

Democracy versus Development Debate

Humphrey N. Nwobashi Ph.D, Anthony Itumo Ph.D
Department of Political Science Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
Ebonyi State University, P.M.B 053, Abakaliki
Department of Political Science Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
Ebonyi State University, P.M.B 053, Abakaliki
Corresponding Author: Humphrey N. Nwobashi Ph.D

Abstract: There are floods of debates among scholars over whether democracy drives development or development that drives democracy. The first stream of the literature argues that democracy is a precondition for development because of its accountability mechanism, open participation, checks and balances, rule of law, respects for human rights and good governance. Arguing further, the scholars assert that democracy promotion is prior to expansion of economic development, pointing out that empirical evidence indicates that democracy has consistently out-performed non democracies in terms of indicators of socioeconomic wellbeing. The second stream of literature on the other hand maintains that development drives democracy, anchoring their argument on the fact that economic development leads to political decay giving rooms for political instability which later moves toward democracy through and after institutionalization. Furthering this debate, the scholars argued that the stability of democracy is dependent on certain socio-economic conditions such high GNP or GDP per capita, wide spread and high educational level coupled with high level of urbanization. The data for the study is gathered from secondary sources while content analysis and narrative analytical technique is used for data analysis. The theoretical framework that guided the analysis of the study is democracy first, development later theory. Pitching tent with the first strand of the literature, the study argues that democracy is a *Sequa non* for development due to the overwhelming empirical evidence supporting the school of thought.

Keywords: Accountability, Contestation, Democracy, Development, Good Governance.

Date of Submission: 28-12-2018

Date of acceptance: 14-01-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

Democracy and development are positive correlates. Ake (1996) affirmed this assertion by stating that there is a strong positive relationship between democracy and development. Democracy is a process while development is an outcome. Democracy according to Nnoli (2011), offers a viable path to a better political life that has the embededness of forces that propel socio-economic advancement in a polity. When the citizens and elites of a country toe the right democratic path, democracy promotes the forces of positive change and discourages constraints against it. The character of democracy prevalent in a country shapes the developmental trajectories that creatively increase the productivity of the vast majority of the people using local resources. This is better achieved when the critical question of what is happening in the rural communities of the country is addressed. This centres on the organization of increasing creative and modernized jobs as well as the provision of social welfare services in the areas of education, health, feeder roads, electricity etc. However, if the character of democracy has the embededness of institutionalized self and class-serving interests that have the grains of domination/ authoritarianism, oppression/ repression, exploitation, inequality, injustice and illegitimacy, it breeds underdevelopment (Nnoli, 2011).

In this context, democracy instead of having strong inter-linkages with development appears like what Fanon (1966:65) has aptly observed:

there is nothing but a fancy dress parade and blare of trumpets. There is nothing except a few reforms at the top while at the bottom, the masses are still marking time. This means that democracy is not and cannot be once-for-all end which may be attained by one fell scoop.

This implies that democracy is not an end in itself but a merely unfolding and unending process toward a better political life.

Globally, there are divergent views among social science scholars on the capacity of democratic governance to stimulate rapid socio-economic development of the society. In this regard, two core arguments dominate the literature on democracy and development. The first argument is that economic development is a

driver for the realization of democracy. For this school, economic development is *sine qua non* for the realization of democracy. The second argument posits that democracy produces environment that leads to economic development because of the basic principles of democracy which ensure accountability, checks and balances provisions, the dignity of the individual persons, freedom of expression and association, popular control and political equity, political participation, supremacy of the will of the people, open communications between the leaders and the led etc (Fukuyama, 1992; Okolie, 2015).

These characteristics limit the abuse of power of democratic leaders because of the prevalence of elections and other processes due to rewards and punishments inherent in democracy. It ensures a predictable reliable procedure. Relying on the conventional wisdom that flows from the philosophical foundation of the second school of democratic theory (Cheema and Maguire, n.d; Doyle, 1983; Huntington, 1993; Feng, 2003; Menocal, 2007), which emphasizes the inter-linkages between democracy and the overall socio-economic development of societies, coupled with the weightier and more rewarding empirically evidence from the field survey, this study anchors its argument on the proposition of the second school.

II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Despite the importance of demystifying the linkage between democracy and development, extant studies have put forward two differing camps that amount to contentious debate. Existing scholarship stated their respective views on the problematic. While scholars such as Pippa (1999); Kiyaga-Nsubuga (2015) and Sen (1999b), had linked democracy to sustainable development, others contended that democracy was better practiced in countries that have attained greater levels of socio-economic development (Menocal, 2007; Lipset, 1959; Lipset *et al.*, 1993; Cnudde & Neubauer, 1969; Lijphart, 1972; Huntington and Dominguez, 1975; Almond & Verba, 1963; Moore, 1966).

The core argument in the 1950s and 1960s was that “the more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances that it will sustain democracy” (Lerner, 1958: 63; Lipset, 1960: 31). A number of quantitative analysis in Political Science in these periods found economic development and a higher GNP per capita to be intricately linked to political democratization (Cutright, 1963; Neeler, 1968; Neubaur, 1967; Flanigan & Fogelman, 1971; Kim, 1971; Flora, 1973; Marquette, 1974; Coulter, 1975; Bollen, 1979, 1980). In fact, a comprehensive effort to locate the correlates of democracy for over 100 countries, using political indicators for 1960 and 1965, which made Bollen and Jackson to report that “the level of economic development has a pronounced effect on political democracy, even when other non-economic factors are considered” (Bollen & Jackman, 1985: 38-39).

Relaying on the Lipset’s seminar report (1959:62) that envisage that economic prosperity is “an initial condition for democracy,” several researchers conceived this to mean that development was necessary for the sustenance and consolidation of democracy. However, the empirical realities of the time did not support this theoretical perspective as economic growth registered by many developing countries within the periods failed to produce the expected democratic outcomes. More than that, some countries with outstanding economic growth records such as Brazil, Spain, South Korea, Taiwan, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf state were quite rich without being democracies and remained staunchly authoritarian.

On the contrary, India with the low per capita income at the time remained “inexplicably” democratic in the eyes of the analysts. To further strengthen the argument, Ngunan (2013) maintained that 18 countries in North Africa and Middle East such as Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Iraq, Syria etc experienced unprecedented uprisings, now known as Arab Spring, even with high economic growth. Yet, these countries are been bedeviled by high rate of unemployment, poverty, political repression and autocratic rules (Spencer, 2011; Abulof, 2011; Cockburn, 2011). In fact, the rise in dictators, especially in Latin America led to arguments that economic growth is linked to authoritarianism, not democracy (Linz & Stepan, 1978; O’Donnell, 1973; Collier, 1979). The import of this argument is that democracy leads to economic development and not the other way round. This study adopts the latter argument that democracy is prerequisite to the development of a society.

