



International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal Homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Communitarianism and Justice: Community Values versus Individual Rights in a Globalizing Constitutional Order

¹Muskan Showkat Shah, ²Prof. (Dr). Ausaf Ahmad Malik

¹ UIIS (university institute of legal studies) Muskanshowkat212@gmail.com

² UIIS (university institute of legal studies) ausaf.e19840@cumail.in

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the tension between communitarianism and liberal rights theory as it surfaces in the arena of constitutional adjudication, with particular focus on Indian constitutional jurisprudence in the context of globalization. Communitarian thought situates justice within the moral grammar of community membership, whereas rights-based liberalism treats individual autonomy, dignity, and equality as the primary standards against which law is measured. The Indian Constitution does not wholly endorse either framework; instead, it subjects all collective power to enforceable norms of liberty, equality, dignity, conscience, and fraternity. Through the analytical lens of 'constitutional morality'—as distinguished from social morality—the paper evaluates landmark decisions of the Supreme Court of India dealing with sexual autonomy (Navtej Singh Johar), partner choice (Shafin Jahan), gender identity (NALSA), freedom of conscience (Bijoe Emmanuel), religious exclusion (Sabarimala), and the institutional limits of judicial recognition (Supriyo). The analysis demonstrates that Indian courts have progressively shifted the locus of justice from the maintenance of traditional hierarchy to the constitutional protection of equal individuality, while simultaneously acknowledging the institutional limits of judicial reform. The paper concludes with policy suggestions for strengthening the legal infrastructure supporting individual rights within pluralistic communities in a globalizing world.

Keywords: Communitarianism; Constitutional Morality; Individual Rights; Globalization; Indian Constitutional Law; Fundamental Rights; Social Morality; Dignity; Equality; Gender Identity; Sexual Autonomy

1. INTRODUCTION

Communitarian thinkers regard justice as coextensive with the ethical life of a community, while rights-based liberalism conceives justice as a bulwark against collective domination. This opposition is not merely theoretical. It surfaces whenever social norms inherited from the past—caste discipline, family authority, religious practice, or moral convention—are accorded priority over autonomy, privacy, equality, or conscience. Law is the arena in which this conflict is rendered into enforceable standards. In a globalizing world, that arena is further shaped by transnational mobility, digital communication, comparative constitutionalism, and emergent demands for recognition that unsettle established social hierarchies.

Indian constitutionalism records this struggle within a deeply pluralistic society. Society is neither so marginal that it can be disregarded nor so supreme as to be the paramount source of constitutional value. It organizes identity, solidarity, duty, and memory; yet it may equally legitimate exclusion, stigma, and hierarchically graded status. The Constitution does not abolish communities but subjects all forms of public and private power to the norms of liberty, equality, dignity, and fraternity. Justice, consequently, cannot be reduced either to majoritarian erasure of minority voices or to atomized individual choice. It must evaluate whether social arrangements within communities accord with the principle of equal citizenship for heterogeneous persons.

Globalization intensifies this inquiry precisely because social life is no longer confined within isolated moral worlds. International rights discourse, transnational advocacy, migration, educational exchange, and comparative adjudication have expanded the vocabulary of human dignity, sexual autonomy, gender identity, and anti-discrimination. Simultaneously, claims of cultural authenticity and communal self-governance have grown more assertive. The Indian judiciary has been compelled, through the concept of constitutional morality—understanding the Constitution as an instrument for dismantling oppressive customs while permitting legitimate diversity—to navigate this territory with increasing rigour. The challenge of justice, thus, lies in determining how communities may persist without requiring the subjugation of the individuals who constitute them.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The debate hinges on competing conceptions of justice, personhood, and social order. One tradition locates moral sense in community practices and inherited duties; the other places the rights-bearing individual at the centre of normative inquiry. India's constitutional judiciary does not completely endorse or entirely dismiss either tradition; it modifies both through a rights-based public order.

A. Communitarianism

Communitarianism conceives justice as bound to the moral grammar of membership. Persons are not understood as isolated decision-makers antecedent to social engagement; they are shaped by language, culture, memory, and role. Expressions of solidarity through family, caste, religious community, neighbourhood, and polity are accordingly regarded not as purely voluntary associations but as constitutive of selfhood. The welfare of the group and social cohesion may, on this view, justify interference with individual preference where a practice sustains solidarity, responsibility, or a way of life that maintains moral order. Justice is understood as relational, historically situated, and publicly shared.

