Harmony in Diversity: Philosophical Foundations and Pathways

Dr. Rachana Jaiswal

Assistant Professor (Senior Scale)
Department of Philosophy
Ganga Devi Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Patliputra University
Patna, Bihar
rachanaj0602@gmail.com

Abstract

When we investigate the changes in human institutions and practices that promote peace among communities with different historical legacies and value systems, a clearer pattern of diversification appears. Communities can perform better in highly competitive contexts; however, just improving performance does not indicate why communities in a polity would diversify in the first place. Two motivational processes of interest here may be expanding the set of value systems within the polity and avoiding interference from communities whose value systems are controversial and contested. An increase in competition between communities does not guarantee motivation. Since the combination of goals is usually too complex to be considered abstract or generalised, it is important to spell out the mechanisms of diffusion within the polity that could equalise historical legacies and value systems. The next stage will be to do so in a set of cases that illustrate the connections among the configurations of such mechanisms, the deep historical legacies in the polity, and the manner of diversification in community types.

Keywords: Harmony, Diversity, Pluralism, Philosophical Foundations, Intercultural Dialogue

1. Introduction

The term 'pluralism' derives from the Latin 'pluralis' (more than one). Pluralism refers to conditions where two or more different entities exist in the same space and time (Mattes et al., 2016). Individual pluralism refers to the existence of a single being composed of distinct elements. Meanwhile, collective pluralism consists of a heterogeneity of beings. The two senses hold that diversity is the norm and cannot be cancelled without causing impairment, entropy, or dysfunction (Sherraden, 2012). The terms permit a view in socio-political

terminology, affirming the validity of different values and patterns of life without a moral agreement. Pluralism recognises the incommensurability of paradigms, but we avoid moral relativism when we assert that there is a possibility of common ground in ethics in the form of a meta-consensus about ultimate justifications or shared goods.

2. Conceptual Foundations

Pluralism, the acceptance and adoption of multiple views and positions, has been a recurring theme in human thought on anything human, social, cultural, and philosophical. In certain kinds of pluralism, acceptance of a host of positions is salient. Conceptual (or explanatory) pluralism holds that a given system may be legitimately construed according to more than one paradigm, language, or conceptual scheme (a view widely held across disciplines) (Sherraden, 2012). This perspective remains attractive because every theory identified targets a different aspect or side while capturing some essential aspect of the actual reality being modelled. Clearly, only dedicated interdisciplinary work will allow for the articulation of a unified overarching approach that is capable of tackling each of these issues one by one and providing an account of pluralism itself, which is site-specific, that is, open to different and multiple entry points (Embong et al., 2015).

2.1. Defining Harmony and Diversity

There is an increasing need to address diversity in harmony with human affairs. People and communities everywhere possess a wide variety of beliefs, attitudes, practices, languages, values, faiths, traditions, and worldviews. Pluralism has become a characteristic of all human social life now; we cannot avoid it. Moreover, societies now also try to organise the relations of many departures of human endeavour with the help of this state of affairs. Pluralism is likely to be thought of as a problem to be addressed rather than an opportunity to be embraced. If difference and variety become a problem - or friction is to be expected - there must be a quarrel about it.

Diversity and harmony make up two sides of a coin. However, from a human viewpoint, harmony cannot be sameness, and diversity cannot be disorder (Sherraden, 2012). The very fact that a system is orderly presupposes that there are norms governing its organisation, relations and dynamics. A situation without norms is disorderly, and such disorder can never be termed harmony. When even the simplest human decisions have unintended effects, it becomes impossible for an individual or community to will or work towards harmony. Nevertheless, many individuals and communities have sought conscious recognition,

articulation, and operation of the phenomena and entities thought to constitute harmony. This applies equally to diversity (J., 2014).

2.2. Historical Perspectives on Pluralism

Philosophers have debated whether the parts are constitutive of the whole or the whole of the parts. Among all thinkers, Aristotle is the most influential. Plato is one of the first thinkers who offered a radical response to diversity in genuine thought. The central idea of Platonic monism is that the highest object of knowledge is an abstract, single, immutable, and eternal unity of being, which can be seen only by pure intellect and understanding. There is a view that particulars possess only being and are therefore much less than reality. The question of unity and plurality for Aristotle does not have to be solved in this radical manner. As you are the Entity or Essence, you are also many other things. Not only the One, but many, many more than one. You can affirm being in the unity of substance or form, but you can also affirm a plurality of the natural and the useful (Brian Thorne, 2010).

2.3. The Role of Intercultural Dialogue

In the world, various languages, cultural heritages, and belief systems. Modern political systems try to impose cultural and institutional conformity to meet their own needs and forms of governance. This is a new restriction that starkly contrasts with the picture of statehood and diversity they paint. Disputes over rule do not make states heedlessly pursue an unnatural rule harmony that, even amid sporadic evolution of armed conflict, on occasion gives the go-ahead to the national cause rather than cultural autonomy. The overlapping governance systems thus inhibit rather than enhance the desirable enrichment and defence culture (Gregory Keller, 2011). To flourish, culture must appreciate diversity, but it depends on shared goals to enrich, not undermine, the sought-after cultural values.

