



Democracy or Loathsome Authoritarianism In Post - Colonial Africa?

Egobueze, Anthony

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt.

ABSTRACT

This study reviewed democracy and dictatorship in post - colonial Africa with a critique on prospects for good governance. Democracy strives when there is a competitive election and political parties freely sponsor candidates for election. This process appears to be in disarray in Africa. The study adopted secondary data and content analysis as methods of data collection and analysis and the Elites theory as the theoretical framework. The study observed that due to greed and inordinate ambition to sit-tight in office, some the post - colonial leaders involved in the liberation of their countries from independence jettison multi - party system in favour of a one party system or adopted militarilism as a fashion for the administration of their states. The study recommends amongst others that there should be institutional reforms that guarantee accountability and transparency in governance as a key antidote to good governance.

KEYWORDS: Authoritarianism, Democracy, Good governance, Militarilism, One - party system, Multi - party system, Political party

INTRODUCTION

The renowned philosopher Aristotle, best regarded as the father of politics in his famous book 'Politics' wrote, '*Man is by nature a political animal*' (Philosophy.com, n.d). Man is a political animal implies that man lives in a polis or a society governed by laws, customs and traditions. Man lives to develop his potentials that would build the enablers that he needs to realize his virtue which promotes better living that engenders a good and just society. For Aristotle, every man has virtue, the virtue of courage and generosity which he uses for epistemological development in the quest for wisdom. The-Philosopher.com (n.d) maintains that the man is in the scheme of nature as "thinking animal." The spirit which distinguishes him as a rational being is "*incapable of being destroyed*"... In understanding the truism of the above statement, politics then, is not only prevalent in our lives, but inevitable. That is, an understanding of politics is important to meaningfully participate in it because it is nothing less than the activity through which human beings attempt to improve their lives and create good and just society. "Politics is, above all, a social activity; it is always a dialogue, and never a monologue (Egobueze, 2020,p.30)", and consensus building, agreement and disagreement (Chapter 1, n.d). Indeed, politics is about perception, how issues are viewed and related to the immediate environment. It is also about disagreement and consensus. Alluding to Aristotle, Stetson University (n.d) opines politics are described as the '*master*

science' upon which all branches of human activities depended on. This *master science* as described by Aristotle has continued to positively influence the world.

Politics strives effectively in a democracy. Okolie (2018) noted that democracy as a form of government is organized in accordance with the principles of popular sovereignty, political equality, popular consultation, and majority rule. Democracy is associated with popular rule; rule by the people; collective decision-making and implementation; consultative and dialogue-based rule; rule by the majority etc. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, *democracy is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people*. This classical definition of Lincoln has influenced several scholars and has been the most popular in human history. It locates government as a product of the people conceived by them and meant for their development. The recognition of the people as the supreme owners of power is elaborated in this definition because power is vested in them and exercised directly by them or by their elected agents under a free electoral system. Democracy is a form of government in which all eligible citizens participate equally either directly or through elected representatives in the proposal, development, rule making, implementation and or interpretation. Very critical to democratic principles are sovereignty and sovereignty belongs to the people and they remain supreme. It is important to note that power belongs to the people; the ultimate rulers of a democracy are the voters but not the leaders. The importance of the supremacy



of the people can never be over emphasized. Therefore, representatives of the people must ensure that their actions and inactions while in the service of the State are predicated toward developing democratic values that would enrich the functionals of the society. Democracy encompasses a gamut of social, economic and cultural conditions that enable the free and equal practice of political self-governance. Liberty, rule of law, freedoms of association, speech as well as movement, electoral/party systems and others are key dividends of democracy. Indeed, a good democracy is a symbol of good governance.

The concept of good governance does not have an exhaustive definition. The operationalization of the term is flexibly conceptualized. However, to a large extent, the context and the overriding objective sought would suggest a theoretical and empirical understanding of the concept. It evokes full political pluralism, respect of human rights, effective participation, the rule of law, multi-actor partnerships, an efficient and effective public sector, legitimacy, access to knowledge, information and education, political empowerment of people, transparent and accountable processes and institutions, equity, sustainability, solidarity, tolerance, populism of rule, attitudes and values that foster responsibility. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights (n.d) clarified the concept of good governance in its resolution 2000/64, the Commission identified the key feature of good governance, as transparency, responsibility, accountability, participation, responsiveness (to the needs of the people).

