

Ethics of Development: Kant and Cabral's Pragmatic Contributions

Godwyns Ade' AGBUDE¹; Israel Oche ADOBA²; Paebi Ibenadou ETETE³

1. College of Development Studies, Department of Political Science and International Relations
Covenant University, Ogun State, Nigeria. agodwins1@yahoo.com
2. Graduate of International Relations, Department of Political Science and international Relations, Covenant
University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria. israeladoba@yahoo.com
3. Graduate of Political Science, Department of Political Science and international Relations, Covenant
University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria. paebietete@ymail.com

*E-mail of corresponding author: agodwins1@yahoo.com; godwyns.agbude@covenantuniversity.edu.ng

Abstract

Development has always been a fanciful word in the political lexicon of policy-makers and politicians at both local and international political affairs. Political leaders and policy-makers seek to authenticate their relevance in the public ambiance by making several speeches that are coded around the concept of development. This paper therefore interrogates the concept not just by providing additional definitions to the concept but rather to re-invent the proper institutional framework under which development should be pursued. Cabral was a revolutionary and development theorist whose relevance in the whole discourse of development in colonial Africa cannot be overlooked. Immanuel Kant stands tall amidst western scholars with his ethical framework, expounded in the categorical imperatives having perennial relevance in several disciplines. This paper, therefore, provokes their theoretical ethical frameworks in addressing the issues of development. The paper gives us the formula for judging the moral 'temperature' of development ideologies and policies.

Keywords: Development, Ethics, Colonialism, Kant, Cabral and Categorical Imperatives

1. Introduction

The notion of development arose after 1945 in the context of decolonization, system competition between capitalism and communism, and the emergence of the non-aligned bloc of nations-the Third World. The First World offered a development model based on an interpretation of its own experience. For Osabuohien (2010) development incorporates for ideal structural and institutional changes to economic growth i.e. enhancement of countries capacity in other aspects of human, socio-cultural and infrastructural development.

However, development is an elusive concept with no univocal definition from scholars as its application varies from one school of thought to another. Several definitions of development cover areas such as economy, political, social and even human capacity development. The proliferation and the divergent definitions of the concept of development have led post-development theorists to argue that development is an unjust concept that must be dismantled. One of the most prominent attempts has been how to differentiate between progress and development. Thomas (2000:1) posited that "progress implies continual development reaching higher and higher levels perhaps without limit, whereas development, as an analogy from the development of living organism, implies moving towards the fulfillment of a potential. Immanent development means a spontaneous and unconscious (natural) process of development from within, which may entail destruction of the old order to achieve the new. International development implies deliberate efforts to achieve higher level in terms of set objectives". Development is thus construed as a progressive growth towards a higher dimension of life.

For the traditional economist, "development meant the capacity of a national economy, whose initial economic condition has been more or less static for a long time, to generate and sustain an annual increase in its gross national product (GNP) at rates of perhaps 5% to 7% or more" (Todaro and Smith 2004:15). For this traditional economist, development is measured by the generated and sustained annual increase as it relates primarily to its gross national product (GNP). Gueye (1995:8) conceived development as:

The multifarious and multi-factorial process through which a given society is moving towards the achievement of what the people living in it consider as being the condition for the happiness of their freedom and their self-actualization as human beings. This requires, undoubtedly, a minimum of physical and human resources, as well as the setting up of machineries (economic, political, social, etc) for the development and more efficient management of these resources, as well as the equitable redistribution of the benefits among all members of the society.

For him, one cannot detach freedom, happiness, and self-actualization from development. And also, development can only result from a deliberate art of providing the socio-eco political platforms that will generate it.

Development can be defined as a sustainable increase in the standard of living that integrates material consumption, education, health and environmental protection (Ghatak 2001).

From the above definitions and descriptions, development cannot be discussed without allusion to change and transformation in the structure of the society whether economically or physically. The point that is germane to any definition is the fact that development cannot be discussed without reference to human development which is the real form of development. According to World Bank Report (1991) held that the challenge of development is to improve the quality of life. Especially in the world's poor countries, a better quality of life generally calls for higher incomes-but it involves much more. It encompasses as ends in themselves better education, higher standard of health and nutrition, less poverty, a cleaner environment, more equality of opportunity, greater individual freedom, and a richer cultural life.

