

## **THE QUEST FOR RECOGNITION IN A MULTICULTURAL STATE: A STUDY OF WILL KYMLICKA'S VIEW AND THE NIGERIAN STATE**

**Dr. Chidiebere Obi**

Department of Philosophy  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka  
ccy.obi@unizik.edu.ng

**&**

**Charles Chukwuedo Nathaniel**

Department of Education Foundations  
Federal College of Education Technical, Asaba

**&**

**David Chinomso Orji**

Department of Philosophy  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka  
Orjidavid195@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

The geographical enclave called Nigeria assumes a multicultural dimension which highlights diversity among nationals. This diversity over time has fostered marginalization and discrimination thus hindering the quest for national integration which represents the necessary ingredient for sustainable development. The efforts of Nigerian governments over-time to eradicate or ameliorate the damaging effects of this disintegration have practically yielded no result to the point that the continuous unity of Nigeria has been termed elusive on the account of this. This disintegration is basically triggered by perceived marginalization and the subsequent fight for identification and recognition in the politics of the day among the plural Nigerians, thus establishing a cat and rat relationship amidst Nigerians. It is on these findings that the paper implores the conception of normative multiculturalism by Will Kymlicka that explicitly ensures fairness, recognition and equality among people of multicultural societies, as a means of projecting unity in diversity through the explication and instrumentality of the good of culture as panacea to this problem.

**Keywords:** Multiculturalism, Identity, Nigeria, Will Kymlicka

## **Introduction**

Nigeria as a multicultural society is a conglomerate of nations with different peoples and culture, a basket of different world-views and more than three hundred ethnic groups. As a multicultural entity, Nigeria is yet to embrace, appreciate and tolerate its cultural differences with the resultant effect of the battle of identity, due to the pluralism of culture therein; which seeks relevance, recognition, and appropriate representation at the center of politics in Nigeria. This situation has over-time initiated clashes, even to the point of fatality, between national-minority and national-majority and has been extended to political appointment in favour of particular ethnic group. It is a fact that Nigeria's basic challenge is to create an integrative nation out of its vast multiplicity of cultural groups: in order to attain unity in diversity. This non-integration in Nigeria's polity was given rise through marginalization of cultural-minorities by the majority; by subjecting cultural-minorities into a gross pressure to either adopt and integrate into the majority culture or remain marginalized; in response to this, cultural-minorities vehemently opposes this pressure, thus resulting in disintegration. It is on this depth and seriousness of identity politics in Nigeria, that the work necessarily called for the eradicating or rather, the ameliorating intervention of Kymlicka's multiculturalism in order to ensure fairness, by projecting the terms of equality as regards recognition and representation among the varying cultural sets in the Nigerian plural society which will consequently allow room for national integration. In the light of this disintegrative status in Nigeria, the questions are:

- Can any developmental projections be achieved without integration in Nigeria?
- Has culture and its depth been granted little consideration?
- What approach best provides remedy to the effects of this situation?

## **Kymlicka's Concept of a Nation and Nationalism**

What is a Nation? Kymlicka defined a nation in his work titled *multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights* thus: Nation means a historical community, more or less, institutionally complete, occupying a given territory or homeland, sharing a common language and culture.<sup>1</sup> Kymlicka definition of a nation and his

conception of a cultural-group is interchangeable, because his definition assumes a sociological sense which is closely related to the idea of a people or culture. Kymlicka postulated that a nation simply implies a cultural group, he upholds that by defining culture as same as a nation, which comprises of both the majority and minority it will convert numerical and superiority/inferiority into a co-equal partnership; while for Kymlicka a state or country comprises of nations (different cultural groups) who are merged or came together as one entity. The contention is, since nations is simply distinct cultural groups and a state is the coming together of these distinct cultural groups, though these nations still retain their different original identities, how best can the state go about the right and permissible way amidst the apparent vast diversity in culture; in institutionalizing and managing nation-building efforts that will be devoid of marginalizing any cultural group, their by embodying the element of all-inclusivity in representation? It is because of this concern that Kymlicka contended thus:

