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INTRODUCTION

The various social forces within a state associate either fight each other politically with the aim of establishing relations, later become political forces in presence capable of influencing a new dynamic of the political class and management. of the public thing. Congolese society, which has been going through several decades, is experiencing a crisis of self-management which deeply affects all sectors of national life and does not allow it to play a significant influence internationally.

On the political and security level, complaints are coming from everywhere, despite the various reforms of political and security organizations on the one hand, and on the other hand the transition from figureheads to the exercise of power. There is also a lack of political consensus around key ideals characterized by the political fragmentation that remains rooted in the country's history of power dynamics. The less effective and less sustainable democratization process in the country could be justified by the State's failure to take into account the crucial issue of the security of people and their property.

Complaints of the regular violation of sovereignty and around the state's inability to defend territorial integrity, recurrent rebellions, secessions and military coups, suspensions of political activities and (or the establishment of a single party, party-State, the absence of a true rule of law and democracy, the absence of a medium and long-term development program for the Democratic Republic of Congo, the non-respect of the Rights of the Man, external interference keeps the Congolese State from fully playing its role and assuming its responsibility in the country's development process.

Aware of the difficulty encountered by the DR Congo in the exploitation of its Congolese system for the benefit of the international community and the small group which pilots the country, the actors of the process are struggling to succeed in this complex undertaking which is democratization.

Do we all know that the Democratic Republic of Congo since independence to date has not yet managed to meet its social obligations and build its own economic base to boost the development of the country. Often the Congolese state continues to be a predatory state or a state referring to the external model of development. Hence the destiny of the Congo is expressed in terms of a territory exploited to the detriment of the natives.

Indeed, Congolese public opinion is held hostage to a small elite or a remaining group that drives the country; it is observed that because of the petty interests of the international community dictates the orders under the pretext of supporting the country in the normalization of its political, security and economic situation, this state of affairs creates ambiguity in the governance of the country. State through a redefinition of the interference of international organizations under public policies of international aid.

In our study, we looked at the reason for the effectiveness or applicability of this process, but also the causes and consequences of the contribution of the international community to the challenges of democratization in the Congo. To this, know the impact of this reform of political organization on the internal and external level of the country.

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON DEMOCRACY

The concept of democracy is an ancient phenomenon that originated in Athens in the fifth century BC. Etymologically, the word democracy comes from
two Greek words: Demos and Kratos', the first of which means people and the second power or command.

According to the political lexicon, democracy is seen as a political regime in which the people exercise their sovereignty themselves, without the intermediary of a representative body (direct democracy) or through their representatives (representative democracy).

For Makwala quoted by Sabakinu, of his distant Egyptian and Greek origins, democracy has always been considered as a political system in which the people are sovereign. So, in this type of political system, authority comes neither from God nor from the rulers themselves, but from the people.

According to Marion quoted by Sabakinu, democracy is the only institution assuming the fragile balance between individual interest, sought by most political constructors.

According to Kapanga, democracy is linked to the idea of freedom, the simplest definition of which is government by the people and sovereignty is vested in the people and exercised directly by them or their designated representatives during elections.

De Tocqueville, for his part, defines democracy as being the power of the people, implying freedom, equality, justice, the capacity for dialogue, listening to others, tolerance, acceptance of the right to difference and respect for others.

Mottu, For his part from a moral point of view to affirm that democracy is first of all a state of mind, a way of being and behaving of a people.

As for Burdwan, Georges. Democracy is above all a fundamental value: the inalienable vocation of men to take charge of their individual and collective destiny. This is what founds the unity of democracy beyond the plurality of expressions.

It should be noted that democracy is also a form of political organization. It is a contingent political practice. In fact, democracy is also a plural notion. This is how we can encounter pluralist democracy based on the game of political parties in the membership of members and in the development of government programs on the one hand. There is single-party democracy which is, on the other hand, based on the only framework of political life which is the single party, for the definition and management of the interests of the community on the other hand.

It’s with Lincoln, Abraham. 16th/President of the United States of America that the term democracy has taken on its most popular meaning, that of ‘government of the people, by the people and for the people’. This postulates a rapprochement of views between the governed and the rulers.

Of all these definitions mentioned above, we believe that democracy, a governmental type, can be summed up in the possibility of the existence within society of conditions that ensure everyone the security, culture and ease required for their happiness.