The World Bank description of development imposes the obligation of transforming human life on the political leaders. In other words, development is not yet complete if it does not translate to an improvement of the quality of life of the people. It implies a better living condition.

From whichever ideological bend we examine development, the human factor has always been the major concern of some scholars. Rather than focusing on mere structural and physical development, the human being should be empowered by their governments so as to grant a voice to their inner potentials.

Human beings are born with certain potential capabilities. The purpose of development is to create an environment in which all people can expand their capabilities, and opportunities can be enlarged for both present and future generations. The real foundation of human development is universalism in acknowledging the life claims of everyone...wealth is important for human life. But to concentrate on it exclusively is wrong for two reasons. First, accumulating wealth is not necessary for the fulfillment of some important human choices.... Second, human choices extend far beyond economic well being (UNDP 1994: 13, 14).

Hence, the purpose of the discourse on development is not just a search for the transference of national wealth into the purses of the citizens but rather empowering them to pursue their own economic growth without undermining the humanity of others. The provision of the platform for personal realization of their inner potentials is the core of UNDP's description of development. It argues against mere economic standard being used as the prerequisite for development. To my mind, I believe truly that though empowering the citizens economically is important but providing an enabling environment for self-realization of their potentials is equally of great importance.

Femi Kayode seemed to share the sentiment that development should lead to accentuation of the potentials of the citizens:

...development is not just to make the poor wealthy, but to make the poor productive. The need of the poor...is not relief but the release of their inherent potential for individual growth, enhanced productivity and higher social/and political responsibility. This way, development turns man into an asset, not a liability (Kayode 2002: 31).

Development does not just make the poor rich but brings the poor to the state of being productive not just to himself but also to the society. The socio-eco political platforms that will enhance the humanity of the human beings were underscored by different scholars.

Okigbo (1981: 34-5) posited succinctly that:

...for man to be himself, at his best (development), all the things required for his being, in its many dimensions, have to be available for him to fulfill himself - as a member of society, as homo economicus, as a politician, as a religious man, at work and at play etc. It is these dimensions that give the things additional meaning and makes development possible.

From the above, development is not just about putting more money into the pockets of the masses. Development entails the provision everything necessary for man to develop himself and to also become an agent of development.

Tomori (1995:246) defined development as:

...a process of self-reliant growth, achieved through the participation of the people acting in their own interest as they see them and under their own control. Its first objective must be to end poverty, provide productive employment and satisfy the basic needs of all the people, any surplus being fairly shared.

For Tomori, not only should development be human-centered (focusing on human development), it must be also be people-driven (i.e. the people participating in the development projects). The first goal of development is to bring an end to poverty through the provision of employment and basic necessity of life to the people. Thus, any development policy that does not focus on alleviating poverty does not pass for a development policy.

2. **Amilcar Cabral: The colonial hero of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde's independent**

While there is no need to re-introduce Immanuel Kant due to his central place in the history of scholarship in the Western hemisphere, introducing Cabral could be said to be a necessity for those who are not familiar with the colonial war in Africa and Portuguese activities in its African colonies.

Like all African societies, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde (the home states of Cabral) were hosts to Western Colonialism and Imperialism under the Portuguese government. Despite the international disengagement and condemnation of colonialism at a point in world history, Portugal held on tenaciously to its colonies namely Angola, Mozambique, Sao Tome, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde. Portugal was the first to set up trading posts in Africa which eventually gave room to colonialism and the last country to disengage from its colonies.

The thought of Aristides Pereira, Cabral's successor as Secretary-General of PAIGC, was catalogued after Cabral was assassinated by Portuguese secret agents. According to him,

In Africa and in the progressive world, nobody was unaware of the international dimension to the thought of Amilcar Cabral, the craftsman of the victories that definitively turned the African people of Guinea and Cape Verde into subject and author of their own history. Our armed struggle for liberation was marked as one of the most advanced in the general framework of the struggle of oppressed peoples against colonialism and imperialism. That is why the ferocity of the criminal face of the Portuguese colonialists had to strike and the architect of our building, the strategists of our military successes, the diplomatist of our initiatives in the international field, and finally at the leader who by his intelligence and by his generosity had shaped the singular character of the war in Guinea-Bissau. An attempt at all cost to bar the way to the march of our struggle and, above all, to prevent the triumph of its example, by virtue of economic interests at stake in Angola and in Mozambique - this was the principal motive that guided the carrying out of the sinister plans for the Portuguese colonialist government (Cabral 1980: xxiv).