B. Liberal Rights Theory

Liberal rights theory proceeds from the premise that every person possesses equal moral worth and that autonomy is the foundational reason law should protect individuals. The measure of justice is the degree to which it shields a person's dignity, privacy, conscience, equality, physical integrity, and freedom of decision from coercion—whether by the State or by social majorities. Rights are not rewards for conformity; they are guarantees that permit individuals to develop beliefs, personal relationships, speech, work, and identity without enforced orthodoxy. In constitutional law, this framework is sceptical of traditional hierarchies, subjects status-based discriminations to scrutiny, and insists that communal welfare cannot be purchased at the price of fundamental individual freedom.

C. Constitutional Morality

Constitutional morality is the conceptual intermediary that the Indian Supreme Court has employed to adjudicate these competing claims. Social morality derives its authority from conventional acceptance, customary discipline, and local honour. Constitutional morality, by contrast, comprises the values of liberty, equality, dignity, fraternity, and limited power inscribed in the constitutional text and its transformative aspiration. When courts invoke this concept, they signal that community practices cannot claim legitimacy by dint of antiquity or popular endorsement alone. The concept accordingly provides a criterion for judicial scrutiny of limitations on sexual autonomy, belief, gender identity, and intimate association where such limitations undermine equal citizenship.

In *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court of India examined the constitutional validity of Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code insofar as it criminalized consensual same-sex relations between adults. The Court held that constitutional adjudication must be anchored in constitutional morality rather than social morality, and recognized sexual orientation as a fundamental aspect of identity, dignity, and privacy. By partially invalidating Section 377, the Court relocated the locus of justice from communal condemnation to constitutional protection of intimate choices and non-discriminatory membership.

Key Holdings:

- Constitutional morality prevails over social morality in rights adjudication.
- Sexual orientation is an intrinsic aspect of personal identity.
- Majoritarian disapproval cannot justify penal exclusion.
- Equal citizenship extends to sexual minorities.

3. CONSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS

The Constitution secures justice principally through the enforcement of rights rather than through the endorsement of majoritarian community preferences. It does not eliminate social interaction but withholds legal protection from discriminatory traditions. The critical question therefore shifts from whether a community approves a practice to whether that practice withstands the constitutional standards of equality, liberty, conscience, and dignity.

A. Equality and Dignity

Articles 14, 15, 16, and 21 of the Constitution of India collectively transform dignity from a moral aspiration into a justiciable criterion. Article 14 prohibits the State from denying any person equality before the law or equal protection of the laws. Article 15(1) forbids discrimination against citizens on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth. Article 16(1) guarantees equality of opportunity in matters of public employment. Article 21 provides that no person shall be deprived of life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.

Taken together, these provisions convert dignity from a moral value into a legal criterion capable of challenging caste stigma, gender hierarchy, sexual exclusion, and forcible intrusion into personal life. Exclusionary community norms—when tested against these guarantees—are frequently revealed as instruments of domination rather than as innocuous traditions. A caste panchayat decree, a family veto over intimate association, a gender exclusion rule, or a compulsion to conform to binary-gender expectations cannot obtain automatic constitutional recognition. Equality, moreover, does not demand social uniformity; it demands that differences of religion, caste, sex, gender, or economic condition shall not translate into civic inferiority.

Key Provisions:

- Article 14 targets arbitrariness and unequal legal treatment.
- Article 15 prohibits discrimination on enumerated grounds.

- Article 16 governs equality in public employment and appointment.
- Article 21 protects dignity, liberty, and decisional autonomy.

B. Conscience and Expression

Article 19(1)(a), guaranteeing freedom of speech and expression, and Article 25(1), securing freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise, and propagate religion, together shield belief, silence, dissent, and conscientious non-conformity from aggressive public conformity demands.

