

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 1

2025

© 2025 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact support@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to submission@ijlmh.com.

Reconciling Cultural and Constitutional Morality in India: An Impact Analysis

BHAVATHARANI NACHIYAR M.¹

ABSTRACT

The interplay between cultural and constitutional morality constitutes a substantial challenge within India's pluralistic legal framework. Cultural morality—anchored in traditions, customs and religion—frequently conflicts with constitutional morality; this latter upholds the values of justice, equality, liberty and fraternity enshrined within the Indian Constitution. This research paper critically examines the evolving relationship between these moral frameworks, their legal interpretations and the broader socio-cultural implications.

Tracing the historical background of constitutional morality and its conceptualization by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, the paper explores its judicial evolution in India, alongside the judiciary's role as custodian of constitutional principles. It further analyzes the legal recognition of cultural practices and judicial interventions that have challenged and, in some instances, redefined these practices to align with constitutional values. However, the complexities of this relationship necessitate a nuanced understanding, because the dynamics of cultural and constitutional morality are not static; they remain dynamic and continually evolving.

Through an analysis of seminal cases such as Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India (2018), Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala (2018) and Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017), this paper critically examines landmark rulings that elucidate the tension (and, indeed, the reconciliation) between cultural norms and constitutional mandates.

The study highlights the importance of courts being aware, laws needing changes, and the public requiring information to lessen the gap between different moral views. It recommends a balanced approach that respects India's varied culture while safeguarding individual rights and constitutional principles.

The article ends with suggestions for encouraging discussion, enhancing understanding of the constitution, and ensuring modern legal changes to balance cultural customs and constitutional values. By carefully managing these conflicts, India can maintain its constitutional values without disregarding its diverse cultural background, promoting a fair and inclusive society.

¹ Author is a LL.M. Student at The Central Law College, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India.

Keywords: Cultural morality, Constitutional morality, Pluralistic Legal Framework, Cultural Practices, Justice and Equality, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Judicial Evolution, Social Justice, Nuanced Understanding.

I. INTRODUCTION

“Constitutional morality is not a natural sentiment. It has to be cultivated. We must realize that our people have yet to learn it.”

— Dr. B.R. Ambedkar²

A careful balance between cultural variety and constitutional demands is maintained by India’s socio-legal structure, which operates within this framework. India’s cultural morality, which is strongly rooted in the country’s traditions, customs, and religious practices, is synonymous with the collective conscience of the country’s many different cultures. It is a reflection of ideals that have been there for generations and have a significant impact on the social fabric, including personal laws, family structures, and rituals. On the other hand, this deeply embedded cultural morality frequently finds itself in conflict with constitutional morality. Constitutional morality is a form of morality that is enshrined in the Indian Constitution and comprises universal ideals such as justice, equality, liberty, and brotherhood. Cultural morality is fluid, varies among areas, religions, and communities, but constitutional morality provides a standard legal and ethical framework for all people. This is the source of the tension that exists between the two. In contrast to constitutional morality, which tries to safeguard individual rights, dignity, and non-discrimination, cultural morality frequently reflects patriarchal, hierarchical, or exclusionary beliefs that are entrenched in tradition. While there is a cultural basis for certain traditions, like as untouchability, child marriage, or gender-based limitations in religious places, these practices contravene the fundamental principles of equality and dignity. These conflicts provide light on the difficulties that arise when attempting to connect deeply ingrained cultural norms with constitutional goals of a society that is progressive and welcoming to all participants. In addition, the historical backdrop makes this interaction much more complicated. During the time before independence, personal laws were the ones that governed social customs, and cultural morality was given priority before national rules. Following independence, the Constitution was drafted with the intention of establishing a transformative framework, with an emphasis on the necessity of reshaping cultural norms so that they are in line with contemporary

² **Ambedkar, B.R.** (1948). Speech during the Constituent Assembly Debates, November 4, 1948. Reprinted in *The Constituent Assembly Debates*, Volume VII. Available at the Official Parliament of India archives: <https://cadindia.clpr.org.in/>.

egalitarian ideas. This change, on the other hand, has been gradual and has frequently been greeted with resistance from various traditionalist sectors. The interpretations of the courts are extremely important in the process of reconciling this disagreement. It has become increasingly common for the courts to step in and enforce constitutional morality, even if it means doing so at the expense of cultural norms. The commitment of the judiciary to protecting constitutional principles against regressive traditions is demonstrated by landmark judgments such as *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018), which decriminalized homosexuality, and *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala* (2018), which allowed women to enter the Sabarimala temple. Both of these cases were decided in 2018. This conflict has a significant and far-reaching impact on society. On the one hand, it confronts practices that have been around for a long time, which helps to encourage social growth and individual responsibility. The other side of the coin is that it gives rise to discussions on the preservation of culture and the role of the state in the regulation of customs. The existence of this dichotomy highlights the necessity of adopting a nuanced approach, which strikes a balance between the imperative to defend constitutional ideals and the respect for cultural identity. In essence, in order to reconcile cultural morality with constitutional morality, it is not only a task from a legal standpoint, but also an endeavor from a sociopolitical standpoint. For the purpose of fostering awareness, encouraging discourse, and putting into effect measures that bridge the gap between these two moral frameworks, it is necessary for the judicial system, the legislature, and civil society to work together. By doing so, India will be able to work toward achieving its goal of being a society that is welcoming to all people, honors its diverse cultural history, and remains true to the transformative vision of its Constitution.

II. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The reconciliation of cultural and constitutional morality is a complex challenge in India, due to its unparalleled diversity, which includes a multiplicity of religions, traditions, and communities. A sense of identity, community, and continuity is fostered by cultural morality, which is based on centuries-old religious practices and customs. It influences personal laws, rituals, and social norms, reflecting the collective conscience of particular groups. Nevertheless, these practices frequently represent patriarchal, hierarchical, or exclusionary values that are in direct opposition to constitutional morality, a framework that is intended to preserve justice, equality, liberty, and fraternity for all citizens. The principle of constitutional morality, as envisioned by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, is a governing principle for social transformation that prioritizes individual rights and dignity over regressive traditions. The interplay between these moral frameworks is evident in landmark judicial interventions such as *Sabarimala* and *Navtej*

Singh Johar, which prioritize constitutional values over exclusionary practices. To reconcile cultural identity with the progressive principles of the Constitution and cultivate a fair and inclusive society, it is necessary to implement legislative reforms, public engagement, and judicial sensitivity.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

(A) Cultural Morality: Concepts and Theories

Cultural morality embodies the ethical principles and values originating from traditions, religious teachings, and enduring societal conventions. These norms establish a feeling of identity and continuity for communities, influencing their worldview and behavioral standards. Cultural relativism underscores the necessity of comprehending actions within their distinct cultural settings, asserting that no culture's morality is intrinsically superior to that of another. This relativism can occasionally contradict with universal values of justice, equality, and human rights. Practices like caste discrimination and gender-based restrictions can undermine constitutional ideals, requiring a careful equilibrium between cultural preservation and progressive transformation.

(B) Constitutional Morality: Principles and Applications

Constitutional morality denotes the dedication to maintain the principles embedded in the Constitution, including justice, equality, liberty, and fraternity, as the basis for governance and societal advancement. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, the architect of the Indian Constitution, advocated for constitutional morality as vital for maintaining democracy in a pluralistic society. He contended that respect to constitutional principles must take precedence over societal norms or traditional practices that sustain inequity or prejudice. Constitutional morality mandates that the state and its institutions emphasize individual dignity and communal good, even when it conflicts with established cultural or religious norms, thereby fostering a progressive, inclusive, and equitable society.

IV. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF CULTURAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY IN INDIA

(A) Pre-Independence Era

Under British colonial governance in India, the legal system was an amalgamation of British legal doctrines and local practices. The British administration implemented their legal system to regulate criminal law, contracts, and evidence, seeking uniformity throughout the colony. In issues closely linked to religion and culture—such as marriage, inheritance, and caste—they

permitted the implementation of personal laws pertinent to each religious community. This methodology was codified in the late 18th century; for example, the Bengal Regulation of 1772 mandated that in matters of inheritance, marriage, caste, and other religious practices, the laws of the Koran would govern Muslims, while those of the Shaster would govern Hindus. This dual system sought to honor India's varied cultural and religious traditions while instituting a colonial legal framework. Personal laws originated from religious scriptures and customary traditions, embodying the cultural ethics of certain communities. Hindu personal law was derived from Dharmasāstras, whilst Islamic law was based on Sharia. These personal laws regulated familial concerns, encompassing marriage customs, divorce protocols, adoption, and succession and inheritance regulations. The British policy of non-interference in personal laws aimed to avert hostility from local populations by permitting the continuation of customary customs. Nonetheless, this resulted in complexity and contradictions, as customary rules exhibited considerable variation among regions and groups, occasionally conflicting with the British legal concepts implemented in other governing sectors. The integration of British legal systems with local personal laws during colonial governance established a pluralistic legal framework in India. Although it sought to honor cultural diversity, it simultaneously established the foundation for persistent discussions on legal uniformity and the difficulties of assimilating varied cultural norms into a unified legal framework. This historical backdrop persists in shaping discussions on legal reforms in modern India, especially on the enactment of a Uniform Civil Code.

