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I. Culture and Human Development

It is a given that human beings belong to the natural biophysical world, and have many elements in common with other species. However, unlike other species, humans create their own habitat (sometimes by invading or destroying the habitat of others), their own languages, cultures, and ways of conducting themselves. Despite their culturally specific attributes (such as languages, beliefs, and manners of behavior), they share some common values and aspirations such as worrying about their fellow beings, the survival of their world, and preserving biodiversity.

**Biodiversity and human cultural diversity**

Loss of biodiversity is considered one of the greatest threats facing humanity today. The loss of biodiversity is related to over-exploitation of natural resources, introduction of exotic species, human encroachment into the bio-habitat, and the greenhouse effect on the eco-system health.

There are four main reasons for such a biodiversity loss: (a) humans have neglected to protect biodiversity; (b) their governments have failed to create appropriate institutions and laws (both at the national and international levels) for internalizing the common good which accrues from biodiversity; (c) inappropriate governmental national policies have condoned (and even sometimes encouraged) the destruction of ecosystems within their national boundaries as well as in oceans; and (d) in their self-interest, nations have pursued the economic development which is in fundamental conflict with other species. It has been estimated that about one million species could potentially be lost during the first decade of the new millennium.

The Earth Summit of June 1992 highlighted this issue, and created a global consensus for biodiversity protection and conservation. The above listed four reasons are, however, equally important to the issue of human cultural diversity because if its protection is neglected, consequences similar to those we have witnessed in the case of eco-system and biodiversity may arise. The world pressure for the protection of biodiversity ought to acknowledge that human cultural diversity is a fundamental feature of our biodiversity. Both human and bio diversity are intertwined; and if one is threatened the other is endangered. As natural resources and biodiversity are essential for human survival, so are the cultures of human diversity; or to put it another way, survival of humanity depends upon the sustenance of its cultural diversity.

**Culture and its diversity**

Culture is a system of values, beliefs, traditions and practices which structures and regulates the behavior of individuals as well as of groups of human beings. As such, culture influences the lives of individuals and collectives. A culture is generally embodied in “its arts, music, oral and written literature, moral life, ideals of excellence, exemplary individuals and the vision of the good life” (Parekh, 2000, pp. 143-144).

Culture helps citizens to lead their lives with freedom and dignity, which, over time, becomes heritage. The cultural heritage of a nation may be seen as possessing a composite and heterogeneous culture, drawing upon diverse traditions. Its myths, customs, rituals, symbols, traditions, institutions, and the manner of communication also represent a culture. As such, it is not uncommon to see different societies differently interpreting, prioritizing and operationalizing their vision of good life, moral values, myths and customs in their respective cultures. Cultural diversity,
then, represents various cultural communities’ distinct ways of life, beliefs and practices, and their views of the world surrounding them.

Cultural diversity consists of at least two constituent parts: cultural freedom and multiculturalism. These are briefly discussed below:

**Cultural freedom**
Cultural heritage includes cultural freedom, which is a rather special kind of freedom compared to fundamental freedoms listed in the UN Charter of Human Rights. While most freedoms refer to the rights of individuals, cultural freedom is a collective freedom, which “refers to the right of a group of people to follow or adopt a way of life of their choice” (UNESCO, 1995, p. 25). Cultural freedom when properly interpreted helps individual freedom to flourish because all core individual rights are exercised within the social context. In that context, collective rights and cultural freedoms exist which provide additional protection for individual rights and freedom. Individual rights are actually entitlements that require corresponding obligations and duties. What the movement for human rights has not done is to create a regime for duties, including the respect for cultural freedom. This is one area where a lot of work needs to be done. Thus, individuals while exercising their rights and freedoms, have certain duties and obligations to their community, society and the country. Also, cultural freedom encourages creativity, experimentation with alternate ways of living, and the protection of diversity, which are essential aspects of human development. Such a freedom, if constitutionally guaranteed, affirms the equality of status for all citizens, gives pride to individual cultures, and allows people to live with dignity. In turn, the cultural freedom creates conditions for multiculturalism.

