



The Concept 'Development' Revisited towards Understanding: in the Context of Sub-Saharan Africa

Brian-Vincent IKEJIAKU

Research Institute for Law, Politics and Justice

Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, UK

Tel: 44-79-4476-5923

E-mail: b.v.o.ikejiaku@ilpj.keele.ac.uk OR ike.bvo06@yahoo.com

Abstract

There has been lingering contention on what development means in the African context. The meaning of development in the African context is crucial in order to know whether Africa is developing or not, particularly since 1970. This debate becomes critical when it is appreciated that Africa appears as the least developed continent in the world. *This paper conceptualises 'development'*; in doing this, the paper considers both economic and political development, and looks into the complex question: Must economic development precede political development in Africa or vice-versa? In an attempt to address these issues, the paper considers and examines the views of many scholars and studies on these subject matters. While the paper recognises the rise and importance of recent global development paradigms, such as feminism, and green-environmentalism, it however, applies the long traditional approaches – modernisation, liberalism, dependency and Marxism in analysing the meaning of development in Sub-Saharan African context. This is because this paper is concerned with *the real development stage* of this Sub continent of Africa, and not merely an intellectual exercise. The paper finally proffers a definition of development, which it believes to be germane in the context of real developmental stage of Sub-Saharan Africa.

Keywords: Political cum economic development, Green-environmentalism, Feminism, Liberalism, Modernisation, Marxism, Democracy, Sub-Saharan Africa

1. Introduction

In much of Africa, it seems that very little economic growth has occurred over the past fifty years. Some countries also appear to be even poorer today than they were thirty years ago. Thirty years ago, for example, the average income in Sub-Saharan Africa was twice that of both East-Asia and South-Asia, yet, despite the fact those regions hold 60 percent of the developing world's population, the crisis of world poverty now appears to be in Africa (Report of the Commission for Africa 'RCA', 2005). More so, economic growth in some parts of Asia has been more than double the average figure for all countries. Growth rates for 2008 are projected to be above 5% for South Asia. This region, like Africa, particularly Sub-Sahara Africa, faced economic challenges forty to fifty years ago, but unlike Africa, South Asia now enjoys sustainable long-term economic growth, helping to reduce their rate of poverty (Marke, 2007). Average African incomes are now well below that of East Asia, where the number of people living on less than one dollar a day has fallen dramatically since 1981. Increasingly we see a similar story in India and South Asia (RCA, 2005: 103). Other indicators are equally depressing: average life expectancy in Africa is only 46 years, compared with 63 years in South Asia, 69 years in East Asia and 73 years in advanced affluent countries. Access to clean water in Africa has also fallen behind the levels in the rest of the developing world, for example, 50 per cent in Africa in 2002, compared with 84 per cent in South Asia (ibid). The term Africa is used in this paper for clarity and convenient sake and therefore means the developing countries of Sub-Saharan Africa.

2. Theoretical Overview of the Concept - Development

While this paper recognises the rise and importance of recent global development paradigms, such as feminism and green-environmentalism; however, it will employ the long traditional approaches – modernisation, liberalism, dependency and Marxism in its analysis of the meaning of development in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa. This is because this paper is concerned with *the real development stage* of this Sub region of Africa, and not merely an intellectual exercise. Feminist scholars, for example simply argue that the concept development is lacking or even meaningless if it does not project women's concerns and relevancy in the mainstreams of development activities. This is emphasised on the field of women in development (commonly tagged as WID), as emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, made prominent the pivotal and central role of women as subsistence producers and providers of basic needs in

developing countries and developed communities (Burchill et al, 1996). Globally, ‘male development planners have seen WID as instrument not a goal, as a means for lower population growth, higher economic growth and more successful political mobilisation’ (Newland, 1988: 507). However, in spite of the seeming usefulness of this development approach, the relegated position of women in development pattern of Sub-Saharan African countries is pronounced (WOCON, 2004: 4), and therefore reduces the relevancy of this development model in the real development stage of the Sub region.

