

From Feyerabend's Scientific Pluralism to Kymlicka's Political Multiculturalism: The Question of Social Unity

Feyerabend'in Bilimsel Plüralizminden Kymlicka'nın Siyasi Çokkültürlüğüne: Toplumsal Birlik Sorunsalı

BAHAR OK 

Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University

Received: 07.04.2024 | Accepted: 23.09.2024

Abstract: The understanding of scientism, developed in the modern period accepted scientific discourses as the only valid form of knowledge in society and excluded alternative views. This inspired totalitarian systems. Paul Feyerabend challenged the “tyranny of science” and proposed a pluralist approach to science in order to realize the ideal of a free and democratic society. Developing the theories of “Epistemological Anarchism” and “Scientific Pluralism,” he argued that knowledge could not be limited to a single method and put forward the concept of “Democratic Relativism” as an extension of these views. Feyerabend's pluralist ideas resonated not only in the scientific sphere but also in political philosophy and were reflected in Will Kymlicka's A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights. Kymlicka argued for a society that recognizes and supports cultural and ethnic diversity, arguing that individual, group and national rights must be protected. This article, Feyerabend's scientific pluralism with Kymlicka's political multiculturalism and evaluates their solutions to the tension between diversity and unity in modern societies. For this purpose, the article seeks answers to vital questions such as how both philosophers aim to keep differences together in their imagination of a multicultural society based on equality, how they plan to resolve possible conflicts, and how social unity can be achieved.

Keywords: Multiculturalism, pluralism, social unity, feyerabend, Kymlicka.



Introduction^{1 2}

The concept of multiculturalism has been discussed intensively in political philosophy since the 1960s. It has become yet more visible since the 1990s as a result of the intensification of political struggles of minorities for the recognition of their identities and cultures. This concept, also known as cultural pluralism, theorizes the possibility and conditions for different identities to live together in modern democracies, which, by definition, opposes the exclusion, oppression, or assimilation of others by a given dominant culture. This article examines Paul Feyerabend's theories of epistemological anarchism and scientific pluralism and their reflections in the political sphere in terms of multiculturalism.

Considering the basis of oppressive approaches to multiculturalism as originating from scientistic conceptualizations and criticizing the uniform and oppressive nature of science as such, Feyerabend emphasized the importance of scientific pluralism. His criticism of science and his thoughts on the social position of science formed the basis of his understanding of democratic relativism and free society. Feyerabend's critique of science, which shaped the basis of his multiculturalism, would find its political echo in Will Kymlicka.

Kymlicka, who developed multiculturalism through criticism of the liberal state, took an approach that defended the protection of minority rights. He based multiculturalism on the multiple cultural structures of societies. In this article, the theories of both philosophers based on pluralism will be introduced, and then a comparison of the theories will follow.

In doing so, it needs to be clarified why Feyerabend needs the theories of epistemological anarchism and scientific pluralism. This also requires an exploration of how he adapts these theories to democratic relativism and how they contribute to the imagination of the free society he wants to create. Simultaneously, this brings the question of why Kymlicka needs

¹ A little portion of the results in this article were presented in SWIPTR 6th Turkish Women Philosophers Conference, 2-3 December 2023, Kadir Has University (<https://swip-tr.weebly.com/swip-tr-6.html>).

² This work is supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK 3501-ShortTerm R&D Funding Program), Project Number: 122K779. Also, the author would like to thank Assistant Professor Tuğba Sevinç Yücel and Phd. Bahtiyar Mermertaş for the constructive feedback.



political multiculturalism through his criticism of the liberal state. In seeking answers to this question, this article will additionally examine his *The Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Finally, the adequacy of the explanations offered by both philosophers for social unity and whether they offer solutions to possible social problems will be discussed. It will be emphasized whether the line from Feyerabend's scientific pluralism to Kymlicka's political multiculturalism has been successful in providing a roadmap for an equal, just, and free society and ensuring social unity.

Feyerabend, Epistemological Anarchism and Democratic Relativism

In addition to being one of the most important philosophers of science of the twentieth century, Feyerabend also dealt with the problem of human and social freedom, bringing his philosophical discussions into a political framework. He examined science not only in terms of its internal dynamics but also as a social institution. He additionally emphasized that science should exist by protecting its limits through democracy. The criticisms underlying Feyerabend's ideas evolving from scientific pluralism to social freedom can be explained under three main headings. Firstly, with his critique of the internal affairs of science, he started with the question of how to produce knowledge. He criticized the authoritarian and oppressive structure of science and expanded its scope with anti-authoritarian determinations and suggestions (Söker, 2023, p. 153). He defended epistemological anarchism by emphasizing that there should not be a single scientific method. Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism is very different in content from the concept of political anarchism (Feyerabend, 2007, p. 25). Feyerabend made use of the concept of anarchism in the sense of theoretical and methodological pluralism and emphasized that science should return to its original free structure. Feyerabend also used the term to describe the emergence of a skeptical consciousness with a complete rejection of the rigid rules of the scientific field (Kaya Keha, 2017, pp. 17-18). It is the exclusionary scientific understanding that claims to be concerned with the general structure of the world, whose methods and standards Feyerabend opposes. It is a scientific understanding that is, in Jacques Monod's words, "cold and austere" and that pretends to have knowledge about everything that exists (Feyerabend, 2011, p. 6). According to Feyerabend, science moved away from its initial free structure with the acceptance of a



