CHAPTER-4
MULTICULTURALISM AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Cultural diversity has become a political challenge throughout the world. One of the major factors of cultural diversification in various societies is globalization. The intensified flow of capital and the global spread of Western consumer culture have prompted a variety of social movements that emphasize their own ethnic, linguistic or religious distinctiveness. All these new social movements have in common, whether based on ethnicity, language or religion, is that they demand full and equal inclusion in society, while claiming the recognition of their particularistic identities in the public sphere they criticize the assumption of congruence between political unity and cultural homogeneity which was characteristic of the classic model of the nation-state, and thereby contribute to its far-reaching institutional transformation. Conflicts about cultural diversity seem to contest the homogenizing assumptions of the classical nation-state model. Policies of assimilation or of differential exclusion are increasingly considered as illegitimate, both at domestic and international levels. It is due to this failure most of the multicultural societies are facing legitimacy crisis. The legitimacy of any state depends on the fact that how far the state is able to cater to the needs of the society. In such a situation multicultural states
need to pursue culturally inclusive policies so that true legitimacy can be achieved. In this chapter we will try to work out how true legitimacy can be achieved in culturally plural societies. We will also examine how good governance as a concept has been defined by agencies who have coined these terms like IMF and World Bank and how later on UNDP through its different reports have tried to redefine this concept keeping in mind the interest of all the groups in the society.

**GOOD GOVERNANCE**

It was due to the intellectual discourse coming from the World Bank and other multilateral agencies that the concept of good governance gained prominence. It was in a particular background that the concept of good governance was aired by IMF and World Bank. Until the early nineties, the 'Washington Consensus' was the main influence in the discourse of multilateral agencies like World Bank. The main prescription of the 'Washington Consensus' were the policies of liberalization, privatization and globalization. It was assumed that adherence to these policies by the developing world would result in higher economic growth and reduction in poverty. It considered excessive intervention of state as a major cause of economic slow down and stressed on the liberation of markets from state regulation, in this way they supported the concept of 'minimal state'.
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However in the early nineties, the ‘Washington Consensus’ and the policies of the IMF and the World Bank were criticized as it lowered the growth of world economy, aggravated the economic and social problems of many countries and increased the gap between rich and poor. Thus the fundamental principles and assumption of the IMF and World Bank policies which were based on ‘Washington Consensus” were seriously questioned. In order to respond to these criticisms the World Bank started emphasizing the importance of institutions and governance. According to them the existence of ‘weak institution’ and ‘poor governance’ were the main reasons which created hurdles in the development process. In 1998, study titled “Assessing Aid: What Works, What Does Not and Why”, the World Bank concluded that foreign and world have made a greater impact on poverty reduction if it were focused on poor countries with stronger economic institutions and policies. Now the World Bank redefined the role of the state also. It now recognizes the important role played by the state in the development process, although markets are regarded as the main engine of sustained economic growth. The state and the market are now viewed as complementary to each other rather than alternatives to each. The effective state is now regarded as vital to creating an environment that allows the markets to flourish.
The concept of ‘Good Governance’ assumes importance against this background. The World Bank maintains that the role of good governance is vital for well-functioning market and thus for the economic performance of the country. Good governance as a concept was aired by World Bank thereof to establish a balance between the power of the state and the markets. The World Bank had emphasized the need for the ‘Minimal State’ until the nineties. However in the post-nineties period the bank acknowledged the ‘effective state’ as essential for economic and social development.

On one hand the World Bank wanted an environment conducive for market to flourish and on the other hand added a new aspect to the concept of good governance in order to reduce the state power. According to the World Bank the power of the state could be controlled and reduced by different measures like ensuring the participation of people in designing and monitoring projects and programmes, bringing more transparency to state activities and making public officials and politicians accountable to people. Decentralization of state power can also check an excessive concentration of power. Effective and strong institutions can limit the space for arbitrary action and restrain corruption. Effective institutions call for greater separation of power among the different branches of state. An independent
judiciary can ensure accountability of legislature and executive authorities. The provision of a regulatory regime can promote competition and innovation while constraining the abuse of monopoly power. The introduction of greater competition in different areas such as hiring and promotion, policymaking and service delivery can improve the performance of state and make it more responsive. The World Bank and IMF talked about the basic tenets of good governance like transparency, accountability, efficiency and fairness in order to check the excessive concentration of state power. Thus the concept of good governance came as a response to the critics of world bank policies in which they tried to show that they are really bothered about addressing the social and economic problem faced by different countries and will stress on pursuing those policies which will help in reducing poverty and will lead to the real development of the society. But in reality the World Bank advocated the concept of good governance in which they wanted state to play an active role only for creating a conducive environment for the market to flourish and wanted the state only to function in a manner that would not intrude upon the efficient functioning of the market forces.

