

Democracy and Accountable Governance in the SADC Region

Jolade Omede Ph.D

Department of Political Science
University of Ilorin Ilorin Kwara State
Email: medajol@yahoo.com

Rufus Akindola Ph.D

General Studies Unit
Federal University Oye-Ekiti
Ekiti State
Email: Rufus.akindola@fuoye.edu.ng

Arinze Ngwube

General Studies Unit
Federal University Oye-Ekiti
Ekiti State
Email: arinze.ngwube@fuoye.edu.ng

Abstract

The call for democracy worldwide is based on the assumption that it allows citizens involvement on how they are governed. Being a representative system of government, democracy is projected to make political leadership responsive and responsible to the entire citizenry of the state. Southern Africa region has the most animated economy in sub –Sahara Africa, and democratic ideals appear more firmly established in the region compared to other regions in Africa. This has made the region, among others in the continent, the preferred choice of many migrants from different parts of the world. It is believed that the region has reached its Eldorado. However, a close observation of the politics of that region tends to suggest there has been the institutionalization of democratic rule without commensurate enthronement of responsible and accountable governance. This study systematically examined the political configurations of the region to concretely determine how the practice of liberal democracy in the sub-region has translated to accountable and responsible governance and its overall impact of the living standard of the citizens of the countries of that region. The paper examined accountable governance in the sense that leaders will be able to manage resource of the state for the well being of the populace. The reverse has been the case for the region. Southern Africa needs a developmental and capable state for socio-economic progress and sustainable democracy. This cannot be achieved without responsible political leadership, which would be responsive to the yearnings of the people. The mode of analysis was based on secondary sources and observation method. The paper adopted secondary and observation techniques as the mode of analysis.

Key words: Accountability, Democracy, Governance, Development, Leadership,

Introduction

Unarguably, the Southern African region has the most vibrant economy in sub-Saharan Africa. Democratic ideals also rank higher in the region compared to other regions in the continent. In spite of this the region is experiencing high rate of unemployment, decay in

educational and other infrastructural facilities as well as problems of corruption. These are the problems militating against sustainable human development of the region. The high expectations of the people that democracy would reverse their decades of poverty corruption and under development have hardly been met by the new democrats. Africa, in the spirit of prevailing global climate has embraced democracy or, more precisely, liberal or multiparty democracy. This has found acceptance within Africa's political elite, and perhaps more significantly, within the donor communities and western democracies that seek to connect the process to market-based economic reforms and development on the continent. They also seek to globalize their own political culture and market ideology as part of the process of universal homogenization.

However, the situation in Zimbabwe is a little more complex and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the African Union (AU), as well as the international community, have largely failed to arrest the steady slide of the country into crises. There is no doubt that in African politics today, there is no choice, but democracy. Yet beneath the progressive veneer of democratization lie a lot of ambivalence and contradictions. It is therefore very important to examine whether what we have is true democracy, and how sustainable it is. Whether we have real democracies or dictatorships? Do the people have a real choice or are they confronted with more of the same, old wine in a new bottle. This is no attempt to reduce the significance of the past cold war political openings on the continent or to downplay the importance of democracy for the freedom and development of Africa. Rather it is to pose very critical questions about the nature and depth of the ongoing democratic experience in Africa. The fundamental question being raised is: whose democracy? Is this exactly true of Developmental State theorists? The correct position as articulated by Adrian Leftwich is that "the few cases of rapid economic growth in the Third World in the last 30 years have occurred in democratic, quasi-democratic and non-democratic politics"(Leftwich,1994). They were thus clearly not a function of common regime type. Leftwich suggested that they are best explained by the special character of their states, understood 'as developmental states'. Also, the forms and features of these states are not simply a function of their administrative structures or principles of governances, but of their politics.

Again this backdrop this paper explains the historical evolution of multi-party democracy in Southern Africa. The paper also discusses the interface between democracy and development and how it relates to the region. Finally, the paper explains in details the various issues involved in the quest for accountable governance in the region.