Green-environmentalists see development in the present dispensation as the conglomeration and vital nature of ecosystem and environmental group, pointing out that the root cause of the current global development problems, particularly environmental crises, is mainly because of the exceptional economic growth experienced during the last two centuries (Patterson, in Burchill, op cit). This approach emphasises on the crucial nature of protecting the ‘global commons’ ... (Eckersley, 1992) for sustained economic development. However, scholars, such as Sachs (1993) are extremely critical of the term ‘sustainable development’ in widespread use in green-environmental circles, contending that this basically serves to make it easier for global ruling elites to coopt environmentalism. Thus, since the effects of globalisation (controlled by the global ruling elites) have been most critical on developing countries of Africa, this paper is yet to see the ‘active character’ of green-environmental approach in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa. Therefore, any application of these and other recent approaches in the analysis of the real development stage of the Sub-Saharan Africa is basically, a mere intellectual exercise. This is because the practicality and impact of these development ideas is yet arid, barren or infertile in the present development pattern of Sub Saharan Africa.

Against this backdrop, this paper ‘applies’ (not discusses) the long traditional approaches – modernisation, liberalism, dependency and Marxism in its analysis of the meaning of development in Sub-Sahara African context (for a detailed discuss and application of these traditional approaches, specifically liberalism and dependency, see Ikejiaku, 2008).

3. Economic and Political Development

Sequel to the above submissions, it appears that Africa is the least developed continent in the world. This paper therefore revisits the meaning and understanding of the concept ‘development’, particularly as it relates to the African context. The concept ‘development’, as many writers (Schaefer, 2005; Abu-Ghaida and Klassen 2004; McLean 1996; Sen and Dreze 1995; Omolayole, 1991; Adebo, 1991; Olowu, 1990; Ofiong 1980 and Seers, 1969) have noted lacks one single generally accepted definition. This is because, in the words of Ndegwa (1986: 1) ‘what is referred to as development is actually, a complex subject’; therefore, the significance of considering economic and political development.

3.1 Economic development

In order to understand the term ‘development’, particularly as it relates to the African context, it will be helpful to consider briefly one critical matter of debate in this area. In one of his contributions to what development means, Nnoli (1981: 21) opposed seriously what he refers to as ‘Artefacts of Development’, which some African leaders (example Nigeria’s Gowon, early 1970 and Tanzania’s Nyerere, late 1970) and scholars (example Akinyotu, 1979) have favoured to be real development. He argues that the widespread view, within and outside Africa, that Nigeria and some other African countries are developing is unsound, ill conceived and misguided. ‘It is based on a notion of development that commits us to a wholesale imitation of others and therefore, to a wholesale repudiation of our state of being’ (ibid). Nnoli further points out that the often stated goal is to catch up with the West. And in effect such a goal permits us to want passionately goods and services that we cannot create for ourselves with the resources at our disposal, and it causes us to neglect our basic needs (such as food, water and housing) and local resources (such as agricultural products and casting). The view of a developing country, which these leaders share, is one of a country that is increasingly acquiring more and more artefacts of the type found in the Western countries and Japan and which are created by financial industrial leaders of these foreign countries. These foreign societies are regarded as developed, and they have a large number of cars, roads, hospitals, computers, television sets, technicians, educated people, good houses, airways, iron and steel complexes, agricultural machinery, a fashion industry, efficient managers, and an advertising industry and so on (ibid).

The meaning of Nnoli’s view is that Nigeria and some African leaders are still viewing their nation’s development in terms of striving to actualise many of the conditions of the good life in the developed world. These according to Nnoli, include industrialisation, economic affluence, military hegemony, advanced technology, urbanisation, and a parliamentary political process. Thus, the concept of development involved here is that of a checklist of artefacts (ibid).

However, contrary to Nnoli’s position, there are different views in relation of development in Africa. One of such views, which are crucial, is: There is a strong belief that the economy of some African countries (such as Nigeria and South Africa) has passed the stage of economic take-off and reached that of self sustaining growth (Akinyotu, 1979).