It was only later that the term good governance was used to represent the interest of all the groups in the society and stressed on the promotion of
social cohesion, integration and well being of its population. Like UNDP views Governance as the exercise of political, economic and administrative management of public affairs. It encompasses the mechanism, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, mediate their differences and exercise their legal rights and obligations. The result of good governance is development that “gives priority to the poor, advances the cause of women, sustains the environment, and creates needed opportunities for employment and other livelihoods”. UNDP defines governance in terms of eight specific characteristics i.e. participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and the rule of law.

Though they are not new concepts, the terms “Governance” and “Good Governance” have recently come to occupy an important place in development literature, and in the concerns and considerations of major international donors. Indeed, more and more importance is attached to the notion of good governance, thus rendering bad governance as one of the worst possible features of society and a major cause of its problems and dysfunctions. Good governance often refers to the task of running the government in an effective manner. It is qualitatively and conceptually superior to a mere good government. The concept of governance and
governments do not have the same meaning. Government often denotes the formal legal institution of the state, capturing the site and dominance of formal political authority and leadership structures. By contrast governance is much broader and more useful concept that includes the exercise of political authority and control over society and how that affects the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development. Governance brings on board all development actors and lays emphasis on shared responsibility in ensuring human development. From this perspective, governance entails the institutional capacity of public organizations (not limited to government) to furnish public and other goods to the citizens in an effective, transparent, impartial and accountable manner. Thus the issues of economic and political governance are inseparable and together they underpin sustainable development.¹¹

The right to a legitimate and accountable government, promotion of a society where the rule of law and fundamental human rights are respected, ensuring a socially and economically equitable society that is inclusive in nature are inherent to the concept of good governance. Good governance depends on various factors. A government, in discharge of its sovereign functions, has to discharge many constitutional obligations and in discharge of these obligations it should be capable of enabling, enhancing and
developing the power of the state for sustainable development. It is essentially a package to strengthen the institutions of government and civil society with the objective of making governments more accountable, open and transparent as well and democratic and participatory.\(^2\)

For good governance, there should be a government which is stable and truly representative and which accelerates the economic growth and development and ensures the welfare of all sections of the society. In this, the fact that transparency is also an important attribute of good governance must not be forgotten. Openness and opportunity for public participation have emerged as a universal principle of good governance.\(^3\) The interested group should be provided with opportunities to observe and contribute in the policy-making of the state where availability of relevant information would give them a chance to advance their ideas in the policy making process.

The traditional concept of governance simply implied an exercise of control by a body of persons elected or brought into power by force, to rule and to reign over their subjects in whatever way they like, in total disregard of their own obligations. However, with the passage of time and the consciousness and growth of democratic atmosphere throughout the world, it began to be realized that the people are not merely the subjects but they have their legal rights and their sovereigns have their corresponding obligations
towards them for securing and promoting their welfare, social, economic and political. The perception came to be realized that the people have their own rights, sometimes called as inalienable natural rights, and that they were entitled to be governed consistent with these rights.

After the Second World War a large number of nations throughout the world achieved their own freedom from colonial domination and after their emancipation, political structures were created providing for the institutions of their self-governance. Constitutions were famed by their own people and in a vast majority of cases they provided for a democratic model of governance to elect the government of their choice through exercise of their electoral rights. They also incorporated specifically certain inalienable human rights. The fundamental concept started gaining ground that mere governance was not enough but in every country, the need was for providing equality governance, i.e. good governance, which took into account not only the social, political and economic rights of the people but the establishment of the social order as well as in which social, economic and political justice would pervade through various institutions of the national life and inequalities in status, facilities and opportunities among the people would be eliminate and the economic system would secure maximum common good by substantially just distribution of material resources of the country so as to
ensure benefit to all concerned in the society. Thus the mandate of the welfare of the people of a nation was entrusted into various political institutions.