Theoretical Framework

This study is conducted within the content of the theory of democratic developmental state. It is important to clarify the concept of a democratic developmental state so that it can be applied to the African Context. Scholars observe that the quest and struggle of the African people for democratic governance are aimed not only at doing away with repressive and autocratic governments but also at improving their socio-economic conditions in a way which will lead to qualitative improvement in their material conditions. This has important social and political value. It is expected that the citizenry will be able to exercise real choice after they have overcome poverty, squalor as these constitute constraints on freedom and equality. In other words, social, economic and political empowerments are mutually inclusive. Embedded in such conception is citizen's active participation as a necessary requirement in the development and governance process. Thus when questioning how the democratic developmental state can be placed in the African context, it is pertinent to bring citizenship back into politics.

This means placing importance on supportive work and deliberative traditions by bringing people together across party lines, racial backgrounds, class divides and other differences for the common good. Conceiving the democratic developmental state in this way is not an endeavor to do away with representative democracy but rather to recast the debate by placing greater premium on how participatory democracy compliments representative democracy. For it to be effective citizens will have to organize themselves to be able to participate in consultative arenas or networks of consultative decision –making. Due to divergent interests in society, citizens organize themselves into various groups which are at times in conflict and are times complementary. But to ensure the objectives of redistribution and the reduction of inequalities the form of civil society that is most suitable for that task is associations of politically marginalized groups (White, 1998). Hence marginalized people have to form popular organizations that will advance their interests. This is because across the globe, it has been shown that where elite groups dominate the consultative arena, it reinforces inequality.

It needs to be stressed that democratic developmental state foster economic growth and development. This means that not only is the state able to transform its economic base by promoting productive income generating economic activities but must ensure that economic growth has the resultant effect of improving the living conditions of the majority of its population. White (1998) puts this succinctly: “development includes a process of economic

change involving the construction of more complex and productive economies capable of generating higher material standards of living”.

In line with the above, a democratic developmental state has to have clearly defined socio-economic objectives that require active state interventions. Some of the Social objectives include:

(the) alleviation of absolute and relative poverty; the correction of glaring inequalities of social conditions (between genders, classes, regions, and ethnic groups); provision for personal safety and security; and the tackling of looming threats such as environmental degradation...overall, to the extent that democratic polities are instrumental in organizing socio-economic progress along these lines, they can be described as developmentally successful; their success depends on the existence and efficacy of the democratic developmental state(White,1998:28).

One strand of the literature emphasizes the developmental goals of the state, what Mkandawire (2001) calls the ideological character of the developmental state. Prominent in this regard are Castells (1992) and Pronk(1997). To Castell (1992) a state is developmental when it establishes as its principle of legitimacy, its ability to promote and sustain development; understood as the combination of steady and high rates of economic growth and structural change in the productive system, both domestically and in its relationship with the international economy. Pronk (1997) follows in Castells footsteps by defining a developmental state only in terms of its objective. In his view, a developmental state is one which is able and willing to create and sustain a policy climate that promotes developmental by fostering productive investment, exports, growth and human welfare.

Contextualizing Democracy in Southern Africa

Democracy has been viewed with various lenses by different scholars based on their experiences and research. This accounts for different definitions of democracy. Plato defines democracy thus:

And a democracy, I suppose, comes into being the poor, winning the victory put to death some of the other party, drive out others, and grant the rest of the citizens equal share in both the citizenship and offices part these offices are assigned by lot.

The above represents the genuine description of the origin of democracy as found in Athens and what the modern democracy tries to be. However democracy goes beyond this definition. It is not only about winning elections neither does the coming of poor into power means that genuine democratic ideas are on stage. In fact, Plato is not known supporter of democracy as he prefers institutional dictatorship to democracy. So his definition of democracy could not

be relied upon. In the contemporary era, democracy is being associated with simple majority. That is why it is not defined as “the rule by the majority rather than by a majority” (Rancy and Kendall, 1955:416). In view with the belief that democracy is a system of government where majority rules, Mayo comes up with four distinguishing principles of democracy namely: (a) Popular control of policy makers. (b) Political equality. (c) Effective popular control (Mayo 1961). However, democracy is not only about simple majority. The idea of simple majority has failed to adequately address what democracy stands for democracy is best understood and appreciated in terms of people rule definition of democracy by Abraham Lincoln as the government of the people for the people and by the people. In expatiating on the definition of Lincoln, Raphael (1976:32) noted that:

The essential idea of democratic government by all the people. Strictly speaking by all the people should mean unanimous decisions. But this of course, is impossible in political matters. Democracy in practice has to mean following the view of the majority. Perhaps Lincoln’s addition of “ for the people” means that the decisive view, which for practical purposes must be that of the majority, should seek to serve the interests of all even though it does not have the agreement of all; otherwise there is the danger that majority rule may become tyranny .

