

Review

Crises of leadership and the ethical grounds of revolution in Africa

Okoye, Chuka A.

Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria.
E-mail: chukeeye@yahoo.com. Tel: +2348037946789.

Accepted 5 December, 2012

Leadership is conceived as a vocation to service backed by authority to exercise administrative powers not for any personal gains but for the good and development of the people and the state. The leadership in Africa seems to derail from this rather noble understanding of leadership while tilting towards the egocentric idea of leadership where there is a shift from the people centered leadership to the person centered leadership and where the interest of the leader and his group is protected. This leads to underdevelopment in most African states and a protracted suffering of the citizens of these states which often comes in form of mismanagement of funds, abuse of human right and wanton discrimination in the state. The need to survive these long sufferings has led some people to demonstrations against the government which often come in form of civil disobedience and more recently revolution in some African countries. This work examines ethical rounds of these revolutions while asserting that no matter how moral a revolutionary movement is, care should be taken to avoid damage that will create more problems instead of solving them.

Key words: Leadership, crisis, Africa, revolution.

INTRODUCTION

The responsibility of development rests on the leadership of a nation. The leader is often given the task of uniting the nation following the constitution of the state which has within itself laws that protect the rights of the citizen and foster the citizens' fulfillment of the civil obligation. The performance of the leader and the support given to such leader leads to the development of a nation. Thus, it is enough to say that the development of a state/nation rests on the leader mainly and the support of the led.

The need for development – a process of transformation which brings the people's collective will and determination into the task of improving the common situation (Rodney, 1976) – challenges the nation on social, economic and political reconstruction of their lives. As such the success in providing a sustainable development in a nation lies on the level of stability and unity which exists in the nation in question. The lack of stability owing to the political, social, and economic misnomer causes a national crises and underdevelopment which culminate

often in national unrest.

An extreme method of expressing disenchantment and dissatisfaction with an existing leadership is revolution against the government. In revolution, the people gather in solidarity to show their unhappiness with the leadership through civil disobedience or, in the extreme form of it, violent challenge against the government which often leads to an overthrow of the government.

In Africa, a lot of problems arising from poor leadership are recorded. These problems result in the underdevelopment of most African nations and hardship in the lives of the people. Sequel to this one sees among many countries seeming disillusionment and the desire for a better life by the desire to overthrow the government. As such there is especially in recent times some revolutionary movements against the governments of various African nations. This work raises issues on the crises of leadership in Africa with the objective of seeing the ethical grounds of the revolutionary acts in Africa.

Revolution

Revolution from its Latin etymology – turning around, connotes a change which occurs within a short period of time that aims at restructuring of either power or an organizational structure. In revolution, there is a socio-political lack of confidence in the leaders by the subjects. This misunderstanding ends up changing both the cultural, economic, and socio-political organization in a particular nation.

Aristotle (1990) (*Politics*, 1052) in explaining revolution outlined two types of revolution – partial and complete revolution. The partial revolution entails a minor transformation, for instance in constitutional revolution. The complete revolution is a total change of the governmental organizational structure. This is often characterized by an elongated disenchantment which proves to be unbearable to the revolutionaries. This complete revolution constitutes what many scholars conceive as ‘mob alteration of governmental and rulership structures’ (Cameron, 1970).

Despite the fact that this understanding relates to the Aristotelian concepts which denotes a cyclical alteration in the governmental forms, revolution tends to imply a fundamental departure from any previous historical pattern. Revolution poses a great challenge to the established political order while replacing it with a radically different one. This change affects both the social, economic and cultural structures of the society. Historically revolution is conceived as a great destructive force which appears after the decay of the fundamental moral and religious tenets of a society with an intention of a new structural rebirth. As such any radical alteration in basic values or beliefs invites revolution.

According to Milson (1997), revolution possesses an inherent ability to stabilize the potential of every society. Revolution is a means of accomplishing freedom. Milson gives a clearer insight to the purpose of revolution which comprises the quest for freedom and autonomy. The French revolution, for instance, is an attempt to gain freedom from poor and bad leadership. His idea on revolution is further corroborated by Kant who believes that revolution is a force for the advancement of mankind. For Kant (1956) revolution is a “natural” step in the realization of a higher ethical foundation for society.