Cabral, who was assassinated on 20th January 1973 by Portuguese secret police, is reputed to be the architect of modern Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde. He was the brain behind the eviction of Portuguese colonialism through the revolutionary struggle and he was the theorist behind the development of the liberated areas. His central place in the history of revolutionary struggle in Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde made him a focal target for Portuguese colonialism.

A common phenomenon in the various works on Cabral by several writers is the profound recognition of Amilcar Cabral as an authentic and genuine African revolutionary leader.

In Patrick Chabal's words:

...Cabral's stature as the most successful African revolution leader was firmly established even in the western countries whose governments continued to support Portugal in its colonial wars. When he was killed in January 1973, he duly entered the African 'Pantheon of Great Men' and became the object of adulation which all outstanding revolutionary leaders receive when dead (especially if, like Cabral, they are murdered). Both his admirers and his adversaries joined in posthumous (Chabal 2003:12).

Cabral's revolutionary nationalism took the form of Guerrilla warfare against the existing draconian political order of Portuguese imperialists, which had profound violent outcomes.

Chabal (2003:54) noted that in 1956, the PAIGC had ostensibly been created as a party of nationalist agitation. Three years later, Cabral opted for a strategy of national struggle.

Amilcar Cabral underscored the importance of force (revolution) when he copiously posited:

We are not going to use this platform to vilify imperialism. In a Tricontinental dimension, this means that we are not going to succeed in eliminating imperialism by shouting or by slinging insults, spoken or written, at it. For us, the worst or best we can say about imperialism, whatever its form, is to take up arms and struggle. That is what we are doing and will go on doing until foreign domination has been totally eliminated from our African countries (Cabral 1980:121)

Thus, to effectively decolonize and develop Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, Cabral was convinced that revolution, in the form of Guerrilla Warfare, was the only method that could be used given Portugal's refusal of dialogue and peaceful termination of its domination in the Portuguese African states. This was due to the aggressive nature of Portuguese colonialists; and history testifies to the success of Cabral's leadership. Cabral stood out, as the central figure, in the Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde's revolutionary expedition.

Hagopian (1975) underscored the importance of leadership in fostering effective social-political transformation which he considers as the goal of any revolution thus:

Without strong leadership, the very complexity of goals, aspirations, and motivations characteristic of a revolutionary situation could easily degenerate into a Hobbesian war of each

against all. Thus, the really distinctive work of the revolution-the attempted restructuring or destruction of one or more of the stratification systems-cannot get very far without resorting to effective leadership (Hagopian 1975:2).

The success of any revolution is tied around the presence of a vibrant leader who is able to appeal to the minds of the masses and organize the revolution to ensure successful transition from one social system to another. Chabal re-echoed the central place of Cabral's political leadership as the foundation of modern Guinea. According to him,

Cabral was largely responsible for the organization of modern nationalist politics in Guinea; he was the architect and uncontested leader of the PAIGC; and the policies which the party adopted and the strategy which it followed under his leadership made its success possible.

Although it is more than likely that, in Cabral's absence, nationalists in Guinea would eventually have sought to engage in a struggle for national liberation, it is far from clear that without him the war would have been launched and organized with such effect.

Probably the most impressive feature of Cabral's leadership was his success in developing a party which could operate effectively without him (Chabal 2003:8).

The historical revolution in Guinea-Bissau is credited to Cabral's leadership skill, military strategies and diplomatic acumen. The possibility of the success of the colonial war in Guinea-Bissau is in doubt without the presence and the indispensable input of Amilcar Lopel Cabral.

Cabral's drive for mobilizing the masses against the oppressive colonial master was informed by the condition the people were subjected to. Cabral described the reason for his armed struggle against Portuguese colonialism thus:

It might be asked whether Portuguese colonialism has not done a certain amount of good in Africa. Justice is always relative. For the Africans who for five centuries have lived under Portuguese domination, Portuguese colonialism represents a reign of evil, and where evil reigns there is no place for good...I saw folk die of hunger in Cape Verde and I saw folk die from flogging in Guine (with beatings, kicks, forced labour), you understand? This is the entire reason for my revolt (Cabral 1980: 19, 41).

