Contextualizing Human Rights in Multicultural Environments

Patrick Agyare[a]

a. School of Business and Economics, UiT The Arctic University of Norway

Email: patriagy@outlook.com

How to cite
Agyare, P. (2024). Contextualizing Human Rights in Multicultural Environments. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, *9*(3), 210-230.
https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.2024.56

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the intricate relationship between socio-cultural dynamics and human rights in multicultural societies. It examines how norms, belief systems, and power structures shape the perception and exercise of these universal principles. The study employs a qualitative research design, specifically using the Cultural Relativism Framework, to investigate how cultural norms and values influence the interpretation and application of human rights. Through the analysis of literature and case studies, the paper elucidates the interaction between cultural context and human rights interpretations. It acknowledges that human rights are not uniform but are influenced by diverse cultural contexts. Key findings underscore the significance of multiculturalism in human rights interpretation, the impact of social, cultural, and political contexts, the intersection of values, beliefs, and customs, and the roles of states, civil society, and international organizations in shaping human rights discourse. The paper advocates for educational initiatives, intercultural dialogue, inclusive policymaking, and legal reforms to promote and protect human rights in diverse societies. It recommends enhancing human rights education, facilitating intercultural exchange, empowering civil society, addressing discrimination and inequality, and integrating customary laws with formal legal systems. By fostering mutual respect and understanding, societies can uphold human rights and cultural diversity, enabling peaceful, equitable coexistence. This assertion is based on empirical observations and scientific principles that highlight the importance of mutual understanding in preserving human rights and promoting cultural diversity. This paper contributes to a deeper understanding of human rights, advocating for a balance between universal principles and cultural specificities.

KEYWORDS

Human rights; multiculturalism; culture; universality; cultural relativism; dialogue.

INTRODUCTION

Human rights as a universal concept is subject to a multitude of interpretations and implementations worldwide. This paper takes a deep look at how norms, beliefs, and power structures in different cultures affect how these rights are seen, claimed, and used in different cultural settings. By investigating this complex interplay, the aim is to enhance the understanding of human rights through a context-specific lens that recognizes the intricate relationship between universal principles and unique cultural expressions. The universality of human rights, enshrined in international instruments such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the UNESCO (2005) Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, does not diminish the importance of cultural diversity (Donnelly, 2006). Rather, it promotes a peaceful coexistence that upholds and safeguards cultural rights, which are inherently associated with fundamental freedoms such as expression, religion, and association (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020; Esses, 2021). According to Article 27 of the ICCPR, cultural rights encompass the protection of cultural integrity for minority groups, including indigenous peoples and their ways of life. The jurisprudence of institutions such as the European Court on Human Rights, the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, and the Inter-American Court further emphasizes the value of cultural pluralism (Donnelly, 2006; Freeman, 2022). In this context, the Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (CESCR) has adopted a dynamic interpretation of 'culture' under Article 15(1)(a) of the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (CESCR), encompassing diverse groups like minorities, migrants, and indigenous peoples (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020; Joppke, 2017a, 2017b).

The interpretation and application of human rights principles in multicultural societies present a unique challenge due to the inherent diversity of cultural norms, values, and worldviews. These socio-cultural factors significantly shape the understanding of rights and justice (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020; Freeman, 2022). In societies characterized by divergent cultural practices and beliefs, the interpretation of human rights can vary considerably. Some communities may emphasize collective rights over individual rights, while others prioritize the reverse, depending on their specific cultural context. These divergences can sometimes lead to conflicts and misunderstandings, particularly when one set of cultural norms is imposed on another. However, it is crucial to remember that the universality of human rights does not equate to uniformity. Instead, it advocates for the respect of diversity and cultural pluralism. Culture, as a dynamic system of shared meanings, beliefs, and practices, fundamentally shapes how individuals and communities experience and express their rights (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020; Joppke, 2017a, 2017b).

The delicate balance between universality and cultural specificity is at the core of the ongoing debate surrounding the interpretation and implementation of human rights in multicultural societies. While the concept of human rights posits a set of universal entitlements for all human beings, the precise relationship between cultural diversity and human rights remains open to interpretation. This paper aims to contribute to this discourse by investigating

the complex interplay between socio-cultural factors and human rights in multicultural settings. The paper delves into how cultural norms, values, and beliefs influence human rights comprehension and application, as well as effective promotion and protection of these rights in diverse cultural contexts. Following this introduction, the paper delves into the existing literature on human rights in various contexts, outlines the research methodology, discusses the findings, and concludes with recommendations for promoting and protecting human rights in multicultural societies. The goal is to provide a more balanced and context-sensitive understanding of human rights, one that embraces cultural diversity while upholding the fundamental principles of human dignity and equality.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human Rights in Diverse Context: A Theoretical Review

Human rights, as articulated by Orend (2002), represent the collective moral and ethical duties we owe to one another. These rights serve as a set of guidelines that inform our interactions, emphasizing the necessity of treating each individual with dignity and respect. Within the tapestry of diverse communities, the socio-cultural fabric plays a pivotal role in shaping the interpretation and application of human rights. Cultural norms and values are instrumental in forming our perceptions of justice and entitlement. It is crucial to recognize that human rights are dynamic; they adapt and evolve in tandem with the socio-cultural evolution of societies, mirroring shifts in collective norms and values. Yet, amidst this variability, the core tenet of human rights stands unwavering: the inherent dignity and respect due to every person. This tenet anchors the concept of human rights, directing our actions and interactions across varying contexts. Human rights transcend their legal and philosophical definitions to encapsulate the moral and ethical responsibilities we hold towards each other. They are guiding principles that advocate for treating everyone with dignity and respect, irrespective of our differences. The philosophical underpinnings provided by thinkers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, John Stuart Mill, and Immanuel Kant offer a broad framework to understand the intricate nexus between human rights and the socio-cultural setting.

