

associations and away from the grievances of minorities and other vulnerable groups claiming to be culturally distinct, who often bear a disproportionate share of the costs of economic and political liberalization, even while they may also derive some benefit from them.

Deepening entails extending democratic principles to all scales of institutional life, encompassing, but not limited to, national and local electoral institutions. Such a perspective would entail building provisions for meaningful and inclusive public participation in planning and other decision-making processes at all levels, local, regional, national, and trans/international. It would also entail ensuring the legal and political infrastructure necessary to support non-governmental organizations and more informal forms of association life, including ethnic and other cultural groups, within civil society. Such dense networks within civil society, when linked vertically to formal political and economic institutions, have been shown to corroborate positively with economic prosperity, sustainable development, and electoral democracy (Woolcock 1998).

Deepening democracy also extends to the economic sphere, lest states attempt to pass on responsibilities for social protection and reproduction to NGOs, informal networks, and individual households, even as they burden vulnerable communities with the social costs of economic liberalization politics. In the context of the globalization of neoliberal ideology and laissez-faire growth strategies, we may recall the important work of Karl Polanyi (1957) on the perils of economic liberalism when disembedded from the imperatives of social life. Polanyi's appeal to re-embed economic institutions within society hold special significance today, as broad constituencies unite to protest the non-transparency of supra-national economic institutions. Hence the injunction here to introduce procedures by which economic institutions at all spatial scales (from local to global) are held accountable by vulnerable groups claiming to be culturally distinct as well as by others affected by their policies and practices (Rankin 2001).

In a culturally plural context, a commitment to deepening democracy must also attend to two equally significant forms of injustice to which marginal groups are subject: cultural injustices that violate the right of groups to recognition and socio-economic injustices that result from inequitable resource distribution. Focusing exclusively on the latter, as many development and welfare programmes do, can exacerbate the former if not accompanied by processes that honour group claims for cultural recognition (Fraser 1997).

In Taiwan, land reform played an important role in addressing the socio-economic grievances of the majority native Taiwanese (*Bendiren*). This did not satisfy their desire for recognition of their cultural distinctness, as expressions of a separate Taiwanese identity and language were suppressed by the Guomindang (GMT) government, dominated by the mainland Chinese (*Weishengren*) minority. However, the land reform policy helps explain why the resentments of the ethnic majority during the political transition were not more explosive.

In Macau, the majority ethnic Chinese population often did well economically, dominating business dealings in the enclave under the Portuguese. However, the use of