Revolution by its ontological structure has a positive intention. This intention lies in the effort to actualize the human ultimate desire which is human happiness. As such violent conflicts like coup d’état, wars for supremacy and oligarchy are not referred to as revolution. Marx (1978) shows, further, the purpose of and the meaning which revolution bears in his *Communist Manifesto*. He uses the Hegelian abstractions of the dialectics and following it demonstrates that revolutionary leaders are necessary to instigate and implement reforms as the basis for a plan of class struggle, centered on the conflict

for resource control in a society: Marx saw the eventual purpose of this conflict as culminating in freedom and societal classlessness. The result of this Marxist-revolution is seen in the revolution experience of Russia, Cuba, Vietnam, Egypt and indeed the current Arab spring.

A revolutionary state, primarily, is characterized by a long period of tension in the political and social spheres. These tensions, according to Briton (1997), are caused by a gradual breakdown of societal values. This leads, he posits, to “fracture of political authority, as the governing body must rely upon an increasingly desperate use of force to remain in power”. The process here is simple. As the emphasis on the weakness of the sitting government becomes stronger, their grasp on authority begins to wane. At this juncture, more strength builds around the various forces that are in opposition to the government. As the government gets disorganized the oppositions unite and together topple the authority.

Briton (1997) identifies different stages of revolution. According to him, after the government is thrown, there exists a period he calls – a period of optimistic idealism. Here the revolutionaries are replete with so much perfectionist rhetorics. This phase/stage suddenly gives way to the next stage – stage of extremity. At this level, there is a slight clash between the moderate and radicals. It usually ends in the defeat of the moderate and the concentration of every authority in the hands of the extremists. For this to be successful the use of force is unavoidable. With this, the objective of revolution appears to fade, giving way for a regime of totalitarianism. Nevertheless, the tenets of the revolutionaries may be eventually accommodated but often times these tenets are swallowed up in the tussle for domination.

Revolution, in sum, refers to any instance in which a state or a political regime is overthrown and thereby transformed by a popular movement in an irregular, extra constitutional and/or violent fashion (Bauer, 1980). It is not just limited to a mass mobilization and regime change, it is also extends to fundamental socio-economic and/or cultural change during or soon after the struggle for state power. One can immediately read from here that the constitutional nature of a democratic state implicitly (not explicitly) justifies any revolution against any negatively impacting state so long as it leads to the stability and happiness of the people. Locke (1988) was clear on this stating that the democratic mandate of a people gives them the right of revolution. Revolution is the strongest weapon for securing freedom from lengthy neglect and marginalization.

Crises of leadership in Africa: a foundation for revolution

Leadership is a vocation of guidance which is tied to

administration. This vocation gives the leader the responsibility of piloting the affairs of the constituency he is leading and providing for the people placed under his charge. As such, leadership is an ability to take initiative to motivate, to influence, to direct and control the thoughts, opinions and actions of the people in a society towards achieving any desired end (Idike, 1996).

Leadership bears a vital relationship to individuality and its complementary elements socially (Bougardus, 1934). This entails that a leader wields a certain level of influence over a group of people by their place in the society and the traits which such leader possesses. Based on this, one can surmise that the position of leadership is reserved for the best in the society. Deviating from this means a doom for the people being governed. Plato (1941) (*Republic* 5a 473) stressed the necessity of the personality of a leader which is hallmark for successful leadership, in his *Republic* thus:

“unless either philosophers become kings in their countries or those who are now called kings and rulers come to be sufficiently inspired with a genuine desire for wisdom, unless... political power and philosophy meet together... there can be no rest from troubles for states, nor yes, as, I believe, for all mankind; nor can this common wealth which we have imagined ever till then see the light of day and grow to its full stature”.

Reading through this work – *The Republic* by Plato (1941) (5a 474), one sees Plato’s attempt to describe the philo-sophical qualities. These qualities ranging from wisdom to maturity form the bedrock of good leadership. The qualities of good leadership must be such that the leader is selfless in carrying out his duties based on the responsibility given to him. David (2011) presents this clearly stating that a society that does not have its best men at the head of its leading institutions “suffers both a sociological and moral absurdity”. Leadership, in brief, determines the morality, and the development of a particular area.