It is the government's foremost moral duty to guarantee and promote public education and to enable a rich, treasured, and facilitated cultural diversity, rather than to ban and censor diverse cultural products.

The moral obligation goes beyond mere tolerance. Nevertheless, it encourages us to actively promote them. This will open up a broader horizon. Moreover, we will have a higher understanding of a diverse world. This is all premised on principles that can assist an uninterrupted cultural development. Also, there is an underlying assurance of further hurdles. Further, there will be no fully imposed policy choice strings attached. The cultural values and aspirations of the underparty may conflict with the public education concerns of the central, yet

they deserve wider debate (Martin Wimmer, 2006). For more contentious matters of historical relatedness that call for a more incremental approach, these rather echo the deliberative framework governing harmony, as they aim to encourage people to progressively extend moral consideration accordingly. Achievement of a more fundamental shared goal certifies that it is restricting content that undermines the achievement of sound discourse among those with shared cultural values.

3. Theoretical Approaches

Will Kymlicka and Bhikhu Parekh are two thinkers who have figured among the more famous theorists related to inclusion and interaction in a diverse society. Both models aim to enhance the autonomy and involvement of cultural minorities, stressing that group membership lies at the core of individual experience.

Kymlicka contends that national and ethnic groups experience a distinct form of injustice that justifies group-differentiated rights (Bairoh, 2008). To this end, Kymlicka proposes three kinds of group-based rights that reflect the injustice:

(1) self-government rights;

(2) polyethnic rights; and

(3) representation rights.

He believes that such rights are not based solely on group values, but on the dignity of individuals whose distinctive patterns of living have been thwarted. The importance of an organisation's status lies in its impact on people's well-being.

Unlike Kymlicka's collective rights framework, he advocates a broader principle of inclusion that can mediate among different conceptions to shape discourse. Criticism of Kymlicka is viewed through a post-colonial lens. Before clarifying what Parekh means by inclusive participation, attention will be drawn to two disjunctions between Kymlicka's notion of inclusion and postcolonial concerns. First, Kymlicka considers dominant and non-dominant groups solely in terms of national identity. Second, Kymlicka envisions a sequence in which multinational states form the first level of a nested global hierarchy of justice and cultural representation.

3.1. Multiculturalism and Assimilation: Comparative Frameworks

According to Kumar (2012), multiculturalism and assimilation are two distinct frameworks for addressing immigrants. The process by which migrants and their offspring acquire the dominant language(s), cultural practices, and social behaviours of a society is called assimilation. This process is usually associated with the displacement or

abandonment of previously held elements of a culture, whether of heritage or of choice (Lutz, 2017). Strategies to blend may also include dispersing or downplaying minority languages, as well as the preference for names, places and notions harmonious with the dominant culture. Generally justified in liberal and conservative thought, assimilation hopes to create social cohesion by having immigrants adapt to native characteristics. Aside from the assimilationist rationale, there are other reasons for interventions. Multiculturalism acknowledges the need for cultural plurality for inclusion and full citizenship in ever-diverse societies. Multiculturalism is an ideology based on the assumption that different practices and views within and across cultures are equally valuable. This political doctrine acknowledges the citizenship rights and cultural identities of ethnic minority groups and takes them into account. The policies associated with multiculturalism aim to protect and promote the cultural activities considered essential to the political and social benefit of individuals and groups.

3.2. Cosmopolitanism and Global Solidarity

Cosmopolitan moral philosophy sees all human beings as members of a global community with shared interests (Leigh Dowdeswell, 2016). The international relations cosmopolitan approach to humanitarian intervention contends that we have a duty to help the populations and governments of states facing humanitarian crises or oppression, irrespective of whether they belong to that state. The policies of affirmative action for the representation of disadvantaged groups – in particular, those disadvantaged groups without voice that face obstacles to participation under different spheres and who suffer from exclusion or marginalisation – are cosmopolitan obligations. Embracing the moral impulse of cosmopolitanism without its more demanding universalizability constitutes, in this sense, global solidarity. Proponents of social contract theory would claim that the principles of justice must conform to what the parties to the contract agree upon; aiming to agree on principles that everyone would endorse is outside the scope of the original agreement. The analysis relevant to multiethnic or multicultural polities is used for common revisions of the social contract position.

3.3. Social Contract and Justice in Diverse Polities

A social contract regime is one in which societies decide what will govern them. Contracts may establish a conjoining of norms and conventions, or a balancing of benefits and burdens, and direct participation strengthens the shared will and comprehension (Siegmund, 2019). Four elements are relevant for

adjudicating between claims: the nature of common benefits, the criteria for inclusive membership, the criteria for inclusive recognition, and the balance between individual and group recognition. Any just social contract should satisfy these four criteria and include a common-good clause.