In *Bijoe Emmanuel v. State of Kerala*, the Supreme Court addressed the case of schoolchildren belonging to Jehovah's Witnesses who stood respectfully during the National Anthem but declined to sing it on account of religious conviction. The Court held that no law required the singing of the Anthem and that faithfulness to conscience under Article 25 could not be overridden by public sentiment alone. Silence rendered with respect is not disrespect. The judgment draws a constitutionally significant distinction between shared civic symbols and enforced ideological conformity, confirming that constitutional protection extends to dissenters who maintain public order while declining to participate in mandated expressions of collective identity.

Key Principles:

- The belief must be genuine and conscientious.
- Any restriction must fall within the limits specified in Part III of the Constitution.
- Mere absence of conformity does not constitute disrespect.
- Compulsion requires lawful authority, not administrative preference.

C. Identity and Self-Determination

Constitutional protection of self-determination proceeds from the recognition that identity ought not to be treated as a concession bestowed by community or State. Gender identity, in particular, is associated with dignity, autonomy, expression, and bodily integrity. Constitutional law therefore resists the compulsion of persons into binary gender categories that do not reflect their experienced reality, as well as the insistence that recognition be contingent upon medical, familial, or customary certification.

In *National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India* ('NALSA'), the Supreme Court recognized the legal invisibility and endemic discrimination faced by the transgender community, holding that Article 21 encompasses self-determination of gender as part of personal autonomy, that Article 19(1)(a) protects gender expression, and that Articles 14, 15, and 16 extend their guarantees to transgender persons. For the first time, the Court recognized a third gender and afforded legal status to self-identified gender. This decision represents a shift from welfare-based paternalism to rights-based recognition, treating identity as constitutive of personhood rather than as a category assignable by the State.

Key Holdings:

- Transgender persons are entitled to recognition as a third gender.
- The right to self-identified gender is constitutionally protected.
- Legal documents must reflect recognized gender identity.
- Social and educational measures may be adopted for inclusion.

4. SITES OF CONFLICT

The conflict between community values and individual rights is most acute in disputes concerning marriage, religion, gender, sexuality, and personal identity. The constitutional challenge is to determine how individual rights may be protected without denying the social reality of collective life.

A. Marriage and Partner Choice

Intimate association remains among the most contested sites of communal control over individual freedom. Caste endogamy, religious boundaries, family honour, and local authority are frequently enforced through surveillance, threats, forcible confinement, and social boycott, all grounded in the claim that marriage pertains to lineage, status, and communal continuity. Constitutional law does not accept this position where it involves the overriding of the free will of consenting adults. The choice of a life partner is fundamental to identity, privacy, belief, and physical freedom, and therefore cannot be treated as a matter subject to parental or community veto.

In *Shafin Jahan v. Asokan K.M.*, the Supreme Court addressed the marriage of an adult woman whose choice of husband and religion had been subjected to judicial and parental interference. The Court reinstated her autonomy, holding that choosing a life partner is an individual's exclusive prerogative, and recognized marital choice as falling within the ambit of intimacy, privacy, and liberty protected under Article 21. The judgment forecloses guardianship models under which family or community suspicion may divest an adult of agency in matters of intimacy, conscience, and association.

Key Principles:

- Choice of a life partner lies exclusively within the individual domain.

- Adult autonomy cannot be displaced by parental preference.
- Faith choice in marriage belongs to the individual.
- Courts cannot convert habeas corpus proceedings into instruments of social supervision.

B. Religion and Gender Justice

The interface of denominational autonomy and gender equality requires careful constitutional calibration. Article 25(1) guarantees freedom of conscience and the right to profess, practise, and propagate religion, but expressly subjects those rights to limitations relating to public order, morality, health, and other provisions of Part III. Article 25(2)(b) additionally permits legislation for social welfare and reform, including the opening of Hindu religious institutions of a public character to all classes and sections of Hindus. The Constitution thus accommodates religion but does not immunize religious practice from constitutional scrutiny.

The central question is whether exclusions grounded in religious tradition ought to be treated as wholly beyond criticism, particularly where women as a class bear the burden or where access to religious practice is conditioned upon notions of impurity, status, or biological condition. In *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala* ('Sabarimala'), the Supreme Court held that a practice premised on the ideas of purity and exclusion cannot override constitutional guarantees, especially where the temple has a public character and the exclusion operates at the expense of women as a class. The judgment establishes that community religious practices are subject to constitutional review where they institutionalize status-based disability in the name of tradition.