universal method and became dogmatic and turned into an ideology. The method that will liberate science from this ideological structure is the method of epistemological anarchism.

The publicity of the method of epistemological anarchism led Feyerabend to be subjected to various criticisms and to be called “the worst enemy of science” in a *Nature* article in 1987 (Feyerabend, 1995a, p. 146). In Feyerabend’s method of epistemological anarchism, his aim is not an enmity or opposition to science but the idea that all scientific methods can be used. According to him, the problems that arise with the interventions of the sciences in nature and traditions manifest themselves not only in the scientific field but also in the cultural field. Feyerabend considers the epistemological theory of knowledge of the philosophy of science as “sick” due to the problems it suffers from, points out that this disease also affects other areas of society, and presents epistemological anarchism as a cure for this disease. The anarchism he proposes as a medicine is not seen as something permanent but as a temporary solution until the disease is cured (Feyerabend, 1993, p. 9).

Secondly, Feyerabend criticizes the social role of science. He criticizes the fact that science benefited from the traditions that preceded it in the process of its development and then became totalitarian and took a privileged position in society that it did not deserve. The oppressive and authoritarian understanding of science suppresses other traditions and does not give them a chance to express themselves. According to Feyerabend, rationalism, and science occupy a large part of the world, and even the most minor project is forced to be rational and scientific in order to be accepted (Feyerabend, 1994, p. 90). Feyerabend opposes this understanding on the grounds that science is not inviolable. For him, the authoritarian attitude of science turns it into the medieval church. The uncritical acceptance of scientists’ discourses as reflecting the truth is again reminiscent of the medieval clergy. According to him, scientists behave as the Roman Church once behaved, assuming that science is perfect and failing to prove it (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 73). Feyerabend argues that scientific assumptions or laws are not perfect and can be criticized, corrected, or even refuted and changed. According to him, the changes in the history of science, especially from Galileo to the present day, constitute the best example of



this (Feyerabend, 1993, pp. 75-76,93). According to Feyerabend, the more opposing scientific theories clash, the faster scientific progress and development will be (Kemaloğlu, 2024, pp. 94-95). With his theory of epistemological anarchism and the principle of 'Anything Goes,' he argued that there is no absolute and single method in science (Kaya Keha, 2017, p. 41; Saygılı, 2019, p. 308; Söker, 2023, p. 59).

Feyerabend believes that since science is the product of human endeavor, there is a connection between scientific laws and the social order that produces them (Feyerabend, 2011, p. 27). According to him, the possibility that an idea that is valid and accepted in one society may be unacceptable and forbidden in another demonstrates that scientific laws lack objectivity and absolute authority. Although scientists and people living in societies are aware of this feature of science, they are deceived by ideology, and in turn, they deceive ideology (Feyerabend, 2011, p. 87). Persuasion methods that were once available in the religious sphere are now finding their place in the scientific sphere. As can be seen, the assumption that the superiority of science is inherent in its nature has gone beyond science and become an object of faith (Feyerabend, 1978, pp. 73-74).

Thirdly, Feyerabend criticizes science and the state in order to restore the place of science in society. He proposes his own solution that the state and science should be separated, with the idea that the state should give all traditions an equal chance. According to Feyerabend, the separation of state and science will not harm technology as feared because there will always be those who will choose to be scholars, who will willingly accept "slavery of the lowest kind" as long as the price is paid. Humanity will advance thanks to these "willing slaves" (Güzel, 1996, p. 25). Feyerabend arrives at the idea of a free society by making science open to all kinds of knowledge, theories, and thought structures without loyalty or hostility to any thought or system. He presents the ideal of the society he wants to achieve as a model of a society in which every person and group is as free as possible. He identified the prevention of one group in society from interfering with the rights of other groups as the ultimate goal of the social ideal (Feyerabend, 2007, p. 17).