Gradually, certain principles were evolved which expected to ensure for good governance. Transparency of the government became the code word through which its accountability was liable to be tested. Another great feature of good governance which gained prominence was participation of the people in running the government at various levels including grass-root level. It was rightly stressed that unless democratic principles had the basic foundation at the lowest village level, their functioning at a particular higher level might not ensure full welfare benefits to the people.

A genuine and moral political structure requires not merely an absolute authority to enact laws but it must have political legitimacy. Thus the political institutions should not merely be constituted in accordance with the provision of formal law but the basic element must be that of creation of effective and informed political institutions. An ideal system of participatory democracy has to be developed by providing public platforms, where informed persons from various fields could air their views of public importance in order to create healthy public opinion. Such dialogue between different groups should form the basis of any democratic society. Apart from
this the civil servants should also become responsive to societal requirements. Thus participation, transparency, legitimacy and responsiveness are the pillars of governance.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

UNDP human Development Report 2002 elaborates the concept of ‘Democratic Governance’. Like the concept of Good Governance, Democratic Governance seeks efficient institutions, and a predictable economic and political environment necessary for economic growth and effective functioning of public services. But the concept of democratic governance concerns political freedom and human rights, and removal of discrimination as central objectives. A reform agenda would aim at building institutions and rules that are not just efficient but also fair, and that are developed through democratic process in which all people have a real political voice. Democratic Governance thus incorporates into the notion of good governance for development, democratic processes and institutions, and a concern with the securing of political and civil rights and freedom as human rights.

Democratic Governance embodies most fundamental of democratic principles: that people should rule themselves through the government they freely choose. In countries where human development is a priority,
governance has to be democratized for development outcomes to be sustained. This means that Democratic Governance incorporates into the notion of good governance, democratic principles, norms and institutions. Democratic Governance seeks in common with good governance, efficient institutions and a predictable economic and political environment that makes economic growth possible and public service effective. However moving beyond economic growth the human development requires political participation and economic freedom backed by a broader human right platform.16

Democratic Governance differs from the concept of good governance in recognizing that political and civil freedom and participation have basic value as developmental ends in themselves and not just means of achieving socio-economic progress. Democratic Governance is built on the concept of human development in its full sense of the term, which is about expanding capacities people have, to be free and able to lead lives that they would choose to. The capability to be free from threats of violence and to be able to speak freely is as important as being literate for full life. While the range of capabilities that people have is huge and almost infinite, several key capabilities are fundamental in human life and are universally valued, not only those in the socio-economic sphere such as health and survival,
education and access to knowledge, minimum material means for a decent standard of living, but those in the political sphere such as security from violence, and political freedom and participation. Indeed, these are core values of human well being. Democratic Governance as a concept wants the political regime to guarantee civil and political freedom and also ensure participation of people and accountability of decision makers.

UNDP, Human Development Report 2002 has elaborated different features of Democratic Governance. Firstly, Democratic Governance means that people human rights and fundamental freedom are respected allowing them to live with dignity. Secondly, the people can have say in decisions that affects their lives and they should have power to hold decision makers accountable. Thirdly, it stresses on inclusive and fair rules, institutions and practices which govern social interaction. Fourthly the concept talks of treating women as equal partners with men in private and public spheres of life and decision-making. Fifthly, it wants people to be free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class and gender. Sixthly, it wants economic and social policies to be responsive to people needs and aspirations and also that policies should respect the needs of future generation. Lastly it talks about economic and social policies aimed at
eradicating poverty and expanding the choices that all people have in their lives. 17

Although Democratic Governance talks of inclusive, responsiveness, participation and society free from discrimination based on race, ethnicity, class and gender but it defines all these in general terms. In this report Democratic Governance as a concept does not talk of those inclusive policies which can take into account the cultural diversity present in the society. It talks of state where there is no discrimination but it does not talk of the ways to include those marginalized cultural groups that have been discriminated for so long. It also talks of participation but does not talk about the ways and means through which participation of different cultural groups can be secured in a culturally plural society. Thus in order to address these problems which are faced in different culturally plural society need to reexamine the concept of governance so that true legitimacy and participation can be ensured in these societies and it is only after this reexamination the concept of good governance will make sense in these societies.

