A Liberal Assessment of Intercultural Relations in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Jamal Shah
Government Degree College, Toru, Mardan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Bican Şahin
Hacettepe University, Turkey

Abstract

Various theories attempt to provide generalized solutions to the challenges arising out of plurality but no unanimous mechanism has been developed so far. Many questions related to cultural diversity can be addressed if theories are complemented by empirical research. This paper is an attempt in that direction. It evaluates the attitudes of cultural groups in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP), Pakistan, towards culture and the strategies for the management of plurality by conducting a field survey for collecting data through 2977 questionnaires and 80 personal interviews from 9 religio-linguistic groups. The paper makes Douglas Hartmann and Joseph Gerteis's model of difference (2005) a theoretical classification and investigates which vision is appreciated most by the people of KP. The paper shows that the majority of the people in KP has a negative attitude towards assimilationism, cosmopolitanism and fragmented pluralism but a positive attitude towards interactive pluralism. After this research it was found that KP society is more tolerant and liberal than it was thought to be.

Keywords, multiculturalism, Muslimization, assimilation, cosmopolitanism, fragmented, pluralism, interactive pluralism

Modern states are faced with multiple challenges both from within and without. Externally, they face the challenge of globalization with its cultural, economic and political dimensions and impacts. Internally, states struggle with the rising tide of religious, ethnic and cultural plurality. Those who are not comfortable with heterogeneity may see plurality as a challenge to the integrity and security of modern state and may support homogeneity by assimilating minority groups. On the other hand, minorities may challenge this assimilative thinking and policies of the majority and may want their identity to be recognized and protected with group rights. Thus, states with plural identities face the fundamental challenge to the idea of homogenous nation-state.

The struggle for minority rights has made many inroads in political theory in the last three decades. Will Kymlicka (2001a, pp. 17–19) has mentioned several reasons for this activism. For example, the wave of ethnic nationalisms unleashed by the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe; the nativist reaction against immigrants in many Western countries; the increasing level of political awareness and mobilization of indigenous peoples due to the draft declaration of the rights of indigenous peoples at the United Nations; and the growing threat of secession within several Western democracies. Nathan Glazer (1997, p. 147) includes the remarkable expansion of the women's movement; the change in sexual mores; and the unsuccessful attempts of the United States to assimilate African-Americans as important triggers for minority rights.

Plurality has become a "fact" that moral and political philosophy cannot bypass while proposing fair terms for stability and co-operation in society. As Christopher McKnight (2000) declares, the universalisability of moral judgments is not a cross-cultural feature; diversity must be accepted as a fact and be recognized as existed. Being a fact, the existence of cultural differences in a society may be an issue undermining the stability and integrity of a society. It was believed that liberal education and modern means of communication would link people together across states and the relevance of cultural identity would progressively vanish. Moreover, the application of the universal framework of rights would properly address the demands of minorities and would cause a steady assimilation of citizens resulting in blending of all cultures and the emergence of a single cosmopolitan society (Kymlicka 2001a: 204–205). However, this optimism has been proved flawed and identity consciousness has surprisingly increased. Neither globalization nor democratic transformation has helped avoiding cultural conflicts (Casals, 2006, p. 3).

Most democratic states are facing a crucial challenge: how to accommodate minorities' interests while preserving the stability of the state and universal human rights. Liberalism has serious difficulties with this question because according to a widespread view, group rights and individual rights are deeply incompatible. Liberalism holds that individual, being an end in itself, has certain basic rights and liberties that need to be the focus of political theories and state actions and that individual should not be deprived of his/her rights on the plea that his/her right violates some perception of good. The problem, and in some way a challenge, for the liberal scholars is how to accommodate and harmonize disagreements which may arise out of ethno-cultural plurality. This observation pinpoints the potential problem of adopting a model of differentiated citizenship based on asymmetrical rights. This problem requires us to rethink the interpretation of the basic principles and values that sustain liberalism. Many liberal scholars have pleaded for accommodating minorities. For example, Charles Taylor (1994, pp. 62–3) argues that as proceduralist neutrality of liberalism cannot accommodate minorities, it must be modified to give way for the politics of difference. Will Kymlicka (1989; 1995) insists that justice requires that the traditional human rights approach

should be complemented by taking into account the group-differentiated rights for minorities. Chandran Kukathas (2003, pp. 93; 237) stresses that a free society is the only answer to the situation of plurality where different groups live together and no group has the right to compel anyone to become or remain its member.

Liberalism is sympathetic to plurality because of its strong belief in the significance of individual's freedom to have a life of his/her own, even if that way of life is disapproved of by the members of the larger society. Liberalism believes in the idea that minorities' ways are to be tolerated. However, the widespread idea that group rights can only be justified from a communitarian perspective assigning value to group over individual is rejected as flawed. Liberal theorists normally oppose group rights because besides skepticism over the satisfactory criteria to define "minority" and "community", the right-holder must have reason and moral agency, which groups lack and consequently, have no basic need for the ascription of rights. Only individuals are capable of reasoning, make decisions and take actions, and the decisions and values of a group are always the product of the individuals' decisions and actions. Thus, all group interests originate from individual ones; individuals, not groups, have interests and are the potential holders of moral rights. This is the ontological and moral individualist stance of liberalism.