Rostow’s theory of the Stages of Economic Growth offers a categorisation of the five epochs in the economic development of human societies. The five stages which correspond to the levels of industrialisation of societies briefly

are: (1) the Traditional Society – here the production functions are limited this is a society that has pre-Newtonian science as well as pre-Newtonian attitude to the physical world. (2) Pre-Take-Off – the stage where the society is getting ready to take off, it is a society in transition. (3) Take-Off – a stage when the society is becoming economically independent, independent industries begin to emerge. (4) Maturity – the society at this stage has taken off and is driving to maturity, economic growth now supersedes population growth. (5) High Mass Consumption – at this stage the society has achieved maturity and it emphasises the production of consumables (Rostow, 1960).

The major criticism here is that though most African countries are developing countries, the proponents and scholars of a development model, in relation to developing countries, have left us with no stipulated criteria for assessing the relative weight to improvements in some areas of life or the deteriorating of state of affairs in other sectors. This is necessary in order to allow us in determining if a country like Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Sudan, Zimbabwe and other developing countries are really developing or not. In other words, sometimes I wonder whether most African states have even reached the ‘take-off stage’. When the rate of economic growth in Africa is compared to its population, and when its GDP is assessed, this (economic development stage) of African states becomes very doubtful; particularly if a comparative work is made with Asian countries as argued above. As a reminder: Thirty years ago, the average income in Sub-Saharan Africa was twice that of both East-Asia and South-Asia, yet, despite the fact those regions hold 60 percent of the developing world’s population, the crisis of world poverty now appears to be in Africa (RCA, op cit). More so, economic growth in some parts of Asia has been more than double the average figure for all countries. Growth rates for 2008 are projected to be above 5% for South Asia. This region, like Africa, particularly Sub-Sahara Africa, faced economic challenges forty to fifty years ago, but unlike Africa, South Asia now enjoys sustainable long-term economic growth, helping to reduce their rate of poverty (Marke, op cit). Average African incomes are now well below that of East Asia, where the number of people living on less than one dollar a day has fallen dramatically since 1981. Increasingly we see a similar story in India and South Asia (RCA: 103).

For Africa, between 1980 and 2002, the population of Sub-Saharan Africa has grown from 383 to 689 million people, which is an increase of 80 percent (RCA, 2005: 112). In contrast, in much of Africa, very little economic growth has occurred over the past fifty years. Some countries are even poorer today than they were thirty years ago. Sub-Saharan Africa has had the lowest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for decades. Statistics confirm that Africa has a population of about 600 million, more than double that of the United States, yet it is estimated that average real GDP per capita, which is 11% in Africa is lower today than it was in 1970 (Marke, 2007). Africa urgently needs economic growth than the rest of the world. In order to close the gap with the wealthy nations, Africa, particularly the Sub-Saharan Africa must achieve sustained high rates of real growth in GDP for decades. A joint study by African Development Bank (ADB), African Economic Research Consortium, Global Coalition for Africa, Economic Commission for Africa and World Bank warned few years ago that ‘five percent annual growth is needed simply to keep the number of poor from rising... (and that)... halving severe poverty by 2015 will require annual growth of more than seven percent, along with a more equitable distribution of income’ (World Bank, 2000). However, Schaefer points out that rather than very much needed economic growth, the countries of Sub-Sahara Africa as a region witnessed a decline in per capita GDP from \$575 in the 1980 to \$524 in 2003 (Schaefer, 2005: 2).