Nationalist movements have attempted to make nations and state coincide in two very different and conflicting ways. On the one hand states have adopted nation-building policies aimed at giving citizens common national language, identity and culture; on the other hand, cultural minorities within a larger state has mobilized to demand a state of their own. We can call the first 'state nationalism' and the second 'minority nationalism'...the successful diffusing of a common national identity is, in many countries, a contingent and vulnerable accomplishment- an ongoing process not an achieved fact".<sup>2</sup>

The insistence by national-minority not to assimilate into national majority-culture has been labeled by many theorists as vehement refusal and defensive reaction to modernity, Kymlicka refusing this label insisted that national-minority nationalism around the world today is geared towards a firm political movement for the creation of a free and equal citizenship. They seek to create a society defined and united by a common sense of culture and history, depiction of these political

movements are cases found in Spain by Catalans, in Britain by Scotland, in Canada by Quebecois etc.<sup>3</sup> It is pertinent to note that Kymlicka is rightly worried about the implications of nation-building efforts, especially due to the unfair measures that the state over-time has pursued it; in the direction of fostering common nation-building efforts, the state has often adopted the cultural values of the majority, to the alter dissatisfaction and disapproval from the part of the minority; the minority have responded to this unfair treatment through the demands of secession. He seconded the right of national-minority groups to exercise self-determination by way of demanding for degrees of local autonomy when they are apparently refused national recognition because it is affirmed in the international law; according to the United States Charter, ‘all people has the right of self-determination’, though the UN did apply this principle of self-government only to oversee colonies and not to internal national minorities, even when it is obvious that national minorities in various states are subjected to the same colonization and conquest as did different colonies.<sup>4</sup> Kymlicka’s concerns were seconded by Charles Taylor who said: “If a modern society has an ‘official’ language, in the fullest sense of the term, that is, a state-sponsored, inculcated, and defined language and culture, in which both economy and state functions, then it is obviously an immense advantage to people if this language and culture are theirs. Speakers of other languages and culture are at a distinct disadvantage”.<sup>5</sup>

It was Raz Joseph who gave a very deeper implication to cultural marginalization, when he said that the prosperity of a culture is important to the well-being of its members, if the culture is decaying, or if it is persecuted or discriminated against, the options and opportunities open to its members will shrink, and become less attractive, and their pursuit less likely to be successful,<sup>6</sup> what Raz implied is that, since the values and beliefs of individuals from minority groups are not helpful in choosing between options in the dominant culture to which these values have little relevance; these individuals are going to have less successful lives. In this case, it is not the perception of the worth of certain options that disappears but the options and opportunities themselves. Thus Kymlicka contended that such individuals are caught in a contradictory position, they are unable

to fully participate in the mainstream of society or to sustain their own distinct societal culture.<sup>7</sup> It is pertinent to note that kymlicka's concern to rectify inequalities between cultures is given impetus by his view that individuals are bound to the values and beliefs of their original community values: People are bound, in an important way; to their own cultural community we cannot just transplant people from one culture to another, even if we provide the opportunity to learn the other language and culture. Someone's upbringing is not something that just can be erased; it is, and will remain, a constitutive part of who that person is. Cultural membership affects our very sense of personal identity and capacity.<sup>8</sup>

In furtherance of the contention that the above quotation embodies, kymlicka turns to look into the status of identity-forming functions of one's own born- into societal culture, he implied that the pressures meted out on seeming minority groups to adopt the societal culture of the majority, which will result in the abandonment of one's own born-into societal culture; is a herculean task which is seemingly doomed to failure. In support of this position, he drew from the empirical evidence that one's born- into societal culture plays a significant role in the development and forming of one's identity, and also that the view of oneself is, at least partially, constituted by one's membership in a societal culture and one's self-respect can be tied up with this membership. Societal culture being such a strong constitutive element of one's identity and self-respect, also builds a strong feeling of belongingness in the minds of its adherents and as such, will prompt a strong determination by adherents to affirm their societal culture by employing strict maintenance and protective measures. Furthermore, it is not only that people would generally have a strong wish to maintain their membership in their societal culture, but also that the consequences of losing the membership of the cultural context one belongs to, can be very catastrophic, because the lost of original cultural membership represents lost of original identity and self-respect.<sup>9</sup> The minorities knows that if they should succumb to the state's unfair pressures to adopt the majority culture in the name of nationalism, they will forever remain aliens, foreigners with limited expressions, because the societal culture that they have been forcefully subjected to does not in any way represents their identity, options,

