

THE GLOBAL DEMOCRATISATION AGENDA: THE LESSONS FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT.

ADAGBA OKPAGA

(Received 7 April 2003; Revision Accepted 20 May 2003)

ABSTRACT

The collapse of the Soviet Union and its communist ideology has continued to witness the propagation of a new democratisation agenda. This new agenda, which is being directed toward the Third World Countries aims at propagating Western democratic values in these states. For Africa, it is assumed that without the option of this new democratic agenda, she cannot experience development. This paper argues that, in as much as democracy is a universal phenomenon and a practice, each society practises a system that is akin to its socio-cultural, economic, political and ecological environment. Africa therefore, needs to restructure her development orientations in line with her indigenous practices. It is only through this that she can experience a sustainable development.

KEY WORDS: Globalization, Democracy /Democratization, Development, Third World, New World Order

INTRODUCTION

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989 and the end of the phenomenal Cold War have seemingly introduced what is now referred to as the New World Order with its attendant agenda. Of this new agenda, its democratic variant has been one of the most talked about, and the one that if practised sufficiently or satisfactorily, will provide the most viable and conducive atmosphere for the promotion of others. From the western conception of democracy, it has been adjudged as the best form of government because its ideals and basic features encourage free participation of the majority of the people in a political system. It has also been assumed too, that based on its comparism with other forms of government, it encourages development in all spheres of life.

But democracy, while it may be seen as the best form of government that enhances an all round development, has its own variants and practises that differ from one country to the other. In the global context, what is being propagated today is the western form of democracy. But on a critical note, is the liberal form of democracy as practised in the West, the best form of democracy that should be promoted for global adoption? Don't other regions of the world outside Western Europe and America, such as countries in Africa and South East Asia have a system of democratic practice indigenous to them that encourages development? To what extent have western democratic values succeeded and encouraged

development, that they should be admired and practiced by states outside the Western world?. Thus, the crux of the paper is whether we need to adopt a global democratic agenda before we can experience development? In looking at this issue therefore, the paper will give some conceptual clarifications of the terms, democracy and development; examine the New World Order and its democratic agenda, and discuss the global democratization agenda and its implications for African development.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS: DEMOCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT;

Democracy

According to Udogu (1996:1), "if there is one area in which political scientists are in agreement, it is that definitionally, conceptually and operationally, democracy is a very complex system". Thus, it has a plethora of meanings, definitions and views that no concrete agreement has been arrived at as to what it actually means. Because of the inability of scholars to provide an acceptable meaning, general resort is made to explain or define it by describing its realization or institutions. Consequently, definitions have tended to emphasize representation, constitutionalism and the process of choice and accountability, among its other ingredients. For the purpose of this section therefore, it will be necessary to examine some of the theoretical views and definitions of democracy in order to

understand the basic features of the concept as it varies in the minds of many people.

The term democracy was first coined by the Greek historian, Herodotus, in the fifth century BC to mean 'popular rule' (demo, meaning "the people" and Krateris, meaning "to rule"). In the democracy of the ancient Greek Polis or city-state as exemplified by Athens, the citizens were equal in their rights before the law, discussed and debated public issues in the assembly, and by majority vote directly decided some issues, exercise ultimate control over others, and elected officers acceptable to them; enjoyed political and civil freedom and there was equality among the people. It was from these early Greek expositions of the tenets of democracy that the various definitions and practices of democracy emanated.

Several scholars (Dahl 1971, 1982, Smith 1972, Scaritt and Mozaffar 1988, Randall and Theobald 1989, Diamond et al 1989, Schmitter and Karl 1993, Schumpeter 1949 among others), have given their various perspectives on the concept of democracy. For Schumpeter (1949), democracy is "that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the peoples vote". It is in the same vein that Schmitter and Karl (1993:40) observe that:

Modern political democracy is a system of governance in which rulers are held accountable for their actions in the public realm by citizens acting indirectly through the competition and co-operation of their elected representatives.

In their own view, Scaritt and Mozaffar (1988) see democracy as a unique type of government regime whose major characteristics are enshrined in a set of constitutive rules which underscore the following dimensions:

- (a) Access to public offices in which effective governmental power is rested must be determined by contestation at regular intervals.
- (b) The outcome of this contestation must be determined by the free broad-based participation of all eligible citizens and form of majority rule and,
- (c) Civic and political liberties of citizens must be guaranteed against government infringement to ensure that they can freely join and establish civic associations and political groups, express and debate a diversity of ideas and issues, and choose public officials.