A diverse society offers competing narratives of justice in a multicultural context. Various theories provide answers to the above problems. The main concepts of Rawls emphasise fairness and the special role of principles that ensure fair treatment. On the other hand, Nozick's minimal-state interference is intended to ensure individuals' inviolable rights. In contrast, MacIntyre criticises modern moral frameworks in virtue ethics. When contract theory is perceived from the perspective of domination, one may think of Pateman and Mills. Further, Taylor assesses the politics of recognition within a liberal framework. According to Walzer, Young, and the readings that follow, inclusion, justice, democracy, and politics of difference are important for those who are socially or culturally marginalised.

4. Epistemic and Ethical Dimensions

Pluralism accepts that important fundamental moral disagreements are to be expected. Such disagreements can be expected even in the face of developments in the human sciences that facilitate deliberative searching for substantive shared understandings of the good. Investigations into the roots of ethical concern, historical, political, and social attestations, give rise to interactive perspectives that heighten intramural understanding and large-scale convergence effects. Moral values shape our paths for further investigations in life and extend beyond the mundane experiences of our daily existence. In other words, we are forced to look towards local, transnational, or global communities if we are to take our membership in diverse communities. According to proponents of pluralism, differences in information and kinds of moral beliefs associated with competing advantages do not preclude significant agreement on elementary principles guiding the acceptable collaboration that respects distinct values.

4.1. Epistemic Humility in Knowledge Claims Across Cultures

Knowledge claims refer to the set of standards that the subject in question must meet to justify the claim. These standards differ amongst cultures (Gobbo & Russo, 2019). These issues indicate that one ought to show epistemic humility about the justified knowledge claims of cultures. Being humble in such a matter does not imply that all is knowledge. It means that the criteria of cultures differ for characters. Different cultures might consider certain evidence

important, while others might consider it irrelevant. In other words, some cultures value epistemic factors that other cultures do not think matter. Standards of epistemic legitimacy often arise from, and express conceptions of the world. When movements struggle to achieve isolated disengagement from other epistemic perspectives, closed epistemic clusters will form. When people are segregated in harmful ways, they may lose motivation to seek opportunities across cultures. Opportunities across cultures disappear, while there are only minimal exchanges that will govern these groups. New Zealand has developed a distinctive epistemic style and a commitment to seeking out contacts. Epistemically engaged clubs expose group members to other cultures but do not advocate adopting those cultures' practices.

4.2. Moral Pluralism and Common Ground

Many moral disagreements across cultures are real disagreements about the concept of the good life. People and groups have constructed contradictory systems of meaning about what is ultimately worthy or what constitutes the good life. The variations relate to different systems of meaning about the world, the self, the divine or sacred, and existence. As a result, different systems often diverge in the means by which that end is pursued, like good and evil, and in the substance of the common good.

Although there is no universal convergence, it is perhaps not impossible to find common ground. A lot of thinking about the good life is not exactly moral, cultural, or individual. Rather, it concerns relations (J. Gergen, 2019).

When participants express their systems of meaning and fundamental conceptions of the good life, many are surprised by how closely their views align. The support of universal moral prescriptions, aesthetic standards, or other higher-order elements of being arising from a lesser-order system of meaning may make possible a consensus that overcomes many apparently mutually hostile beliefs. Disagreements can occur about what the common good consists of. Grindstead notes that while some differences about the good cannot be resolved, others involve different imaginings, or differences regarding the instrumental or latter goods by which the good is achieved. Although arguing for a common good or a moral claim at a higher level may conveniently eliminate part of the debate, the inquiry can be focused on more than just the moral. The common good could meanwhile, as the debate itself gravitated towards, be articulated as peace (Brian Thorne, 2010).

4.3. Rights, Duties, and Responsibilities in Diverse Communities

Pluralism raises questions about the entitlement to rights within culturally

heterogeneous communities. Discussions among community members often concern broad political arrangements and common resources. Philosophical texts have long grappled with problems using rights, usually linked to the task of securing justice. According to some, these rights do not enable individualistic communities to negotiate effectively for entitlements related to culture and settlement place. Multiculturalism is described as prescriptive by certain other thinkers, whereas other communities define obligations similarly, emphasising personal autonomy, regardless of accommodation, additional dimensions, and entitlement (Pirani Hirji, 2015).

5. Institutions and Practice

When different individuals, cultures, and societies relate to one another respectfully, harmony prevails. Bringing together contrasting worldviews through mutual dialogue is the essence of peacebuilding. The education of young learners can help cultivate intercultural competencies, develop knowledge, and, perhaps more importantly, provide opportunities for active engagement with peers from diverse backgrounds and for assessing these competencies.

Promoting Responsible Engagement through Civic Pedagogy. Law, governance, and public policy institutions must be guided by principles that foster harmony across plural settings

and promote mechanisms of inclusiveness and representation for our country's diverse populations. Greater economic equity helps foster a sense of common membership among citizens and reduces polarising divides that disrupt harmonious relations. When policy instruments to establish culturally pluralistic social change and equity are pursued in a just and responsible manner, they can uncover and correct the injustices and inequities that underlie other grievances that cause harm. Economic equality can enable transitional justice, soften the difficulties of people experiencing poverty, encourage communicable forms of economic distribution that bolster a sense of national collective membership, and prevent extreme redistribution demands that polarise and heighten tensions, division, and disunity among a people divided by language, culture, and religion (Mattes et al., 2016).

