

An Assessment of the Effect of Authoritarian Leadership on Democratic Project in Africa

USMAN D. UMARU, Ph.D

Department of Public Administration, University of Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria

Abstract

This paper assesses the Effect of Authoritarian Leadership on Democratic Project in Africa. The objective of the paper is to draw attention to the contemporary negative issues trying to derail the democratic project which started in the 1990s in Africa, with a view to finding solution to them in order to avoid a reversal to the old order, which are authoritarianism and one party state. These objectives shall be achieved with the aid of secondary source of data and other documentary evidences. The paper was able to realise that African Leaders that perpetuate themselves in power after the constitutionally allowed time limits are suffering from a disease known as Hubris Syndrome. This disease normally kick-start after about five years in power and get steadily worst leading to chronic authoritarianism in the State. The paper also identify that Liberal Democracy in Africa is facing resistance from two forces: adventurist soldiers who nurse a nostalgia for the period when the military was the shortest route to power in Africa and civilian beneficiaries of this third wave of democracy who nurse a nostalgia for the period of one party dictatorship that prevailed in most parts of the continent shortly after independence until the end of the Cold War. The paper therefore concluded that some Africa countries have now moved from the eras of one party-state, military coups and multi-party to the era of constitutional coup attempts via constitutional amendments to remove two-term laws to allow for third terms in office. This is to ensure the perpetuation of some African leaders in power. To overcome the derailment of the Democratic Project in Africa, it was recommended that any attempt to derail democratic project in any country in Africa should be strongly resisted by the people, civil society organisations, the regional organisations like the ECOWAS and the African Union. It was further recommended that dialogue and inclusiveness in government should be imbibed at all cost in the African Democratic Project. These will ensure the peaceful resolution of crisis of any nature and type and also ensure the cohesiveness and brotherly tolerance among the various political parties in Africa.

Keywords: Authoritarianism, Leadership, Democratic Project, contemporary issues

1. Introduction

Democratic Project in Africa was embarked upon and won in order to erase economic exploitation, political and social repression and to ensure the enthronement of democratic system devoid of authoritarianism, militarism and abuse of incumbency. The Democratic Project which started between 1989 and 1993 saw to the movement to multiparty democracy of about 43 African countries that were hitherto under one party rule or military dictatorship. Two major parts were chosen by the African countries to transit to democracy i.e. multiparty democracy. These parts were through the Ballot Box in national elections and through the mechanism of the Sovereign National Conferences. The Anglophone and Lusophone countries opted to transit to democracy through the Ballot Box in nationally held elections, while the Francophone countries preferred the Sovereign National Conference angle. But after about 25 years of these democratic independence, the leaders in Africa, who are beneficiaries of these democratic wave using the liberal democratic methods, abused the ballot box systems and also the right of the people to change a government that no longer serve their interests or to overthrow such an undemocratic regimes that perpetuate themselves in power autocratically.

This study is therefore intended to assess the Effect of Authoritarian Leadership on Democratic Project in some selected Africa countries i.e. countries in Central Africa, East Africa, North Africa and West Africa. These shall be arrived at using secondary sources and other documentary evidence.

2. Conceptual Presentations

Democracy stems from the desire of the people of Africa to attain better situation, freedom to pursue their economic, social and cultural interest. Democracy in this sense is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. This definition of democracy was given by the then American President, Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865), which implies that the ultimate authority of government is vested in the people so that public policy is meant to conform to the will of the people (Mbah, 2006). Democracy has also been defined by Nwankwo (1988) as cited by Banjoko (2004), as a form of government in which the citizens exercise the governing power either directly or through their elected representatives who may be changed or re-elected periodically. Here again, democracy emphasises one of its principles, i.e. the right of the people to change their representatives or a government that no longer serve their interests or as required by the constitution. In most African countries, it is the Liberal Democracy in which decision making is carried out through representatives of the people instead of directly by them that is in use. The liberal democracy is utilised through the Presidential

system of government, composed of the Executive, Legislature and the Judiciary. The Legislature is represented by the State Houses of Assembly Members, the National House of Representative Members and the Senate with its Senators which serve as the representative of the people. The decisions or consensus reached are then implemented or carried out by the Executive arm of the government represented by the Leadership of the people in accordance with the constitutional provisions.

