DEMOCRACY IN AFRICA: PROBLEMS, PROSPECTS AND MATTERS ARISING

Elijah Okon John, PhD
Department of Philosophy
University of Uyo, Uyo
Email: elijahjohn@uniuyo.edu.ng

Abstract
One of the things that has greatly eluded the post-colonial Africa politically, perhaps, is the deficit in the real practice of democracy. However, this characteristic elusiveness is not unconnected to some fundamental problems, which African leaders have wittingly or unwittingly refused to recognize or address for so long now. Thus, the prospects of democracy are trodden under the feet in Africa. This paper, therefore, attempts to explain the meaning, problems, prospects and the matters arising therefrom. It however concludes with the observation that the misinterpretations, misapplications and/or misunderstanding of democracy in Africa have unfortunately become a sad commentary on African political development.
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Introduction
It appears that democracy has become "whatever one says it is". Most countries and continents of the world have had traumatic, exasperating and destructive experiences in organizing themselves democratically. Almost every nation, rightly or wrongly, freely or compulsively, wants to be seen as democratic even when the political system bears no semblance to the concept. Yet, the irony of it all is that all over the world, there is a serious clamour for democracy, and the clamour seems to make democracy very fashionable. But philosophical concerns about democracy are: is democracy suitable and convenient for the modern man in Africa? Can it stand to the teeming problems of poverty, political instability, illiteracy, social insecurity, religious intolerance, war, hunger, disease as well as man’s basic moral questions? These and other questions shall be our immediate concern in this paper. But first, what is democracy?

Meaning of Democracy
“Democracy” as a concept is difficult one to define. The difficulty is not because the concept is vague like so many political terms, but more importantly, because democracy is a complete polymorphous concept. Hence, it is common for one to talk of “participatory”, “popular”, “consensus”, “guided”, “bourgeois”, “liberal” and very recently “assassin”, democracies as well as “eastern democracy”, “western democracy” among others. Secondly, the difficulty is that what “one person would regard as a paradigm for democracy, another would deny it as democracy”.

Thirdly, because of the acquisition of what Stanley Benn (338) regards as “a high emotive charge” in the last hundred years. Thus, it has become convenient and a matter of good tactics to apply it to one’s own favoured type of regime and to deny its rivals. Consequently, the most diverse systems have been claimed as democracy of one sort or the other. And, above all, the word has been completely and competitively redefined “to match changes in extension by appropriate changes in intention” (Benn, 338). The explanations so far provided have given support to Macpherson’s position on democracy when he declares: “Democracy has become an ambiguous thing, with different meanings, even apparently opposite meanings for different people” (22). The above notwithstanding, democracy, etymologically, comes from the combination of two Greek words demos (people) and kratos
(rule) which literally means rule by the people. The term democracy, according to Robert McHenry (5), has several different senses in contemporary usage; and these include:

1. A form of government in which the right to make political decisions is bestowed on and exercised directly by the whole body of citizens, acting under procedures of majority rule, usually known as direct democracy;

2. A form of government in which the citizens exercise the same right not in person but through representatives chosen by and responsible to them, known as representative democracy; and

3. A form of government, usually a representative democracy, in which the powers of the majority are exercised within a framework of constitutional restraints designed to guarantee all citizens the enjoyment of certain individual rights, such as freedom of speech, movement, association and religion known as liberal or constitutional democracy.

Abraham Lincoln, in his Gettysburg Address of 1863, closed it with the immortal phrase: “That this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth”. In point of fact, Abraham Lincoln, in that Address, was not interested, in the first place, in defining democracy, nor was he interested in theorizing about forms of government. However, political demagogues have adopted and bastardized this phrase as the definition of democracy. Interestingly, this phraseology has become a rambunctious rambling among political activists.

But few comments are necessary at this point for any serious minded scholar to note: Firstly, this off-the-cut definition of democracy as “the government of the people, by the people, and for the people” can be subjected to multi-faceted interpretations that accounts for anything, and yet explains nothing. Secondly, both the word “democracy” and the phrase “government of the people, by the people, and for the people” had been in existence thousands of years before Lincoln made his famous statement. Therefore, it is not proper to say that Lincoln patented this phrase and is exclusively a Lincolonian view-point. History books reveal that Cleon of Athens who lived some 500 years before the earthly birth of Jesus Christ must have been the first person to speak of democracy as “the rule of the people, by the people, and the people”. It is also discovered that this phraseology by Cleon later found its way into many books and addresses. For instance, in the “Preface” to John Wycliffe’s translation of the Holy Scriptures in 1383, declares: “This Bible is for the government of the people by the people and for the people”. This accounts for the reason that some Christian historians still refer to the Wycliffe’s Bible as “the people’s property” (John, 102).