It was Dahl (1982:11) that gives it its most comprehensive definition when he defines it as:

Any system that is rooted in the notion that ultimate authority in the governance of the people rightly belongs to the people, that everyone is entitled to an equitable participation and share in the equal rights and equitable social and economic justice are the birthright of everyone in the society. The basic characteristics of democracy includes the existence of the mechanisms for political and economic choice, balanced political structure and stable political system

Most of the above is the political definition of democracy which does not separates it from the economic and social system. It is this political definition that Diamond et al (1989:6) subscribe to when they argue that unless economic and social dimensions of democracy are kept conceptually distinct from the political, there is no way to analyse how variations on the political dimension is related to variations on the others. They therefore observed that issues of the so-called "economic and social democracy be separated from the question of governmental structure". They base their arguments in line with Dahl (1971) who terms democracy as polyarchy. Thus, for Dahl democracy is:

A system of government that meets three essential conditions: Meaningful and extensive competition among individual and organized groups (especially political parties), "a highly inclusive" level of political participation in the selection of leaders and policies at least through regular and fair elections, such that no major (adult) social group is excluded; and a level of civic and political liberties-freedom of expression, of the press and to form and join organizations-sufficient to ensure the intensity of political competition and participation (Dahl 1971:38)

But this politically-oriented definition of democracy has not gone well with liberal democratic scholars. For instance, Macpherson (1966) points out that liberal democracy is found only in countries whose economic system is wholly or predominantly that of the capitalist enterprise. He went further to say that the demand for political choice acts as an important supplement to the market economy as a way of

securing the foundations of the whole systems. Smith (1972) also places emphasis more on economic democracy than the political saying that without a growing economic freedom there cannot be a political one. For him therefore, economic liberalization is a pre-condition for political liberalization which implicitly means a tight relationship between the development of capital and the rise and existence of democracy.

Randall and Theobald (1988) arguing in the same vein, observed that democracy can thrive only after its economic variants have been established. In most developed countries, they say, an industrial base was firmly established before the masses were admitted to the political arena, that is, before the working masses were permitted to participate in politics. In the Third World where this has not been the case, the masses were given access to the political arena as their economies are much more underdeveloped than was the case in the developed world.

The above arguments notwithstanding, democracy cannot be defined unilaterally or unidimensionally as it should be seen as a comprehensive phenomenon which embraces all aspects of human endeavour. To emphasize on only one aspect of it would mean underplaying the roles of the others in the overall development of a political system. That is why socialist democracy looks at democracy as a comprehensive endeavour involving not only the political but the economic, social, human and even the technological and scientific aspects. From the following observations therefore, democracy can be regarded as a concept and a reality that has a multi-dimensional face, the complexity of which has made its practice more difficult to operate.

There are various forms of democracy as the liberal and socialist variants practised mostly in the Western capitalist and communist states respectively. There are other democratic forms in the world which are practiced outside the above types which nevertheless have contributed to the socio-political and economic development of such areas as Japan, India, some South East Asian and African Countries. In Africa, the current idea of democracy was introduced during the era of colonialism when constitutional processes were put in place to lead Africans toward the achievement of independence. Various features of democracy such as elections into legislative houses, political parties and other forms of political participation were introduced. When independence was achieved, it was expected that these democratic practices would be carried out in a pronounced manner. But, the intricacies of the systems were too much for African leaders,

hence, the eventual collapse of most post independence democracies. Even today that most states are back to democratic practice, the basic conditions for democratic practice as proposed by Dahl (1982) such as, free and fair election, freedom of association and economic choice, popular control of government, existence of opposition, rule of law among others are yet to sufficiently exist.

Development

Development, like democracy is also a controversial term to define. While one needs not border about this controversy, generally it has been seen as a process which involves the progress of the people in the society. It involves changes in social, economic, political and cultural life of the people. Thus, it is a multi-dimensional and comprehensive transformation of the structures of the society.

Because of the various perspectives of development, so many theories have also been propounded about it. Most of the theories of development originate from two perspectives, the Western and Third World viewpoints. From the West emerged the modernization theories of economic, intellectual, political and socio-cultural change which had taken place in the advanced countries. This theory was specifically developed for third world countries which were coming out of colonialism. If they were to develop, they were expected to tow the line of the Western form of development. Expectedly these theories which were applied to Third World countries in the late 1950s and 1960s did not provide the needed development solutions. Thus, emerged the dependency or underdevelopment theory which was a reaction to the modernization theory. Leading dependency theories have debunked the modernization perspectives. Today and perhaps, a new form of the modernization theory is emerging as globalisation.

