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Abstract—The political and societal orders face the awesome task of overcoming the difficulties which lead to growing tensions and conflicts in Africa. At the core of analysis is the question, how stable and adaptable are established democracies, new democracies, and political and societal actors? The idea of development-democracy, as implying the strong linkage between economic development and political democracy, appropriately describes the distinguishing characteristic of this new demand for democracy in Africa. The theoretical study examines the political and philosophical foundation of the idea of development-democracy and the arguments presented to support the need for its adoption in Africa today. This paper critically examines the polemic between the advocates of developmental dictatorship and developmental-democracy and argues for the adoption of the latter in Africa. The paper sets out to expose for the political and philosophical foundation of developmental democracy maintaining that only democracy can facilitate development. This argument is supported further by the claim that both democracy and development are two sides of the same coin in the sense that the two are both ethical concepts. The paper also maintained that the only way by which democracy is worthwhile is when it is developmental. Finally the paper affirms that since the two concepts of democracy and development are like Siamese twins then the way out of Africa’s present crisis of development is to wholeheartedly embrace democracy. It posits that when genuine democracy is adopted, genuine and sustainable development can then be attained.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of developmental-democracy is precisely an ideological contrasting proposition of developmental-dictatorship. Developmental-dictatorship was presented in the first decade of post-independence Africa as the best model for realizing the goal of economic transformation of these new states in world politics. Advocates of this viewpoint argue that authoritarian rule is a worthy sacrifice because of its capacity to promptly and effectively transform the material situation of the ordinary people. It was this ideological argument that sustained authoritarianism for so long in the African society and brought about the fizzling away of the first tempo of democratisation in the early days of post-colonial Africa. The latest agitation for democratic governance in the continent is essentially an indirect desire to realize development which has eluded Africa throughout its post-independent history. This new clamour for democracy is a response to the failure of authoritarian regimes throughout the continent to facilitate development which was the reason for its toleration in the first years of the history of African nation states as independent countries. There is therefore, emerging in the last two decades a consensus that “Africa cannot deal with the crisis of underdevelopment without embracing democracy, at any rate, abandoning the legacy of authoritarianism” (Ake 1996:82).

But in the last two decades the support for democratic governance has been unprecedented. And the reason for this new clamour for democracy has to do with the empirical evidence that dictatorship far from facilitating development stifles it. The failure of authoritarianism to bring about the expected transformation, more than any factor, is responsible for the strong often-violent-agitation for democracy in the last two decades of Africa’s history. Rather than creating the enabling environment for national cohesion, social mobilization and economic growth, authoritarianism brought misery, squalor and complete loss of the fundamental inalienable rights of the citizens. It is this overwhelming African crisis of development that prompted the impoverished citizens to turn round to behold the other side of the ideological spectrum and begin to ask for their human and democratic rights, which include the joint ownership of the commonwealth. As Claude Ake appropriately describes the recent democratic turn, it is, “among other things, an expression of the will to survive. The survival strategies which ordinary people spontaneously devised to cope with economic austerity and to reduce their vulnerability to a predatory state…” (Ake 1992:4). The massive failure of the developmental project by the authoritarian regimes of Africa, combined with the similar dismal performance and eventual collapse of authoritarian communism in Eastern Europe, provided empirical evidence for the position hitherto repressed, that democracy facilitates economic advancement and social enhancement more than other forms of government.
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But for a long time to come, the debate in discourse about the more suitable form of governance between democracy and authoritarianism for promotion development shall persist, particularly in Africa. And if care is not taken, the failure of many pseudo-democratic regimes to provide the good life for the people may become a ready weapon against democracy, which can ultimately lead to the unpopularity of this mode of governance. In this respect it is therefore necessary to provide a solid case for a genuine, rather than the pseudo democracy. It is the genuine form rather, than the pretentious one that can facilitate material improvement for the people and merit the lofty appellation of “developmental-democracy”. In order to avoid a situation where the counterfeit version of democracy would be paraded, as an instance of democracy’s incapacity to facilitate development, therefore, genuine democracy ought to be argued for, particularly within the context of the prevailing overwhelming African predicament.