Democracy

The term “democracy” is defined and interpreted variously by different scholars and practitioners. Indeed, there exists a wide range of meanings, contents, interpretations and conclusions of democratic experiment with its accompanying circumstances that can ease its actualization (Bassiouin, 1996). The prevalence of variations occur due to the scholars’ philosophical, ideological, political, cultural, social and economic orientations. These differing perceptions create the difficulty in achieving a universally accepted definition. This complicates every effort to assign it a precise definition. Buhlman *et al.* (2008) corroborate this position by stating that there are avalanche of studies that attempts to explain democratic theory which has given rise to great number of definitions. These several definitions have confused readers on what democracy should be and what democracy is. Kekic (2007) agrees with him by stating that there is no consensual standpoint that can measure democracy, concepts of democracy has remained continual contested, therefore creating an unending argument on what democracy really mean.

According to Wikipedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wik/Democracy>), “Democracy is a system of government by which political sovereignty is retained by the people and exercised directly by the citizens”. The same website list the following as forms of democracy: parliamentary democracy, direct democracy, indirect democracy, consensus democracy, super-national democracy and non-governmental democracy. In etymological sense, the word democracy is derived from ancient Greek (*onuokpatia/demokratia*) which is the combination of demos, the “people” with kratos meaning “rule” power or strength. Conversely, this definition as etymological configured, that people in democracy are the sovereignty. The people create and remove government are deemed to have the right to create and undo government. Abraham Lincoln in 1863, equated democracy as: government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The crucial passage of Lincoln’s speech is:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task of remaining before us – that from these honored dead, we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion – that we highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain – that this nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall not perish from the earth (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gettysburg_address, see also Sodaro, 2004: 168; Campell, 2008:5).

Some conceptual works of academic scholars, aptly and explicitly renew the conceptual diversity of democracy (Buhlman *et al.*, 2008). For instance, Sodaro (2004: 63) opines that “the essential idea of democracy is that the people have the right to determine who governs them through election, hold them accountable and impose legal limits on the governments’ authority”. He expands the concept further by what he terms “four faces of democracy:

- Popular sovereignty – creating the idea of the prevalence of the people’s right to govern themselves;
- Liberties – consisting of fundamental rights and liberty that must be protected by law to the citizens;
- Democracy values consisting of critical components of tolerance, fairness and compromise justice, etc;
- Economic liberty which ensures fairness, equality as well as socio-economic empowerment as basic components of democracy.

Betham (1998) identified some basic ideologies of democracy that can be enshrined in a set of institutions and practices so that these principles can be realized. The dignity of man in which the citizens must bear their rights and responsibilities as well as being actively involved in the overall decisions and policies of government directed towards them. The cardinal elements of democracy are discussed thus: the inalienable rights of people to control and influence decision and policy makers so that they could be treated with equal respect and equal worth within the domain. Such regulative ideas bring about citizens’ control with the embeddedness of political equality should be treated with equal respect and as of equal worth in the context of such decisions. These regulative ideas vested on the people are called principles of popular control and political equality respectively (Betham, 1998).

Betham (1998) further attempts to convince his readers on the imperative of discussing democracy as basic principles instead of seeing it as a set of political institutions. Given as reasons are:

- (i) That institutions are democratic is purely as a result of convention; rather than with a set of political institutions but of the contributions they offer in the realization of aforementioned principles; they have not emerged readymade, but due to popular struggles so as to enable people access and influence government.
- (ii) Defining democracy institutional elevate means to ends which concentrates on the forms rather than the content and abandon the very critical standpoint to judge these institutional arrangements whether they more or less democratic in their social milieu. Democracy is accessed to the extent in which certain principles are realized and not its final states of perfection.
- (iii) Aligning or relating democracy to its basic principles lead us to observe democracy working rather beyond the formalism of government. Democracy reveals specifically, how the people can organize themselves together in groups so as to solve their common problems; thrive to protect the interest and effectively influence other to accept their point of view. This is represented as a manifestation of true democracy more than the structural pattern and process put in place as democracy (Betham, 1998:21).

The citizen is epicenter of virile democratic process. Normally, citizens ought to possess certain vital qualities. The fundamental one is that the citizens must have the right, ability, commitment and willingness to play critical part in their common affairs. This role may be located either within local, state, national or international and acknowledge sincerely some responsibilities for them. The citizens must respect the right of others, honestly permit the existence of equal dignity as well as other person’s right to an opinion, especially when it is different from one’s own.

As novel as the principles are, some problems confront democracy especially new democracies. For instance, the existence of a state that is operationally functional and exercises authority over its sphere in which the leaders motivate their personnel rather than selfish interest is a prerequisite for the sustenance of democracy. The people develop modalities and agree on common nationhood of the nation state. These conditions are

lacking in these new democracies. In this regard, democratic process tends to exacerbate, rather than provide the expected solution in the task of nation building. Another problem that is experienced very acutely by new democracies in Africa is the prevalence of high incidence of poverty and ignorance. And, the development strategies, of the new democracies, whether political or economic are influenced by external forces without due democratic acceptance and approval.

The universal declaration on democracy as adopted by the inter-parliamentary council at its 161st session at Cairo on 16 September, 1997 adopts the following principles, elements and exercise of democratic government and advises various governments in the world to adopt its contents as follows:

1. Democracy is universally, democracy is both ideal and a goal as it share common values in which the people world over inspite of their cultural, socio-economic and political differences, exercise their basic right under enabling conditions that allow for freedom, equality, transparency and responsibility. They strive to respect differing views and interests in the polity.
2. Democracy is pursued as an ideal as well as applied as a mode of government based on the existing procedures. This procedure reflects the peculiarities of divergence of experiences and culture. They must be based on universally accepted principles, norms and standards but in line with these requirements, democracy is valued as a perfect or condition whose success depend upon an array of social, political, economic and cultural milieu.
 1. Essentially, democracy preserves as well as promotes fundamental rights and the dignity of the individual person. It fosters socio-economic development and achieves equity and justice, strengthens the stability of society and enhances national harmony. It creates a conducive environment for international peace. Democracy as a form of government is generally accepted as best option for achieving the stated objectives. It is seen as the only political system that possesses the capacity for self-correction.
 2. Attainment of democratic rules creates a genuine relationship between leaders and the led in conducting the affairs of the society. The leaders and followers work harmonious in equality and complementarity, ensuring the existence of mutual enrichment from their diversities.
 3. Stable democratic rule presents processes that enable power to be acceded to, wielded as well as alternated in order to allow for free political competition which allows for inclusive participation of the people. The power must be exercised both in letter and spirit in line with the rule of law.
 4. Democracy and the right of the people are inseparable as set forth in international instruments and institutions. The effective and proper apply of these rights must be anchored on individual and collective responsibility and occupation.
 5. The primacy of law and exercise of human rights are fountains of democracy. This is to ensure that no one is above the law and everyone is equal before the law.
 6. The prevailing of peace and sound economy, stable society and cultural secularization are both requirements for and fruits of democracy. Peace, development, respect of the rule of law and observance of the law and human rights are interdependent.