THE NEW GLOBAL DEMOCRATIZATION AGENDA

The new globalization agenda and its democratic variant has its immediate history from the end of the cold war and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union and its socialist ideology. But on a further historical perspective, the movement for a democratic world can be traced to the time of the independence of the United States of America in 1776. In particular, however, the vociferous propagation of western democratic ideals started just after the end of the Second World War. The end of this war saw the emergence of two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, with each of these powers creating spheres of

influence with their capitalist and socialist ideologies respectively. In fact, the first test of their ideologies was the Korean War of between 1947 and 1956 which led to the polarization of the new United Nations as being pro-Capitalist and pro-communist. This was in earnest the beginning of the cold war popularly regarded as the "War of Nerves". The Cuban missile crisis, the US intervention in Indo-China crisis, the formation of economic and military organizations and the rivalries of the two superpowers in Africa particularly in Angola and Congo (former Zaire) were all manifestations of the propagation of the ideologies of these superpower divide.

The new global agenda has its recent history from the end of the cold war and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union with its socialist ideology. What then is the new global agenda and its ingredients? The new global agenda seems to have emerged as a result of the realization by international actors that problems existed in the world which needed to be solved outside the face-up between the superpowers in terms of arms race. It was also realized that these problems have assumed international and global proportions particularly in the way in which the destinies of states were becoming intertwined in ever more complex manners. Thus, there is the necessity for interdependence between nations. This interdependence, at the international level, means that nations are sensitive or vulnerable in significant ways to developments taking place beyond their borders some of which are, or at least potentially could be, under some form of foreign control. Thus, because of the necessity to solve the world's problem both at the domestic national level and the global arena, states need to cooperate in some form of interdependent relationship. This is why in recent times the trend in economic matters has been specifically pronounced due to spectacular increases in international trade and investments in the world.

Other issues that have become the concern of the new global agenda are political, social, natural resources, environmental, transportation and communication. Thus, the content of the new global agenda is diverse, dynamic and multifarious. Incidentally, these agenda are designed, formulated and implemented by the West as policy responses to the realities of the post cold war situation. It should be noted that before the end of the cold war, these agenda were not strategically very relevant to the western actors, but the issues of arms race and control, propaganda, espionage, intelligence, economic competition, struggle for spheres of influence and space exploration among others, were of primary concern. It was the end of the cold war that led to the ushering in

of the issues. However, this is not to say that the ingredients of the new global agenda emerged as fresh agenda. It should be noted that they have their historical root in the Cold War. The difference, perhaps is that with the new unipolarity, the West adopted the new set of agenda to match its own nascent aspirations. Thus, as Abari (1997:5) observed, "the New Global Agenda is a Western project aimed at primarily entrenching firmly the unipolar arrangement"

Incidentally, the agenda is directed toward the countries of Eastern Europe that were formerly under the Soviet yoke, those in Africa, Latin America and South East Asia. This new deliberate policy of the West seems not only subjective but it re-enacts the modernization tendencies toward the Third World in the late 1950s and the 1960s. Then, it was hoped that Third World Countries, if they imbibed the development orientations of their erstwhile colonial masters and indeed, advanced capitalist states, they would be in the path to development. Seemingly, this is the orientation of the New Globalization doctrine as the instrument for pursuing this incorporative agenda.

Globalization itself has been seen as several processes. Okpeh (2000:44) has seen it as "a process of change in which the world's countries and their economies are increasingly integrated as a function of rising cross-border economic activities" It has also been seen as a decoupling of space and time, emphasizing that with instantaneous communication, knowledge and culture can be shared around the world simultaneously. It is the belief that divergent cultures can be harmonized by dint of a globalized system that does not recognise geographical distance as a barrier in the trans-border relations. This is enhanced by good networks in the telecommunication system through which the world is inter-linked.