In this respect, the aim of this paper is to analyse the philosophical foundation of developmental-democracy. To what extent will the ethos of democracy produce an atmosphere that is facilitative of economic growth, social stability, peaceful co-existence and all the positive transformations that the ordinary people in Africa are yearning for? The argument of this paper is that democracy does not only facilitate development, but that the two ideas-democracy and development-are two sides of the same coin. Development and democracy are like Siamese twins with a symbiotic existence. The life of one depends on that of the other, in such a way that independent existence of any one of the two is not possible. The ideological underpinning of ‘developmental-democracy’, which is that there is a strong synthetic linkage between economics and politics, is what this paper is out to underscore. The bottom line of our argument in this paper is that the two important and desirable values of sustainable democracy and development can be realized within one ideological platform and that is if the hitherto neglected ethical aspect of both is given serious consideration.

The essential proposition of this paper is that the goal of sustainable development and democracy has been elusive in Africa because we have been operating as if the two ideas, development and democracy are independent. Secondly, and most importantly, developmental-democracy has been elusive in Africa because the ethical dimension of the two concepts has been consistently ignored. The strong linkage between democracy and development becomes more manifested if the ethical connection of the two is revealed. In essence genuine democracy and proper development can only be attained if they are both seen as ethical ideas. The prevalent conception of the two as ethically neutral is responsible for the failure of the two interrelated projects of development and democratisation, particularly in Africa. The paper concludes by affirming that the related values of sustainable democracy and development, that is, an enduring and self-sustaining development and democracy, can only be attained if both projects do not neglect their ethical essences.

II. DEVELOPMENT DEMOCRACY: CONCEPTS, THEORY AND ARGUMENTS

The idea of ‘developmental-democracy’ as we have earlier indicated is a dialectical anti-thesis of the idea of ‘developmental-dictatorship’ in the sense that it conceptualizes and represents the belief that democracy engenders and is facilitative of development more than the authoritarian form of government. Indeed, the history of political discourse in the Third World, short as it may be, has been the history of the dialectical struggle for prominence and adoption between democracy and dictatorship, which necessitates the coinage of the two dialectically opposed concepts of ‘developmental-dictatorship’ and ‘developmental-democracy’.

It should be noted that ‘Developmental-dictatorship’ in the Third World political literature gained popularity in the early part of post-independent era when developmental project was indeed a priority project. During this period, it is true to say that from all sectors of the ideological spectrum-left, centre, right-analysts asserted or conceded the historical necessity of developmental-dictatorship to cope with the causes and consequences of economic underdevelopment (Sklar 1987:686). The argument that was then popular is that democracy, unlike authoritarianism, will give room for differences, diversities and official opposition that can be diversionary and make the society lose focus of the important ideal of development. The argument continues that inasmuch as national cohesion and social mobilization are all expedient for development, that is, economic growth then democracy becomes a liability and ought to be jettisoned in the meantime by the Third World countries in order to face squarely the ultimate goal of modernization.

The modernization school, as the advocates of this viewpoint became identified, presented the argument that the need for economic growth in the Third World demands that the dictatorial regimes should be tolerated and mass participation should be discouraged. The viewpoint of this school is essentially that democracy should be compromised for a more important deal of economic growth. Political participation would be detrimental to social savings or capital accumulation for productive investment as opposed to mass (Sklar: 1987:709). Despot rule, because of the more important value of modernization, was supported and allowed. With this conscious desire to alleviate the suffering of the ordinary people of the Third World, the consensus of opinion in the sixties is that the evil of authoritarianism ought to be tolerated for the goodies of development. Gradually and steadily, the light of democracy began to get dim and the political theoreticians consistently rationalize and justify the necessity for this democratic recession.

