

The Dagomba, Gonja and Bulsa Political Systems and the Concept of Democracy, Myth or Reality?

Dominic Alimbey Dery (Phd)¹, Jacob Ibrahim Abdu ², Adam Bawa Yussif (Phd)³

^{1,2,3}*Department of Languages and Liberal Studies, Tamale Technical University (Ghana)*

Abstract: - The west has always assumed the aura of supremacy when it comes to the practice of democracy. What however, will be contested is any attempt at describe Africans as new entrants to the practice of At best, democracy is no more than a system of government, but in western democracies it has acquired a sacred status, and it is taboo to question it. Democracy, which is the gravamen of this paper. This is what Bhikhu Parekh says of liberalism: Unless, we assume that liberalism represents the final truth about human beings, we cannot indiscriminately condemn societies that do not conform to it. For example, recent Archaeological findings about the existence of functional states in the pre-colonial era, point to the fact that contrary to the age old belief of Africans, these pre-colonial African states were innovative and well organized political institutions of power. States like the Ashanti kingdom, the Zulu kingdom, the Great Zimbabwe, Mapungubwe and Thulamela in South Africa. The study was basically a qualitative one. The study used an ethnographic approach; it is based on how people go about their daily lives. The study was conducted across three different districts and three different ethnic groups. A purposive sample of 50 respondents was purposively sampled, with a breakdown as follows: key informants (5) from each of the three paramountcies making (15), king makers (5) from each of the three paramountcies making (15), kings/chiefs (5) from each of the three paramountcies making (15) and governance experts (5) all adding up to a total of fifty (50) respondents. Because the focus was on chieftaincy, we considered chiefs and king makers as the main actors in the chieftaincy institution. Data were recorded on an audio recorder and in some cases video alongside writing by the researcher. The respondents were assured that this was only to ensure that no details were left out. The key findings are as follows: chieftaincy in the three kingdoms it was revealed practised devolution of power, also decisions were taken in consultation with the chiefs in Council. Council was normally composed of 'trusted and wise' chiefs and finally chieftaincy allowed for participation of the ruled. These chiefs will normally create for a where local interest issues were debated and finally accepted before they were promulgated as laws.

Key Words: Political, systems, concepts and democracy

I. INTRODUCTION

Contrary to the several claims through Eurocentric histories which infantilized Africans and threw doubts on their innovative abilities, there is now a general consensus that state formation in Africa is not a post-colonial development (Diop 1974). There is enough evidence for instance, that functional states like the Ashanti kingdom, the Zulu kingdom and the great Zimbabwe existed in pre-colonial Africa. Archaeological findings in recent times in sites such as Mapungubwe and Thulamela in South Africa demonstrate that

pre-colonial Africans were innovative and had well organized political institutions of power (Kargbo 2007). The question that has occurred the minds of lots of people is whether chieftaincy/traditional governance is democratic or not. The debate has been raging on and depending on where one belongs to, (the liberal and neo-liberal schools), the chieftaincy is both democratic and undemocratic. The problem that captures the attention of this paper is to dispel the notion that democracy is something new to Africa, which we learnt only after our encounter with the colonial project.

The opponents of the school of organic democracy, otherwise referred to as the neo-liberal school have discounted the claims of the proponents of traditional governance. They accuse traditional governance as being inherently defective and as such cast doubts as to its compatibility with democratic values and fundamental human rights principles (for instance, Mamdani 1996; Ntsebeza 2005; 2001).

Scholars of the neo-liberal school argue that traditional governance is not democratic. There have been many such misconceptions about the structure and functions of traditional political systems in Africa. These misconceptions have degenerated, with some scholars being skeptical about the relevance of these traditional systems to modern political life (Ajei 2001). One such scholar is V.G. Simiyu, a Kenyan historian, who denies any relevance of the traditional African political systems to the political development of the continent, for the reasons that these systems were undemocratic.

In the opinion of Simiyu, social organization in the traditional African setting was non-egalitarian, and this feature of African social structures denied some citizens an "opportunity to rise in the social and political ranks". He goes on to argue that a democratic system should allow for equal opportunity for citizens who want to rise, to do so on the social ladder "on personal merit" (1987, 64-69). Thus, Simiyu sees in traditional African political practice, a hierarchical system that promotes gerontocracy and stifles upward social mobility. On this premise, he concludes that these systems cannot be democratic.