Development

The concept of development is not amenable to generally accepted definition. This is as a result of the emergence of the radical or Marxist perspective that competes with the liberal oriented paradigm or perspective in the study and explanation of the phenomenon. Scholars have rightly observed that Marxist notion and the liberal concepts of development are always at variance (Okereke & Ekpe, 2002). However, there is general consensus among some scholars that development is a multifaceted, multi-dimensional, many sided process but gradual process (Rodney, 1972; Todara & Smith, 2004; Thomas, 2010; and Nwankwo, 2014).

Most times the concept of development is used interchangeably with other terms such as growth, change, modernization and industrialization which compounds and complicates the problems of achieving a universally accepted definition. Development in a liberal perspective has been accused by the radical scholars as roping the term to economic domain, thereby side tracking other aspects of development. This is gauged in relations to Gross National Product (GNP) or National Per Capital Income (NPI) (Okereke *et al.*, 2002. Nnoli (1981) conceptualizes development as:

A dialectic phenomenon in which the individual and society interest with their physical, biological and inter-human environment transforming them for their own betterments and that of humanity at large and being transferred in the process. The lesson learned and passed on to future generations, enabling them to improve their capacities to make further valuable changes in their inter-human relations and their ability to transform nature (Nnoli, 1981: 12).

Nnoli contends that development is normally associated with changes in man and his innovative aptitude not that of materials. Okolie (2015), seeing development from this same lens, states that; development

is a product of sound, sustained and cogent planning and administration of curative pills purchased at genuine market and attuned to the needs of the targets.

Sen (1999) in Harapopal (2003) equates development with freedom. He maintains:

Development should be looked not only from the perspective of freedom but equated with freedom. That wealth is only means and not an end in itself and it is means for happiness which being shaped by freedom as they cannot be divorced from each other (Harapopal, 2003: 56).

He explains and explores the meaning of freedom by bringing the notion of unfreedom which he considers as poverty, deprivation and even inequality as conditions of unfreedom. He opines that development can only occur when these constraints are removed. Sen (1985) argues that capacity to determine whether someone is poor or non poor person and Sen (1999) further argues that the ability to enhance the life people lead and the freedom is ultimately what development is all about.

Development is seen as an integrated process in which environment, technology, economy and other social aspects interact mutually to achieve both economic and social objectives (Alechina, 1982 cited in Ohaugwu, 2010). Development in this line of thought is meant to encompass economic, social, political and cultural transformations. It occurs as a process by which members of a country develop themselves and their institutions in such scale and degree that can enhance their ability to concretely and effectively create, mobilize and manage resources (Brown & Korten, 1989). This produces sustainable and mutual enhancement in the content and quality of their lives and their own aspirations. In this sense, the phenomenon is seen as a way in which social change produces new ideas that are positive and capable of creating conducive environment that permits higher wellbeing of the people. It reflects the main alterations in social patterns, regular attitudes and government agencies, in which these elements reinforce mutually to accelerate economic growth, reduce inequality and eradicate poverty. It represent the entire range of alteration by which each social system exist steadily stray away from the condition of life generally regarded as dissatisfactory toward a way of life perceived as economically, socially and psychologically enhanced (Todaro & Smith, 2004).

Seers (1969) maintains that the pertinent questions people should asked is how a country's development is? In terms poverty, unemployment and inequality. He asserted that:

if all these three have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt, this has been a period of development for the country concern, if one or two these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all the three have, it would be strange to call the result development even if per capita income doubled (Seers, 1969:3).

Seers analyzed the importance of understanding development as a process that is centred on how to enhance the standard of living of individual. It implicates the widespread notion of economic growth that continues to excite some development practitioners. Economic growth without real development with the elements as encapsulated by Seers cannot have trickledown effect on the people.

Expanding this position, Todaro correctly observed: there were, for example a figure of less developed countries which witnessed some degree of growth of per capita income between 1960's and 1970's although these countries simultaneously manifested insignificant economic development in terms of employment, equality and real income growth for majority of their citizens. By using growth rate to define a country's development, these countries appeared to be developing but using more recent parameters such as poverty, equality and manpower utilization; however, there were not (Todaro, 1982). The World Bank (1991) that earlier championed the promotion of economic growth as a parameter for measuring development was also constrained to accept a more broadened perspective of development. It asserts that "the challenge of development is to improve the quality of life, especially in the world's poor countries. A better quality of life calls for higher income but it involves much more. It encompasses as ends in themselves better education, higher standards of health and nutrition, less poverty, a cleaner environment, more quality of opportunity, greater individual freedom and a right cultural life" (World Bank Development Report, 1991:14).

Rodney (1972:9-27) in deepening and expatiating on the concept of development, maintains that for development to occur in any human society, it must be anchored on bi-dimensional processes, creating two pathways. At the individual pathway, it requires enhanced skill and capacity, freer society that promotes creative, self-reliant, responsible and material prosperity. At the society pathway, development refers to enhancing the capability to monitor relationship between them and others.

What could be deduced from these varied definitions and expositions of development from scholars already reviewed, conveys that development is the sustenance of progression of whole society and social milieu to achieve an improved and fulfilling wellbeing of the people. In this sense development is a condition that is attuned with good life even though good life varies with time, environment and society. Thomas (2010) observes that scholars have identified and advanced three core values that provide theoretical foundation and empirical model that enable people to understand the deeper notion and essence of development. They entail:

- Sustainability which consists of the capacity to meet essential needs such as food, health, shelter and protection;
- Self confidence which consists of ability of an individual to achieve self-worth and not to be exploited by other as a tool for their own end; and
- Liberty which consist of the ability to be free from slavery, exercising total freedom from isolation and from social entanglement to state of nature, superstition, other members of the society, nursery, institution and idiosyncrasy (Thomas, 2010: 31).

Freedom allows people and societies to have expanded range of choices and alternatives and minimizes internal and external constraints for the pursuit of social goals and objectives generally called development (Goulet, 1971:89-90; Human Development Report, 1992:20; Thomas, 2010:31).