(B) Post-Independence Era

An important step toward constructing a society that is founded on justice, equality, and individual dignity was taken when the Indian Constitution was adopted in 1950. This event marked a dramatic shift. The people who drafted the Constitution were adamant about guaranteeing that constitutional ideals would take precedence over old, backwards customs. Article 17³ is a prime example of this commitment because it categorically eliminates the concept of "untouchability" and prohibits its practice in any form. Furthermore, it makes the enforcement of this concept a criminal violation. To add insult to injury, the Constitution enshrines secularism, which guarantees that the state would remain impartial in matters pertaining to worship. To compel any individual to pay taxes for the purpose of promoting or maintaining any particular religion or religious sect is against the law, as stated in provisions such as Article 27⁴. The Constitution's significance as a catalyst for social transformation is

³ The Constitution of India,1950

⁴ The Constitution of India,1950

highlighted by these policies, which strive to eradicate discriminatory norms and foster a society that is inclusive, secular, and egalitarian based on equality.

V. KEY CONCEPTS IN CULTURAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY

(A) Dharma and Dhamma

Dharma and Dhamma are two important ethical notions that appear in Indian philosophy. These concepts have their origins in ancient writings and traditions, and they have been influential in shaping cultural morality for ages. The term “dharma” originates from Hindu philosophy and refers to the moral obligations and responsibilities that are imposed to an individual based on their age, the roles they play in society, and their caste (varna). It places an emphasis on sticking to these particular commitments in order to prevent disruptions to social harmony and order. One example is the Manusmriti, which lists specific responsibilities for each caste, so contributing to the establishment of a hierarchical system within society. Dharma, despite the fact that it fosters societal stability, frequently sustains practices that are in direct opposition to the principles that are enshrined in modern constitutions. These practices include discrimination based on caste and gender inequity. On the other hand, Dhamma, which has its origins in Buddhist philosophy, promotes universal ethical principles that are independent of and transcend societal inequalities. It places an emphasis on compassion, nonviolence, and equality, and it promotes individual moral responsibility as well as the well-being of all sentient beings. Dharma coexists with cultural practices that are anchored in Dharma, which creates ideological contradictions. Although Dhamma is more closely aligned with the constitutional objectives of justice and equality, it is also a cultural practice. These ideas have had a considerable impact on the development of Indian cultural morality; yet, the rigid application of these ideas frequently comes into conflict with the transformational aspirations of the Indian Constitution. Untouchability and the subjection of women are two examples of behaviors that are directly in conflict with the fundamental concepts of equality, liberty, and fraternity. Dharma is a religious doctrine that justifies certain practices. It is necessary to rethink these historical moral frameworks in order to bring them into alignment with the present constitutional morality in order to resolve these difficulties.

(B) Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles

The Indian Constitution creates a nuanced equilibrium between individual rights and societal goals, shown in the contrast between Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy. This dual framework seeks to reconcile cultural values with the progressive principles of the Constitution, acknowledging the importance of safeguarding individual liberties while

also advancing social welfare. Fundamental Rights, established in Part III of the Constitution, assure a collection of civil rights and protections for individuals, safeguarding them against discrimination and capricious official actions. The rights encompass the right to equality (Article 14)⁵, the right to freedom of speech and expression (Article 19), the right to life and personal liberty (Article 21), and the right against exploitation (Article 23). These rights represent constitutional morality, emphasizing individual dignity, liberty, and fairness, regardless of culture or traditional customs. Conversely, the Directive Principles of State Policy, delineated in Part IV, offer directives for the state to create a welfare society. Their objective is to advance economic, social, and political justice, concentrating on matters such as the mitigation of inequality (Article 38), the assurance of sufficient livelihood (Article 39), and the safeguarding of children and youth (Article 39(e) and 39(f)). Although these principles lack legal enforceability, they embody the state's duty to strive for a just and equitable society in alignment with constitutional aspirations. The Constitution's endeavor to harmonize individual rights and society welfare exemplifies a wider initiative to reconcile cultural morality with constitutional morality. Although cultural norms frequently emphasize societal and social stability, the Constitution, via its Fundamental Rights, highlights the significance of safeguarding individual individuality. The Directive Principles mandate the state to honor cultural traditions while also advancing equality and justice. This equilibrium aims to safeguard personal liberties while promoting societal unity, rendering it a dynamic tool of government in India's diverse population.

VI. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY

(A) Similarities and Differences

Cultural morality and constitutional morality both seek to create ethical frameworks that govern human conduct; nevertheless, they markedly differ in their scope, application, and interpretation. Cultural morality is fundamentally anchored in the traditions, customs, and religious practices of particular groups, frequently transmitted throughout generations. It embodies the values, beliefs, and social conventions of specific groups, including caste-based traditions, regional customs, or religious mandates. These standards varies significantly among societies, with actions in one culture potentially contrasting entirely with those in another. The practice of Sati (widow immolation) in specific historical situations, while integral to cultural morality, was thereafter regarded as undesirable under constitutional standards. Cultural morality is dynamic and evolves over time, however it predominantly remains localized within