Again, any socio-economic indicator suggests that Sub-Saharan Africa lags behind the rest of the developing regions in the world. Example, among the 49 countries classified by the UN as ‘least developed’ in the year 2001, sadly, Sub-Saharan Africa had 34. Since 1975 precisely, the region has been backwards economically, while the rest of the developing regions are making accelerated advancement. In the periods 1960-73 the growth rate of the region cannot be differentiated with those of both East and South Asia. Ghana, for example at independence in 1957, was more flourishing than the Republic of Korea, however, between 1975 and 1995 Ghana’s exports increased by four times, compared to more than 400 times in the Republic of Korea. Nigeria, in 1965 had economic output approximately that of Indonesia, but by 1997 Indonesia’s output was as high as eight times that of Nigeria (Regional Survey of the World, 2002: 12). Scholars have also argued that ‘Takeoffs’ could be said to be rare in most African countries, but most plausibly limited to the Asian success story (Schaefer, 2005).

Other scholars have defined development from different and wider perspectives. McLean (1996: 137) defines development as a ‘multi – dimensional process that normally connotes change from a less to a more desirable state’. He holds that development is considerably more of a ‘normative concept’, hence the inadequacy of any attempt at a single definition. It is in this connection that some writers have argued that development must be relative to time, place and circumstance. Included in this school of thought is Adebo (1991: 3), who defined development as ‘a process concerned with people’s capacity in a defined area, over a defined period, to manage and induce positive change; that is to predict, plan, understand and monitor change; and reduce or eliminate unwanted or unwarranted change’. By way of elaboration, the more people develop themselves, the more they would become instruments for further change. Education is therefore identified as the key to people’s ability to manage and induce change (ibid). Suffice it to say that Education is a means to fulfilment of an individual, transfer of values from one generation to the next and critical for economic growth and healthy population. World Bank study in seventeen Sub-Sahara African countries shows a clear correlation

between education and lower HIV and AIDS infection rates (Abu – Ghaida and Klassen, 2004). Drez and Sen (1995: 13) argue ‘education can be an important promoting factor in determining the ability of individuals to make use of economic opportunities’.

The view is therefore held that any good definition of economic development should make resources and the objective of their exploitation its central concern; hence Walter Rodney’s socio-economic definition of development as quoted by Omolayole (1991), ‘as a process of increasing the ability, capacity and capabilities of a people to exploit the resources of their environment, so as to satisfy their needs at any given time’. Other writers have looked at development from the point of view of increased economic efficiency, expansion of productive capacity of the nation’s economy, technology advance, economic, and industrial diversification. These are seen as necessary conditions for sustainable development (Ndegwa, 1986, Omolayole, 1991).

In an attempt to understand what is meant by the concept ‘development’, it is important to stress that there is a difference between socio-economic and political development. For example, Salih (2003) argues that Africa has made tremendous achievement in political development, as opposed to socio-economic development. Ndegwa (1986) contends that Africa must be aware of the fact that apparent development in terms of ‘per capita incomes’ could be achieved while the country comes even under imperialistic neo-colonialism. He cites professor Adebayo Adedeji, the former Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, ‘the African region cannot escape the retreat into economic colonialism which now threatens it without bold and imaginative measures to build – at national and multi – national levels – the political capabilities to develop and exploit (its) resources itself... And it is only by facing up to this task that Africa can realise its long – term economic prospects’ (ibid: 8). The Commission for Africa (2005: 106) notes that Africa cannot continue to face weak governance and poor capacity building by its leaders, which hinder socio-economic development. Based on the above views, it will be helpful to consider briefly the distinction between political development and economic development.

3.2 Political Development

Political development concerns the improvement of the political sector that will help in achieving socio-economic development. Nnoli (1981) for example, notes that political development focuses on political stability and the institutionalisation of political goals and the means for achieving them; ‘sometimes it is also seen as the increase in the various capabilities of the system to solve such problems as the extraction and distribution of resources and the regulation and integration of the society...’ (ibid: 21).