Poor leadership generally engenders underdevelopment. People, in a bid to come to terms with the gap between their idea and the situation of things, often get disillusioned and disenchanted with the state of affairs and as such crimes increase and endure. This is the current situation of Africa. Africa has since been marked out as an underdeveloped continent. This is generally believed to be due to absence of good leadership in most African states. The leaders, as a result of corruption, put the populace into serious economic problem and in such deplorable condition, they engage themselves with the cumbersome task of struggling to provide for themselves any means of livelihood, disenchanted with political activity of these selfish and visionless leaders. A lot of people seem to blame this problem of back-wardness and bad governance on the negative precedence set by

the colonialists. Granted, colonialism had great negative effect on the African man which still makes the African inferior till date. The West looted the resources of the African, damaged the African system, robbed the African of certain important values and liberated them. The liberation which Africa claims to have still hunts her as she depends on the West for virtually everything including the strangulating imbalance of economic and political globalization.

The Western colonialism may have done a great damage to the African soil but surely these colonialists who are no longer here today (at least directly) still look at Africa and yet see in it a continent that is dysfunctional. The leadership of the African states wears the African continent down a great deal. These leaders in the name of leadership impoverish their states. Some leaders are in some cases richer than their own country and give the country loans to sort out some economic problems as one can see in the instance of Mobutu Sese Seko Kuku Ngbenduwabanga of Zaire. One traces this African leadership problem straight to the greed and corruption of such leaders.

These fundamental characteristics of many African leaders reflect in their constant desire to remain in office for a long period of time and at times till death. Some engage in serious corrupt practices such as money laundering. Others yet kill any form of opposition that tries to confront the government and by extension anybody identified with such opposition. Of great interest is the parochialism of African leadership which currently wears down on the unity of most multiethnic countries in Africa by the amount of wars and terrorist movement found in countries like Nigeria and previously Sudan. These problems associated with African leadership often make it impossible for any kind of development to take place; Africa therefore is seen to remain in the state of underdevelopment and crises. The non-affirmative action of the African leadership turns into confusion and disorder among the states of Africa.

Most African nations were introduced to democratic system of government after their independence and subsequent military intervention. However, with the power transition from military to civilian leadership, these nations encounter a form of civil dictatorship or, according to Agbaje (1990), ‘democratism’ (a situation where the civilian leaders are authoritarian). These civil dictators render themselves visionless and non-accountable since their mode of entry is questionable. The people are not given the opportunity of electing their leaders; therefore, these leaders who usurp power, bully the people and show clearly their alienation from the people.

This dictatorship causes untold harm to Africa as it destroys the unity which would have been there had such leadership embraced the culture of dialogue which makes tolerance take root in the nation in question. In Africa generally, there is a destructive politics which pushes

people to politicize not for common good or development but for personal enrichment and abuse of power. The result is that the leaders either prefer to sit tight for life or as long as possible; or that they sponsor (as godfathers) the next administration which fights to protect them and causes further harm. These sponsored administrators come to power with basically no plan and no vision about their expectation for their nation. The tendency is to take an *ad hoc* method of solving problems which may end up either worsening the situation or creating more problems.

Africa can survive better under visionary leadership; leadership with integrity and high perspicuity. The African leadership is not ignorant of the African state and is equally not ignorant of how better this deplorable state can be improved. Raila Odinga (the prime minister in a power sharing government of Kenya following the violence in an election which many believe he won) blames ethnic conflict on the mediocrity of African leadership and lack of this leadership to address their basic national issues. He believes that the African leaders know what to do but doing what they know is a problem.

The Malawi President, Bingu Wa Mutharika, for instance, keeps stressing on the need for an all accommodating leadership where opponents are allowed to take part in governance yet he has been said to be arresting his opponents after the elections that returned him to power. President Namanga Ngugi is another example of the president who barely acts following his theorizing. President Ngugi extensively extols green revolution after the blue print of Asia but surprisingly devoted only 4% of his national budget to agriculture. President Mugabe of Zimbabwe frowns at corruption yet has delayed the whole nation by withholding the results of the general elections which he is believed to have lost. There is big difference between knowing what to do and doing what one knows. The examples here are enormous.