The above explanation by Raphael clearly shows the inherent deficiencies in democracy. But not withstanding this, democracy still stands out as the system of government that allows for checks and balances, periodic elections and fair involvement of citizens in the decision process.

Democracy is a concept that does not have any universally accepted definition. In spite of the differences in conceptualization and practices, all versions of democracy in the view of Osaghae (1992:40), share one fundamental objective of “how to govern the society in such a way that power actually belongs to all people”. Chafe (1994) argued that democracy is the involvement of the people in running the political, socio-economic and cultural affairs of their society. The degree of involvement of the people in the total control of their polity, within the standard of natural justices, determines the degree of democratic substance of a political system (Sadeeq, 2008:250). This shows that the peculiar virtue of democracy is thought to lie in the fact that it is the only government that can advance the interests of all the members of a politically organized community (Barry, 1992). Schumpeter (1954) defined democracy as an institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide, by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote. Competitive struggle, according to this definition, is that individual can take advantage of whatever loopholes they perceived in their opponents’ political strategy and thereby rise to

power. Held (1982) conceptualized democracy as a cluster of rules and institutions permitting the broader participation of the majority of citizens in the selection of representatives who govern them? In the course of summation of varied definitions of democracy, it is deduced that democracy provides opportunities for the people to freely exercise their franchise in the selection of their representatives and leader. This type of exercise excluded the use of force and coercion through the state apparatus.

Meanwhile, the journey to the present multi party democratic states in the SADC region has been a tortuous and difficult one, which cannot be divorced from the happenings in other part of Africa. Southern Africa region has held its own share of long duration of authoritarian rule. That is the era in which there was imposition of “lone political group or interest over everyone else. They restrict pluralism and limit public participation, calling for obedience and not dissent (Jackson and Jackson, 1997). During this period, there was no room for opposing views. Everybody must toe the line of thought of government of the day. Southern Africa region has been exposed to various winds of authoritarian systems. These include (a) one – person dictatorship. This was the prevailing system in Malawi under – Kamudzu Banda until 1994; (b) military incursion into politics like the one that overshadowed Lesotho’s political scene between 1986 and 1993; (c) one party states. This was the order of the day in Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia until the early 1990s; and monarchial dynastic rule as we have in Swaziland even up till the present day (Matlosa, 2005b). One could see little or no traces of authoritarian rule in southern Africa during the pre-colonial era, the fact cannot be disputed with ration argument that the foundation for authoritarian rule in Southern Africa was laid during the colonial rule. This was extended to the post colonial one by the so- called political activists who inherited state power from the colonial masters not for the development of the state but mainly to promote their own interests (Mamdani, 1996). In the period of 1960s -1980s, except for Botswana and Mauritius who enjoyed liberal democracy majority of southern African counties such as Zimbabwe, Zambia, Tanzania, Mozambique, Angola, Malawi, Lesotho and even South Africa were under the jackboots of authoritarian rule.

Africa experienced the wind of change in the 1990s and this rubbed off greatly on the southern African region. Beginning from this period, there was a reinvigorated clamour for genuine democratization and multi-party systems across the continent. African presidents released political prisoners, unfettered the independent press and recognized opposition political parties in preparation for competitive election. This liberation reform put an end to the political monopoly enjoyed by African one party state and made it difficult for military

officers to again stake a legitimate claim to rule (Bratton et al, 2005). The genuine process of decolonization, transition from military rule and from apartheid to multi-party liberal democracy started in the 1990s in SADC region. This led to the political independence of Namibia in 1994. Since then almost all the SADC states have embraced the political practice of regular multi-party elections with the exception of Angola, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Swaziland (Matlosa, 2005).

