Volume 13 Issue 32
Originally issued as F4

Global Journal of human social science
Political Science
Volume 13 Issue 4 Version 1.0 Year 2013
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

The Challenges of Democracy and Neo-Liberalism and its Implications to the Politico- Economic Development of Developing Countries

By Dr. Chigozie Enwere
Turkish Nile University, Abuja, Nigeria

Abstract - This paper examines the nature, content, democratization process and challenges of the practice and institutionalization of democracy and its relationship to the political development of Africa. The paper also takes a cursory insight into how the transition process and the misapplication of democratic values have escalated the degree of poverty in African states. The greatest challenge to development in Africa is the ascendency of economic liberalization development option prescribed by World Bank and IMF to complement the consolidation of democracy in Africa, creating complex web of poverty and erosion of citizens' confidence in democracy. We discovered that in Africa, there are political institutions and elections but no democracy. The institutions of government are democratically organized, oligarchically controlled and authoritarianly enforced, creating the dynamics of sham democracy that stifles political and economic development. Also, the paper shows that the characterization of political development is often fused with the politics of modernist economic development strategy leading to the triumph of authoritarian methods of political control over democratic process. This paper concludes that the practice of democracy in Africa has led to the emergence of a new class of political elites who use state power for the actualization of self interests rather than for consolidation of the institutions and virtues of democracy. Therefore, we recommend that political leader should be educated on the virtues of democracy and the dangers of authoritarianism primarily to develop in them strong morals and habit of the heart with which to govern their countries democratically, so as to produce the institutional frameworks necesssary for the political and economic development of Third World countries.

Keywords : *democracy, development, poverty, liberalization, authoritarianism.*

GJHSS-F Classification : *FOR Code: 349901p*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2013. Dr. Chigozie Enwere. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The Challenges of Democracy and Neo-Liberalism and its Implications to the Politico-Economic Development of Developing Countries

Democracy, Poverty and Political Development in Africa

Dr. Chigozie Enwere

Abstract - This paper examines the nature, content, democratization process and challenges of the practice and institutionalization of democracy and its relationship to the political development of Africa. The paper also takes a cursory insight into how the transition process and the misapplication of democratic values have escalated the degree of poverty in African states. The greatest challenge to development in Africa is the ascendency of economic liberalization development option prescribed by World Bank and IMF to complement the consolidation of democracy in Africa, creating complex web of poverty and erosion of citizens' confidence in democracy. We discovered that in Africa, there are political institutions and elections but no democracy. The institutions of government are democratically organized, oligarchically controlled and authoritarianly enforced, creating the dynamics of sham democracy that stifles political and economic development. Also, the paper shows that the characterization of political development is often fused with the politics of modernist economic development strategy leading to the triumph of authoritarian methods of political control over democratic process. This paper concludes that the practice of democracy in Africa has led to the emergence of a new class of political elites who use state power for the actualization of self interests rather than for consolidation of the institutions and virtues of democracy. Therefore, we recommend that political leader should be educated on the virtues of democracy and the dangers of authoritarianism primarily to develop in them strong morals and habit of the heart with which to govern their countries democratically, so as to produce the instituitonal frameworks necesssary for the political and economic development of Third World countries.

Keywords : democracy, development, poverty, liberalization, authoritarianism.

I. Introduction

Democracy is a feeling or a unity of hope that the people are more powerful that the political party, even a dictatorship (Hood,2004). Democracy, therefore, embodies a faith that a more prosperous, moral and dignified way of living exists than been ruled by authoritarian regimes. Democracy represents liberty, responsibility, good standard of living devoid of extreme poverty as well as pursuit of happiness, love, tolerance and friendship. Thus, these fervors felt for these promises of democracy was more in the twentieth century when humans became more conscious to establish the best regime to achieve the general good for all.

However, ancient and modern philosophers have theorized about the best regime. During the nineteenth century, the democratic advances in America, France and Britain provided powerful evidence that democracy, not withstanding its flaws, benefited humankind in ways never before realized. So the closing decades of the twentieth century were characterized with issues and political events that led to development of democratic values and transformations that change the scope and dimension of world politics (Abba, 2006).