Most of the concepts above, not only exist in nomenclature in Africa, but are practically extricated from existence in all the presumed democracies on the continent. Hence, Africa has weak institutions that are shadows of good governance. This explains why good governance is elusive and the reason why the leaders resort sit - tight in office. Abiodun (2018) notes that 'the phenomenon of sit-tight syndrome and tenure elongation in African politics has been traced to the history of leadership in Africa right from the era of independence till date. The post-independence politics of African countries have been dominated by the phenomenon of sit-tight African Heads of State and government who achieved the leadership of their state either by conventional elections or through coup *d'état*'. This study therefore interrogates the model of governance in African state; - a democracy or loathsome authoritarianism in post - colonial Africa? Thus, the implications of this on good governance was also given attention by the study.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In political science and indeed social science research or inquiry, theories are a very essential tool for interrogating social phenomenon. They explain the nature of social behavior, event, or the phenomenon itself. They also explore why and how of subjects under interrogation and provide the underlying logic of the occurrence of a phenomenon by explaining what are the key drivers and key outcomes

of the target occurrence. To Bacharach (1989), 'a scientific theory is a system of constructs (concepts) and propositions (relationships among those constructs) that collectively presents a logical, systematic, and coherent explanation of a phenomenon of interest within some assumptions and boundary conditions.' This is why social science inquiries utilizes theories a lot. For this inquiry therefor, the elite's theory was adopted. The elite theory interrogates and explain power relationships in contemporary society. The theory postulates that a small minority, consisting of members of the economic or political elite or policy-planning networks, holds the most power—and that this power most often is autonomous or is achieved through flawed democratic elections.

Elite theory is deeply rooted in the classical work of sociologists like Weber (2005 [1922]), Pareto (1935), Mosca (1939) and Michels (2009 [1915]). These authors are usually labeled as 'classical elitists'. Beyond its strong roots in classical sociology, elite theory developed into a vibrant theoretical field, intersecting other theories, such as rational choice theory and political culture theory. Indeed, Lopez (2013) argues that current elite theory often tends to be Weberian. He asserted that that 'Weber's concepts of power and domination, as well as his theoretical work on political parties and the related affirmation that social classes are not necessarily social actors are fundamental pillars of contemporary elite theory.' According to Lepez (2013), in the elitist view, 'elites could only be substituted by another set of elites, meaning that the majority is necessarily ruled by a minority'. This notion however was expressed in Pareto's (1935) 'law of elite circulation', in Mosca's (1939) 'notion of political class' and in Michels' (2009 [1915]) 'iron law of oligarchy.'

The idea of 'elites' is based on the perception that every society holds a ruling minority, a group that controls and disputes the most important power sources. That is, the elites dispute power and also enters the game through different recruitment mechanisms. Thus, the fundamental of elite theory relies in elucidation of elite behavior, elite interaction, elite transformation and, ultimately, the linkage between those instances and state outcomes.

The basic physiognomies of this theory are that power is concentrated, the elites are unified and strong, the non-elites are docile, diverse and powerless, elites' interests are integrated due to common circumstances and situations and the defining characteristic of power is institutional position. Thus, loss of power means loss of economic wealth and prestige, therefore the tenacious hold of power.

In Africa, through the echelon positions the political leaders and gladiator occupied during the struggle for independence, they made frantic effort to succeed the colonial masters and occupy vantage positions in governments or corporate boards of post-colonial states,' Thus, their influence over policy-planning systems through financial support and control key

policy-discussion groups. They also exert significant power over government and corporate decisions. This was made possible through colonial experience, especially colonial education. In Nigeria for instance, as opined by Ogele, (2020, p.5), the colonialist achieved the creation of a new social order through the manipulation of the system to suite their economic interest. It was not long, the educated elites became conscious of the segregation in the affairs of the country and got interested in participating in the decision making level. The statement above, underscores the impact of colonial experience of the post-colonial politics of African States.