Key Holdings:

- Article 25 rights are subject to other Part III guarantees.
- Social welfare and reform legislation may reach public religious spaces.
- Exclusion tied to status or biological condition invites constitutional scrutiny.
- Denominational autonomy is not absolute as against equality claims.

C. Sexuality and Social Belonging

Sexual minorities experience community control not only through formal legal prohibition but also through expulsion, coercive family pressure, corrective violence, and denial of ordinary social goods. Decriminalization is accordingly only a partial measure of justice. Constitutional order must additionally ask whether a person can live openly without forfeiting respect, recognition, or access to social goods. Communitarian arguments often depict heterosexual norms as prerequisites of moral continuity. Constitutional jurisprudence negates this assumption by regarding sexuality as an element of identity and human dignity, holding the law accountable for securing equal membership without compelling conformity to socially sanctioned forms.

5. GLOBALIZATION AND CONTEMPORARY JUSTICE

Globalization has transformed the conditions under which constitutional arguments are advanced and evaluated. The language of rights now circulates rapidly and globally through courts, academia, civil society, and media. Local customs nonetheless retain considerable force. Justice accordingly evolves through dialogue: Indian law is informed by comparative constitutional materials, yet Indian courts remain anchored by their own constitutional text, legal system, and democratic constraints.

A. Global Rights Discourse

International human rights materials, comparative constitutional law, and transnational advocacy have updated the vocabulary available to Indian constitutional courts. Concepts of dignity, privacy, anti-discrimination, and autonomy are no longer exclusively domestic formulations; they draw strength from a global repertoire of judicial understanding that exclusion tends to operate in recognizable patterns across jurisdictions. Indian courts do not merely transplant foreign doctrine; they engage with a broader range of examples and principles in defining constitutional meaning. In disputes concerning sexuality, identity, and family, courts have increasingly construed the living Constitution as imposing ongoing obligations of equal citizenship rather than as encoding fixed historical categories.

B. Local Traditions and Pluralism

Indian constitutional law pursues pluralism neither by permitting cultural practices to continue unmodified nor by compelling social homogeneity. Customs are recognized not only as social facts but, in some instances, as collectively protected ways of life. Constitutional pluralism is, however, conditioned on the requirement that differences shall not produce domination. Courts therefore seek an equilibrium between under-enforcement and over-interference: they accommodate religious practices, associational life, and group identity while refusing to permit caste-based exclusion, discrimination against women, or forced conformity merely because a community endorses them. The governing principle is that cultural difference may be preserved only insofar as equal citizenship is not calibrated by inherited social status.

C. Institutional Limits of Judicial Recognition

Rights claims may be normatively persuasive yet exceed what courts can achieve through interpretation alone. When recognition requires not merely the removal of prohibition but also the reconstruction of statutory frameworks governing succession, adoption, maintenance, and registration, the institutional constraints of the judicial branch become acute. Courts may declare exclusions unconstitutional and guarantee liberty against coercion; their authority to enact new statutory codes is, however, far more limited. This tension is especially pronounced in family law, where marriage is simultaneously an indicator of personal liberty, a legal status, and a domain governed by legislative frameworks that courts cannot unilaterally rewrite.

In *Supriyo @ Supriya Chakraborty v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court considered whether queer couples are constitutionally entitled to legal recognition under marriage laws, including through a gender-neutral interpretation of the Special Marriage Act, 1954. The Court affirmed that queer individuals enjoy the same constitutional rights as others to dignity, autonomy, association, and union, but the majority declined to extend statutory marriage rights through judicial interpretation. The Court held that the creation of a legally binding status equivalent to marriage or civil union is a matter for enacted law, and that reading such a status into the Special Marriage Act would constitute impermissible judicial legislation. The case delineates the contemporary limits of the adjudicative process: equality and dignity arguments can bring rights claims to the threshold of legislative reform without crossing it unilaterally.

Key Holdings:

- Queer persons enjoy constitutional protection of union and association.
- There is no judicially declared fundamental right to marry under existing law.
- The Court cannot read words into the Special Marriage Act, 1954.
- Creation of a legal status akin to marriage or civil union requires enacted law.