Hobbes (1996) posited that in the state of nature, humans are motivated by self-interest, and without a social contract, life would be 'nasty, brutish, and short'. According to Hobbes, human rights emerge from a social contract where individuals cede certain freedoms to a sovereign in exchange for protection and order. Thus, the scope of human rights is largely determined by societal agreement and the sovereign's will. Locke (1988) presented a contrasting view, arguing that individuals possess natural rights to life, liberty, and property, which precede the formation of government. Consistent with Locke, the governed establish a legitimate government with their consent to safeguard these pre-existing rights. Therefore, human rights are inherent, and the role of the government is to safeguard them. Rousseau (2018) also centered his theory around the social contract, but he believed that humans are inherently good, and that society corrupts them. Rousseau's concept of the 'general will' reflects

the collective interest of the people, which should guide the interpretation and implementation of human rights. In his view, human rights are best preserved in a society where individuals act according to this general will. Mill (2011) emphasized the importance of individual liberty and autonomy. His utilitarian approach suggests that actions are right if they promote happiness and wrong if they produce the opposite. Furthermore, Mill's advocacy for freedom of expression and women's rights indicates his belief that human rights should be interpreted in a way that maximizes overall well-being. Kant focused on the intrinsic dignity of individuals, arguing that humans, as rational beings, are ends in themselves and should never be used merely as means to an end (Kant & Wood, 2018). Additionally, Kant's categorical imperative demands that we act in ways that respect the humanity in others, suggesting that human rights should be implemented universally and without exception.

Moreover, Hegel perceived the nation-state as the embodiment of moral liberty, a realm where the individual's genuine liberty is actualized within the state's logical framework (Blunden, 2021). In contrast, Marx interpreted the state as an instrument for perpetuating class subjugation, envisioning history as a narrative of class conflicts that ultimately led to the proletariat's triumph over the bourgeoisie (Blunden, 2021). Fukuyama (2012), on the other hand, theorized that the end of history coincides with the global embrace of liberal democracy, indicating that the ideological journey reaches its zenith in a form of governance that optimally embodies human freedoms. These philosophical viewpoints mirror the dynamic nature of ideologies, their impact on societal perceptions, and the prioritization of human rights, with each thinker providing a unique perspective for assessing their significance and practical application. Hence, human rights interpretations are not static concepts but are significantly influenced by communities' socio-cultural contexts and philosophical underpinnings.

Universality and Cultural Relativism

The discourse surrounding the concepts of universality and cultural relativism in the context of human rights is complex. It presents a dichotomy that reflects the tension between globally accepted ethical standards and the norms that are specific to individual cultures. The principle of universality asserts that human rights are inherent to every individual, regardless of their cultural or societal background. This principle supports the notion of universal rights, which include the right to life, the right to be free from torture, and the right to freedom of expression. These rights are deemed applicable to all individuals, irrespective of their cultural context (Bayefsky, 2021). However, applying a universal system of values, often centered around Western ideologies, to diverse cultures can result in conflicts. This highlights the tension that exists between the concepts of moral universalism, which advocates for a single set of moral principles for all humans, and moral relativism, which posits that morality is relative to the norms of one's culture. Alternatively, cultural relativism presents a different perspective. It argues for the interpretation of human rights within the specific cultural contexts, acknowledging the diversity and multiplicity of cultural norms and values (Donnelly, 2006; Freeman, 2022). It asserts that cultural foundations deeply embed the legitimacy of rights and

rules, cautioning against enforcing a uniform set of rights that could disregard local traditions and violate autonomy. This viewpoint underscores the importance of understanding and respecting the distinctive aspects of different cultures when considering human rights.

In multicultural societies, the tension between the principles of universality and cultural relativism becomes more evident, necessitating a deeper understanding and appreciation for diverse worldviews (Kymlicka, 1995; Modood, 2019). The challenge lies in respecting and honoring cultural differences without compromising fundamental human rights. While societies strive to apply human rights uniformly, certain rights, such as human dignity, are universally recognized. However, other rights, including freedom of speech and minority rights, require more poised approaches that take into account the specific cultural contexts (Esses, 2021; Joppke, 2017a, 2017b). The task is to reconcile these approaches with existing power dynamics. Cultural relativism, while advocating for respect of cultural norms, can inadvertently intensify power disparities. There are instances where the notion of "religious freedom" is exploited in ways that violate the established norms that regulate freedom of religion or belief. In certain situations, nations have declined to acknowledge entire classes of rights, such as economic, social, and cultural rights, or have attempted to deny rights to entire groups of people (OHCHR, 2018). In Kenya, the traditional laws of some ethnic groups unfairly discriminate against women in matters of property ownership and inheritance (Reid, 2013). During the early 1990s in the United States, "traditional values" became the battle cry for evangelist Pat Robertson's "Culture War", which was essentially a coded opposition to women's rights that he alleged were eroding family values (Reid, 2013).

Moreover, cultural norms that approve of gift-giving to officials might conflict with global standards that categorize such practices as bribery. This is supported by studies that have explored the cultural contexts of corruption, particularly in societies where gift-giving is a common practice. In her book "Suspicious Gifts", Malin Åkerström (2014) examines the dynamics of gift-giving in international adoptions. She discusses how gifts can compromise adoption integrity and the dilemma agencies face when aid work isn't separate from adoption work. If not provided, agencies risk appearing solely interested in their "own" children (Akerstrom, 2014). Another study highlighted the grey areas of morality within bribery issues, suggesting that what might be considered a gift in one culture could be seen as a bribe in another (Dion, 2016). Furthermore, gender inequalities, especially in some parts of the Middle East and Africa, exemplify the potential conflicts between cultural relativism and universal human rights standards. A report by UNICEF on the situation of women and girls in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region highlighted that despite progress related to gender equality, gender gaps persist and are often exacerbated by cultural norms and practices (UNICEF, 2021). Another study pointed out that gender egalitarianism has not been achieved in any society worldwide and is particularly curtailed in the MENA region (Benstead, 2021). These issues underscore the necessity for open dialogue to navigate power imbalances, promote understanding, and foster an inclusive environment.

Dialogue serves as a powerful tool for fostering mutual understanding, empathy, shared values, and intercultural exchange. It encourages societies to learn from one another, promoting openness and challenging ethnocentrism (Parekh, 2006). Through dialogue, societies can identify common norms that transcend cultural limits, laying the groundwork for universal human rights. Dialogue is closely associated with intercultural and interreligious communication, as well as pluralism (Donnelly, 2006, 2013). In the broader human rights framework, cultural rights warrant attention alongside the traditional emphasis on civil and political rights. These rights are vital for the harmonious coexistence of individuals and communities. Dialogue encourages critical inquiry into how cultural practices affect rights, what adjustments are necessary, and how cultural disputes can be resolved. It is essential to advocate for human rights education that integrates cultural perspectives, teaching both universal principles and context-specific applications. Involving diverse voices in policy formulation ensures that marginalized communities actively participate. Acknowledging legal pluralism, where formal legal systems coexist with customary or religious laws, is also essential. Thus, balancing individual rights with collective rights is a complex but indispensable pursuit for achieving justice and equality (Kymlicka, 1995; Modood et al., 2020; Parekh, 2006).