It is important to note at this juncture that even though almost all the SADC countries have embraced multi party democracies, the level of its development varies from one country to the other. While countries like Botswana, South Africa, Namibia and Mauritius are practicing liberal democracies with stable and consolidating democratic frameworks, majority of SADC countries such as Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia practicing electoral democracies whose democratic credentials are stronger in relation to holding regular elections but suffer great democratic deficits between and beyond elections. Zimbabwe is a typical example of another facet of democracy in SADC region. It is a country that has embraced the political culture of regular multiparty elections but election in the country is a mere façade behind authoritarian indulgences. Swaziland represents the lost group which is indifferent to the multiparty democracy (Matlosa, 2005; Schedler, 2002; Diamond, 2002).

Democracy and Development in Southern Africa

The interconnectedness between democracy and development in Southern Africa has been a contentious issue. The bone of contention has been whether democracy could assist the evolution of developmental stages. Their belief is that multiparty would come with its divisive tendencies which would affect the national unity, the development and the process of nation building in their respective countries. Their opinion was that accelerated development would not have been achieved if democracy was not given chance to flourish as it ought to be. In fact, this account for the preponderance of one party state in most of the southern African states after independence.

The political reform process that ushered in multiparty democracy in Africa has been the subject of heated debates (Olukoshi, 1998). While some scholars have celebrated the transition from authoritarianism to democratic rule as a positive development, others have criticized them for being elitist, and not addressing the interest of the grassroots, or even

worse for being non transition (Ihonvbere, 1996). The former points to the connection between the struggle for democracy by the civil society and the enthronement of democracy that guaranteed people their rights. Furthermore, they have noted that the expansion of political space meant hitherto excluded groups participate in the political process, while elections signify that the leaders were meant to account to their people, and could no longer rule in an arbitrary manner. There is no doubt that this position did make some mark to some African States, where the return to multiparty democracy created conditions within which the opposition was able to organize and defeat incumbent ruling parties.

However, this idea of detaching genuine democracy from the process of evolving a developmental state might not have been the best way to achieve national unity. According to Mandaza and Sachikonye (1991:10), “the flows in this ideology partly explain the failure to attain both political stability and economic development in much of the continent”. It is quite saddening and ironical that the political leaders who were in the forefront for political independence never had real plans for the development of their states after independence. Rather they were more entangled in power struggle, the fallout of which is the mortgage of the development of the state on the altar of their selfish pecuniary gains. In essence, the much talked about development by the political elite in place of genuine democracy to the unending power struggle among them. The situation was appropriately captured by Ake when he states thus: “it is easy to see that the political environment at independence was profoundly hostile to development. The struggle for power was so absorbing that everything else, including developments was marginalized” (Ake, 1996:26). So, rather than focusing on the how to develop their states, the political elites “locked horns in an unending zero-sum struggle over state power and rampant accumulation by both fair and foul means” (Matlala, 2005:20). At the end both democracy and development suffered.

When we talk of development in this paper we mean sustainable human development. Here, we believe that sustainable human development is anchored on democracy coupled with a government that is accountable. According to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1990) sustainable human development basically has to do with a process of expanding people’s choices in a manner that enables them to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives. UNDP came up with three indices to measure sustainable human development. These are Human Development Index (HDI), Gender Development Index (GDI) and Human Poverty Index (HPI). These indices were accompanied with three components used in measuring the socio-economic progress of any country. These are Longevity- This is the variable that measure life expectancy and state of health; b)

Knowledge- This variable measures the literacy level and c) Per capital income- This is a variable that measures the standard of living and poverty incidence. The region is expected to have developed but faces crisis in governance. By crisis in governance we mean the inability of the government and its agencies to adequately address the cultural, economic, political and social needs of its citizens. The institution of governance is regarded at all levels as the most sensitive human enterprise. It is regarded as such because it is an institution that has the onus to decide the fate of the generality of the masses under such territorial designation. For example concerning human development worldwide, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Millennium Declaration Committing Member States to achieving eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as follows:-

Goal1: Eradicate extreme hunger and poverty; halving the proportion of people living on less than \$1 a day and having malnutrition'

Goal 2 : Achieve universal primary education. Ensuring that children are able to complete primary education'