**Multiculturalism**
The term represents culturally derived differences found among various cultural communities; and refers to a society within a country, which is characterized by ethnic or cultural heterogeneity. A multicultural society is one where two or more cultural communities reside, where cultural diversity is cherished, and where cultural communities feel that they are a constituent part of the national identity rather than being encouraged to disappear over time. Multiculturalism, as a policy refers to a government action Programme to recognize cultural (including ethnic and racial) diversity as a fundamental character of a country, and to ensure that the rights and freedoms of all cultural communities are fully protected, without any coercion for any community to follow a mono-cultural standard, and to allow and encourage inclusionary participation and contribution by all. Multiculturalism embraces the concept that cultural differences are a source of strength and a foundation for liberal democracy.

It has been claimed that until the 1970s, Western political thought did not show appropriate understanding or respect for the cultural diversity of humanity, within its own governing system (McRae, 1974). Monoculturalism, as a concept, emerged in those Western nations, which had a single dominant national culture into which it was expected that all their citizens would assimilate. Afterwards, these nations found that there were distinct cultural groups although well established were not totally assimilated. Also there were the newly arrived immigrants after the World War II, who would not or could not assimilate. This dimension was addressed in various countries like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the UK, and even the United States (which had earlier insisted on swift assimilation into mainstream American Culture). In the case of Canada, the demographic
changes during the later half of the 20th century have shown that the country has become ethnically and racially more diverse than what it was earlier. Managing diversity within the framework of liberal democracy has become a central concern for the Canadian federal government. As a matter of fact, compared to various nations, Canada can claim to have entered the twenty-first century as a better-prepared country, which enjoys the benefits of its own multicultural policy.

There are many benefits, which may accrue from cultural diversity. Some of these are: an increase in the available range of options and freedom of choices for citizens; the creation of a rich, varied and aesthetically pleasing and stimulating world; encouragement of a healthy competition between different ideas and ways of life thereby preventing a dominance of one culture over the other; generating tolerance and respect for different cultures; and creating a climate in which different cultures can have a mutually beneficial dialogue and collaborate on commonly agreed national goals and vision (Parekh, 2000). For cultural diversity to survive and be sustained in any country, it is important that different people from varied cultures to share at least some common values, and also agree on some common commitments towards the common good. Indeed the overriding aspect of cultural freedom has a strong requirement for one to go beyond individual liberty and rights to seek equality of freedom for all (Sen, 1999, p. 233).

II. The common good, democratic pluralism and representative bureaucracy

The term ‘common good’ has come to mean several things, such as ‘the good of the whole in which the parts share’, ‘the greatest good of the greatest number’, ‘the commonweal’, or ‘the universal happiness’. The term also “refers to a comprehensive set of goods in which the entire civil society participates” (Simon, 1993). This ‘comprehensive set of goods’ relates to material as well as spiritual goods and services of an entire society. Also, we should note that rarely does anyone know in advance how all the components of the common good can be made to fit together; the challenge is how to bring together individuals’ or groups’ needs and aspirations within the over-arching domain of the common good. Further, the common good should not be perceived as some kind of a rigid or static declaration of values; rather it is a dynamic affirmation and promotion of values, beliefs, institutions, and cultural determinants which encourage the pursuit of a common endeavor by a society, a nation, or a global community. Thus the essence of the common good is to secure universal welfare by voluntary cooperation of community members; and it requires willingness of individuals in the society to sacrifice a part of their own advantages or privileges to the common good. Essentially, it resides in the conscience of a person. A person who is conscious of his or her duties and obligations sustains the common good just as the common good persuades people to attain that consciousness and reach for that common goal.