Some five hundred years after Wycliffe, President James Monroe of United States of America made use of the same phraseology in one of his Addresses. Monroe is not the only person who made use of the chunk. Four years after its appearance in Monroe’s Address, Webster used it in his famous reply to Hayne: “The people’s government made for the people, made by the people and answerable to the people”. Again, Theodore Parker borrowed it into one of his Addresses when he declared: “Democracy is a direct self-government, over all the people, by all people and for all the people”. And it was from Parker’s compiled Addresses that Abraham Lincoln read, underscored and extracted the phraseology into his now famous Address delivered on November 19, 1863 (Soyinka, 5).

The important thing to note about all these labourious traces is that the word democracy has a very long history, and should not be given a Lincolonian exclusivity. Writing on the same wave-length with Abraham Lincoln, Nnamdi Azikiwe defines democracy as “The rule of the people by its majority inhabitants and includes a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation, usually involving, periodically held free and fair elections” (2,3). Azikiwe
seems nearer to the truth than most of his contemporaries. It is in this consideration that Schumpeter in his philosophical aphorism defines democracy as “A system in which individuals acquire the power by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote” (186).

The people, according to Schumpeter, constitute not the sovereign power, but rather the arena in which leadership is contended for. The role of ordinary citizens, therefore, is to provide others with power. John Dewey, in his characterized experimental knowledge of psychology, observes democracy to be “The settling for free use of the experimental method in social inquiry and thought, which is required for the solution of concrete social, political and industrial problems” (Copleston, 373). Expectedly, Dewey sees democracy not only as a system and a method of government, but also as a needful means for realizing the domain of human relationship and the ultimate growth of the individual personality. Appadorai on his part defines democracy as “A system of government under which the people exercise the governing power directly or indirectly, that is, through representatives periodically elected by themselves” (137).

Thomas Carlyle, in his cry for an ideal leader, posits that democracy is “self-government of the multitude by the multitude” (353). At this point, I want to formulate a provisional definition to the concept of democracy. But first, it should be observed that democracy is a robust and vibrant concept which, when practiced unfettered, blossoms and builds the best of society. It is on the basis of this conviction that I believe that certain nations of the world are not ripe yet for democracy. This is on the account of their profligate and visionless leaders whose bent is for prodigality and in which case democracy can be ambushed. Having said that I now give a definition of democracy as a method of government through which leaders are held accountable for their actions and inactions in the public realm, and by which citizens are actively involved in the competition and cooperation of their elected representatives.

From the above definition, one can conveniently add that the working definition of democracy is one that embodies the essence of the concept as “the rule of the people”. By this token, therefore, democracy implies a method of government in which everyone takes part in the process of governance either fully as a member of the majority, or partially as part of the minority. In this way, the right of the people to participate in the process of governance must be emphasized. Until and unless democracy is perceived this way, governance cannot be demystified and adequately applied in addressing the monumental injustices directed against the masses by certain political elites in different nations of the world. Accountability in this way will compel elected political leaders to truly serve the people rather than live like masters. In the language of Mill, it will make our leaders to see themselves as tenants in the corridors of power. But in spite of the differences in conceptualization, definition and practice of democracy, I still agree with Eghosa Osaghae that “All versions of democracy share one fundamental objective: how to govern the society in such a way that power actually belongs to the people” (41). From the foregoing, it is clear that a great deal of efforts has been made to define democracy. But we need, first of all, to understand that “democracy is not a government but rather a procedure or method for producing a government”. We can conveniently, therefore, term as democratic, any society where the following marks or minimal conditionalities are observed:

a. An atmosphere of political, legal, economic and social equality; where freedom and justice must prevail;

b. The opportunity for political participation either directly or through representatives periodically elected; and

c. The possibility of an alternative government.
The last two points are very necessary because no political philosophy should be held in absolute finality. However, there still is this much agreement in the observation: that democracy consists in the government by the people or popular self-government. Democracy at any rate would still be different and universally distinguished from, say, monarchism that makes no pretence to popular participation. There remains, as Benn (338), has noted, plenty of room for disagreement about the conditions under which the people can properly be said to rule themselves.

