

Transformation



Transformation is essential and the multicultural individual is portrayed as the standard of this system of worldwide culture. However, the cosmopolitanism inspires individuals to view religions as measly tacky, idiosyncratic objects or toys that individuals buy in the market and play with occasionally when they are bored. Cosmopolitanism never gets into religion on its own terms, but maintains loyalty to the substantial values of the market and secular democracy. Thus, cosmopolitanism preserves the superficial as the ultimate (Hicks 22).

Appiah's article underlines the contamination of frequently over-romanticized native ethnics by globalizing sways. Fascinatingly, he inscribes this article in the shadow of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's newly approved concord on the fortification and promotion of ethnic diversity. This document strives to reserve traditional distinctiveness in the face of an allegedly standardizing Western monoculture. He reproaches United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization as if there is no danger to native culture. He argues that the loss of ethnic diversity worldwide is similar to and steered by the same current economic powers that have triggered us to lose inborn biodiversity.

The shield of threatened species and biodiversity is a continuation and an extension of the fortification of cultural diversity via multiculturalism. These two are linked in engagement and in sharing a metaphysical underpinning. What he suggests as the ultimate distinction to traditional standards is Cosmopolitanism. He elevates the apparent features of the current social and economic system to an unmerited place. Contemplating whether it is

vital to safeguard “cultures” or individuals, Appiah resolves that the person should be the reconnaissance of ethical concern (Hicks 31).

Bearing in mind equality, Appiah claims that pockets of monoculture do exist, however, their “uniqueness” is weaker than it was 100 years ago. For the writer, this is an admirable thing as numerous of the undesirable ethnic issues such as fear of medicine, condemnation of outside fresh water consumption technologies, refutation of female education is being dismissed by outside forces. Additionally, because ethnics are never unchanging, the small territories of homogeneity are constantly in the process of usurping culture to generate new systems of difference. Appiah notes from this line of reasoning that Western capitalism monoculture might prowl across the world. Yet, it is barely a monoculture (Singer 229). He denotes that if individuals want to reserve a wide variety of human circumstances, which gives free individuals the chance to build their own lives, one cannot impose diversity by entrapping individuals within differences they long to escape from.

Considering the authenticity and preservation of ethics, Appiah resorts to cultures’ and societies’ right to self-government in the handling of their art, dress, and the way of life, rather than telling “authentic” ethnics how they ought to be in the globe. Hence, it is essential for individuals to have the privilege to decide how they exemplify themselves. He says that societies with no change are not authentic, they are just dead. Building on the notion of ethnic imperialism, he remarks that the philosophy that multinational capitalists founded in the West propels culture across the world. Therefore, standardizing society is absurd because it assumes an absence of self-

government and individuated hermeneutics (Singer 233). The ethnic industries could be producing a lone, identical message. Conversely, how that message is acquired, interpreted, and duplicated is something different.

At the end of the piece, Appiah contemplates counter-cosmopolitans that discard the standards of liberal republics in the West. He also contemplates the ridiculous consumerist ideas of Western world, such as the Ummah or global Muslim brotherhood. These are different from the “ extreme neo-fundamentalists” or what is identified in the US as extreme Muslim jihadists. Bearing these and the entire cosmopolitanism in mind, Appiah claims that a central commitment of the universal citizen is to diversify and acknowledge many existing ethics and customs. This in turn depends on knowledge that is flawed, impermanent, and subject to review in the face of fresh evidence. Bearing this in mind, he asks his readers to contemplate the consequences and obligations of worldwide declarations of privileges, as these depend on altering the laws of each nation in the globe (Singer 243).

Appiah emphasizes the function of perspective changes, and does not encourage the embodiment of cultural contamination. In other terms, it takes time for a person to be accustomed to changes. Such is the issue with women’s civil rights, slavery, and homosexuality. This indicates that it is important for people in the world to be receptive, and understand other individuals, other civilizations, other places, other contentions, other faults and other accomplishments. It is essential to understand where the differences and similarities overlap, and from that point people can gather information about how to live together in peace.