METHODS

Based on the work of Creswell and Poth (2018), Denzin and Lincoln (2017), and Yin (2018), this paper used a qualitative design to look into how socio-cultural factors affect how people understand and apply human rights. This design allowed for a thorough exploration of cultural norms, beliefs, and power dynamics, as well as their impact on the perception and exercise of human rights across communities. A Cultural Relativism Framework was adopted to examine how cultural norms and values influence the perception and implementation of human rights (Donnelly, 2006). This framework posits that there is no single, universal standard for human rights and that the understanding and application of these rights are shaped by the cultural context in which they are embedded. This approach aligns with the qualitative design's emphasis on understanding the subtle ways in which cultural factors shape individuals' and communities' experiences and interpretations of human rights (Donnelly, 2006, 2013).

A systematic literature review was conducted using peer-reviewed journals, academic books, and reports from recognized human rights organizations. The inclusion criteria focused on relevance to human rights theories, socio-cultural impacts, and empirical evidence across diverse geographical and cultural contexts. Case studies were meticulously selected to illuminate the cultural distinctiveness of human rights practices, taking into account cultural representation, geographical diversity, and the potential to provide insight into successful integration or challenges in aligning human rights with cultural practices. In a dual-method content analysis, a coding framework was used to organize literature and case studies data in a way that made it easier to find main themes that were relevant to the research question and allowed for a more in-depth look at how human rights and socio-cultural factors interact.

Themes were identified through a rigorous process of coding and analysis, revealing the socio-cultural factors impacting human rights, including the importance of community over individual rights in some cultures, and examining specific case studies where cultural practices either support or hinder human rights implementation. A thorough document analysis was conducted to understand the perspectives of various groups involved in and affected by human rights practices across cultural contexts. Ethical integrity was paramount, focusing on the responsible use of secondary data, proper attribution, and adherence to copyright and privacy standards. A culturally sensitive approach was adopted to mitigate potential misinterpretations and biases in the analysis. Comprehensive documentation of the study process was maintained, including database searches, search terms, and the rationale behind case study selection, enhancing the study's reproducibility.

FINDINGS

The study identified several key themes from the literature and case studies, elucidating the intricate relationship between socio-cultural dynamics and the interpretation and application of human rights. The findings underscore the profound influence of diverse cultural expressions on the understanding and implementation of human rights principles. In multicultural settings, significant variations were observed in the interpretation and application of these principles, highlighting the critical need to acknowledge and respect cultural diversity when advocating for universal human rights.

The research illustrates the substantial impact of social, cultural, and political contexts on the application of human rights. These contexts shape the perception, valuation, and exercise of human rights within different communities, leading to variations in priorities and strategies. The convergence of various cultural elements in shaping human rights practices emerged as a pivotal finding. The complex interplay of values, beliefs, and customs underscores the dynamic nature of human rights implementation across cultures, where local norms and traditions often intersect with international human rights standards.

The study critically examines the roles of various entities in shaping human rights interpretations. The contributions and interactions of states, civil society organizations, and international bodies were found to be essential for understanding the broader impacts of socio-cultural influences on the realization of human rights at both local and global levels. These entities play a crucial role in mediating between local cultural practices and international human rights norms, facilitating a more subtle and context-sensitive approach to human rights advocacy.

Furthermore, the research highlights the importance of theoretical frameworks in analyzing the socio-cultural dimensions of human rights. By integrating empirical evidence with theoretical insights, the study provides a comprehensive understanding of how cultural influences permeate human rights practices. This approach allows for a more detailed examination of how cultural contexts shape human rights priorities and strategies, offering

valuable insights into the complexities of human rights implementation in diverse settings. The intricate interaction of values, beliefs, and customs, along with the roles of various entities, underscores the need for a culturally sensitive approach to human rights advocacy.

DISCUSSION

Multiculturalism and Diverse Interpretations

Multiculturalism advocates for the harmonious coexistence of diverse cultural groups within a society, championing equal rights and opportunities for all (Kymlicka, 1995). This philosophy stands in contrast to assimilationist policies that pressure minority cultures to conform to the dominant one. The application of human rights in multicultural contexts, however, presents complexities. Cultural variances in the interpretation of human rights can lead to a preference for communal rights over individual freedoms in some societies, prioritizing collective well-being and harmony over personal liberties. In Western societies, rights such as freedom of speech and privacy are cornerstones of individual autonomy. When these individual rights conflict with communal norms, it underscores the intricate balance needed between upholding collective welfare and respecting individual freedoms. This dichotomy prompts a critical examination of how cultural practices should be integrated within the human rights framework and sparks discussions on national identity and the role of education in fostering intercultural respect (Donnelly, 2013; Kymlicka, 1995).

Kymlicka (1995) emphasizes the significance of preserving minority cultures' unique identities, advocating for "group-differentiated rights," including the establishment of educational institutions and the use of native languages in public services. These rights are pivotal for sustaining cultural diversity and social cohesion. Parekh (2006) highlights the necessity of dialogue for mutual cultural understanding, proposing that human rights emerge from intercultural discourse rather than being imposed by a single culture. This view challenges the Western-centric human rights paradigm, advocating for a more inclusive approach. Modood (2019) addresses the challenges of integrating Muslim communities into Western Europe, suggesting a re-evaluation of political secularism to accommodate cultures where religion is integral to public and private spheres. This calls for an interdisciplinary approach, merging normative political theory with empirical sociology, to gain a comprehensive understanding of multiculturalism's societal impact (Modood, 2019; Modood et al., 2020).