The idea of ‘developmental dictatorship’ of putting development first and democracy second, is a contractual agreement between the people and the rulers. The term of the contract is very clear-that the people should forgo their rights and freedom for the good life that authoritarianism promises. It is just a bargaining of their rights for the promise of the
basic needs. The failure of these tyrants to fulfill the promise of the material goodies will necessarily imply the re-visitation, if not the outright dissolution, of the agreement. So ‘developmental-dictatorship’ in Africa became obviously a ruse as dictatorship, rather than improve the life of the ordinary citizens, worsens it. This failure of dictatorship to promote development is responsible for the yearning for democracy in the latter part of the last century by the ordinary people of Africa. Claude Ake graphically describes the crisis of development and the agitation for democracy thus:

The democracy movement has gathered momentum as commodities disappeared from the grocery stores in Lusaka and Dar es Salaam, as unemployment and inflation got out of control in Kinshasa and Lagos, as a bankrupt government failed to wages in Cotonou… (Ake 1992:4)

The point we are making is simply that just as realism necessitated the prominence and acceptance of dictatorship in the early days of independent Africa, so is the same reality demanding for its expulsion. The falsification and contradiction of the arguments of ‘developmental-dictatorship’ by social experience push the arguments of ‘development-democracy’ into the limelight today. (Ake 1992). Having experienced the incapacity of this system of government and how it not only stifles economic growth, but also flagrantly violates and abuses the rights and dignity of the people, the ordinary people of Africa can therefore no more tolerate this dictatorial government that neglect their rights and failed to give them the promised improvement of their standard of living.

The arguments for developmental-democracy therefore remerged particularly within the context of a crisis of development in Africa. This is a crisis that seriously implicated the various dictatorial regimes in the continent. The experience now brings into clear perspective the fact, hitherto unappreciated, that for genuine development as a holistic and all encompassing idea to be realized, there must be equitable access to power, resources, privileges and opportunities for self and communal development. All these conditions for development can only be possible within a democratic structure. In other words, the crisis of development in Africa and many Third World countries has made it obvious that searching for development in an undemocratic society is like embarking on a Sisyphean task. The argument that democracy furnishes development more than dictatorial government is therefore becoming very popular today.

The question that we need to ask is this: why is democracy suddenly becoming acceptable to those who seek the good life, particularly in Africa? The answer is obvious. Social experience has now brought into critical focus the hasty conclusion, reached in the years immediately after independence, that dictatorship can engender development. At the point that this fallacy was being committed, the anxiety for modernization and economic growth blinded the people from realizing that genuine and enduring development, that is, what the ancient Greek thinkers call the good life in its multidimensional essence cannot be realized if the people are not allowed the freedom to operate. The experience of the last three decades in Africa register in the minds of the people that democracy and genuine development in their holistic sense are not opposed but strongly related.

The new arguments for democracy as being facilitative of development began with a re-conceptualisation of the concept. Democracy is now defined simply as a situation where sovereignty rests with the people. This conceptualisation is indeed loaded and should therefore be carefully decoded and this has been done vigorously in recent times. By this definition of democracy as sovereignty of the people, we are referring to the mode of governance in which the people rule by participating in the process of governance or, for the sake of expediency, expect those who rule to be responsive and accountable to them. This definition of democracy implies the affirmation of two important values, which are the empowerment of the people and the accountability of the government officials. With those values, there is no way that the people will not be protective of their interests, with the most important of those interests being the good life, otherwise regarded as development. The point is now very clear that if democracy is about the rule of the people then development will be topmost in the agenda of any genuinely democratic system. Indeed if democracy is sincerely the rule of the people and it is allowed to be so, then democracy stands and survives pursuing this single agenda; that is, the positive development of the commonwealth so that the people can benefit maximally from it.