Feyerabend argues that the structure of a free society is not an ideology but a protective structure and that it should work like an iron fence



that protects individuals from danger, not like an iron fence that restricts people's freedom (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 30). According to Feyerabend, in a free society that protects everyone equally and gives every tradition an equal right to life, there will be a sense of trust and a stronger sense of belonging to society. This is because a free society cannot be created by imposing things. Such a society will come about through the initiatives of citizens on a small scale and the cooperation of nations on a large scale (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 30). Feyerabend consolidates his place in the field of political philosophy by presenting the idea of a protective and egalitarian state to determine the place of science in society and to ensure such cooperation. According to Feyerabend, who argues that all traditions are equal, the institution that will ensure and protect such cooperation and equality is the state. Just as religion and the state were once separated, science and the state must also be separated. The state should stand at an equal distance from all traditions and give each tradition a chance to express itself.

Based on Feyerabend's three main topics, it seems that he draws political conclusions from his theory of epistemological anarchism, which he developed to determine the role of science in contemporary democratic society. His theory of political philosophy, which he calls Democratic Relativism, is based on the idea that in a free society, all traditions are considered equal. According to him, societies that are committed to freedom and democratic relativism recognize the existence of all ideas, no matter how irrelevant they may be (Feyerabend, 1994, p. 57). With this acceptance, each tradition lives with its own cultural values while recognizing the existence of other traditions. Citizens of a free and democratic society in which democratic relativism prevails will be able to criticize, control, and, when necessary, change the institutions and science that surround them (Feyerabend, 1995b, p. 25).

Feyerabend has been criticized on the grounds that each tradition will think that it is the only true one and that the equality in question cannot be achieved. Steven Yates is one of the important figures who criticized Feyerabend's theory of democratic relativity by posing various questions. First of all, based on Feyerabend's assumption that the basic unit of society is tradition, he criticized the idea that in a system where tradition



takes precedence over the individual, one cannot freely choose one's tradition. According to Yates, the first question to be answered is whether individuals choose a tradition because they have grown up with the standards of the tradition they were born into or because they have actually chosen that tradition in comparison with other traditions (Yates, 1984, pp. 138-140). The questions of whether a society of the kind envisioned by Feyerabend can emerge, even in principle, and whether it is desirable for society if it is accepted that it can emerge, must then be addressed. According to Yates, in order for the individual to freely choose which tradition to join, the selection criteria mentioned by Feyerabend need to be clarified (Yates, 1984, p. 139). In order to determine whether Yates' criticisms of Feyerabend's democratic relativism are justified, it would be useful to elaborate on Feyerabend's views on how to achieve the ideal of a free society.

According to Feyerabend, in a free society, individuals are not bound by the standards of any tradition but choose between existing traditions after undergoing an educational process. This training includes a comparative but purely historical study of the major ideologies. What is taught here are theories, and in the end, educated individuals make choices between rationalism and irrationalism, science and mythology, or science and religion. According to Feyerabend, choices based on such post-training preferences would be more rational than the forced choice of science. Feyerabend defines individuals with a certain level of education as mature citizens who are able to decide what is best for their minds and themselves (Preston, 1997, p. 203). A mature citizen will have the mental fortitude to make choices and will not accept any pressure or imposition.

Feyerabend's epistemological anarchism, scientific pluralism, and democratic relativism stem from his ideal of a free society. Feyerabend believed that "people could move towards a way of life of peaceful coexistence of traditions, where people could form civil society organizations and interest groups and ensure that their demands were given equal consideration" (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 10).

However, Feyerabend does not tell us what should be done to ensure social unity in the event of a possible conflict with the deterioration of the sense of equality in society and the damage to social peace. He did not tell us what to do in the event that the conflictual situation, which he argued



was necessary for scientific traditions, reflected on society but left it to its natural process. In this natural process, since people will make decisions based on the cultural values in which they are involved, everyone's own culture will be more prominent, and they will hold their own culture superior to other cultures. When a conflict arises between traditions in society, the questions that need to be asked are who will be the person or persons to resolve it and how the conflict will be resolved. If one were to say that a group of experts is needed to solve the problem, Feyerabend would contradict what he has said so far (Yeniçırak, Hasan et al., 2013, p. 42). By finding answers to the questions of what role the state should play in these conflict situations and how these conflicts should be resolved, every culture in society should be liberated by believing that it is governed by equality and justice.

Kymlicka, Minority Rights and Multiculturalism

Kymlicka, one of the leading figures in the multiculturalism debates of the twentieth century, discusses the reflection of the concept of multiculturalism in the political sphere. He talks about the needs from which the theory of multiculturalism has emerged and the ways in which it was developed. The concept of equality-based democratic relativity, which is the basis for Feyerabend's transition from the scientific realm to the political realm, prepares the beginning of Kymlicka's multiculturalism to a certain degree. Of course, there is no question of influence or continuity here. Basically similar suggestions have been made in different methodological areas in this case. In particular, the gaps in the views of Feyerabend, evolving from the scientific realm to the political one, allow us to consider Kymlicka's position as complementary.