Other scholars Soremekun (2000), Oji, (1997), Clapham (1996), Ake, (1982), Milbrath, and Goel, (1977) argue that political development involves elements such as political mobilisation, political participation, party politics, the rule of law, a free press and universal suffrage. Milbrath and Goel (1977) argue that for a political system to be taken as developing politically there is the need for the citizenry to participate in the act of governance. This is because the whole essence of the state, and, therefore government, is to regulate the conduct of individuals in the society and provide security and the good life of the people. The participation of the people is therefore a ‘sine qua non’ for political progress and good governance. They note that this participation can be either direct, in the sense of being involved in governance, particularly at the local level or indirect, by observing and making contributions to government, including exercising voting rights. Political participation obviously is accommodating in a democratic regime than in a military regime, because in a democratic setting, people are freer to express themselves and they recognise the power of their votes. Oji (1997) therefore, points out that the presence of alternative competing parties that allows the populace choice of candidates, and free press are essential tools of political development.

Ake (1982), points out that political development should not be confused with the politics of development. In the latter case, there exists a developmental relationship among nations in which one nation due to its technological and managerial advantage agrees to develop the economy of another less advantaged nation, for example through technological transfer. Political development on the other hand, involves the entirety of the developmental process of a nation. It aims at classifying societies in terms of their level of political modernisation. Precisely, this includes the level of educational attainment, the level of political awareness, mobilisation and participation, the practicability of the electoral process based on universal suffrage or unrestricted franchise and the holding of free and fair election, with a free press and the effectiveness of bureaucratic structures, the judicial system and ability to relate with and understand one another in the social strata. Soremekun (2000) provides us with a good example: the high level of political participation in both Botswana and India suggests that these two countries are politically developed and quality governance is enshrined in them, comparatively Kenya and Nigeria (that share the same British colonial heritage with the former set of countries), there is low level of political participation and democracy. This negatively affects their level of political development. Besides, while the neo-colonial or external factor(s) cannot be completely disregarded, Botswana and India clearly indicate that psychological and cultural variables contribute to differing outcomes in places like Nigeria and Kenya on the one hand and Botswana and India on the other.

3.3 The relationship between Economic Development and Political Development

Economic development stresses economic growth. Seers (1969) defined economic development as the increase of economic wealth of countries, pointing out that achieving economic growth, an aspect of economic development is an increase in the national income. There is a general acceptance by economists that 'socioeconomic progress' is measured by two indicators, which are – economic growth as reflected by the annual growth of the GNP, and the distribution of its benefits (Olowu, 1990).

The questions that come to mind with respect to the definitions above are: what is the exact relationship between political development and economic development? Must economic modernisation lead to political modernisation as some have argued (Rostow, 1971, Emerson, 1971)? The lessons of economic history in the West, the East, and most recently the breakthroughs in the Far East (e.g. South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan) suggest that socioeconomic transformation in terms of rapid economic growth is a prerequisite for political participation or political development (Emerson, *ibid*).

Some political scientists, such as Huntington (1968), see political development as the ability of the political leadership to exert control and 'mobilise' the people in a given state. Economic development theorists have also premised authoritarian control as indispensable for the management of the path to economic growth (Riggs, 1970). The apparent ease with which some socialist or communist and the newly industrializing countries in Asia and Middle East carried out accelerated industrialization and development of their economies provides full proof and support to this position. The case of Singapore is a good example, Singapore, with a population of 4.5 million (July 2007 estimate), which became a British colony in 1867 is not poor and it is very developed, this is evidenced by her GDP per capita (US\$), which rose from 2,450 in 1975 to 31,400 in 2006 (Marke, 2007). It came to be generally accepted that some sort of authoritarian coercion is essential for economic growth and economic development in developing world (Goran, 2000; see also Rostow, 1971 and Ward, 1971). Again, there is a conviction shared by both some of the intelligentsia in the Third World and their foreign advisers and aid providers that economic development requires political stability which only authoritarian governments could guarantee (Goran, 2000).

However, political scientists and sociologists who have contributed to this debate such as Dankwart Rustow, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, and Seymour Martin Lipset differ in their positions. For example Rustow (1970) argues that democracy can only flourish when a country attains a certain level of economic development. On the other hand, Almond and Verba (1963), provide the cultural factors essential for democracy. They contend that only 'civic culture', typified by a high predisposition by citizens to participate or involve in politics and high level of confidence and tolerance, is favourable to the emergence and growth of democracy.