Perhaps, in the distant past, the term might have meant to embrace ‘all and everyone’; but presently in the Western thinking, the term rarely encompasses universality. On the contrary, in Asian and other non-Western cultures, the term means an action or a deed which is beneficial to all and everyone although such benefits or privileges may not be immediately attainable or available, including whether or not everyone realizes it; furthermore, while the benefits may be available to all, it does not mean that all the people are entitled to the same (identical or equal) benefits, instead the concept means that everyone should receive (or given) their individual and collective due share (Dwivedi, 1998, p. 253). The concept of the ‘common good’ in some cultures also includes both
receiving from others (including the community, state or other entities) and rendering to others whatever is their due share. A nation with a strong base for cultural diversity strengthens this kind of common good, which in turn requires the backing of democratic pluralism as a commonly agreed value by all.

**Democratic pluralism**

The concept of “democratic pluralism” as a foundation of human development is based on a few major ideals, namely: (a) *fundamental freedoms for all* which means that human-beings are the ultimate measure of all human values; (b) *equality of all* so that everyone receives an equitable recognition from others but especially from the state; and (c) *universal participation in the governing process*. These ideals, then, constitute democratic morality, which draws from three implicit virtues: equality, empathy and tolerance for diversity.

For democratic pluralism to flourish and survive, it is important that these ideals and values remain as necessary conditions for the humane and open society. Further, process by which these conditions are met is equally important; and such processes depend upon the operationalization of such commitment of the state through its civil service, including the sensitization of its own workforce.

Democratic pluralism and the foundation of good governance are based on a society’s cultural values. That foundation includes a special kind of fundamental freedom, which enables citizens of a country to integrate diverse cultural values and ideals towards a just society for sustainable human development. And as an ideal, such freedom ought to be the basis of a nation’s political system. This concept fosters and supports different and differing opinions and traditions in the society. By reflecting the wishes of the people, these democratic ideals are culturally and collectively sensitive. These ideals also include such values like fundamental freedoms, human rights, the rule of law, equality, cultural and spiritual diversity.

Democratic pluralism, to elaborate further, does allow individuals and groups to have their own opinions, follow their specific cultural traditions, and encourage the accommodation and sharing of common values through the liberal democratic process. The fundamental goal of democratic governance is the provision of appropriate conditions by the state for the realization of individual (and group) potentialities. Finally, democratic pluralism is an integral part of good governance, which reflects such traits as the common good, liberal democracy, public service ethics, control of corruption, and spiritual guidance for secular affairs. It is in this context that the notion of representative bureaucracy becomes important to democratic pluralism.

**Representative bureaucracy**

It has been argued that to be effective and responsive in a complex and multicultural society, public service agencies should be composed of the microcosm of the total population. There is no doubt that the belief in democratic pluralism demand that all sections of society should have unfettered access to all government services. Such an access and representation becomes more important in order to increase theResponsiveness of citizens’ needs and to generate a requisite service attitude on the part of public servants. The advocates of diversity representation in government claim that the Weberian concepts of meritocracy and civil service neutrality have worked against the interest of minorities. Representation in government service is desired because:
(a) representatives from different cultural groups can bring a variety of perspectives to policy planning and determination; (b) as expertise and professional competence is not the preserve of any one ethnic group in this information technological age, the overriding concern of public services should be to secure such services from everywhere in the society; (c) as people from diverse cultural 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; and (d) a barrier or a glass-ceiling resulting in systemic discrimination to diversity representation in the public sector, if continues, may generate public distrust about the fairness and equity of the governing process. Of course, opponents to pluralism in public sector agencies have decried such a move as parochialism, reverse discrimination, promotion of less experienced minority people, pluralism gone mad, protection of incompetents, and the possible disintegration of the society (Stahl, 1983, pp. 82-83). Other arguments against diversity in government have included: breeding double cultural consciousness resulting in loyalty to more than one country, emerging ethnic ghettos, and continuing ethnic hostility among groups rather than assimilation to the mainstream. Despite such xenophobic views, it is clear that cultural diversity provides a vision for a strategic policy designed to “address the historical and contemporary exclusion of ethno cultural and racial minorities” (Wilson, 1993, p. 654). That vision, sometimes, gets into conflict with the contemporary administrative culture of a country where a monocultural view of organizational life may prevail. Such a monocultural view of administering public programmes tends to ignore potentially valuable new perspectives and visions which can be contributed by those who represent diverse cultures; and in addition, it deprives the organization of value added human capital by placing pressure to conform to prevailing administrative sub-culture thereby stifling human creativity.