Therefore, in the 1990s, with the demise of communism and authoritarianism, democracy became a universal paradigm that defines the tenets of political development in Africa or lack of it. The hysterical euphoria of global democracy induced African leaders to believe that the only option to political development and economic growth or survival is the need to centralize power while democratizing the institutions of government (Roskin, Cord and Jones, 2008). In this way, much of the African states fell into sham democracy embedded in authoritarianism with single party dominance.

In their efforts to democratize, African states embark on political and economic reforms that open their economies to compete with more powerful and established industrialized nations so as to attract investment. They employ brilliant economic plans but have no idea to encourage economic development because the processes are embedded in absolute corruption. This has increased poverty and inequality in Africa which forms the backbone of political protests,

Author : Senior Lecturer/Head of Department, Political Science and International Relations in Nigerian Turkish Nile University, Abuja, Nigeria. E-mail : c.enwere@ntnu.edu.ng

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

conflicts, terrorism, civil wars and violent revolutions that stifle political development in Africa.

This study is about democracy and political development in Africa. This will help us understand how the misapplication of democratic values has created and escalated poverty rate in Africa, thereby retarding the political development of the continent.

II. Conceptual Understanding of Democracy and Political Development in Africa

Scholars have not only exerted great effort to theorize about how countries become democratic, they have also adopted a rather limited working definition of democracy. In their efforts to present a concise universal definition of democracy, the conceptual quality of democracy has been lost, since most scholars limit the definition of democracy to a set of processes.

However, Joseph Schumpeter and Robert Dahl in their attempt to define democracy spent a good deal of time elaborating the key role the leaders play in democracies and minimal role that people play. For Schumpeter, how power is acquired and political decisions are made are the key components toward understanding democracy. He therefore, defines modern democracy as "that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which people acquire power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the peoples vote", (Schumpeter, 1942).

Looking critically at Schumpeter's definition of democracy, it is pertinent to note that he is doubtful of the validity of concepts such as "the will of the people" because he argues the peoples' will are merely the ideas given to them by the leaders of which they accept and collectively support. Therefore, he asserts that the classical doctrine of democracy based on the will of the people is idealistic in its approach and fails to address the human nature properly and also does not accurately portray the modern democratic process.

Like Schumpeter, Dhal believes the characteristics that distinguishes democracy from other regimes, is that a good democracy demonstrates the quality of being completely or almost completely responsive to all its citizens (Dahl, 1971). Rather than referring to this type of regime as a democracy, Dahl uses the term "Polyarchy" because modern democracy are substantially popularized, liberalized, inclusive and extensively open to public contestation, which reflects the inclusion of individuals, groups and interests that compete in the political arena (Dhal, 1971). Dhal suggests that the roles of individuals in democracy competes with groups and common and competing interests while Schumpeter in a similar vein agrees with Dhal that the roles and will of the people are determined by the groups interest of the leaders. Therefore, their use of the term democracy has an equivalent meaning to polyachy.

Consequently, the understanding of democracy as polyachy has existed since the first formal theories of democracy appeared. Greek political philosophers reveals the important role that leaders play in installing the ideas and principles that people should embrace for democracy to prevail. Also classical democracy thinkers understand the promise of influential leaders, groups and ideologies competing for influence in a democratic regime (Aristotle, 1984).

Drawing inference from Schumpeter's conception of democracy and Dahl's conception of Polyachy, we can deduce that democracy in Africa has extended towards polyachy. A close reading of African democracy reveals the influential roles that political leaders and the ruling political parties play in shaping the peoples' ideas and political opinions. The basic feature that distinguishes African democracy from modern democracy is the responsiveness of the citizens' opinion to the preference of its leaders. For this reason, many scholars have expressed concern over the growing disconnection or separation of citizens' from the government. This explains the loss of public spiritedness in African democracies to the point of general dissatisfaction with policy performance in relation to popular expectations. Citizens show support for democracy in general but do not approve of the way government does its work (Norris 1999). Such dissatisfaction and frustration triggers off aggression, political protest, violent revolution and terrorism which characterized African democracies, because the collective behavior of political leaders and of the ruling party are authoritarian based, becoming a tool of anti-democratic objectives that is at variance with the works of modern democratic thinkers like John Locke, Montesquieu and Alexis de Tocqueville.