Some Basic Principles of Democracy

The basic principle of democracy is based on the need for political and legal equality for citizens, such that every citizen will have equal opportunity in the socio-political system. This basic assumption of equality of all men does not in any way include mental equality. Else, the upshot will mean that ability is sacrificed to number, while numbers are manipulated by trickery (Durant, 70). This number game problem is very true of African democracy. Thus, one central defect of democracy is that there is a possible tendency to put mediocrity in power; and there is no way of avoiding this except by certain criteria. Durant captures the implication of this import more appropriately when he submits that “Numbers by themselves cannot produce wisdom, and may give the best favoured of office to the grossest flatterers. But among the trained and fit democrats, we recommend number game exercise, seeing that all cannot think alike” (149). In addition to the above, democracy which is often claimed to be the greatest and most valuable political achievement of modern western civilization, though its origin is traceable to the ancient Greece, has four other fundamental considerations:

a. In a democratic system, the people have the final authority, and those who govern in their names are responsible to them. The implication here is that democracy is governed by the consent in the sense that it is a government by representatives who have the general approval of the majority. This is the point that advocates of democracy would claim that government must be controlled by the people if their grievances are not to be merely heard but taken seriously. Lincoln once said: “No man is good enough to govern another man without that other’s consent” (John, 108-109);

b. Democracy must seek to serve the common good of the people as a whole without bestowing advantages on any privileged group. It must therefore reject the fallacy of collectivistic theory which maintains that a state or class or race transcends in importance the persons who are their members;

c. Democratic governance must also uphold the principle of the majority rule as the practical method adopted to secure the responsibility of representatives to the people and enable general policy to be decided by as large a proportion of the citizens as possible. Hence, in a truly democratic society, free discussion is protected by the rights of free speech, a free press, and freedom of assembly or association; and

d. Democracy, in an ideal situation, must make provision for reasonable high standard of education available to all. But with poor educational infrastructures and facilities which account for illiteracy and make education inaccessible to people in Africa, the real practice of democracy may be very doubtful. This is where African continent and many third-world countries must watch in their attempt to please western super-powers by embracing democracy un-cautiously.

Closely associated with democratic conditions is the notion of the responsibility of the democratic representatives. This means, in practice, those representatives must submit themselves periodically for re-election. And as a corollary to democracy, the preparation of the representatives to justify their actions and to attend to the experiences, circumstances and needs of their constituencies, whose good-will, supports and welfare they must retain so
long as they wish, or are permitted to remain in office or re-contest are the necessary democratic conditions. As earlier noted, democracy in our own time, especially in Africa, has become very fashionable. The internal and external forces of different nations of the world have made democracy the “in-thing”. Recently, a representative view-point by “liberal democrats” in Africa is best summarized by President Alpha Oumar Konare of Mali at a Freedom Forum of African Newsmakers Breakfast in Washington when he declared that all the conflicts that exhibit themselves today in Africa can only be resolved by strengthening democracy. Accordingly, Konare declares: “Africa can only take advantage of democratic practice ... I believe that the deficit of democracy on our continent is the reason for the ethnic problems and the conflicts that lead to civil war … All the conflicts that exist today can only be resolved by strengthening democracy” (Fullerton, 14).

It is also true that democracy, if properly managed, can stand out as the best political option for modern man, but first, we must agree with Kofi Busia that “The best kind of democracy is the one which enables as many people as possible to share in the making of decisions and in the actual functions of government” (18). Busia’s idea of democracy is that which considers as many people as possible but would not consider all the people. For democracy always “ruins itself by excess of democracy” (Durant, 19). The clamour for all to hold office and determine public policy could be a welcome development. But it is also disastrous because people are not properly equipped by training (though not along the Platonic curriculum) to elect the best into leadership. The selection of citizens into office by the relevant criteria is very necessary. The error of selecting men by lot has for many centuries overshadowed the real insight into democratic processes in many societies. Lindsay (256) maintains that democracy and expertise are two inseparable engines of stability and progress. Lack of expertise in our democratic processes has vividly portrayed an abject, flaccid and sad situation of square pegs in round holes. This, predictably, has caused chaos and confusion. Until skilled men in the business of statesmanship are given a chance, democracy will continue to remain a mirage.