In this regard, Simiyu is not the only scholar who considers the traditional political system/governance in Ghana and Africa undemocratic. For instance, Professor Mawusi Dake has expressed similar views on the traditional political structure in Ghana. In an assessment of the extent to which democratic practice in Ghana's political future can be "really meaningful and likely to succeed",

Dake (1996), reflects on “our traditional background” and holds that every Ghanaian and, generally, every African grows up in an environment premised on unquestionable obedience to *seniority* and *authority*. Dake surmises that the environment in which the African grows up has a debilitating effect on one’s political consciousness, which he thinks can be reduced to the thought that “I grow up obeying authority absolutely and, therefore, expect to be obeyed absolutely when we have authority” (Ibid., 1993).

Another strand in the political consciousness of Ghanaians, we learn from Dake, is that government, to the Ghanaians, means power centred in Accra and that:

“it is considered a tribute to someone’s intelligence to steal from the national coffers, and that even if caught such theft will not be considered a social crime but rather as a misfortune” (Ibid).

These conceptions of the functions of government and its responsibilities to the governed, derive from our “traditional understanding and use of authority” (ibid). But until we are able to do this, and “seek to establish democracy as a way of life for ourselves, a truthful manifestation of democracy will continue to elude us” (Ibid., 95). In Dake’s claims, three propositions can be gathered:

- Gerontocracy is an important feature of African and for that matter Ghanaian social organization and decision-making processes, and therefore our traditional systems of government were intrinsically non-egalitarian and non-democratic. This conclusion derives from Dake’s assertion that the African’s political consciousness is premised on ‘unquestionable obedience to seniority’.
- Ghana at present lacks a democratic culture, and this derives from the said non-democratic past. This is legitimately inferred from Dake’s contention that we are yet to “seek to establish democracy as a way of life”, and that “a truthful manifestation” eludes us.
- The political center and the institutions of government in the traditional setting were separated from the people. To the citizens, government was a “we” and “they” affair. This conclusion is entailed by the claim that government, to the Ghanaian, means power centred in Accra.

In my opinion, these are very harsh and negative perspectives on the African political past, and they naturally invite comment, especially that they come from distinguished African scholars. To begin with, the claim of authoritarianism from gerontocracy is debatable, it is not true that a system in which deference to elders is valued, is necessarily autocratic in outlook. But more importantly, it is unclear which political ‘tradition’ it is that Dake and his likes consider to be undemocratic; nor is it clear what, to such scholars is democracy.

The most common and time-tested definition of democracy is ‘a government of the people by the people and for the people’ and I wish to use this as the basis of my determination of whether the Ghanaian traditional political systems (the Dagbon, Gonja and Bulsa) are democratic or not. In an analysis of the definition of democracy, Gyekye (1997) contends that the phrase “of the people” means, at least two things:

It is the people who should govern, or at least it is the people who should choose their rulers, find mechanisms to control them, and ensure that the course of government conforms to the wishes of the people. Democracy is a form of government whose practice derives entirely from the historical and cultural experiences of a people, and is in conformity with their vision of how they want to be governed or to govern themselves.

Additionally, Gyekye further interprets “a government by the people” as essentially one whose constitutional rules, principles and procedures are set up by the people themselves. (Ibid., 133-134). In other words, the people, in a democracy should have intellectual, ideological and emotional attachment to the structure of government: they should be subjects of a government whose roots are nourished by the goals, values, ideals, experiences and aspirations of the people.

These are legitimate interpretations of the concept; to which I adopt without hesitation. Thus defined, democracy would appear to imply, among other things that the power vested in the important organs of government derives from the governed. Similarly, it would also imply that except for some reasonable restrictions, every adult member of a democratic state is qualified for an office in that body politic.

Furthermore, it would imply that the underlying principles, institutions and practices of a democracy derive from the consciousness of the governed and a conscious response to it by government. Also, the people’s perception of human nature and man’s place in society; of their aspirations, values and ideals, and how these may be furthered, must determine the course of good democratic governance.

Granted that these are the defining characteristics of democracy, then it is clear that the likes of Dake, Simiyu and the neo-liberal scholars’, denial of democracy as an attribute of traditional political systems cannot be upheld in the case of Dagbon, Gonja and Bulsa traditional political systems. I will subsequently consider some features that demonstrate the democratic nature of these systems.