6. CONCLUSION

Justice in a globalizing world cannot be attained by the absolute privileging of community over the individual or of the individual over community. Community is a source of belonging, moral education, spiritual sustenance, and collective purpose. Constitutional law, however, does not permit those benefits to be purchased through stigmatization, coercion, or the abridgement of citizenship rights. The Indian constitutional framework accordingly demands a calibrated balance: it recognizes diverse social life while subordinating all collective power to the higher legal obligation of dignity, equality, liberty, conscience, and fraternity. The governing question is not whether a community's claim is emotionally charged; it is whether that claim can survive constitutional justification.

The trajectory of Indian constitutional adjudication indicates a sustained judicial commitment to displacing social morality, family honour, and customary status as sufficient grounds for interference with intimate choice or identity. Decisions concerning sexuality, conscience, gender identity, partner choice, and religious exclusion reflect a convergent trend: courts are shifting the locus of justice from the maintenance of traditional hierarchy to the protection of equal individuality. Constitutional morality serves as the institutional intermediary in this transformation. It does not seek to dissolve communities but insists that communities coexist with a rights framework that precludes the civic inferiority of those who dissent, differ, or fall outside dominant norms.

That balance remains incomplete and contested. Judicial recognition, while significant, does not automatically alter social attitudes, and courts cannot fully restructure the legislative frameworks governing family law and social status. The constitutional direction, however, is unmistakable: community values may shape the social environment, but they do not possess unlimited legal sovereignty. In India, justice is increasingly realized through rights-based interpretation that evaluates customs, traditions, and collective claims against the constitutional standing of the individual. The primary lesson is that a democratic society committed to maintaining diverse traditions can do so sustainably only by securing autonomy, dignity, equality, and choice as the foundation of full membership.

7. SUGGESTIONS FOR LAW AND POLICY REFORM

The following reform measures are proposed to strengthen the legal infrastructure supporting individual rights within pluralistic communities:

A. Codifying Standards for Constitutional Review of Community Norms

Stricter legal standards should be developed to distinguish 'legitimate diversity' from 'oppressive custom,' emphasizing the elements of dignity, non-discrimination, and voluntariness. Proof of willing agreement should be required where communal norms govern marriage, apparel, worship, or identity. Coercion in its various forms—social boycott, threats, confinement, and 'honour' violence—should be explicitly recognized as a constitutional violation triggering heightened judicial scrutiny. These standards should be promulgated as practice guidelines to reduce inter-High Court inconsistency in application.

B. Emergency Protective Mechanisms

Expedited refuge measures should be established for adults facing family or community coercion in cases involving partner choice and faith conversion. Mandatory requirements for secure accommodation, confidential proceedings, and the issuance of protection orders without moral policing should be

introduced. Police directives should be harmonized to prevent missing-person records from being deployed as instruments of social control, and sanctions should be imposed on personnel who facilitate unlawful detention or enforced counselling.

C. Strengthening Anti-Discrimination Law

Anti-discrimination legislation should be extended beyond State action to encompass private actors in housing, education, employment, and digital platforms. Protected grounds—including caste, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, and disability—should be codified with robust civil remedies including penalties, injunctions, and compensation accompanied by accessible evidentiary rules for structural bias. Equality commissions at Union and State levels should be established for monitoring and enforcement.

D. Legal Aid and Community Paralegal Networks

Legal aid coverage should be expanded and community-based paralegal networks developed for marginalized groups facing pressure from caste councils, religious bodies, and family institutions. Paralegals should be trained to document coercion, assist in habeas corpus filings, and facilitate access to welfare schemes. Ongoing student legal aid clinics, operated in collaboration with universities and State Legal Services Authorities, should replace sporadic legal camps. Rights information should be disseminated in multiple languages to reach local communities.

E. Institutional Embedding of Constitutional Morality

Constitutional morality should be treated as an institutional practice rather than a courtroom formulation. Rights education—covering autonomy, conscience, privacy, and equality—should be integrated into police training, school curricula, and civil service induction, using landmark decisions as teaching material. Departmental performance should be assessed through compliance indicators, including non-discriminatory service delivery and the protection of vulnerable complainants.