Yet, a slight deviation in the debate about the relationship between economic and political development is epitomized by the international donor community pioneered by the World Bank and the IMF. This school posits that economic development can best be achieved in a liberal political setting. If sustainable development is to occur, a predictable and transparent framework of rules and institutions for the conduct of private and public business must exist. In other words, political development is a *sine qua non* for economic development (Wayande 2000: 241). The current thinking of the donor community is that economic development (in the form of market oriented reforms) and political development (in the form of political reforms with the emphasis on transparency, accountability, governmental responsiveness to popular will, rule of law and press freedom) should go hand in hand (*ibid*).

All of these views are open to question. First, on the issue of authoritarian control, trends of events in Africa suggest that in countries where authoritarian control has been adopted, economic development has not followed; for example in Kenya under Arap Moi (1978), in Nigeria under Babangida (1985) and in Uganda under Museveni (1986). In Moi's Kenya for example, President Moi demonstrated a shift back to a pre-reform period by restricting political freedom, imposing arbitrary resolutions with far reaching political implications and denouncing constitutional reforms to reflect the multiparty system politics that began in Kenya in early 1992, thus continuing to challenge calls for changes that agree with democratic ideals and in line with elements of political development (Wayande, 2000). Then, what happened? This authoritarian control had bad economic consequence on Kenya, since GDP continued to decline from 2.1% in 1991 to 0.5% in 1992 and 0.2% in 1993 (Okafor, 2004: 67, Ikejiaku, 2009). An Aid embargo was also imposed on Kenya for lack of governance in the early 90s (*ibid*). Even in countries like Ghana, President J. Rawlings (1982) (who arguably performed well during his administration) could not continue with authoritarian control. Clapham (1996: 248), for example argues that Rawlings in Ghana and Museveni in Uganda who tried to regulate economic activities, turned out to become two of the leading African exponents of economic liberalisation. The major problems with authoritarian control are that it creates opportunities for radical social change and political and bureaucratic corruption (Olowu 1990), particularly under 'malevolent' leaders. It works against the tenets of good governance and democratic principles. On this contentious issue, Olowu and Wunsh (1990: 310) argue:

'A belief that authoritarianism is essential to development helps explain trends toward centralisation and the personalisation of power and authority in Africa. Yet the consensus of many of those who have carried out careful

analyses of the African development effort is that the authoritarian models imposed in much of Africa, either of the military or of civil variety, have hindered rather than fostered development’.

Again, on that presents problems for leaders in Africa such as Moi of Kenya, Babangida of Nigeria, Museveni of Uganda, P. Botha of South Africa, Mobutu of Zaire, Bokassa of Central African Republic, Mugabe R. of Zimbabwe to mention but a few. Even though such leaders cherish economic reforms, they are very uncomfortable with liberal political values such as transparency, accountability, political participation, free press, and responsiveness to popular will. Obviously, liberal political values (and therefore political development) threaten their use of office for personal gain (for corruption or personal gain/enrichment of African leaders while in political office, see Ikejiaku, 2009). Thus, Hyden (2000: 246) argues:

‘The current African malaise can be best understood by a critical examination of governance in Africa. By ‘governance’ we mean here the use of political authority to promote and enhance societal values – economic as well as non-economic – that are sought by individuals and groups’.

4. Other Conceptualisation or Interpretations of ‘Development’

Writers have attached several additional ingredients in the conceptualisation of development. Offiong (1980: 21) also defined development ‘as a type of social change in which new ideas are introduced into a social system in order to produce higher per capita incomes and levels’. In some interpretations, the increase in general social welfare goes beyond economic aspects of welfare, to embrace for instance, spiritual and cultural attainments; individual dignity and group esteem. Again, in respect of ‘individual dignity’, Drez and Sen (1995: 10) submit that ‘one way of seeing development is in terms of the expression of the real freedoms that the citizens enjoy to pursue this objective they have reason to value, and in this sense the expansion of human capability can be, broadly, seen as the central feature of the process of development’. The problem here is that most countries of Sub-Saharan Africa still lack the developed governance institution to provide the necessary social and political freedoms to the people. There is unavoidable connectivity between unbridled (unrestrained or participatory) democracy, poverty and development. Development cannot thrive for all citizens unless citizens enjoy certain basic rights (Azinge, in Okafor, 2004), such as rights to food, minimum wage-income, health, education and political participation.