Globalization and indeed, the New world order, has an economic imperative which involves a general integration of cross-national economic system through the growth of investment and capital flows among states operating in the international economic system. But the other ingredient of the New World Order and globalization that is the concern here is the liberal democratic perspective. Thus, since the demise of the Soviet communist ideology, the West has been promoting its agenda in favour of globalization of democracy and its liberal variant. The promotion of this agenda is thus, directed toward the transiting third world countries of Africa, Latin America, South East Asia and the Eastern European Countries that were formerly under the Soviet hegemony.

principle should be encouraged. Governments which persist with repressive politics, with corrupt management or with Wasteful and discredited economic systems should not expect us to support their folly with scarce aid resources.

It is on account of the above statement that Western nations, using international finance and political organizations like the IMF, the UN, European Community, Commonwealth of Nations and Amnesty International among others, have taken on respect for human right as a condition for giving aids to poor nations. As Abari (1997) pointed out, it was on this basis that the British in 1992 took a tough stance toward such countries with bad human right records like Sri Lanka, Somalia, Sudan, Malawi, Kenya, Sierra Leone and Gambia. In the case of Nigeria, Britain and other countries placed some restrictions on military aid to her after the annulment of June 12, 1993 Presidential Election and the execution of Ken Saro-Wiwa and nine other Ogoni minority and environmental activists. Despite all these human right promotion tendencies, it seems obvious that this western concern may have some other motives behind them which cannot be divorced from the hegemonic relationship between the advanced countries and their less-developed Third World counterparts.

Following from the above, how would one thus assess the promotion of democratic values with respect to African development? Should democracy in Africa be a direct reflection of what it is considered to be in the West? Do democratic values and indeed development orientations not differ from one socio-cultural and political system to the other? As rightly observed by Sandbrooks (1994) shouldn't democratic practice in Africa, for example, be different since cultural, historical, political and socio-economic conditions are relatively different from those of the advanced democratic states? The adopting and imbibing of democratic values from other political systems will therefore have some implications for development. For Africa therefore, what are the implications for its development, of the new democratization agenda, in the New World Order?

GLOBAL DEMOCRATIZATION AND AFRICA

As it is obviously known, Africa's relations with the developed world until the advent of the New World Order was marked by economic and political dependence. The advent of unipolarity has brought in its wake far-reaching political, economic and strategic changes in the world. These global changes, especially on the

economic front, have left the world with capitalism and free market economy as the dominant mode of production. The extent of this is witnessed by the states of the former Soviet Union, that is, the Commonwealth of Independent States and the former Soviet allies of Eastern Europe which all had centralized planned economies, and are now moving toward the market economy and opening their markets to foreign investments. The implication of this economic aspect of globalization for Africa is the likely transfer of a good portion of the financial aids, grants, loans and investments, formerly coming from the United States, Western European countries and Japan to the Eastern European states and Commonwealth of Independent states toward re-building their economies on the capitalist mode.

On the political plane, the implications are obvious. The capitulation of the former Soviet Union and her socialist ideology has inevitably led to the triumph of democratic politics and to the institution of liberal democratic principles. Thus, the end of Cold War seems to draw a curtain on totalitarian regime.

Furthermore, one decisive factor that has led to political changes in Africa has been the weakening of the Soviet Union relative to the United States, making it possible for the latter, which is now the most dominant political power in the world, to bring about changes that she desires unchallenged and to encourage the installation of governments and regimes sympathetic to its cause. The implication of this trend can be seen below.

In Ethiopia, the hold by the former Soviet Union and her allies, Cuba and Yemen, in financing and militarily supporting the Marxist government of Mengistu Haile Marian, enabled the U S backed coalition of a rebel group, Ethiopian Peoples Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), led by Melesse Zenawi, to overthrow it in June 1991. Earlier in 1988 there was an accord in New York between the United States, Angola, South Africa and Cuba on December 22 1988 which led to the withdrawal of Cuban forces in Angola in July 1991. This withdrawal of Cuban forces which were stationed in Angola to help withstand the activities of the US backed UNITA rebels against the MPLA government, prepared the way for a free multi-party Portuguese supervised election in 1994. This had been the main demand of UNITA which the former Soviet Union and Cuban backed Marxist government in Angolan had consistently refused to acquiesce. In other parts of Africa, democratic movements and protests led to the collapse of many regimes. These included those in Benin Republic, Mali, Niger, Madagascar, Nigeria, Zambia, Congo (former Zaire),

This political aspect of the New World Agenda according to Sandbrooks (1994:56) involves "the establishment of a minimal liberal state, enabled by a capacity-building initiative and disciplined by a democratic politics well enough to maintain the legal administrative, political and infrastructural conditions for private capital accumulation" This process will not only safeguard human rights but, it will also advance all developmental objectives. Implicitly, liberal democracy involves the transformation of relationships between states that have well-established liberal democratic institutions and those that are yet to reach that level. It also involves the transformations of institutions, groups, the universalization of certain practises, identities and structures that are linked to those of the advanced Western World. A state that does not practice these liberal democratic values of human rights, equality and justice is said to be undemocratic. Thus, since the end of the Cold War, the pursuit of the democratic values has been on unabated.