ONE PARTY SYSTEM AND EMERGENCE OF AFRICAN SOCIALISM

Political parties have made giant strides in the decolonization process and subsequent attainment of independence of African states. However, changes started to occur in some of these states soon after the attainment of self-rule with some of them drifting from multi-party system to a one party system. Laudable of note is the fact that most of the leaders that led the struggle for independence eventually became political heads at the period of independence. Importantly, the irony of the situation is no sooner than they assumed office in their respective countries, that they began moving to transform these states of multi-party system to a one party system. The spirit in this is to assure themselves domination of the political leadership of their countries. Suffice it to say that these elites were beneficiaries of the colonial government, and the colonialist saw one party system as obnoxious and antidemocratic during the colonial imbroglio.

One party system, exists in a Country where there is at work, only one very-powerful and well-known political party. In such a system, political power is acquired and successively determined by one political party. During elections, this single party fields several candidates of its extraction to jostle for respective accessible political positions, out of which, one candidate is elected by the people as their representative. Importantly, the system abhors the existence of any other political party without the consent of this party. Describing one - party system, Chemoh (n.a) opines that is 'a type of party system in which a single political party forms the government and no other parties are permitted to run candidates for election. Sometimes, the term de-facto single-party system is used to describe a dominant-party system where laws or practices prevent the opposition from legally getting power.' Monyani (2018) refers to one party system as 'a political framework where a one/single political party forms and runs the government.' The party achieves this either by out-lawing completely the activities of the opposition leaders such that they are not allowed to participate in an election or the chances of the opposition to secure power are frustrated by the inauspicious and bad legal framework that is in place.

The match to freedom from the shackles of colonialism in Africa opened with party formation which signaled actual

democratic experiment, with Africans at the helm of affairs of the various political architectures in their respective countries. The journey to self - rule in Africa commenced with the independence of Sudan in 1956, Ghana in 1957, and Nigeria in 1960 amongst others. While the road to this victory was smooth in some states in the Continent, especially Ghana and Nigeria, it was hazy in some other states like Kenya, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and Angola, to name but a few. Guerilla warfare was waged by the locals to liberate themselves from the tyrannical hands of colonialists. These experiences created the consciousness for dictatorship and sit-tightness of the new leaders in office.

Singles-party politics infiltrated into the continent through the Francophone states of West Africa, where Houphouët-Boigny in the Ivory Coast and Sekou Toure in Guinea installed what were virtually one-party regimes even before the formal transfer of power. By the middle of the 1960s, with the exception of Senegal, most of the other Francophone countries had followed the Houphouët - Boigny and Sekou Toure examples. In English-speaking Africa, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana had the first shot, while Julius Nyerere of Tanzania opened the gate in eastern Africa; this was followed by Hastings Banda of Malawi and the Zambia by Kenneth Kaunda. Most other countries in the continent have at one time or the other experienced one-party system; an example of some of the counties are Cameroon, Cape Verde, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Zanzibar, Central Africa Republic, Chad, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Togo and Algeria. The above system is in trend with authoritarianism. Authoritarianism has some advocates around the globe and some of the advocates in Africa claim that the system is the best method for mobilization of natural energies to nation building. Intrinsically, some of these nations were poor and in need of development, hence, one party idea would eliminate competitiveness and guarantee even development.

Indeed, one party regime in Africa was exemplified in socialism and this wave was believed as an antidote to African democratic development. It was seen as an opposite to capitalism, which bred competitiveness and openness as well as free market enterprise. The protagonist saw in socialism a system which would annihilate poverty and protect their people from the hydra-headed monster of hunger and poverty looming across the states. As a result, Barrie argues that 'a proliferation of socialist ideologies emerged in Africa, including some that were quite bizarre.' Notable of these were; Kwame Nkrumah's *Nkrumanism* in Ghana; Julius Nyerere's *Ujaama* (family hood or socialism in Swahili) in Tanzania; Kenneth Kaunda's *humanism* in Zambia; Marien N'Gouabi's *scientific socialism* in the Congo (Brazzaville) and Mobutu Sese Seko's *Mobutuism* in Zaire.

Nigeria, Kenya and a few other states were pragmatic enough to shun the African brand of doctrinaire socialism. These leaders believed on African brand of socialism anchored as

it were with the Eastern world experience hinged on a single party structure. Most of the leaders amended their State's Constitution making themselves Chairman and automatically, Heads of states and government that could not be removed through the ballot process. The Constitutional reforms entrench them in power and made them very dictatorial and their regimes obnoxious and repressive. With the exception of Julius Nyerere, who practiced his African brand of socialism without primitive accumulation, all other leaders became extremely corrupt, very stupendously rich, looting their state's treasury, and some became almost richer than their countries.