Liberals disagree among themselves on how to treat minorities' cultures and practices. The first group is strongly against multicultural practices of tolerating minorities' practices and places emphasis on the protection of individual rights.[1] The pioneer of the second group is Chandran Kukathas who supports "benign neglect" and advocates that groups should neither be hindered nor promoted.[2] The third group is comprised of the liberals who strongly defend a version of multiculturalism where state should give recognition to group rights and offer special protections to minority culture with their activities subsidized.[3]

Thus, a debate about multiculturalism has been started which has produced major fault lines within the liberal tradition. Multiculturalism as a policy is considered as against assimilation (Hartmann & Gerteis, 2005). Multiculturalism is thought to be a divisive policy producing major upheavals. However, there are differences which can be accommodated by providing a number of policies without bringing any major discontent. A fuller conception of multiculturalism, as Hartmann and Gerteis (2005) also propose, must begin by breaking down the false opposition between unity/solidarity and difference/diversity.

Minority rights are special rights that individuals have by virtue of their association with particular groups. The existence of minority rights as moral rights can be rejected on their face value as against liberalism; however, their recognition might be justifiable only as long as they are adjusted and understood in terms of individual rights. For example, the representation of a minority in parliament, though legally attributed to group, is founded on the individual right of all citizens to political participation.

However, those group rights which are irreducible and not based on the consent of the members of the group cannot be justified under liberal theory. Again, social group is accepted as an artifact of individuals and has no distinct existence of its own apart from its members. This means that communities are important and have, if they, value because of their

---

[1] For further discussion see Barry (2001).
[2] For more information see Kukathas (2003).
[3] For further detail see Kymlicka (1995).

contribution to the well-being of individuals whose lives have the ultimate value. Michael Hartney (1995, p. 206) calls this view as value-individualism as opposed to value-collectivism. It does not mean that groups do not matter but, as Kukathas (1992) says, rather that there is no need to depart from the liberal language of individual rights to do justice to them. Thus, an attractive political theory must accommodate the claims of minorities, on the one hand, and the promotion of democratic citizenship, on the other.

Multiculturalism[4] is considered as one of the policies which has been applied by many Western states to cope with the rising tide of plurality. Multiculturalism may contribute to stability in a pluralist society beset with problems arising out of plurality, though some people may object to it, specifically in Asian and Eastern European states, who may say that the provision of minority rights may pose a threat to the security and stability of the state. They may also argue, specifically in the case of formerly colonized states, that the existing minorities have received many benefits from the former colonizing masters and have collaborated with them, so equality requires that minorities should not be provided with minority rights[5]. Consequently, some of the states will not give greater autonomy, power or resources to minority groups perceived as a threat to national integrity and security and are thought as collaborators of foreign enemies, a phenomenon called as the "securitization" of ethnic relations (Waever, 1995). However, if minorities have legitimate grievances and those grievances are practically heard and accommodated, then such a policy may create in them a sense of belonging to the state and if taken prudently, may establish a harmonious and stable pluralist community.

Yet we have a fundamental problem with normative theories of multiculturalism which rely on an essentialist conceptualization of cultures which cannot be sustained and justified. Cultures are not homogeneous and fixed, specifically at national level. They have internal variations and external overlaps (Patten, 2011). However, this does not mean that there are no distinct cultures. The members of groups have a broad consensus on certain generalizations which makes the group distinct from others (Patten, 2011).

Pakistan is faced with the problems of plurality and, like other Eastern states, is a neglected country as far as research regarding plurality is concerned. No attempt has been so far made to study the attitudes of cultural groups towards cultural differences and the status of multiculturalism in Pakistan. The main concern of this paper is to evaluate the attitudes of cultural groups towards culture and the state's management of plurality from liberal perspective in one of the provinces of Pakistan namely Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. It evaluates the attitudes of the cultural groups in KP towards assimilationism, cosmopolitanism, fragmented pluralism and interactive pluralism. Though this distinction of the ways of managing plurality is based on Hartmann and Gerteis's (2005) theoretical classification of managing differences, we submit it to an empirical test by evaluating the attitudes of the cultural groups in KP towards these models.

We have chosen KP because the degree of plurality here is higher than the other provinces of Pakistan. KP is home to more than 25 linguistic[6] and five religious groups. The study takes the most prominent groups in KP into account and leaves out the groups which are minor and

---

[4] We take multiculturalism as a policy or approach of accepting and treating the fact of multiculturality.
[5] See for example W. Kymlicka (2001b).
[6] See for further detail Rahman (n.d.).

least prominent for future research. Furthermore, we are interested in the evaluation of their attitudes towards culture and the state's management of plurality in KP. Again, the findings of this study should be taken as specifically related to KP and cannot be generalized to the whole of Pakistan.

Section two deals with the methodology adopted in the present study. Section three evaluates the attitudes of cultural groups in KP towards culture and the strategies for managing plurality while section four concludes the papers by positing that the attitude of cultural groups in KP is negative towards assimilation, cosmopolitanism and fragmented pluralism but positive towards interactive pluralism.