5.1. Education, Civic Pedagogy, and Dialogue

Transforming educational institutions from transmitters of knowledge to cultivators of intercultural competencies is a challenge. Nonetheless, many modern democracies already have curricula on pluralism and dialogue at various educational levels. The themes specified in this category, aside from their content, differ significantly in their intellectual frameworks, pedagogical

protocols, and assessment criteria, thereby rendering their transmission of these conceptual resources less straightforward.

However, educational design experiences in this area can reveal important themes and suggest possible pedagogical pathways for discussions about intercultural issues (Morrison, 2017).

Education in multicultural societies is critical to the development of civic values, knowledge, and dispositions that enable public discourse and democratic action. Fostering intercultural understanding through respect for cultural differences has become a major concern for educational systems in diverse democracies. The definition of harmony in diversity implies, at the very least, that communities must respect one another and appreciate their diversity.

5.2. Law, Policy, and Institutional Design for Harmony

Institutional arrangements reflect and shape the commitment to living harmoniously among diverse communities (Mattes et al., 2016). Local histories and characteristics, existing conflicts, and what harmony stands for, influence these arrangements (Nurdin, 2017). Measures for harmony that would promote peace and security in a more multicultural setting would have to take into account the numbers, proportions, and location of major communities.

5.3. Economic Equity and Cultural Representation

The fair distribution of resources in the face of cultural diversity, especially in multicultural democracies, has been a largely neglected area of discussion: distributional justice. Much of the existing literature is output-focused and focuses on socioeconomic or cultural participation indicators. Because such indicators depend on the relative size of different cultural groups, they only present a partial picture. The presence of various cultural groups, by itself, does not guarantee that their multifaceted voices will be represented in public debate or involved in decision-making processes that affect them (J Stern & C Seifert, 2002). Allowing representation by different stakeholders requires careful consideration of each stakeholder's qualifications as a legitimate representative and which policies are best suited to the purpose. To harmonise relations among several major cultural groups, structural inequality stemming from the colonial–imperial legacy must be addressed. A tricky issue arises regarding the need for empowerment, yet not to impose one-size-fits-all economic policies that deprive the socio-institutional architectures already in place and the preferences that actually benefit from the local or indigenous architecture. In Global Cities, it is possible to experiment with different modalities of

governance under conditions that remain, at best, at the surface or rapidly undone in strictly monocultural states or regions (Casi, 2013). Ultimately, a more limited meaning of distributional justice refers to the socially accepted minimum for the arts and culture as basic human needs. This meaning is highlighted in the literature on cultural policy. The literature has a similar premise where engagement fosters greater cultural participation. Furthermore, to achieve higher levels of participation, adequate material conditions are a must. As Goodwin (2003) argues, a broader conception of economic equity has both direct and indirect implications for material well-being and cultural production.

6. Pathways to Harmony

The challenge of creating harmonious, diverse societies requires defining ways for institutions and conflicting groups to build social glue. Attention needs to be paid to the three interrelated pathways: the provision of inclusive and representative institutions; systematic approaches to conflict prevention and resolution; and conditions conducive to the development of values of transformative non-violent change.

The first pathway is focused on inclusion and representation; in other words, how different groups are recognised as entitled to participate in decision-making and in which this entitlement operates. To date, the most attention has been on different types of electoral systems, proportional representation, presidential versus parliamentary settings, and vote-district configurations. The comparison of governance diversity across political facts is less studied, yet perhaps more important. A conflict between self-determining groups will occur where simple administrative mechanisms will not suffice. Group-sharing arrangements in the executive and the legislature will be crucial for stability. The situation is further complicated in societies with closely settled populations, like Cyprus or Bosnia-Herzegovina, where no group is in the majority. So far, attention in conflict prevention has mainly been retrospective; governmental and research efforts have mostly sought to detect warning signs of renewed violence. Although several theoretical frameworks exist for mediation, the know-how is mainly absent.

6.1. Mechanisms of Inclusion and Representation

Researching more kinds of factors and instruments aimed at stimulating the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders in a governance process, here described as Inclusion Mechanisms. The effectiveness of these mechanisms employed is indicated by the Assessment of Inclusion selected by the preceding mechanisms. The following subsections provide a

more detailed presentation of the Inclusion Mechanisms and the Assessment of Inclusion.

To enhance participative governance at any level of administration policy, with relevant stakeholders, academia has examined additional factors and instruments, referred to as Inclusion Mechanisms. Typically, an **Assessment of Inclusion** dimension complements these mechanisms by communicating their overall effectiveness, which is generally based on qualitative or quantitative insight. The next subsections will provide additional information for both the Inclusion Mechanisms and the Assessment of Inclusion.