Belief in the African traditional kingship system is another justification for a single party structure in most African states. The leaders at independence believed that democracy was in the western tradition that negates African traditional belief. It was to them, a scheme founded on the acculturation of Africans and a continuation of neo-colonialism. Most traditional African kingdoms and empires practiced monarchical system of government, and those that did not practice monarchy had a regime structure that kings ruled for life. So a departure from this pattern of leadership was an anathema and possibly a denunciation of African belief system. More so, the kings were right in every circumstance, so an argument or opposition against the king is visited with hostility. One party system, therefore, offers the necessary palliative for consolidating the African brand of leadership.

The bipolarity of the cold - war era stimulated a Renaissance of hope for African leaders who became beautiful brides that were rushed by both the capitalist and socialist blocs. The socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union made advances through proposals of aids and grants. The acceptance of this was a move towards the adoption of that doctrine of government. Ghana under Nkrumah almost drifted to the Soviet Union's interest due to the disapproval of '*Nkrumalism in Ghana*' by the West. In similitude with Ghana were Angola, Zambia, Mozambique, Benin, Ethiopia and others. The Western bloc was led by America and they also supported African dictators because of economic wealth of the State. The exploitation of the natural resources of these states was of utmost importance to them. Barrie (n.d) again states that for geopolitical, economic, and other reasons, the West propped up tyrants in Cameroon, the Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Zaire, and other African countries to the detriment of democratic movements. This to most Africans was a means to cement neo-colonialism in a continent that desired not to leave due to their selfishness and egocentricity.

Liberal democracy guarantees pluralism, and individual rights are legitimately recognized and protected, while the exercise of political power is limited by the rule of law. Therefore, it abhors one party system because it limits these rights of citizens and it is anachronistic to natural justice, very outdated and not fashionable at all. A census of democratization in the world indicates that very few

countries still operate this party structure; their number is indeed insignificant, compared to the number of democracies in the world. African states have since 1990s, embraced democratic reforms; jettisoning one party idea in preference for multi-party system. Most of the leaders amended their State's constitutions amidst wide oppositions in order to accommodate the incumbents to perpetrate themselves in power for life by seeking further terms in office as they wished. The multi-party system as adopted by these countries is ineffective because the transformation was just in name but not in practice. The leaders still draconianly administer their countries by applying maximum force. Also, all known crude methods are adopted to rig themselves into office and sustain themselves in such offices. The electoral processes cause tension and lead to many losses of lives and properties. Then President Olusengu Aremu Obasanjo declared that his re-election in 2003 was '*a do or die affair*', that is all known crude means would be employed to return him to power. His successors have not transformed the electoral process to be better, rather they continued with the crude methods, jettisoning all known best practices as theorized by the social sciences. Till date, in collusion with the Legislators, the leaders have continued to reject e-voting, which is a mean of leading the country to electoral Eldorado. In fact, the 2019 general election in Nigeria wore such toga of '*do or die*'; many Nigerians were killed in exchange for seeking for or retaining power. This to all intents and purposes is primitive. The electoral fortunes of no candidate should worth the blood of any citizens as championed by former President Goodluck Jonathan is hardly adhered to. African leaders must live and rule with integrity in order to enjoy the legitimacy of the office they occupy. A governance structure without the trust and confidence by the citizens is a drift to self-seeking and personalization of office which is no longer fashionable. The leap to consolidating democracy is a match away from any form of dictatorship like one party system or African brand of multi-party system which incubates phenomena that subvert democracy and good governance.