LEGITIMACY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Democratic Governance talks of strengthening democratic institutions by granting civil and political freedom and by ensuring participation of
people but the real essence of democracy is legitimacy. Now legitimacy in a culturally plural society can only be achieved when a state pursues culturally inclusive policies instead of culturally exclusive policies. Pursuing multicultural policies is not easy. Some believe that such policies undermine the building of a cohesive nation state with a homogeneous cultural identity. Most states influenced by this thinking were deeply committed to fostering a single, homogeneous national identity with a shared sense of history, values and beliefs. Recognition of ethno-cultural diversity, especially of organized, politically active and culturally differentiated groups and minorities, was viewed a serious threat to state unity, destabilizing to the political and social unity achieved after historic struggles.

Around the world, ethno-cultural minorities are demanding greater recognition and accommodation of their cultural practices and identities. Example includes demand for the recognition of the customary law of indigenous people; demands for language rights by sub state national groups; demands for the accommodation of cultural and religious practices by immigrant groups and so on. The true legitimacy of the state can only be achieved when this ethno-cultural diversity is respected and accommodated rather than suppressed or ignored by the state.
Although Democratic Governance is a right step forward in redefining governance as it stresses on granting political rights and participation. But when we talk of governance in a culturally plural society then we have to take into account how far the state has been able to accommodate the demands placed by different cultural groups. The main aim of Democratic Governance was all round human development of citizens. But real human development requires more than health, education, a decent standard of living and political freedom. People cultural identities must be recognized and accommodated by the state and people must be free to express these identities without being discriminated against in other aspects of their lives. In short cultural liberty is a human right and as an important aspect of human development and thus worthy of state action and attention. Human development is the process of widening choices for people to do and be what they value in life. The earlier reports on governance have focused on expanding social, political and economic opportunities to expand these choices. They have also explored ways of equitable growth, expansion of social opportunities and deepening of democracy but missed out one of the very vital component needed for the real human development i.e. cultural liberty which is central for the capability of people to live as they would like. The advancement of cultural liberty must be a central aspect of governance.
and human development and this requires going beyond social, political and economic opportunities since they do not guarantee cultural liberty.

Cultural liberty is about allowing people the freedom to choose their identities and to lead the life they value without being excluded from other choices important to them such as those for education, health and job opportunities. In practice there are two forms of cultural exclusion. First is living mode exclusion which denies recognition and accommodation of a lifestyle that a group would choose to have live exactly like all others in society. Examples include religious oppression or the insistence that immigrants drop their cultural practices and language. Second is participation exclusion, when people are discriminated against or suffered disadvantage in social, political and economic opportunities because of their cultural identities.¹⁸

Historically, states have tried to establish and enhance their political legitimacy through nation building strategies. They tried to secure their territories and borders, expand the administrative reach of their institutions and acquire the loyalty and obedience of their citizens through policies of assimilation or integration. Attaining their objectives was not easy, especially in a context of cultural diversity where citizens, in addition to their identification with their country, might also feel a strong sense of
identity with their community- ethnic, religious, linguistic and so on. Most states feared that the recognition of such difference would lead to social fragmentation and prevent the creation of a harmonious society. In short, such identity politics was considered a threat to state unity. In addition, accommodating these differences is politically challenging, so most states have resorted to either suppressing these diverse identities or ignoring them on political domain.¹⁹

Policies of assimilation often involving outright suppression of the identities of ethnic, religious or linguistic groups try to erode the cultural differences between groups. Policies of integration seek to assert a single national identity by attempting to eliminate ethno-national and cultural differences from the public and the political arena, while allowing them on the private domain. Both sets of policies assume a singular national identity. Assimilationist and integrationist strategies tried to establish singular national identities through various interventions. Like first, centralization of political power, eliminating forms of local sovereignty or autonomy historically enjoyed by minority groups, so that all important decisions are made in forums where the dominant group constitutes a majority. Second, constitution of a united legal and judicial system, operation in the dominant group's language and using its legal tradition and the abolition of any pre-
existing legal systems used by minority groups. Third, adoption of official language laws, which define the dominant groups language as the only official language to be used in the bureaucracy, courts, public services, the army, higher education and other official institutions. Fourth, constitution of a nationalized system of compulsory education promoting standardized curricula and teaching a dominants groups language, literature and history and defining them as the ‘national’ language, literature and history. Fifth, adoption of state symbols celebrating the dominant groups history, heroes and culture, reflected in such things as the choice of national holidays or the naming of streets, building, etc. Sixth is seizure of land forests and fisheries from minority groups and indigenous people and declaring them ‘national’ resources. Seventhly, adoption of settlement policies encouraging members of the dominant group to settle in areas where minority groups historically resided. These strategies of assimilation and integration sometimes worked to ensure political stability, but at the risk of terrific human cost and denial of human choice. In all cases these strategies involved some form of cultural exclusion that made it difficult for people to maintain their way of life, language and religion or to hand down these values to their children.