From time to time, some individuals in society perceive different cultural structures as a threat to social integrity, resulting in an idea that restricts the granting of various rights to cultures that are seen as a threat. In such a situation, individuals of non-mainstream cultural structures who think that they are marginalized may create problems and conflicts in society by thinking that they are disqualified and assimilated (Landowski, 1997, p. 80). Kymlicka finds the solution to such problems that are considered likely to occur in most of today's societies in an ideal state that will approach all citizens in society equally.



According to Kymlicka, in all liberal democracies, one of the major mechanisms for accommodating cultural differences is the protection of the civil and political rights of individuals (Kymlicka, 1997, p. 366). Certain cultural assumptions underlie this ideal. Kymlicka points out that when thinking about common rights, we need to take into account cultural pluralism and differentiated rights according to groups more (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 327). According to him, the idea of the ideal of the state in question, which will allow multicultural societies to live peacefully together, is a comprehensive ideal that will also affect world politics. In this ideal, which is called "Difference politics,' 'identity politics,' 'multiculturalism,' 'recognition politics'," "the aim is to develop a certain common national identity among citizens" (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 328).

While studying the desires and needs of different ethnic and cultural groups, Kymlicka combined them with the concept of multiculturalism. Since the ethnic or cultural groups that fill the content of the concept of multiculturalism are minorities, he conceptualized it in the form of a "Liberal Theory of Minority Rights". He stated the purpose of this theory as "to explain how minority rights correspond to a left-liberal tradition committed to equality of opportunity and social justice" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 12). In Kymlicka's philosophy, a minority is a cultural group that lived in their historical homeland before becoming part of a larger state. According to him, the transformation of minority groups into a part of a large state usually happens reluctantly, but sometimes it also happens voluntarily. The reason for this reluctance is that some cultural groups think that their own self-values will be assimilated if they integrate into a common national culture. Kymlicka suggests that minority groups should be given the right to self-government so that such an idea does not lead to conflicts and negativity in society. We can read this suggestion of Kymlicka from the following sentences; "I argue that Western democracies should accept the demands of national minorities concentrated in a certain piece of land, national recognition and national autonomy" (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 13).

Kymlicka holds that many nation-states in the past considered national minorities as a threat to national security and political stability. These states have taken various measures to ensure that national minorities do not have the idea of creating an identity of their own and that such a



request does not come up publicly. These measures have reached the extent of harsh sanctions from time to time and have harmed social peace and tranquility. Over time, attitudes towards national minorities have changed and societies have accepted the mistakes they have made against national minorities. “Empirically, the evidence has shown that it is useless to pressure national minorities to integrate with the dominant national group. Western states are grossly mistaken about the durability of minority national identities against time. The attributes of a national personality - namely, heroes, myths, and traditional customs- can change rapidly. But the identity itself, namely, the feeling of being a separate nation with its own national culture- is much more permanent” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 14).

According to Kymlicka, while some national minorities are content to continue to exist within the sovereign nation, others want self-government, the designation of their mother tongue as the official language, and public institutions to provide services in their own language. The question that needs to be asked here is why some national minorities are satisfied with the conditions in which they live while others see this as a restriction of their rights. Kymlicka answers this question by suggesting that national minority groups who feel their rights are restricted may equally feel a hierarchy in society and that they are governed by another nation. In a similar vein, they might think that using the language of the dominant nation rather than their own language would jeopardize the vitality and continuity of their own language. Speaking the language of the dominant nation in public institutions and organizations will relegate the languages of national minorities to secondary status, and the hierarchy of status will turn into cultural inequality. In the face of this situation, many minority groups may engage in aggressive behavior that is contrary to the dominant culture of the nation (Berger, 1995, p. 26). This would jeopardize the principle of equal citizenship, which is the basic principle that ensures the survival of multinational societies, and so conflicts would arise. The point to take into account is that the desire of all national minorities to ensure the development and continuity of their culture must be established as one of the most basic human rights.

Kymlicka argues that these national minorities can escape from this disadvantaged position by preserving and perpetuating their existence



within the sovereign nation through self-government rights and the preservation of their own culture. According to Kymlicka, only in this way can the sovereign nation ensure the loyalty of national minorities. Otherwise, separatist movements would eventually turn into ethnic nationalist conflicts. "In the experience of Western democracies, the best way to secure the loyalty of national minorities is not to attack their sense of separate nationality, but to acknowledge it, and perhaps to resolve their desire for self-government through the adoption of some form of federalism" (Kymlicka, 1995, pp. 14-15).