The failure of the African leadership is not something that can be rectified by just remaining nonchalant about the political and social affairs of the national as many citizens do. It is something that needs to be stopped by some measure of practical utilization of human freedom. One, based on this, will not be surprised seeing the various reactions (violent and silent) against various governments in Africa. Achebe (1983) expresses this clearly stating that leaders' undisciplined actions can incite the masses to anger and rebellion. Since it is clear that the leadership in Africa contributes immensely to the underdevelopment of Africa and sufferings of the masses, the populace takes to hard means to save their races hence revolution in Africa.

Revolution and African Leadership

Revolution begins with the understanding of the intrinsic

value of human freedom. Freedom here connotes choice; an ability to choose between alternatives without external coercion or restriction. Some thinkers do not believe that human beings have choices. As such every action a man takes is predestined. Maugham (chapter 16) states that:

"Before I do anything I feel I have a choice and that influences what I do, but afterwards, when the thing is done, I believe that it was inevitable from all eternity".

The thinkers would have possibly thought that since there is predetermination in the human life, that freedom of humans is absurd. Otherwise why would Nostradamus envision the future and it will come to pass? In fact, what Nostradamus gives as revelation are the things that nature has set and determined, and allowed them to play out according to nature's demands.

Their observation appears attractive at a cursory observation but reduces the human rational character to puppeteering. The human rationality gives man the act of freedom and will. This is the essence of responsibility. Sartre explains human freedom as ontological to him. Man does not have freedom but is freedom – we are condemned to be free. The meaningfulness of life and the activities that go therein lie on the human interpretation and the meaning human beings give it. Sartre (1989) concludes that "we have neither behind us, nor before us in a luminous realm of values, any means of justification or excuse. We are left alone without excuse".

Sartre's postulation suits us. One's experiences move one into the choice of action. The Africans' experiences allow them the rational realization of the intrinsic human freedom to extricate themselves from the problem they find themselves. The African problem which is basically a result of crises in leadership left many African nations disillusioned and frustrated. The tendency becomes a revolution against the government that is believed to have meted such level of hardship on the people. This sort of revolution, according to Fanon (1968), "is a cleansing force; it frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair... it makes him fearless and so restores the respect for his right". The African revolution against her leadership is one which is apt since the people have seen the need to exercise their freedom from operation which they feel cannot be achieved through long silence and resilience.

The political mass revolution encountered in Libya, for instance, shows a total disenchantment of the Libyans against the autocratic leadership of Muammar Gaddafi. The beginning of Gaddafi's leadership in Libyan came as a violent coup. Having usurped power, he cancelled any form of constitution and enacted the *Sharia* law as the governing state law in 1973. Since the application of this law, there came upon the populace lack of freedom under the dictator Gaddafi.

The popular movements against the leadership of

Tunisia and Egypt become a spurring force to the demand for freedom and basic human rights by the Libyans. From February 17th, 2011 Libya experienced a full scale revolt which spread to the capital – Tripoli by the 20th of February, 2011. Like it is typical of African leadership, this revolt which would have been a benchmark for ousting the President like the Egyptians did for economic reasons was hijacked. The military led by the son of Muammar Gaddafi broke into highly paid, trained and armed units closely linked with the regime of the dictator and the other group Gaddafi camp what started like a peaceful demonstration aimed at overthrowing the regime degenerated into a civil war.

The revolution in Libya among other countries in Africa is not a surprise. Under the leadership of Gaddafi, there is a popular discrimination against the minority ethnic groups as the state restricts the labor rights of foreign jobs. These ethnic groups complain in vain and languish unnoticed. This is typical, of most African nations. The Eastern part of Libyan suffered great impoverishment under the leadership of Gaddafi. In Nigeria, as well, some ethnic groups have also over the years suffered neglect especially those around the eastern part of the country. The precedence set by this ill treatment makes it almost a culture of Nigeria that such people may not need to surface in major decisions of the country. This stereotype leads to the incessant bombing and terrorism which is on the increase in the country. Every nation bedeviled by such instability is bound to face total collapse, disintegration or revolution from the people since such leadership leads to the improvement of a people's life and the violation of the ultimate of statehood which according to Aristotle is happiness.