⁵ Ibid,

particular communities. Conversely, constitutional morality is intended to be generally applicable throughout the nation, surpassing cultural, religious, and socioeconomic divisions. Embedded in the Indian Constitution, it aims to establish a consistent standard of justice, equality, liberty, and brotherhood for all individuals, irrespective of their distinct cultural backgrounds. It guarantees that legislation is formulated and court rulings are rendered in alignment with principles that safeguard individual rights and dignity. Constitutional morality underpins the legal system, directing the state in its decision-making and policy formulation. The Supreme Court of India has frequently engaged in reconciling these two moralities. An illustrative instance is found in *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala (2018)*⁶, wherein the Supreme Court let women of all ages to access the Sabarimala temple, so superseding a longstanding cultural tradition. The Court underscored that constitutional morality, specifically the right to equality (Article 14)⁷ and the right to religious freedom (Article 25), must take precedence over cultural customs that discriminate against women. The basic distinction between cultural and constitutional morality resides in their scope: culture morality is specific to communities and may occasionally sustain discriminatory behaviors, whereas constitutional morality is universally applicable, safeguarding fundamental rights. Nonetheless, both seek to cultivate a moral and equitable society, albeit via distinct ways.

(B) Challenges and Opportunities

The tension between cultural and constitutional morality often arises when certain cultural practices come into direct conflict with constitutional values. This tension poses challenges, but it also offers opportunities for legal and social reform, contributing to the advancement of justice and equality in India.

One of the most prominent examples of this conflict is the issue of child marriage, a prevalent practice in some rural and tribal communities in India. Despite being outlawed by law under the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, the practice persists in certain areas due to deeply ingrained cultural traditions. In such cases, constitutional morality, which upholds equality (Article 14) and protection of children (Article 21), comes into direct conflict with cultural norms. The legal system, however, must ensure that the best interests of the child are protected, irrespective of traditional practices. In *Shah Bano Begum v. Union of India (1985)*⁸, the Supreme Court, while addressing the rights of a divorced Muslim woman, highlighted the conflict between cultural practices and the constitutional right to equality and justice. This case

⁶ [2018] 9 S.C.R. 561

⁷ The Constitution of India, 1950

⁸ *1985 AIR 945*

exemplified how cultural practices (such as the husband's right to divorce) were challenged by the broader constitutional framework of rights guaranteed to women under Articles 14 and 15.

Another area where cultural morality clashes with constitutional morality is the caste-based discrimination entrenched in Indian society. Although the Constitution abolished untouchability under Article 17, caste-based discrimination continues to persist in various forms, particularly in rural areas and religious practices. In *People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India* (2001)⁹, the Supreme Court acknowledged the persistence of caste-based discrimination and ordered the state to take affirmative action to eliminate untouchability practices. This case demonstrates how constitutional morality has led to progressive reforms, despite opposition from cultural norms.

However, these challenges provide significant opportunities for legal reforms. The Supreme Court's ruling in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018)¹⁰, decriminalizing same-sex relations under Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, is a prime example. The Court, in its judgment, affirmed that the cultural morality of conservative views on sexuality could not override the constitutional guarantees of equality and freedom of expression. This ruling not only reinforced the supremacy of constitutional morality but also opened the door for greater social acceptance and legal reforms in the area of LGBTQ+ rights.

Thus, while cultural practices can present challenges in aligning with constitutional morality, they also offer an opportunity to effect progressive change. The judiciary plays a critical role in these scenarios, ensuring that constitutional values of justice and equality remain paramount. Additionally, legislative reform can help bridge the gap between cultural practices and constitutional norms, promoting an inclusive and progressive society.

VII. IMPACT OF CULTURAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL MORALITY ON INDIAN SOCIETY

(A) Gender Equality and Women's Rights

Cultural traditions in India have historically relegated women to secondary positions in society, limiting their rights and possibilities. Cultural traditions frequently clash with constitutional ideals of equality and justice, which ensure women essential rights including dignity, equality, and non-discrimination. Judicial action has been crucial in aligning cultural traditions with constitutional morals, thereby safeguarding women's rights. A significant case in this context is *Shayara Bano v. Union of India* (2017)¹¹, in which the Supreme Court annulled the practice