III. Administrative culture and values: has cultural diversity weakened the merit principle?

It may be an understatement to say that the field of public administration is going through a period of turmoil, both in practice and in theory. After a period of unprecedented growth from the end of World War II until the mid-1970s, the industrialized nations experienced recession. Led by politicians, business people, and some academics, bureaucracies were blamed for creating such problems. The New Public Management movement (NPM) began with the following major characteristics: (a) budget restraint, reducing bureaucracy and accent on results, both in planning and in evaluation of programmes and people; (b) service to the public, with a special concern for quality, citizen as client; (c) decentralization and devolution, and delegation of authority as close as possible to the level of action, and empowerment of employees; (d) greater attention to cost through comprehensive auditing, contracting out and introduction of competition; and (e) private sector techniques for motivating employees, such as merit pay, mission statements and quality circles (Dwivedi and Gow 1999, p.130).

The NPM has also introduced notions like corporate management, corporate culture and bottom-line management, an essentially market-driven rhetoric. This paradigm is based on the premise that by reducing the opportunities for incompetence and corruption through the narrowing down of the scope of government activities, efficient, transparent, effective and accountable governance would appear. The rationale appears to be that with less bureaucratic structures there would be only a few bureaucratic problems. Once more, the Western-driven emphasis is being placed on values and
culture of administration worldwide with total disregard for different cultural dimension. This anti-public service stand has created a strong challenge to the public sector and the welfare state being influenced drastically the prevailing administrative culture.

Such influences created in turn a flurry of publications dealing with public service ethics, values, and more broadly, administrative culture, bureaucratic behavior, and its effects upon governance, democracy and policy effectiveness. From a long-range perspective this preoccupation is not new. Since the beginnings of the political and administrative development literature, questions of public accountability, probity, nation and state building, citizenship, and political culture were central to the analysis. Perhaps, we have come full circle, as we try to grapple with fundamental questions of democratic governance, and human security. Administration is something more than rational cooperative action. It is full of meaning and marred in conflict and controversy, at the root of which lie various values, which shape the cultural characteristics of any organization.

One important characteristic of the dominant cultural regime emanating from the West is the emphasis on functional rationality over substantial rationality. Thus, the prevailing administrative culture believes in procedural and quantifiable correctness, which has become the only valuable ethical standards against which to make policy decisions, judge administrators’ behavior or evaluate program performance. Viewed against this context, only those with the appropriate technical competence can judge; but they do so within the narrow and specific confines of a never-questioned ideal model, teleology, discipline or professional competence. In this context, categorical imperatives are cast in deontological terms and encased in lofty terms such as maximization of profit, order, rationality, comparative advantages, competitiveness, or efficiency which all displace moral responsibility.

*Traditional mono-cultural values of public administration*

Max Weber and various management philosophies have influenced the administrative culture of Western nations in the past. The American scientific management specialists thought that science of administration was an end itself worthy of systematic study and improvement. For them, public service administration was a machine to be driven by scientific management theories such as POSDCORB principles, PPBS, MBO, etc. It was also thought that the scientific study of administration led to the discovery of principles of administration analogous to the principles or laws of the physical sciences. And finally, it was assumed that the principles of administration determined the way in which specific administrative values such as efficiency and economy could be realized. The stress was on quantitative rather than on a qualitative nature of administration.