In search of moral grounds of revolution in Africa

Revolution is generally reactionary. This reaction is a crusade for change in the current situation of things which are perceived to be unpalatable to the revolutionaries. As such revolution is a sort of dialectical synchronism in the state or societal structure. Fanon (1968) sees revolution as a total overturn. For him it is a transformation which entails an entire removal of the old self into a new self.

This removal is not a transition from a good condition to a bad one. Nor is it a clash to distract peace. What underlies the ethical value of revolution is the intention of the revolution. Generally, people revolt to bring back discipline, remove slavery and embrace equality and freedom. The shift that revolution tries to achieve may be collective or particular. When it is collective it puts into consideration the problem that is universal. Being particular, it seeks to correct or put back the things that are not right among a group of people within a general community.

The general revolution is often viewed as just since it puts the interest of the general people one and above the individual or particular interests. There is an apparent class struggle between the leadership who are the in the particular (minority) and the general who feel marginalized as a result of principles brought about by these minor leaders. Marx (1978) identifies this as class struggle. According to Marx a society does not change in itself. It is the human beings in the world that change the society.

This change, which Marx emphasizes, comes when there is an increase in internal pressure resulting from disenchantment with the economic status of the society. When this happens the class in power seeks to preserve the old order while the class rising in power seeks a change. In this way "class conflicts are generated by these inevitable economic dynamics and social revolution erupts" (Marx, 1978). This revolution is generated and leads to a total development of the society since it concerns the will of the many who seek a social change from the economic imbalance which may have led to so much hunger and poverty, and lack of freedom associated with the particular leadership.

The particular revolution is more of a one sided attack on the society's administration. This particular revolution is as a result of a breach in the particular groups' right or a feeling of marginalization from the group. Bakunin (1978) in his *Catechism of Revolution* pointed out this manner of revolution is best initiated by the group elites and followed up by a determination to achieve freedom and equality. Particular revolution springs up as a result of deep-seated sense of suffering or even a trivial change in value which seems to affect a life of the group who opposes it. The former cause is a more objective drive to freedom and equality while the latter is more inclined to a subjective feeling of superiority and/or ego of status in a society.

In Africa these two forms of revolution are experienced. While in some nations, there is a desire for freedom from enslavement, dictatorship and economic instability, others experience revolution aimed at asserting superiority. The Libyan revolution act shows the need of the people of Libya to extricate themselves from the long dictatorship since 1969. They took to the streets to demonstrate for a change from autocracy to democracy where there will be freedom of life and respect for human rights. The revolution acts of Egypt and Tunisia seem to be something similar. They reacted against the government for sit-tightism and economic instability. Ghana, after her independence, went through the revolutionary process also.

Ghana championed the liberal democracy of the post colonial Africa which was more like a "sad cross between paternalism and corruption" (Okoye, 2009). The idea of equality and justice inherent in the life of the core African which seeks to negate corruption in post-colonial Ghana

led to the particular revolution of 31st December, 1981. This revolution set the stage for a national democratic ideas and aspiration of Jerry Rawlings, who led the June 4th, 1979 revolution. The leaders of the revolution emphasized that the revolution is aimed at resolving socio-economic problems in country based on the history and culture of the people rejecting extreme ideological tendencies and multiparty system which had been divisive, corrupt and elitist.

They also tried to achieve this by an apparent decentralization aimed at the practical application of the ideas of mass participation, establishment of democratic structure and institutions, and national unity and commitment to ideas of pan- Africanism, non alignment and non interference in other nations' internal affairs. These general revolutions are aimed at turning the negative and state of a nation to the positive collectively.

The particular revolution is both subjective and objective. Nigeria, for instance, experiences this particular revolution in a bid to achieve leadership, and gain resource control. In the recent times in Nigeria, there are incidents of bombing and direct attack on the government. Such issues include elections which favored the ethnic minority and the religious crusade which seeks to reject every form of Western education led to Boko Haram al Sunna wal Jamma.