The propagation of these democratic tendencies have therefore manifested in the statements and actions of their major promoters. For instance, in the period of 1990 – 1991, most of the industrialized countries of the world particularly the members of the G. 8 have through their actions, expressed the non-negotiable stand of their countries in terms of democratization. One of the first instances of this position of the United States of America was expressed by its Ambassador to Kenya, Mr Smith Hempstone in May 1990. For him:

there is strong tide flowing in our Congress which controls the purse strings to concentrate our economic assistance on those of world's nations that have democratic institutions, defend human right and practice multiparty politics (cf; Amuwo 1992:12 in Abari 1997:7)

It was in the same vein that the then French President, Mitterand, in June 1990, declared in the Franco-African Summit that:

France was at one with the Western allies in stating that democratisation and observance of human rights will henceforth be the supreme prerequisite for aid to every Third World country (cf Abari 1997:7)

Like the United States and France, the British have expressed similar reservation about the democratisation process in the Third World. In

1991, the United Kingdom leading the European Union then, while giving a 2.5billion as aid to Africa, demanded that the aid benefactors must meet certain conditionalities before the aid could be granted them. These conditions included respect for human rights, movement toward democracy and a conducive social, political and economic atmosphere. As it was observed elsewhere (Okpaga 2002), the United States followed this approach when, she declared through her Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Herman Cohen, that it expects Third World countries to provide a democratised political environment for any conducive foreign investment in these countries.

As if the use of aids, loans and technical assistance were not enough for urging Third World countries to adopt democratic values, the West instituted economic and military sanctions which could be seen in the case of Nigeria after the annulment of the June 12 1993 Presidential Election and the military invasion of Haiti by the United States in 1994. Needless to over-emphasize the propagation of these democratic tendencies, it should be noted that, there have been democratic pressures on the Third world countries before the early 1990s. Even today, the recent election brahala in Zimbabwe is warranting the imposition of sanctions by the Commonwealth of Nations and other international organizations.

Since human right is an aspect of democracy, it has also become a dominant issue in the democratization agenda. In the history of the world the ways in which human rights have been protected and violated have been the concern of many international actors. Thus, there have been several declarations by international bodies and even national governments on human rights. From the Western conception of human rights and democracy, these cannot function well if human dignity and freedom are not respected. Hence, for any democratic system to operate successfully, the existence of human rights must be its major feature. No wonder then that, the new democratic movement has continued to emphasize the promotion of human rights. As it was pointed out, both declarations of the US Ambassador to Africa and the Canadian Prime Minister in 1990 indicated the relevance of human rights as a major ingredient of democracy. And they have gone as far as including human rights promotion as a conditionality for aid donation to any Third World country.

Cumming (1996:190) expressed the opinion of the British Secretary of Foreign Affairs thus:

Countries tending toward pluralism, public accountability, respect for the rule of law, human right and market

should thus, listen to the words of one of the leaders of the new world agenda, Tony Blair (2002), who declared that

Africans Must not be wards of benevolent guardians; rather they must be the architect of their own sustained upliftment

This declaration by Blair explains the scanty attention that Africa's problems receive from the developed nations and also underscores the necessity for Africa and Africans to brace up to the challenges facing the people. African leaders should show more interest and resolve toward resolving the perennial causes of conflicts from the roots or base rather than seeking solutions from outside the continent. Internal contradictions such as political instability leading to wars, corruption, economic mismanagement and social conflicts have roots in the nature of the colonial system. Africans need a new system of governance that entails the recreation of a new social order with a new political culture that will set its values, and beliefs which will regulate the process of government, and the exercise of power and authority

The new global agenda is a reincarnation of the modernization era which recommended the imbibing of Western development orientations for Third World countries. It should be noted that the failures of these recommendations led to the formulation of dependency theories. Learning from the past experience therefore, African states should pursue policies, which will guarantee greater social harmony among their citizens so that these policies will ameliorate the growing polarization of social classes.