In addition, democracy remains and remains a means of limiting the scope of action of those who govern and of materially and morally raising the standard of living of citizens.

In the context of our study, democracy is understood by Congolese men and women as the solution to all problems, in particular: political, economic, social and cultural. In this order of ideas, democracy is seen as a form of government of the city that must ensure the realization of the reasonable expectations of the people. To do this, it must be well conducted, because its poor application leads to disorder, anarchy, the non-development sought. In short, to the much condemned dictatorship.

According to G. Burdeau, democracy means: “a more open power that gives a large place to human rights”. NGOY adds to say that democracy is a permanent process of conquest of new rights and freedoms. On the one hand and on the other hand is a recalcification of social and political transformation that takes root in the mind of man.

According to MakengoNkutu; “Democracy is a political regime in which sovereignty is exercised or controlled by the people”.

This term democracy is the regime in which the people are sovereign. According to the famous formula of Abraham Lincoln, (16th President of the United States of America from 1860 to 1865), democracy is “the government of the people, by the people and for the people”.

This is one of the commonly used canonical definitions. This definition is close to the etymological meaning of the term democracy. However, this definition remains open to different interpretations, both in terms of the concrete meaning of popular sovereignty and its practical application. This is clearly apparent in view of the diversity of political regimes that have claimed and claim to be democratic.

Thus, even today, there are no commonly accepted definitions of what is or should be democracy. Some, like that of Jean Jacques Rousseau, consider that democracy cannot be represented, for the same reason that it cannot, and the will generally cannot be represented.

In general, a Government is said to be democratic as opposed to monarchical systems of one, where power is held by a single person, and on the other hand, to oligarchic systems, where power is held by a small group of individuals. Nevertheless, these oppositions, inherited from Greek philosophy (in particular from Aristotle’s classification) are today equivocal due to the existence of parliamentary monarchies. Others, including Karl Popper in particular, challenge democracy as opposed to dictatorship or tyranny, considering that it allows the people to control their leaders and oust them without resorting to a revolution.
Moreover, the term democracy does not only refer to governments, but can also designate a form of society whose value is freedom and equality.

II. PROCESS OF DEMOCRATIZATION IN DR. CONGO

The political trajectory of the Democratic Republic of Congo involves the entire Great Lakes region and beyond. It makes it possible to better appreciate the difficulties encountered by Africans in building the rule of law and in modernizing society, which constitute the fundamental objectives of the democratization process.

Congolese political history is strewn with paradoxes. Getting to know it better allows us to better appreciate the current situation of the country, which is struggling to lay the solid foundations for its development, its long-term existence, that is to say its survival in a world that sees its space shrinking every day.

The destiny of the Congo is expressed in terms of a territory exploited to the detriment of the natives. As history will show, with decolonization the brief interlude of the first democratic experience was carried away by an authoritarian power. Three decades of monolithism have consecrated the third experience of appropriation of the Congolese territory and whose convening of the National Conference was proposed as a moment of re-reading.

The objective of the work of the "National Sovereign Conference" organized in 1991-1992 was in fact to democratize Congolese society by putting an end to more than thirty years of personal power characterized by the decay of the State, political violence and the criminalization of the country's economy by a predatory and corrupt ruling elite.

This process of democratization of the DRC which is taking place just as painfully, follows several phases with the hope of breaking the cycle of appropriation of the country on behalf of an individual and the West. The main stages of this long and painful process are marked by the Popular Consultations of 1989, the National Sovereign Conference (1991-1993), the wars of 1996-2013, the Inter-Congolese Dialogue (2002) and the general elections of 2006 and those of 2011.

a) Popular Consultations

In January 1990, Marshal Mobutu decided to organize "popular consultations" where Zairians were called upon to give their opinions on the functioning of the country's institutions. The opinions gathered across the country by the President's envoys are very critical and severe. In the overwhelming majority, the Popular Movement of the Revolution (MPR-Party-State) is held responsible for the "Zairian evil" characterized by the country's "multifaceted" crisis. He is disavowed. The Zairians express their desire to see a multiparty system established.

In a speech delivered to the militants of the MPR gathered in N'sele on April 24, 1990 and drawing lessons from these popular consultations, Marshal Mobutu took leave of the MPR and thereby put an end to the "leading role of the MPR become a private fact, that is to say a simple political party.