According to Kymlicka, the concept of multiculturalism has changed in accordance with the paradigm of the age and has become a necessity today. When the historical adventure of the concept of multiculturalism is examined, it can be seen that it was initially used to support the communitarian criticism of liberalism. It is interpreted that there is a conflict between communitarianism and liberalism and that communitarian minorities receive support from the concept of multiculturalism as a means of protection from liberalism. While liberalism takes a stance against multiculturalism with the idea that individual freedom is privileged and takes precedence over society, communitarians defend the necessity of multiculturalism in order to preserve the value of the community (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 18). It seems that the concept was later considered and debated in a liberal framework. These debates continue between individuals and groups who support the basic liberal-democratic consensus but disagree on how to interpret these principles in multi-ethnic societies, in particular concerning the role of language, nationality, and ethnic identities in liberal democratic societies and institutions (Kymlicka, 2002, pp. 338-339).

The debate has shifted from the decisional conflict between Congregationalists and liberals to whether minority groups that share liberal principles should need minority rights. Kymlicka focuses on the reasons why groups, despite being liberal, want to have minority rights. According to him, there is a possibility that the actions that some minorities will take as a right may be in content that will harm some segments of society. "For example, similar of minority rights that enabled a group to deny education or health care to children, or that enabled a group to forcibly confine women to the home. ... For example, an immigrant group may want to



maintain traditional customs regarding arranged marriages, or to maintain traditional rules regarding divorce, both of which may seriously disadvantage women” (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 340). According to Kymlicka, this situation presents us with a new problem; such minority rights will harm the individual autonomy of individuals in the group and restrict their individual rights.

As a solution to the problem encountered, Kymlicka proposes that minority rights should be divided into internal rights and external rights. According to him, individual rights will be protected by internal rights, and the rights of the minority group against other groups will be protected by external rights. Based on the perception of what is Good for a group as a result of cultural belonging, internal rights allow free actions on the theoretical level. External rights, in turn, establish freedom by guaranteeing equity via reflecting the conception of Good to the level of law and institutions (Koçak, 2013, p. 71). Kymlicka aimed to protect the freedoms of individuals within the group by dividing the self-government rights of national minorities into two and to ensure the continuation of the current national culture by protecting external rights outside the group.

Kymlicka states that the acceptance of a common cultural belonging of all cultural groups in a society will lead us to the concept of citizenship. Citizenship is closely related, on the one hand, to the idea of existing as an individual and, on the other hand, to the idea of being connected to a certain community (Kymlicka vd., 2000, pp. 18-19). Citizenship refers not only to the understanding of individuals with democratic rights and demands for justice with the concepts of democracy and justice but also to being a member of a political community. The content of the concept of citizenship has been based differently by different groups in society and has been decomposed in such a way as to demand different rights. This situation, which has led to contradictions in the concept of citizenship, has necessitated the reformulation of democracy and the transformation of the concept of citizenship (Benhabib, 2011, p. 171). As a result of the transformation of the concept of citizenship, society is confronted with conflicting demands of different parties, and a compromise is required that is acceptable to all parties (Parekh, 2000, p. 239). According to Kymlicka, for this reconciliation, we need to distinguish between three different types of



groups and three different types of group rights: (a) special representation rights (for disadvantaged groups), (b) multiculturalism rights (for immigrant groups and religious groups), and (c) self-government rights (for national minorities) (Kymlicka, 1995, pp. 27-33). Kymlicka's assessment of these uncertainties in the theory of citizenship shows that a theory of citizenship to be formed with liberal commitment takes precedence over the theory of democracy and justice.

The Problematic of Social Unity in Feyerabend and Kymlicka

The process that started with Feyerabend's criticism that science is the only authority on society first turns into scientific pluralism with the thesis that all traditions in the scientific field should be equal, and then into social pluralism, in which all cultural traditions in society will be considered equal (Feyerabend, 1978, p. 30). The concept of equality, which Feyerabend seeks on the basis of scientific pluralism, finds its support on the basis of cultural pluralism in Kymlicka. The lack of acceptance of the superiority of a culture in the cultural diversity of Kymlicka is similar to Feyerabend's inability to accept a single scientific method in science. Pluralism, which ensures the progress and development of science in Feyerabend, ensures the development and progress of society in Kymlicka. According to Kymlicka, by accepting the existence of other cultures with respect and tolerance, uniformity in the cultural field will be prevented, the existence of each culture will be protected, and its continuation will be ensured. Here, the process of getting to know each other by culture is in question. During this recognition process, each culture should try to recognize another culture that it defines as the other according to its identity, cultural, and ethnic characteristics. As Taylor pointed out, the recognition of their existence as they deserve is not only a requirement of the respect that should be shown to people but also a humanitarian need (Taylor vd., 1994, p. 42). The state of non-recognition is identity, cultural, linguistic, etc. depending on the situations, it causes the wrong recognition of the "other". In such a situation, the "other" opposes not being recognized with a reactive attitude (Yanık, 2013, p. 88). Since the opposition in question can be harmful to society from time to time, the recognition process becomes a situation that societies will be afraid of. According to



Kymlicka, groups marginalized due to their cultural identity can overcome this situation by being subject to legal provisions.