Methodology

We took five linguistic and three religious minorities and the dominant Pakhtun group as the domain of our research. Linguistic groups are taken because in the subcontinent the linguistic affinity is the powerful mobilizing factor in the enunciation of demands for regional autonomy (Jalal 1995, pp. 223–4). For selecting linguistic minorities, we adopted three criteria as a test. The first criterion was the population of the linguistic minority groups and here we took 200,000 as a bench mark for selecting a group, leaving further smaller groups for future research. The second test was the geographical representation where we took groups from the South, middle, East, West and North of KP. The third test was the activism in airing their demands through media and group mobilization. These tests were qualified by five linguistic groups namely Seraiki in the South, Hindko in the middle and East, Kohistani and Gujar in the middle and West and Chitrali in the North of KP. For religious minorities three groups namely Christian, Hindu and Sikh were selected.

Two research tools namely questionnaire and interview were used. Questionnaire was first pilot-tested. For the determination of sample size from each group the following formula for simple random sample was applied.

$n = z^2 p(1-p)/e^2$ or $z^2 pq/e^2$ (Cochran, 1977, pp. 75–6)

Where n = Simple random sample size.   z = Confidence interval = 95 per cent whose value in z table is 1.96   p = probability of response = 0.50
e = margin of error = 5.5 per cent.   q = 1-p

Now n = 1.96*1.96*0.5(1-0.5)/0.055*0.055= 317. Thus, the estimated sample size is 317.

For each of the minority group 450 questionnaires were distributed among the population for which the lower limit was kept as 317 while for the dominant Pakhtun group 550 questionnaires were distributed among them for which the lower limit was kept as 400.

For the collection of data we went to the region where the target group is in majority. We went to the universities, colleges and schools located in that area. In the university we selected departments and classes randomly and distributed questionnaires among the students there. We gave three questionnaires to each student- one for him/her and two for his/her parents. Similar was the case with the colleges. In schools we distributed the questionnaires among the staff members only. We gave two questionnaires to each staff member-one for him/her and one for his/her family member. Similarly, we distributed questionnaires to other

members of the group. During our stay in the group we took interviews from the common members and intellectuals of the group.

At the end of the field work which lasted from March 21, 2013 to August 18, 2013 taking 4 months and 29 days, 2977 questionnaires were collected after discarding the ambiguous and partially filled questionnaires out of which 1591 were filled by males and 1386 by females. The total number of interviews conducted with the members of all the targeted groups was 80.

Data Analysis

After the data was collected, we thoroughly checked all the questionnaires and discarded those which were ambiguously or half filled. In this way a total of 78 questionnaires were discarded. The remaining questionnaires, 2977, were entered in the SPSS statistical program and were analyzed by simple descriptive statistics. Interviews were analyzed through content analysis. The recorded and written material of the interviews was carefully analyzed and the important statements of the interviewees were coded. The findings obtained from the analysis of the data of the questionnaires were cross-checked with the finding of the interviews.

Attitudes of Cultural Groups in KP Towards Culture and the State's Management of Plurality

This portion empirically explores the attitudes of various linguistic and religious groups in KP towards culture and the strategies for managing plurality in terms of assimilation, cosmopolitanism, fragmented pluralism and interactive pluralism through various related questions asked through questionnaire and interview.

Attitudes of Cultural Groups in KP towards Culture

A number of questions were asked in the questionnaire regarding the attitudes of the members of the groups towards culture. The first question was "Is culture important for a group?" As shown in Table 1, 97.92 per cent[7] of all the respondents agreed that culture has importance for a group.

The second question regarding culture was whether culture should be preserved. As Table 1 shows, a high percentage of 98.35 per cent of the total respondents was of the opinion that culture should be preserved. Religious minorities were highly supportive of the preservation of culture (99.43 per cent).

The third question regarding culture was "Why culture is important for a group?" For Kymlicka (1995, p. 83) culture is important because it provides us with the set of options from which we make meaningful choices. Similarly, for Modood (2013, pp. 39–40) culture has importance for the people because it shows the identity that matters to people marked by difference. The present study judges the position of the people in KP in respect of the theories of Kymlicka and Modood. Kymlicka's assumption is not supported while Modood's is in KP

---

[7] Out of 97.92 per cent, 48.54 per cent strongly agree, 39.07 agree and 10.31 per cent near to agree. In the text of this paper we will use the word "agree" to mean the aggregate of "strongly agree", "agree" and "near to agree" while the word "disagree" will mean the aggregate of "near to disagree" "disagree" and "strongly disagree". In the tables the values of all the above terms have been given separately and it should be considered as such in the whole of this paper.

because a majority of 86.53 per cent (P^8_1 89.05 per cent, P_2 9.51 per cent, P_3 1.32 per cent and P_4 0.12 per cent) of the total respondents said that culture is important not because it provides us with the range of options from which we choose but because it shows the identity of the members of a group (Table 2). Only 22.67 per cent of the total respondents believed that culture provides a range of options from which we choose.

The same results also came from the interviews with the members of the targeted groups. For example, Nusrat Tehsin, a Seraiki, said "Culture is important for a group. It has a role in our life. It represents our traditions and us. It identifies us. It shows what and who we are" (personal communication, March 29, 2013). Similarly, Gobind Ram, a Sikh, said "Culture is important for a group because it shows its identity. For example, we are Sikhs. We wear turbans and have long beards. These show that we are Sikhs and are treated accordingly" (personal communication, July 15, 2013).