II. A BRIEF LITERATURE

My observation is that humanism is a foundational principle in Dagbon, Gonja and Bulsa socio-political thought. The principle of the political sovereignty of the people may be deemed to come from the Dagbon, Gonja and Bulsa humanism. The principle of sovereignty states that political power rests in the hands of the populace. This means that the

stakeholders in the political process have a fundamental right to be represented both in the composition of the council and in the content of the decisions of that council, though their rights may be given up for the purpose of reaching a consensus.

African societies have established elaborate institutions that regulate the lives of the people. These range from political to socio-cultural and economic systems. Politically, chiefs managed the politics of the society or community (Millar, 2012). Because of its participatory nature, its communitarian social structure, and its humanistic outlook Dagbon, Gonja and Balsa politics considered consensus building in decision making as a vital ideal.

Though sharp disagreements and divisions along ideological lines existed during deliberations in council, however, the desire to reach consensus and reconciliation was more paramount than another thing. Consensus did not mean a complete identity of views as has been held by some commentators of African traditional thought. Through dialogue for example, the minority would normally suspend its disagreement to make concerted actions possible (Adjei 2001).

The parties with dissenting views satisfy themselves that serious consideration had been given to their views. The general council then worked at the restoration of goodwill through reconciliation and accommodation. This was concerned important because coexistence in society was not optional, though the immediate interests of members of the society might be polarized, the lesson was that there was always a strong tendency that these different interests were reconcilable. Thus, “government becomes a kind of coalition – a coalition not, as in the common acceptance of parties, but of citizens” (Wiredu 1997).

It is in this regard that Agyeman-Duah (2008) points out that traditional/chieftaincy institutions in the north is set up for participation and not for appropriation – and the underlying philosophy is one of cooperation – not confrontation. This assertion of Agyeman-Duah is variously corroborated by Mahama (2004) when he describes the Dagbon chieftaincy in his ‘History and Traditions of Dagbon’. Likewise, (Brammah, 1966 & Jawula 2011) share similar opinions about the Gonja chieftaincy whilst Schott (1977), shares same opinions of the chieftaincy.

Due to this virtue, that I describe the Dagbon, Gonja and Balsa political system as a substantially consensual democracy and distinguish this from formal democracy. Dagbon, Gonja and Balsa consensual democracy is expressed in some of the maxims that are common among the people of these three traditional areas. For instance, there is a maxim in all three languages that says that no single head is the single repository of wisdom. This expresses the view that on matters of public policy, consultation is the better mode of deliberation.

Consultation is preferred because no single head is the repository of wisdom, hence consultation is needed if wise counsel is to prevail. And wisdom, it is presupposed, is required in matters affecting the whole community. Gyekye has advanced three reasons why the choice and practice of consensus building in political decision-making is recommendable. In his view:

- 1) other individuals may be equally wise and capable of producing equally good, if not better, ideas and arguments
- 2) one should not, or cannot, regard one’s own stand as final or unassailable or beyond criticism, but must expect it to be evaluated by others
- 3) In consequence of (2), one should be prepared to modify or even abandon one’s earlier position should it be judged unacceptable or unreasonable by others, (Gyekye 1992). It would appear to me that the three chieftains’ political system understood the need for, and accepted and compromise. It enjoined rulers to eschew dogmatism and intolerance. I believe that the adoption of such an attitude in the conduct of national affairs would be most beneficial in the political context of contemporary Ghana.

III. METHODOLOGY

Minded by the two schools of thought, on research methodology – qualitative and quantitative, my study is a qualitative one. The study uses an ethnographic approach; it is based on how people go about their daily lives. The reasons why I settled on a qualitative approach were as follows; it allows for an in-depth study of the chieftaincy institutions among the Dagomba, Balsa and Gonja in northern Ghana, it allows for participation of my respondents in the study and finally it is flexible and allows for the collection of data from multiple sources explaining perceptions, feelings and experiences of my participants. However, the criticism is that there are questions around generalization of findings.

The study was conducted across three different districts and three different ethnic groups. These are Sandema traditional area in the Balsa North Districts, Yendi traditional area in the Yendi Municipality and the Damongo traditional area in the West Gonja District. The reason was to give the researchers the opportunity to study the practice of the various traditional systems of governance, since all three people have very unique but well developed traditional systems of governance.

Besides, we chose these three traditional areas for the reasons that they had a history of chieftaincy that spanned a very long period, they were unique in their own ways and wielded some influence. For instance, the Dagomba and Gonja came from their places of migration, with a well-developed traditional governance structure while in the case of the Balsa of Sandema, though some scholars have argued that chieftaincy was alien to them and that it was a colonial imposition.