⁹ Writ Petition (Civil) No.196 of 2001

¹⁰ AIR 2018 SC 4321

¹¹ AIR 2017 SC 4609

of triple talaq (immediate divorce) under Muslim personal law. The Court acknowledged that the practice, although culturally ingrained in some Muslim groups, infringed upon the fundamental rights of women, notably their right to equality under Article 14 and the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. The Court determined that the practice was capricious and unlawful, underscoring the necessity of prioritizing constitutional morality over established cultural customs. This important ruling underlined that the Constitution's provisions must dictate legal and societal standards, guaranteeing that gender equality takes precedence over discriminatory cultural traditions. In *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997)¹², the Supreme Court examined the subject of sexual harassment in the workplace, a phenomenon frequently overlooked or minimized in conventional societies. The Court established principles to avert sexual harassment, which were subsequently enshrined in legislation as the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013. This ruling indicated a notable transition towards harmonizing cultural practices with constitutional morality by confronting the gendered power structures that have sustained violence and harassment against women. The significant case, *Independent Thought v. Union of India* (2017)¹³, Addressed the matter of marital rape in India. The Supreme Court determined that sexual intercourse with a wife under 18 years of age constitutes rape, regardless of marital status, thereby abolishing a legal provision that permitted sexual relations within marriage. This verdict affirmed that cultural norms cannot be used to justify infringements on a woman's autonomy, thereby upholding the constitutional principles of gender equality and human dignity. These cases illustrate the Supreme Court's function in reconciling cultural customs with constitutional morality, while also underscoring the persistent challenge of achieving gender equality in India. Notwithstanding legislative progress, societal views and customary practices persist as obstacles to the complete attainment of women's rights. The Indian judiciary plays a crucial role in tackling these difficulties, offering a strong foundation for the safeguarding of women's rights in a culturally varied country.

(B) Caste System and Social Justice

The caste system, entrenched in India's cultural ethics, has perpetuated significant socioeconomic inequity and injustice for millennia. Notwithstanding the explicit prohibition of untouchability in Article 17 of the Indian Constitution and the assurance of legal equality in Article 14, the caste system persists in influencing social interactions, especially in rural regions. Cultural practices that sustain caste-based discrimination frequently contradict the

¹² (1997) 6 SCC 241

¹³ AIR 2017 SC 4904

constitutional principles of justice, equality, and non-discrimination. Judicial intervention and affirmative action measures have been essential in contesting and eradicating caste-based inequity in India. The *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India* (1992) case¹⁴, commonly referred to as the Mandal Commission case, is pivotal in the discourse on caste-based discrimination. The Supreme Court affirmed the decision to prolong affirmative action via reservations for OBCs (Other Backward Classes) in government employment and educational institutions, thereby acknowledging the necessity of positive discrimination to address the historical disadvantages experienced by specific populations. The Court underscored that the Constitution's conception of social justice should direct state actions, and affirmative action measures must be implemented to attain genuine equality for marginalized communities. The ruling highlighted the tension between traditional cultural practices that sustain caste-based inequalities and the constitutional framework that requires the advancement of socially marginalized groups. In *M. Nagaraj v. Union of India* (2006)¹⁵, the Supreme Court reexamined the matter of caste-based reservations in public employment and educational establishments. The Court affirmed the constitutional legitimacy of reserves while stipulating that their execution must adhere to specific circumstances, including the requirement for states to substantiate the backwardness of populations. This ruling emphasized the necessity of reconciling traditional practices, including the caste system, with constitutional principles of equality and fairness. Furthermore, Dr. Ambedkar perceived cultural practices that perpetuate caste discrimination as impediments to achieving constitutional equality within his framework of social justice. Article 46 of the Constitution obligates the state to advance the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, safeguarding them from social injustice and exploitation. Nonetheless, despite legislative measures, caste-based violence and prejudice remain in many regions of India, presenting continual obstacles to the attainment of social justice. In *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997), although the case primarily addressed sexual harassment, it also underscored the confluence of caste and gender, revealing that Dalit women frequently endure the dual affliction of caste-based oppression and gender-based violence. The National Commission for Scheduled Castes has persistently expressed concerns on the existence of caste-based discrimination in rural and urban areas, pushing the state to implement more robust measures. In summary, the caste system persists as a significant influence in Indian society, obstructing the attainment of social justice as outlined in the Constitution. Nonetheless, judicial interventions and affirmative action rules persist in offering avenues for advancement. The

¹⁴ AIR 1993 SC 477

¹⁵ 2006 8 SCC 212

Court's function in harmonizing the conflict between cultural traditions and constitutional ethics has been essential in promoting social fairness, while significant efforts are still required to eradicate caste-based prejudice from Indian culture.

VIII. LEGAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

(A) Judicial Interpretations

The Indian judiciary has played a crucial role in harmonizing culture and constitutional morality, frequently intervening to resolve disputes between established cultural norms and the principles embedded in the Constitution. The courts have utilized judicial interpretations to guarantee that laws develop in accordance with constitutional ideals of justice, equality, and individual rights. The *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018) case serves as a significant example of the judiciary's role in maintaining constitutional morality. The Supreme Court decriminalized Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, which had prohibited consensual same-sex interactions among adults. The Court's ruling was a substantial advancement for the safeguarding of individual rights, especially the right to privacy, and was grounded in the constitutional tenets of dignity and equality. The Court determined that Section 377 contravened Article 14 (equality before the law), Article 15 (prohibition of discrimination based on sex), and Article 21 (right to life and personal liberty) of the Constitution. In doing so, the Court harmonized cultural and societal norms with the Constitution's dedication to individual liberties, superseding conventional moralities that deemed same-sex partnerships immoral or unlawful. In *K.S.Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017)¹⁶, recognized as the right to privacy case, the Supreme Court affirmed the right to privacy as a fundamental right under the Indian Constitution, a decision with significant consequences for personal and cultural autonomy. These instances illustrate how judicial action can reconcile cultural traditions with constitutional values, safeguarding individual rights in a pluralistic society. The judiciary has significantly influenced the legal framework to embody constitutional morality, occasionally contesting entrenched cultural norms in support of progressive legal interpretations that emphasize equality and individual dignity.