THE MILITARY LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

The Armed Forces of a State, namely the Army, Navy and the Air Force are primarily responsible for the defense of the State against external aggression. This function limits them to the protection of the territorial boundaries of the State against any infiltration by any other body or nation with territorial ambition or annexation interest. Given the above, they are excluded from the civil government of the State. That is, they are by law barred from direct management and governance of the State. This factor eliminates any form of legitimacy on their involvement in the direct governance and administration of the State. The first military coup d'état in the continent took place in July 23, 1952 in Egypt, known as Egyptian revolution. Since then, many other African military heads tested power at one time or the other, became fascinated by it and were spellbound in keeping it for as

long as possible. Military in politics has therefore become a common phenomenon in Africa. At independence, most African states were democratic with multi-party system, but the post-independence Africa presents a different scenario; most of the nationalist that became the leaders of their respective countries became high handed, some drifted from multi-party system to the one party system, others had violence of all sorts in the post- independence elections organized. A Kenyan retired Major, Jimmi Wangome states: 'as the military was struggling to attain a national character in order to gain national acceptance, the politicians were becoming more self-seeking, power-hungry and ambitious. Some were out seeking instant wealth for themselves, their friends and relatives. Nepotism became rampant, commonplace and a norm.'

Huntington (1968) contends that 'the major driving factor behind military intervention in politics is ideological difference and also threats to national interests. The military only handed power after it succeeded in designing a political system that safeguarded its own core interests.' Accordingly, he further posits that 'the sources of military interventions in politics have not only been the keen interest of the military itself but it is also the result of weak political institutions and low political culture of the developing countries.' Leite *et al* (2002) argues that 'a justified reason why the military intervenes in politics is to act in defense of human rights and also the constitution.' Thus, it intervenes in politics only to stabilize the political system by returning the rule of law as can be noted by the ouster of Jammeh in Gambia by ECOWAS Leite, C. and J. Weidmann (2002).

Succinctly put therefore, it is important to legitimize such intervention in politics as a result of filling a constitutional vacuum, and protecting democratic values which at that point were under siege. Also, Huntington (1968) argues and justified that 'the military will intervene when civilian governments lack legitimacy due to inadequate economic performance and an ineffective executive.' This seemingly aligns with the social development theory of military intervention. General Badamusi Babangida's overthrow of General Muhammadu Buhari in a palace coup in Nigeria in 1985 aligns with this philosophical thought because Buhari could not revamp the economy as he posited before the coup.

Dewa (n.a) believes that 'the military most likely intervene in politics in states with the absence of institutionalized political cultures, which suffer from economic hardship, political upheavals and social divisions.' This school of thought is in line with the environmentalist view that 'the prevailing State's socio-political and economic environment is responsible for military takeover within society.' This argument is substantiated drawing example from Algeria in 1992 where the military intervened because it feared the outcome of multi-party elections where an Islamic movement was poised to win and form the next government.

The consciousness of the military to abort democratic government led to the take over power.

Graeff and Mekkop (2003) posit that, this can be noted when civilian dominated governments gain power and are not responsive to security demands. Hence, military involvement in politics is associated with the concept of national security. National security deals with peace and stability and security of lives and properties. A State that cannot protect the lives and properties of its citizens is doomed and shows weakness in the governance architecture. Such weakness is an invitation for military interregnum. Consequently, the military is not only interested in devising military techniques and doctrine for confronting domestic insurgence but they are also interested in political and social reasons for the insurgency. The current spate of violent extremist insurgences in Nigeria, Sudan, Somalia, and the Democratic Republic of Congo calls for attention.

Post-colonial African military was not oblivious of the above factors. Rather than intervene in politics to address perceived injustices within the polity, the armed forces or a section of it intervened due to the unbridled ambition of the leaders to sit - tight in office in order to perpetrate their primitive accumulation coast and appropriate the common wealth selfishly to their advantage. This act defines democracy and democratization in Africa from the post colonial era till the early 1970s.

Suffice it to say that the Nigeria has one of the worst histories of military interregnum in Africa. On January 15 1966, the nation was greeted with the first coup led by Major Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogu. The coup plotters pointed out the issue in the Western part of the country and a few other factors as part of the reason for their toppling the Abubakar Tafawa Belewa's government. The Nigeria's experience is similitude to most African State that had one form of military infractions or the other.