F. Identity Document Reform

Document acquisition processes should be reformed to ensure that self-identification is honoured without invasive medical or family certification requirements. A unified service for updating name, gender marker, and photograph across Aadhaar-linked and non-linked identity systems should be established, accompanied by grievance officers, time-limited appeal mechanisms, and access logs mandated for privacy protection.

G. Negotiation-Based Compliance Frameworks for Religious Space Conflicts

Religious space conflicts should be addressed through negotiation-based compliance frameworks capable of achieving equality while minimizing the risk of conflict escalation. Judicial mediation panels comprising women worshippers, community members, and religious leaders should be empanelled where appropriate. Administrative bylaws of religious institutions of a public character should be required to be transparent and constitutionally compliant, with implementation monitored through regular evaluation reports.

H. Legislative Capacity Building for Family Law Reform

Parliamentary committees should be established to review and reform family law in areas where courts encounter institutional barriers, including civil-union protections and related rights. Modular reforms in inheritance, maintenance, medical decision-making, next-of-kin recognition, and tenancy rights should be developed independent of marriage status, with sunset review provisions to facilitate post-implementation adjustment.

I. Addressing Digital Vigilantism

Legal frameworks should be strengthened to address digital vigilantism targeting inter-caste and inter-faith couples, LGBTQ+ persons, and dissenters. Platforms should be required to respond swiftly to doxxing, threats, and non-consensual publication of personal information. Cybercrime frameworks should be reoriented toward victims' rights and witness safety, and courts should be encouraged to recognize online harassment as a serious violation of fundamental freedoms.

J. Community Dialogue and Social Inclusion Initiatives

Local efforts directed at raising inclusiveness and reducing the social costs of rights exercise should be supported through investment in community dialogue initiatives led by neutral institutions—schools, panchayats, and legal services bodies—operating under clear non-discrimination norms. Safe community spaces, mental health support, and livelihood pathways for socially ostracized persons should be funded. District-level dashboards tracking hate incidents, honour violence, and discrimination complaints should inform policy development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Cases

Bijoe Emmanuel v. State of Kerala, (1986) 3 SCC 615.

Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala, (2019) 11 SCC 1. National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, (2014) 5 SCC 438. Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

Shafin Jahan v. Asokan K.M., (2018) 16 SCC 368.

Supriyo @ Supriya Chakraborty v. Union of India, 2023 INSC 920.

B. Books and Journal Articles

- Agnes, Flavia, *Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1999).
- Austin, Granville, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1st edn., 1966).
- Bergh, Andreas and Nilsson, Therese, 'Is Globalization Reducing Absolute Poverty?', 62 *World Development* 42 (2014).
- Bhatia, Gautam, 'Equal Moral Membership: Naz Foundation and the Refashioning of Equality under a Transformative Constitution', 1 *Indian Law Review* 115 (2017).
- Brock, Gillian, *Global Justice: A Cosmopolitan Account* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1st edn., 2009).
- Buchanan, Allen E., *Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-Determination: Moral Foundations for International Law* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1st edn., 2003).
- Caney, Simon, 'Liberalism and Communitarianism: A Misconceived Debate', 40 *Political Studies* 273 (1992).
- Chowdhury, Nupur, 'Privacy and Citizenship in India: Exploring Constitutional Morality and Data Privacy', 11 *NUJS Law Review* 421 (2018).
- Dixit, Pratik, 'Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India: Decriminalising India's Sodomy Law', 24 *The International Journal of Human Rights* 1011 (2020).
- Etzioni, Amitai, *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda* (Crown Publishers, New York, 1st edn., 1993).
- Goldsmith, Jack L. and Posner, Eric A., *The Limits of International Law* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1st edn., 2005). Hart, Herbert, 'Are There Any Natural Rights?', 64 *The Philosophical Review* 175 (1955).
- Hirst, Paul, Thompson, Grahame et al., *Globalization in Question* (Polity Press, Cambridge, 3rd edn., 2009). Kamil, Mariyam, 'Puttaswamy: Jury Still Out on Some Privacy Concerns?', 1 *Indian Law Review* 190 (2017).
- Kapur, Ratna, *Gender, Alterity and Human Rights: Freedom in a Fishbowl* (Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, 1st edn., 2018). Khaitan, Tarunabh, *A Theory of Discrimination Law* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1st edn., 2015).
- Khosla, Madhav, *India's Founding Moment: The Constitution of a Most Surprising Democracy* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1st edn., 2020).
- Mandal, Saptarshi, 'Out of Shah Bano's Shadow: Muslim Women's Rights and the Triple Talaq Verdict', 2 *Indian Law Review* 89 (2018).
- Merry, Sally Engle, 'Transnational Human Rights and Local Activism: Mapping the Middle', 108 *American Anthropologist* 38 (2006).
- Mutua, Makau, 'Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights', 42 *Harvard International Law Journal* 201 (2001). Narrain, Arvind, *Queer: 'Despised Sexuality', Law, and Social Change* (Books for Change, Bangalore, 1st edn., 2004).
- Raz, Joseph, 'On the Nature of Rights', 93 *Mind* 194 (1984).
- Sandel, Michael J., *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edn., 1998). Sen, Amartya, 'Ethics and the Foundation of Global Justice', 31 *Ethics & International Affairs* 261 (2017).
- Walzer, Michael, 'The Communitarian Critique of Liberalism', 18 *Political Theory* 6 (1990).