The summary of the arguments presented so far, for the adoption of democracy as a vehicle of development shall now be presented. Democracy is essentially a mode of governance that respects and ensures the promotion of the fundamental human rights of the citizens, such as freedom and equality of all. Democracy is also about various rights of the people. This includes the right to be involved in the process of policy making, the right of the majority to rule, and the right of the minority to nurse and voice their dissent and disagreement. In this type of atmosphere differences can be managed to produce consensus and a community of citizens can emerge, fostering national cohesion and common interests that can be jointly promoted by even parties who are not of the same orientation. The conclusion therefore is that the overall national development can be fostered more by a cohesive civil society that can moderate the excesses of the state than one with a monolithic culture, where only the interests of the powerful or the elite are identified as communal interests.

In as much as democracy respects the right of the individual to rule, protects the interest of the individual to benefit maximally from the product of their labour and ingenuity, allows the market forces to control the economic activities and strictly and constantly makes the state officials to be accountable to the ordinary people, the atmosphere for
economic growth is created. Within such a context social relation is managed by a consistent and equitable idea of social justice, which will constantly facilitate social order, and peaceful coexistence that is necessary for the people and the state to pursue both micro and macro-economic interests that will promote economic growth. Most importantly, democracy is development in the sense that it creates a legitimate government that gives the moral strength for the rulers to operate. Democratic legitimacy is indeed a morale booster that encourages the state to mobilize all the people for development. A democratic state is one that rules according to the general will, to use the language of Rousseau, where all men are morally compelled to obey such a legitimate authority.

The claim that democracy will facilitate development is even an understatement. The reason why it has taken so long for people to appreciate that democracy is the only means to development is because people assume erroneously that development means mere economic growth. But development is more than that. It refers to the overall transformation of all aspects of the human life such that the individual is contented and at peace with the other members of the society. While it includes economic advancement, it does not end with that. Precisely, the ideal of the good life for the individual, which the Greek philosophers talk about, is the idea of development. Development is indeed a holistic concept, an encompassing idea that includes political advancement and sophistication, which can only be brought about by the democratic mode of governance.

The second reason democracy is not seen as facilitative of democracy is because most of the regimes that claim to be democratic are not. When such pseudo democratic regimes are found not to be engendering development, the wrong impression that democracy cannot bring about development shall be formed. The truth is that genuine democracy is too demanding and once all the conditions are put in place, development automatically follows. Indeed it is only through a government that is genuinely democratic that the kind of positive transformation that characterizes development can be realized.

Therefore, it is a trite to argue that democracy is development. Indeed, certain component of democracy “is an important aspect of what it means to be developed” (Ake 1996:76). In this respect, rather than belabour the position that democracy enhances development, we should affirm the obvious fact that democracy is about development and development is about democracy. As Claude Ake suggests, what we need to emphasize is “the democratisation of development and the development of democracy that is the deepening of the democratic experience in every sphere. This produces a new set of development strategies”…(Ake 1996:86).

The argument that democracy facilitates development has been taken a step further with the position that democracy does not only facilitate development, but it is also equivalent to development. In other words, development is about democratisation; that is, taking the good conditions of life to all the members of the polity. What we are saying in essence is that a society only becomes really and fully developed only if the transformations are being enjoyed by the totality of the populace. The only genuine and durable development is the one that benefits the totality of the populace. Development that still presents a situation of haves and have-not is not sustainable because, sooner or later, the poor will not make the rich to have the peace and order necessary for the enjoyment of the so-called development. This position, which we hope to develop further in this paper, shall be improved by our new argument that the strong relationship between democracy and development will become clear if the ethical connection of the two is considered. This is precisely what we intend to do in the next section.

III. THE ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT

The fact that democracy is a moral concept may not be controvertible, but definitely the idea that development is not morally neutral can be seriously contested. But it is the ethical essence of the two ideas that explains their proximity to one another. When we say that democracy is an ethical concept, we have in mind the idea of ethics as respect for the rights of others, in order to guarantee that our own right shall also be respected. Development, if it is liberated from the shackles of its misconception as mere material acquisition, will also reveal itself as an ethical concept. Development is essentially equivalent to what the Greek philosophers call the good life. And since the issue of goodness always belongs to the realm of ethics, we cannot but appreciate the fact that development is an ethical concept. This is the point that Etuk seems to be making when he says:

If development is good, that is if development in itself is something that is universally desirable and if the proper focus of development must be the human beings who constitute not only the agents but also beneficiaries of development, then clearly we must be seen to be involved with ethical concerns since the question of what is good for men have always belonged to the realm of ethical discourses (Etuk 1998:279).