Apart from Jerry Rollins of Ghana and Thomas Sankara of Burkina Faso, most other military elites that seized power in some African countries at one time or the other, rather than support Africa's development, corruptly enriched themselves and became profligate, reckless, spendthrift and wasteful with the funds got from State's resources and this has a contaminant effect on Africa's development. In fact, the draconian military leadership has not improved Africa's economic conditions, nor create political stability; rather, militocracy has exacerbated turmoil's and driven the continent into even further suffering with an aura of insecurity and uncertainty everywhere. This has heightened the unpredictability of African politics and weakened the economy of most states, hence, creating monsters and mirage in the development of the continent. It is important to note that the African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and other sub-regional organizations have been very committed to the war against military regimes in the continent. Their zero tolerance is

exhibited in sanctions which are usually imposed on military juntas, forcing such draconian regimes to quickly return the affected State(s) to democracy

SOME EXAMPLES OF SIT-TIGHT AFRICAN DICTATORS

Egobueze (2019) notes that Africa is reckoned as the oldest and second largest continent in the world and the epicentre of human civilization. The continent is blessed with abundant human and material resources, yet, it remains the least developed and poorest in committee of nations. The cause of this is the absence of good democratic culture which is incarnated by weak institutions, leading to the dictatorship of the leaders against the people. In fact, African is reckoned as home to many dictators and sit – tight leaders that gained a leadership position at either through democratic process or barrels of guns. Some of these leaders entered office with the belief of promoting democratic principles, but abdicated that responsibility for their selfish advantage. Prominent of these leaders were Moummar Ghaddafi of Lybya ruled for 42 years from 1961 – 2011, Zimbabwe’s Robert Mugabe ruled for 31 years from 1980 - 2017, Hosni Mubarak of Egypt ruled for 30 years from 1981 – 2011, Jose Santos of Angola ruled for 32 years from 1979, Algeria’s Abdelaziz Bouteflika, Gambia’s Yahya Jammeh, Togo’s Gnassingbe Eyadema, Paul Biya of Cameroon has been in power from same is Yoweri Museveni whose leadership of Uganda commenced since 1986, till date, Ben Ali of Tunisia ruled for 23 years from 1988 – 2011, Zaire’s Mubutu Seseseko, Paul Kagame of Rwanda since 2000 and Al-Bashir, ‘then a Brigadier in the Sudanese army, rose to power in 1989 after leading a group of officers in a coup that ousted the democratically elected government of Prime Minister Sadiq al-Mahdi’ (The Guardian, 2019). He was ousted from office in a military coup after thirty years of obnoxious rule. Other prominent African leaders that gained powers through the barrel of gun in order to corruptly enrich themselves from the common wealth were Tunisia’s Ben Ali (1988), Egypt’s Hosni Mubarak (1981), Presidents Nguema Mbasago of Equatorial Guinea (since 1979), Blaise Campore of Burkina Faso (since 1987), Isaias Afewerki of Eritrea (since 1993), include Presidents Idrissu Deby of Chad (since 1990), Pakalitha Mosisili of Lesotho (since 1998), Ismail Omar Guelleh of Djibouti (since 1999), Mohammed VI of Morocco (since 1999), Mswati III of Swaziland (since 1986), Paul Biya of Cameroon (since 1982) and Paul Kagame (since 2000) and Meles Zenawi of Ethiopia (since 1995). These leaders are some examples of sit-tight leaders in the African Continent. While most of these leaders have been forcefully exited from power, others are superintending over their states till date. Importantly, their reigns which span for over a decade is characterized by corruption, nepotism and bad governance.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The African continent has faced several challenges among which is the peaceful transition from one government to

another. At one time or the other, the continent has become home to several sit-tight and long – serving leaders, who repudiate to relinquish power enthusiastically at the expiration of their constitutional tenures in office. As noted above, very few countries have experienced a quiet transition of power, while the recent power change in the Democratic Republic of Congo and The Gambia was reactionary and witnessed unholy hostility. This, indeed, is the character of most African states, and it has implications for democratization and good governance.

African leaders claim to hold on to power based on the prescriptions of the State’s Constitutions, which they have arm-twisted the people and changed or amended several times to assuage their unbridled appetite for primitive accumulation. Albeit, the same constitution, which gives them the leverage to remain in power is ambivalent most often and creates monsters and vacuums that hinder the smooth transfer of power. Based on this, Africa leaders are defiant to constitutional changes and they desperately defile all odds to remain in office at all cost. They achieve this through the clamping of opposition, the institution of militias and killer squads, kidnapping of known opposition leaders, scuttling of the electoral process and using anti – corruption institutions set – up by them to chase known opposition leaders. However, the wind of change is gradually blowing and some of the leaders are beginning to leave power without any rebellion. President Goodluck Jonathan of Nigeria in 2015 handed over power to President Muhammadu Buhari, Liberia’s Ellen Johnson in 2018 democratically handed over power to George Weah after exhausting her term limit and most recently Ernest Koroma of Sierra Leone peacefully transferred power. Also, military regimes have been seen as an aberration and not fashionable, thus, the African Union, ECOWAS and some regional organizations have sanctions placed on military coupist and military states. This has dampened the zeal of military leaders to seize power and it is a move towards the attainment of good governance.