For him, the existence of Portugal in Africa has brought no good to its colonies. The Africans were not just subjected to hard labour, they were also brutalized and killed in the process.

Cabral also clearly identified who the enemy was. For him, the battle is not against the citizens of Portugal but rather against all the forces that oppress the people. The struggle is against imperialist countries who take advantage of other countries to enhance their own economic benefit in the world economy system.

The relevance of Cabral is not just in term of revolution but also in contemporary discourse of development in Africa. He was one of the writers that devoted his revolutionary activities on the development of the African states with focus on the liberated areas in Guinea during the colonial war.

3. Ethics

According to Solomon, the etymology of ethics suggests its basic concerns: (1) Individual character, including what it means to be "a good person," and (2) the social rules that govern and limit our conduct, especially the ultimate rules concerning right and wrong, which we call morality (Solomon 1984: 3; Shaw and Barry 1995: 3). Ethics is the other major type of practical discipline. Ethics tries to help us decide how we should act not just in order to attain a given objective or objectives but, rather, all things considered (Elegido 2004:3). An issue is moral or ethical if it has the likelihood of affecting the lives of others. According to Barcalow (1994: 4), "moral issues arise most fundamentally when the choices people face will affect the well-being of others by either increasing or decreasing it, causing either harm or benefits".

As we proceed to consider the interplay between development and ethics, it will be important to state that development ought to be achieved without destroying the lives of the people for whom it could be said to be pursued. The goal of development should be to enhance the humanity of the people. Ethics provides the framework for achieving growth and development without inhibiting the humanity of the people.

3.1. Development Ethics

'Development ethics' can be seen as comparable to business ethics, medical ethics, environmental ethics and similar areas of practical ethics. Each area of practice generates ethical questions about priorities and procedures, rights and responsibilities. So, first of all, 'development ethics' can be seen as a field of attention, an agenda of questions about major value choices involved in processes of social and economic development. What is good or 'real' development? (Gasper 2009).

Development ethics is the field of studying ethics and development issues. For development ethicists (Goulet 1975 and 2006; Dower 1988; Gasper 2006; Crocker 2008), development ethics perceived as both the ethical reflection on the means and on the ends of local, national and international development. This ethical reflection

not only takes the form of a philosophical discourse, but also offers “a space of analysis, evaluation and action regarding the trajectory of societies, with special reference to suffering, injustice and exclusion within societies and between societies at a global scale” (Gasper and Truong 2005: 373-74; Astroulakis 2013: 100).

Ethical judgments regarding the good life, the good society, and the quality of relations among people always serve, directly or indirectly, as operational criteria for development planners and as guidelines for researchers (Goulet 1996). Ethical framework is used to interrogate the moral content of several development agendas and strategies. The impact of the policies on the people is considered as the ground for adjudging the desirability of these policies. According to Goulet (1996), development ethics borrows freely from the work of economists, political scientists, planners, agronomists, and specialists of other disciplines. Ethics places each discipline’s concept of development in a broad evaluative framework wherein development ultimately means the quality of life and the progress of societies toward values expressed in various cultures. How development is pursued is no less important that *what* benefits are gained. The central issue in development ethics is the moral justification of the methods and the processes taken in achieving development.

4. The Ethics of Development in Kant and Cabral’s Political Thought

It is important to examine what could possibly constitute ethics of development within the spectrum of Cabral’s analysis of how to grow and develop the liberated areas. The predication of development on the people is central to the whole ideology of development. Samir Amin, Arturo Escobar, Amartya Sen, Claude Ake among others development theorists also agree that the people are supposed to be the means of development. Among them, Escobar and Ake articulated the central place of the people and their culture in the pursuit of any meaningful development ideology. For Cabral, the people are central to any ideological discourse of development. The people are supposed to be the agents and targets of development. Also for him, the people are an institution to be considered in development discourse. Cabral emphasized several times on the need to improve on the living conditions of the people. Writing to the cadres and the responsible workers about how the future generation should conduct themselves, he said, “*they must constantly improve the lot of our people and our land, serving not only our interests but also those of Africa and of all mankind*” (Cabral 1980:78). The focus of the workers and leaders must be to improve the well-being of the people. Within the pursuit of development is also the idea of universalism of human nature and the universalism of human needs. Cabral seemed to believe that the resources of all human beings are to be shared by all but not through exploitation but rather through willing contribution (Cabral 1972; 1980). He was never “afrocentric” but rather he embraced the whole human race as belonging to the same family whose interests should be to promote the well-being of another family member. Imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism violate the proposal of universalism of humanity and mutual promotion of collective well-beings of all. It is within this universalism as an ideological persuasion that Cabral argued that no country should exploit another country; and no man has the moral right to exploit another man (Cabral 1973; 1972). It was on the basis of this he argued for equality of right for both gender without any gender being relegated and subjected under the other. This has become the mainstream discourse in gender equality, women empowerment, women in politics, women in development and the feminist ideological bent. He also consistently argued that they were trying to build a new state where no man would exploit another man. Thus, the idea of the people as an institutional framework in development calls for a social eco-political system where the people are both the means and the ends of development.