The political pluralism proclaimed in this speech of April 24, 1990 limits to three, initially, the number of political parties which has been authorized, that is to say an integral multiparty system of three. Speaking on June 30, 1990 on the occasion of the National Independence Day, the President of the Republic Marshal Mobutu announced the calendar of the "primary elections" at the end of which the first three winning political parties would be constitutionally recognised. On this date, several dozen political party candidates have been registered. These elections will never take place, the opposition having refused to adhere to the principle of tripartism, seeing in it a maneuver by the authorities to establish what it calls a "multimobutisme".

In a manifesto, thirty-nine political parties reject the law on political parties, inaugurating with this gesture the idea of regrouping already experimented in the 1960s, which will give birth to the "Sacred Union of the Opposition" (USO) which will become the "Sacred Union of the Radical Opposition" (USOR) after the exclusion of some of its members who have switched to the "Presidential movement".

In October 1990, understanding the benefit he could derive from it, President Mobutu widened the system to full pluralism. At the same time, he announced his candidacy for the presidential election scheduled before December 5, 1991, the deadline for the expiry of his third seven-year term. The opposition could not pretend to ignore the political maneuver underlying such an enlargement. What the government was looking for was to weaken the opposition by favoring or creating microscopic political parties with a system of generalized corruption.

This strategy aimed to cause the implosion of the Zairian political system. Objective largely achieved since, in February 1991, the Ministry of Territorial Administration registered 66 political parties. This figure will be exceeded and increased to 156 at the opening of the Sovereign National Conference. One hundred and ten of these political parties will be referred to as "consensus parties", saying they are ready to collaborate with Marshal Mobutu.

The freedoms of association and opinion won, it became obvious that the definition of a new Zairian political order was essential. All that remained was to find the frame. Zaire, all opinions combined, will demand the States General of the living forces of the country.
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b) National Conference

On April 29, 1991, after much hesitation, President Mobutu called a national political conference to prepare a draft Constitution. He also entrusted him with the mission of drafting a new electoral law intended to organize free pluralist elections. Several opposition parties refuse to get involved in the formula proposed by Mobutu. They demand “his departure from power”. They propose their own formula for a “Sober National Conference” (CNS), which should be composed of “all the living forces of the Nation” and which was responsible for laying the foundations of the Third Republic.

Its schedule provides for the drafting of a new Constitution, the formation of a transitional government responsible for applying the political calendar, the organization of elections and the establishment of new institutions.

After several postponements, the work of this National Conference opened on August 7, 1991. The “Speakers”, as they were called, who numbered 1,875 delegates, came from all walks of life, namely, public institutions, parties politics and civil society. From the start of the Conference, they proclaimed the “sovereignty” of the assizes. The majority of the population adheres and supports the Speakers who believe that the death knell is sounding for the Marshal’s regime.

Full of illusions, the population believed even more in its victory when on August 15, 1992, the Sovereign National Conference which was led by Mgr Laurent Mosengwo Pansinya, then Bishop of Kisangani, elected Mr. Etienne Tshisekedi Wa Mulumba, the leader of the opposition, as Prime Minister of a government of public safety.

On August 23, the delegates to the national conference adopted a “Transition Act” which changed the name of the country and its regime. The Republic of Congo was, in this act, a federal state with a bicameral parliamentary system, as in 1960. The “constitutional commission” chaired by Mr. Marcel Liahu elaborates a constitutional text in relation, which defines the nature of the new state. It is one of the so-called “sensitive” commissions of the CNS, along with the “ill-gotten gains commission” and “the commission for assassinations and human rights violations”.

The opposition sets conditions for its participation in the elections. Its demands are considered unrealistic. For observers of Zairian political life at the time, this chronicle, which highlights the leadership conflicts at the top of the state, is a good reminder of what happened in 1960 and which pitted Prime Minister Patrice Emery Lumumba against President of the Republic Joseph Kasa-Vubu.

At the time, Marshal Mobutu decided in his own favor by removing the two personalities from power. While politicians are vying for power in Kinshasa, the population is going through one of the most tragic periods in its history. The economic crisis reached record levels, with inflation of 10,000% in 1994. Twice in a row, Kinshasa and the main cities of the country were the scene of encouraged and organized looting. A first time in September 1991; a second time in January 1993 when several hundred men were killed during security operations.

c) 1996 Liberation War

While the country had resumed hoping and waiting for the forthcoming organization of the constitutional referendum, Kivu was set ablaze under the pressure of the Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo (AFDL) led by the man no one was waiting for, Mr. Laurent-Désiré Kabila.