Attitudes of Cultural Groups in KP towards Assimilation

Assimilationist vision of dealing with plurality has its classical expression in the work of Robert Park (1939) and Milton Gordon (1964). This vision emphasizes on the existence of substantive moral bond as the basis of moral cohesion. It gives more emphasis on mutual responsibilities and cultural homogeneity. The mediating role of the internal groups is strongly denied. The individual is pressurized to lose the features of his/her former group identity and adopt the new society's core values. This vision deals with differences by removing them (Hartmann & Gerteis, 2005). Alexander (2001) is of the opinion that under assimilationist vision private differences may be tolerated as long as these are not pushed into the public sphere.

The present study shows that cultural groups in KP had a negative attitude towards any sort of assimilationist tendencies on the part of the state or dominant group. This was demonstrated by the attitudes of the members of the targeted groups towards various questions in the questionnaire which show liberal and non-assimilationist tendencies in KP.

The first statement incorporated in the questionnaire was "Groups in KP should be blended in dominant Pakhtun culture". This means whether various groups in KP wish to blend in the dominant Pakhtun culture or try to maintain their particularities. As shown in Table 3, a majority of 56.3 per cent of the total respondents said that groups in KP should not blend in dominant Pakhtun culture. A very strong negative attitude towards the statement came from the Gujars (71.14 per cent) followed by Sikhs (70.53 per cent). This shows that various groups in KP wanted to keep their particularities and did not want to be blended into common Pakhtun culture.

The same attitude was also expressed by the interviewees of the targeted groups. For example, Mian Zarin, a Gujar, said "Every group should maintain its own culture and traditions and should not be blended into one culture. This blending of various cultures into one will destroy our identity-the basis of who we are" (personal communication, May 13, 2013). Imran Khan Jadoon, a Hindko speaker, said "Every culture has a beauty and identity inherent in it. If you destroy the culture, you destroy the identity of its members" (personal communication, April 12, 2013). All of the Pakhtuns who were interviewed gave their opinion that groups in KP should not be blended into Pakhtun culture. For example,

---

[8] P shows priority. P_1 means first priority, P_2 means second priority, P_3 means third priority and so on.

Muhammad Iqbal, a Pakhtun, said "Unity through diversity is the mechanism which brings comparatively better harmony. Assimilation as a mechanism of treating diversity has brought failure and should be avoided" (personal communication, August 14, 2013).

The second statement incorporated in the questionnaire regarding attitudes towards assimilationism was "Different groups in KP should not mix together". The purpose of this statement was to show whether groups in KP should mix together by non-forcible ways which will result in slowly losing their own identities and forming a new one not necessarily Pakhtun culture like the mathematical expression of A+B+C+D=Z. The cultural groups in KP showed a negative attitude even towards this soft way of losing one's culture. A high percentage of respondents (68.27 per cent) said that different groups in KP should not mix together (Table 3). These groups should not be assimilated into one group to lose their particularities through mixing. A marriage effect was also found. 70.45 per cent of the married respondents as against 65.17 per cent of the single respondents did not favor the mixing of various groups in KP.

The above opinion was also demonstrated by the interviewees of the groups. For example, Ganga Vishan, a Sikh, argued "We have interactions with each other and that is beneficial for us. By interacting with each other most of our misconceptions about each other's ways and cultures are removed. However, we must retain our own particularities and should not mix in a way to lose what we are identified with [our culture]" (personal communication, July 14, 2013). Similarly, Sayed Musarrat Shah, a Hindko speaker, said: "Interaction of the members of various groups with each other is important for the smooth running of a multicultural society. But they should not mix so as to form a new culture while losing their own" (personal communication, April 7, 2013).

The third area where responses of the groups towards assimilationist tendencies were elucidated was the attempt for Pakhtunization on the part of dominant Pakhtun group. The findings given in Table 3 show that 63.69 per cent of the total respondents said that there has been no attempt for Pakhtunization in KP. This attitude was also represented by the interviewees during our interviews with them. For example, Ganga Vishan, a Sikh, said "We have never been compelled to adopt Pashto language, Pakhtun culture or to embrace Islam. We are not aware of any such attempt. Every group lives according to its own religion and culture" (personal communication, July 14, 2013). Alam Din, a Kohistani, said "Certainly, no attempt for Pakhtunization has been done in KP" (personal communication, May 19, 2013). During the field survey we found that a large number of Kohistanis have adopted Pashto language and have voluntarily integrated into Pakhtun culture. However, this adoption of Pakhtun culture is voluntary and not a forced one. For example, while interviewing Muhammad Salam of Kohistani group, he said "We have adopted Pashto for pragmatic reasons. We have marriages with Pakhtuns which compel us to learn Pashto. In this way we forgot our language [Kohistani] and have become Pakhtuns culturally" (personal communication, May 25, 2013). All of the Pakhtuns when interviewed said that no attempt for Pakhtunization has been done in KP. For example, Muhammad Iqbal, a Pakhtun, said "All the provinces of Pakistan are multicultural. The need for imposing one's culture and language on others arises when the dominant group feels some threats from the minorities. As there is no such situation in KP, we have never seen any attempt in that direction" (personal communication, August 14, 2013).