Modern democracy is built upon two components- rights and virtues, both of which is lacking in African democracies. Both of these components belong to the tradition of liberalism associated with the work of Locke and Montesquieu. In his discussion on the concept of right as a requisite to liberal democracy, Locke sees individuals as free agents with inherent rights, based on the premise that all persons are equal in power, freedom and in their desire for self preservation (Locke, 1998).

On the premise, Locke agrees with Thomas Jefferson that human beings are created equal and are endowed with the particular rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness (Jefferson, 1975). The acceptance of individual rights within the rubric of modern liberal democracy allow the citizens to rule themselves by selecting representatives to govern them as they would have them govern. Contrarily, the acceptance of human rights is a real challenge to African democracy because

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

the citizens are not free to consider all matters of public policy because of fear of retribution by the government.

However, because of the prominent fear that states founded only on rights would not have desirable results, Montesquieu and Tocqueville affirm that the notion of virtue will help to offset the potential abuse of rights and adequately curb zealous self interests. It will also help people to develop strong moral habits of heart with which to govern their lifes. To this effect, Tocqueville shares the same view with Ibn Khaldun that democracy should be based on a leadership of the learned, controlled by the pious and checked by the righteous for the benefit of mankind (Knoke, 1996). In many respects, these virtues complement the rights of Locke's concept of Liberalism. These imply that political leaders in democratic societies must be generous, prudent and possess noble ambition, as well as a sense of justice and intelligence, primarily for creation of national identities and establishment of political stability, civic order and ideological assumptions that underpin ideas about political development in the economic sense of development (Anderson, 1967).

For this reason, earlier characterization of political development in Africa is often fused with the politics of development. Political development was seen as buying into the modernist nation building project which was primarily identified with economic development. This in turn requires political stability and order, tended to exclude the principle focus on freedom, civic virtue and equality. This meant that in the focus on order, development in many African countries turned authoritarian.

The emphasis upon political stability as a feature of political development supports orderly political processes including frequent change. Change and its frequency are not a problem for political development in Africa; a lack of respect for democratic values and adherence to political rules is. Too often, in Africa, the claim to political stability is supported by political compulsion, resulting either in rewriting or throwing out the political rules. This in turn closes down the public space for a free determination of ideological preferences in the pursuit of economic development that might lead to lesser rather than greater political development in Africa. Orderly political process and an adherence to political rules are the guarantors of democratic values of equality based on freedom.

Political development defined in material and economic terms has frequently been the overriding theoretical concern of the governments of developing countries in Africa, and the point by which governments have attempted to legitimize their rules and policies. The goal of development defined as economic development has been predicated upon order and stability which has in turn been the major rationalization for the development of authoritarian methods of political control as well as for democratic process. By this logic, political development in Africa is restricted and out of touch with the realities of the modern world, facing toward the abyss of violent revolution, terrorism and irreconcilable political cum religious conflicts and protests.

III. The Phases of Democratization in Africa

Generally, there are three phases of democratization. In the actual processes of democratization; few countries in Africa will democratize in an orderly course from one phase to the next. The transition and consolidated processes are of special concern in the study of African democracy while the established democracy process is still a mirage to African political actors because of the fusion of authoritarianism and oligarchy in the practice of democracy, which blurs the drive towards the attainment of liberalism. The phases of democratization include.

a) Transition Process

O'donnel and Schmitter refer to a transition, as the interval between one political regime and another, even if the authoritarian regime in power is replaced by another authoritarian regime (Hood, 2004).Thus, African democratic transition process follows this various cycle of authoritarianism. The ascendency of authoritarianism in the practice of democracy in Africa is based on the assumption that African political leaders often believe that economic survival and growth need centralized power. In this way much of the African states under the guise of transition to democracy fell into authoritarianism with a single party dominance. In this way, such countries as Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Tunisia, Egypt etc end up with neither democracy nor economic growth.