The war is, in reality, the logical consequence of four major political and/or geopolitical facts: the procrastination of the democratization process in Zaire and the long disastrous management of the regime of Marshal Mobutu challenge the Congolese population. (i) the genocide of the Tutsi and moderate Hutus following the assassination of President Juvenal Habyarimana in 1994. the collapse of the Zairian state, whose territory has become both the bastion of the mafia and the rear base of many foreign rebel groups for the destabilization of their respective countries, (iv) for the United States of America, the new order in Central Africa and in the Great Lakes region must be based on new so-called non-ideological leaders.

It is therefore a large and powerful coalition of Mobutu's enemies who are plotting to put an end to three decades of the Marshal's reign. All that was missing was the opportunity. She was found in September 1996 when the news of Marshal Mobutu's critical state of health and his "secret" hospitalization in Switzerland spread. Physically weakened, Mobutu was unable to manage a war and emerge victorious. This was the reasoning of the General Staff of the anti-Mobutism coalition.

Thus, the war began in April 1996, with skirmishes and intensified with attacks on towns in eastern DRC. This war and subsequent events confirmed the prediction of Mr. Jacques Delors, then President of the European Commission, according to which the 1990s risked being that of the political explosion in Africa "which will become an area of fundamental instability". With this war, the question of the future of the democratization of Zaire was posed. People were then inclined to think that the process would be accelerated. Hence the enthusiasm of all those who had been fighting for many years without success against the Mobutu regime and who thought that “things” were finally going to change.

Indeed, the war in Zaire revealed the multiplicity of power issues and strategies of national, regional and international actors. Among the actors involved in the
conflict, either in the causes, or in the effects, or even in the solutions, there are first of all the Congolese and the confrontation between Mobutism power and the opposition forces. Opposition political forces are torn between two strategies to overthrow Mobutu. For some, it is necessary to rely on the legality which follows the National Sovereign Conference. This is the strategy of the so-called “radical” or “Sacred Union” opposition formed around the UDPS under the leadership of TSHISEKEDI, the PDSC and some Lumumbist factions. For her, the post of Prime Minister is rightfully hers according to the agreements made with the “presidential movement”.

When war broke out, Mr. Etienne Tshisekedi, who was the “Leader of the unarmed opposition”, proposed the formation of a government of national unity which he would lead and which would be responsible for negotiating with the Rebel leader Laurent-Desire Kabila. But, Marshal Mobutu decides to renew Mr. Kengo Wa Dondo at the head of the government.

This government was responsible for leading the reconquest of the eastern provinces heavily occupied by AFDL forces, aided mainly by Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi. But the "total and lightning" offensive promised by General Likulia, who was the Deputy Prime Minister in charge of Defence, failed. The reconquest army was actually unorganized and ineffective.

More worrying for the power, the Zairian soldiers lack the will to fight. Especially since they no longer know in the name of which power they must fight; since the Mobutism regime reduced them to misery. They have been unpaid for several months, finding a way to live on their own and the systematic looting of areas still controlled by the government. Fleeing the fight without a fight, the Zairian defense system regularly gives way to the thrust of the Alliance forces.

Obviously, only negotiation could have saved the loyalist troops from total collapse. The emergence of the armed opposition was a new deal that considerably changed the rules of the game. The Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo believed that its military strategy, supported by political and diplomatic actions, would enable it to succeed in the liquidation of the Mobutism regime. This strategy began with the phase of political rallying to the Alliance. The AFDL or the Alliance itself was not officially formed until October 18, 1996 in Lemera Kivu, more than a month after the “official” outbreak of hostilities. The personalities who “create” it each have a history of political activism.

The creation of the AFDL constitutes the first link in the political “platform” that the political actors in Kinshasa neither expected nor had foreseen. This new force imposed itself. Laurent-Désiré Kabila has multiplied calls towards his compatriots in order to obtain their support. He counted in particular on the Lumumbists, the partisans of Tshisekedi and other political formations of Kinshasa composing “the Sacred Union”. The war is directed against all those who participated in the Mobutism management. The CNS had pointed the finger at them in the Commission on Assassinations and Violations of Human Rights as well as in the Commission on Illicit-Acquired Assets.