Goal 3 Promote gender equality and empower women. Eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary schooling, preferably by 2005 and no later than 2015

Goal 4 Reduce child mortality. Cutting the under-five death rate by two-thirds

Goal 5 Improve maternal health. Reducing the maternal mortality by three-quarters;

Goal 6 Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases;

Goal 7 Ensure environmental stability. Cutting by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation; and

Goal 8 Develop a global partnership for development. Reforming aid and trade with special treatment for the dearest countries (United Nation Development Programme 2005)

When we critically examine these eight point agenda the question to be asked is that how far has most states in the region gone in achieving these? Signs of hunger are visible everywhere while many people are living below poverty level. There is no well designed programme for universal primary education which would have made all children able to compulsorily complete primary education. Primary health care delivery system has not been given adequate attention while other infrastructural facilities such as road and pipe borne water are in a sorry state (UNDP, 2015). Lack of responsible governance has impacted negatively on achieving the Millennium Development Goals for sustainable human development in the region. There is the need to have a government that is accountable.

The Quest for Accountable Governance in Southern Africa

We cannot afford to neglect the importance of the state in the development enterprise. It also needs to be understood that in every political order and system there must always be a bargain involved in being a member of that political community. The question we must ask ourselves is what the bargain is for the ordinary Southern Africa today in being a member of a political community? What does it mean to be a Zimbabwean? What does it mean to be a South African? This is the arena of citizenship, the arena for the articulation of the relationship between state and society. It is an arena suffused with informal relationships but also an arena where formalized social contracts exist between essential ingredients of the political society. As a result would not be able to theorize governance and accountability if we do not have a sense of the nature of the social contract in any given political system. It is within the social contract that makes one a member of a political community. We rediscover issues of how people in their everyday struggles articulate demands on the state through a set of expectations that they have in order to make it more accountable? People's expectation on the dividends of democracy in southern Africa is nothing to write home about.

This refocuses to your attention to the absence of the social bargain that is a key element in the glue that makes democracies function and the system reproduce itself on the basis of legitimacy and be able to achieve the kind of consent that is necessary. Next and perhaps even more difficult for us working on democratic questions is the fact most countries in SADC have lost ground with regard to policy-making on the continent. Policymaking, policy process and policy institutions have not only been captured, but hijacked to a point where rulers on the ground essentially exercise power, but the determinants of policy appear to be external to the continent. In technical terms, governance deals with the systemic framework, institutional arrangements as well as the machinery meant for the formulation and execution of the policies of a given country. In this case, it is extended to include putting in place a legally constituted authority to administer the state affairs on behalf of the concerned population at all layers of social formation. It also includes the exercise of political power to run state affairs (Hyden, et al 1992; Hyden et al., 2000). This is in conformity with the submission of Hyden that:

Governance refers to the aspect of politics that aim to formulate and manage the rules of the political arena in which state and civil society actors operate and interact to make authoritative decisions. In more operational terms, governance refers to these measures that involve settling conflicts over such rules. Such rules translate into constitutions, laws,

customs, administrative regulations..... All of which in one way or the other provide the framework for the formulation and implementation of policy decision (Hyden 1999:181).

Governance has remained a subject of development discourse in the Southern African region. Consequent upon the above, a government that is alienated from the majority of the people could not be said to be accountable. This loss of legitimacy will force those in power to adopt undemocratic tactics and unconstitutional methods, including corrupt practices, to retain power as the opposition to the government mounts. As soon as the government feels unsafe, it thinks more of security than any other thing. In fact, most of its attention would be directed to security to the detriment of other important sectors of the economy that could have direct impact on the citizens. What would result is the gradual impoverishment of the citizenry because the largest chunk of the state budget would go to defense and security. It is in view of the aforementioned situation that this paper places much premium on accountability in governance especially its attainment and sustenance.