Problems of Democracy
From the above observations, few things should be pointed out and taken very seriously at this stage if Africa must overcome her abject situation. And these are:

1. **Illiteracy**: That is to say that Africa’s attempt at democracy may not at the end of the day yield the required fruits because of illiteracy. The simple understanding here is that voting pattern can be negatively affected by this factor. In any case, illiteracy would not allow the very process of election to be fair and free. The follow-up implication here is that owing to illiteracy, the people do not know how to distinguish party symbols and read and understand manifestoes of different political parties for them to vote for ideology. Above all, technical know-how cannot be waved away in any democratic setting. Democracy primarily requires tact and wisdom for it to thrive well. It is not a game for political neophytes. That is, it takes a superior mind to accept defeat without resorting to violence, and even a greater mind-set to campaign and win votes on the strength of superior arguments.

2. **Tribalism and Religion**: These two issues have become major obstacles hindering democracy in Africa. They constitute the two determinant factors in Africa’s voting pattern. Democracy cannot flourish in the atmosphere of extreme or negative tribal and religious consciousness. Democrats should therefore not encourage people to vote for candidates on the basis of tribes and religions but on grounds of the capacity of the contestants to lead well.

3. **Poverty**: In Africa, the masses are generally poor and the poverty level in the continent is alarming. Hence, Africans usually suspend their rationality and sense of justice during
election periods because of poverty. This is the case when one considers the role played by money in the voting pattern in Nigeria, that is, in the face of poverty and hunger. In other words, the people would not mind mortgaging their consciences for any immediate gain they could grab. As a result, political office is always given to the highest bidder. In fact, this has become a combined effect of poverty and ignorance, which hampers the very democratic due process in Africa. Poverty-induced thinking is very dangerous to democracy, howsoever. This explains why election periods in almost all African nations are mere means of institutionalizing mediocrity in governance. Poverty is bad: it makes a man to be voiceless and irrational in his decisions and judgements. It is on the above score that I strongly agree with Whitehead (125) that “there can be no successful democratic society till general education conveys a philosophic outlook”. That means there must be a general education which emphasizes the fundamental issues of human existence, that is, the issues of the nature, meaning and importance of life, truth, goodness, justice, etc. On the basis of this, it therefore means that people may not have problems on what makes a small group democratic, but when it comes to adopting and applying the concept to mass organization. Thus, Benn categorically submits that “There is plenty of room for different interpretations of the principles to be applied and of the ways to realize them under very different conditions ...” (339).

4. **Excessive Individualism and Extreme Self-Centredness:** Another problem facing the real practice of democracy in Africa is excessive individualism and extreme self-centredness. That means in spite of the ideals of democracy which are innumerable, but in real practice, democracy generally tends to encourage excessive individualism and self-interest. This problem of excessive self-interest and negative individualism is where democracy has often been discredited especially when those holding offices are such that they do not truly command the respect of the electorate by consistently being too selfish, and insensitive to the feelings of others. A case in question is the type practiced in Africa. In Nigeria for instance, it was sad to see tribalized President like Obasanjo overtly presiding over the affairs of the nation with a typical Yoruba agenda. His programme was more or less an exercise in the empowerment of his kinsmen and nothing else. He successfully carried this to the extreme by allotting key appointments and contracts to his Yoruba kinsmen. President Buhari is also noted for this: the overt and covert protection of northern and Islamic interests by all means. This is reminiscent of Babangida and Abacha’s days of nepotism in Nigeria. The duo of Babangida and Abacha can be set aside because they did not get power through a democratic method. But Obasanjo and Buhari cannot be forgiven for destroying democracy in particular and Nigeria, in general. This is because in the ‘next’ election, other tribes will do just anything including rigging and killing to ensure the emergence of their sons and daughters not minding the conditionalities of democracy.