At the time of the conflict, the neutrality of civil society organizations is desired by the belligerents. This does not prevent the pressures from being exerted on them; especially since they happen to be witnesses to abuses or to suffer them themselves. In most cases, the Zairian NGOs defend their “little village” without however clarifying their position vis-à-vis the government whose sovereign role they have taken over, nor vis-à-vis the armed opposition considered by their leaders sometimes as an ally in the fight against the Mobutu regime, sometimes as an invader and enemy. However, local populations quickly embraced the Alliance’s “liberating discourse”.

During this time, on the military level, the strategy of the Alliance is to generalize the attacks by pushing further and further towards the West. The city of Kisangani is a capital objective on the symbolic level. The occupation of this city would also make it possible to neutralize the main rear base of the government army and to definitively register the armed struggle as the only way to access power in Zaire. It obviously remained to succeed in the conquest of the other rich provinces of the country, in particular Shaba and the two Kasai; with the foreseeable consequence of asphyxiating Kinshasa financially. And above all, it was necessary to reach Kinshasa and Gbadolite, stronghold of Mobutu.

Since it was difficult to militarily occupy all of the national territory, the Alliance’s strategy had aimed to occupy as much of the “useful” (meaning: richer) national territory as possible in order to be in a position of strength in the negotiations. However, during the course of the military campaign, the Alliance understood that it could and would win the war thanks to the support of several armed groups. Among the rallies, there are the former. Katangese Gendarmes or their descendants from Angola. Party after the liquidation of the Katangese secession in the sixties, this group is the author of two Zairian wars, the first is that of 1977 called “war of 80 days” and the second is that of 1978 or “war of six days which nearly carried away the regime. This one was saved only thanks to the intervention of the foreign armies; notably French and Moroccan and other African countries which intervened to save the autocratic Mobutism regime in 1977. The allies of the regime reproached Marshal Mobutu in his way of autocratically leading the country, demanding that he liberalize political life.

Having become the “Tigers” under the banner of the National Front for the Liberation of Congo (FNLC), the ex. Katangese gendarmes joined the AFDL after the
capture of Kisangani. The rallying was organized and facilitated thanks to the contacts that took place between Kabila and certain leaders of the FNLC who were exiled in Belgium. The “Tigers” made it possible to take the towns of Shaba and two Kasais alongside the Angolan Army.

The latter, which brings Commander Faustin Munene in "his suitcases", will be decisive for marching on Kinshasa after Kikwit and the battle of Kenge, the last stronghold or before the capital and the capitulation of Marshal Mobutu.

While the war "was in full swing", diplomacy worked and aimed to put pressure on the belligerents to bring them to a negotiating table with the powers that sponsored these negotiations wanted to make Mobutu and Kabila admit, the idea of fair sharing and balance of power. Meetings organized in Togo, South Africa and off Pointe-Noire in Congo-Brazzaville aboard a South African military vessel bearing the name Utenika, under the patronage of the United States of America and of South African President Mr. Nelson Mandela, all fail. Doubt was no longer permitted; Laurent-Désiré Kabila was convinced of his victory over the military approach.

During this time, the cities of Goma and Lubumbashi were taken by storm, at the beginning of the month of May 1997, by the Zairians of the diaspora who had come mainly from Africa, Europe and America. The emotional call of the Fatherland, which at the political invitation of the rebel leader or even a desire to concretize a project of return to the native land, these hundreds of Zairians were in fact the scouts of their compatriots for whom the victory of the The Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Congo (A.F.D.L.) would open new and interesting perspectives for Zaire; or better, the fall of Mobutu would mark the end of the dictatorship and the beginning of a new era of democracy in the country. The misunderstanding was there and the sequence of events will show it more.

When Alliance forces entered Kinshasa in single file on May 17, 1997, all hopes were high. Zaire as the denomination of the State is reanimated. The Democratic Republic of Congo restored and proclaimed by Laurent-Désiré KABILA, who declared himself President of the Republic. It therefore appears as a huge construction site where, for some, everything has to be rebuilt: these start from the idea that Mobutu inherited an organized and prosperous State, which he completely ruined and destroyed in three decades of reign. For the others, everything is to be built. In other words, the post-colonial Congolese state was never built; the Lumumbist project, the only democratic one, having been unexpectedly interrupted by the anti-national forces, it is at this level that we should resume and start.