The need for us to affirm the ethical essence of development is now gaining currency in recent times. This new paradigm shift may be borne out of the recognition of the fact that for development to be sustainable it has to genuinely reflect in the lives of all members of the society that lay claim to it. This urgent need was brought home by the new environmental challenge. It has been recognized in recent times that all the stuff about development is more of over-exploitation of the environmental resources than any other thing. Our use of the environment is so imprudent that if care is not taken nature will lose its naturally endowed capacity to replenish itself due to the so much pressure we exert on it in order to satisfy our material needs. In the anxiety to get developed our technological age has invented means and technique to take from nature more than what it can offer,
without it getting destroyed or losing its potency for self-replenishment. It is this environmental challenge that originated the idea of sustainable development in replacement for mere development that we have been familiar with in the discourse of development. Sustainable development as a concept brings into focus the need to emphasize the moral essence of the idea of development. It has been defined as development that takes into consideration not only the interests of other humans whether living or unborn but also the capacity of nature to replenish itself. Sustainability is therefore about a developmental process that can sustain itself. It has in mind a long-term and enduring project, one in which the chances of successor generations to enjoy the same benefits are not compromised by the egoism of the present generation. It is therefore meaningful now to talk of a good or moral development and a bad or immoral development.

In actual fact, whether a particular process of development is moral or immoral does not depend only on whether it is environmentally friendly or not. The ethics of any process of development depends on a number of factors according to the contemporary scholars who are championing this new paradigm shift. The development ethicists as they are called believe that all efforts and projects of development should be critically examined to know whether or not their means and ends are good or bad. Development is considered as good if it is humane and just. A project of development must not be seen as destructive of cultures or individuals (Goulet 1998:162). In this respect, development cannot be mere economic growth or material improvement alone; it must be demonstrated that the new situation is commonly shared that there is equality, equity and fairness in the process of development. Development is therefore not merely an economic concept but also a very political and therefore ethical idea since, as Aristotle says, ethics is the culmination of politics.

Development in this respect does not mean that a particular society has made material improvement alone. Efforts should be made to ask whether or not that goal has been achieved through the over-exploitation of some underprivileged people. Before the development of a society can be determined, there is the need to know whether the new benefits are equitably distributed or not, whether all the members of the society are partaking in this new celebration or just a few are the beneficiaries of it. It is also necessary for any project of development not to be externally determined. The real people who need the development must determine what their conception of development is. It is only when the culture and values of the people are considered that the new change will make meaning to them. It is only when the new things introduced are consistent with the value system of the society that is being developed that they can really appreciate it and accept it as promoting their own idea of the good life. In essence, development can only be considered ethical, sustainable and worthwhile only when it is effected without treating any individual or group as a means, but as an end in itself, to adopt this Kantian phrase. Also real development is attained only when the beneficiaries are made to enjoy the objects of their desire and not values and taste that are externally determined.

In affirming the idea of development as being ethical, we have returned back to the issue raised earlier that the only form of development is the one that is democratic. The argument we are presenting is this: if it is only a development process that takes into consideration the interests of all parties involved, that is, ethical, genuine and sustainable; if it is only a form of development that is equitable, just and takes into consideration the values and taste of all the beneficiaries-that is, genuine and worthy of the name development, then it is logical to conclude that the only kind of development that is genuine is the one that is democratic. What we are saying is that development is ethical if it is democratic. But there is an issue hanging that we need to clarify and that is that democracy itself is ethical. We think that this proposition is rather easy to defend. In fact, it is easier to defend this than the proposition that development is ethical. This has been engaging our attention since.