Development is progressive, dynamic and non-static. This exemplifies that the development indicators and indices are ever changing with time, environment, society and cultural milieu. That is why Todara & Smith (2004) posit that development involves material reality and a state of the mind in which people are both the object and subject. The people through their governments utilize various mixtures of processes that are social, economic, political and constitutional and other ways for accessing and fulfilling wellbeing of the people. Thomas (2010) insists that development in every society has the underlining objectives are to:

- Promote the abundance and broaden the allocation of essential necessity of life, which includes: food, health, shelter and protection;
- Ensure steady growth of standards of living which include real income, employment, quality education, and promotion of culture and social norms all work to improve people's lives materially and spiritually as well as install individual national ethos;
- Make available much needed socio-economic options to citizens and make them not to depend whole on other people and nations as well as the forces of superstition and human penury;
- Elevate human life and comfort from a given level considered unsatisfactory to a better and perhaps more comfortable level and expand the mental state of the people;
- Effect changes and remove the inhibitory elements in the cultural patterns of the people and pave way for them to have the capacity meaningful enough to serve and sustain a better life;
- Stimulate the requisite knowledge and information in the people and posses sound application strategies to secure and sustain good life (Thomas, 2010: 31-32).

In essence, United Nations Asia Development Institute (1975) deepens the understanding of development which its report enunciated the objectives of development to centre around five core components which accordingly must stand inseparably together:

- Man as the end of development – which is therefore to be judged by what it does to him.
- De-alienation of man, which enables him to face at home with the process of development in which he attains the object.
- Development of collective personality of man in which he finds his richest expression.
- Participation as the true form of democracy.
- Self-reliance as the expression of man's faith in his own abilities (UNADI, 1975: 19).

Theoretical Framework

The "Democracy first, development later thesis" is a contrast to "development first, democracy later". This thesis strongly reflects the modernization school and Lipset development first, democracy later thesis. The scholars on the side of this thesis argue that democracy is a prerequisite for development and that when democracy is promoted; it becomes the approach that is strategic and most efficient to attain prosperity, development, security and peace (Siegle, Weinstein and Halperin, 2004).

Basically, the democracy first thesis originates from the theoretical underpinning of institution/regime type to economic performance/growth. The theorists argue that both institution and democracy matter. They argue that first, institutions influence state's economic and social performances, second, from the perspective of regime type, democracies indeed out-perform non-democracies in economic development. They deduced the following reasons; first, due regular elections, democratic regimes do respond to the demands of their citizens and societal groups, as a result of the institutional arrangement of election which is key for democracies, democracies perform better in economy; due to a number of characteristic features of democracy; such as accountability, checks and balances, low corruption, openness, competition, the flow of information, transparency and adaptability, democracies do out-perform non most indicators of economics social well being (Siegle, Weinstein and Halperin, 2004: 57-71).

Analysis and Discussion

The links between democracy and development have generated debates for decades now. The camps inherent in this debate as identified by Carothers and the de Gramont are distinctly two categories. The democracy first argument;

There exist some strong empirical evidence and supports that counter cases for authoritarian state development. In analyzing the broader concept of human wellbeing and social progress. Lekvall (2013) states that there is a positive links between democracy and development.

Many studies analysed agree that democracy promotes economic and social benefits for citizens. This is true for both developed and developing economies. According to Anna, poor democracies often out-perform poor autocracies in delivering service and social progress. This is supported by a study of data on low income countries from 1960 to 2004, that shows that poor democracies rapidly (Siegle, Weinstein and Halperin, 2004). As outside eastern Asia, the median per-capita growth rates of poor democracies have been 50 percent higher than those of autocracies and the risk that poor autocracies will experience severe economic contractions is twice that of the poor democracies.

In 2011, the Economist made a public apology for “regrettably” calling Africa the ‘hopeless’ continent ten years before. It then called it the hopeful continent (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2011) 60. It may be recalled that ten years before 2011, many African countries were in authoritarian military regimes type, but then ten years in 2011, there were good news that spurred new hopes for Africa development. The quality of life i.e. social progress in poor democracies has been shown to be significantly better than their counterparts in low income autocracies. Poor democracies have 20 percent lower infant mortality rates; have 40 percent greater chance of attending secondary schools, benefit from agricultural yields that are 15 percent higher than poor autocracies.

In the same vein, Siegle, Weinstein and Halperin (2004) reviewed 40 years of hard and empirical data, they show that people even in the level of poor nations, poor democracies in every economic and social indicators. Brown and Hunter (199:789) studied 17 countries in Latin America from 1980-1992 and they show that democratic regimes are associated with higher rates of social expenditure even when faced with severe economic constraints. Similarly, Weifel and Navia (2000) argue that fewer children die in democracies than dictatorships. Lending credence to this, Leblang (1996) argue that economies of most nations that do protect citizens’ rights grow up more rapidly than those in nations that do not do so, hence, democracies champion citizens’ rights more than non-democracies. Some world renowned economists do support democracy first, development later strand of the argument. Kaufman and Zoido-Lobaton (1999) studied more than 150 countries and finds a strong causal relationship that links accountability with high levels of income, with one standard deviation in voice and accountability gives a 2.5 fold increase in per capita 46. Similarly, Easterly (2006) finds strong correlation between accountability and service delivery while Collier (2011) maintains that regular elections do induce government to adopt beneficial policies for their citizens. Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) clearly show that the most wealthy and powerful nations have developed inclusive political and economic institutions. Studies also show significant statistical relationships between electoral fraud and poor economic policies and poor governance (International IDEA and Kofi Annan Foundation, 2012).

Democracies as put forward by Sen (1999) are also reasonably better at avoiding catastrophic conditions by which he observed that no democracy with free press has ever experienced a major famine. Famine or starvation is a feature of authoritarian regimes that do ignore wellbeing of their citizens due to poor policies. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2012) report of Africa Human Development does affirm that food shortages in Africa were as a result of the governing elites paying deaf ears to this serious issue.

One key difference in terms of civil liberties is that one is less likely to be jailed in a democracy if one protests against the government’s failure to perform. It is observed that among the top 20 countries in the UNDP’s 2011 Human Development Index, all but one Hong Kong are full democracies. Then out of top 50 countries that achieved the highest level of human development in 2011, only four are either authoritarian or hybrid regimes. It is found that 39 of the 50 countries with the highest human development index are considered democracies while 5 countries are not classified and six are considered “flawed democracies” 56. In a similar case, Legatum Index, found in 2012 that 27 of the top 30 most prosperous countries are democracies (Legatum Institute, 2012).

Even though none of these studies of findings are undisputed facts that democracy delivers more sustainable development that autocracies in which Edegheji (2005) argues “if there were a positive correlation between undemocratic regimes and development, then Africa countries would have been among the most developed countries in the world.

Development first argument:

Unarguably, it is naturally a tendency for a democratic polity to experience fragmentation, diffusion and division of power among her various and differing stakeholders at varying levels both within and outside in terms of in-groups and out-groups respectively (Dahl, 1971). This complicates and delays decision making processes. It is on this premise that many analysts in academic and policy circles strongly argued that authoritative regime advance and fast track socio-economic development more than democracy (Halperin *et al.*, 2005). The core argument proposes a strong, centralized and highly autonomy government, especially as it concerns poor countries that are desirous to “catch-up” with developed countries. Corroborating to this assertion, Huntington (1968) argued earlier that democratic polity embodies too messy and unpredictable environment that is incapable of providing the structure needed to drive development. He stated that an authoritarian government enjoys much time-horizons and does not worry about the short- time politicking that arises from electoral system in a democracy.