Leadership, according to Drucker as cited by Sharma and Sadana (2010), is the lifting of people's vision to a higher sight, the raising of their performance to a higher standard and the building of their personality beyond its normal limitations. Leadership is also the ability of an individual to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of a country. Furthermore, leadership, according to De Pree (1989) as cited by Dimowo and Shaibu (2005), is about the art of liberating people to do what is required of them in the most effective and humane way possible. The leadership should go where no one has gone before. The leader is like a coach or a teacher who performs the art of leadership painstakingly, carefully putting followers through in order to navigate them from the unknown to the known. Dimowo and Shuaibu (2005), quoting De Pree (1989) said:

The goal of thinking hard about leadership is not to produce great or charismatic or well-known leaders. The measure of leadership is not the quality of the head, but the tone of the body. The signs of outstanding leadership appear primarily among follower. This signs are measured by the extent or degree to which the followers are reaching their potentials, achieving required results and exhibiting gracefulness in reacting to change.

Therefore, in discussing democracy, leadership and citizens, the explanations of Arthur Schlesinger as cited by Ruscio (2004) comes into play:

An adequate democratic theory must recognise that democracy is not self-executing; that leadership is not the enemy of self-government but the means of making it work; that followers have their own stern obligation which is to keep leaders within rigorous constitutional bounds; and that Caesarism is more often produced by the failure of feeble government than by the success of energetic ones.

Any leadership that does not motivate, influence and liberate people that will enable them contributes towards the effectiveness and success of their country and is still leading the people, is an authoritarian leader. An authoritarian or autocratic leader is a leader who makes decision alone, assumes full authority and responsibility, is oppressive and his cabinet members do as they are told (Polinaidu, 2004). An Authoritarian leader exercise authority regardless of popular consent. The contemporary authoritarianism in Africa stem from the use of democratic transition or project by the elected leaders to assume leadership and later on intimidate voters, manipulate democratic apparatus and opposition for their selfishness and perpetuate themselves in power. Democratic transition on the other hand implies a passage from a non-democratic to a democratic situation. The passage of Nigeria from a Military Dictatorship Regime to a Democratic Regime from 1999, is a good example (Ibrahim, 2003).

3. Theoretical Issues

Four basic theories of democracy were put forward by Meier (2015) as follows:

- i) Protective theory of democracy believes that government exists to protect the rights of individual citizens in the area of their material wealth and maintaining a free market;
- ii) Pluralistic theory of democracy believes that governmental leadership rests in the hands of those who are elected because the citizens are disinterested in becoming involved;
- iii) Developmental theory of democracy on the other hand acknowledges the need for elected officials to accept that the people are responsible for selection and oversight of their work.

These theories of democracy are relevant to this study because democracy strongly hold that sovereignty rests with the people and the leaders only hold political power as a trust on behalf of the people as a result of the social contract.

The Social Contract Theory of John Locke (1939) as cited by Asirvatham and Misra (2006), stipulated that the contract is first, among the people themselves and secondly the contract is between the people in their corporate capacity on the one hand and the ruler on the other. Therefore, the setting up of a government is a secondary transaction and the dissolution of the government does not mean the dissolution of civil society. It means that the society will have to set up another government in its place. The surrender of the peoples' right during the contract is not completely; rather the people give up certain of their natural rights to a common authority in order that the remaining rights may be kept intact. But when the ruler fails to maintain these rights, people are justified in overthrowing him and setting up a new government. The implications of John Locke's theory is that he insisted that authority of government must be based on the consent of the people; that the community is the legitimate source of political power; that the power of the ruler are limited; that the main object

of the government is to help the people not to ruin them and that the government must be resisted if it steps beyond its bounds (Mbah, 2006).

The realisation of the implications of Locke's theory is dependant on the Leadership. However, in the contemporary African situation, the Behavioural theory of leadership may suffice, because it offers certain responses to a leaders' behaviour. The behavioural theory of leadership analysis what the leader does, how he leads and behaves. The theory is concerned with how the leader behaves and not who the leader was (Umaru, 2014). A number of studies looked at behavioural theory of leadership. These studies are the Ohio State Group, the University of Michigan Group and the Managerial Grid Concept. Blake and Mouton, as cited by Sharma and Sadana (2010) presented and discussed the five key positions on the grid (five major leadership styles) as follows:

- i) 9.1 Authority/Compliance Management: This style emphasises arranging work conditions in such a way that the human element can only interfere to a small degree. The leader concentrates on task efficiency but shows little concern or the development and morale of subordinates (citizens);
- ii) 1.9 Country Club Management: There is a lot of attention to the needs of the people. This is because satisfying relationships are being sought, as that will lead to a comfortable, friendly organisational atmosphere. The leader is considerate to the subordinates to the exclusion of concern for task efficiency;
- iii) 1.1 Impoverished Management (or laissez faire): A minimum effort is extended on getting the work done and sustaining organisation membership;
- iv) 5.5 Middle of the Road Management: There is a balance between getting the work done and maintaining morale at a satisfactory level. The goal of this kind of organisation is adequate performance. It probably involves relying on tried and tested methods and a minimum of risk-taking;
- v) 9.9 Team Management: This approach is characterised by interdependence and a shared commitment to the organisation's purpose. Relationships are based on trust, respect and getting things done by committed cabinet members, employees or citizens. The leader facilitates the task efficiency and high morale by coordinating and integrating work related activities.

These five categories of leadership are presented in a simplified form by Terry and Franklin as cited by Sharma and Sadana (2010):

Table 1: Managerial Grid Categories of Leadership

S/No.	Outcome	Style of Leader	Effectiveness
1	1.1 Little concern for either production or people	The impoverished type	Worst leadership style
2	1.9 Lowest concern for production, highest for people	The country club type	People-oriented style
3	9.1 Highest concern for production, lowest for people	The autocratic type	Production oriented style
4	5.5 Comfortable concern for both production and people	The middle of the road type	Maintain present balance style
5	9.9 Highest concern for both production and people	The team type	Peak of leadership styles

Source: Sharma and Sadana (2010).

The five styles of leadership given by Blake and Mouton and simplified by Terry and Franklin and cited by Sharma and Sadana (2010), point to the relative concern for production and people. It thus implies that the most desirable leadership behaviour is 9.9, i.e. maximum concern for production as well as people. In as much as it has been emphasised that the five positions in the managerial grid are rarely found in their pure form in actual life, an attempt to emulate them in actual life is highly desirable.

3.1 Leadership Styles

Prior to the implementation of the Democratic Project in Africa, there were various styles of leadership in existence. There was the Authoritarian or Autocratic, Democratic and Laissez faire leadership styles. During the Colonial era in Africa, the Authoritarian Regimes were prominent with their respective Authoritarian or Autocratic leadership piloting the affairs of the State. At independence and post-independence eras, most African countries witnessed Democratic and Military Authoritarian leadership styles in play. This study is mainly concerned with the Authoritarian and Democratic Leadership styles. Authoritarian or Autocratic leadership style is a style in which the leader interprets policies and procedures to suit his interest, manipulate the goals to be achieved, direct and control all activities without any meaningful participation or contribution from his cabinet members, stakeholder and experts. The authoritarian leader tells and enforces and is very conscious of his position; he has little trust and faith in the members of his cabinet as such he neither sought nor need

contributions from them; he manipulate legislative decisions and gives orders to be carried out without any question being asked. In short, the authoritarian leader rarely respects the principle of separation of power between the executive, legislature and judiciary and is fond of not respecting the rule of law. While the Democratic Leadership style refers to a leader who has sharing decision-making abilities with cabinet members, respects the separation of power between the executive, legislative and judiciary and obeys all judicial decisions and interpretations, in addition to welcoming and accepting suggestions and criticisms (Nwachukwu, 1992).

3.2 Principles of Democracy

After the enthronement of democracy in Africa, it became a problem for some African leaders to clearly assimilate the concept of democracy and to also adhere to its principles, especially the aspect dealing with the right of the people to change a government that no longer serve their interests. Nzongola-Ntalaja (2001) and Ajaero (2009) briefly discussed the universal concept and principle of democracy. The universal concept of democracy refers to three basic ideas as follows:

- i) Democracy as a moral imperative in the sense that it represents a permanent aspiration of human beings for freedom, for a better social and political order, one that is more human and more or less egalitarian;
- ii) Democracy as a social process in that it is a continuous process of promoting equal access to fundamental human rights and civil liberties for all; and
- iii) Democracy as a political practice or a mode of governance based on the principles of popular sovereignty, the rule of law, accountability, participation and alternance (meaning leadership renewal or change).