The particular revolution in Nigeria takes a more subjective form. It is geared towards ethnic autocracy and superiority where a section of the country feels superior to the others and as such seeks to lord it over the others. This degenerates into politicization of religion. The movement poses itself as a maneuver to cause confusion through violent confrontation. This creates acute insecurity in the nation and endangers social integration. Obasanjo (internet retrieved, 2011) points out an apparent cause of such problems. He blames the problem of ethnic revolution in Nigeria on the unhealthy competition and maneuvers for power and control among the elites. The above issues go to explain that revolution in itself is always geared towards a result. The various revolutions in Africa have many purposes. The purposes justify each revolution that takes place. Hedges (1967) sees revolution and conflict as a necessity. He stresses that "revolution and conflict brings up a new development from long period of strife and subjugation. He, like Hegel (1953), believes in (a sort of) dialectics in which a synthesis is arrived at from the conflict which exists between a thesis and its antithesis. Revolution from the above is necessary in sorting out problems of instability. Thus 'when peaceful negotiation becomes impossible violent revolution is inevitable'.

The revolutions in Africa are not strange and most of them are really morally justified. Human beings know when there is need for an action to extricate themselves from subjugation and suffering. Since the source of happiness and fulfillment lies in the all round wellness of

the community there is need to recast community standards which deter such a fulfillment. Thus the acts of men in this regard are geared towards goodness and ensuring the actualization of the end of the state. Hegel (1953) posits that:

"If men are to act, they must not only intend the good but must know whether this or that particular course is good. What special course of action is good or not, right or wrong is determined, for the ordinary circumstances of life, by the laws of the state. Each individual knows what honorable course of conduct is..."

Revolt against bad government is a noble course and a very moral act to perform since the course of happiness which is the end of a state must be protected and reinstated where it is lacking. As such any revolution which is general and which seeks the common good is morally justifiable. It shows a step forward in the development of a nation. On the other hand, some particular revolutionary practice experienced in some African countries is wrong. It presents itself as a mode of distraction aimed at destabilizing the national leadership and as such interrupting the peace and unity of the nation from achieving its end – happiness.

No doubt, some particular revolutionary movements are justified since they are geared towards presenting their situations in such a manner that the long neglect suffered by them is attended to. This kind of particular revolution often comes up when every form of delegation and peaceful negotiation with the government fails. They are in the minority and they pursue a particular course but this time the particular course being pursued is objective not subjective since it is geared towards happiness end fulfillment in the state.

However, no matter how morally justified any revolution is, repeated revolution brings up two major possible bad effects:

- i) Systemic underdevelopment and poverty,
- ii) And internal suspicion and national disintegration.

The systematic underdevelopment and poverty is usually a most anticipated side effect of revolution. The nation which has encountered revolution often brings into power and administration which rules more out of emotion not plan. This kind of administration often lands the revolved nation into worse situation which poses danger to national development. Describing this revolutionary aftermath problem, Terry (1998) asserts that:

"The major problem encountered after every revolutionary process is a temporary poverty as the new government appears to be at sea about what steps to take to resolve the crises from within itself and finally face the difficulty of the external supporters [...] The temporary poverty brings with it an apparent underdevelopment if things are not put

in place as such inviting a counter revolution either implicitly or explicitly”.

Terry’s position suggests that revolution can yield a retroactive effect as far as development is concerned. There is every possibility that a nation which has a constant revolution, instead of developing, degenerates into a war zone where nothing goes on well. This introduces a worse situation than the bad governmental situation which has been revolted against.

The second effect – internal suspicion and national disintegration – manifests especially when there is a particular revolution. During the particular revolution, some groups who are favored may not see any reason why the marginalized few should revolt. The revolution carried out in effect will either be foiled along the line or break into intense bad blood coming from the various groups in a particular place. The Biafran secessionist revolution is a vivid example. The Eastern region felt that they have been marginalized and have been unfairly treated. They “demanded for a redress which was not honored and they took to a violent revolution against the Nigerian Government” meaning to break off.