Equality in Feyerabend's scientific pluralism is not equality in the political sense but in the epistemological sense. His democratic relativism, born of his scientific pluralism, gives us the ideal of a free society. Feyerabend defined a free society as one in which all traditions are given equal rights regardless of what other societies say about them. He explains that democratic relativism has interesting ancestors with the example of Orestia of Aiskhylos. Orestes must kill his mother to get revenge on his father. Orestes killed his mother. Feyerabend points out that this situation, which is in accordance with the laws of Zeus, represented by Apollo, is inappropriate for Eumenides, who does not accept the killing of blood relatives. This was resolved in favor of Orestes by a court of Athenian citizens (Feyerabend, 1994, pp. 59-60). As seen in Feyerabend's Orestes example, in democratic relativism, cultures are given too much autonomy, and individual autonomy remains secondary. According to Kymlicka, our cultural past forms an important part of our identity, and our individual autonomy ensures the continuity of our culture. The sustainability of culture is important for individuals' autonomy and meaningful choices, and culture is the basis for autonomy. According to Kymlicka, autonomy is defined as "the most fundamental liberal right", and culture is the ground for this right; therefore, culture is as essential as autonomy and needs to be protected (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 68). Because of these ideas, some thinkers believe that Kymlicka sets the sine qua non for cultural recognition in liberal democratic governments as the affirmation of liberal autonomy (Casatella, 2006, p. 83).

Feyerabend criticizes the unity of science and state, which he sees as one of the biggest obstacles to a free society in terms of social unity. He criticizes the state for discriminating against science, which is one of the traditions in society because not every scientific method can preserve its existence and is not separate from science. According to Feyerabend, the acceptance of a single method will disadvantage other scientific methods and move society away from democracy. What needs to be done here is the separation of the state and science, and the state should stand at an equal distance to all traditions and give them equal say (Ertangil, 2014, p.



213). A similar criticism to Feyerabend's criticism appears in Kymlicka's criticism of the liberal state. Kymlicka points out that in multinational societies it is the responsibility of the liberal state to protect each culture with its own values. According to Kymlicka, in multinational societies, the liberal state should treat each culture within it with equity, promote its rights to language, culture, and life, and finally support its own existence. Kymlicka criticizes the liberal state for failing to preserve its neutrality between cultures (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 44). According to him, the liberal state prioritizes a certain culture in order to create a common language, culture, and institutional structure in society, and other cultures are disadvantaged in this way. Kymlicka's aim is to offer a philosophical reflection on how the liberal state can impartially allow the various cultural minorities living in its countries to live with the majority without giving up their identities.

The concept of citizenship was important for both philosophers to ensure social unity. According to Feyerabend, citizens are individuals who are free in their choices through a certain educational process and support diversity and flexibility in science. Individuals who complete this education are defined as mature citizens and do not accept any pressure or imposition on their decisions. Mature citizens will know about each tradition and choose the one that suits them. What is important here is that he acknowledges the existence of all traditions, has knowledge of them, and chooses the one he prefers. In Kymlicka's view, the concept of citizenship strengthens social cohesion and keeps groups belonging to different cultures together in society with a sense of mutual respect and trust and prevents potential conflicts (Kymlicka vd., 2000, p. 20). With the concept of citizenship, societies from various cultures will transcend their differences and become part of the social unity for the good and development of the whole society. Groups that do not feel that they are part of the social unity because the concept of citizenship has not been established will react in ways detrimental to social unity, thinking that they are assimilated because they cannot exercise their cultural rights. According to Parekh, who positively evaluates the concept of assimilation, assimilation is not imperfect; it is how it is carried out that matters. If minority groups are left free to conduct their social relations and decide to assimilate into the dominant culture,



they should be given every support to do so. However, they will react if this assimilation is attempted through imposition or coercion (Parekh, 2000, p. 241). Kymlicka rejects all views on assimilation for both theoretical and practical reasons.

Both philosophers challenged the hierarchical structure of society, where a single culture prevails, and aimed for a social unity based on equality. While criticizing the philosophy of science, Feyerabend actually prepared the ground for cultural pluralism. Kymlicka complements Feyerabend's discussion of cultural pluralism by conceptualizing it. However, the term "multicultural" encompasses different forms of cultural pluralism, each presenting its challenge (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 10). The perspectives of philosophers who advocate the preservation and continuity of the existence of every culture as a democratic right seem to be in harmony. In a democratic society, the protection of minority cultures must be guaranteed while ensuring social cohesion. A compromise is needed to allow each culture to decide to preserve its cultural heritage freely. This reconciliation must be achieved through persuasion; when reconciliation is achieved through coercion, social problems will arise (Tassara Zevallos, 2013, pp. 480-481). What will be done, and how will social unity be ensured in the event of social issues with similar causes that have occurred and continue to occur in many multicultural societies from the past to the present? Both philosophers do not have an assessment of how to solve social problems that may arise if social unity is disrupted by possible conflicts or when social ideals are not realized.