The principle or characteristic of democratic governance are as follows:

- i) Power or Authority: legitimate power or authority emanates from the people, who exercise it either directly through popular assemblies or by delegation through elected assemblies, elected executives or some other mode of representations (e.g. dignitaries like lineage heads or clan elders in some African societies).
- ii) Rule of Law: This means that power should not be arbitrary and its exercise must be circumscribed by a set of rules with respect to its limits and mode of operation;
- iii) Rulers: The principle that rulers are chosen by and are accountable to the people for their acts, implies that democracy is government by the consent of the governed;
- iv) Citizens Participation: The citizens have the right to participate in the management of public affairs through free, transparent and democratic elections, decentralised governmental structures and non governmental organisations;
- v) Change of Government: The right of the people to change a government that no longer serves their interests or to overthrow an undemocratic regime (the right to revolution) should be respected.

3.3 Future of Democracy in Africa

It was earlier argued in the 1990s that the future of democracy in Africa remains uncertain in spite of the substantial progress that was made in the process of launching Africa on the path of democracy. This uncertainty arose from the observations made which showed that the efforts made at democratisation does not seem to have the potential of going far to the roots to address the problems militating against enduring democratic practice in Africa, because according to Issa Shivji as cited by Olaitan, (1992), the massive upsurge of the African peoples for democracy is nothing more than a façade; when he said:

The origin of the wind lies in Eastern Europe. The mentors of change, as always are from the West, including erstwhile IMF/World Bank. "Conform or else....", is the tenth commandment. And lo, behold – from military to multi-party; from one party to multi-party; from no party to multi-party – African rulers are changing colours – haltingly at times, reluctantly often, but surely no doubt, lest they fall out of the queue of aid beggars.

The above statement is implying that the new found fervour for democracy in Africa is due more to the world-wide democratic wind that was unleashed by the Mikhail Gorbachev's Perestroika and glasnost; and that the collapse of the communist stronghold in Eastern Europe only gave the liberal West the chance to universalise its ideals of government whereby democratisation along the Western line is made a condition for Western aid. The effect of this development on the African scene that was characterised by bankrupt governments is the compulsory democratisation that was witnessed. The logical implication of this is the fact that the present democratisation in Africa is due largely to external instigation; as such democracy is yet to receive adequate internal normative appeal in Africa (Olaitan, 1992). In order to have an enduring democracy in Africa, it was then suggested that:

- i) the democratisation process should be amenable to the vagaries of African condition. This was because during the democratic transition process, there exist many indicators of a throw-back to the era of dictatorship and authoritarianism;
- ii) any treatise on how democracy can be sustained in any polity ought to be predicated on an adequate exposition of the concept of democracy itself. This was because despite the existence of inexhaustible literature on the concept of democracy, there were glaring absence of consensus by scholars on the appropriate delineation of the nature and contour of the term, which made it difficult to argue for a specific conceptualisation;
- iii) if democracy is to reign and be sustained in any society, it should be due to the activities and demand of the people for it, even against opposition of the government. This was because democracy symbolises the basic contradiction between the people and the government in any society, because the government is often times interested in acquiring more power while the people are concerned more with how to limit the power available to the government. The implication of this is that the government is not usually one of the most enthusiastic proponent or supporter of democracy since the ultimate aim of democracy is to limit the power of government;
- iv) the important thing in the democratisation process is not only social struggle but also the organisation of individuals for a consistent social struggle. This was because the imperativeness of social struggle for the enthronement of democracy demands that the struggle be organised and consistent, if it is to make the desirable impact, since it has to be against government's and other interest opposition;
- v) the most reliable way to make democracy enduring is for the civil society to successfully demand for it through social struggle carried out independent of the State and on the basis of internal dynamics, potentials and endowments of the civil society. This was because the sustenance of democracy in any society is dependent more on the readiness of the members of civil society to enthrone and preserve democracy in that society through struggle;
- vi) founding a democracy and preserving it require a profound moral commitment and emotional allegiance from the people. The people in the civil society must view democracy the best, the most appropriate form of government for their society before they can commit their energies and resources to struggle for it enthronement in their society (Olaitan, 1992).

These are lacking in most African countries; notably Zimbabwe, Burundi, Rwanda, Cameroon, Gambia, Egypt, Libya etc. While democracy was sustained in Nigeria, Ghana, South Africa, Kenya etc as a result of the resistance of the people, civil society organisations, ECOWAS, African Union and friends of Africa.

