrades the importance of the community; and second, it presupposes a defective conception of the relation between the self and its ends.

Regarding the first criticism, communitarianism challenges liberal individualism for downgrading and discounting the importance of the community and more specifically, for ignoring the extent to which it is the society or the community which people live in that shape who they are and the values they have.



As seen above, individualism understands people to be self-sufficient outside of society and not in need of any community context in order to develop and exercise their capacities for self-determination. In other words, individualism does not recognise the importance of community membership in shaping a good life for the individual. Communitarians argue that the liberal picture of individuals picking and choosing their conceptions of the good is facile. Sandel and MacIntyre argue that Rawls exaggerates our capacity to stand back from and question our social roles and views the self as 'unencumbered'. On the contrary, communitarians argue that the self is 'embedded' in existing social practices.

For communitarianism, however, the community is a fundamental and an irreplaceable ingredient in the good life of the person. However resilient and independent people may be human existence outside social and community life is unthinkable. People, according to communitarians, are not Robinson Crusoes able to live in complete and permanent isolation. Rather individuals are constituted, and their identity shaped, by the community to which they belong. We, as human beings, are essentially members of a family, religion, tribe, race and nation. As such, rather than being distant from social and community ends and values, we have a history and are placed in specific social circumstances. The attachments and the moral engagements from these community membership determines "who we are" and shape "the values we have". Communitarians, thus, criticise liberal individualism for producing a particular conception of self, which is divorced from the social reality that constitutes it.

As for the second criticism, communitarianism criticises individualism for holding a mistaken or a false understanding of the relationship between the individual self and its ends. As discussed above, individualism understands 'the self to be prior to its ends' in the sense that individuals reserve the right to question, revise and reject their most deeply held convictions about the nature of good life, if these are found to be no longer worth pursuing.

According to communitarianism, to accept this understanding of self is to see oneself as disembodied, unencumbered and sharing a voluntary relationship with one's social ends and attachments. They oppose this voluntaristic picture of the relationship between the self and its ends assumed by individualism. According to them, this picture ignores the way we are embedded or situated and partially constituted by social roles and community membership.

Criticising the individualist conception of the self, communitarians ask whether we can really step back from particular values that we have and change them for new ones, or are we rather made the very people that we are by the values that we endorse so that detachment is impossible? Human beings, they argue, are essentially social beings. As such, we neither choose nor reject our social and community ends and attachments; rather we discover them. We are neither free nor standing at a distance from our social and community ends; instead, we find ourselves located/situated in them. For instance, we do not choose our family, caste or nation; we find ourselves located in them. We, then, determine our conception of the good and ends given our place, position and situation in a family, religion and nation. According to communitarianism, we are never free from all social roles and community identities. Our membership of social groups and communities determine and constitute our identity and understanding of good life. We cannot always stand back and opt out of social relations and community membership. Our social relations and roles, or at least some must be taken as given. As Sandel notes 'I can interpret the meaning of the roles I find myself in, but I cannot reject the roles themselves, or the goals internal to them as worthless. Since these goals are constitutive of me as a person, they have to be taken as given in deciding what to do with my life; the question of good in my life can only be a question of how best to interpret their meaning. It makes no sense to say that they have no value for me, since there is no 'me' standing behind them, no self prior to their ends or constitutive attachments. The self is constituted by and not prior to its ends'.

In this way, communitarians denounce the historical, asocial and disembodied conception of the person found in individualism. According to them, this conception overlooks the way in which it is the kind of society in which people live that affect their understanding, both of themselves and of how they should lead their lives. A valuable life, they argue, is one that is filled with commitments and relations. And what makes them commitments is precisely that they are not the sort of things that people can question every day.

**Check Your Progress 6**

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Discuss the communitarian critique of the individualistic conception of the self.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

**24.7 THE COMMUNITARIAN CRITIQUE OF THE IDEA OF STATE NEUTRALITY**

---

The other main focus of communitarian critique of liberal individualism is the latter’s understanding of the nature and functions of the state. As discussed above, liberal individualists characterise the state as a minimal and neutral political authority, whose functions are limited to protection of individual rights and maintenance of law and order. Since individuals are free, rational and capable of self-determination, the primary value in political order, according to individualism, ought to be neutrality of the state. As mentioned above, a neutral state is one that is not committed to any particular conception of the good, and remains equidistant from and tolerant of all conceptions of the good.

Communitarians oppose this connection between individual self-determination and state neutrality. According to them, the view that the state should be value-neutral and individuals should be free to make their own choices stems from an atomistic belief that autonomy is protected only when judgements about the good life are taken out of political realm and made on an individual basis. Rejecting such “atomism”, communitarians argue that, in reality, individual judgements require sharing of experiences, the give and take of collective deliberation and collective evaluation of shared practices. In other words, individual choices about good life can only be exercised in a particular sort of community and not a cultural marketplace guided by freedom and neutrality, of the type guaranteed by liberal individualism.

The communitarian perspective, therefore, argues for abandonment of liberal neutrality in favour of politics of the common good. Communitarians conceive of the common good as a substantive conception of good life that defines the community way of life.