The idea of democracy in totality is indeed an ethical idea if ethics is about goodness and also about the good of all members of the community, then democracy is the most ethical of all systems of government. Ethics has been defined as men’s endeavour to harmonise conflicting interests, to prevent conflict when it threatens, to remove conflict when it occurs and to advance from the negative harmony of non-conflict to the positive harmony of cooperation” (Perry 1993). If we analyse this definition of ethics critically, we will appreciate that there is no system of government that strives to ensure harmony and reconciliation of divergent interest as democracy.

Democracy as a system of government is essentially about the participation of all in the process of decision-making that concerns all members of the polity. There is no way to realize harmony as to allow everybody to articulate their interests and defend them in a dialogue with all other members of the community. Nothing brings harmony as the feeling that you are not left out of the decision-making process. Even if one’s views are not accepted as it often happens, the feeling that your consent has been sought and that the decision reached came from consensus rather than force is enough to make the individual to be at peace with the system. This will obviously promote harmony rather than resentment that would be expected when one’s views were not sought before the final decision was made. Democracy as a system of government which facilitates majority rule and minority rights is therefore the most ethical and the bet way for promoting the good life for all that ethics is all about.

Every aspect of democracy manifests this ethical nature. Democracy is in fact the only means of achieving justice and justice is considered by the Hellenic tradition as the highest virtue. How can you ensure that justice, equity and fair play is
maintained at all times? This is the question at the heart of both ethics and politics. Democracy seems to have the most viable answer to this and therefore the most ethical of all modes of governance. Democracy operates and develops as an effort to ensure social justice in the society. It is precisely a desire to ensure full participation of all the members of the society and when this is impossible or unrealisable, democracy demands that the privileged people chosen to represent the people should be responsible, responsive and accountable to the totality of the society. In this respect, justice is done because the individual is treated fairly by being allowed to articulate his interests. Even when expediency does not allow him to be part of the decision making process, he is allowed to select those who will represent him and defend his interests. The representatives are expected at all times to be accountable to him. There is no other possible means of realising justice and fairness as to involve the individual to be part of all decisions that concern him/her.

The ethics of democracy is also underscored by its strong respect for the freedom, choice and responsibility of the people. Ethics as we know is about the freedom and reason to choose what is considered as the best line of action. It is also about the responsibility of the individual to pay for his action or in action. There is no system that allows for this freedom of choice and responsibility as democracy. Democracy is the only system of human organisation that gives expression to this moral nature of humans. It allows human beings to choose what they want and makes those who have to decide for others to be responsible to those they represent and also to stand morally responsible for wrong and bad actions. It is precisely this morality of democracy that informs the contention that the idea is not about a mode of human administration alone but also a view of legitimation.

Democracy is said to be a theory of legitimation, in the sense that it guarantees that those who are chosen to rule have the mandate and consent of the people and therefore acceptable by them. Their decisions are not interpreted as having ulterior motive, rather the discretion exercised by the representatives is considered to be in the interests of the generality of the people that they represent. In this way a democratic government is considered legitimate and always acceptable to the masses. This is indeed the ideal way to ensure the harmony and social order that is the purpose of ethics. The democratic system is ethical because it is the most effective system of ensuring the moral obligation of the citizen to obey the state laws. It is also the means of ensuring social order social justice and harmony. Precisely, it is at this point that the ethical nature of ethics meets with the moral nature of development. Democracy remains the only system that can guarantee genuine development because of its capacity to ensure social justice, order, harmony and, also, the rule of law. All these conditions as we know, are necessary and imperative for genuine and sustainable development rather than mere economic growth that dictatorship can produce sometimes and later squander through its immoral and arbitrary tendencies.

The ethics of development therefore will necessarily be the point of convergence between it and democracy that is if such a democracy is genuine and therefore ethical.