Some argue that guaranteeing individual civil and political rights—such as freedom of worship, speech and association— is enough to give them
the ability to practice their religion, speak their language and to be free of
discrimination in employment, schooling and many other types of exclusion.
They agree that cultural exclusion is a by-product of economic and political
exclusion and once these are resolved, the cultural exclusion will disappear
on its own. But this has not happened and to expand cultural freedom the
state is required to pursue culturally inclusive policies. In order to pursue
culturally inclusive policies the state need to recognize cultural differences
in their constitution, laws and institutions. They also need to formulate
policies to ensure that the interest of minorities are not ignored or overridden
by the majority or by the dominant group. Thus redressing the cultural
exclusion of minorities and other marginalized groups requires more than
providing for their civil and political freedom through instruments of
majoritarian democracy and equitable socio-economic policies. It requires
explicit multicultural policies to ensure cultural recognition. Thus the
concept of governance in a culturally plural society must emphasize on the
legitimacy of the state which can only be achieved if the state pursue
culturally inclusive policies.

PARTICIPATION AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Most of the governance reports including, Governance for Sustainable
Human Development, 1997, UNDP characterizes participation as the core
feature of good governance. But just stressing on participation as the core value does not mean much for cultural plural societies because in these societies the state is not just supposed to ensure participation but also has to evolve a system in which people of diverse groups can freely participate. Many historically marginalized groups are still excluded from real political power and so they often feel alienated from the state. In some case the exclusion is due to lack of democracy or the denial of political rights. In such societies democratization would be the first step to ensure participation. However, sometimes more is required because even when members of minorities have equal political rights in democracy, they may be consistently underrepresented or outvoted. In such a situation they consider central government alien and oppressive. Thus in order to address this problem the state needs to evolve a multicultural conception of democracy.  

Several emerging models of multicultural democracies provide effective mechanism for power sharing between culturally diverse groups. These kinds of power sharing arrangements are crucial for securing the rights of diverse cultural groups and minorities. There are two broad categories of democratic arrangements in which diverse groups and minorities can share power with in political processes and state institutions. The first involves sharing power territorially through federalism and its
various forms. Federal arrangement involves establishing territorial subunits within a state for minorities to exercise considerable autonomy. This form of power sharing arrangement is relevant where minorities are territorially concentrated and where they have a tradition of self-government that they are unwilling to surrender.\textsuperscript{24}

The second category of arrangement involves power-sharing through consociations, using a series of instruments to ensure the participation of culturally diverse groups dispersed throughout the country. These arrangements address claims made by groups that are not territorially concentrated or do not demand autonomy or self-rule. Consociations are based on the principle of proportionality.\textsuperscript{25} Achieving proportionality requires specific mechanism and policies. Electoral arrangement such as proportional representation can better reflect group composition. Both federal and consociational types of power-sharing arrangements are common around the world.

Federalism is a system of political organization based on a constitutionally guaranteed balance between shared values and self-rule. It involves at least two levels of government- a central government and its constituent regional units. The constituent units enjoy autonomy and power over constitutionally defined subjects. The degree and scope of autonomy
varies widely. Some countries such as Brazil grants considerable power to their regions. Others such as Argentina, retains overriding control at the centre.\textsuperscript{26} Federalism provides practical ways of managing conflicts in multicultural societies through democratic and representative institutions and also enables people to live together even as they maintain their diversity. Sometimes the political demands of culturally diverse groups can be accommodated by explicitly recognizing group diversity and treating particular regions differently from others on specific issues. In such ‘asymmetric’ federal systems the power granted to the subunits are not identical. Some regions have different areas of autonomy from others. Federal states can thus accommodate some subunits by recognizing specific distinctions in their political, administrative and economic structures as Malaysia did when the Borneo states of Sabab and Sarawak joined the federation in 1963. This allows greater flexibility to respond to distinct demands and to accommodate diversity.\textsuperscript{27} These special measures enable territorially concentrated group distinctions to politically co-exist with the central authority, thereby reducing violent clashes and demands for secession.