The people are the means and the ends of development. According to him,

Our struggle is for our people, because its objective, its purpose, is to satisfy the aspirations, dreams and desires of our people: to lead a decent and worthy life, as all the peoples in the world want, to have peace in order to build progress in their land, to build happiness for their children. We want everything we win in this struggle to belong to our people and we have to do our utmost to form an organization such that even if some want to divert the conquests of the struggle to their own advantage, our people will not let them. This is very important (Cabral 1980: 77).

The national liberation struggle had its locus on the people. The struggle was to oust the colonialists and also build a society where the aspirations, dreams and desires of the people would be realized. The intention of the struggle was to make room for the building of progress and happiness for the people. And the benefits of the struggle should accrue to the society at large and not to some enlightened petty bourgeois. Thus, the people are the means and the ends of development in Cabral’s political thought (development thought).

It is this ideology that quickly stands in consonance with Immanuel Kant’s categorical imperatives. There are three formulations (though the first two are more pronounced) of the categorical imperatives in Kant’s philosophy. But we may not be able to drive deeply into the discourse of Kantianism except for the relevance of the categorical imperatives as they capture Cabral’s ideas of development. The idea of ethics of development is to show the moral imperative in development discourse and since Kant’s categorical imperatives can be a

building block for Cabral's thesis of development, I consider this evaluation of ethics of development as a necessity.

For Kant, as for Cabral, humanity has a universal reality. Thus, Kant argued that all rational beings must act with maxims that will be in consonant with the objective principle of morality. The distinction between a maxim and a principle in Kantian ethics is that a maxim is a subjective principle on which a person acts (whether consciously or unconsciously), while a principle is an objective law of morality on which man ought to act. All human action (guided by maxims) must be in consonance with objective law of morality which is has a universal orientation. On the basis of that, Kant went on to state the first categorical imperative thus:

Act only on that maxim whereby thou cast at the same time will that it should become a universal law ...although, no one should contribute anything to the happiness of others, provided he did not intentionally withdraw anything from it (Kant 1778/1949: 22, 29).

An application of this to policy-makers and political leaders imply that all their decisions, policies and legislations should be such that they are applicable to every citizen including themselves. The maxim that guides their actions and policies should be universalized in order to have an effect on them and not just on the citizens only. The implication of this to development is that legislations and policies on development are to be evaluated and implemented within the framework of the categorical imperatives. The question is, 'will those who exploit others and make policies and legislations that impoverish the people be willing to make exploitations, impoverishing policies and legislations a general law such that they themselves will be exploited and be impoverished by others?' Thus, Kant argued that the first law of morality is that our maxim of action should be capable of being universalized such that we are willing to let others apply the same maxim of action we subscribe to. The test of the morality of our action is in our willingness or unwillingness to make our maxim of action a universal law. Our refusal or unwillingness to universalize our maxim of action is a proof of the immorality of our action.

The implication of this for development is that the policy-makers of development who do not make the people the means and the ends of development should evaluate whether they will be willing to subscribe to a development ideology that neglects their own interests (as the means and ends of development) if they were to be citizens and not policy-makers. If they will not or do not subscribe to such ideology that neglects their interests, then they should not make the policies that impoverish the people. If they are not willing to universalize their maxim then such maxim is morally wrong or not good for the people. Thus, if a maxim passes the test of the categorical imperatives, then the action is morally permissible but if otherwise, the action is morally forbidden.