(B) Legislative Reforms

Legislative reforms in India have been crucial in bridging the disparities between cultural norms and constitutional principles. Judicial interventions have concentrated on interpreting the Constitution in accordance with changing society values, whilst legislative reforms have sought

¹⁶ (2017) 10 SCC 1

to codify these values and prevent cultural traditions from perpetuating discrimination or infringing upon fundamental rights. These reforms represent an effort to reconcile established cultural norms with the progressive objectives of the Indian Constitution. The Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006, is a notable legislative measure. Child marriage, entrenched in cultural traditions, remains a critical issue in India, where girls, especially in rural regions, are wed at a young age, infringing upon their rights to education, health, and personal autonomy. The Act prohibits the marriage of girls under 18 and boys under 21, thus harmonizing the legal system with constitutional ideals of equality, dignity, and child safety. It functions as a crucial instrument in deconstructing conventional practices that sustain gender inequity and restrict the autonomy of young girls. The Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, was another significant legislative measure. Domestic violence, frequently regarded as a cultural norm, was ultimately confronted by laws that offered legal remedies to women enduring assault. The Act rendered physical, emotional, and economic abuse within marriages a criminal offense, enabling women to pursue legal recourse against offenders. The reform recognized cultural practices that frequently rationalized domestic abuse, while it emphasized the supremacy of constitutional values by safeguarding women's rights to safety, equality, and dignity. The Muslim Women (Protection of Rights on Marriage) Act, 2019, was enacted to safeguard Muslim women from the practice of triple talaq, representing a legal reaction to a cultural tradition that contradicted constitutional norms. The legislation prohibited the practice of instant divorce, safeguarding the principles of equality and justice from being undermined by old customs. This legislative reform embodied a compromise between preserving cultural customs and conforming to constitutional morals. These legislative improvements, in conjunction with judicial interpretations, are essential in reconciling the conflict between cultural practices and constitutional principles. They demonstrate a continuous endeavor to guarantee that India's legal framework safeguards individual rights and maintains the tenets of equality and justice.

IX. CASE STUDIES AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

(A) Landmark Judgments

Pivotal Rulings India's legal system has had numerous landmark rulings that act as vital interventions in harmonizing cultural traditions with constitutional morality. These rulings demonstrate the judiciary's proactive engagement in contesting established societal norms that contradict fundamental rights, thereby offering a progressive legal framework for safeguarding individual liberties. The subsequent examples illustrate the progression of judicial reasoning in confronting conflicts between cultural norms and constitutional morality.

Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala (2018) – Sabarimala Case¹⁷

The Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala (2018) lawsuit represents a pivotal moment in the pursuit of gender equality in religious activities. The Supreme Court of India annulled the prohibition on women aged 10-50 from accessing the Sabarimala temple in Kerala, determining that the exclusion contravened women's fundamental right to equality under Article 14, the right to freedom of religion under Article 25, and the right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution. The case contested the entrenched cultural practice of prohibiting women from the temple due to their menstrual status, arguing that these prohibitions stemmed from patriarchal interpretations of religion rather than from doctrinal scriptures. The Court's decision underscored the significance of personal autonomy and freedom of worship, dismissing the assertion that religious practices might warrant gender-based discrimination. Justice Chandrachud, in his sole judgment, asserted that "the Constitution mandates that the authority to delineate the essence of religious practices should reside with the individual, rather than with any collective or institution that seeks to impose its interpretation of religious doctrines on others." This ruling was not only pivotal in the Sabarimala case but also established a precedent for contesting gender-based cultural limitations disguised as religious freedom. It emphasized that constitutional morality prevails over traditional cultural customs when they violate basic rights.

Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017) – Case on Triple Talaq¹⁸

In Shayara Bano v. Union of India (2017), the Supreme Court examined the practice of triple talaq, whereby a Muslim man could unilaterally divorce his wife by uttering "talaq" three times, irrespective of her consent. The petitioner, Shayara Bano, contested the practice, asserting that it infringed upon her fundamental rights to equality, dignity, and non-discrimination, as enshrined in Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution. The Court deemed the practice unlawful, declaring it arbitrary and a violation of women's fundamental rights. This ruling was founded on the acknowledgment that religiously rooted cultural practices cannot supersede individual rights, particularly when these practices sustain gender inequality and discrimination. The ruling, issued by a five-judge panel, underscored that the tenets of constitutional morality—justice, equality, and liberty—were of utmost importance, and no practice, regardless of its religious origins, could violate these rights. The ruling represented a pivotal advancement in gender justice, confirming that legal equality and the right to live with dignity are fundamental

¹⁷ [2018] 9 S.C.R. 561

¹⁸ [2017] 9 S.C.R. 797

principles of the Indian Constitution. The ruling additionally mandated legislative action to establish a framework for the rights of Muslim women in marriage and divorce.