Furthermore, liberal democracy as it is being promoted now is not likely to be a universal phenomenon as it is incompatible with the realities of economic and political situation of African countries. The individualistic requirements of liberal democracy are direct antithesis to the normative reality of most African countries which are essentially communal. The implication of all these is that since the long term goal of the promotion of Western democratic values, will lead to the perpetual dependence on the West, these foreign political values would underpin the mobilization of the people toward national development goals and aspirations. These values will definitely suppress the aspirations of most African states in order to preserve the advantages of a specifically Western model of development.

It is well known that Africa's crisis of development stems in part from the fact that the development agenda and strategies its governments have pursued have usually been

determined for them, and not by them. They have usually applied intellectual, scientific and financial knowledge regarding the definition of the problem of development, strategy and instruments of development, as well as the direction, nature and the tempo of change almost without question. In this new era of globalization, Africa must learn for itself what is proper for it, and what is within it, for the benefit of its people. Africa should not allow itself to enter into this new period of what Ninsin (2000:25) calls "neo-imperialism". Even though a seemingly universal phenomenon, democratic practice differs from state to state. For, as Sandbrooks (1994) rightly observed, the form of democratic practice in Africa should be seen as different since her cultural, historical, political and socio-economic conditions are relatively different from those of the advanced democratic states. In the final analysis therefore, Africa must evolve its own democratic process that has foundations in African indigenous socio-cultural, political and economic systems. It is only in this way that development can be achieved.

CONCLUSION

The new global agenda which came after the collapse of the Soviet Union has introduced some changes into the international arena. While some of these changes have their roots in the pre-1990 era, the new thing in them is that new actors, new roles, views, orientations and transactions have emerged. Thus, a transformed agenda is being proposed for the world. Of relevance to this agenda is the promotion of the democratic agenda as part of the New World Order. The actor of this agenda is the Western Capitalist World which has a long history of practising liberal democracy. From its advantage point of now controlling the world after the demise of the Soviet Union, it is imposing a democratic agenda that African countries have to follow. But the implications of towing the lines of this agenda are enormous as it will implicitly make Africa a more dependent continent. The solution to this new imposition of Western democratic values is for African nations, to restructure their socio-cultural, economic and political values in line with their indigenous practice. Africa needs to develop on her own and with her own resources and orientations. Without this inward approach, democratic development will be a mirage. For Nigeria, it is a missed opportunity for the great potentials of the country. She needs to look back to history and prepare toward off the expected holocaust of the globalization agenda which are being manifested in the activities of its role players, the neo-imperialists.

Cameroon and Kenya among others, where there was a call for a new charter of political and economic arrangements that would be sanctioned by a constituted National Sovereign Conference. Even sit-tight leaders in Kenya, Cameroon, Zaire and Gabon who were adamant on democratic change from one party system, reluctantly bowed to the agitation for change.

Thus, the New World Order has had effect of spurring democratic change in Africa. While this was a welcome development because of the previous African experience, it was hoped that African leaders would be acceptable to their citizens. But since the last decade that introduced new changes into the global system, African states are implicitly yet to experience much of the changes as they are still tacitly tied to their metropolitan mentors. What lessons does Africa have to learn from the impact of this new wave of change for her development?

WHAT LESSONS FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

The history of the present global democratisation movement is not recent as it dates back to the period immediately after the Second World War. This was the time the United States and the Soviet Union had emerged as the most powerful nations of the world with each of them carving its spheres of influence where they would promote their capitalist and communist ideologies respectively. For the United States, it was liberal democracy as subsumed under the capitalist system, or nothing else. From 1945 to the end of the cold war, the propagation of democratic principles of the Anglo-American type was therefore the main concern of the Americans. No wonder then that the collapse of the Soviet Union which the United States fuelled, has given the latter the opportunity to assert its position as the major leader of democratic practice in the world.

Today, the world is witnessing a more serious propagation of democratic values as a variant of the globalization agenda. While globalization is not new, but in this era, it seems different and worst as it is being propagated under new tools, new rules and values and new actors, and through different processes. For Africa, this new approach to globalization is not in the interest of Africa either economically, socio-culturally or politically.