On the other hand, Richard Gunther, Nikiforos and Diamandouros suggest that a true transition begins with the breakdown of an authoritarian regime and ends with the establishment of a democratic regime characterized by free elections (Hood, 2004). No doubt, transition must imply a transition from one kind of regime to another, in this case a democratic transition. Therefore, according to Steve Hood, the best definition of transition relies heavily on political circumstances that result in a transition from authoritarianism to democracy. A transition is only a transition when agreement is reached to end authoritarianism by th creation of institutions that allow for free elections. (Linz and Stepan, 1978).

b) Consolidation Process

There is no universally, accepted conceptualization of a democratic consolidation. The conceptualization varies from one scholar to the next. Adam Przeworski suggests democratic consideration is based more on economic development than any broad based consensus on democratic institutions. Based on this premise, he argues that there is no such thing as consolidation (Przeworski, Alvarez Cimonji, 1996).

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

Andreas Schedler disagrees with Przeworski as he insists that consolidation is a real phebnomenon. Scheduler sees democratic consolidation as institution building necessary to move a regime beyond mere elections toward modern Liberal democracy (Schedler, 1998). Thus,Llinz and Stepan's definition of consolidation is more widely accepted. They define democratic consolidation a a process in which a substantial majority of public opinion believes that democracy is the best way to govern society; and if governmental and non-governmental forces agree to solve conflicts as outlined by rules of the democratic process (Linz and Stepan, 1978).

This conceptualization of a consolidated democracy is useful in analyzing African democracies. In Africa, there are democratic institutions and elections but no democracy. Elections in Africa lack the credibility of fairness and it is a mere process of recycling corrupt political actors who use the state resources to intimidate opponents, and accumulate wealth and hold firm to power contrary to the wishes of the people. The problem is that African democratic elections and strides have never led to democratic stability but plagues with political instability, post election violence, emergence of dangerous militant groups and political protests or revolution as was seen in Cote d' Voir, Tunisia, Sudan, Somalia, Zimbabwe and Nigeria.

The practice of democracy has led to the emergence of a narrow stratum of political elites who are only interested in consolidating power for actualization of self interests rather than consolidation of democracy. Government officials push wasteful, unrealistic projects, stifle individual interests by introducing austere economic measures and crush critical view points. Poverty and corruption are massive. In this way, democracy is weakened and the citizens loss of confidence in democracy as the best way to govern society, thereby derailing democratic consolidation in Africa.

c) Established Liberal Democracy

We are more concerned with the transition and consolidation phases of democracy because most countries of Africa are fixated at this stage while still wrestling with the challenges of transiting to another phase. We use the term established democracy for advanced or mature democracies that are characterized by the existence of a strong notion or rights, democratic virtues and confidence that democracy has an enduring quality not found in other regimes. Hence, because of the lack of rights, virtues and enduring qualities in African democracies, African countries have not been able to move beyond the consolidated phase to transit to the advanced phase of established democracy that upholds general good and happiness for all citizens.

IV. The Impact of Sham Neoliberal Economic Policy Reforms on Democracy and Conomic Development in Africa

Obviously, the institutions, constitutions and power relations in African democracies are democratically organized, oligarchally controlled and authoritarianlly enforced leading to the ascendency of sham democracy that stifle political development in African political system. Sham democracy is the fusion of oligarchy and authoritarianism in the structure, functions and practice of democracy. It is a situation where political power lies in the conservative forces of former authoritarian leaders and where economic power remains under the control of political actors and international finance capital, bringing misery and poverty to the people rather pursuit of general good and happiness to all.

The degree of fusion of oligarchy with democracy depends on the degree of wealth distribution. If the wealth distribution is equitable, democratic values and procedures endures and prevails, but when the distribution of wealth is unequal, government and democracy will be likely to fall into the hands of a clique (Sabine and Thorson, 1973). And when this happens it will be hard to prevent abuses of authoritarian rule.

The common feature in understanding sham democracy (fusion of authoritarianism and oligarchy with democracy) is that most African democracies discourage political discourse, they may speak of political rights, but they are careful not to elaborate a specific notion of rights in any detail for fear of setting in motion calls for liberalization and true democracy. They are every suspicious of political opponents and fear circumstances that could lead to their loss of power, hence they instigate racial and religious conflicts, that are tacitly detrimental to the politico-economic development of developing countries.