Failure in governance arises from the fact that too many of those in the higher rung of governance i.e. the leadership cannot be counted upon to act for the benefit of the polity just for the sake of doing so. It often appears as a free for all where the institutions of society are not strong enough to constitute a serious check. Public official and those in authority to ensure that: Some set of recipients receive information about the outcomes of decision made by identified individual who are source decision makers. These sources can be made to explain their decision; and some sanctions can be imposed if the explanations are unsatisfactory (Economic Commission for Africa 2003). Since accountable governance has to do with accounting, many governments especially in the SADC region have failed. The governments are only good in the manipulation of the instruments of government in favor of certain classes of people. This in no small way accounted for the tension, conflict and instability being experienced in these countries. In fact, it was this scenario that had put many countries in a state of ferment because political power has been taken to mean a winner-take-all affair with respect not only to patronage and the prerogatives of office but also to the nation's wealth and resources. The concentration of power in the hands of a particular group can in that sense serve only as a source in that the resulting economic deprivation alienates the government from the majority of the people.

This is not the case in most SADC countries. This region has many consolidated democratic states in Southern Africa which are deficient in accountability. Lack of accountability in governance arises when social ethnics and constitutional and provisions in

conducting public affairs are ignored, tasks to be performed are so complex, corrupt practices are widespread, political and personal loyalty is rewarded more than merit. Accountability is therefore vital in any polity this involves both the political justification of decision and actions, and managerial answerability for implementation of agreed tasks according to agreed criteria of performance (Day et al, 1987).

To the cursory observer, the surfeit of elections in Southern Africa is proof that democracy has been firmly entrenched in the region. However a closer examination of trends underlines the fact that freedom is on the retreat whilst authoritarianism is on the rise across the region. Mainza (2015) in his penetrating study of the Zambian polity explores the relationship between political competition and political instability. He explores the popular perception that political competition should improve government responsibilities in the same way that competitive economic markets yield benefits to consumers. From the perspective of various governance and fragility indicators, Mainza demonstrates that political instability in Zambia has risen due to the increased political competition. Accountability in the political sense makes duty bound for those in authority to be answerable to the citizens in all their actions. The failure of governance itself points to the fact that those in political control have not properly managed the economy and the other social institutions.

On a more positive note Singh and Ngubane (2015) examine Mozambique's democratic consolidation since the signing of the Rome General Peace Accords in 1992. For more than two decades, the country has been making steady progress at democratic consolidation. Interestingly, progress in the political orb has mirrored advances in the economic realm of whether proponents of democracy should not pay equal attention to economic growth and poverty reduction as a means towards political stability. However democratic consolidation theory clearly argues that a liberal democracy is unattainable in the absence of a sizable middle class-once more highlighting the interface between politics and economics. Windhoek, the Namibian capital, was synonymous with press freedom. It was the city which lent its name to the Windhoek Declaration which inaugurated world press freedom day twenty four (24) years ago. The Windhoek Declaration emphasized the importance of press freedom for the health of all liberal democracies. The declaration emerged from a country which just achieved independence from apartheid South Africa and the country's leadership was at pains to emphasize its democratic credentials. The mood of Namibian journalist in recent years however is far more somber. The country's journalists lament that government departments often ignore written requests from journalist for information thereby undermining transparency and accountability. Journalist highlight

weakness in service delivery and the government responds with hostility towards the media (Freedomhouse, 2015).

Issue of press freedom however cannot be separated from other freedoms like the freedom of association and ultimately is related to the relative dearth of democracy in Southern Africa. Indeed, the region is a classic example of what Zakaria(1997) referred to as ‘illiberal democracies’ where regimes have the trappings of democracy such as going through an election but the regimes are fundamentally illiberal in their hostility to a free press, civil society and the political opposition. Indeed, these regimes are fundamentally authoritarian in nature. Zimbabwe is perhaps the quintessential example of such an illiberal democracy at work despite the charade of hosting an election. According to Amnesty International’s deputy regional director for Southern Africa, Noel Kutuwa, “ Zimbabwe is a very sophisticated state and use sophisticated methods of repression to punish those who stand against it, and the crisis has internalized within ZANU PF while factions fight for power” (Nicolson,2015).