5. **Weak Institutions:** Weak institutions in Africa constitute a major set-back to democracy. Respective institutions that should support democracy in Africa are weak and corrupt. In this circumstance, the possibility of having vibrant democratic culture is very slim. The judiciary, the security agencies like the police force, Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC), Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences (ICPC), the legislature, labour unions, Directorate of State Security (DSS), Independent National Electoral Commission (INEC), etc, the press, civil society groups, religious, economic, political parties and other trade and professional bodies are highly sentimental, bias, corrupt and, as a result, very weak and incapable of supporting democratic ideals in different African nations.
6. **Absence of Viable Competitors/Opponents:** The absence of viable competitors or opponents in the field is not good for democracy in Africa. Democracy thrives when there are strong, true and committed oppositions to check-mate the immoderateness and extravagance of the ruling party. The careless and selfish attitude of cross-carpeting from one party to the other cannot oil and properly serve any democratic structure in Africa, either internally or externally. Strong oppositions must continue to thrive and be committed. People should ruggedly and constructively criticize and oppose the ruling political parties and other unfavourable policies of the government of the day.

7. **Poor or Lack of Ideology:** Another issue militating against smooth progress of democracy in Africa is poor or lack of ideology. Most players and political parties in Africa do not have (meaningful) ideologies. Continuity or the all-purpose “change” cannot be said to be an ideology. One is yet to see a political party or an individual with a clear-cut ideology or blue-print for the development of the society as it is done in the United States of America, United Kingdom, Germany, Sweden, France, etc. The absence of this does not augur well for the continent of Africa, democratically and/or politically.

8. **Subordination of Duties to Rights, and the Pushing of Liberty to Excess:** Democracy has also suffered from the subordination of duties to rights, and from pushing of liberty to excess. Perhaps, this is where democracy has tacitly failed to recognize that unbridled political power is dangerous and liable to abuses, because men generally lack self-control.

9. **The Number Game:** Democracy has the tendency to put mediocrity into power through the number game. That is, in a democratic state, numbers are easily manipulated by trickery; and a typical example was the 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria where numbers were highly manipulated in favour of one man. It must be noted that because numbers themselves cannot produce the wisdom needed for ruling. Hence, a sensitive office can be given to the grossest flatterer on the platter of ethnic and religious sentiments. The case in question is the 1983, 2003 and 2015 General Elections in Nigeria. For one, none of the elections in question was fair, free and peaceful. The 2003 General Election still stands out as the most dubious and satanic of all elections in the history of Nigeria. In most places, elections did not hold, but results were fabricated and released in those areas and INEC - a body responsible for the proper conduct of elections saw the truth but declared a different thing just to please the government of the day.

10. **Plural Society:** One of the strongest problems facing democracy in Africa is that of plural society. About a century ago, John Stuart Mill observed that “Free institutions are next to impossible in a country made up of different nationalities. Among a people without fellow-feeling, especially if they read and speak different languages, the united public opinion, necessary to the working of representative government, cannot exist” (230). Even before Mill made the above observation, it was Aristotle who posited that “a state aims at being, as far as it can be, a society composed of equals and peers” (181). To a medieval thinker, Machiavelli, the flaccidity of democracy is always a common phenomenon in a society “differing in language, in customs, and in institutions” (36). Most political theories and analysis have agreed with Mill, Machiavelli and Aristotle on this position. For instance, Rabushka and Shepsle hold that there is no way “to demonstrate that stable democracy can be maintained in the face of cultural diversity” (1971:462). In a more elaborate work, they further submit that viable democracy is a complete impossibility in plural societies (1972:62-92).
Plural societies are considered responsible for instability and breakdown in democratic system of government. That means, democracy in ethnic communities is Hobbesian and it often results in "war of all against all" (Brian Barry, 502). Democracy cannot be implemented in plural societies of multinational dimension. Although Arend Lijphart (1977) and Ekeng Anam-Ndu (1990), have respectively argued that democracy is not at all impossible in plural societies; but experiences of various countries of the world reveal, in most cases, that their argument is a mere sophistry or an academic exercise, to put it very mildly. A fundamental erroneous orientation guiding some of our political leaders is that of thinking that the United States of America and other countries of the world are similar societies. This has been the probable reason that African States, for instance, are led to believing that the American Constitution can serve as a model for them to copy. But the fact is that United States of America is one of such countries characterized “with plural features, but not plural societies” (Ogundowole, 79). America is not a thorough going plural society as African States such as Nigeria, Liberia, Congo just to mention but a few.