There are many federations which have failed.\textsuperscript{28} Federal arrangements that attempt to create ethnically ‘pure’ mono-national sub territories have
broken down in many parts of the world. Yugoslavia is a prominent example. The federal arrangements were not democratic. The units in the federation were put together and were ruled with highly unequal shares of political and economic among the key groups, an arrangement that fostered ethnic conflicts that eventually became territorial conflict, and the federation fell apart. This collapse is sometimes attributed to a flawed federal design that failed to establish free and democratic processes and institutions through which ethnic groups can articulate multiple identities. Instead it reinforced demands for separation, thus ending in political disintegration.29

The success of federal arrangement depends on careful design and the political will to enhance the system of democratic functioning. For the success of federalism the arrangement should be such which accommodates important differences, yet buttress national loyalties such as in India. For example, federal structures that merely respond to demands for the designation of “exclusive” or “mono-national” home republics for ethnic groups may go against the idea of multiple and complementary identities. Thus for the true success of federalism the arrangement should be democratic and should foster loyalty to common institutions while giving communal concessions.
The second category of arrangement which involve power-sharing is consociation. Consociation applies the principle of proportional representation. Majoritarian democracies have a dismal record on political participation by minorities, under representing them and marginalizing their electoral voice. Now the question is how multicultural societies become more inclusive and how to insure adequate participation of minorities and other marginalized cultural groups. One way is through proportional representation rather than winner-takes-all systems. In winners-takes-all system, the political parties with the most votes get a majority of the legislative seats. For example in United Kingdom a party can win less than 50% of the votes but get a much bigger of seats in the House of Commons. In 2001 elections Labour Party won 41% of the vote and walked away with 61% of the seats. In the same election liberal democrats received 19.4% of the vote but managed only 7.5% of the seat. In proportional representation system legislatures are elected from multi-seats districts in proportional to the number of votes received like 20% of the popular vote wins 20% of the seats. Since winner-takes-all system exclude those who do not support the view of the party in power, then do not lend themselves to culturally inclusive environment. But in proportional representative systems parties that get a significant number of votes are likely to get a share of power.30
Thus proportional representation voting system gives a more accurate picture of public opinion and likely to foster the inclusion of minorities as long as minorities organize themselves in political form.

Proportional representation is most effective in stable democracies and can remedy some of the major differences of majoritarian electoral system by strengthening the electoral voice of minorities. Proportional representation is not the sole solution in all circumstances as innovation in winner-takes-all system can also address the problem of minority representation like in India where seats are reserved for certain groups and minorities so as to ensure there representation. Thus the concept of good governance should not merely talk of participation as its core value but should also emphasize on the ways and means through which real participation from different sections of society can be secure in a culturally plural society.

REPRESENTATIVE BUREUCRACY: MEANS TO MANAGE CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN GOVERNMENT

It is quite recent that managing diversity is considered an integral part of governance as until the 1970’s western political thought did not show appropriate understanding or respect for the cultural diversity of humanity, within its own governing system. Monoculturalism as a concept emerged in
those western nations that had a single dominant national culture into which it was expected that all their citizens would assimilate. Afterwards, these nations found that due to the arrival of large number of immigrants, a total cultural assimilation was not possible, as these immigrant groups belonging to different and distinct cultural groups decided to remain distinct rather than merge with the main stream. Later the issue emerged as the major public policy concern, which was addressed in various countries like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States. Soon after this managing diversity within the framework of liberal democracies became a central policy concern for most of the states. The concept of representative bureaucracy is considered a mean to manage diversity in government and it is only after the incorporation of this principle the governance as a concept will become relevant in culturally plural societies.

Representative bureaucracy is the most viable concept to handle diversity in cultural plural societies because what is required in these types of societies is a responsive bureaucracy which can formulate and execute policy keeping in mind the interest of different sections of the society. Thus a bureaucracy will be more responsive to public interests if its personal reflect the public served in characteristics such as race, ethnicity and gender.31 This idea forms the rationale for the theory of representative
bureaucracy. The central tenet of the theory of representative bureaucracy is that passive representation, or the extent to which a bureaucracy employs people of diverse social backgrounds, leads to active representation, or the pursuit of policies reflecting the interests and desires of those people. The argument is premised on the belief that such attributes led to certain early socialization experiences that in turn give rise to attitudes, values and beliefs that ultimately help to shape the behavior and decisions of individual bureaucrats.