While many often cite Canada as a successful model of multiculturalism (Uberoi, 2016), European nations have had varying experiences with the implementation of such policies (Esses, 2021; Joppke, 2017a, 2017b). In Europe, multiculturalism has been both celebrated for its inclusiveness and criticized for its potential to fragment societies. Sweden, for example, has long been a proponent of multicultural policies. The country has implemented measures such as the inclusion of multiculturalism in school curricula and the funding of bilingual education, which have helped immigrant communities maintain their cultural identities while integrating into Swedish society (Vézina, 2021). However, these policies have also faced criticism for leading to

the creation of parallel societies where immigrant groups live in segregated communities, potentially hindering full integration (Kivisto & Wahlbeck, 2013; Staver et al., 2019). The Netherlands once embraced multiculturalism but has since shifted towards a more assimilationist approach. Previously, Dutch policies supported minority languages and funded ethnic group organizations. Yet, the rise of social tensions and concerns about national identity led to a re-evaluation of these policies, with a greater emphasis now on integration and Dutch language proficiency (Joppke, 2017a, 2017b).

Germany has grappled with multiculturalism, particularly in light of its significant Turkish immigrant population. Efforts to integrate these communities have included support for cultural activities. Nonetheless, debates continue over the balance between preserving cultural identity and ensuring cohesion within German society (Joppke, 2017a, 2017b). France stands out for its staunchly republican model, which emphasizes equality and secularism over cultural recognition. This has led to controversies, such as the ban on religious symbols in public schools, reflecting a tension between the state's secular values and the multicultural reality of its population (Joppke, 2017a, 2017b). The United Kingdom has pursued a version of multiculturalism that promotes diversity while also seeking to foster a shared British identity. Initiatives like the Race Relations Act and the establishment of the Equality and Human Rights Commission are examples of this approach.

However, the UK has also faced challenges, such as the difficulty of addressing socio-economic disparities among different cultural groups (Joppke, 2017a, 2017b). The Nordic countries, particularly Norway and Denmark, have robust social support systems that aim to balance social welfare with respect for cultural diversity (Kivisto & Wahlbeck, 2013; Staver et al, 2019). These countries offer comprehensive social services to all residents, regardless of background, which helps to mitigate some of the economic disparities that can arise in multicultural societies. However, there have been debates about the extent to which these welfare systems can accommodate the cultural practices of diverse populations without compromising the Nordic social model (Kivisto & Wahlbeck, 2013; Staver et al., 2019). The experiences of these countries illustrate the delicate act of balancing the preservation of cultural diversity with the promotion of social cohesion and a shared sense of national identity.

The Impact of Social, Cultural and Political Contexts

The understanding, interpretation, and implementation of human rights are deeply influenced by the socio-cultural context of a society. This context, characterized by a dynamic interplay of values, social norms, religious traditions, historical experiences, and socio-political ideologies, shapes how individuals, groups, and communities perceive the significance of various rights, the urgency of addressing violations, and the appropriate methods for achieving rights protection. Rousseau's concept of the "social contract" and the inherent goodness of people in their natural state suggest that the socio-cultural framework of a community can significantly affect the interpretation and application of human rights (Rousseau, 2018). Values, which form the foundation of how human rights are perceived, play a crucial role. Societies that emphasize

equality may underscore non-discrimination principles more broadly than those that prioritize other values such as hierarchy or tradition. Social norms, which are informal yet widely accepted rules of behavior, also shape attitudes towards rights and individual willingness to defend them. For instance, societies that are against violence are likely to adopt stricter stances on the right to life and physical safety than those where violence is more commonplace. Haiti battles political instability, poverty, and disasters, facing widespread violence and safety issues despite efforts to ameliorate conditions through local and global aid. Conversely, Norway enjoys a peaceful, stable environment underpinned by strong social welfare, education, and healthcare, ensuring safety through effective law enforcement and strict gun control. While Haiti works to overcome safety challenges with limited resources, Norway's emphasis on preventive measures and human rights safeguards its citizens' well-being and security.

Religious traditions significantly shape the human rights landscape. Locke's emphasis on a state of perfect freedom suggests that the governance structures within a community can influence the implementation of human rights (Locke, 1988). The ongoing debates in Europe about abortion rights and religious symbols in educational spaces reflect the intricate relationship between individual rights, national traditions, and public order. Saudi Arabia's Sharia law starkly contrasts with Western standards of rights, particularly concerning women (Al-Rasheed, 2016). However, religious influences on human rights are not confined to Islam. Despite being outlawed, India's caste system, linked to Hindu traditions, continues to be a persistent violation of human rights (Deshpande, 2020). Religious freedom often collides with state security concerns, as seen in China's treatment of religious groups like the Tibetans and Uighurs (Chan & Carlson, 2005). The United States wrestles with debates on abortion rights, which have strong religious underpinnings (West, 2014). The Buddhist-Muslim conflicts in Myanmar tragically demonstrate the impact of religious differences on human rights (Schissler et al., 2017). In Iran, the legal system is shaped by strict adherence to religious interpretations (Kamali, 1998). The Orthodox Church's influence on Russian policy impacts minority rights (Stoeckl, 2016). The role of religion in state policy highlights the challenges of aligning international human rights law with nations guided by socio-cultural principles, as seen in Brazil's Indigenous land disputes and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Busbridge, 2018; Cambou, 2020; Conceição et al, 2021). These cases underscore the profound influence of religious traditions on the interpretation and implementation of human rights.

The historical context of a society can significantly influence the interpretation and application of human rights. Hobbes' theory of social contract, for instance, posits that the collective agreement within a community can shape the interpretation of human rights (Hobbes, 1996). Societies with a history of oppression or discrimination may place a stronger emphasis on equality and non-discrimination (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020). In societies with diverse cultures, the historical backdrop significantly shapes the understanding and application of rights. For instance, in the United States, the civil rights movement of the 1960s has shaped the country's understanding and implementation of equal rights (National Park Service, 2024).

Similarly, in Germany, the legacy of the Holocaust has had a profound impact on the country's approach to human rights. The historical experience of state-sponsored genocide has led to a strong commitment to human rights, both domestically and internationally (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020). Therefore, issues such as the integration of immigrants and refugees show that historical contexts must be considered in the ongoing efforts to protect and promote human rights. These issues highlight the importance of understanding historical contexts when advocating for universal human rights in multicultural environments. Moreover, it underscores the need for inclusive and context-sensitive approaches to human rights advocacy. The dynamic interaction between these factors and the interpretation of human rights principles is critical for effective human rights promotion and protection.