Ake notes that development also involves equality, in the sense that the countries with seemingly ‘inferior culture’ try to catch up with the more developed countries in terms of technological growth and individual socio-political enhancement. And the capacity of such nations to develop or adopt a culture of development aimed at harnessing its technological endowments for the ultimate good of its citizens (Ake: 1982). However, trends of events in Sub-Saharan Africa have convinced us that the doctrine of ‘catch up’ as it applies to developing countries of Sub-Saharan Africa, closing the gap with the technological advanced nations has been futile all ‘these decades’. Just as Sanbrook (1982) submits the industrial base of the wealthy nations is so great, their technological capacity so advanced, and their consequent advantages so immense that it is unrealistic to expect that the gap between the rich and the poor nations will narrow at the end of the century. Every indication is that it will continue to grow.

Yet other conditions that have been induced in the interpretation of the concept of development, particularly by Marxist scholars (such as Baran, 1957; Frank 1971; Sweezy 1978) are increasing national self-reliance and self-determination predicated on the notion that development is something a country does itself and that it involves a reduction in dependency (Ward, 1962). It is from the above perspective that Offiong (1980:21) defines development as ‘the coincidence of structural change and liberation of men from exploitation and oppression perpetuated by the international capitalist bourgeoisie and their internal collaborators’. Therefore, it follows that real development involves ‘a structural transformation not only of the economy, but also of the society, polity and self-perpetuating use and development of the people’s potentials’ (ibid: 21). Similarly, the said structural transformation of the economy and global system is still begging.

Therefore, the definition of the development is a phenomenon undergoing improvement processes. In other words, development now emphasises people and attainment of political goals, as distinct from just growth in the volume of goods/commodities. Thus, pointing out the separation between political and economic development. However, scholars such as Baran (1957) and Frank (1971) have in varying degrees approached political development as the political prerequisite of economic development.

5. Summaries and Conclusion

In summation therefore, generally, all the definitions as presented above point towards achieving either one or more of the three different goals of development, that Todaro (1981) identifies:

- producing more ‘life sustaining’ necessities such as food, shelter, and health care and broadening their distribution
- raising standards of living and individual self esteem
- expanding economic and social choice and reducing fear.

Based on the above considerations, this paper sees development as *an increase in economic growth; properly harnessed by leaders toward both economic and political enhancement of the citizens*. This definition is germane to Africa's present level of development, because Africa not only needs economic growth, but also a reliable political sector that will harness its growth for both political and economic benefits of the populace. This is why having political aspect or consideration of political development is important. Thus, a political system must be capable to mobilise the citizens, allow for a competing political parties, regular and free election, free press and association, an acknowledgement that politics is rightfully a mechanism for solving problems and not an end in itself and finally an acceptance of some form of mass participation (Lucian, 1966).

This agrees with Seers (1969), who argues that development is about positive outcomes. That is, development is not just high economic growth, but in addition what the governments or leaders are doing with the said growth in order to positively transform the lives of the people (essentially the provision of basic needs, such as food, water, shelter, health and literacy). This is crucial to many countries of Sub-Saharan Africa.