The empirical evidence that has always been leaned on by pro-development analysts the recent development witnessed in some East Asia countries, called Asian Tigers (Korea, Taiwan, Hongkong and Singapore) that have authoritarian regimes and yet have experienced socio-economic transformation from 1960 to date. Alluding to this development first argument, Haggard (1990) and Evans (1995) showcase the recent socio-economic transformation in China and Vietnam. These pro-development first analysts are in consensus that the secret of the Asian developmental states is as a result of their “embedded autonomy” that has provided them with institutional capacity to promote and fast track developmental goals without being “captured by particularistic interests that are engrained in institutionalized channels for the negotiation and renegotiation. However, these East Asian developmental experiences being paraded by pro-development first analysts cannot ignore that embedded autonomy can be rooted in an excessively exclusionary system in which these states are not directly linked to societies at large, instead, they can only be serving interests of the dominant groups within them (Rocha-Menocal, 2004).

Table 1: 2016 Democracy Index (Full Democracy)

Rank	Country	Score	Electoral process and pluralism	Functioning of government	Political participation	Political culture	Civil liberties	Category
1*	Norway	9.93	10.00	9.64	10.00	10.00	10.00	Full democracy
2*	Iceland	9.50	10.00	8.93	8.89	10.00	9.71	Full democracy
3*	Sweden	9.39	9.58	9.64	8.33	10.00	9.41	Full democracy
4	New Zealand	9.26	10.00	9.29	8.89	8.13	10.00	Full democracy
5*	Denmark	9.20	9.58	9.29	8.33	9.38	9.41	Full democracy
6*	Canada	9.15	9.58	9.64	7.78	8.75	10.00	Full democracy
7*	Ireland	9.15	9.58	7.86	8.33	10.00	10.00	Full democracy
8*	Switzerland	9.09	9.58	9.29	7.78	9.38	9.41	Full democracy
9	Finland	9.03	10.00	8.93	7.78	8.75	9.71	Full democracy
10*	Australia	9.01	9.58	8.93	7.78	8.75	10.00	Full democracy
11	Luxembourg	8.81	10.00	8.93	6.67	8.75	9.71	Full democracy
12*	Netherlands	8.80	9.58	8.57	8.33	8.13	9.41	Full democracy
13*	Germany	8.63	9.58	8.57	7.78	7.50	9.71	Full democracy
14	Austria	8.41	9.58	7.86	8.33	6.88	9.41	Full democracy
15	Malta	8.39	9.17	8.21	6.11	8.75	9.71	Full

								democracy
16*	United Kingdom	8.36	9.58	7.14	7.22	8.75	9.12	Full democracy
17	Spain	8.30	9.58	7.14	7.22	8.13	9.41	Full democracy
18	Mauritius	8.28	9.17	8.21	5.56	8.75	9.71	Full democracy
19	Uruguay	8.17	10.00	8.93	4.44	7.50	10.00	Full democracy

Source: The Economic Intelligence Unit, 2017

Legend: * = Countries found among the top countries with high disposable per income

Table 2: 2016 Democracy Index (Flawed Democracy)

R an k	Country	Score	Electoral process and pluralism	Functioning of government	Political participation	Political culture	Civil liberties	Category
20	Japan	7.99	8.75	8.21	6.67	7.50	8.82	Flawed democracy
21	United States	7.98	9.17	7.14	7.22	8.13	8.24	Flawed democracy
22	Italy	7.98	9.58	6.43	7.22	8.13	8.53	Flawed democracy
23	Cape Verde	7.94	9.17	7.86	6.67	6.88	9.12	Flawed democracy
24	France	7.92	9.58	7.14	7.78	6.25	8.82	Flawed democracy
25	South Korea	7.92	9.17	7.50	7.22	7.50	8.24	Flawed democracy
26	Costa Rica	7.88	9.58	7.14	6.11	6.88	9.71	Flawed democracy
27	Botswana	7.87	9.17	7.14	6.11	7.50	9.41	Flawed democracy
28	Portugal	7.86	9.58	6.79	6.67	6.88	9.41	Flawed democracy
29	Israel	7.85	9.17	7.50	8.89	7.50	6.18	Flawed democracy
30	Estonia	7.85	9.58	7.86	6.11	6.88	8.82	Flawed democracy
31	Czech Republic	7.82	9.58	7.14	6.67	6.88	8.82	Flawed democracy
32	India	7.81	9.58	7.50	7.22	5.63	9.12	Pseudo democracy
33	Taiwan	7.79	9.58	8.21	6.11	5.63	9.41	Flawed democracy
34	Chile	7.78	9.58	8.57	4.44	6.88	9.41	Flawed democracy
35	Belgium	7.77	9.58	8.57	5.00	6.88	8.82	Flawed democracy
36	Cyprus	7.65	9.17	6.43	6.67	6.88	9.12	Flawed democracy
37	Slovenia	7.51	9.58	7.14	6.67	5.63	8.53	Flawed democracy
38	Lithuania	7.47	9.58	5.71	6.11	6.25	9.71	Flawed democracy
39	South Africa	7.41	7.92	7.86	8.33	5.00	7.94	Flawed democracy

Source: The Economic Intelligence Unit, 2017

Table 3: 2016 Democracy Index (Hybrid Regime)

Rank	Country	Score	Electoral process and pluralism	Functioning of government	Political participation	Political culture	Civil liberties	Category
97	Turkey	5.04	5.83	6.07	5.00	5.63	2.65	Hybrid regime
98	Kyrgyzstan	4.93	7.42	2.93	5.56	3.75	5.00	Hybrid regime
98	Bhutan	4.93	8.33	5.36	2.78	4.38	3.82	Hybrid regime
100	Thailand	4.92	4.50	3.93	5.00	5.00	6.18	Hybrid regime
101	Bosnia and Herzegovina	4.87	6.50	2.93	5.00	3.75	6.18	Hybrid regime
102	Lebanon	4.86	4.42	2.14	7.78	4.38	5.59	Hybrid regime
102	Nepal	4.86	4.33	4.29	4.44	5.63	5.59	Hybrid regime
104	Nicaragua	4.81	4.50	3.29	3.89	5.63	6.76	Hybrid regime
105	Morocco	4.77	4.75	4.64	4.44	5.63	4.41	Hybrid regime
106	Burkina Faso	4.70	4.42	4.29	4.44	5.63	4.71	Hybrid regime
107	Venezuela	4.68	5.67	2.50	5.56	4.38	5.29	Hybrid regime
108	Sierra Leone	4.55	6.58	1.86	2.78	6.25	5.29	Hybrid regime
109	Nigeria	4.50	6.08	4.29	3.33	4.38	4.41	Hybrid regime
110	Palestine	4.49	4.33	2.14	7.78	4.38	3.82	Hybrid regime
111	Pakistan	4.33	6.00	5.36	2.78	2.50	5.00	Hybrid regime
112	Cambodia	4.27	3.17	5.71	3.33	5.00	4.12	Hybrid regime
113	Myanmar	4.20	3.17	3.57	4.44	6.88	2.94	Hybrid regime
114	Iraq	4.08	4.33	0.07	7.22	4.38	4.41	Hybrid regime
115	Mozambique	4.02	4.42	2.14	5.00	5.00	3.53	Hybrid regime
115	Haiti	4.02	5.17	2.21	2.22	3.75	6.76	Hybrid regime