Furthermore, socio-political ideologies and the philosophical narratives that underpin them exert a profound influence on the understanding and prioritization of human rights within different societies. Mill's advocacy for utilitarianism and freedom of speech, for instance, suggests that the dominant ideologies within a community can shape the interpretation of human rights (Mill, 2011). The focus of Hegel on the state, Marx's emphasis on class struggle, and Fukuyama's 'end of history' proposition all reflect shifting ideologies that shape socio-political contexts (Fukuyama, 2012). For example, post-colonial societies, having endured exploitation and discrimination, strive for social justice to rectify past injustices (Gandhi, 2018; R'boul, 2020). Affirmative action and providing opportunities for disadvantaged groups through quotas in education and employment are examples of measures taken. Land reforms redistribute confiscated lands to indigenous populations. Cultural revival promotes suppressed indigenous cultures, languages, and traditions. Legal reforms repeal or amend discriminatory laws favoring colonial powers. Discussions on reparations from former colonial powers are ongoing. These efforts aim to create a more equitable society, acknowledging and addressing the systemic inequalities of the colonial era (Baxi, 2012; Gandhi, 2018; R'boul, 2020). Similarly, South Africa's focus on equality is a response to its legacy of apartheid (Klug, 2000), while Rwanda, in the aftermath of its devastating genocide, prioritizes unity and reconciliation, with an emphasis on reducing inequality to prevent future conflict (Barnett, 2002). Bosnia's constitution grapples with the challenge of addressing ethnic division and minority rights in the aftermath of war (Belloni, 2007). Meanwhile, countries with more peaceful histories, such as Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, emphasize social welfare rights (Esping-Andersen, 1990). These instances underscore how socio-political contexts significantly shape the focus of human rights within multicultural societies.

Intersection of Values, Beliefs, and Customs

The intersection of varied values, beliefs, and customs in multicultural environments underscores the complexities in the realm of universal human rights (Modood, 2019; Modood et al., 2020). These diverse settings, though culturally rich, intensify the issues faced by indigenous populations, women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities (Parekh, 2006). Indigenous communities often find their rights in conflict with the dominant society. Their

ancestral lands are frequently targeted for resource extraction, leading to displacement and the devastation of vital ecosystems (Conceição et al, 2021; Ford et al., 2020; Scheidel et al., 2023). This not only disrupts their livelihoods but also erodes cultural practices intrinsically tied to the land. The Sámi people of Northern Europe exemplify this struggle, as their reindeer herding traditions and cultural identity are threatened (Österlin & Raitio, 2020). Respecting indigenous rights requires recognizing their deep connection to the land, the significance of self-determination and collective rights, and the validity of their customary laws (Cambou, 2020). Legal frameworks must be strengthened to ensure land ownership, self-governance, and meaningful participation in decision-making processes.

In many multicultural societies, such as those in South Asia, the Middle East, and parts of Africa, women face unique challenges due to gender inequality interwoven with cultural or religious norms. Discriminatory practices often undermine women's autonomy, with the concept of family 'honor' being particularly damaging in some contexts (Chantler & McCarry, 2020; Dikmen & Munevver, 2020). Under the guise of upholding morality, the notion of family 'honor' serves to control women's behavior and can lead to violence, forced marriages, and even honor killings. This is particularly prevalent in societies where patriarchal norms are deeply entrenched, such as in parts of South Asia and the Middle East (Chantler & McCarry, 2020; Dikmen & Munevver, 2020). Women's economic empowerment is also limited by restricted access to education, restrictions on property rights, and participation in the workforce, perpetuating dependence (World Bank, 2023).

In countries like Tanzania, Uganda, Kenya, and Liberia, women often face restrictions on land ownership and inheritance, which limits their economic independence and reinforces patriarchal power structures. This is because, despite legal frameworks promoting equitable land ownership, social and cultural norms often do not recognize women as the rightful owners of communal land (World Bank, 2023). Furthermore, issues around arranged marriages in some cultures bring up concerns regarding autonomy and consent, especially for women. This necessitates a delicate balance between respecting cultural practices and ensuring the right to marry freely (Chantler & McCarry, 2020). In societies where arranged marriages are common, such as in South Asia, this can often result in women being forced into marriages against their will, undermining their autonomy and rights (Chantler & McCarry, 2020; Dikmen & Munevver, 2020; World Bank, 2023). Tackling these issues necessitates legal reform, awareness campaigns, and investment in women's education and economic opportunities to shift harmful norms and create a society where women's rights are fully realized. This includes implementing laws that protect women's rights, raising awareness about the harmful effects of discriminatory practices, and promoting women's education and economic participation.

Minority groups, defined based on ethnicity, religion, language, or sexual orientation, frequently encounter systemic discrimination and marginalization, which can significantly impact their well-being and access to opportunities (Esses, 2021; Joppke, 2004; Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2006; Tyrberg, 2024). These experiences are not isolated incidents but rather pervasive

issues that affect numerous communities worldwide. The Rohingya people in Myanmar exemplify the extreme consequences of such discrimination. They have faced intense persecution, including violence, displacement, and denial of citizenship, reflecting a severe violation of human rights (Zarni & Cowley, 2014). Their plight underscores the potential consequences of unchecked discrimination and the international community's role in addressing such injustices. Similarly, the Roma people in Europe, despite their longstanding presence on the continent, continue to confront significant prejudice and barriers to inclusion. This marginalization manifests in various forms, including limited access to education, employment, and healthcare, which perpetuate cycles of poverty and social exclusion (Lecerf, 2024). Migrants represent another group that often faces discrimination and exploitation. Their experiences can include labor exploitation, inadequate access to essential services, and xenophobia, which can exacerbate their vulnerabilities and hinder their integration into host societies (Esses, 2021; Tyrberg, 2024).