meaningfulness, choices, happiness and this will result in their less and less participation in mainstream social or political affairs, thereby necessitating their developmental and transcendental retardation. Thus, in order to escape a subjected miserable existence and to foster the institutionalization of their identity, national -minorities often continue to press for secession. On this point, Kymlicka said it is not surprising that national-minorities will always inevitably resist unfair integration and continue to seek official recognition, he states further, that demands for national recognition needs not take the form of secessionist movements for a separate state, but such genuine demand should take the rather better form of call for some degree of local autonomy.<sup>10</sup>

In Kymlicka's work titled *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship* he devoted a copious amount of ink in his bid to postulate a fair conception of nationalism, which he called liberal nationalism. For Kymlicka, liberal nationalism is the "legitimate function of the state to protect and promote the societal cultures of the nations within its borders."<sup>11</sup> Liberal nationalism is distinguished from illiberal nationalism by the means of the following characteristics: It uses no coercion to impose a national identity, it does not prohibit a mobilization against minority-nationalism, it enables a fairly inclusive definition of a nation and, consequently, a thinner conception of national identity. It is non-aggressive, that is, it does not seek to dismantle institutions of other nationalities.<sup>12</sup> Further, nationalism in Kymlicka's view is an integral part of a developed liberal democracy, because social justice, deliberative democracy, and individual freedom are most efficiently achieved within national units. Nationalism serves as a social justice in that for him it must encapsulate all-inclusivity of cultural identity in a state, because individual autonomy can only be attained, if one has commands over the necessary cultural tools that enable an individual to make choices. Societal cultures deliver these cultural tools as contends by Kymlicka. Thus on the strength of this important delivery of societal culture to individual autonomy which will foster development and transcendence, Kymlicka having in mind of the herculean task of incorporating pluralism, called on the state to make sacrifices, this is exactly where his normative multiculturalism comes in, it requires states to recognize equally the valid claims of national-minorities, by granting national-minorities institutional

supports and some degree of self-government. Kymlicka held that this equal representation of nations in the state's polity will inevitably foster a sense of solidarity among plural members of the state, because everyone is adequately recognized.<sup>13</sup> And it is exactly this solidarity among members of a state that represents the primary goal of nationalism, and it can only be delivered through multiculturalism which emphasizes cultural liberty.

### **Limits of Autonomy/Tolerance of Culture**

It is important to note that, political theorists often have discussed the issue of limits of tolerance in terms of the relationship between group rights and individual rights. The question is how cultural practices fit into a constitution that is committed to the firm protection of individual rights?, it is important to note that a liberal state is one that is committed to fostering a society of free and equal citizens, and only through multiculturalism policies can a state constitution which is committed to protecting individual rights be compatible with the accommodation of cultures as implied by Kymlicka. It is on the strength of the permission of societal culture to find expression within a larger constitutional state, which highlights liberty, that Kymlicka's multiculturalism policies is referred to as a liberal multiculturalism.

Due to the intricate emphasis of multiculturalism on autonomy, fears and anxieties have piled up regarding the seeming over-bearing impetus given to culture through the deep emphasis on autonomy in Kymlicka's multicultural thoughts. Critiques have exploited this seeming lacuna, as Neil Bissonath implied that since Kymlicka's multicultural thoughts suggests no limits to the accommodations offered to distinct cultural practices, why doesn't the logic of multiculturalism extend to accommodating clitoridectomy?, Richard Gwyn made the same point in its starkest sense, he implied that, if female genital mutilation is a genuinely distinctive cultural practices, as it is among Somalis and others, then since Kymlicka's multicultural thoughts sets its purpose to preserve and enhance the values and habits of all cultural groups, why should this practice be disallowed?<sup>14</sup> Kymlicka in response to this concern argued that his multicultural postulations is not only concerned with all-inclusive integrative measures of cultures, but also has a keen interest in the concerns of the limits of cultural autonomy or cultural