In such a scientific environment, the use of merit principle became the life-blood, which sustained the functioning of government administration. Although the human element was introduced at a later stage, public administration remained a scientific endeavor. Individuality was emphasized in scientific management because the individual was the unit of measurement in relation to output, efficiency and accountability. Such a philosophy was well suited for the entrenchment of the merit principle, which encouraged individual achievement.

It was much later after the World War II that a different philosophy of administration emerged which stated that public service administration couldn’t be reduced to a science alone because the imperatives of ethics and morality could remain fenced out. Emergent values such as equity, social
justice, and non-discrimination based on race, ethnic origin, culture, language, etc. started making inroads into the monolithic world of administrative culture. However, the introduction of social equity in the public service (human resources) management also created an uncertainty including the fear for loss of objectivity, efficiency, economy, and accountability. Thus, a tortuous evolution occurred when the issue of social equity or affirmative action in the public service was raised which was perceived as the beginning of the end of the merit principle.

**Has cultural diversity weakened the merit principle in the public service?**

In each of the countries where an affirmative action, equal employment opportunity, or a quota system was introduced, various objections were raised. The main objection was that the merit system in the public service would get weakened. It was also thought that such a social equity Programme may not in reality benefit those who were the real victims of discrimination but assist and accelerate the mobility of those in an organization who (because of their race or ethnic origin) were already doing well under the existing system. Finally, it was also thought that if the high-test scores were to be reduced or waived for the disadvantaged, how long such a discriminatory practice could continue.

Should not there be a sunset clause to such a practice so that when the public service employment, at all ranks, is equal to the proportion of disadvantaged group to the population at large, the practice gets discontinued? Why should there be a reverse discrimination? Or, once granted, should such a special treatment for cultural minorities become a fundamental right for generations to come? These questions are still asked in many countries although the severity of discontent in the dominant culture may have weakened. These tough questions need to be discussed thoroughly, not because they are raised by those who are adversely affected but mostly because such issues influence the trust of people in the process of democratic pluralism and good governance.

**IV. Managing diversity in the multicultural world**

In this short essay, I have made an attempt in a preliminary way to explore the essence of cultural diversity by linking it with the worldwide movement to protect biodiversity, the role of common good and democratic pluralism in safeguarding the cultural dimension of good governance, the impact of diversity on the prevailing mono-culture and values of administration including implicit threat to the merit principle, and the requirements of representative bureaucracy. To conclude, the following four observations are offered.

**1. Creating a culture of diversity in the public service**

The cultural diversity in the public service is worth it, because without the work of public servants, the public would not feel duty bound to practice what it does not see its own government doing! Public servants are the public’s interpreters of the conscience, but they are also the people who turn the public’s moral values into fair results by operationalizing public morality in action. Public trust is what civil service is all about. For a liberal democracy to flourish, it is crucial that its civil service exhibits a sense of fairness and a sense that everyone (irrespective of their color, creed, race, language, and culture) is entitled to that fairness. From that heart of fairness, we protect other values in the society – integrity, compassion, tolerance, courage and idealism. All these values are an integral part of the shared values that a nation has. Thus idealism, integrity, tolerance, compassion and courage are the cherished values of the profession of civil service. Only when the
civil servants exhibit such values through their deeds, will public respect and history’s gratitude be theirs. And so it is up to them to make the dream of cultural equality, equity and justice come true.

For that dream to be realized, some concrete steps must be taken to create a culture of diversity in the public service: among these the followings are suggested:

(a) First and foremost, governments set the stage by endorsing the value of diversity by enacting enabling legislation, by creating a corporate culture that embraces diversity, preparing policy document and programme directives to all ministries and departments, and creating structures and institutions to implement such policy and programmes;

(b) A systematic process of awareness generation and cultural change by education for cross-cultural management, and relevant training programmes for all managerial and supervisory positions;

(c) Nurturing an inclusive administrative culture by maintaining ongoing assessment for measuring the degree of acceptance and implementation to control organization’s cultural rigidity and resistance for change; and

(d) Strengthening top management commitment and demanding results as well as revisiting the goals (Nancoo, 1995).