Thus, the sham democratic leaders in Africa may be able to employ brilliant economic plans and policies but lack the idea on how to encourage economic growth or development. In their bid to encourage economic growth successes, they invite in outside experts to offer policy advice, needed for economic diversification and development. These experts who are familiar with liberal economic theory are consulted or engaged regardless of whether they are engineers or economists. The advice of these experts is a key reason for the numerous economic reforms in Africa which has geometrically escalated the vicious cycle of poverty, dependency and underdevelopment.

Anxious to attract foreign investment through economic freedom and liberalization, African democracies open their economies to compete with

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

more and established industrialized nations, which forms the back bone for what we today call globalization that maintains the historic unequal global rules of trade; has increased poverty and inequality in African democracies

The impact of economic liberalization, a condition prescribed by IMF and World Bank for democratization of Africa is devastating. Factors such as privatization, subsidy removal, minimal role for government in economic activities and monetary austerity lead to further poverty or misery for Africa and keep African democracy dependent on the dictates and whims of international finance capital.

However, anxious to satisfy the demands of economic liberalization and diversification, African democratic leaders become extremely corrupt, out of touch with the people and run the machinery of government for their selfish interest. For this reason, the citizens of African democracies view their elected leaders as problems and consistently show their dissatisfaction for democratic regime because democracy has failed to make people happy in Africa, thereby creating the structures for disaffection, dissatisfaction and frustration that triggers off violent protest, revolution and acts of terrorism against the state and its sham democratic institution as the case in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and even Nigeria buttressed. These acts of violence triggered off by poverty and frustration stifles and nip the political development of Africa from authoritarian regime to modern liberal democracy.

The introduction of Neo-classical liberalism as an economic catalyst to boost the consolidation of democracy in developing countries has led to emergence of a new class order, which employ the professional political and economic elites as instruments to redistribute power and wealth. These new class of elites perceive and narrow down the meaning, practice and dimensions of neo-classical economic liberalism only to what Anna-Maria Blomgren (1997) described as 'consequentialist neo-liberalism'. Thus, the economic and political elites in developing countries seem to favour neoliberal economic policies such as deregulation, privatization, monetization, subsidy removal and commercialization because of the perceived positive consequences such courses of political action will have for the overall economic development of countries in the Third World.

These policies advocate a radical roll-back of the state and the creation of a society principally governed by market mechanisms. This conviction is based on the belief that the state ought to be minimal or at least drastically reduced in strength, scope and size; and any transgression by the state beyond its sole legitimate purpose is unacceptable. Free markets and free trade will, it is believed, set the creative potential and entrepreneurial spirit which is built into the spontaneous order of any human society, and thereby lead to more individual liberty and well-being, and a more efficient allocation of resources (Hayek, 1973: 34).

Contrarily, the practical implementation of neoliberal economic policies in developing countries has created a conceptual dichotomy between democratic values and liberal economic ideals. In fact, the practice of neo-liberalism in developing countries is conceptually silent on the issue of whether or not there ought to be democracy and free exchange of political ideas. This assumption collaborates with the views of Harvey (2005) who argues that policies inspired by neo-liberalism could be implemented under the auspices of autocrats as well as within liberal democracies. But in Africa the political elites under the guise of democracy adopts authoritarian models in the practice and implementation of neoliberal economic policies, thereby creating more authoritarian economic policies that disconnect the people from high standard of living and economic self reliance.

The authoritarian nature of neo-liberalism in Africa sidestep and replace the virtues of modern democracy with the rule of experts and the relocation of power from political to economic processes, from the state to markets and individuals and finally from the legislature and executive authorities to the judiciary (Osterud et al. 2003:35). Such trend inspires the people to become more acquisitive and self-centered, thus hampering their moral development and stimulating the vices of corruption, thereby weakening the internal economic structures and solidarity in developing countries.