tolerance, in response to the critiques he inferred that cultural groups are not permitted to restrict the civil liberties or equality rights of their members, and that oppressive practices are not permitted through multiculturalism.<sup>15</sup> Kymlicka noted that if culture is granted absolute autonomy or tolerance, many dehumanizing practices will be practiced and condoned by the state on the account of cultural autonomy. Kymlicka's multicultural thought welcomes diversity and aims at birthing institutional grounds that will bring about unification of these diversities, but this agenda is not achieved without certain clear demarcated bounds. Kymlicka firmly asserted that oppressive practices are not the logical extension of current multiculturalism policies, the existing multicultural policies are intended to enable culture to express their identity and to reduce some of the external pressures on them to assimilate into the majority culture, and this shows that multiculturalism grants protective measure to vulnerable cultures from external pressures by advancing liberal values that promote fairness between groups, and that multiculturalism rejects demands for internal restrictions that are inconsistent with liberal values, which restricts the freedom of individuals within groups.<sup>16</sup> This shows that the limits of cultural autonomy is explicitly noted, for instances, the preamble to the multiculturalism Act in Canada show apparent limit to cultural tolerance in that it emphasizes human rights and individual freedom.

### **Cultural Diversity in Nigeria**

Cultural diversity has been present in societies for a very long time. In Ancient Greece, there were various small regions with different costumes, traditions, dialects and identities, for example, those from Aetolia, Locris, Doris and Epirus. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, societies remain culturally diverse, with most countries having a mixture of individuals from different races, linguistic backgrounds, religious affiliations, and so forth. Contemporary political theorists have labeled this phenomenon of the coexistence of different cultures in the same geographical space multiculturalism. Diversity is a fact of life, which has to be faced rather than erased. Hence, the reference to a "tapestry" evokes the image of a mosaic of cultures, each of which exercises its right to existence, alongside others. For, in a mosaic or tapestry, each color retains its identity but adds to the overall beauty of the object. To remove a piece from a mosaic or a thread from the tapestry is to destroy



it, consequently, diversity is a positive force and tampering with it through homogenization would damage its essence and utility.<sup>17</sup>

Nigeria is unquestionably a culturally diverse country; consisting approximately more than 300 cultural groups, with varying languages and customs, creating a country of rich cultural diversity. The largest cultural groups are the Hausa-Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo, together accounting for more than 70% of the population, while the Urhobo, Itsekiri, Isoko, Edo, Ijaw, Kanuri, Ibibio, Ebira, Nupe, Gwari, Jukun, Igala, Idoma, Efik and Tiv comprise between 25 and 30%; other minorities make up the remaining 5%. These various cultural groups represent over 300 languages that have been spoken over time, though some are now extinct, the official language of Nigeria is English; it was chosen to facilitate the cultural and linguistic unity of the country, owing to the influence of British colonization that ended in 1960. Even though most cultural groups prefer to communicate in their own languages, English as the official language is widely used for education, business transactions and for official purposes, English as a first language is used only by a small minority of the country's urban elite, and it is not spoken at all in some rural areas. Hausa is the most widely spoken of the three main languages spoken in Nigeria (Igbo, Hausa and Yoruba), with the majority of Nigeria's populace in the rural areas, the major languages of communication in the country remain indigenous languages. Nigerian Pidgin English, often known as 'Pidgin' or 'Broken' English, is also a popular language, though with varying regional influences on dialect and slang. The Pidgin English is widely spoken within the Niger Delta Regions, predominately in Warri, Sapele, Port Harcourt, Benin City and other areas.<sup>18</sup>

### **National Integrative Policies in Nigeria**

National integration has long been seen as an important focus for postcolonial Nigerian governments upon Nigerian decolonization in 1960, due to its cultural multiplicity. Nigerian governments, past and present, have made serious efforts to propagate policies and programs that are geared towards national integration, this is because, the achievement of national identity will help curtail culturally incited violence thereby ushering Nigeria into a new era of progressive existence. The disintegrative status in Nigeria has convulsed the

productive sector, limited the impact of government's economic programs on the people, threatened food security, made social insecurity more complex, deepened the deterioration of physical and social infrastructures, distressed the living standards of the vast majority of Nigerians, militated against the educational system and resulted in the ostracization of the generality of Nigerians and their exclusion from the political and economic space, among other glitches. As Kirk-Green recorded:

“Nigeria has a unique problem not experienced by any state in the world past or present. The problem is that of achieving solidarity in action and purpose in the midst of hundreds of ethnic nationalities each exerting both considerable forces on the central issue of the nation”.<sup>19</sup>

It is worthy of note that Nigeria have sometime recorded solidarity and oneness, in the beginning, there is a recorded progress with the first generation of patriots who agitated and struggled together in the 1950s for a sovereign Nigeria, which they achieved in 1960. This struggle for an independent Nigeria was spearheaded by nationalist politicians, trade unionists and other laudable patriots who converged from different ethnic and cultural divides, who put aside these divide and successfully wrestled power from the hands of the colonial master, under common strong Nigerian-interest platform. But after independence, the patriots let go this integration and relapsed back to cultural divide; thus came the need to build it again for a better Nigeria. Nigeria being a host to unwilling and variegated partners on the account of multiple cultural identities, efforts has been put in place starting from the colonial era to create systems, institutions and programs of government aimed at promoting national integration.

**Federalism:** Firstly, the colonial administration in Nigeria in 1954 using the instrumentality of the Lyttleton constitution introduced federalism into Nigerian as an integrative mechanism. The colonial masters must have been swayed by the opinion that such a system of government was necessary to preserve both integration and stability in a deeply divided society like Nigeria. While federalism has been applauded as a silver bullet to the cultural problem in Nigeria, the

perversion of its correct typology of governance has frustrated the benefits it could have provided the nation.<sup>20</sup>

**State Creations:** The creation of states is geared towards strengthening Nigeria's unity. Immediately after the Nigerian civil war in 1967, as a way to strengthen the reversion of the country to federalism, General Gowon resorted to the creation in a bid to keep the country united. General Gowon felt that the problem confronting the operation of federalism in the three regions was that the regions were so powerful as to consider themselves to be self-sufficient and almost entirely independent.<sup>21</sup> The federal government which ought to give the lead to the whole country was relegated to the background; the people were not made to realize that the federal government was the real government of Nigeria". In order to strengthen the federal government, the regions were taken to the slab of sacrifice resulting in the creation of twelve states in 1967. Subsequently this decisive move curtailed the domineering proclivities of the major cultural groups and secured some measure of autonomy for the minority groups. Between 1960 and 1966, creation of states within the federal system comprised three regions, four regions in 1963, twelve states in 1967, nineteen states in 1976, twenty one states in 1987, thirty states in 1991 and finally till date, thirty six states in 1996. The very notable achievement of these creations of states is that the old regional hegemony by the dominant three tribes of Hausa, Yoruba and Igbo in their respective regions was broken, consequently granting minorities in these three regions adequate expression.<sup>22</sup>

**The National Youth Service Corps:** The National Youth service Corps was conceived during General Gowon's time in office as another policy that could help unite the country. The platform was created by Decree No. 24 of May 22, 1973, the National Youth Service Corps is geared towards enhancing interaction among the nascent educated youth in the country scattered in different parts of the country, by providing them with the opportunity of living and serving in some developmental capacities in states other than their places of origin, so that they could better understand the cultures, perhaps the language and general lifestyle of their host communities. Thus, while helping to develop different parts of the country through their one-year compulsory

national service, young educated Nigerians were to also understand more about their other brethren living in other parts of the country and culture, their strengths and challenges. This knowledge is believed to be handy for youth who participated when they assume leadership position, because they would be able to proffer ready solutions to the challenges other Nigerians are facing.

However, this well-meaning scheme has been fraught with so much cultural considerations, favoritism and cronyism in the positing of corps members, one evidence is the exposure of National Service Youth Corps members to security risk areas, as what was seen during the 2011 General Elections in Nigeria, where many corps members of the Southern descent were butchered by some very angry Northern youths. Compounding the seeming utter realization of the scheme, Ojo had this to say:

Among various dimensions to the problem facing the thriving of the NYSC in Nigeria, is the problematic nature of citizenship, indigeneship and settler status in Nigeria. In this sense, many Nigerian youths have experienced more frustration rather than integration because after serving in a particular state other than theirs, they do not expect to get jobs where they have thanklessly undergone the NYSC program because in many cases, they would be tagged as non-indigenes and will be forced to go back to their states of origin to avoid being discriminated against. Even when they are employed, it is mostly on contract basis”.<sup>23</sup>

**Federal Character principle:** The aim of this policy is targeted towards achieving fair and effective representation of the various components of the federation in the country’s position power, status and influence.<sup>24</sup> The federal character principle was later enshrined in the 1979 constitution of Nigeria with the goal to accommodate the diverse linguistic, cultural and geographic groups in the decision-making, socio-political and economic apparatus of the country. The policy also aims to foster unity, peace, equal access to the country’s resources and promote the integration of the less advantaged states for better improvement and good conditions of living in the country.