For diversity initiatives to survive and flourish, appropriate change in the administrative culture of a nation must take place so that the full potential of the diverse workforce can be harnessed to the benefit of the entire society.

2. Cultural diversity protection as an essential element of good governance
The concept of governance has emerged as a 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 means of laws, rules, and regulations enforced by the state apparatus; 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, civil society, and the private sector.

Viewed in this context, the term governance involves all such activities, which are of social, political and administrative nature that guide, steer, control or manage society. In essence, governance includes a range of activities involving all cultural communities and other stakeholders in the country, all governmental institutions (legislative, executive, administrative, judicial, and parastatal), political parties, interest groups, non-governmental organizations (including civil society), the private sector, and the public at large (Frederickson, 1997, p. 86).

Thus, the concept of good governance implies a complexity of activities which derive from a multicultural context, are pluralistic in nature, inclusive in decision-making, and set in a multi-institutional organizational context, which empower the weaker sections of society (including minority cultural groups), and attempt to achieve the common good. Such a multicultural context, in order to operationalize it, requires a moral determination and governance.
Recognition of the moral dimension of governance raises concern for improvement of the conduct of the public service and government. The broad principles, which should govern our governmental conduct, are not obscure; rather they mark the direction in which those who govern must channel their efforts towards the common good if they are to serve society. These principles include a call for individual moral responsibility and obligation, sacrifice, compassion, and justice, and an honest effort to achieve the highest good. It is morality, which provides the foundation for the governing process. Public confidence and trust in liberal-democracy and democratic pluralism can be secured only when the governing process exhibits a higher moral tone. And yet that moral tone is only one of several prerequisites of good governance. Other elements are: the degree of trust, the reciprocity of relationship between government and civil society, the degree of accountability, and the nature of authority wielded (Hyden, 1993, p.7).

Elites must share an essential degree of trust concerning the nature and purposes of the state, and the rules and practices of socio-political behavior. Without trust in the political system, individuals and interest groups have no reason to engage in active political life. Public trust helps to create an environment in which stakeholders are able to interact across public, private, and community sectors to form alliances and seek change in the governing process.

Reciprocity is necessary within a civil society because it permits associations, political parties, and other interest groups to promote their interests through competition, negotiation, and conflict resolution.

A degree of accountability forces those who govern to be accountable by means of institutionalized processes (such as fair elections, public oversight of governmental operations, referenda, etc.).

Finally, it is also vital to understand the nature of authority and the way in which power is wielded by political leaders to devise and implement policy.

In other words, the capacity to govern depends upon the political legitimacy obtained by creating conditions in the polity, which sustain these three criteria. In addition, the moral dimension of governance is equally crucial, since public confidence and trust in the process of governance can be maintained only in the presence of a higher moral tone, which draws on spirituality and sustains the common good. Thus, effective governance is founded on the four pillars: legitimacy, transparency, accountability, and morality. Furthermore the author believes that there ought to be certain articles of faith (drawn from societal values, cultural traditions, and moral ideals, and commonly agreed by all), which should govern our lives, and that these should be encouraged, reinforced, resurrected, and strengthened, because good governance is essentially a moral enterprise. In essence, cultural pluralism is the foundation of good governance.

3. The impact of globalization on administrative culture and values
One of the foundations of the traditional Western public administration system has been the merit principle, which strengthened functional rationality. The principle was initially used to control political interference and patronage as well as corruption in the government service recruitment and appointments. It also meant that civil servants would not be permitted to engage in any
partisan work. The principle when applied to recruitment, and promotion in the civil service emphasized individual suitability to perform a fixed set of duties; merit, then, involved the determination of an individual’s basic abilities (including educational qualifications, training and preparedness for the task), and the ability to develop new skills as change dictated.