Moreover, individuals with disabilities face unique challenges that hinder their full participation and integration in many multicultural societies (Dammeyer & Chapman, 2018; Degener & de Castro, 2022). Discrimination is a significant barrier, where societal biases and stereotypes lead to unequal opportunities in education, employment, and social engagement. Such discrimination not only affects their material conditions but also undermines their sense of self-worth and dignity. Inaccessible infrastructure further exacerbates these challenges. Public spaces, transportation, and buildings often lack the necessary accommodations, making it difficult for people with disabilities to navigate and participate in society. This physical inaccessibility reflects and reinforces societal attitudes that do not prioritize or value the needs and rights of disabled individuals. Negative societal attitudes, including prejudice and ignorance, contribute to the marginalization of people with disabilities. These attitudes can manifest in overt discrimination or more subtle forms of exclusion and paternalism, undermining the dignity and autonomy of disabled individuals. The concept of dignity, central to Kant's philosophy, emphasizes the inherent value and worth of every person, irrespective of their abilities or societal status, which deserves respect and should be afforded the chance to engage fully in societal activities. In Kant's philosophy, dignity is a fundamental principle that underscores the intrinsic value and importance of all individuals, regardless of their capabilities or social position (Kant & Wood, 2018).

In multicultural contexts, a myriad of human rights issues emerge, predominantly affecting indigenous populations, women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities (Kymlicka, 1995; Modood, 2013). Indigenous communities assert their rights to land, cultural practices, and self-determination. It is imperative that legal systems evolve to acknowledge these rights and ensure indigenous peoples' significant involvement in decision-making processes that impact them. Women face multifaceted discrimination; redressing this necessitates legal amendments, educational initiatives, and economic empowerment strategies. Minorities require robust safeguards against discrimination, equal opportunities, and a sincere sense of inclusion. For

individuals with disabilities, the elimination of obstacles to comprehensive societal involvement is crucial. Promoting mutual understanding among diverse groups, implementing stringent legal protections, and providing substantial societal support are critical to mitigating tensions within different societies. This strategy is fundamental to fostering inclusive communities where the rights and dignity of all individuals are respected and upheld.

Roles of States, Civil Society, and International Organizations

States play a crucial role in shaping human rights interpretation in multicultural societies. They have a primary responsibility to implement treaty obligations within their domestic legal systems. Their courts and legal processes shape the understanding of rights through case law (Donnelly & Whelan, 2020). These states are also responsible for enforcing human rights by investigating violations, holding perpetrators accountable, and providing remedies. States are accountable to the international community, obligated to participate in monitoring and reporting mechanisms, and must uphold international human rights law. Thus, states are obligated to respect, protect, and fulfill human rights through legislation, policies, and practices. However, many states face challenges such as balancing individual rights with collective rights, managing cultural diversity, and addressing discrimination. In Canada, the state promotes multiculturalism and human rights through the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. However, it faces challenges in addressing the rights of indigenous peoples and racial minorities. In South Africa, the state has implemented affirmative action policies to redress past injustices. However, it struggles with issues of inequality and xenophobia (Ndhlovu, 2019). In India, the state grapples with religious diversity and caste-based discrimination, despite constitutional protections for human rights (Mosse, 2018).

Civil society organizations (CSOs) play a pivotal role in interpreting human rights (Bayefsky, 2021; Donnelly & Whelan, 2020). They utilize advocacy to raise awareness, instigate reforms, and address instances of rights violations. CSOs monitor state compliance with human rights norms, document violations, and assist in reporting these abuses internationally. They use strategic litigation to clarify how rights are applied in specific scenarios and seek justice for victims. Moreover, CSOs facilitate human rights discussions by acting as intermediaries between governments, communities, and international bodies, ensuring those most affected have a voice in rights interpretation. However, they encounter challenges such as resource limitations, state repression, and societal resistance. In the United States, entities like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) advocate for civil rights but grapple with systemic racism and discrimination (Clayton, 2018). Similarly, in Brazil, CSOs work to protect indigenous communities' rights despite facing violence, discrimination, intimidation, threats, attacks, criminalization, and legal barriers related to land demarcation and territorial rights (Hanna et al., 2016).

In China, civil society faces challenges such as freedom of expression and assembly restrictions, limited government capacity to control NGO corruption, NGO dependence on the government, and motivational issues among NGO staff (Biddulph, 2015; Chan & Carlson, 2005; Lu, 2005; Teets, 2014). Recent developments suggest an intensified crackdown on political

dissent, independent NGOs, and human rights defenders (Freedom House, 2024). The revised Counterespionage Law restricts information transmission related to national security and permits authorities to inspect electronic equipment and data (Freedom House, 2024). These actions have significantly weakened China's civil society, limiting its ability to advocate for human rights (Freedom House, 2024). Although human rights provide individuals with rightful claims to certain goods, services, opportunities, and protections, formal recognition of these rights does not guarantee their fulfillment. Group assertiveness and mobilization, often through institutional and policy reform initiatives, are crucial in ensuring equal rights and recognition within a state. Human rights empower minority rights activists to advocate for their rights, regardless of their background or cultural identity. In this sense, human rights safeguard human dignity and equip citizens to become active agents of change. Activism is thus instrumental in promoting understanding, tolerance, and peace (Donnelly, 2006, 2013; Donnelly & Whelan, 2020; Freeman, 2022).

International organizations also navigate complex terrain when it comes to human rights protection in diverse societies. Their role is multifaceted, encompassing interpretation, implementation, and grappling with cultural relativism. On the interpretation front, these organizations establish universal human rights frameworks through treaties and conventions. Nonetheless, multicultural realities require interpretations that strike a balance between respecting cultural diversity and upholding fundamental human rights. The UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) exemplifies this approach by offering "General Recommendations" that take into account cultural contexts while maintaining essential principles (Donnelly, 2006; Freeman, 2022). This approach ensures that rights are not just universally applied but are interpreted in a manner that respects the cultural diversity of different societies. At the same time, it prevents harmful practices from being justified as traditional customs. However, the actual implementation of these balanced interpretations poses its own set of challenges, such as ensuring compliance, dealing with resistance, and navigating complex socio-political landscapes.

Similarly, the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) conducts country reviews and identifies gaps. These treaty bodies collaborate with national governments and civil society to design implementation strategies that are culturally sensitive (Bayefsky, 2021; Donnelly, 2006). This might involve supporting the development of laws that resonate with local contexts while adhering to international standards. For instance, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) works with countries to translate human rights principles into national action plans that consider cultural specificities. However, the concept of cultural relativism can be a double-edged sword. While it encourages respect for diverse practices, it can also be misused to justify human rights abuses. International organizations need to tread carefully, harmonizing universality with cultural sensitivity. The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process, a UNHRC mechanism, exemplifies this. It allows member states to raise concerns about each other's human rights records while also acknowledging cultural particularities (Freeman, 2022).