Proponents of representative bureaucracy contend that a bureaucracy that reflects the diversity of the general population implies a symbolic commitment to equal access to power. When members of distinctive groups become public officials; they become legitimate actors in the political process with the ability to shape public policy. Representative bureaucracy provides a means of fostering equity in the policy process by helping to ensure that all interests are represented in the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes. It offers a means of reconciling bureaucratic government with democratic values by ensuring that public organizations are responsive to the public through employ representation and subsequently are more effective.
The advocates of diversity representation in government or representative bureaucracy claim that the weberian concept of meritocracy and civil service neutrality has worked against the interest of minorities. Representation in government services is desired because of various reasons. Firstly, representatives from different culture groups can bring a variety of perspectives to policy planning and determination. Secondly, as people from diverse culture and ethnic background do perceive public issues differently and thus democratic pluralism demands that all such perceptions be considered before a firm and commonly agreed policy is made. Thirdly, a barrier or systematic discrimination to diversity representation in the public sector, if continued, may generate public distrust about the fairness and equity to the governing process.36

It has been agreed that to act in an effective and responsive manner in a complex and multicultural society; government services should represent the total population. There is no doubt that the belief in democratic pluralism demands that all sections of society should have access as well as representation in all government services. Such access and representation becomes more in order to increase the responsiveness of citizens needs and to generate a requisite attitude on the part of public servants to provide to service to all. Despite such views it is clear that cultural diversity provides a
vision for a strategic policy designed to “address the historical and contemporary exclusion of ethno-culture and racial minorities”. That vision, sometimes, gets into conflict with the contemporary administrative culture of a country where a monocultural view of government and administration. Such a monocultural view of administering public programmes tend to ignore potentially valuable new perspectives and visions which can be contributed by those who represent diverse cultures; in addition, it deprives the organization of value-added human capital by placing pressure to confirm to prevailing administrative sub-culture thereby blocking human creativity and finally representative bureaucracy as a concept creates an atmosphere for strengthening diversity in public service.

In order to create a multicultural organization and to integrate people from different cultures into state institutions, the institutions have to adopt acculturation process in place of assimilation. A fundamental tension exists when individuals with ethnic, racial, gender and cultural backgrounds different from the dominant culture attempts to interface or coexists within the dominant institutional cultural environment. In essence, these individuals are often faced with the polarity between assimilation and acculturation. Assimilation is the process of integrating oneself within the institutional culture and subsequently, assuming the values, beliefs and attitudes
attributed to the institutional culture. Through assimilation, the individual’s
culture of origin is often subordinated and thus compromised in an effort to
blend in with the prevailing institutional culture. Although the process of
assimilation does not explicitly mandate that an individual lose his or her
culture but in reality the majority culture assumes precedence over the
minority cultures. As a result, the individual’s culture of origin is diluted and
homogenized through the process of organizational socialization.\textsuperscript{39}

Alternatively, the process of acculturation challenges the conforming
nature of assimilation and the negative consequences of differentiation.
Acculturation is the process of maintaining one’s cultural background while
immersed in an institutional cultural environment. In spite of immersion in a
different culture, an individual is expected to maintain his or her values,
beliefs and attitudes that may run counter to the prevailing institutional
culture. The process of acculturation postulate that non-dominant cultures
can coexist within an environment of dominant culture.\textsuperscript{40} Furthermore the
individuals from the non-dominant do not tend to experience the overriding
pressure whether overt or covert, to integrate into the dominant institutional
culture.

Assimilation and acculturation are processes that individuals
experience in ranging degrees as they move from their culture of origin into
their organizational culture. In assimilation the individuals from different culture have to compromise with the organizational cultures which ultimately dilute their individual personal values, attitudes and beliefs. Whereas acculturation supports cultural coexistence and in turn presents a more accepting approach to diversity and represents a clear movement toward multicultural understanding and learning.