The second formulation is derived from Kant's conception of all rational beings as ends in themselves. Man should not treat another man as a means because in every man there exists the principle of 'end-in-themselves'.

So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as means only (Kant 1778/1949: 27).

In development discourse, man is not to be used as mere means only. Kant recognized the fact that man is a means to be used to realize certain ends; but beyond this, man is an end in himself. Thus, no development ideology or policy should violate the humanity in men as end in themselves. The people are to be the means and the ends of development and not only the means of development. If development is to improve the lives of the people, they must be the means and the ends of development. Political leaders and policy-makers should not treat the people as a means only but the ends of development.

Kant continued:

It is not enough that the action does not violate humanity in our own person as an end in itself, it must also harmonize with it. For the ends in himself ought as far as possible to be my ends also, if that conception is to have its full effect with me ...although, no one should contribute anything to the happiness of others, provided he did not intentionally withdraw anything from it (Kant 1778/1949: 29).

The implication of this is that all our actions must be that they add to our humanity and the humanity of others and do not reduce or destroy it. The implementation of the Structural Adjustment Programme was a tool of impoverishment of the citizens by the international imperialist countries (represented by their agencies) and the impassive and corrupt African political bourgeoisies. For Kant, man should always promote the well-being of others. The focus of political leaders and policy-makers therefore should be to always initiate and implement policies and legislations that enhance the well-being and welfare of the people.

Kant further argued that whoever cannot add value or improve the welfare of the people should not harm or reduce it.

In Kant's words:

...although, no one should contribute anything to the happiness of others, provided he did not intentionally withdraw anything from it (Kant 1778/1949: 29).

In other words, if no one has the right to increase the welfare or add to the happiness of others, in the same vein, no one has the right to withdraw, whether intentionally or non-intentionally, from the welfare or the happiness of the people. In the same line of reasoning, one could argue that if the policy-makers and the politicians have no responsibility to increase the welfare or the happiness of the citizens of a state through their policies and legislations, they have no responsibility or justification to negatively affect the welfare or well-being of the people.

Kant went on to the third formulation of the categorical imperatives thus:

The conception of the will of every rational being as one which must consider itself as giving in all the maxims of its actions from this point of view – this conception leads to another which depends on it and is very fruitful, namely that of a kingdom of ends.

A rational being must always regard himself as giving laws either as member or as sovereign in a kingdom of ends which is rendered possible by the freedom of will (Kant 1778/1949: 30-31).

All rational beings are united in the kingdom of ends and are bound by common laws. The resultant effect is that we, as members of the kingdom of ends, legislate universal laws to which we ourselves are subject to. Both the leaders and the led are members of the kingdom of ends. All laws, policies and legislations are to be made with the considerations of the welfare and the well-being of other human beings in the same kingdom of ends. A rational being (including the leaders) must only give laws that will favour the whole humanity. Within the purview of development discourse, the leaders must always legislate or initiate and implement policies that will advance the human dignity of the citizens. This is the ethics of development. Any development policy and ideology that do not improve the lives of the people is a violation of the ethics of development. In the same vein, any ideology or policy that cannot improve the lives of the people must not diminish their welfare. In other words, we can still accommodate the fact that a development policy or ideology does not improve the lives of the citizens but it must not diminish or reduce the people's ability to meet their own needs.

Both Cabral and Kant agree on the sanctity of the people as an institutional framework to be considered in all human actions and decisions. The people are not to be used as means only but to be treated as ends in themselves. All decisions and policies are to be such that they improve the lives of the people. The policy-makers must be ready to universalize the policies and ideologies of development they propose for the state and the people such that if they were not policy-makers they will still uphold their policies and the ideologies. These are the components of the ethics of development.

Cabral emphasized consistently that the new leaders must not disengage themselves from the people given their central place in the struggle for independence and development. The failure of Guinea-Bissau, as well as most African states, is the neglect of this Cabral's ideology of people-centeredness in the quest for development.

Another component of the ethics of development is self-reliance. Cabral emphasized the need for self-reliance as against reliance on foreign aids. The history of the development of most of the countries in the Asian world is traceable to their reliance on endogenous development instead of relying on foreign aids. Instead of foreign aids, they rather opened their countries to foreign direct investment, trading with the world best industrialized countries (Izagbo 2012). That explains the industrialization taking place in these countries. The problems with the African states is that they focus more on the financial benefits derived from their trade with the developed countries rather than also imbibing the technological and scientific expertise that are available in the international market.