However, Hindko speakers and Seraikis were less inclined to accept the statement that attempt for Pakhtunization has not been made in KP. Only 45.53 per cent of the Seraikis and

39.57 per cent of the Hindko speakers were of the opinion that there has been no attempt of Pakhtunization in KP. Interviews with some of the members of Hindko and Seraiki group also depicted the same thoughts. For example, Baba Haider Zaman, leader of the Movement for Hazara Province and a Hindko speaker, said "From the very beginning Pakhtuns have made attempts to impose their culture and language on us but we have resisted" (personal communication, April 14, 2013). Similarly, Zafar Durani, leader of the Seraiki National Party and a Seraiki, said "The renaming of this Province from North West Frontier Province (NWFP) to KP was nothing less than a forced attempt to evade our identity. It was an attempt to impose Pakhtun identity on us" (personal communication, March 25, 2013). As far as gender differences are concerned, males disagreed more (66.75 per cent) than females did (60.17 per cent). Similarly, a significant difference was found in the opinions of married and single respondents with more of the married respondents (68.73 per cent) than single respondents (56.25 per cent) disagreed that there have been attempts for Pakhtunization in KP.

The fourth area where the responses towards assimilationist tendencies were investigated was the attempt for Muslimization. In this regard the results of the survey show that compared to Pakhtunization, a fewer number of respondents (53.85 per cent) agreed that Muslimization has not taken place in KP (Table 3). The highest percentage (71.73 per cent) came from the Sikhs who were followed by Hindko speakers (60.12 per cent). The results regarding Pakhtunization and Muslimization also show the actual multicultural practices and policies of KP state and society regarding Pakhtunization and Muslimization.

These results were supported by the interviews conducted with the members of the groups. For example, Ameet Kore, a Sikh, said "There has been no attempt for Muslimization in KP. The Muslims have their own way to preach Islam but that is not a forced Muslimization. Everyone is free to follow his/her religion" (personal communication, July 25, 2013). However, Hindus (61.26 per cent) and Christians (58.62 per cent) were of the opinion that there have been attempts for Muslimization in KP. However, majority of the Hindus and Christians who were of the opinion that there have been attempts for Muslimization fall into "Near to Agree" category (Hindus 47.30 per cent and Christians 43.89 per cent). Again, the members of these groups (Christians and Hindus) when interviewed gave the opposite opinion and said that there has been no attempt for Muslimization in KP. For example, Haroon Sarab Diyal, a Hindu, said "Culture and religion can never be imposed. Muslimization has not been attempted forcibly. I do not see any attempt for Muslimization in KP" (personal communication, June 27, 2013). Similarly, Willium Ghulam, a Christian, said "There has been never an attempt for forced Muslimization in KP" (personal communication, June 9, 2013). The responses given by the interviewees are contrary to the results of the questionnaires collected from the Christians and Hindus. This may be due to the fact that the question set in the questionnaire simply said "There has been an attempt of Muslimization in KP". It did not mention forced Muslimization. So, the respondents thought of all the attempts, forced and non-forced, for Muslimization. However, in the interviews it was made clear to the interviewees to reply whether there has been any forced attempt for Muslimization in KP. The fifth area where the attitudes in respect of assimilationist tendencies were judged was about newcomers. Should newcomers who come to live in their group adopt their values and language? As shown in Table 3, a majority of 60.87 per cent of the total respondents said that newcomers should not be compelled to adopt the values and language of their group. According to them it is up to the newcomers to adopt the values and language of the receiving group or not. Sikh community presented the highest support for this liberal view (84.82 per cent). Even 61.43 per cent of Pakhtuns responded that non-members should not be

compelled to adopt their language and culture. A significant difference of opinion was found between married (64.20 per cent) and single (56.42 per cent) respondents on this issue.

The same response also came from an overwhelming majority of the interviewees. For example, Hazrat Salam, a Kohistani, said "No. Those who want to come and live in our group are perfectly at liberty to adopt or not to adopt our values and language" (personal communication, May 18, 2013).

Attitudes of Cultural Groups in KP towards Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism recognizes diversity, but is skeptical about the restrictions that group membership places on individuals and defends plurality only if it allows individual rights and freedoms but is silent about groups and group rights (Hartmann & Gerteis, 2005). This vision does not believe in cultural specificity and mutual obligation, but in tolerance and individual choices. For Hartmann and Gerteis (2005) it is largely individualized and voluntaristic vision while for Alexander (2001) it is ''ethnic hyphenation'' where group qualities are neutralized rather than negated.

The cultural groups in KP had a negative attitude towards cosmopolitanism. Though the majority of the respondents (81.73 per cent), as shown in Table 5, said that groups should not be given the right of internal restrictions which violate human rights, groups and cultures in KP are valued with a strong attachment to them. This can be construed from the time they allocate to work for their group or to know more about their group, its history and culture. In order to construe response to group attachment, a statement "I spend much time trying to learn more about the culture and history of my group" was incorporated in the questionnaire. As Table 4 shows, 62.14 per cent of the respondents said that they spend much time to learn about the culture and history of their group. This shows that groups are kept dearer by the people in KP. The highest response to the statement came from Chitralis (74.31 per cent) followed by Christians (74.21 per cent) and Pakhtuns (69.04 per cent). Significant difference was found between the opinion of males (66.56 per cent) and female (57.07 per cent) respondents. Similarly, a higher percentage of single (70.33 per cent) than married (56.45 per cent) respondents were found giving much time to study the culture and history of their group.