CONCLUSION

The complex relationship between human rights and multicultural societies necessitates a poised approach that harmonizes universal principles with diverse cultural contexts. As globalization intensifies, cultivating mutual respect and understanding among culturally distinct communities becomes paramount. The universality of human rights, as enshrined in international frameworks, must be reconciled with the cultural particularities inherent in different societies. Achieving this equilibrium requires multifaceted strategies. Educational initiatives should integrate comprehensive human rights curricula that encompass both universal principles and cultural contexts, fostering awareness and respect. Dialogue among diverse groups is vital for mutual understanding and conflict resolution, facilitated by intercultural exchange platforms at various levels.

National legal systems should align with international human rights standards while accommodating cultural considerations and safeguarding individual and collective rights. Empowering civil society organizations to advocate for human rights and hold governments accountable is essential. Policymaking processes must be inclusive, involving diverse groups to ensure policies reflect the needs and rights of all. Proactive measures are necessary to combat discrimination and inequality faced by marginalized groups. Integrating customary and religious laws into formal legal systems while ensuring compliance with fundamental human rights principles can increase legitimacy and acceptance. International cooperation and support are crucial in assisting states to implement human rights standards. By implementing these recommendations, societies can establish environments where human rights are respected and protected for all individuals, irrespective of cultural background. This approach not only upholds the universality of human rights but also embraces the richness of cultural diversity, fostering peaceful and equitable societies.

Moreover, it is vital to acknowledge the limitations of this study. The qualitative research design, while providing in-depth insights, limits the generalizability of the findings. The reliance on secondary data from literature reviews and case studies may introduce biases based on the selected sources. Furthermore, the study's focus on theoretical frameworks and specific case studies means that the findings may not be applicable to all multicultural contexts. Future research could benefit from quantitative methods to complement the qualitative insights, ensuring a broader understanding of the interplay between human rights and cultural diversity. Additionally, more empirical research is needed to explore the practical implementation of the proposed strategies in different cultural settings.

REFERENCES

Akerstrom, M. (2014). *Suspicious gifts: Bribery, morality, and professional ethics* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315130507

Al-Rasheed, M. (2016). *Muted modernists: The struggle over divine politics in Saudi Arabia.* Oxford University Press.

Bayefsky, A. (2021). *The UN human rights treaty system: Universality at the crossroads.* Brill.

Baxi, U. (2012). Postcolonial legality: A postscript from India. *Verfassung Und Recht in Übersee / Law and Politics in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, 45(2), 178-194. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43256851

Belloni, R. (2007). *State building and international intervention in Bosnia* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203938003

Benstead, L. J. (2021). Gender equality and egalitarianism in the Middle East and North Africa. In: Leal Filho, W., Marisa Azul, A., Brandli, L., Lange Salvia, A., Wall, T. (Eds.) *Gender equality. Encyclopedia of the UN Sustainable Development Goals*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95687-9_4

Biddulph, S. (2015). *The stability imperative: Human rights and law in China*. Asia Pacific Legal Culture and Globalization. University of British Columbia Press.

Blunden, A. (2021). *Hegel, Marx and Vygotsky: Essays on social philosophy,* (vol. 195). Studies in Critical Social Sciences. Brill.

Barnett, M. (2002). *Eyewitness to a genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda.* Cornell University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt7zhf0

Busbridge, R. (2018). Israel-Palestine and the settler colonial 'turn': From interpretation to decolonization. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 35(1), 91-115. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276416688544

Cambou, D. (2019). The UNDRIP and the legal significance of the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination: A human rights approach with a multidimensional perspective. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 23(1-2), 34-50. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2019.1585345

Chan, K.-K., & Carlson, E. R. (2005). *Religious freedom in China: Policy, administration, and regulation: A research handbook*. Institute for the Study of American Religion.

Chantler, K., & McCarry, M. (2020). Forced marriage, coercive control, and conducive contexts: The experiences of women in Scotland. *Violence Against Women,* 26(1), 89-109. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219830234

Clayton, D. M. (2018). Black lives matter and the civil rights movement: A comparative analysis of two social movements in the United States. *Journal of Black Studies*, 49(5), 448-480. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934718764099

Conceição, K. V., Chaves, M. E., Picoli, M. C., Sánchez, A. H., Soares, A. R., Mataveli, G. A., & Camara, G. (2021). Government policies endanger the indigenous peoples of the Brazilian Amazon. *Land Use Policy*, 108, 105663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105663

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dammeyer, J., & Chapman, M. (2018). A national survey on violence and discrimination among people with disabilities. *BMC Public Health*, 18, 355. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5277-0

Degener, T., de Castro, M. G. C. (2022). Toward inclusive equality: Ten years of the human rights model of disability in the work of the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. In: Felder, F., Davy, L., Kayess, R. (eds). *Disability law and human rights. Palgrave Studies in Disability and International Development*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86545-0_2

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2017). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Deshpande, A. (2020). *The grammar of caste: Economic discrimination in contemporary India.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198072034.001.0001

Dikmen, H. A., & Munevver, G. I. (2020). The relationship between domestic violence and the attitudes of women towards honor, gender roles, and wife-beating in Turkey. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing,* 34(5), 421-426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2020.07.012

Dion, M. (2016). Bribery and the grey areas of morality. In: Dion, M., Weisstub, D., Richet, J. L. (Eds.) *Financial crimes: Psychological, technological, and ethical issues.* International Library of Ethics, Law, and the New Medicine, (vol 68). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32419-7_12

Donnelly, J. (2006). Cultural Relativism and Universal Human Rights. In M. Addo (Ed.), International Law of Human Rights (1st ed., pp. 173-192). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315092492

Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice* (NED-New edition, 3). Cornell University Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt1xx5q2

Donnelly, J., & Whelan, D. J. (2020). *International human rights* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism.* Princeton University Press.