Source: The Economic Intelligence Unit, 2017

Table 4: 2016 Democracy Index (Authoritarian)

Rank	Country	Score	Electoral process and pluralism	Functioning of government	Political participation	Political culture	Civil liberties	Category
148	Azerbaijan	2.65	0.50	2.14	3.33	3.75	3.53	Authoritarian
149	Afghanistan	2.55	2.50	1.14	2.78	2.50	3.82	Authoritarian
150	Burundi	2.40	0.33	0.79	3.89	5.00	2.65	Authoritarian
151	Sudan	2.37	0.00	1.79	3.89	5.00	1.18	Authoritarian
152	Eritrea	2.37	0.00	2.14	1.67	6.88	1.18	Authoritarian
153	Laos	2.37	0.83	2.86	1.67	5.00	1.47	Authoritarian

154	Iran	2.34	0.00	3.21	3.89	3.13	1.47	Authoritarian
155	Libya	2.25	1.00	0.00	1.67	5.63	2.94	Authoritarian
156	Yemen	2.06	0.00	0.00	4.44	5.00	0.88	Authoritarian
157	Guinea-Bissau	1.98	1.67	0.00	2.78	3.13	2.35	Authoritarian
158	Uzbekistan	1.95	0.08	1.86	2.22	5.00	0.59	Authoritarian
159	Democratic Republic of the Congo	1.93	0.92	0.71	2.78	4.38	0.88	Authoritarian
159	Saudi Arabia	1.93	0.00	2.86	2.22	3.13	1.47	Authoritarian
161	Tajikistan	1.89	0.58	0.07	1.67	6.25	0.88	Authoritarian
162	Turkmenistan	1.83	0.00	0.79	2.78	5.00	0.59	Authoritarian
163	Equatorial Guinea	1.70	0.00	0.43	2.22	4.38	1.47	Authoritarian
164	Central African Republic	1.61	1.75	0.36	1.11	2.50	2.35	Authoritarian
165	Chad	1.50	0.00	0.00	1.11	3.75	2.65	Authoritarian
166	Syria	1.43	0.00	0.00	2.78	4.38	0.00	Authoritarian
167	North Korea	1.08	0.00	2.50	1.67	1.25	0.00	Authoritarian

Source: The Economic Intelligence Unit (2017)

Table 5: Distribution of Number and Percentage of Countries by world population for each regime type as at 2017

Type of regime	Scores (s)	Number of countries	Percentage of countries	Percentage of world population
Full democracies	$8 \leq s \leq 10$	19	11.4	4.4
Flawed democracies	$6 \leq s < 8$	57	34.1	44.3
Hybrid regimes	$4 \leq s < 6$	39	23.4	17.7
Authoritarian regimes	$0 \leq s < 4$	52	31.1	32.3

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit (2017)

Table 5 shows that 11.4 percent representing 19 countries have full democracies, 34.1 percent accounting for 57 countries practice flawed democracies while 23.4 percent representing 39 countries practice hybrid regimes and authoritarian regimes account for 31.1 percent representing 52 countries. This suggests that flawed democracies and authoritarian regimes are the most dominate regimes practice by over 65 percent countries of the world. Furthermore, the Table shows that only 4.4 percent of the world population has full democracies, while 44.3 percent of the world population is governed under flawed democracies, 32.3 percent of the total world population lives under authoritarian regimes and 17.7 percent of them are governed under hybrid regimes. The world population used here comprises the total population of the 167 countries covered by the Index. Since this excludes only micro-states, this is nearly equal to the entire estimated world population of 7.2 billion.

Table 6: Disposable Income per capita

Rank	Country	2015 Per Capita (PPP \$)
*1	United States	46,509
\2	Switzerland	38,372
\3	Norway	37,566
\4	Australia	36,473
\5	Germany	36,175
\6	Austria	34,278
*7	France	32,694
*8	Belgium	31,968
\9	Sweden	31,266
\10	Finland	31,168
\11	Canada	31,086

√12	Denmark	30,475
√13	Netherlands	30,442
*14	Japan	30,376
√15	United Kingdom	30,072
*16	Italy	27,900
√17	Ireland	26,593
√18	Spain	24,381
*19	Czech Republic	22,144
*20	Portugal	22,092
*21	Slovenia	22,091
*22	South Korea	21,723
**23	Slovakia	21,339
*24	Estonia	19,442
**25	Poland	19,363
**26	Greece	18,644
**27	Hungary	17,647
**28	Turkey	16,870
*29	Latvia	16,644
***30	Mexico	14,502

Source: OECD (2018)

Legend: √ = Countries under full democracies
 * = Countries under flawed democracies
 ** = Countries under hybrid regimes
 *** = Countries under authoritarian regimes

Table 7: Top 20 Countries with highest Human Development Index (HDI), 2015

HDI Rank	Country	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
*1	Norway	0.939	0.941	0.942	0.945	0.948	0.949
*2	Australia	0.927	0.93	0.933	0.936	0.937	0.939
*2	Switzerland	0.932	0.932	0.934	0.936	0.938	0.939
*4	Germany	0.912	0.916	0.919	0.92	0.924	0.926
*5	Denmark	0.91	0.922	0.924	0.926	0.923	0.925
**5	Singapore	0.911	0.917	0.92	0.922	0.924	0.925
*7	Netherlands	0.911	0.921	0.922	0.923	0.923	0.924
*8	Ireland	0.909	0.895	0.902	0.91	0.92	0.923
*9	Iceland	0.894	0.901	0.907	0.915	0.919	0.921
*10	Canada	0.903	0.907	0.909	0.912	0.919	0.92
**10	United States	0.91	0.913	0.915	0.916	0.918	0.92
**12	Hong Kong, China (SAR)	0.898	0.905	0.907	0.913	0.916	0.917
*13	New Zealand	0.901	0.904	0.908	0.91	0.913	0.915
*14	Sweden	0.901	0.903	0.904	0.906	0.909	0.913
^{NA} 15	Liechtenstein	0.904	0.909	0.908	0.912	0.911	0.912
*16	United Kingdom	0.902	0.898	0.899	0.904	0.908	0.91
**17	Japan	0.884	0.889	0.894	0.899	0.902	0.903
**18	Korea (Republic of)	0.884	0.889	0.891	0.896	0.899	0.901
**19	Israel	0.883	0.889	0.891	0.895	0.898	0.899
*20	Luxembourg	0.894	0.892	0.892	0.892	0.896	0.898