Based on the factors noted above, this study recommends, as follows, that:

(i) The African Union, and other regional organizations should continue with the drive to entrench democracy and good governance in the continent. Campaigns should be mounted by the Unions against sit- tight leaders that have scuttled democratic principles in the continent. Similarly, the Civil Society Organizations and other non – governmental organization should champion campaigns against countries with sit – tight leadership in the continent.

(ii) Part of the challenges noticed in the continents drift from democracy to dictatorship is the docility of the people. Democracy is predicated on a system of government of the people, which implicitly gives sovereignty to the people, and the government is designed by the people, for their general benefits. Leaders in Africa like in many other climes are elected or selected by the people and such leaders hold power

in trust for them to support and engender development in the states. Unfortunately, the people who are expected to be the owners of government have jettisoned their powers and surrendered all to a few elites who are today at the helm of the affairs of government in most of the states. Upon ascension to office, and noting the weakness of the people, the leaders introduced draconian and repressive policies that extricate the rights and privileges of the people, pauperize them and make them absolutely submissive to their whims and caprices. The people must say no and rise against absolutism of power and dethrone wicked dictator that have usurped the powers of the people. This would be achieved through mass revolt by the people. Democracy has come to stay and the peoples' right to democratic principles should no longer be held in chains and subverted, but must be protected.

(iii) Institutional reforms that guarantee accountability and transparency in governance and eliminate loathsome dictators from governance should be instituted in the continent. Towards achieving this, the electoral umpires of the various states should adopt electronic voting system. This would check the faulty electoral process characterized by corruption and ensure the emergence of the true leaders of the people that entrench government directed by the citizen. The political parties too should adopt direct primaries; this would check the possible hijack of the political parties by cabala who become possible *godfathers* and *godmothers* that determine who gets what, when and how. Indeed, the people shall govern, and this starts from democratic party system.

(iv) Corruption is at its crescendo in Africa and this is poisonous for good governance. Most African leaders and states are suffering from a debilitating corrupt leadership and this incubated poverty and undermine good governance. Almost all the sit – tight leaders, their family members and cronies have large accounts in foreign and local banks with monies stolen from the respective state's accounts; this is to all intents and purposes is villainous. African states must evolve local and global models to fight corruption and make governance less attractive for those with intents to serve rather than steal from the common wealth. In Nigeria, the Economic and Financial Crime Commission (EFCC) and the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC) the Code of Conduct Bureau (CCB) are all institutions put in place to fight corruption. Some top government functionaries have been indicted by these Commissions, but, the Government has continued to pay lip services to the war on corruption, and the Commissions sometimes have been used to witch-hunt perceived political enemies. This is inglorious to good governance. A paradigm shift is required, and that could be achieved by making governance less financially attractive through ensuring that salaries and allowances of elected and appointed political officers are in line with the prevailing order in the public service or the civil and service of the State.

(v) States should entrench good public financial management regime, which is a system by which the

financial aspects of the public services' business are directed, controlled and influenced, to support the delivery of the sector's goals. It encourages openness and accountability as well as accessibility of public accounts and records. All these promote good governance.