Nevertheless, as laudable as the policy is, there is a yawning gap between intent and practicing the policy, especially in the current President Buhari led government of Nigeria, this reality has rendered the policy counterproductive. The policy has been criticized for introducing crass mediocrity into the public service, weak at fighting ethnicity, cronyism, and corruption. The policy though a well-meaning one has been hugely and negatively politicized in Nigeria, because of this, it apparently engenders instability rather than integration.

### **Kymlicka's Multicultural view as Panacea to Nigeria's Multicultural Issues**

The marginalization of the minority culture by the majority culture in Nigeria is evidenced by an interview given by the late premier of the Northern Nigeria by name Ahmadu Bello, he implied thus: Northernisation policy, which is as well called a Northerner first. The policy holds according him, that all important positions in Nigeria must be held by a Northerner, if a qualified Northerner is not readily available, then a foreigner like you (addressing the British journalist interviewing him) will be taken but on contract, if we (The North) can't find a foreigner, then we will take 'another' Nigerian (implying other regions as lower citizen of Nigeria) but on contract too.<sup>25</sup> Important is the fact that other regions as well sought domination of other regions. This represents discrimination on people and culture as well represents people's identity. Going by historical antecedence, one will perceive the domination ambition of the South by means of their educational superiority in comparison to the North, but the Northern population won them the fight in that, politics is a game of numbers. It is pertinent to note that, with this kind of policy invoke in Nigeria, the domination ambitions in Nigeria and the inherent transcendental capacity of man which finds expression within the context of culture, Nigeria will never attain success in terms of national integration, and by extension make Nigeria's ambition for a sustainable development a mere fantasy.

Kymlicka held that our culture conditions the way we perceive our identity, in that, there is a certain way of being human that is 'my' way, inculcated in me by my own cultural context, I am called upon to live my life in this way, and not in imitation of anyone else's life, this gives me the status of being true to myself, if am not, I miss the point of my

life: I miss what being human is for me. But despite the strength of culture to our identity, recognition also plays a vital role in the expression of identity; this means that our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person can suffer real damage, real distortion if the people around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Non-recognition or mis-recognition can inflict harm; it can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted and reduced mode of being.<sup>26</sup>

The question at this juncture is what is the relation between recognition and cultural survival? Recognition is an important part of making a culture “visible” and operational, that is, it is only by recognizing a group that the state can give expression to its particular collective goals. Being visible is an important way in which a culture maintains itself; a lack of recognition in this case is how culture disappears, which will rid its adherents of the good of culture. Firstly let me distinguish the two implications of cultural recognition and protection:

First, connected with the move from honor to dignity, one form of politics has come to emphasize “the equal dignity of all citizens” in an effort to avoid the existence of first and second class citizens. Here, the emphasis is on equality, similarity and equal treatment. Secondly, connected with the development of identity, has come a “politics of difference” which emphasizes that everyone is owed “recognition of the unique identity” of each individual or group. This politics has a universal, egalitarian basis, equal recognition for all, but “it asks we give acknowledgment and status to something that is not universal shared”, which is distinct cultural practices by different groups. Let’s just call these two models the politics of dignity and the politics of difference respectively. To proponents of the politics of dignity, the latter model can seem like a negation of their principles. The politics of dignity is motivated by the idea that all humans are equally worthy of respect based on a transcendental capacity that all humans share. Kymlicka’s notion of multiculturalism provides for the services of the State to be fashioned thus:

1. Access: Government services should be available to everyone who is entitled to them, regardless of where they live, and

should be free of any form of discrimination on the basis of birthplace, language, culture, race or religion.