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit (2017)

Legend: * = Countries under full democracies
 ** = Countries under flawed democracies
^{NA} = Not available

Table 8: 20 Countries with lowest HDI, 2015

HDI Rank	Country	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
>169	Afghanistan	0.454	0.463	0.47	0.476	0.479	0.479
>170	Malawi	0.444	0.454	0.459	0.466	0.473	0.476
>171	Côte d'Ivoire	0.441	0.444	0.452	0.459	0.466	0.474
>172	Djibouti	0.451	0.46	0.464	0.467	0.47	0.473
>173	Gambia	0.441	0.44	0.445	0.449	0.45	0.452
>>174	Ethiopia	0.411	0.422	0.427	0.435	0.441	0.448
>>175	Mali	0.404	0.411	0.421	0.43	0.438	0.442
>176	Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	0.398	0.407	0.412	0.419	0.425	0.435
>>177	Liberia	0.406	0.416	0.419	0.426	0.427	0.427
>178	Guinea-Bissau	0.41	0.416	0.415	0.419	0.421	0.424
>179	Eritrea	0.405	0.41	0.414	0.416	0.418	0.42
>>179	Sierra Leone	0.392	0.401	0.413	0.426	0.431	0.42
>>181	Mozambique	0.397	0.4	0.405	0.409	0.414	0.418
>181	South Sudan	0.429	0.419	0.417	0.421	0.421	0.418
>183	Guinea	0.385	0.396	0.406	0.412	0.414	0.414
>184	Burundi	0.385	0.393	0.398	0.404	0.406	0.404
>>185	Burkina Faso	0.377	0.384	0.392	0.398	0.399	0.402
>186	Chad	0.37	0.381	0.387	0.39	0.394	0.396
>187	Niger	0.323	0.331	0.341	0.345	0.351	0.353
>188	Central African Republic	0.361	0.366	0.37	0.345	0.347	0.352

Source: Economist Intelligence Unit (2017)

Legend: >> = Countries under hybrid regimes

> = Countries under authoritarian regimes

From Tables 1-8, we show 2016 democracy index for full democracies, flawed democracies, hybrid regimes and authoritarian regimes, the 2015 disposable income per capita for top 30 countries in the world number and percentage of countries and the percentage of the world population for each regime type as at 2017; top countries with highest Human Development Index – 2010 – 2015, and 20 countries with lowest HDI, 2010 – 2015.

Adopting Tables 1-5 as basis of comparing with each of the other tables. It is found that out of 30 countries with top disposable income per capita, on Table 6, 13 countries are found within countries with full democracies, 10 countries are found within 20 top countries with flawed democracies while 8 countries are found within 10 top countries with flawed democracies while one 1(one) is found in countries with hybrid regimes. None was found within countries that operate authoritarian regimes.

Among the top 20 countries on table 7 with the highest Human Development Index (HDI) 2010-2015, 13 countries are found within the top countries with full democracies, 6 countries are found within countries with flawed democracies while one is not classified. None was found in countries with hybrid regimes and authoritarian regimes. Among the 20 countries with lowest Human Development Index (HDI) 2010-2015, 16 countries are found within countries that operate authoritarian regimes while 4 countries were found within countries that have hybrid regimes. None was found in both full and flawed democracies.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the overwhelming evidence arising from deepening understanding of development, which goes beyond economic development and equated development with freedom and the contemporary perspectives of development which essentially entail sustainability, self confidence, liberty, making development progressive, dynamic, and non-static and that development centres around five core components that stand inseparably together: man as the end of development; de-alienation of man; development of collective personality of man; participation as the five forms of democracy; and self-reliance. More importantly, this study has empirically proven that countries that have democracies have achieved more sustainable economic development than authoritarian regimes. Therefore, I align myself with scholars on the democratic governance camp.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Abulof, U. (2011). What is the Arab Third Estate? The Huffington post. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/uriel-abulof/what-is-the-arab-third-es_b_832628.html. 1May, 2011
- [2]. Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- [3]. Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. Spectrum, Ibadan.
- [4]. Bassioun, C. (1995). From Principle to Realization: Some General Considerations in Democracy, its Principles and Achievement. In C. Bassioun, D. Betham, M. Justice, F. Beevi, A. Boye, A. More, H. Kubiak, V. Massuh, C. Ramaphosa, J. Sudrarsuno, A. Touraine, and L. Villoro (eds). Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy>. Retrieved on 18th November, 2013.
- [5]. Betham, D. (1998). Democracy: Key Principles, Institutions and Problems. In C. Bassiouni, D. Beetham, U. Justice, F. Beevi, A. Boyce, A. Mor, H. Kubiak, V. Massuh, C. Ramaphosa, J. Sudarsono, A. Touraire and L. Villoro (eds), *Democracy: Its Principles and Achievement*. Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union.
- [6]. Bollen, K.A. (1979). Political democracy and the timing of development. *American Sociological Review*, 44: 205-218.
- [7]. Brown, L.D. and Korten, D.C. (1989). *The Role of Voluntary Organization in Development: A Concept*. A paper for Development Research, Institute for Development Research.
- [8]. Buhlman, M., Wolfgang, W. and Bernhard, W. (2008). *The Quality of Democracy: Democracy Barometer for Established Democracies*. National Centre for Competence in Russell: Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century. Working Paper [<http://www.necr-democracy-uzh.ch/nccr/publications/workingpaper/10>]
- [9]. Campbell, D.F. (2008). *The Basic Concepts for the Democracy Ranking of the Quality of Democracy*. Vienna: Democracy Ranking.
- [10]. Cheema, G.S. and Maguire, L. (n.d). *Democracy, Governance and Development: A Conceptual Framework*. Available online @ <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan005781.pdf> (04/01/2014
- [11]. Cockburn, P. (2011). So the Arab landscape shifts – and confusion reigns. London: The Independent. Retrieved <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/patrick-cockburn-so-the-arable-landscape-shifts-ndash-and-confusion-reigns-2269022.html>. 4 June, 2011
- [12]. Collier, P. (2011). *Conflict, Political Accountability and Aid*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- [13]. Coulter, P.B. (1975). *Social mobilization and liberal democracy: A macro-quantitative analysis of global and regional models*. Lexington: Lexington Press.
- [14]. Cutright, P. (1987). National political development: measure and analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 28: 17-63.
- [15]. Dahl, R.A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. New Haven: CT Yale
- [16]. Doyle, M. W. (1983). Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12 (3): 205-235.
- [17]. Easterly, W. (2006). *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest have Done so Much Ill and so Little Good*. New York: Penguin.
- [18]. Economist Intelligence Unit (2011). 'Democracy under stress', Democracy Index, 2011
- [19]. Economist Intelligence Unit (2017). *Democracy Index 2016: Revenge of the "deplorables"*. Available online @ eiu.com. Retrieved 20 July 2017.
- [20]. Edigheji, O. (2005). *A Democratic Developmental State in Africa? Research Report 105*. Johannesburg: Centre for Policy Studies, 46p.
- [21]. Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Prince, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [22]. Fanon, F. (1966). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- [23]. Flanigan, W.H. and Fogelman, E. (1997). Patterns of political analysis. In J.V. Gillespie and B.A. Nesvold (eds), *Macro-Quantitative analysis: conflict, development and democratization*. London: Beverly Hills, Sage.
- [24]. Flora, P. (1973). Historical processes of social mobilization: Urbanization and literacy, 1850-1965. In S.N. Eisenstadt and S. Rokkan (eds), *Building state and nations: Models and data resources*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- [25]. Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- [26]. Goulet, I. (1971). *The cruel choice: A New Concept in the Theory of Development*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- [27]. Haggard, S. (1990). *Pathways from the periphery: The politics of growth in the Newly Industrializing countries*.