The fact that Zimbabwe’s President, Robert Mugabe, currently heads both the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the African Union (AU) (Nicolson, 2015) begs conviction and that his African peers demonstrate total disregard for his actions which has brutalized his own people and brought his country into penury. The Amnesty International report on Southern Africa demonstrates systematic abuse on the part of governments against those espouse the freedom of expression, association and assembly. The brute force of the state, In other words, is used to crush legitimate dissent. The litany of such abuse captured in the report makes depressing readings. The report exposes

how force was used on peaceful demonstrators and unlawful killings of those challenging President Eduardo do Santos in Angola. Swaziland experienced ongoing violence, arrests and prosecutions against those advocating for human rights and political reform. Sexual minorities have been targeted in Zambia, and thousands of people have been forcefully evicted from their homes in a number of countries (Nicolson, 2015).

In Zambia, meanwhile the ruling party has made use of the draconian public order Act as a means to intimidate and harass opposition political parties (Freedom House 2015). In South Africa, the regional hegemony, democracy has suffered blow after blow with creeping politicization of the state security apparatus and the justice system. Additionally, according to Human Rights Watch (2015) it has witnessed increased incidents of police violence in South Africa from Mohutling in Brits, North West Province to Relela in Kgapanne, Limpopo Province to Bekkersdal in Gauteng Province. Neither is this unique to South Africa. In

Tanzania, there has been a growing trend of extra judicial violence on the part of the security forces (Freedom House, 2015). The poor people are disenfranchised economically. It becomes impossible for individual citizens to realize their optimum development in the provision of affordable and qualitative education, health care, housing, jobs and other things that would guarantee good life for the citizens. No conducive environment for employment, education, decent housing and medical care. Majority of the SADC states survive on aids, donations, and grants from few developed countries and international agencies.

Conclusion

Our task in this paper is not really about evolving a system of accountable governance in Southern Africa. Rather, we have proved that multiparty democracy does not necessarily translate to accountable governance. We have gone ahead to discussing the evolutionary process of multiparty democracy in SADC region. We gave vivid illustration of the fact that almost all the countries in the region are enjoying multiparty democracy but accountable governance is far from the body polity. It concludes that there is a disconnect among democracy, development and governance in the region. We therefore recommend that leadership at every level of governance in the region should exhibit high sense of accountability and transparency which will in turn ensure sustainable democracy for the populace.

References

- Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Washington: The Brookings Institutions.
- Barry, N.I (1992). *An Introduction to Modern Political Theory*. London: Macmillan Educational Books.

Bratton N, Mattes R, Gyimah-Boadi E (2005). *Public Opinion, Democracy and Market Reform in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Castells,M. (1992). Four Asian Tigers with a Dragon Head: A Comparative Analysis of a State,Economy and Society in the Asian Pacific Rim.In Applebaum,R and Henderson,J(eds) *State and Development in the Asian Pacific*.Newbury Park:Sage Publication.

Chafe, S.K (1994). *The Problem of African Democracy: Experiences From the Political Transition in Nigeria*. African Zamani New Series No 2.

Cornwall, A. etal. (2000). Introduction: Accountability though Partcipation: Developing Workable Partnership Models in the Health Sector.*IDS Bulletin*, Vol 31(1) Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Day, P. and Kelin, R. (1987). *Accountabilities: Five Public Services*. Tavistock: London.

Diamond L (2002). Thinking about Hybrid Regimes. *Journal of Democracy*, 13(2): 57-65.

Economic Commission for Africa (2003). *Public Sector Management Reforms in Africa*. Addis Baba: Economic Commission for Africa.

Freedom House (2015) *Freedom in the World 2014* <<http://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files-sub-sahara%20Africa%factosheet%pdf> accessed May 2015

Goetz, A.M and Gaverta, J. (2001). *Bringing Citizen Voice and Client Focus into Service Delivery* .IDS Working paper 138, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Goetz, A.M. and Jenkins, R. (2001). Hybrid Forms of Accountability: Citizen Engagement in Institutions of Public Sector Oversight in India. *Public Management Review* Vol 3(3) September.

Held, D. (1982). *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Human Rights watch (2015) *Southern Africa: A year of Little Rights Progress*.29th January 2015<<http://www.hrw.org/news/2015/01/29southern-africa-year-little-rights-progress>>accessed May 2015

Hyden, G. (1999). *Governance and the Reconstitution of Political Order*. In: Richard Joseph (Ed.): *State, Democracy and the Market*. Boulder Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

Hyden, G. etal. (Eds.) (1992). *Governance and Politics in Africa*. Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers.