REFERENCES

1. Abiodun, T. F., Nwannennaya, C., Ochei, B. O., & Ayo-Adeyekun, I. (2018). Sit-Tight Syndrome And Tenure Elongation In African Politics: Implications For Regional Development And Security, *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* Volume 23, (4) , pp. 59-65
2. Bacharach, S. B. (1989). "Organizational Theories: Some Criteria for Evaluation," *Academy of Management Review* (14:4), 496-515
3. Chapter 1 .(n.d). What is Politics? – Macmillan International Higher. Assessed November 28, 2021 from: https://www.macmillanihe.com/resources/sample.../9780230363373_sample.pdf
4. Chemoh, B. (n.a). Political Science Essays from 1960s through the 1980s, One Party System in Africa. Assessed November 28, 2021 from: https://www.academia.edu/4787636/POLITICAL_SCIENCE_ONE_PARTY_STATE_IN_AFRICA
5. Dewa, B. (n.a). The reasons for military intervention in politics. Assessed November 28, 2021 from: https://www.academia.edu/32001321/the_reasons_for_military_intervention_in_politics
6. Egobueze, A. (2020). *The State and the People*, Port Harcourt, A&G Hildian Ltd and Pearl International Publishers Ltd.
7. Egobueze, A. (2019). *Perspectives on African Politics*, Port Harcourt, A&G Hildian Ltd
8. Graeff, P. and Mehlkop, G. (2003). The impacts of economic freedom on corruption: different patterns for rich and poor countries. *European Journal of Political Economy*, cited in Dewa, B. (n.a). The reasons for military intervention in politics. Assessed November 28, 2021 from: https://www.academia.edu/32001321/the_reasons_for_military_intervention_in_politics?a
9. Huntington, S. (1968). *The political order in changing societies*, Yale University Press: New Haven, CT
10. Leite, C. and Weidmann, J. (2002). Does mother nature corrupt? natural resources, corruption and economic growth. Chapter 7 in Abed, G. and S. Gupta (eds.): *Governance, corruption, and economic performance*. Washington DC: International Monetary Fund, cited in Dewa, B. (n.a). The reasons for military intervention in politics. Assessed June 28, 2020 from: https://www.academia.edu/32001321/the_reasons_for_military_intervention_in_politics?a

11. López, M. (2013). 'Elite theory', Sociopedia.isa. Assessed November 29, 2021 from:(PDF) Elite Theory | Raja Anand - Academia.edu
12. Michels, R/ (2009 [1915]).*Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Democracy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
13. Monyani, M. (2018). One Party State: Is it good or bad for governance? Assessed November 28, 2021 from: <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/05/21/is-revolution-brewing-in-iran/>
14. Mosca, G. (1939).*The Ruling Class*. London: McGrawHill Book Company.
15. Ogele, E. P. (2020). Elitism, Election, and Governance in Nigeria's Fourth Republic: a study of Rivers State, in *Journal of Law and Global Policy*, Vol. 5 (1), pp. 1-13.
16. Okolie, A. (2018, August). Democracy and Nigeria's development. A paper presented in at Workshop organized by A&G Hildian Ltd on Scrutinizing public expenditure: assessing the role of the Public Accounts Committees for Hon. Members of Houses of Assembly, Auditors, Permanent Secretaries Directors, etc at the Excel luxury hotel, Federal Capital, Abuja.
17. Pareto, V. (1935).*The Mind and Society*. London: Jonathan Cape Limited.
18. The-Philosophy.com,(n.a). Man is a political animal (Meaning of Aristotle quote). Assessed November 28, 2021 from: <https://www.the-philosophy.com/man-political-animal-meaning-aristotle-quote>
19. The Guardian. (2019). Africa and the burden of sit-tight leaders. Retrieved November 20, 2020 from, <https://guardian.ng/features/africa-and-the-burden-of-sit-tight-leaders/>
20. United Nations Human Right, Office of the Human Right Commission. (n.d). Good Governance and Human Right. Assessed November 29, 2021 from: <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Development/GoodGovernance/Pages/GoodGovernanceIndex.aspx>
21. Wangome, J. (1985). Military coups in Africa-the African "neo-colonialism" that is self-inflicted. Assessed November 29, 2021 from: <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/1985/WJ.htm>.
22. Weber, M. (2005 [1922]).*Economia y sociedad*. Mexico DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica, cited in López, M. (2013), 'Elite theory', Sociopedia.isa. Assessed November 29, 2021 from: (PDF) Elite Theory | Raja Anand - Academia.edu

Citation: Egbueze, Anthony, "Democracy or Loathsome Authoritarianism In Post - Colonial Africa?", American Research Journal of Humanities and Social sciences, Vol 9, no. 1, 2023, pp. 27-34.

Copyright © 2023 Egbueze, Anthony, This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.