Evidently, the Nigerian situation is better experienced than told. Since after the revolutionary civil war, there has been mutual suspicion among the various groups in Nigeria especially among the Easterners (believed to be the Biafran revolutionaries) and the Northerners (believed to champion the revolution resistance). This problem has really worked down on the Nigerian development since Nigeria spends time, energy and resources on conflict management rather than on development strategies. The problem with revolution is mainly with the resolution. If this is not well handled, the situation will lead to national disintegration.

Conclusion

Revolution by its reasons and end shows that there is need for stability in governance and fulfillment in statehood. Revolution is a means of maintaining justice and instilling equality in a nation. Each party that revolts tries to show its lack of fulfillment in the structure of governance which either denies it happiness or arouses in it a feeling of marginalization. It is a move to stabilize the government and bring back the happiness which seems to be lost in statehood.

The morality of revolution lies in the very purpose of the revolution. So long as the intention of a particular revolution is geared toward a positive goal and directed towards a better development, it is a morally sound act. But care should be taken not to destroy the state by the way in which these revolutionary activities are carried out. Avoiding revolution costs less than carrying out one. The leadership of Africa should live up to the expectation by

providing for the people and enhancing national unity by being just in the services they render, and working for national development.

Note

Maughan Somerset Wrote a Play “Of Human Bondage” Where in Chapter 67, one of his Characters – Philip made the above statement in relation to God and freedom. Here he asserts that nature gives man Freedom but at the same time this freedom is limited by God’s sovereignty.

REFERENCES

- Achebe C (1983). *Trouble with Nigeria* Enugu: Fourth Dimension Pub. p.21.
- Agbaje A (1990). “Travails or the Secular State: Religion, Politics and the outlook of Nigeria’s 3rd Republic”. *J. Commonw. Comp. Polit.* xxxvii edition
- Aristotle (1990). *Politics* 1052 Baltimore Penguin books.
- Bakunin M (1978). *Catechism of Revolution* NJ: Princeton University Press p.46.
- Bauer J (1980). *Theories of Revolution* New York: Harper and Row Pub. p.51.
- Bougardus E (1934). *Leaders and Leadership* New York: Appleton Century Croft Inc. pp. 1-2.
- Briton C (1997). *Authority and Revolution* London: Hogarth Press p.85.
- Cameron N (1970). *Conflict in Leadership* Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins p.49.
- David S (2011). *The State and Political Stability* New York Scribner
- Fanon F (1968). *The Wretched of the Earth* USA: Groove Press Ltd. 1:94.
- Hedges C (1967). *War and the Human Race* New York: Barnes and Noble Inc. p. 28.
- Hegel GWF (1953). *Reason In History, a general introduction to the Philosophy of History*, Transl. by Robert S. Hartman. Indianapolis, In: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Idike E (1996). *Leadership for the New Era in African Philosophy and public Affairs* Enugu: Delta Pub. Ltd. p.138.
- Kant I (1956). *Foundations of Metaphysics of Morals* trans. Lewis White Beck Indiana Polis: Bobbs – Merrill, Lib. Liberal Arts p.48.
- Locke J (1988). “An Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government”, in *Two Treatises of Government* p.240.
- Marx K (1978). *Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* ed. Robert Tucker *The Marx. Engels reader* 2nd ed. New York: Norton p.3.
- Milson J (1997). *Problems of State Revolution* Edinburgh: Edinburgh House Press p.77.
- Obasanjo O (2011). *Press Speech on Religious Riot in Nigeria* <http://234nig.com/xsp/plt/sites/index.xsp> Retrieved 28 – 07 – 2011. Art. 25.
- Okoye KRE (2009). *Globalizing instructional practices in technology education: Issues and prospects*. *Knowledge Review: Multidiscip. J.* 19(4):109-115.
- Plato (1941). *Republic* Transl. F. Mac Donald London: Oxford University Press Ltd. 5a 473.
- Rodney W (1976). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* London: Bogle l’Ouverture p.6.
- Sartre J-P (1989). “Existentialism is Humanism,” in *Existentialism from Dostoyevsky to Sartre*, ed. Walter Kaufman, trans. Philip Mairet (Meridian Publishing Company), <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/sartre/works/exist/sartre.htm>.
- Terry A (1998). *Revolution and State development* London: Allenlane pub. p.38.