Conclusion

Feyerabend and Kymlicka argue throughout the article that theories of science and politics of a pluralist nature have to answer the following fundamental question: Has the problem of social unity within the free society to be formed by democratic relativism or multiculturalism been successfully resolved? Although the theoretical framework presented by both philosophers provides satisfactory answers to this question, it is difficult to say that the solutions they propose work successfully in practical social situations. The reasons for this can be summarized under four main headings. Firstly, Feyerabend opposes scientific uniformity and political uniformity, arguing for the existence of alternative traditions. Society will



have a valid scientific method or political culture, and others will continue to exist within the same culture. It is unclear who will determine the current valid method or culture in their theories created against the hierarchical order. Since there will be people with a particular culture who will evaluate this, everyone will consider their own culture superior, and in fact, a closed hierarchy will always exist. Secondly, Feyerabend takes refuge in democracy to base his views, while Kymlicka offers a more objective framework based on liberalism, but this is insufficient for social unity. In Feyerabend's democratic relativism, since each culture has the right to choose a separate tradition, one can choose mythology, the other science. In this case, the same society will have no common solidarity or unity. In Kymlicka liberalism-based theory, on the other hand, the problem of how to apply liberal autonomy to non-liberal groups arises. It remains unclear how a union based on liberal autonomy will be achieved between liberal and non-liberal groups within the same society. Thirdly, Feyerabend's solution to science criticism is that the state controls science. In Kymlicka, the state is the institution that will ensure equality by granting certain rights to disadvantaged groups in society. The main problem here is that the state is an institution run by people and the question of how impartial the people who run the state will be when ensuring these rights. This is because it is doubtful whether the social groups that hold state power will objectively treat social groups other than themselves in an egalitarian manner. It is also unclear how a mechanism to monitor this can be established. Finally, regarding the process of the formation of the concept of citizen, Feyerabend's idea of the individual becoming mature enough to choose the culture of their choice after primary education comes into our mix. In Kymlicka, this happens through persuasion. Feyerabend did not explain the position of individuals who have not reached the level of mature citizens even though they have not received or received relevant education in society. On the other hand, Kymlicka, it has not been stated how these individuals will be positioned in society if individuals who have not been provided with a sense of belonging through persuasion do not consider themselves citizens of society. Although he developed many points that Feyerabend left unsolved with the political theory he proposed, Kymlicka, like Feyerabend, remained unsolved on the problem of social unity. Finally,



whether the arguments put forward by both philosophers for social unity offer a solution to possible social issues, how to act in conflict situations, how to resolve conflicts, and how to ensure social unity has not been able to provide sufficient explanations.

References

- Benhabib, S. (2011). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens* (Nachdr.). Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Berger, B. M. (1995). *An Essay on Culture: Symbolic Structure and Social Structure*. Univ. of California Press.
- Cassatella, A. (2006). Multicultural Justice: Will Kymlicka and Cultural Recognition. *Ratio Juris*, 19(1), 80-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9337.2006.00318.x>
- Ertangil, T. (2014). *Biri "Bilim Masaldır" mı Dedi? [Did Someone Say "Science is a Fable"?]* (1st ed.). Cinius Yayınları.
- Feyerabend, P. K. (1978). *Science in A Free Society* (First). NLB.
- Feyerabend, P. (1993). *Against Method* (3rd ed). Verso.
- Feyerabend, P. (1994). *Farewell to Reason*. Verso.
- Feyerabend, P. (1995a). *Killing Time: The Autobiography of Paul Feyerabend*. University of Chicago Press.
- Feyerabend, P. (1995b). *Problems of Empiricism Philosophical Papers Volume 2* (Repr). Cambridge Univ. Pr.
- Feyerabend, P. (2007). *Anarşizm Üzerine Tezler: "Kaldırımın Altında Kum Vardır" dizisinden [Thesen Zum Anarchismus Artikel aus der Reihe "Unter dem Pflaster liegt der Strand]* (E. Altınsöz, trans.). Öteki Yayınevi.
- Feyerabend, P. (2011). *The Tyranny of Science* (E. Oberheim, Ed.). Polity Press.
- Güzel, C. (1996). *Bir Bilgi Anarşisti: Feyerabend [An Anarchist of Knowledge: Feyerabend]*. Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Kaya Keha, M. (2017). *Bir Bilgi Anarşisti ve Bilim Paul Karl Feyerabend [An Anarchist of Knowledge and Science Paul Karl Feyerabend]* (1st ed.). Fenomen Yayınları.
- Kemaloğlu, Ö. S. (2024). *Paul Feyerabend'in Bilim Anlayışlarına Eleştirileri [Paul Feyerabend's Criticism of Conceptions of Science]* (1st ed.). Aktif Yayınevi.