According to Finch and Michalopoulos:

...effective participation in international trade permits economies of scale not open to small protected economies. By introducing greater market competition, it encourages a more efficient utilization of resources and greater growth in productivity in the whole economy. Moreover, open trading policies permit quicker adaptation to new technologies and greater flexibility in responding to international economic development (Finch and Michalopoulos 1988: 132).

A country should rather get involved in trade at the international market, focusing more on the technical knowledge and scientific know-how that could be learned or borrowed to meet the internal demand for industrialization, growth and development. Growth in the economy is only meaningful if it is used to improve the standard of living of the people. Cabral argued for a country's self-reliance in the global market. In other words, a country's involvement in the international market should be such that it has goods to offer and it is able to diversify its export market so that it does not rely on development assistance (foreign aids). Dependence on foreign aids and foreign loans is one of the evils that have befallen the post-colonial African states. In consonance with this idea of self-reliance is the claim that "no external advantages can supply the place of self-reliance; the force of one's being, if it has any, must necessarily come from within (Kiawi and Mfoulou 2002: 12). Despite several developmental projects implemented in Africa with foreign aids, the African economy is

still deteriorating, with poverty characterizing every facet of African life (Abrokwa 1999: 656). The inability of foreign aids to serve as an engine of development was underscored by Julius Gatune. According to him:

Underdevelopment has been the reality for Africa over the past 50 years. The development projects undertaken after independence and underpinned by Western aid have largely failed to deliver. Aid has been disbursed in the trillions, but the statistics have deteriorated in tandem. For instance, the high income per capita growth of 2.2 percent experienced in the 1960s plunged to 0 percent by the end of 1970s, averaged -1.76 percent between 1981 and 1985, and stayed in negative territory until 1995 (Gatune 2010: 103-104).

The proposed thesis that self-government (independence) was a prerequisite for development has been defeated since the 50 years of post-independence has not been able to justify the connection between self-government or freedom and development in Africa. Without 'radical' ideology for development, foreign aids were supplied as largesse to the African continent without any visible proof that these aids have been utilized to improve the living condition of the people. The discourse of foreign aids and African development has created two opposing camps. The first camp believe that foreign is responsible for Africa's underdevelopment (Easterly 2005) while the second camp holds that Africa would have gone into extinction, due to the unfortunate circumstances Africa inherited upon independence, without foreign aids (Sachs et. al. 2004; Collier 2006; Gatune 2010).

Therefore, the ethics of development is necessary to curb the evil of underdevelopment in Africa. The two components of the ethics of development are: First, the people are not to be treated as means only but ends in themselves. In other words, all forms of legislations and policies must be such that they contribute to the welfare and wellbeing of the people. If they cannot improve their standards of living, they must not diminish their capacity for self-development, self-reliance, self-actualization and self-satisfaction. Second, development should be pursued primarily with self-reliance which entails the reliance on the internal dynamism of a country or a people to develop rather than predicating their development on foreign aids and loans.

5. Conclusion

The point that must be re-emphasized again is that development only makes meaning if the peoples' lives are bettered and if the people are not disadvantaged by the development policies. Allusion must not just be made to short-term or long-term implications of development. The focus should be on policies that really advanced the lives of the people. If the policies do not make the people better both on the short-term and long-term, they must not destroy the capabilities of the people to advance their own well-being. African political leaders should rise up to the task of embracing the concept of the ethics of development. Development must not just be pursued; there must also be an integration of moral framework with which development ideologies should operate. Both Kant and Cabral provided convincing arguments on pursuing development within an ethical framework with the people being the means and the end of development. At the level of the international politics, it could be argued that no country should use another country as the means to its own ends (development).