3.4 Presidential Authoritarianism and Authoritarian Leadership

The effect of the inability to lay a proper foundation for democracy in Africa as explained earlier, led to the emergence of authoritarian regimes with autocratic leaders in some African countries. Authoritarian regimes were arrived at through the use of democratic apparatus, hence the birth of Presidential Authoritarian regimes. The Presidential Authoritarian Regime is one in which the President is the central entity in the wielding of political power through appointment to the civil service, nominations of candidates for competitive or semi-competitive elections in the one-party or non-party state, control of the armed forces, police and the secret service, dispensation of rewards and punishments, award of national honours and artifacts of privilege, determination of national symbols, distribution of economic, social and other developmental goods, and disposal of public assets. There may be institutions within the State which are charged with some or all of these responsibilities, they were often ignored by the President or they have to seek the "presidential nod" in fulfilling their functions (Ayang Nyongo, 2007).

Presidential Authoritarian Regimes tend to invoke popular causes and seek to renew their legitimacy through elections that are quite often non-competitive or semi-competitive. These regimes do not rule by decrees and they have more respect for public institutions which they use over time. Therefore the effect of Authoritarian Leadership on democratic project in Africa was the re-emergence of Authoritarian Leaders who perpetuated themselves in office through the abuse of the power of incumbency, removal of the two-term clause from their respective constitutions or holding of referendums of give way for a third term or even fourth term in office and thus turning themselves into presidents for life. The result is that as democratic regression sets in, violent conflicts, civil war, despotic rule and mega corruption returned and served as key characteristic of the African politics (Ibrahim, 2015).

4. Beneficiaries of Democratisation

Most of the African Leaders who benefited from the wave of democratisation which began in the 1990s tried to elongate their tenures beyond the constitutionally allowed term limits. Disappointedly, even those once lionised by the West as representing a new crop of African leaders such as Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria and

Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal that tried to elongate their tenures. While Olusegun Obasanjo tried to elongate his tenure beyond 2007 to run for a third term in Nigeria and failed, Wade succeeded in changing his country's constitution in Senegal to permit him to run for a third term, but he lost the presidential election in 2012 (Adibe, 2015). The desire of some African leaders to rule forever has been described by Lord Owen, a British Politician, as cited by Ibrahim (2015), as a form of mental disease known as Hubris syndrome.

The disease normally kicks off after about five years in power and get steadily worse. The intoxication by power gradually bring out the worst in an authoritarian leader of excessive pride and arrogance, that start to affect their judgments and cut them off from ambient reality and good advice. They will then start to make decisions that are destructive to the society while believing with more and more conviction that they have divine inspiration in solving national or indeed world problems (2015). In Africa, the following leaders, according to Ibrahim (2015) and Adibe (2015), may be said to be mentally sick and suffering from Hubris syndrome:

- i) Sheikh Professor Alhaji Dr. Yahaya Jame came to power in Gambia through a military coup in 1994 and returned the country back to democratic rule in 1998. Since then he has won successive elections through regular elections where pebbles and small stones can be used instead of ballot papers for voting; opposition politicians were prevented from campaigning, jailed or even killed. Yahaya Jame has been in power for 21 years. His megalomania knows no bound, as he is a doctor who cures all diseases including HIV/AIDS, wizard that can identify and kill witches and a master in statecraft. He has expressed disaffection with regular elections and wants to convert himself into a monarch. He has now declared Gambia an Islamic Republic. He is 50 years of age.
- ii) President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni has been in power as President of Uganda for 29 years. He has consistently won all elections conducted and still wants to run for more terms in office. In 2001 he had said that he would stand down at the following election and would choose a successor. But he changed his mind and instead had the constitution amended to let him run for a third term in 2006. He has accused Dr. Kizza Besigye, his political main rival of treason and rape just to see him out of the way, but the courts have since dismissed the charges. Dr. Bisgye was once Museveni's personal doctor; he has lost three disputed election to President Museveni. When President Museveni lost a ruling in the constitutional court in 2004, he appeared on the state television and lambasted the judges. He is 71 years of age.
- iii) President Denis Sassou Nguesso of Congo has been in power since 1979. He had once convened a national dialogue which came out by a large majority in favour of amending the constitution to remove a upper limit on age of presidential candidates as well as the number of terms the head of state can serve, thus paving way for him to stand for a third term in 2016. He removed two of his Ministers for attending opposition organised meeting that called for resistance against any attempt to revise the constitution. He is 72 years of age.
- iv) President Paul Barthelémy Biya became the President of Cameroun in 1982. In 2008 the constitution was amended to enable him run for a third term in office. He introduced multi-party politics and won elections in 1992, 1997 and 2004. In 2011 election, he won a new 7 years term, which was characterised by widespread fraud. He is 82 years of age and is the longest serving dictator in the world with huge personal fortune around \$200 million with wealth in Europe. He is completely dependent on his wife and cabal around him. These cabals are busy sending potential rivals to jail as they all wait for the old man to die.
- v) President Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe has been in power since 1980 (35 years). He is 91 years of age and because of his age, he was incapable of exercising power in any real sense and is increasingly dependent on his wife, who hopes to take over when he dies. He is also one of the longest serving dictators. He was re-elected twice in the 1990s. In 2000 he organised a referendum on a new Zimbabwean constitution that would expand the powers of the President and allow government to seize white-owned land. In 2008, he was forced to form a inclusive government with MDC leader Morgan Tsvangirai as Vice-President. President Mugabe kept on pressuring the MDC by subjecting the parliamentarians to arrests, imprisonment and torture.
- vi) President Jose Eduardo dos Santos has been president of Angola since 1979 (36 years), after the death of Agostino Neto. He is one of the richest Africans and his daughter the richest African woman. He has turned his regime into the most efficient corruption machine on the continent. He is the head of the armed forces and responsible for appointing senior judges; he has bought up the state media organs as such do not criticise him. He is 73 years of age.
- vii) President Paul Kagame of Rwanda came to power in 1994 as the Country's Vice-President and Minister of Defence up to 2000 when he became his country's substantive President. He was hailed as part of new generation of African leaders helping to usher in democracy. He won election in 2003 under a new constitution adopted that year and was again elected to a second term of seven years in 2010. Though his term expires in 2017 and should not be constitutionally extended, but

- the Rwandan constitution is about to be changed to allow him to stay on for a third term, thanks to a referendum by the people which allowed for the amendment of the constitution. He has been consistently criticized for stifling opposition and interfering in neighbouring countries affairs including the long-running conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo and of recent in Burundi. He is 58 years of age.
- viii) President Pierre Nkurunziza of Burundi has been President of since 2005. He has sought for a third term in office and won, thus plunging the small East African nation into its biggest crisis where dozens were killed. Before the third term elections, demonstrations were held to stop the election, a coup was staged and failed, there were clashes between rebel soldiers and the army plus 175, 000 Burundians who took refuge in neighbouring countries. President Nkurunziza is currently driving his country into civil war and has already armed thousands of militia to support the military in killing all those who contest his third term bid. He is 52 years of age.
- ix) President Blaise Compaore of Burkina Faso has ruled the country for 27 years, after overthrowing Captain Thomas Sankara in a Military coup in 1987. It was Thomas Sankara that changed the name of the former French colony from Upper Volta to Burkina Faso (land of honest men). When Blaise Compaore took over the leadership, he transformed himself into a civilian President. He failed in his attempt to extend his tenure beyond the constitutionally allowed two terms. This attempt led to uprisings which forced him into exile. A new Transitional Government was set up. The government came up with a new electoral law which banned all candidates linked to the failed 2014 bid to elongate the tenure of Blaise Compaore from contesting in the elections scheduled for October, 2015.

5. Conclusion

Some Africa countries have now moved from the eras of one party-state, military coups and multi-party to the era of Constitutional coup attempts via constitutional amendments to remove two-term laws to allow for third terms in office. This is to ensure the perpetuation of some African leaders in power. The Liberal Democracy in Africa is being resisted from three forces: the adventurist soldiers who nurse nostalgia for the period when the military was the shortest route to power in Africa and the civilian beneficiaries who nurse nostalgia for the period of one party dictatorship that prevailed in most parts of the continent after independence until the end of the cold war.

The next threat to democracy is the fight against terrorism in Africa. This is because the counter-terrorism measures have not only lead to the curtailing of citizens freedoms such as the imposition of curfews and roadblocks as being experienced in most part of Nigeria, especially the North Easter part, but also people trained in the new techniques for fighting terrorism could become security risk to the State. Cases in point are the leader of the recent coup (September 2015) in Burkina Faso, Lieutenant-General Diendere was the president of the country's Flintlock 2010 Committee, which is a major US-led military exercise designed to enable Africa partners to combat violent extremist organisations and provide increased interoperability, counter-terrorism and combat skills training while creating a venue for regional engagement. Also, Lieutenant-Colonel Yacouba Isaac Zida who served as Burkina Faso's acting head of state in November 2014 after seizing power in the aftermath of the 2014 uprising that forced the abdication of Compaore, also previously received US military training.