At this point we can ask whether the idea or phrase "developmental democracy" is an oxymoron or not, whether it is a combination of two strange bedfellows as some people may be tempted to say. The answer is easy and has been answered in this paper. Precisely our answer is that the two are not only related but are Siamese twins, with the two sharing the same vital organs and therefore cannot be separated without jeopardising the “lives” of both. We have maintained consistently in this easy that the political variant of development is democracy while the overall positive transformation of every aspect of the life of a citizen is the idea of development or sustainable development as some people would like to call it. In this respect the concept developmental-democracy is not an oxymoron, rather we can call it a tautology in the sense that it is impossible for development to be realised and be enduring without being democratic. The concept of developmental-democracy is therefore tautological for a purpose, the purpose being the underscoring of the fact that there cannot be one aspect without the other. Just as there cannot be a genuinely democratic system without development, so is it true to say that any development that is not democratic is not going to be sustainable.

The challenge of sustainability is also the connecting link between the two concepts of development and democracy. Sustainability as we know is an ideal. Developmental-democracy is therefore the idea that guarantees the sustainability, of both democracy and development particularly in Africa that has been described as the graveyard of democracy. There is also the fear expressed throughout the world today that the process of development as it is being pursued cannot be sustainable, because it is unethical. It is this that informs the need for the development of the idea of developmental-democracy. Developmental-democracy guarantees that if the two projects of democratisation and development are jointly pursued, their sustainability can be realised. This is because development cannot be sustainable if it is not democratic and democracy cannot be sustainable if it is not development oriented. In essence when the two projects are genuinely and jointly promoted their stability and sustainability can be assured. It is this assurance that shall inform our conclusion in this paper, which is that developmental-democracy, is an imperative that can guarantee the resolution of Africa’s overwhelming crises.

IV. CONCLUSION: THE IMPERATIVE OF DEVELOPMENTAL-DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA

This study is a theoretical analysis of the concept of developmental-democracy as a synthesis of the two ideals of development and democracy. In our analysis of this concept, we have arrived at some conclusions. First, we realised that both democracy and development are eternally connected such
that a genuine pursuit of one will lead to the other. Second, we realised that any form of democracy that is not developmental or vice versa is not genuine because the ethical tendency of the two will always bring them together. Third, we realised that the genuine desire to sustain either democracy or development will necessarily guarantee the sustainability of the other. All these conclusions become premises for our final conclusion, which is that the pursuit of developmental-democracy is an imperative in today’s Africa. The debate over the type of government that Africa should produce to facilitate the development of the society needs to terminate now because, as we have argued in this essay, the only way to genuine and sustainable development is through the democratic process.

Hence, the point about politics and ethics is always one of choice. If morality were easy and showed a clear way forward, then Africa would not have so many problems. Therefore, it is expedient to intersperse ethics with political analysis.

The crisis of development facing most countries of Africa today can only be resolved by putting in place a process of establishing developmental democracy. This will involve making a joint and related effort of liberalising both the economy and the political process. It will involve complete expansion of the democratic space to include all citizens. It shall also imply allowing all the people to participate in the public discourse, especially on the issue of how the process of development shall be realised. Most importantly the democratic project shall put in place institutions that will foster transparency, openness and accountability of all the privileged public officials. As we know most of human conflicts arise out of the feeling of injustice and inequitable distribution of resources. The best way to resolve this is to allow for open dialogue among the various groups. Simple as this may sound, it can only be possible in a democratic atmosphere. Only a democratic situation can allow for this kind of orderly bargain among groups in the society. Once a government is legitimate, it is easy for the people to trust it, open up and engage in dialogue with other members of the policies. Once this is put in place, it will be possible to attain consensus necessary for facilitating the positive transformations.

Developmental-democracy therefore is the only means through which many African states can resolve their myriad of problems and move away from the situation of the chaotic state of nature and return back to take their appropriate place as the Garden of Eden. We should warn that developmental-democracy will not come on a platter of gold; it will always come as result of torturous struggle for better conditions of life. There is indeed no easy way to democracy, but there is no alternative to it. Richard Sklar in his treatise emphasises that the alternatives to developmental-democracy “could be famine, war, pestilence and death on a fearful scale” (Sklar 1987:714). But those are not what we need today in Africa.
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