Approaches to facilitate inclusion mechanisms are multifarious and can be used individually or collectively.

* Quotas ensure that a certain percentage of representatives from civil society, vulnerable groups, minorities or other groups take part in decision-making. The implementation of quotas for the representation of gender and ethnic minorities has proven useful in enhancing the overall quality of decisions. * The right to participate means that all relevant stakeholders at certain stages of the policy cycle have the opportunity to put forward their views for the record and can always call on others to make a representation. There must be channels of expression, dialogue or negotiation. * Coleman and Perrow (1974) describe participation rights of governance that give specific stakeholders the power to influence decisions at the administrative level. In most cases, social partners or civil society organisations representing vulnerable groups are systematically consulted. * Measures set ex-ante appointments or complementary safeguards aimed at minimising pandemic governance-related risks. In this case, the relevant participation or social justice criteria could later be used to assess how far the conditions of equitable inclusion regarding the issues introduced ex ante are satisfied (Bouma, 2016).

6.2. Conflict Prevention and Conflict Resolution

Social and political conflicts can take myriad forms across a wide range of spheres. For instance, institutional, civilizational, mino…

Conflicts can occur at a macro level, conflicts among the state, nation, religion, and communities, at an intermediate level among organisations, networks, unions and societies and on the individual level in families, neighbours, schools and the workplace. Interestingly, cultural or civilizational dimensions often influence social and political conflicts at these levels. It is possible to identify relevant indicators and frameworks to

monitor, assess and respond to different types of conflicts.

All conflict-prevention efforts are undertaken at an early stage by detecting potential issues that could generate future conflict and by regularly analysing and observing political, social, economic, and other data that affect harmony. A conflict-resolution framework can help identify solutions to detected problems. Theoretical models provide general yet flexible steps toward resolution, guiding the sequencing and modalities of negotiation to increase the likelihood of agreement. Once the agreement is negotiated, mediation efforts may assist with implementation. Such measures may bring the parties together for negotiation, monitor progress, or help resolve new barriers that emerge. (Harris Danarson, 2015)

6.3. Cultivating Transformative, Nonviolent Change

As the world's population grows, mass migration continues, bringing people from different races and cultures. As opposing groups vie for supremacy over space, ideology, and culture, understanding the causes and mechanisms of nonviolent social change becomes increasingly critical and practical.

The struggles for liberation, equity, and inclusion reveal a different process of transformative nonviolent change.

Processes can be initiated by a vision of a fairer, more equitable, harmonious, or sustainable alternative, in stark contrast to the dominant or hegemonic condition. For transformative change to take place, there must exist unfulfilled needs, aspirations, demands or grievances. Such unqualification usually finds vocal expression. Failure by elites to respond fairly and equitably produces a protracted state of anticipation and fosters movements for change that could draw support from outside the priority stakeholders. However, in the absence of well-designed manifestations, large-scale systemic change often returns to domination and violence, producing long-drawn phases of renewed domination and human suffering. Consequently, it is essential, after the prospect of major change is crafted, to facilitate a successful transition by paying attention to both arrangements for managing that prospective change and to the continuance of broad confidence that those arrangements will actually be respected (Menkel-Meadow, 2013; Danzi, 2012).

7. Case Studies

Many modern states profess to manage diversity. Nonetheless, they have sufficiently different ways of understanding, approaching, framing or navigating diversity – the range of perspectives, worldviews, life experiences and ways of knowing present

in a territory. Many frameworks categorise these approaches. Multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism are two popular concepts worldwide. However, over time, objects have become more ambiguous regarding their objective. Ethnographic studies of minorities in multicultural democracies, post-conflict societies, and global cities offer particularly rich opportunities to understand how pluralism can be managed.

7.1. Multicultural Democracies

Multiculturalism refers to the coexistence of different and distinctive (often minority) cultures within a nation-state, though practice does not always reflect this. The pejorative term is often used in Australia, the EU, and the US to describe a collection of subcultures that have neither been integrated nor successfully assimilated into a unifying national culture. Many countries are trying to formalise multiculturalism by putting respect for, and protection of, the minorities in their constitutions and laws. Canada was among the first, with its Multiculturalism Policy proclaimed in 1971. 1990 1n Section 27 of the Constitution Act states that: The Charter shall be "interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canada." The Constitution Act of the Republic of South Africa was adopted after the end of apartheid in 1994. It reads that: the Republic is one; sovereign; democratic state founded on the principles of human dignity; the achievement of equality and advancement of human rights and freedoms; non-racialism and non-sexism; and supremacy of the Constitution and the rule of law; separation of powers and above all participation of the people; public administration that is democratic accountable; transparent The Constitution also emphasizes that the state must take reasonable legislative and other measures within its available resources to achieve the progressive realisation of the rights; founding provision reads that the Republic is founded on the values of human dignity; the achievement of equality; and advancement of human rights and freedoms (Cohen-Almagor, 2018).