In addition, Captain Amadou Haya Sanogo, who led renegade military faction that overthrew the democratically elected government in Mali in 2012 equally received US military training. It is therefore advisable to keep an eye on the African soldiers receiving advanced military training to help combat the current terrorist challenges (Adibe, 2015).

6. Recommendations

Liberal Democracy is universalised in Africa and is accepted. Any attempt to return Africa back to military rule and one-party state should be resisted by the people, regional organisations (such as ECOWAS) and the African Union. This came into play during the September 17th 2015 Coup in Burkina Faso against the Interim Leadership of that country. Pressures were mounted by demonstrators, striking labour unions and the continental regional organisations all against the coup. The coup leader, Lieutenant-General Gilbert Diendere was forced to step aside and he confessed that the coup was the biggest mistake and that he should not have taken such an action.

In addition, dialogue should always be used to resolve crisis, disputes and any other issue threatening corporate existence instead of resorting to the use of arms, which rarely lead to successful ends. Furthermore, the 'winner takes all' syndrome in African politics should be discouraged and discarded.

At the end of each election, winners of election should know that they have to serve all irrespective of party affiliations. Good hands and experts together with professionals in the opposition camp should be integrated into the new government and the continuity of government should be strongly encouraged.

References

- Adibe, J (2015). The Military Misadventure in Burkina Faso. Abuja, Daily Trust Newspaper, October 1st, page 72.
- Ajaero, C. (2009). The True Meaning of Democracy. Lagos, Newswatch Magazine, December 21st, pages 15-16.
- Anyang'Nyongo, P. (2007). Good Governance for whom? How Presidential Authoritarianism Perpetuates Elitist Politics in Affirca. In O. Oculi and Nasidi, Y.A. (Eds.). Issues in Governance. Zaria, Ahmadu Bello University Press.
- Asirvathan, E. and Misra, K.K. (2006). Political Theory. New Delhi, Rajendra Ravindra Printers (Pvt) Ltd.
- Banjoko, O.O. (2004). Universal Democracy. Ibadan, Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Dimowo, F.A., and Shaibu, I. (2005). Management: A Nigerian Perspective. In B.A. Agbonifoh, A.B. Agbadudu and F.I.O. Iyayi (Eds.) Leadership in Management. Lagos, Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Ibrahim, J. (2003). Democratic Transition In Anglophone West Africa. Senegal, CODESRIA.
- Ibrahim, J. (2015). Bleak Horizon for Democracy in Africa. Abuja, Daily Trust Newspaper, July 13th, page 64.
- Kwari, T. (2015). Political Transition. Retrieved on 27th September 2015 from www.gmu.edu
- Mbah, M.C.C. (2006). Political Theory and Methodology. Nsukka, Rex Charles and Patrick Ltd.
- Meier, K.S. (2015). 4 Basic Theories of Democracy. Retrieved on 28th September, 2015 from www.classroom.synonym.com
- Nwachukwu, C.C. (1992). Management: Theory and Practice. Onitsha, Africana-FEP Publishers Ltd.
- Nzongola-Ntalaja, G. (2001). The Democratic Project in Africa: The Journey So far. Abuja, The Nigerian Social Scientist, Vol. 4, No.1 pages 20-24.
- Olaitan, W.A. (1992). Democracy and Democratisation in Africa in Africa: Not yet the Glorious Dawn. In B. Caron, A. Gboyega and E. Osaghae (Eds.) Democratic Transition in Africa. Ibadan, CREDEU.
- Polinaidu, S. (2004). Public Administration. New Delhi, Galgotia Publications PVT. Ltd..
- Ruscio, K.P. (2004). The Leadership Dilema in Modern Democracy. U.K. Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.
- Sharma, M.P. and Sadana, B.L. (2010). Public Administration in theory and practice. New Delhi, Kitab Mahal.
- Umaru, D.U. (2014). New Dimension to Public Administration Theories and Management Paradigm in Nigeria. Makurdi, AT-Mishad Publishers.