In any plural state, democracy is not only hazardous but it also entails the imposition of the structure necessary for domination by one of the segments, as a vital aspect of the exercise. Under such conditions of co-existence, there can be no intellectual and moral courage for democracy. The fiats and processes by which political authorities of different nations are avoiding honest self-examination and confrontation, in the language of Ogundowole, are “Complex and ingenious. The price, however, has been costly. It includes numerous [civil wars, tribal clashes, insurgencies and bloody] coups and attempted coups and continuous political coups and continuous political instability” (19, 20). John and Usoro (140-146) have carefully discussed the problems of democracy in a plural society and the way forward in that circumstance. However, the added truth is that democracy does not thrive on that which reduces the dignity of man. It does not also thrive on that which emphasizes our differences. Equity is the bedrock of democratic edifice; a system where the foundation of slavery will be lacking and all forms of injustice eradicated; a government of sensitivity and accessibility to public opinion.

11. The Size of the Population and Technical Know-How: These two factors, namely: the size of the population and the specialized knowledge required to govern have greatly undermined the real actualization of democracy within the political structure of contemporary global States in general and Africa in particular. Hence, people all over the world tend to doubt the practice of real democracy outside its ideal superstructure. Obviously, the conditions prevalent do not allow for real practice of democracy with direct participation. And, African nations are badly affected by these factors.

Matters Arising
Despite the challenges of authoritative regimes in Africa and the subsequent imposition and/or change of leadership in many African countries, there still is the need for a proper examination of the meaning, problems, prospects and implications of democracy in the continent. If these considerations are taken seriously, then democracy will not have the potentiality for breakdown as the case had been with socialism. Remember the way socialism was introduced in the continent: it arose as a child of circumstance with no structure for its survival. It was over-cherished and pampered, and as a result, it failed to tally with and reflect the true notion of reality and experience of the people of Africa that it was expected to serve. This means socialism, in its method and content, became dogmatic. Its dynamics were watered down and it became a mere coincidence that what usually happens to dogmatic theories befell socialism in Africa. Thus, socialism failed because it did not make room for self-criticism and openness, which are some of the basic political prerequisites that make for good and viable philosophy.
The thesis of socialism, as it was introduced in the continent of Africa, had refused to allow new ideas to permeate it and oil its system. Hence, like an ill-conceived theory, became weak, lame and vulnerable to cracks and collapse as was evidenced throughout Africa and also, in the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR). By way of logical juxtaposition, therefore, this democracy will not survive and serve the continent better except Africans take the necessary steps and pains, perhaps through a constitutional review and sound ethical re-orientation, to deal with the anomalies and excessiveness of African leaders who claim to be democrats. Secondly, African scholars should understand that political experience in the post-independent Africa has shown that democracy cannot be maintained and cultivated in the continent except Africans themselves are ready and willing to abide by certain certified norms and principles.

Thirdly, Africans should be very cautious in their desire to embrace democracy. This is because any political ideology like western democracy also needs an ideological super-power like the old socialism of the former USSR to challenge and sharpen its wits and test its claims. But in the face of a single ideological superstruction and political civilization like democracy, the possibility of truly examining its worth and essence is very doubtful. Finally, Africans should note that the ground must be thoroughly prepared for democracy to survive. The implication, therefore, is that democracy must be tailored along African world-view and values. We are sorry to announce that this approach may involve a conscious effort by all to do away with some preconceived ideas and methods about democracy, which have beclouded Africa's sense of proper judgement for too long. Anything short of this perspective, there may be no expectation that democracy in Africa would not be retarded the way socialism was.

Conclusion
It is a common knowledge that democracy usually thrives in an environment where all and sundry effectively see themselves as political stakeholders and not just disinterested spectators; and thus, do all that they could to protect it. And until this is the case, the problems militating against democracy in Africa will still remain unabated and the prospective dividends therefrom will continue to be a mere mirage. But, the lessons embedded in this work should be taken very seriously if Africa must come out of the already messy political ambience and be at the appropriate place of social, scientific, economic and political legitimations. This is because politics, as always, is the engine house of any society that determines every other thing and move.
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