However, the hegemony of neo-liberalism as a dominant economic development strategy in developing countries has stimulated many African states to move away from a society marked by large room for democratic governance to a new type of society in which the conditions for politics has been severely curtailed because of the onslaught of political reforms inspired by neoliberal economic thought and theories. Thus, the radical implementation of neoliberal economic reforms through the auspices of political reforms is gradually and insidiously converting public utilities into private property and state welfares into individualism. This conversion process creates the institutional forces that drives African economy towards Rothbard's 'anarcho-capitalism' which entails the transfer of the economic powers of the state to selected and privileged elites who appropriate the resources of the state for egoistic purposes rather than for the stimulation of economic activities.

The transfer of public properties to private property owners is overtly reflected in the neoliberal policy of privatization covertly imposed on developing countries by international finance institutions. Over the last decade, privatization has been very much in vogue in developing countries as a form of development

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

strategy as well as a neoliberal panacea for correcting the pathological inefficiency of government bureaucracies in the management of public enterprises. In the first half of 1980s to 1995 more than 847 firms in West Africa were privatized. Thus, between 1988 and 1993 over 55 state owned enterprises (SOE) in Nigeria were privatized; in Ghana over 159 SOE were sold; while in countries like Cote d' Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Niger, Togo and Mali over three quarter of the SOEs have undergone the privatization process (Parker and Kirkpatrick, 2005: 513-541).

Although there has been a geometric increase in the privatization of state owned enterprises in developing nations, yet a systematic assessment of their performance indicators shows that African nations are experiencing great difficulties in implementing such neoliberal policy. This conceptual perspective has generated strong debates and controversy in developing countries, where privatization is perceived more negatively as means to placate the international finance institutions' conditions so as to attract more grants, loans and aids. While proponents of neoliberal policy see privatization as an efficient way of promoting competition and enhancing economic growth, dependent theorists argue that it makes the poor poorer by reducing the access of the poor to basic goods and services through astrological increases in prices.

In fact, privatization is seen as a liberal classical economic policy imposed on developing nations and micromanaged by International Financial Institutions (IFI) without being synchronized with the prevailing socio-economic culture. The citizens are alienated while the few privileged political and economic elites benefit by amassing wealth for themselves through the sale of public enterprises. Through this process, corruption become widespread because the minimal role of the state in stimulating economic activities or investment has created a pool of unused funds which are not invested in productive ventures but ends up in the private purse of the political actors necessary to increase their influence and prestige in the political system.

Therefore, the institutionalization of corruption in developing countries has devalued the perception threshold of the political actors to transfer the responsibility of developing their states to foreign investors in Europe and America. Particularly, African political elites and bureaucrats believe that only foreign investors can help Africa and Africans out of their economic misery and crisis of development.

Most African political actors do not see any virtue in working for the development of viable technology and industrial base to drive their economy. These political leaders travel from pillar to post in Europe and America looking for loans, grants and aids to execute infrastructural projects like roads, schools, hospitals etc, while spending next to nothing on Research and Development. Therefore, when African leaders fail to achieve appreciable success in convincing or attracting foreign investors, they give up any hope of improving the lives or living standards of their citizens and result to amassing wealth for themselves, their families and political collaborators. In the final analysis corruption becomes a norm and a compass that direct their economic and political reforms.

So, the neoliberal economic policy that helped the developed countries to modernize has become a cog that retard the wheels of development in Africa because of the inability of African political and economic elites to translate its values into the existing realties of African economic problems and political culture. This implies that liberal economic policy, particularly privatization is easier to produce positive results in a competitive market oriented economy than in a country where the economic actors are politicians who lack the ability to invest but have the capacity to accumulate state resources for non economic purposes. Therefore the poorer the technological base of a country, the longer the odds against liberalism producing its anticipated benefits and the more difficult the process of preparing the economy for effective privatization.