2. **Equity:** Government services should be delivered on the basis of fair treatment of clients who are eligible to receive them.
3. **Communication:** Government service providers should use strategies to inform eligible clients of services and their entitlements, and how they can obtain them. Providers should also consult with the community regularly about the adequacy, design and standard of government services.
4. **Responsiveness:** Government services should be sensitive to the needs and requirements of different communities, and responsive to the particular circumstances of individuals.
5. **Effectiveness:** Government service providers must be 'results-oriented', focused on meeting the needs of clients from all backgrounds.
6. **Efficiency:** Government service providers should optimize the use of available public resources through a user-responsive approach to service delivery which meets the needs of clients.
7. **Accountability:** Government service providers should have a reporting mechanism in place which ensures they are accountable for implementing Charter objectives for clients.

With the adaptation and application of Kymlicka's normative conception of multiculturalism in Nigeria, which places enormous premium on the equal respect, protection and recognition of every culture therein because culture bears a deep intrinsic dimension to the being of man; Nigeria will by so doing set the appropriate direction and pace for the realization of national integration, because Kymlicka's notion avails every culture equal participated in the central issues of the nation, which will give room to the unanimous transcendental realizations of each individual, thereby eradicating hatred amidst Nigerian's thus fostering peace and ultimately national integration in the culturally plural Nigeria.

### **Conclusion**

In a vastly multicultural society like Nigeria, the first integrative allegiance is to the culture one belongs, because of the importance of culture to the being of man. Thus, for the state to achieve a national

integration it has to go through the phenomenon that already has a deep core to the being of man. Here is the call of cultural recognition which chiefly represents the recognition of identity, recognition of identity being the recognition of an existence expressional being of man. To envisage Nigeria in the nearest future with such a national integration process, where all cultural groups is allowed equal access to the central polity of the country, where the dividends of governance is equally distributed and where all cultural groups are categorized as equal, is a big step to the developmental direction. This process if implemented will kill all this secessionist agitations (for instance, the Biafran secession agitation from the South-Eastern part of the country), all the call for restructuring, Niger-Delta economic agitations, and the non-seriousness of the government at the center to put to a stop the shameful war between headsmen and famers which has now graduated to headsmen versus communities. The eradication of these ills through the right measure of national integration which is through cultural recognition, Nigeria will set off to the attainment of considerable sustainable developments.

## REFERENCES

1. W. Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Right*.P. 81.
2. W. Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Citizenship*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) p. 222.
3. *Ibid.* p. 246.
4. W. Kymlicka, *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. P. 131.
5. C. Taylor, *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992) p. 29.
6. J. Raz, "Multiculturalism: A Liberal Perspective" in Dessent, Vol. 4, (1994). P. 52.
7. W. Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) p. 101.



8. W. Kymlicka, *Liberalism, Community, and Culture*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) p. 175.
9. *Ibid.* p. 176.
10. W. Kymlicka, *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) p. 31.
11. W. Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Citizenship*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) p.38.
12. *Ibid.* p. 39-41.
13. *Ibid.* p. 226-229.
14. W. Kymlicka, *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) p. 60.
15. *Loc.Cit.*
16. *Ibid.* p. 65.
17. Ayodeji, "Nigerian's Cultural Tapestry and the Challenge of Development". Nigerian Academy of Letters Convocation Lecture University of Lagos, (2013). Pp. 1.
18. *Ibid.* p.3.
19. A.H.M. Kirk-Green, "The Peoples of Nigeria". Journal of African Affairs, 1 (1996). P. 262.
20. T. Falola. P. 120.
21. *Ibid.* p. 126.
22. *Ibid.* p. 128.
23. E. Ojo, "Federalism and the Search for National Integration in Nigeria". In African Journal of Political Science and International Relations. Pp. 389.
24. S.C. Ugoh, W.I. Ukpere, "Policy of the Federal Character Principle and Conflict Management in Nigerian Federalism". In African Journal Business Management, vol. 6(23) (2012). Pp. 6777.
25. <https://www.youtube.com>, A video Interview of Late Premier of the Northern Nigeria, Ahmadu Bello on Northernization Policy; as accessed on 30<sup>th</sup> June, 2018.
26. W.Kymlicka, "Multicultural States and Intercultural Citizens" in Theory and Research in Education, (London: Sage Publications, 2003), vol. 1(2), p. 157.