The above results were also depicted by the interviews' findings. For example, Jalaludin, a Chitrali, said "Yes. I give time to study my history, language and culture. This is not fixed. Whenever I get time in excess to my other important engagements, I do study my culture to know who we are" (personal communication, April 21, 2013). Margaret, a Christian, said "I devote time to study my religion. I have thoroughly studied Bible. I study Christianity and its literature regularly" (personal communication, June 14, 2013).

A second justification for the cultural groups in KP having a negative attitude towards cosmopolitanism is that, as shown in Table 1, 97.94 per cent of the respondents said that culture has importance for a group. The preservation of culture was also highly emphasized by the respondents (98.35 per cent) (Table1).

A third justification that people in KP have a negative attitude towards cosmopolitanism is that majority of the respondents (86.33 per cent) supported the provision of group rights to the minorities (Table 4). These group rights, what Kymlicka calls as "external protections", are the rights given to a group to protect it from the adverse policies of the larger society.

This empirical finding is in accord with the theoretical framework of Kymlicka (1995, pp. 37–8) and Taylor (1994, p. 40).

The above results were also supported by the responses given in the interviews. Nearly all of the interviewees supported the view that minority should be protected by the provision of minority rights. For example, Nargis Zaman, a Pakhtun, said "Rights should be given to minorities so that they could freely follow their culture. If you are not giving them some basic rights, that will be injustice because they cannot adopt your culture and religion and you cannot impose your culture and religion on them. However, they should not be given, and never be given, so much internal autonomy to violate fundamental human rights" (personal communication, August 17, 2013).

Attitudes of Cultural Groups in KP towards Fragmented Pluralism

Fragmented Pluralism provides for the existence of a variety of distinctive and self-contained mediating communities and is the closest to being the opposite of assimilation. Here group membership is essential rather than partial and voluntary. Pressure for conformity to group's values rather than society's center values is strong. Group decides who are included in or excluded from the group. The state is largely concerned with managing the incompatible rights-claims of groups without imposing any substantive moral claims of its own (Hartmann & Gerteis, 2005).

The present study shows that majority of the respondents presented a negative attitude towards fragmented pluralism because the groups are not considered as sacred in KP. The attitudes of the cultural groups, as shown in Table 4, are much positive towards the provision of group rights but as shown in Table 5, they were not supported to have the right of internal restrictions violating human rights.

According to Kymlicka (1989, pp. 240–141; 1995, p. 152; 2001b, pp. 27–28) minorities have two types of demands, i.e. those against their own members which could be used to restrict their liberty (internal restrictions); and those against the larger society to protect itself against the impacts of the decisions of the larger society (external protections). For Kymlicka, the former demands are not while most of the latter are consistent with the liberal principles for the promotion of fairness among the groups. The former restrict the autonomy of the members of minorities while the latter protect it.

As shown in Table 5, a clear majority of 81.73 per cent of the total respondents were against the demand for internal restrictions for a group, if those restrictions intend to violate human rights. This empirical finding is in accord with Kymlicka's assertion that the right to impose internal restrictions, if violate human rights, should not be accorded to groups (Kymlicka 1995, p. 152). Significant marriage effect was found with a higher percentage of married (84.05 per cent) than single (78.33 per cent) respondents saying that groups should not be given the rights to violate human rights.

This conclusion was also supported by the interviewees. For example, Preet Kore, a Sikh, said "Human rights are sacred. They should not be violated at any cost. The group's autonomy should not be taken as a plea to violate human rights" (personal communication, July 28, 2013). Similarly, Abdul Hameed, a Kohistani, said "Group should be given minority rights so that it can develop its culture but not at the cost of human rights" (personal communication, May 20, 2013).

A second justification for the fact that the cultural groups in KP did not support fragmented pluralism is their attitude towards new comers. As shown in Table 3, a majority of 60.87 per cent of the total respondents said that the newcomers should not be compelled to adopt the values and language of their group. According to the respondents it is up to the newcomers to adopt the traditions and values of their group or not. This is a liberal and non-assimilationist thinking.

Attitudes of Cultural Groups in KP towards Interactive Pluralism

Interactive pluralism recognizes the existence of distinct groups and cultures but tries to cultivate common understanding across these differences through their interactions. The main purpose is the cultivation of cross-cultural dialogue and exchange with an emphasis on mutual recognition and respect of differences. Both fragmented pluralism and interactive pluralism stress the role of groups, but the later stresses groups in interaction with each other and group differences are celebrated and identity claims are regarded as legitimate for entry into public life. The substantive moral order in interactive pluralism is understood to be emergent and is produced in a more or less democratic manner through the interaction of groups (Hartmann & Gerteis, 2005).

The present study shows that cultural groups in KP supported interactive pluralism. The empirical results, given in Table 6, show that 93.05 per cent of the total respondents declared that different groups in KP should live together and have various interactions with one another. The highest response to the statement came from the religious minorities. The Sikhs were at the top (99.11 per cent) followed by the Christians (95.28 per cent).

The above results were supported by the interviewees of the targeted groups. For example, Ravi Kumar, a Hindu, said "Interaction is very beneficial. It helps in reducing the tension which might be created out of plurality. We learn from each other and acquire the good habits of each other. For example, here we have good relations with Muslims. We meet them on *Eids* while they come to us on *Devalis*" (personal communication, July 13, 2013). Similarly, late Israrullah Gandapur, a Pakhtun and Ex-Law Minister of KP, said "Problems will snowball if the groups live in isolation. Understanding the culture of other groups and interaction among them will help in reducing the tension arising out of plurality" (personal communication, March 28, 2013).