7.2. Post-conflict Reconciliation

According to the evidence, reconciliation constitutes an important dimension of post-conflict recovery and could have broader implications (Sokolić, 2020). Inter-community violence witnesses and survivors sometimes necessitate the recognition of their pre-, peri, and post-conflict experiences as reparative justice for restoring community ties in the same social milieu or across cultures. When this is the case, it becomes a necessary engagement in the face of overlapping forms of violence and fragmented collective memory (C. Nwoye, 2014). The

threshold of violation, connectedness with the 'other', acknowledgement of injustice and responsibility, and freedom from lingering fear all have a significant impact on later coexistence. In recognition of the fact that tangible events drive reconciliation and that these events are set within specific socio-economic, legal, political and cultural configurations, it is important for both theorisation and intervention. This is also because reconciliation is not a one-size-fits-all approach.

Reconciliation can occur at different levels, including societal, institutional, and individual. The socio-linguistic and bio-eco-nomies that embed the open episodes of violence in question inform, enhance or block progress at these levels when those involved acknowledge past violations and move towards alternative grammars of coexistence. Through the forging process, reconciliation enables societies to become greater than the sum of their parts.

Societies emerging from genocidal situations require enormous attention and resources, in part as acknowledgement and "rehabilitation" become prerequisites for broader recovery. In such situations, a mere separation or partitioning does not ensure peace or a sufficient exit. Violent instability might persist in diverse guises until a differentiation ontology takes breaks with division; otherwise,

reconstruction merely reproduces stratified authority under newly defined identities. When communities function on a basic level, the way is made for the 'other,' a greater geo-logical, topographic-metric, and cartographic humanness may be available. Machine-learning reconcilers will therefore tend to voice inner generosity; when these offers enter into field co-membership across histories, wider openings become available.

7.3. Global Cities and Cross-Cultural Ecosystems

Cities are where ideas are forged and then put to the test. Modern cities like Istanbul, Hong Kong, New York, and Sydney are composed of multiple social networks through which new practices and views spread. Temporary gatherings and meetings bring people into proximity, forming local networks that connect, dissolve, and reconfigure on the streets. As people move through various social worlds in transit, they interact more often with out-group members and exchange ideas, engaging in diverse cross-cultural experiences. New technologies like social media, virtual reality, and co-working spaces offer new opportunities to interact and engage. New York, Paris, London, Los Angeles, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Singapore are global cities of the first order for a large variety of participants. They foster pluralistic artistic and intellectual movements that recreate

culture. Cities with a mixture of cultures are now referred to as "global cities", "diverse cities" or "global hubs". However, opening space for other traditions does not alter the previously established social practices. These are everyday activities like shopping, dining, sports, music, faith, hangouts, learning, and transit that develop their own rhythm. As a result, they increase in size by attracting expanding circles of followers. As global cities exemplify the benefits of amalgamation, they also show us the complexities of co-existence and the need for new modes of management. Across the globe, research is starting to explore urban living-learning environments and increase cross-city collaborations. New knowledge that can benefit different parts of the world must not flow solely from one periphery to another, creating an ever-growing interdependence between similar large urban centres globally.

8. Challenges and Critiques

What are the challenges to sustaining harmony in diversity? They arise from two things: the contrary claims of universalism and particularism, and the continuation of power relations between cultural practices. Universalists affirm a universal heritage grounded in reason, morality, or agency. In contrast, particularists assert that specific cultural content cannot be reduced to universals, since practices are civilizational in nature.

According to F Bendle (2015), suitable universal values can facilitate participation in society without sacrificing one's identity. The paternalistic aims of giving voice to indigenous knowledges, practices, or languages that locals from formerly colonised or dominated – or whatever adjective applies – communities may have, which are interpreted as hegemonic and/or imperialistic on account of their endorsement of better global solidarity, complicate harmony in diversity. The critical views warn that imposed and submitted cultural bases must be viewed with caution.

Measuring harmony and diversity represents a final challenge. Discussions in public discourse often take place within unstated parameters of harmony and diversity, hiding crucial assumptions, stakeholders, and values. Indicators for both concepts would require the construction of a set of categorical or operational measures. However, the range of previous efforts rarely used these measures. Political theorists (and indeed, most theorists) work within qualitative frameworks that establish what counts as agreement, and evaluate similarities and deviations. According to empirical literature, concepts can be adequately specified through boundary queries, though researchers point out that the number of possible categories is limited. There is still

a gap in the development of operational indicators, with measurement and data sources being popular.

8.1. Tensions Between Universalism and Particularism

Universalism refers to a legitimacy beyond time, space, culture and situation. Legitimate distinctions of some kind, particularism maps the issues at hand. A conceptual dualism underlying most theoretical and practical systems of thought is universalism vs. particularism. To claim a theory, belief, practice or institution is universal is not to suggest it is outside time, space, culture or context, but that its legitimacy or value is somehow thought to extend beyond those and to have some meaning or worth for those who might be interested in or engaged with it in new settings and different circumstances. In contrast, saying something is particular does not mean it cannot move or cross borders. Rather, it indicates that once engaged, it must be translated or adapted in some way, and it cannot be considered valid, real or good until that happens. As a particular object, it produces another element in the system in question. The greater the number of conceptual or material elements regarded as singular, the more the universal aspect of the corresponding relationship risks being overwhelmed or obscured. Largely, what is regarded as a universal phenomenon on either side is true or of value for all the rest of the items in that category found at that place (F Bendle, 2015).