The creation of multicultural environment at the workplace also includes the creation of a climate of trust i.e. an appropriate environment to hear and attend to diverse voices.41 Even after securing the representation of different minority groups in public institutions there will be an environment of mistrust which will prevail during the transitional period because after long period of racial and ethnic discrimination maltreatment and violence these minority communities have developed a feeling or distrust with the majority culture. Thus during this transitional period the organizations have to promote opportunities for connectedness so that a feeling of trust can be generated among the minority groups.

Public organizations are faced with the challenges to preserve cultural, racial and gender identities to foster multicultural expression. The process of assimilation or melting pot theory of diversity is flawed in the sense that it is based on the myth of color blindness that overlooks an individual group
membership, thus denying an intimate critical aspect of their identity. Fostering a multicultural environment suggests that an individual’s ethnicity, race or gender is not considered a necessary evil but rather cherished as an asset to the organization’s diversified culture. In this process the public organization will realize their capacities to comprehend values and benefit from cultural diversity through there movement toward creating an environment of genuine acceptance of and sincere respect for ethnicity and other characteristics that define individual cultural background.

Managing multiculturalism is a process that encourages agencies to examine themselves critically and move forward as they learn. When state agencies value diversity and appreciate differences associated with the heritage, characteristics and values of member of different groups, as well as respect the uniqueness of each individual, then they will make a serious commitment to workforce diversification. Creating a multicultural organization is about changing the mix of employees and is about satisfying constituent demands and meeting the needs of all citizens without making employees from non-dominant groups or cultures feel discriminated. It is about changing work processes to reflect the diversity and creativity of unique perspectives that exists within an organization and creating a culture that encouraged diverse workers to stay and contribute overtime. Thus in a
cultiually plural society it is this creation of multiculturals environment that will led to the real legitimacy of democratic regime and will form the real basis of “Good Governance”.

Cultural diversity protection is an essential element of good governance. The concept of governance has emerged as the new paradigm which denotes more than government. While the term government refers to a set of instruments through which people living in a state, believing and sharing a common core of values, govern themselves by laws, rules and regulations enforced by the state apparatus. Whereas the term governance denotes a system of values policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interaction within and among the state civic society and the private sector. Viewed in this context the term governance involves all government activities that guide, steer, control or manage society. In essence, governance includes all range of activities involving all cultural communities and various stakeholders in the country all government institutions (legislative, executive, administrative and judiciary), political parties, interest groups, non-governmental organizations (including civil society), the private sector and the public at large.
Nowadays most of the liberal theories are trying to adjust themselves to the cultural plural reality of all societies, in the same context governance as a concept should also be redefined so that it remains a relevant concept in culturally plural societies. Governance is all about responsiveness of a state toward its citizens which means that a well governed state is a state which is responsive to the societal problems. Now since most of the societies are confronted with the problem which arises in their state due to the presence of different diverse groups it becomes imperative to include cultural diversity as a relevant category with in the discourse of good governance. In such a situation governance should not be defined in just economic terms because the real test for the legitimacy of a particular state which is the core value of good governance lies in how a particular state handles its cultural diversity. The real legitimacy with in a culturally plural society can only be achieved if the state pursues culturally inclusive policies instead of culturally exclusive policies. Secondly the state should adopt a constitutional structure in which due representation of different minorities can be secured. The state also needs to recognize cultural differences in their constitution, laws and institutions. They also need to formulate policies to ensure that the interest of minorities are not ignored or overridden by the majority or by the dominant group. Thus redressing the cultural exclusion of minorities and
other marginalized groups requires more than providing for their civil and political freedom through instruments of majoritarian democracy and equitable socio-economic policies which is the main concern of all governance reports till today. Managing cultural diversity require explicit multicultural policies to ensure cultural recognition. Thirdly, the concept of governance should widen the scope of participation which is another core value of Good Governance. But just stressing on participation as the core value does not mean much for cultural plural societies because in these societies the state is not just supposed to ensure participation but also has to evolve a system in which people of diverse groups can freely participate. So governance as a concept should also stress on evolving an effective power-sharing model through which different cultural groups can resolve their differences. Lastly, in order to have a real democratic and legitimate decision making process the concept of governance should also stress on the concept of representative bureaucracy so that all groups can easily participate in the public policy decision making process. Thus we can say that the concept of good governance includes the ways state handles it cultural diversity. It also include the state makes the decision-making process inclusive and set up institutions to empower the weaker section of society including minority cultural groups.
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