In the first instance, as Rotomi (1999:9) observed, the New World Order in the name of globalization can be seen as colonisation of the third kind. Colonization in the first phase was occasioned by imperialist domination, in the second, after the achievement of political independence, by neo-colonialism, and the third

phase is sponsored by international organizations like the IMF, World Bank, WTO and other multinational and transactional organizations which have taken it upon themselves to sing the song of economic and political liberation to the Third World Countries. Obviously, since the last decade, their recommendation for the adoption of the economic and political values of the Western developed countries have not met with the exigencies and the conditions of the African and other Third World countries. For Third World countries have indigenous economic and political values that are peculiar to them. That is why, for instance, so many IMF recommendations for revitalizing the economies of the Third World countries have failed to meet their expectations. Recently, Nigeria had to withdraw from the IMF economic policy designed for the country.

As we have pointed out, the promotion of liberal democracy worldwide is one of the main agenda of the globalization of liberal democracy which entails the practice of "a government of the people for the people and by the people" is something to cherish, but the practice of this system as advocated by the advanced countries is something else. African countries are expected to imbibe all the values of democracy from the West, but established monarchies such as Saudi Arabia and others should not imbibe democratic values. Even among African countries, the non-practice of liberal democracy in some countries was hailed by the advanced countries particularly in such countries as former Zaire and Uganda. For instance, writing on the internationalization of liberal democracy by the West, Ankomah (2002) observed that:

Often described as a darling of the West, Museveni's human rights record is not better than Mugabe's though his economic record (fuelled by massive injection of donor cash) is said to be slightly better and the international community "is very happy with his 16 years in office

This shows the level of international deceit and blindness to the rightful course of development in Africa. Africa therefore, needs to learn lessons from the new global agenda. In the first instance, there is a need for serious reappraisal of the African situation with a view to making a new beginning. The imperative for a re-appraisal is predicated on the ground that African interest has not received adequate attention within the concept of the global agenda. On the political plane, there is the need to re-evaluate the imported political practices which have since the end of colonialism formed the bedrock of the failed political systems in practice. African states

REFERENCES

- Abari, G., 1997. The Post-cold War Global Agenda and the Third World: Problems and Implications University of Maiduguri Public Lecture
- Amuwo, K. cf Abari G., 1997. The Post-Cold War Global Agenda and the Third World: Problems and Implications University of Maiduguri Public Lecture
- Ankomah, B., 2002. cf Africa Today, February 2002
- Blair, T., 2002. cf Africa Today, February 2002
- Chazan, N, Mortimer R, Ravenhill, J. and Rotchild, D., 1992. Politics and Society in Contemporary Africa Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Cummings, G.D., 1996. British aid to Africa: A Changing Agenda. Third World Vol. 17 No 3
- Dahl, R., 1971. *Polyarchy, Participation and Opposition* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Dahl, R., 1982. Dilemmas of Plural Democracy. New Haven: Yale University Press Diamond, L. Linz J.J, Lipset SM (eds) (1990) Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc
- Ninson, K., A., 2000. Globalization and the Future of Africa, in Occasional Papers Services Vol. 4 No 1 African Association of Political Science
- Okpaga, A., 2002. Globalization of Liberal Democratic Values: What Lessons for Nigeria in Arts and Social Science Forum Journal Vol. 6 No 1
- Okpoh, O.O Jnr, 1999. Globalization and the African Question in the 21st Century" in African Journal of Economy and Society" Vol. No 2 January - December.
- ... V and Theobald, R., 1988. Political Change and Underdevelopment. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- Rotomi, O., 1991. Globalization and Africa's Expectations, Lagos: The Guardian Newspapers December
- Sandbrooks, R., 1994. The Politics of Africa's Economic Recovery Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Scaritt, J and Mozattar, S., 1988. Democratic trends in Developing Countries, in Diamond, Let al Democracy in Developing Countries. Africa, Boulder, Co: Lynner Rienner
- Schmitter, P. C., and Karl, L., 1993. What Democracy is and is no," in Diamond and Platter, MF (ed) The Global Resurgence of Democracy. Baltimore and Loudon: the John Hopkins University Press
- Schumpeter, J., 1947. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers
- Smith, G., 1972. Politics as Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis New York: Holmes and Meir
- Udogu, E. Ike 1996. Incomplete Metamorphic Democracy as a Conceptual Framework in the Analysis of African Politics: An Exploratory Investigation" in Journal of African and Asian Studies Vol. Xx1, 1-2;