Hyden, G. etal. (Eds.) (2000). *African Perspectives on Governance*. Trenton: Africa World Press.

Ihonvbere, J (1996). Where is the third wave? A Critical Evaluation of Africa's non-transition to democracy. *Africa Today*, vol. 43, no. 4.

- Jackson, R. et al. (1997). *A Comparative Introduction to Political Science*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mainza, M. (2015). The Patriotic Front (PF) Government under a Competitive Political Environment: Implications for Political Instability in Zambia. *Southern African Peace and Security Studies*. Vol 4(1), 41-56.
- Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. London: James Currey.
- Mandaza, I. and Sachikonye, L. (1991). *The One-Party State and Democracy: The Zimbabwe Debate*. Harare: SAPES Books.
- Matlosa, K. (2005). *Governance Research Agenda: Towards a Democracy Assessment Framework for Southern Africa*. EISA Occasional Paper No. 35. Johannesburg: Elections Initiative for Southern Africa.
- Matlosa, K. (2005). *The State, Democracy and Development in Southern Africa*. A paper presented at the 11th General Assembly of CODESRIA held in Maputo, Mozambique, 6-10 December, 2005.
- Mayo, HB. (1960). *An Introduction to Democratic Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking About the Developmental States in Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. 25 (3), 289-314.
- Nicolson, G. (2015). Amnesty International: Not a good time for human rights 'Daily Maverick' 27 Feb 2015 <<http://www.daily.maverick.co.za/article/2015-02-27amnesty-international-not-a-goodtime-for-humanrights> accessed May 2015
- Olukoshi, A. (1998). *The Elusive Prince of Denmark: Structural adjustment and the crisis of governance in Africa*, Research Report No. 104, Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute.
- Olukoshi, A. (1998b). *The Democracy Debate in Africa – An Outline*. In Steve Kayizzi-Mugenwa, Adebayo Olukoshi and Lennart Wohlgemuth (eds.), *Towards a New Partnership for Africa: Challenges and Opportunities*, Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute.
- Osaghae, E.E (1992) *Ethnicity and Democracy*. In Ayo, F (Ed) *Understanding Democracy*. Ibadan: Book Craft Ltd.
- Pronk, J.P (1997). *Changing Relationships between State and Society and their implications for Development Policy*. Public Lecture .Centre for Development Studies. University of Groningen Netherlands. February 26.
- Przeworski, A Stokes, S and Manind, B (Eds) (1999). *Democracy Accountability and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ranney, A. and Kendall, W. (1955). Democracy: Confusion and Agreement. *Western Political Quarterly*, 4: 416- 430.

Rapheal, DD. (1976). *Problems of Political Philosophy*. London: Macmillan.

Sadeeq, W. (2008) Mass Media and Democracy .In Ojo, E.O(Ed) *Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Archers.

Schedler, A etal. (1999). The Self –Restraining State: Power and accountability in New Democracies. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Schedler, A. (2002). Elections without Democracy: The Menu of Manipulation. *Journal of Democracy*. 13(2): 19-35.

Schumpeter, J.A (1954) Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper and Row.

Singh, P and Ngubane, S (2015). Democratic Consolidation in Search of Peace: A Tempered Assessment of the Mozambican Post War Experience. *Southern African Peace and Security Studies*. Vol 4(1), 5-17.

Therkildsen, O. (2001). Efficiency, Accountability and Implementation, Public Sector Reform in East and Southern Africa. Democracy, Governance and Human Rights Programme Paper. Number 3, Geneva: United Nations Research for Social Development.

UNDP (1990). *Human Development Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNDP (2005). *Human Development Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White,G.(1998) Constructing a Democratic Developmental State. In Robinson Mark and White Gordon (eds).*The Democratic Developmental State: Political and Institutional Design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Bank (1989). *World Bank Development Report*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (1992). *Governance and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Yahaya, D. (1999). Public Service and Good Governance. A public lecture delivered at Abuja, Nigeria to mark the nation's Civil Service day.

Zakaria, F. (1997) The Rise of Illiberal Democracy. *Foreign Affairs*. 76(6), 22-43.