A movement for managing diversity, propelled by the United Nations, is going to have some global impact on the conventional views of public administration and its culture. Irrespective of the definition of the term “globalization”, we also know that the context, the structure, the processes and the effects of administration are decisively influenced by globalization. The circumstances of administration are increasingly defined by parameters outside the confines of the nation-state. So are goals, resources (human, material and symbols), values, communications and performance. The same is the case with the impact of policy decisions, non-decisions, actions and inactions upon the context of administration; for the latter encompasses interwoven domestic and extraterritorial dimensions. This global influence on administrative culture can be understood in the context of the following eight general propositions:

(1) The administrative cultures of any part of the globe reflect the distinctiveness and complexity of the various regional, national and local realities, their unique historical experiences, their forms of insertion (subordination or domination) into the system of regional and global relations, and their levels of development and fragmentation.

(2) Such cultures are historical products, where past experiences, myths and traditions have shaped modal psychological orientations.

(3) Any administrative culture is also conditioned by actually existing structural and conjunctural circumstances and challenges. Even perceptions of the past are mediated by current experience.

(4) The administrative culture is part of a larger attitudinal matrix, containing values, practices and orientations towards the physical environment, the economy, the social system, the polity and culture itself.

(5) Administrative cultures, like all cultures, are dynamic and subject to change. Syncretism, continuities and discontinuities are part and parcel of their fabric and texture.

(6) An administrative culture is the result of a process of immersion, acculturation and socialization, whose structural drivers are both implicit as well as induced and explicit.

(7) Most attempts at administrative reform and “modernization” address, either directly or indirectly the question of administrative culture. Any profound administrative reform entails significant attitudinal and value changes.

(8) Administrative cultures are influenced by global and regional trends. In the lesser-developed regions of the world, they are particularly derivative, reflecting a center-periphery mode of international political economy (Dwivedi and Nef, 1998, pp.6-7).
The globalization of administrative culture should be watched carefully so that no one single nation or a culture acts as a global missionary and assume the role of a moral leader to dictate its own values such as those advocated by the New Public Management or other business management precepts which may not be relevant in the public sector. The presence of cultural diversity in governance, national and sub-national administration, multinational corporations, as well as in international organizations is equally desirable. For good governance to be sustained, cultural diversity needs protection because in this context, the administrative culture of a nation has an obligation to foster the convergence of such democratic ideals as respect for individuals, individual freedoms, equality, justice, rule of law, and constitutionalism.

4. The world of the 21st century is a cultural mosaic
The world of the 21st century is going to be a world of cultural mosaic and polyethnicity instead of the world of cultural homogeneity and dominance or exclusion and coercion. The prevailing historical and ethnocultural demography of our world has virtually displaced any possibility of a worldwide mono-cultural society, be it based on the Western or a non-Western culture. The challenge before us is how to manage cultural diversity within the framework of liberal democracy, multiculturalism, and good governance. The world of the 21st century will have to learn to live with, accept, celebrate, and operationalize its own diversity. But the process of operationalization, if it is to succeed, must proceed with necessary national laws, constitutional amendments where necessary, and governmental commitments to the international human and cultural rights.

Recognition in law for cultural diversity is the foremost prerequisite for good governance because a multicultural society can foster a strong sense of unity and common belonging among its citizens; furthermore, it is a valuable collective national asset. That is why it is imperative to see that it becomes a state policy adopted by all members of the United Nations. One country, as an example, did it when Canada passed its Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988 with the following preamble:

“The Government of Canada recognizes the diversity of Canadians as regards to race, national or ethnic origin, color and religion, as a fundamental characteristic of Canadian society, and is committed to a policy of multiculturalism designed to preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians while working to achieve the equality of all Canadians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada” (Canada, 1988).

A similar commitment is needed from all other states.
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