References

- Abu – Ghaida and Klassen. (2004). the Cost of Missing the Millennium Development Goal in Gender Equity. *IZA discussion paper*, No. 1031, February.
- Adebo, O. (1991). 'Leadership and the Concept of Development' in Olusegun Obasanjo and Akin
- Ake, C. (1982). *Social Sciences as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan University Press: Ibadan.
- Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture; political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. (1996). *Theories of International Relations*. Macmillan Press (London).
- Commission for Africa (2005). *The Report of the Commission for Africa*. CA.
- Dreze J. and Sen, A. (1995). *India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*. Delhi Oxford University Press: Bombay Calcutta Madras.
- Eckersley, R. (1992). *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Towards an ecocentric approach*. London.
- Huntington, S. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. Yale University Press: New Haven.
- Ikejiaku, B. (2008). Africa Debt Crisis and IMF, with a case of Nigeria: Towards Theoretical Explanations. *Journal of Politics and Law*, Vol.1, No.4, Dec. 2008 pp2-8.
- Ikejiaku, B. (2009). The Relationship between Poverty, Conflict and Development. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 2, No. 1, March 2009.
- Ilchman, W. and Bhagarva R. (1970), 'Balanced Thought and Economic Growth', In Riggs, F. and Durham, N. (1970). *Frontiers of Development Administration*. eds., Duke University Press: Duke pp.247-273.
- Mabogunje (1991). eds., *Elements of Development*. A.L.F.Publications: Abeokuta Nigeria, pp. 17-28.
- Marke, D. (2007). *'Will Africa Ever Be Able To Replicate Successful Economies?'* Standard Times Press: West Virginia.
- Milbrath, L. and Goel, M. (1977). *Political Participation*. Rand Menally: Chicago.
- Ndegwa, P. (1991). *Africa's Development Crises and Related International Issues*. Heinemann: Nairobi.
- Newland, K. (1988). 'From Transnational Relationships to International Relations: Women in Development and the International Decade for Women'. *Millennium*, 17, 3: p.507.
- Nnoli, O. (1981). (ed.) *'Path to Nigeria Development'*. Zed Press California: USA.
- Offiong D. (1980). *Imperialism and Dependency, Obstacles to African Development*. Fourth Dimension Publishers: Enugu.
- Oji, O. (1997). *Introduction to Political Science*. Marydan Publishers: Enugu, Nigeria.
- Okafor, C. (2004). *Neo-Democracy and Poverty Management in Africa*. Mercury Bright Press: Awka, Nigeria.
- Olowu, D. (1990). Centralisation, Self-Governance, and Development in Nigeria, in Wunsch, J. and Olowu, D. (1990). eds. *The Failure of the Centralised State; Institution and Self Governance in Africa*. Westview Press Boulder: San Francisco USA, pp. 193-244.
- Regional Survey of the World, Africa and Sub-Sahara (2002). Europa Publishers: Britain.
- Rostow, W. (1960). *The Stages of Economic Growth*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Rustow, D. (1970). *Transitions to democracy: toward a dynamic model*. Lynne Rienner Publisher: Boulder.
- Sachs, W. (1993). *Global Ecology A New Arena of Political Conflict*. London.

Salih, M. (2003). *Governance, Information and the Public Sphere*. United Nations, Economic and Social Council, Economic Commission for Africa: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Schaefer, B. (2005). *How the Scope of Government shapes the Wealth of Nation*. 'Heritage Lectures No 925 Delivered December 1, 2005: Heritage Foundation, March 7, 2006.

Soremekun, K. (2000). The International Dimensions of Governance, In Hyden, G. Okoth-Ogendo, H. and Olowu, B. (Eds.) (2000). *African Perspectives on Governance*. Africa World Press: Trento NJ pp.267-293.

Todaro, M. (1981). *Economic Development in the Third World*. 2nd edition: New York; also available at http://encyclopedia.calendarhome.com/cgi-bin/encyclopedia.pl?p=Economic_develop... (05/05/2007).

Women's Consortium of Nigeria. (2004). *Nigeria NGO Report of the Decade of Review of the Implementation of Beijing Platform for Action (Beijing + 10)*. Final Version, prepared by (WOCON) August 2004: Lagos Nigeria.

World Bank. (2000). *Can Africa claim the 21st century*. World Bank: Washington D.C

World Bank. (2005). *World development indicators*. World Bank: Washington D.C.