C. Online Sources

- Article 19(2) and 'Public Order', Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, available at: <https://vidhilegalpolicy.in/blog/article-192-and-public-order/> (last visited on March 11, 2026).
- Communitarianism, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/communitarianism/> (last visited on March 13, 2026).
- Constitutional Morality: Key Principles and Significance for Indian Democracy, Drishti IAS, available at: <https://www.drishtiias.com/to-the-points/paper4/what-is-constitutional-morality> (last visited on March 10, 2026).
- Customary and Informal Justice, International Development Law Organization, available at: <https://www.idlo.int/what-we-do/access-justice/customary-informal-justice> (last visited on March 10, 2026).
- Legal Pluralism, GSDRC, available at: <https://gsdrc.org/topic-guides/safety-security-and-justice/themes/legal-pluralism/> (last visited on March 13, 2026).
- Liberalism, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism/> (last visited on March 12, 2026).
- Provide Column for 'No Religion', 'No Caste' in Birth Certificate Applications, SCC Online, available at: <https://www.sconline.com/blog/post/2023/08/03/> (last visited on March 6, 2026).

Shafin Jahan v. Union of India (Hadiya Marriage Case): Judgment in Plain English, SC Observer, available at: <https://www.scobserver.in/reports/> (last visited on March 14, 2026).

Special Marriage Act's Notice Regime and Judicial Denial of Protection, Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, available at: <https://vidhilegalpolicy.in/blog/special-marriage-acts-notice-regime-and-judicial-denial-of-protection/> (last visited on March 8, 2026).

What Is Constitutional Morality, India Seminar, available at: https://www.indiaseminar.com/2010/615/615_pratap_bhanu_mehta.htm (last visited on March 6, 2026).