- Koçak, M. (2013). *Çok-Kültürlülük Açısından Dil Hakları [Language Rights in terms of Multiculturalism]* (S. Durgut, Ed.; 1st ed.). Liberte Yayınları.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1997). Justice and Minority Rights. In R. E. Goodin & P. Pettit (Ed.), *Contemporary Political Philosophy* (pp. 366-388). Blackwell Publishers.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*. Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary political Philosophy: An Introduction* (Second edition). Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W., Norman, W. J., Callan, E., & Waldron, J. (2000). *Citizenship in Diverse Societies* (W. Kymlicka & W. J. Norman, Ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Landowski, E. (1997). Quêtes D'identité, Crises D'altérité. In N. K. Burçoğlu (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Identity and Otherness Multiculturalisme: Identité et Altérité* (pp. 75-105). Boğaziçi University Press.
- Parekh, B. C. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Harvard University Press.
- Preston, J. (1997). *Feyerabend: Philosophy, Science and Society*. Polity Press [u.a.].
- Saygılı, S. (2019). *Paul Karl Feyerabend'in Bilim Felsefesi [Paul Karl Feyerabend's Philosophy of Science]* (1st ed.). Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Söker, Ç. (2023). *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Bilim, Bilgi ve Yöntem Paul K. Feyerabend ve Epistemolojik Anarşizmin İmkânları [Science, Knowledge and Method in International Relations Paul Feyerabend and the Possibilities of Epistemological Anarchism]* (1st ed.). Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Tassara Zevallos, V. (2013). *Una Interpretación Multicultural Liberal del Artículo 149 de la Constitución*.
- Taylor, C., Appiah, K. A., Habermas, J., & Walzer, M. (1994). The Politics of Recognition. İçinde A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (pp. 41-73). Princeton University Press.
- Yanık, C. (2013). *Dünyada ve Türkiye'de Çokkültürlülük [Multiculturalism in Turkey and the World]* (1st ed.). Sentez Yayıncılık.



- Yates, S. (1984). II. Feyerabend's democratic relativism. *Inquiry*, 27(1-4), (pp.137-142). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00201748408602031>
- Yeniçırak, Hasan et al., (2013). *II. Türkiye Lisansüstü Çalışmalar Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı: 6-8 Mayıs 2013, Bursa [Proceedings of the II. Turkey Graduate Studies Congress Book: May 6-8 2013, Bursa]* (Ü. Güneş, Ed.). İLEM.

Öz: Modern dönemde gelişen bilimcilik anlayışı, bilimsel söylemleri toplumda tek geçerli bilgi türü olarak kabul etmiş ve alternatif görüşleri dışlamıştır. Bu da totaliter sistemlere ilham kaynağı olmuştur. Paul Feyerabend, bu duruma karşı çıkarak “bilimin tiranlığı”na meydan okumuş ve özgür, demokratik bir toplum idealinin gerçekleşmesi için bilimsel alanda plüralist bir yaklaşım önermiştir. “Epistemolojik Anarşizm” ve “Bilimsel Plüralizm” teorilerini geliştirerek bilginin tek bir yöntemle sınırlanamayacağını savunmuş, bu görüşlerin uzantısı olarak “Demokratik Görelilik” anlayışını öne sürmüştür. Feyerabend’in çoğulcu düşünceleri, toplumsal alanın yanı sıra siyaset felsefesinde de yankı uyandırmış, Will Kymlicka’nın “Azınlık Haklarının Liberal Teorisi”nde karşılık bulmuştur. Kymlicka, bireysel, grup ve ulusal hakların korunması gerektiğini öne sürerek kültürel ve etnik çeşitliliği tanıyan ve destekleyen bir toplum yapısını savunmuştur. Bu makale, Feyerabend’in bilimsel plüralizmi ile Kymlicka’nın siyasi çokkültürlülük anlayışını karşılaştırarak, modern toplumlarda çeşitlilik ve birlik arasındaki gerilim için sundukları çözüm önerilerini değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla makalede, her iki filozofun eşitliğe dayalı çokkültürlü toplum tahayyülünde farklılıkları nasıl bir arada tutmayı hedefledikleri, olası çatışmaları nasıl çözümlmeyi planladıkları, toplumsal birliğin nasıl sağlanabileceği gibi temel sorulara yanıt aranacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çokkültürlülük, çoğulculuk, toplumsal birlik, Feyerabend, Kymlicka.