Similarly, a more positive attitude of the members of a group towards the statement "I like meeting and making friendship with members of other groups" shows that they do not consider their group to be exclusionist. They like to maintain their diversity but at the same time like to have interactions with the members of other groups. The present study shows that a great majority of the respondents (93.92 per cent) liked meeting and making friendship with members of other groups (Table 6). The interviews results also show the same trend. For example, Nauman Yousaf, a Christian, said "I feel joy while interacting with the members of other groups. I learn something new from them about their culture. This interaction clears many of my misunderstandings about their religion and culture" (personal communication, June 4, 2013).

Conclusion

This paper evaluated the attitudes of the religio-linguistic groups in KP towards culture and the policies and practices adopted by the KP state and society for managing diversity and tried to add to the existing literature. Currently this is the only known study of this nature conducted in Pakistan. Though this study cannot be generalized to the whole of Pakistan or to other places, at least it gave a picture of the attitudinal status of the cultural groups towards the cultural differences in one part (KP) of Pakistan. Study of the similar nature in other parts of Pakistan will contribute to further expand the frontiers of knowledge in the field and will enable us to give generalized assumptions not only about Pakistan but also about the states having the same nature of plurality as exists in Pakistan.

The study looked into the attitudes of cultural groups in KP towards assimilation, cosmopolitanism, fragmented pluralism and interactive pluralism. The paper showed that majority of the respondents in KP had a negative attitude towards assimilationism. The views of the respondents supported that the groups in KP should maintain their particularities and should not be blended into Pakhtun culture. Even the soft way of losing one's culture and forming a new identity not necessarily Pakhtun culture but a mixture of all the cultures living in KP, was not supported by the members of various groups. The study also showed that the actual practices of the state and society of KP are not assimilative because majority of the respondents were of the opinion that there has been no attempt for Pakhtunization (63.69 per cent) and Muslimization (53.85 per cent) in KP.

The paper showed that cultural groups had a negative attitude towards cosmopolitanism because groups and cultures in KP are valued, for example, 97.94 per cent of the respondents said that culture has importance for a group. The preservation of culture was also highly emphasized by the respondents (98.35 per cent). Similarly, majority of the respondents (86.33 per cent) supported the provision of group rights to the minorities.

Fragmented pluralism was also not supported by the cultural groups in KP because here the groups are not considered as sacred. The groups did not support the right of internal restrictions for groups which violate human rights. Again, a majority of the respondents said that newcomers should not be compelled to adopt the values and language of their group.

The paper showed that the attitudinal position of KP society is nearer to interactive pluralism. The results showed that in KP 93.05 per cent of the total respondents declared that different groups should live together and have various interactions with one another. Similarly, a great majority of the respondents (93.92 per cent) liked meeting and making friendship with members of other groups.

This study is a launching pad for further research projects. Future research of the same kind may take the smaller than 200,000 linguistic groups in KP to evaluate their attitudes towards intercultural relations. Again, studies of the same nature may be conducted in other provinces of Pakistan to show their attitudinal status in respect of intercultural relations. This will eventually give the overall status of Pakistan which may, with certain limitations, be generalized to a similar case.

Though changes have occurred in the political administration of KP since 2013, it is reasonable to expect that its society still exhibits the same, and because of the advances in education and globalization even increased, trends in accommodation, toleration and liberal

values. KP society is conservative and change, if any, in the attitudes of the people occurs slowly and is usually positive.

References

Alexander, J. C. (2001). Theorizing the modes of incorporation. *Sociological theory (19)*3, pp. 237–49. https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00139

Barry, B. (2001). *Culture and equality: An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Casals, N. T. (Ed.), (2006). *Group rights as human rights: A liberal approach to multiculturalism.* Netherland: Springer.

Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques.* 3rd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Glazer, N. (1995). Individual rights against group rights. In W. Kymlicka, *The rights of minority culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Glazer, N. (1997). *We are all multiculturalists now.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, Milton M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion and national origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartmann, D., & Gerteis, J. (2005). Dealing with diversity: Mapping multiculturalism in sociological terms. *Sociological Theory (23)*2, 218–240. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2005.00251.x

Hartney, M. (1995). Some confusion concerning collective rights. In W. Kymlicka, *The rights of minority culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jalal, A. (1995). *Democracy and authoritarianism in South Asia: A comparative and historical perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511559372

Kukathas, C. (2003). *The liberal archipelago: A theory of freedom and diversity.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kukathas, C. (1992). Are there any cultural rights? *Political Theory (20)*1, 105-139. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591792020001006

Kymlicka, W. (1989). *Liberalism, community and culture.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2001a). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship.* New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0199240981.001.0001

Kymlicka, W. (2001b). Western political theory and ethnic relations in Eastern Europe. In W. Kymlicka & M. Opalski, *Can liberal pluralism be exported? Western political theory and ethnic relations in Eastern Europe.* New York: Oxford University Press.

McKnight, C. (2000). A little toleration, please. *Journal of Medical Ethics (26)*6. https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.26.6.432

Modood, T. (2006). British Muslims and the politics of multiculturalism. In Modood, A. Triandafyllidou, & R. Zapata-Barrero, *Multiculturalism, Muslims and citizenship: A European approach.* London and New York: Routledge.

Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea.* UK & US: Polity Press. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452276052.n239

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

Park, R. E. (1939). The nature of race relations. In E. T. Thompson, *Race relations and the race problem.* Thompson. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Patten, A. (2011). Rethinking culture: The social lineage account. Retrieved January 17, 2015, www.princeton.edu/~apatten/apsr%202011.pdf https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541100030X

Rahman, T. Language policy and localization in Pakistan: Proposal for paradigmatic shift. Retrieved November 2014 from, http://www.apnaorg.com/research-papers-pdf/rahman-1.pdf

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Guttmann, *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Weaver, O. (1995). Securitization and desecuritization. In R. D. Lipschutz (Ed.), *On security*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Corresponding Autor: Jamal Shah
Email: jamalkhattana@gmail.com

Tables:

Table 1: Attitudes of Cultural Groups towards Culture and Cultural Preservation

Statement/Choices	Strongly Agree	Agree	Near to Agree	Uncertain	Near to Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Groups in KP should blend in dominant Pakhtun culture	174 5.84%	347 11.66%	431 14.48%	349 11.72%	288 9.67%	818 27.48%	570 19.15%	2977 100%
Different groups in KP should not mix together	818 27.48%	865 29.06%	350 11.76%	211 7.09%	140 4.70%	439 14.75%	154 5.17%	2977 100%
There has been attempt for Pakhtunization in KP	117 3.93%	187 6.28%	397 13.34%	380 12.76%	461 15.49%	975 32.75%	460 15.45%	2977 100%
There has been attempt for Muslimization in KP	90 3.02%	303 10.18%	671 22.54%	310 10.41%	384 12.90%	724 24.32%	495 16.63%	2977 100%
The adoption of our culture by those who come to live in our group	167 5.61%	406 13.64%	414 13.91%	178 5.98%	412 13.84%	1034 34.73%	366 12.29%	2977 100%

Table 2: Why Culture is Important for a Group

Options/Priorities	Priority$_1$	Priority$_2$	Priority$_3$	Priority$_4$	Priority$_5$	Priority$_6$	Total
Shows our identity	2294 89.05%	245 9.51%	34 1.32%	3 0.12%	0 0%	0 0%	2576/2977 86.53%
Provides range of options	87 12.89%	156 23.11%	303 44.89%	95 14.07%	33 4.89%	1 0.15%	675/2977 22.67%

Legacy of our forefathers	346 23.78%	928 63.78%	145 9.97%	27 1.86%	9 0.62%	0 0%	1455/2977 48.87%
Don't know	5 83.33%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 16.67%	0 0%	6/2977 0.2%

Table 3: Attitude of Cultural Groups in KP towards Assimilationism

Statement/Choices	Strongly Agree	Agree	Near to Agree	Uncertain	Near to Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Groups in KP should blend in dominant Pakhtun culture	174 5.84%	347 11.66%	431 14.48%	349 11.72%	288 9.67%	818 27.48%	570 19.15%	2977 100%
Different groups in KP should not mix together	818 27.48%	865 29.06%	350 11.76%	211 7.09%	140 4.70%	439 14.75%	154 5.17%	2977 100%
There has been attempt for Pakhtunization in KP	117 3.93%	187 6.28%	397 13.34%	380 12.76%	461 15.49%	975 32.75%	460 15.45%	2977 100%
There has been attempt for Muslimization in KP	90 3.02%	303 10.18%	671 22.54%	310 10.41%	384 12.90%	724 24.32%	495 16.63%	2977 100%
The adoption of our culture by those who come to live in our group	167 5.61%	406 13.64%	414 13.91%	178 5.98%	412 13.84%	1034 34.73%	366 12.29%	2977 100%

Table 4: Attitude of Cultural Groups in KP towards Cosmopolitanism

Statement/Choices	Strongly Agree	Agree	Near to Agree	Uncertain	Near to Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I spend much time to learn about the culture and history of my group	364 12.23%	673 22.61%	813 27.31%	177 5.95%	337 11.32%	508 17.06%	105 3.53%	2977 100%
Group should be protected by the provision of minority rights by the state	1144 38.43%	1111 37.32%	315 10.58%	162 5.44%	72 2.42%	134 4.50%	39 1.31%	2977 100%

Table 5: Attitude of Cultural Groups in KP towards Fragmented Pluralism

Statement/Choices	Strongly Agree	Agree	Near to Agree	Uncertain	Near to Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Cultural groups should be left alone in their internal affairs without external interference by the state even if they violate some of the human rights	66 2.22%	148 4.97%	153 5.14%	177 5.95%	310 10.41%	1242 41.72%	881 29.59%	2977 100%

Table 6: Attitude of Cultural Groups in KP towards Interactive Pluralism

Statement/Choices	Strongly Agree	Agree	Near to Agree	Uncertain	Near to Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Groups in KP should live together and have various interactions	1190 39.97%	1205 40.48%	375 12.60%	90 3.02%	35 1.18%	66 2.22%	16 0.54%	2977 100%
I like meeting and making friendship with members of other groups	933 31.34%	1280 43%	583 19.58%	66 2.22%	21 0.71%	68 2.28%	26 0.87%	2977 100%