V. Conclusion

In this paper we have examined the nature, institutional content and challenges of democracy in Africa as well as the democratization process in Africa. We also analyzed how the transition process has brought about Western induced economic liberalization which has escalated the race into poverty, political instability and misappropriation of democratic values in Africa. This paper clearly reveals that the practice of democracy in Africa has extended more towards polyarchy and less towards liberal democracy to the extent that the citizens' ideas and public opinion are determined by political leaders to achieve their self interests of using the state power for wealth accumulation and prestige. We also identified that the structure of the state and institutions of government in Africa are democratically organized, oligachally controlled and authoritarianly enforced, leading to the ascendency of sham-democracy that stifles political development. This also shows that economic liberalization policy of African democracies prescribed by World Bank and IMF to complement African democracy has geometrically escalated the vicious cycles of poverty, and extreme frustration among the citizens which also triggers off acts of terrorism, political instability, aggressive political protests and violent revolutions that bastardizes the political development of Africa. Hence, the citizens of African states have lost confidence in democratic institutions and values.

Therefore, we recommend the following actions that we will make the process, practice and

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

consolidation of democracy to promote and achieve general good, happiness and better life for all.

For African democracies to develop there is need to establish "welfare state" which helped today's rich industrialized countries to develop their democracies. The welfare state will serve as a bulwark against the mercantilist structures of globalization and the exploitative monetary austere measures of western imposed policies of liberalization and privatization, which has Balkanized African democracies. The welfare state will not be based on absolute subsidy of all utilities but looking inward to protect and explore African resources for the good and happiness of African peoples.

Also, for democracy to strive in Africa, African peoples and political leaders should be taught the ideas of reason and the principles of virtue in other to make the people behave better and to help the political leaders to develop strong morals and habit of the heart with which to govern their countries democratically.

Finally, in order to reduce the incidence of authoritarianism in African democracies, there is need to educate the leaders of the dangers of authoritarianism and to ensure the prevalence of free and fair elections in African states to avoid the emergence of authoritarian leaders.

References Références Referencias

1. Abba, Sadeeque, (2006), "Democracy in Nigeria", Journal of Political Studies, Abuja, Yaliam P 83
2. Aristotle, (1984), Politics, Ed Carnes Lord, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, Page 8
3. Dahl Robert A., (1971), Polyachy: Participation and Opposition, New Haven, CT: Yale Univeristy Press, Pages 1-2
4. Hood Steve (2004), Political Development and Democratic Theory, New Delhi Asoke Gosh PHI Learning, Page 4
5. Harvey David, (2005), A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford, Oxford University Press, Page
6. Hayek Friedrich, (1973), "Law, Legislation and Liberty: A New Statement of the Liberal Priciples and Political Economy", The Mirage of Social Justice, Vol. III, London, Routledge, Page 34.
7. Jefferson, Thomas, (1975)," Letter to Thomas Law, June 13 1814" in The Portable Thomas Jeferson, Ed. Merril D Peterson, New York Viking- Penguin.
8. Kaoke Bold, (1996), New World: The Essential Road Map to the Twenty-first Century, Kondarsha, America inc.
9. Linz Juan and Alfred Stepan, (1996), Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: southern Europe, South America and Post-Communist Europe, Baltimore, MD Jones Hopkins University Press, Page 45
10. Locke John, (1988), Ed. Peter Laslett, New York, Cambridge University Press page 4
11. Micheal Roskin etal, (2008), Political Science: An Introduction, New York, Pearson Prentice Hall, Page 89
12. Norris Pippa, (1998), Critical Citizens: Globalized Support for Democratic Governance, Oxford Ubiversity Press, Pages 269-70.
13. Osterud Oyvind, Friedrick Engelstad and Per Selle, (2003), Makten og demokratiet: En sluttbok fra Makt-og demokratiutredningen, Oslo, Gyldendal
14. Parker and Colin Kirkpatrick, (2005), "Privatization in Developing Countries: AReview of the Evidence and the Policy Lessions", The Journal of Development Studies, Taylor and Francis Journals, Vol. 41, Pages 513-541
15. Prezeworsky Adam, Micheal Alvarez, Jose Chiebub and Fernando Cimonji (1996), "What Makes Democracies Endure", Journal of Democracy, 7 (January), page 39-55
16. Sbine George and Thorson Thomas, (1973), A History of Political Theory, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH Publishing Co, Page 114-115
17. Schedler Andreas (1998) "What is Democracy Consolidation", Journal of Democracy, 9 (April) Page 91-107
18. Schumpeter Joseph. A, (1942) Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy, New York, Harper and Row Page 269.

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)