In Kinshasa, the enthusiasm for building a modern, democratic and powerful state is at its peak. Upon their arrival, the new elites discovered the general state of disrepair of the country. All administrative, economic, social infrastructure, etc. are to be rebuilt. Kinshasa and the cities crossed by the forces of the Alliance offer the image of the places devastated by the cyclone.

The Government of Public Safety installed by President N’zéé Kabila inaugurates forum after forum to collect ideas and initiatives. The enthusiasm is general. It is within this framework that the symposium on development was organized by Congolese from the diaspora. The government’s initiative to organize a national meeting on reconstruction did not succeed; it is carried away by fratricidal conflicts.

To rebuild this vast state, the AFDL government drew up a three-year plan of more than 3 billion dollars. He asks for the support of donors. Promises are made by “friends of the Congo” in Brussels; but, they will not be held.

The waste of national resources, mismanagement, corruption and impunity form the breeding ground of Mobutism. To remedy this, we must make a kind of revolution. This does not occur, we have also witnessed the manifestation of the same practices decreed under Marshal Mobutu to the point where President Kabila did not refrain from qualifying his collaborators as a band of adventurers. And the other collaborators will dissociate themselves from him while denouncing his way of managing with the freezes of the dictator of the regime as under Mobutu.

III. Conclusion and Recommendations

Democracy in Congo-Kinshasa has brought a governance of dependence and mediocrity to power, because until then, it does not seem to be fully understood by the Congolese population following the political lack of culture of the natives: it does not apply as validly because everything would be dictated by the West or by great powers or either for the benefit of the International Community to the detriment of the Congolese people. Since all the decisions taken would come to us from the West, so it sometimes proves that there is a hand in control of the country. In other words, the DR Congo is considered a territory under the trusteeship of the International Community despite its independence.

The awareness of Congolese policies and the improvement of the behavior that Congolese politicians must display in the face of the whims of the policy of the International Community expressed by the great powers impose a broad spirit of saying no to Western hegemony. The policy of the international community which has an impact on the domination and exploitation of Congolese leaders on their soil does not allow the Congolese people as sovereigns to change the standard of living despite the democratization of the country. This policy is only intended to plunder the raw materials and create the market to sell the materials into finished products. As a result, we have found that so far:
Democracy is not yet understood by the Congolese population because of the primordial role played by Westerners in the DR Congo, which manifests itself despite the democratization of the country, as the search for natural resources by exploiting the Congolese to impoverish the population.

Interference has also manifested itself when Congolese politicians find their strength and protection in the international community, rather than in the Congolese population which gives them a mandate. It is also observed that Congolese politicians do not consider themselves equal in the face of so-called great power politicians, they work first and foremost for the international community under pressure from their overthrow from power by the West, their own both biological and political family. Congolese politicians think that the prerogative of development is the West, which means that the latter considers the DR Congo as a territory under their tutelage.

Through this study, we wanted to inform Congolese politicians and the people they manage to understand that the prerogative of development is not Western; but it is a question of the Congolese taking their destiny in hand, because no state in the world has received a mandate to develop another state.

Therefore, we suggest to the Congolese authorities to have ethics, to work first for Congo-Kinshasa, because it is their one and only wealth, and also to find their strength and protection only in the Congolese people; because he is the only one who has the power to give mandate to Congolese politicians. The Congolese authorities must understand that international relations are made on the basis of interests, that is to say, States have no soul, only national interests that concern them; so here the domination and exploitation of one people by another is natural in the sense that States are looking for territorial integrity, the permanent and perpetual survival and ultimately the survival of their culture and their population. So the development of one country does not depend on the other, because we repeat in this study that no country in the world has received a mandate to develop the other. Hence the Congolese democracy, which must be a "democracy of palaver" must be built not only on the method based on permanent dialogue, or at least on the Congolese palaver which is its original model; but, also, relies on the positive contributions, the basic principles of liberal democracy adapted to Congolese community realities in order to build and develop true Congolese democracy as the name of the country "Democratic Republic of Congo" indicates. To remedy this, institutionalization remains the only criterion for the development of the DR Congo. This institutionalization will suppose the achievement by a system of a high level of adaptability, complexity, autonomy, and cohesion. Because it is said that development is an observable phenomenon of all ages of humanity.
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