NOTES

- 1 Simon Caney, 'Liberalism and Communitarianism: A Misconceived Debate', 40 Political Studies 273 (1992).
- 2 Michael Walzer, 'The Communitarian Critique of Liberalism', 18 Political Theory 6 (1990).
- 3 Communitarianism, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/communitarianism/> (last visited on March 13, 2026).
- 4 Amitai Etzioni, The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda 204 (Crown Publishers, New York, 1st edn., 1993).
- 5 Michael J. Sandel, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice 141 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edn., 1998).
- 6 Liberalism, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberalism/> (last visited on March 12, 2026).
- 7 Joseph Raz, 'On the Nature of Rights', 93 Mind 194 (1984).
- 8 Herbert Hart, 'Are There Any Natural Rights?', 64 The Philosophical Review 175 (1955).
- 9 Constitutional Morality: Key Principles and Significance for Indian Democracy, Drishti IAS, available at: <https://www.drishtiias.com/to-the-points/paper4/what-is-constitutional-morality> (last visited on March 10, 2026); What Is Constitutional Morality, India Seminar, available at: https://www.indiaseminar.com/2010/615/615_pratap_bhanu_mehta.htm (last visited on March 6, 2026).
- 10 Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.
- 11 Madhav Khosla, India's Founding Moment: The Constitution of a Most Surprising Democracy 147 (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1st edn., 2020).
- 12 Granville Austin, The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation 120 (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1st edn., 1966).
- 13 Mariyam Kamil, 'Puttaswamy: Jury Still Out on Some Privacy Concerns?', 1 Indian Law Review 190 (2017).
- 14 Nupur Chowdhury, 'Privacy and Citizenship in India: Exploring Constitutional Morality and Data Privacy', 11 NUJS Law Review 421 (2018).
- 15 Provide Column for 'No Religion', 'No Caste' in Birth Certificate Applications, SCC Online, available at: <https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/2023/08/03/> (last visited on March 6, 2026); Article 19(2) and 'Public Order', Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, available at: <https://vidhilegalpolicy.in/blog/article-192-and-public-order/> (last visited on March 11, 2026).
- 16 Bijoe Emmanuel v. State of Kerala, (1986) 3 SCC 615.
- 17 Tarunabh Khaitan, A Theory of Discrimination Law 203 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1st edn., 2015).
- 18 National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, (2014) 5 SCC 438; Arvind Narrain, Queer: 'Despised Sexuality', Law, and Social Change 78 (Books for Change, Bangalore, 1st edn., 2004).
- 19 Saptarshi Mandal, 'Out of Shah Bano's Shadow: Muslim Women's Rights and the Triple Talaq Verdict', 2 Indian Law Review 89 (2018).
- 20 Special Marriage Act's Notice Regime and Judicial Denial of Protection, Vidhi Centre for Legal Policy, available at: <https://vidhilegalpolicy.in/blog/special-marriage-acts-notice-regime-and-judicial-denial-of-protection/> (last visited on March 8, 2026).
- 21 Shafin Jahan v. Asokan K.M., (2018) 16 SCC 368; Shafin Jahan v. Union of India (Hadiya Marriage Case): Judgment in Plain English, SC Observer, available at: <https://www.scobserver.in/reports/> (last visited on March 14, 2026).
- 22 Flavia Agnes, Law and Gender Inequality: The Politics of Women's Rights in India 164 (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 1st edn., 1999); Ratna Kapur, Gender, Alterity and Human Rights: Freedom in a Fishbowl 132 (Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, 1st edn., 2018).
- 23 Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala, (2019) 11 SCC 1.
- 24 Pratik Dixit, 'Navtej Singh Johar v Union of India: Decriminalising India's Sodomy Law', 24 The International Journal of Human Rights 1011 (2020).

-
- 25 Gautam Bhatia, 'Equal Moral Membership: Naz Foundation and the Refashioning of Equality under a Transformative Constitution', 1 Indian Law Review 115 (2017).
- 26 Paul Hirst, Grahame Thompson et al., *Globalization in Question* 198 (Polity Press, Cambridge, 3rd edn., 2009).
- 27 Gillian Brock, *Global Justice: A Cosmopolitan Account* 143 (Oxford University Press, New York, 1st edn., 2009).
- 28 Sally Engle Merry, 'Transnational Human Rights and Local Activism: Mapping the Middle', 108 American Anthropologist 38 (2006).
- 29 Makau Mutua, 'Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights', 42 Harvard International Law Journal 201 (2001).
- 30 Customary and Informal Justice, International Development Law Organization, available at: <https://www.idlo.int/what-we-do/access-justice/customary-informal-justice> (last visited on March 10, 2026).
- 31 Legal Pluralism, GSDRC, available at: <https://gsdrc.org/topic-guides/safety-security-and-justice/themes/legal-pluralism/> (last visited on March 13, 2026).
- 32 Jack L. Goldsmith and Eric A. Posner, *The Limits of International Law* 117 (Oxford University Press, New York, 1st edn., 2005).
- 33 Supriyo @ Supriya Chakraborty v. Union of India, 2023 INSC 920; Allen E. Buchanan, *Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-Determination: Moral Foundations for International Law* 209 (Oxford University Press, New York, 1st edn., 2003).
- 34 Amartya Sen, 'Ethics and the Foundation of Global Justice', 31 Ethics & International Affairs 261 (2017); Andreas Bergh and Therese Nilsson, 'Is Globalization Reducing Absolute Poverty?', 62 World Development 42 (2014).