8.2. Power, Hegemony, and Cultural Sovereignty

The consequences of colonialism and imperialism still haunt post-colonial societies and the interaction between former coloniser and colonised cultures. Indigenous cultures experienced the suppression and destruction of their cultural practices and material heritage under colonial rule. After colonialism, claims to cultural sovereignty have tended to focus on the various aspects of material culture and immaterial practices from an indigenous perspective.

Cultural domination and epistemic injustice can undermine the epistemic framework, collective identity, and existential security of dominated cultures (Collste, 2019). Indigenous cultures were rendered marginal by colonialism, which has hidden the rightness and wrongness of the colonisers and turned off the colonised. Globally, these power imbalances persist and have served as dependency-reinforcers for imperial powers in the past (Morse, 2018). With the assertion of cultural difference and sovereignty, post-colonialism attempts to contest all traditions of dominance and the related outcome of projecting pre-colonial cultures as sterile.

8.3. Measurement of Harmony and Diversity Outcomes

The absence of accepted definitions and indicators makes it inherently challenging to measure the impacts of harmony and diversity. The three-dimensional space shown in Figure 8 can be viewed in the light of the two positive dimensions of systemic harmony and system diversity. There is also a third negative dimension of tension or strain operating in this system. Governed societies seek peace and harmony while ensuring diversity; however, plural systems face pressure to homogenise some aspects. It is necessary to determine whether there is overt pressure or merely latent tension within governance frameworks when the goals are to control for harmony and diversity.

The Fractal Dimension and the Cultural Participation Index are examples of key indicators that can be created to examine culture at the national level. Fractal Dimension estimates the complexity of administrative boundaries. In most Member States and Candidate Members of the European Union, the value is typically below 1.05 (Huisman et al., 2017). The Cultural Participation Index generates one-year participation metrics by aggregating in-Power and out-Power transition states across localities through cultural venues. In general, the relevant indicator values are low and vary only slightly. As a result, they sometimes create "static or motionless" interactions rather than dynamic ones.

The nature of harmony and diversity in post-colonial Guinea-Bissau is beginning to evidence the growing impact of a decade-long civil war. The Afro-Maguire Independent Cultural Movement in Guinea-Bissau was founded in 2009 to promote the preservation of local culture without impeding socio-economic development, showing an increasing trend in roots-oriented cultural engagement (van Dam, 2019).

9. Conclusion

Throughout history, harmony and diversity have been two rival aspirations. The term harmony typically implies a strong degree of sameness. On the other hand, diversity means placing two different things side by side. The concept of pluralism, on the other hand, connotes the positive recognition and affirmation of multiple values and their interaction and coexistence. Between unity and diversity, one can describe pluralism. It often describes the coexistence of various worldviews. However, it deepens significant differences. Pluralism receives its liturgical form through intercultural dialogue. It also occurs through various bridges that come up in response to divergent worldviews. A framework for cross-fertilisation that offers a common yet enriched vision conducive to harmony in the context of creative processes and generative change is essential.

Contemporary life today is characterised by diversity. We are devoted more to pluralism today than ever before, whether it is in the social, political or economic sphere. Still, our quest for a harmonious society that co-exists with diversity is a tremendous need and challenge today. The emergence of multicultural societies, which is at the centre of the contemporary world, human activities that are damaging the earth's atmosphere, and other major issues necessitate serious and concerted attention to cultures and civilizational dialogues revolving around pluralism. The emerging themes are certainly not mainstream; they are fast becoming important not just for nations but also for cities, communities, and organisations.

The modern urban area is a worldly place; the city of the world, a cosmopolitan; yet at the same time, it may be a multicultural city with ethnic and cultural differences. As many nations and races stand together in one place, the multiplication of cultural forms and activities becomes exponential, giving rise to the intensive problem of how to manage difference one of the urgent problems of the cities Transborder phenomena are developing very rapidly, not only in the transmission and arrival of goods and services but also in the development of cultural events, receivers' behaviours, value orientations, and transition schemes. The resulting spatial rush of values, ideas, and groups seriously impacts, collides, and destroys one another. However, no matter how much a nation or the world offers us, we will not get harmony, wholeness, peace, partnership, or new exploration. This path ultimately does not seek merely to create a peaceful environment. The Coordinating Adaptability has always been tacit; it stays active at so many stages, released through so many actions and arrangements. Many partners and participants meet at the same point in space and time, but the various elements interwoven there communicate quite different meanings.