Esses, V. M. (2021). Prejudice and discrimination toward immigrants. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 503-531. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-080520-102803

Lecerf, M. (2024). Understanding EU action on Roma inclusion. *European Parliamentary Research Service,* European Parliament. Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_BRI(2021)690629

Ford, J. D., King, N., Galappaththi, E. K., Pearce, T., McDowell, G., & Harper, S. L. (2020). The resilience of Indigenous peoples to environmental change. *One Earth*, 2(6), 532-543. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.05.014

Freeman, M. (2022). *Human rights*. (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Freedom House. (2024). *Freedom in the world 2024: China*. Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://freedomhouse.org/country/china/freedom-world/2024

Fukuyama, F. (2012). The end of history? In R. K. Betts (Ed.). *Conflict after the Cold War: Arguments on causes of war and peace* (4th ed.). (pp. 16-27). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315664484

Gandhi, L. (2018). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. (2nd ed.). New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press. https://doi.org/10.7312/gand17838

Hanna, P., Langdon, E. J., & Vanclay, F. (2016). Indigenous rights, performativity, and protest. *Land Use Policy*, 50, 490-506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.06.034

Hobbes, T. (1996). *Hobbes: Leviathan: Revised student edition*. (R. Tuck, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joppke, C. (2017a). Civic integration in Western Europe: Three debates. *West European Politics*, 40(6), 1153-1176. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2017.1303252

Joppke, C. (2017b). *Is multiculturalism dead? Crisis and persistence in the constitutional state*. John Wiley & Sons.

Kamali, M. (1998). *Revolutionary Iran: Civil society and state in the modernization process* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429447532

Kant, I. & Wood, A. (2018). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals: With an updated translation, introduction, and notes*. New Haven: Yale University Press. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300235722

Kivistö, P., & Wahlbeck, Ö. (2013). *Debating multiculturalism in the Nordic welfare states*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Klug, H. (2000). *Constituting democracy: Law, globalism and South Africa's political reconstruction*. Cambridge University Press.

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

Locke, J. (1988). *Locke: Two treatises of government*. (P. Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lu, Y. (2005). *The growth of civil society in China: Key challenges for NGOs*. Asia Programme ASP BP 05/01. The Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Mill, J. S. (2011). *On liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139149785

Modood, T. (2019). *Essays on secularism and multiculturalism*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Modood, T., Baubock, R., Carens, J., Mahajan, G., & Laegaard, S. (2020). Ethnocentric political theory, secularism and multiculturalism. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 20, 447-479. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-020-00414-4

Mosse, D. (2018). Caste and development: Contemporary perspectives on a structure of discrimination and advantage. *World Development*, 110, 422-436. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.06.003

National Park Service. (2024). *Civil Rights Movement*. U.S. Department of the Interior. Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www.nps.gov/subjects/civilrights/index.htm

Ndhlovu, F. (2019). South Africa's social transformation policies: Raciolinguistic ideologies and neoliberal rhetoric. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 14(2), 131-151. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2019.1592177

OHCHR (2018). *Universality, cultural diversity and cultural rights.* Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www.ohchr.org/en/stories/2018/10/universality-cultural-diversity-and-cultural-rights

Orend, B. (2002). *Human rights: Concept and context*. Broadview Press.

Parekh, B. (2006). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Reid, G. (2013). The trouble with tradition: When "values" trample over rights. In Human Rights Watch (Ed.), *World Report 2013: Events of 2012* (pp. 20–28). Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www.hrw.org/news/2013/01/11/trouble-tradition

Rousseau, J. -J. (2018). *Rousseau: The social contract and other later political writings.* (V. Gourevitch, Ed.) (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316584606

R'boul, H. (2020). Postcolonial interventions in intercultural communication knowledge: Meta-intercultural ontologies, decolonial knowledges and epistemological polylogue. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 15(1), 75-93. https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2020.1829676

Schissler, M., Walton, M. J., & Thi, P. P. (2017). Reconciling contradictions: Buddhist-Muslim violence, narrative making and memory in Myanmar. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 47(3), 376-395. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2017.1290818

Scheidel, A., Fernandez-Llamazares, A., Bara, A. H., Del Bene, D., David-Chavez, D. M., Fanari, E., Garba, I., Hanaek, K., Liu, J., Martínez-Alier, J., Navas, G., Reyes-García, V., Roy, B., Temper, L., Thiri, M. A., Tran, D., Walter, M., & Whyte, K. P. (2023). Global impacts of extractive and industrial development projects on Indigenous Peoples' lifeways, lands, and rights. *Science Advances*, 9(23). https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.ade9557

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research,* 104, 333-339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Staver, A. B., Brekke, J. P., & Søholt, S. (2019). *Scandinavia's segregated cities–policies, strategies and ideals*. Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www2.bufdir.no/Bibliotek/Dokumentside/?docId=BUF00004900

Stoeckl, K. (2016). The Russian Orthodox Church as moral norm entrepreneur. *Religion, State & Society*, 44(2), 132-151. https://doi.org/10.1080/09637494.2016.1194010

Teets, J. C. (2014). Civil society in China: Better governance under authoritarianism. In *Civil society under authoritarianism: The China model* (pp. 1-37). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139839396.002

Tyrberg, M. (2024). The impact of discrimination and support on immigrant trust and belonging. *European Political Science Review*, 16(1), 18-34. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773923000139

Uberoi, V. (2016). Legislating multiculturalism and nationhood: The 1988 Canadian Multiculturalism Act. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique*, 49(2), 267-287. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423916000366

UNICEF (2021). *Situational analysis of women and girls in the Middle East and North Africa: A decade review 2010 - 2020.* Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www.unicef.org/mena/reports/situational-analysis-women-and-girls-middle-east-and-north-africa

UNESCO. (2005). *Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.* Retrieved May 27, 2024, from https://www.unesco.org/creativity/en/2005-convention

Vézina, V. (2021). *Political ideologies and worldviews: An introduction*. Kwantlen Polytechnic University.

West, R. (2014). From choice to reproductive justice: De-constitutionalizing abortion rights. In R. West, J. Murray, & M. Esser (Eds.), *In search of common ground on abortion* (1st ed., pp. 19-51). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315588124

World Bank. (2023). *Women, business, and the law 2023*. Retrieved May 27, 2024, from http://hdl.handle.net/10986/39462

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zarni, M., & Cowley, A. (2014). The slow-burning genocide of Myanmar's Rohingya. *Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal*, 23, 683. https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wilj/vol23/iss3/8

Österlin, C., & Raitio, K. (2020). Fragmented landscapes and planscapes: The double pressure of increasing natural resource exploitation on indigenous Sámi lands in Northern Sweden. *Resources*, 9(9), 104. https://doi.org/10.3390/resources9090104

Disclosure/conflict of interest statement

The author declares no conflicts of interest.