References

- Abrokwa, K. C. (1999). "Africa 2000: What Development Strategy?", *Journal of Black Studies*, (29), 646-668.
- Astroulakis, N. (2013) "Ethics and International Development: The Development Ethics Paradigm", *East-West Journal of Economics and Business*, 16 (1), 99-117
- Barcalow, E. (1994) *Moral Philosophy: Theory and Issues*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- Cabral, A. (1972) *Revolution in Guinea: Selected Texts*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cabral, A. (1973) *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*. New York: Monthly Review Press
- Cabral, A. (1980). *Unity and Struggle*. London: Heinemann
- Chabal, P. (2003). *Amilcar Cabral: Revolutionary Leadership and the People's War*. London: Cambridge University Press
- Collier, P. (2006). "African growth: Why a Big Push?", *Journal of African Economies*, (15, Suppl. 2), 188-211.
- Crocker, D., (2008) *Ethics of global development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Dower, N. (1988) "What is development? - A philosopher's answer", *Centre for Development Studies Occasional Paper Series*, 3, Glasgow: University of Glasgow.
- Easterly, W. (2005). "Reliving the '50s: Poverty Traps, the Big Push, and Takeoffs in Economic Development", *Center for Global Development Working Paper 65*, Washington, DC.
- Elegido, J.M (2004) *Fundamentals of Business Ethics: A Developing Country Perspective*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Finch, D. and Michalopoulos, C. (1988) "Development, Trade and International Organizations", in: Anne O Krueger (ed.), *Development with Trade: LDCs and the International Economy*. San Francisco, California: ICEG, pp. 121-139.

- Gasper, D. (2006) "Introduction: Working in development ethics – a tribute to Denis Goulet", *Éthique et économique/Ethics and Economics* 4(2): 1-24.
- Gasper, D. (2009) "Development Ethics and Human Development", *HDR Networks, Issue 24, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague*
- Gasper, D. and Truong, T. (2005) "Deepening development ethics: From economism to human development to human security", *The European Journal of Development Research*, 17(3), 372–384.
- Gatune, J., (2010) "Africa's Development beyond Aid: Getting Out of the Box", *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, (632), 103-137.
- Ghatak, S. (2001). *An Introduction to Development Economics* (4th ed.). London: Routledge
- Goulet, D. (1975) *The cruel choice: A new concept in the theory of development*: New York, Atheneum.
- Goulet, D. (1996) "A New Discipline: Development Ethics", *A Working Paper for the Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies*
- Goulet, D. (2006) *Development ethics at work: Explorations 1960-2002*, (ed.) Routledge: London and New York.
- Gueye, S. P. (1995) "Science, Culture and Development in Africa", *CODESRIA Bulletin, Dakar* (2), 17-20
- Hagopian, D. (1975) *The phenomenon of Revolution*. Wisconsin: Mead Company Inc.
- Izagbo, A. N (2012) *Rebranding Nigeria: Leadership and the National Image Project*. Ikeja: Crowns Media Limited.
- Kant, I. (1778/1949) *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. Thomas Kingsmill Agbbolt. Indianapolis: Library of Liberal Arts
- Kayode, F. (2002). "Refocusing Economic Development: The Holy Grail of Economics and Economist?". *University Lecture, University of Ibadan, Ibadan*
- Kiawi, E. C. and Mfoulou, J. (2002) "Rethinking African Development: Social Science Perspectives", *CODESRIA Bulletin*, (1&2), 12-17
- Okigbo, P. (1981), *Essays in Public Philosophy of Development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Co. Ltd.
- Osabuohien, E. S. C. (2010) "Technological Innovations and Africa's Quest for Development in the 21st Century", in: Ndubuisi Ekekwe (ed.) *Nanotechnology and Microelectronics: Global Diffusion, Economics and Policy*. New York: Information science reference, pp. 382-398.
- Sachs, J. D., John W. M., Guido, S., Margaret, K., Chandrika B., Michael F., and Gordon M. (2004). *Ending Africa's Poverty Trap*, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Shaw, W. H & Barry, V (1995) *Moral Issues in Business*. (6th ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Solomon, R. C (1984) *Morality and the Good Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thomas, A. (2000) "Meaning and Views of Development", in: Allen, T and Thomas A. (eds.) *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century*. UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 23-48.
- Todaro, M. P. and Smith, S. C. (2004). *Economic Development*. (8th ed.). New Delhi: Pearson Education.
- Tomori, S. (1995) "Evolving a New Development Paradigm in Africa", in: Onimode, B. and Synge, R. (eds.) *Issues in African Development*. Ibadan: Heinemann, pp. 78-113
- United Nations Development Program, (1994). *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. (1991) *World Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press