References:

1. Bennett, M. J. (2016). *The value of cultural diversity: Rhetoric and reality: Meeting report on Fellows Day, International Academy of Intercultural Research 9th Biennial Congress, Bergen, Norway.* https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4923010/

2. Mattes, A., Mourão Permoser, J., & Stoeckl, K. (2016). *Introduction.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=Mattes%2C%20A.%2C%20Mour%C3%A3o%20Permoser%2C%20J.%2C%20%26%20Stoeckl%2C%20K.%20(2016).%20Introduction.

3. Sherraden, M. (2012). *Perspective on diversity, human nature, and social inclusion.* Retrieved

from https://google.com/search?q=
Sherraden%2C%20M.%20(2012).%20
Perspective%20on%20Diversity%2C
%20Human%20Nature%2C%20and
%20Social%20Inclusion.

4. Grandpierre, A. (2003). *On the fundamental worldview of the integral culture: Integrating science, religion, and art: Part two.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Grandpierre%2C%20A.%20(2003)...

5. Embong, R., Hakim Abdullah, A., & Dina Adnan, N. (2015). *Philosophical analysis of the foundations underlying the Islamic integrated curriculum.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Embong%2C...

6. J., H. (2014). *Rituals for harmony: Exploring the Bersih Dusun local genius behind rubber tapping.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=J
.%2C%20H....

7. Thorne, E. B. (2010). *Contra Hick: Epistemology of faith and belief.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Brian%20Thorne...

8. Keller, J. G. (2011). *Dialogue as moral paradigm: Paths toward intercultural transformation.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Gregory...

9. Wimmer, F. M. (2006). *Intercultural polylogues in philosophy.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Martin%20Wimmer...

10. Bairoh, S. (2008). *Current debates in classifying diversity management: A review and a proposal.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Bairoh%2C%20S....

11. Kumar, C. (2012). *Multiculturalism in a global society: Minority rights and justice.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Kumar%2C%20C....

12. Lutz, P. (2017). *Two logics of policy intervention in immigrant integration: An institutionalist framework based on capabilities and aspirations.* https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5721120/

13. Dowdeswell, T. L. (2016). *Cosmopolitanism, custom and complexity: Kant's cosmopolitan norms in action.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Leigh...

14. Siegmund, W. (2019). *Difference without deference: An individualistic theory of group accommodation.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=
Siegmund%2C...

15. Gobbo, F., & Russo, F. (2019). *Epistemic diversity and the*

question of lingua franca in science and philosophy. Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Gobbo%2C...

16. Gergen, K. J. (2019). *Toward a relational ethic.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=J .%20Gergen...

17. Hirji, N. P. (2015). *The rule of liberal legalism: The challenge of the normativities of multiple modernities and religious diversity.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Pirani%20Hirji...

18. Morrison, J. (2017). *Pedagogical dialogue: A study of pedagogical dialogue in a multicultural education theory course.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Morrison%2C...

19. Nurdin, R. (2017). *Karakteristik harmoni dalam kajian Qur'ani.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Nurdin%2C...

20. Stern, M. J., & Seifert, S. C. (2002). *Cultural participation and distributive justice.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q=J %20Stern%2C...

21. Casi, L. (2013). *Essays on cultural diversity and economics.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Casi%2C...

22. Goodwin, N. (2003). *Equity.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Goodwin%2C...

23. Bouma, G. (2016). *Religious diversity and the challenge of social inclusion.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Bouma%2C...

24. Manojlovic, B. P. (2016). *DIPL 6250 conflict and conflict resolution in plural societies.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= PhD%20Manojlovic%2C%20B....

25. Danarson, J. H. (2015). *Sustaining conflict-free team leadership in a cross-cultural project management setting: Observational evidence from China.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Harris...

26. Menkel-Meadow, C. (2013). *Toward a jurisprudence of law, peace, justice, and a tilt toward non-violent and empathic means of human problem solving.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Menkel-Meadow...

27. Danzi, R. (2012). *The conflict transformation team of the Henry Martyn Institute and its pursuit of transformation.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Danzi%2C...

28. Cohen-Almagor, R. (2018). *Between individual rights and group rights.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Cohen-Almagor%2C...

29. Sokolić, I. (2020). *Reconciliation rising: The roles of the everyday and the informal in successful post-conflict reconciliation.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Sokoli%C4%87...

30. Nwoye, L. C. (2014). *Partners or rivals in reconciliation? The ICTR and Rwanda's Gacaca courts.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= C.%20Nwoye...

31. Bendle, M. F. (2015). *Globalisation, neo-humanism and religious diversity.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= F%20Bendle...

32. Collste, G. (2019). *Cultural pluralism and epistemic injustice.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Collste%2C...

33. Morse, B. (2018). *Freedom en el fin del mundo: Antarctica as the key to renegotiating identity-based power hierarchies.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Morse%2C...

34. Huisman, J., Lepori, B., Seeber, M., Frølich, N., & Scordato, L. (2017). *Measuring institutional diversity across higher education systems.* Retrieved from https://google.com/search?q= Huisman%2C...

35. van Dam, A. (2019). *Diversity and its decomposition into variety, balance and disparity.* https://arxiv.org/pdf/190 2.09167.