Rather than being neutral to different individual conceptions of good life, the common good provides standards by which individual preferences and values are evaluated. In other words, the common good forms the basis on which individual conceptions of good are ranked, and the weight given to an individual's conception depends on how much it conforms or contributes to the common good.

In the communitarian view then, a just state is not one that remains neutral towards all individual conceptions of good. Rather, a just state is one which encourages its citizens to adopt conceptions of good that conform to the common good, while discouraging conceptions of good that conflict with it. According to communitarianism, the nature of the state should not be neutral or minimalist; rather it ought to play a role in guiding its citizens in leading a good life. Hence, while liberal individualism encourages each person to define and seek his own "good", communitarianism believes that a political structure has an important role to play in defining and in helping people seek the "good".

Further, communitarians argue that the common good is required not only for guiding people's decisions about the good life, but also for establishing a just and legitimate political community. According to Taylor, the idea of the common good is required to enable citizens to accept the demands of justice demanded by a welfare state. At the heart of the theory of justice in a welfare state is the claim that the privileged ought to sacrifice a portion of their rights and rewards for the sake of others (the underprivileged). For instance, in a liberal capitalist society, the propertied classes are required to sacrifice some of their property (derived in the form of taxes) for the benefit of the non-propertied and for sustaining a just society. According to Taylor, however, the demand for such a sacrifice, in an individualistic society would seem improper as citizens would be required to sacrifice their rights for the sake of those with whom they share no community identity or common way of life. If we are distanced from a community or a shared way of life, we would necessarily be unwilling to shoulder the burdens of liberal justice. In the communitarian view then, justice is rooted in a community whose primary bond is the shared understanding of the good of both man and community.

### Check Your Progress 7

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.  
ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

- 1) Examine the communitarian critique of the idea of state neutrality.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 24.8 LET US SUM UP

---

Above, we have examined the main ideas of the debate between individualism and communitarianism. We shall now conclude this unit by pointing to some of the contributions and limitations of individualism and communitarianism.

As already discussed, the debate between individualism and communitarianism is one between those who favour individual rights and autonomy and those who emphasize the bonds of community and social attachments. While individualism sees political reality as being shaped by decisions and actions of free and rights-bearing individuals, communitarians emphasise the relationship between the person and the community and see this relationship to be the basis of politics. In spite of this opposition, both individualism and communitarianism have contributed in a big way to the theory and practice of politics.

Historically, the individualist ideas and policies constituted an emancipatory movement against the excesses of organised religions, social hierarchies and the absolute state. It asserted the worth, dignity and freedom of the individual against the absoluteness of the state. This in turn brought about the democratisation of vote. However, there are certain limitations of the principle of individualism. The central assumption of laissez-faire individualism, that it would promote economic progress and social harmony did not come through. Instead, the freedom of the individual, which had been won earlier from the absolutist state, was later denied to the non-propertied class by the system of a free market economy. In this situation, the deprived turned to the state for supportive intervention or welfare. Hence, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the idea of laissez-faire or economic individualism gave way to that of welfare liberalism. Today, once again there are arguments in favour of restoring freedom of the individual by replacing the idea of the welfare state with the principle of laissez-faire. Mainly, the libertarians or the neo-liberals hold this argument.

The communitarian perspective has contributed to the study of politics by rightly emphasising the importance of social/community membership and values in determining the good life of the citizen. Moreover, in societies like India which are basically made up of communities, it is imperative to recognise and respect different community values and identities. However communitarianism, if not complemented with individual rights, may some times have conservative and repressive connotations because of its respect for securing existing communities and their traditions. It can result in the exclusion of some groups whose way of life does not conform to the common good or shared way of life.

In contemporary political theory, there are attempts to highlight the complementarity between individualism and communitarianism. Some of the political theorists who made such attempts are Will Kymlicka, Bhikhu Parekh and Charles Taylor. These theorists attempt to underscore the possibility of a liberal position which does not conflict with and which perhaps take on board the arguments which communitarians have to offer. Such attempts at locating the complementarity between individualism and communitarianism are important for settling some of the major disputes in contemporary political theory and practice.

---

## 24.9 SOME USEFUL REFERENCES

---

Ebenstein, William, 1969, *Great Political Thinkers: Plato to the Present*, Oxford, New York and IBH.

Hampton, Jean, 1998, *Political Philosophy*, Oxford, Delhi.

Kymlicka, Will, 1990, *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*, Clarendon, Oxford.

Mulhall & Swift, 1992, *Liberals and Communitarians*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Heywood, Andrew, 1994, *Political Ideas and Concepts: An Introduction*, Macmillan, London.

---

## **24.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES**

---

Gandhism (Dharma,  
Swaraj, Sarvodaya and  
Satyagraha)

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 1**

- 1) See Section 24.2 and especially, subsection 24.2.1
- 2) See sub-section 24.2.2

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 2**

- 1) See sub-section 24.3.1
- 2) See sub-section 24.3.2

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 3**

- 1) See Section 24.4

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 4**

- 1) See Section 24.5

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 5**

- 1) See Section 24.6

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 6**

- 1) See Section 24.7

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 7**

- 1) See Section 24.8