- [28]. Halprin, J., Siegle, T. and Weinstein, M. (2005). *The democracy advantage: How democracies promote prosperity and peace*. New York: Routledge.
- [29]. Human Development Report (1992). 1992 Human Development Report. New York: United Nation Development Programme.
- [30]. Huntington, S. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale.
- [31]. Huntington, S. P. (1993). The Clash of Civilization? *Foreign Affairs*, 72 (3): 22-49.
- [32]. Huntington, S.P. and Dominguez, J.I. (1975). Political development. In F. Greenstein and N. Polsby (eds), *Handbook of political science*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- [33]. International IDEA and Kofi Annan Foundation (2012). *Deepening Democracy: A Strategy for Improving the Integrity of Elections Worldwide*. Report of the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security. Stockholm: International IDEA.
- [34]. Kaufman, D. K. A. and Zoido-Lobaton, P. (1999). *Governance Matters*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [35]. Legatum Institute (2012). *Legatum Prosperity Index, 2012*. Available at: <http://prosperity.com>
- [36]. Lekvall, A. (2013). *Development First, Democracy Later?* Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- [37]. Lijphart, A. (1972). Towards empirical democratic theory: Research strategies and tactics. *Comparative Politics*, 4: 1021-1030.
- [38]. Linz, J.J. and Stephen, A. (1978). *The breakdown of democratic regimes*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- [39]. Lipset, S.M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53: 69-105.
- [40]. Lipset, S.M. (1960). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53: 69-105.
- [41]. Lipset, S.M., Seong, K. and Torres, C.J. (1993). A comparative analysis of the social requisites of democracy. *International Social Science Journal*, 136: 102-143.
- [42]. Marquette, J. (1974). Social change and political mobilization in the United States: 1870-1960. *The American Political Science Review*, 66: 475-493.
- [43]. Menocal, A.R. (2007). *Analyzing the Relationship between Democracy and Development: Defining Basic Concepts and Assessing Key Linkages*. Background Note (1) Prepared for the Wilton Park Conference on Democracy and Development, 23rd – 25th October.
- [44]. Needler, M.C. (1968). Political development and socio-economic development: The case of Latin America. *The American Political Science Review*, 62: 23-41.
- [45]. Neubauer, D.E. (1967). Some conditions of democracy. *The American Political Science Review*, 61: 594-612.
- [46]. Ngunan, T. (2013). The Arab spring and the flow of small arms and light weapons (SALWs) into Nigeria. In I.O. Alberta and W.A. Eselebor (eds), *Managing security in a globalised world*. Ibadan: John Archers Publishers Ltd, pp. 121-139.
- [47]. Nnoli, O. (1978). *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- [48]. Nnoli, O. (2011). *The struggle for democracy in Nigeria*. Enugu: Pan African Center for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution (PACREP).
- [49]. Nwankwo, O.U. (2014). Deregulation of the Downstream Sector of Petroleum Industry and the Crisis of Nigeria 1999-2012. *African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies (AJAPS)*, 6(2): 78-94.
- [50]. OECD (2018). Household disposable income (indicator). doi: 10.1787/dd50eddd-en (Accessed on 15 February 2018)
- [51]. Ohaugwu, C.A. (2010). *Rural Development in Nigeria: Issues, Concepts and Practice*. Enugu: John-Jacob's Classical Publishers Limited.
- [52]. Okereke, O. and Ekpe, A. (2002). *Development and Underdevelopment. Politics of the North-South Divide*. Enugu: John-Jacobs Publisher.
- [53]. Okolie, A.M. (2015). *Global Political Economy and the Development of Underdevelopment: Different People, Same Market and Clarification of Poverty*. An Inaugural Lecture of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka delivered on 14th May.
- [54]. Rocha-Menocal, A. (2004). And if there was no state? Critical reflections on Batas, Polanyi and Evans on the role of the state in promoting development.
- [55]. Seers, D. (1969). The Meaning of Development. *International Development Review*, 4: 206-213.
- [56]. Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities in farm*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [57]. Sen, A. (1999a). Democracy as a Universal Value. *Journal of Democracy*, 10(3): 3-17.
- [58]. Sen, A. (1999b). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [59]. Siegle, J. T., Weinstein, M.M. and Halperin, M.H. (2004). Why Democracies Excel,” *Foreign Affairs*, 83(5): 57-71.

- [60]. Sodaro, M.J. (2004). (2004). *Comparative Politics: A Global Introduction*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [61]. Spencer, R. (2011). Libya: civil war breaks out as Gaddafi mounts rearguard fight. London: The Daily Telegraph. Retrieved at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnes/africanandindianocean/libya/8344034.html>. 12 June, 2011
- [62]. Thomas, A.N. (2010). *The Praxis of Development and Underdevelopment*. Benin City: Ethiope Publishing Corporation.
- [63]. Todara, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2004). *Economic Development*. Delhi: Pearson Education (Singapore) PTE Ltd.
- [64]. Todaro, M.P. (1982). *Economics for a Developing World*. London: Longman.
- [65]. United Nations Development Programme (2012). *Africa Human Development Report 2012: Towards a Food Secure Future*. New York: UNDP.
- [66]. World Bank (1991). *Development Report*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Humphrey N. Nwobashi Ph.D. "Democracy versus Development Debate. "IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 1, 2019, pp 63-78.