Joseph Shine v. Union of India (2018) – Case Concerning Adultery¹⁹

In *Joseph Shine v. Union of India* (2018), the Supreme Court decriminalized adultery by annulling Section 497 of the Indian Penal Code, which had classified adultery as an offense solely when perpetrated by a male against a woman who was not his spouse. The law regarded women as the property of their husbands, thereby sustaining a gender-biased conception of marriage and personal liberty. The ruling stated that Section 497 was unlawful for infringing upon Article 14 (right to equality), Article 15 (prohibition of discrimination), and Article 21 (right to life and personal liberty). Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, in his ruling, emphasized that the legal rules were antiquated and failed to embody the principles of individual autonomy and dignity inherent to the Indian Constitution. The Court maintained that an adult's decision to partake in an extramarital affair ought to be a personal choice, free from state intervention. The verdict underscored the necessity for revision in legislation that embodies antiquated societal values. The legalizing of adultery represented a triumph for individual rights, affirming that personal autonomy in decision-making, particularly regarding marriage and relationships, should be maintained in a contemporary, progressive society.

Naz Foundation v. Government of NCT of Delhi (2009) – Case Concerning Section 377²⁰

In *Naz Foundation v. Government of NCT of Delhi* (2009), the Delhi High Court declared that Section 377 of the Indian Penal Code, which criminalized homosexuality, infringed the rights of persons to life and liberty under Article 21 and equality under Article 14. The case was a major victory in the fight for LGBTQ+ rights in India, challenging a colonial-era statute that criminalized consenting same-sex encounters. The Court concluded that the clause was arbitrary and unjust, since it disproportionately harmed LGBTQ+ individuals, criminalizing their sexual expression and depriving them the right to a private and consensual relationship. Although the Supreme Court ultimately reversed this judgment in 2013 (in *Koushal v. Naz Foundation*), the case marked an important step in challenging cultural practices and legislation that disadvantage vulnerable people. In 2018, the Supreme Court reviewed the matter in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, where it decriminalized same-sex interactions between consenting adults. This reinforced the concepts established in *Naz Foundation* and further underscored the significance of constitutional morality in protecting individual liberties, regardless of societal or cultural

¹⁹ (2019) 3 SCC 39

²⁰ 2009 (6) SCC 712

resistance.

(B) Social Welfare Programs

Social Welfare Initiatives Social welfare programs in India have proven crucial in reconciling cultural customs with constitutional objectives. These programs frequently seek to advance justice, equality, and social inclusion, while concurrently honoring cultural beliefs and customs. One of the most significant initiatives is *Beti Bachao Beti Padhao* (Save the Girl Child, Educate the Girl Child), which was inaugurated by the Indian government in 2015. This project underscores the government's dedication to mitigating gender inequities in society while respecting India's unique cultural landscape. The *Beti Bachao Beti Padhao* initiative was established to address the diminishing sex ratio and enhance the status of girls via education and empowerment. The initiative emphasizes gender equality by advocating for the protection, survival, and education of girls. Cultural traditions, especially in rural and conservative regions, frequently prioritize male offspring over female offspring, resulting in practices such as female feticide, neglect, and restricted educational opportunities for females. This curriculum highlights that gender equality is fundamental to India's constitutional framework and must be upheld in all societal dimensions. The project confronts cultural and constitutional morality by advocating for every girl child's right to dignity and opportunity, as stipulated in the Indian Constitution, while simultaneously addressing entrenched patriarchal beliefs. The program has effectively raised awareness and altered cultural beliefs, particularly in rural areas, on the significance of education and empowerment for females. *Beti Bachao Beti Padhao* endeavors to foster a more just and equitable society by ensuring that cultural practices do not impede constitutional principles. **Alternative Social Welfare Initiatives** Alongside *Beti Bachao Beti Padhao*, initiatives such as *Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana*, aimed at enhancing financial inclusion, and the *Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)*, which prioritizes employment opportunities for rural populations, further advance constitutional principles like equality and social justice. These programs correspond with the constitutional objective of ensuring the welfare of the populace, especially underprivileged communities, and endeavor to generate chances that surpass cultural constraints and biases. These programs demonstrate a governmental endeavor to reconcile traditional cultural values with the progressive tenets of constitutional morality, guaranteeing that society advancement is anchored in respect for human dignity, equality, and the right to opportunity for all citizens.

X. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) Summary of Findings

An complicated landscape in India emerges from the interplay between cultural morality and constitutional morality. This region is defined by the convergence of conventional society norms and the essential legal tenets of the country. The values and beliefs of certain communities are often mirrored in India's cultural morality, which is firmly rooted in the nation's diverse traditions and practices. Constitutional morality represents the embodiment of the universal principles enshrined in the Indian Constitution. These principles encompass justice, equality, and liberty, and they are universally relevant to all individuals. The Indian judiciary has played a crucial role over the years in ensuring that cultural traditions do not infringe upon the fundamental rights provided by the Constitution. The judiciary's dedication to prioritizing constitutional morality over existing cultural norms is exemplified by significant rulings such as *Shayara Bano v. Union of India* (2017), which invalidated the practice of triple talaq, and *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India* (2018), which decriminalized homosexuality. Both cases were adjudicated in 2017. Nonetheless, challenges persist. Some cultural contexts remain marked by practices that directly contradict the objectives established in the Constitution, including discrimination based on caste and gender orientation. The intricate equilibrium of honoring cultural diversity while safeguarding constitutional principles necessitates ongoing vigilance. In conclusion, cultural morality reflects the diverse traditions of India, whereas constitutional morality underpins the nation's legal framework, ensuring that all individuals are afforded dignity and equality. Maintaining a dialogue between these two moralities is essential for fostering a community that loves its cultural heritage while firmly upholding the constitutional principles of fairness and equality.

(B) Policy Suggestions

To properly reconcile cultural and constitutional morality, the following ideas are suggested:

- 1. Augmented Legal Education and Awareness:** Establish extensive educational initiatives that enlighten citizens regarding their constitutional rights and the significance of constitutional morality. This project can enable individuals to identify and contest cultural practices that violate their rights.

- 2. Community Engagement and Dialogue:** Promote open discussions within communities to examine the effects of certain cultural traditions on individual rights. Involving community leaders and influencers can facilitate the reconciliation of traditional beliefs with constitutional ideals.

3. Enhancing Judicial Oversight: Urge the court to persist in its proactive engagement in evaluating and, when warranted, nullifying cultural practices that contravene constitutional norms. This method guarantees that the law serves as an instrument for social justice and equality.

4. Legislative Reforms: Implement and uphold legislation that unequivocally ban practices that contravene constitutional values, including caste-based discrimination and gender-based violence. Legislative measures can establish a definitive legal foundation for safeguarding individual rights.

5. Advancing Media and Public Discourse: Leverage media platforms to communicate the significance of constitutional morality and its contribution to societal advancement. Public debate has the capacity to contest antiquated cultural norms and foster a more inclusive society.

6. Assistance for Affected those: Offer legal and social aid to those contesting cultural practices that violate their rights. Support systems can enable individuals to claim their rights and pursue justice.

7. Research and Documentation: Promote scholarly and governmental investigations to record occurrences when cultural practices contradict constitutional values. Data-driven insights can guide policy decisions and legal reforms. Executing these proposals necessitates a unified endeavor by the government, court, civil society, and citizens to establish a society that honors cultural variety and upholds constitutional ideals, thereby guaranteeing justice and equality for all.

XI. REFERENCES

1. Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. VII (1948–49), 38–42.
2. Upendra Baxi, *The Future of Human Rights* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 45.
3. Granville Austin, *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 23.
4. Baxi, Upendra. *The Future of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
5. Austin, Granville. *Working a Democratic Constitution: The Indian Experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
6. National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution. *Report of the National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution*. New Delhi: Government of India, 2002.
7. Kumar, C. Raj. "Human Rights and Development: The Role of the Right to Education in Promoting the Right to Development." *Human Rights Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (2011): 548–582.
8. *Indian Young Lawyers Association v. State of Kerala (Sabarimala Case)*. (2019) 11 SCC 1.
9. *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, (1973) 4 SCC 225.
10. Austin, Granville. *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999
11. Ronald Dworkin, *Taking Rights Seriously* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), 50–53.
12. *Sarla Mudgal v. Union of India*. (1995) 3 SCC 635.
13. *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*, (2018) 10 SCC 1.
14. Chigateri, Shraddha. "Secularism and Women's Rights in India: Constitutional Morality in Practice." *Feminist Review* 91, no. 1 (2009): 58–78.
15. India's Constitution, Article 25.
16. *Shayara Bano v. Union of India (Triple Talaq Case)*. (2017) 9 SCC 1
17. *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*. (2018) 10 SCC 1.

18. Chandrachud, Abhinav. *Republic of Rhetoric: Free Speech and the Constitution of India*. New Delhi: Penguin India, 2017
19. Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946), 345–347.
20. N. R. Madhava Menon, *A Handbook of Legal Education in India* (Gurgaon: LexisNexis, 2011), 72.
21. Dworkin, Ronald. *Taking Rights Seriously*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.
22. Bajpai, Rochana. "Constitutional Morality: An Overview of Its Meaning and Implications in Indian Constitutionalism." *Economic and Political Weekly* 53, no. 4 (2018): 50–55.