A purposive sample of 50 respondents was purposively sampled, with a breakdown as follows: key informants (5) from each of the three paramountcies making (15), king makers (5) from each of the three paramountcies making (15), kings/chiefs (5) from each of the three paramountcies making (15) and governance experts (5) all adding up to a total of fifty (50) respondents. Because the focus was on chieftaincy, we considered chiefs and king makers as the main actors in the chieftaincy institution. Our study population was categorised as follows:

15 key informants in all

15- Traditional Rulers/Chiefs/Elders

15- King Makers

5- Governance Experts

This categorization of research participants is most relevant and well suited for the study in the sense that, they are believed to have different but very important experiences from their diverse experiences and backgrounds. The targeted group interviewed were mainly the chiefs and king makers. This approach was targeted at them because they were in my opinion, the key actors in the chieftaincy institution. It was considered the most appropriate because it afforded me a face to face opportunity to elicit for clarifications as and when the need arose.

Data were recorded on an audio recorder and in some cases video alongside writing by the researcher. The respondents were assured that this was only to ensure that no details were left out. In one case, where the person insisted that there should not be any audio recording that was respected and the researchers had to literally write all that they thought was relevant.

Questionnaires were administered on governance specialists because this approach suited the busy schedule of such a category, who were mostly workers. Thus, they felt relaxed and provided the needed information at their convenience. The focus group discussion was mainly used for key informants or the local knowledge experts who comprised mainly of the historians in the courts of the various palaces. To be able to collaborate claims, there was the need to bring them together for an in-depth discussion on their perspectives of the chieftaincy institution. Lastly, we also made use of observation approach because there were times we needed to observe certain happenings and events at the palaces, as they happened.

Interviews were structured according to James P. Spradley's (1979) model of interviews which he referred to as the "Ethnographic Interviewing." This method of Spradley requires that one conducts a series of interviews with each informant. The target group who were interviewed were chiefs/elders, king makers and governance experts. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the use of question guides (developed before fieldwork).

The technique was used basically because chiefs/elders and their linguists in particular could not read and write. In the case of governance experts, there was the need for an in-depth engagement on the subject matter, therefore the use of semi-structured interviews. In the case of the former (chiefs and linguists), questions were written and read to them in their local language, sometimes through the help of an interpreter. Their responses were then recorded on an audio-tape to be transcribed later.

These interviews were normally started by a self-introduction and then a statement of the purpose of my study. The reason why we always stated the purpose of this study was to allay any suspicions because chieftaincy is regarded as a very sensitive area, considering the number of chieftaincy disputes and conflicts that have be-devilled this institution. Respondents feel free and tell their story as it related to traditional governance (chieftaincy). At this stage, we took a very active role in listening, and only intermittently asking questions to seek clarification over issues or discussions that were not very clear.

In addition to asking respondents to explain why certain things regarding governance were done in the manner they described, they were asked to describe their personal experiences, especially for those who worked closely with these chiefs, i.e. elders, drummers, kingmakers and the chiefs themselves. They were also made to explain what they thought and how they felt about certain practices. This method is based on the assumption that there is a web of meaning lying somewhere in-between behaviour, thoughts and feelings, and that the reasons for actions (or inactions) are not always consciously accessible Baataar (2010).

Most of these interviews were conducted electronically, with the exception of one case, where an elder in Sandema declined my recording him and insisted that we could only take notes. These interviews recorded electronically, were later transcribed. We also took field notes as a backup of the electronic recordings.

We were not very happy with Focus Group Discussions, after our first field trip because the elders would always insist on electing the senior most or the one they considered their mouth piece to do the talking. The other group members would rather keep quiet and only throw in an explanation from time to time or come in to make a correction when they felt the speaker had not explained something well. This experience perhaps is founded in the principle of respect for the elderly and so people did not just speak anyhow in the presence of older ones or the elderly.

The areas on the Focus Group Discussion were in four categorizations: (1) the search for a chief and his/her selection (2) Installation and enskinment (3) day to day administration of the chiefdom (4) death and burial of a sitting chief and handling the vacancy. Respondents were allowed to speak freely on the issues without any limitation. Though these areas were in themselves limiting participants, there

were instances of follow up questions which in most cases were more detailed.

In the opinion of Spradley (1979), the manner in which an ethnographic interview is conducted has a great effect upon the depth and accuracy of findings. People who feel comfortable, safe, and valued are more forthcoming than those who are treated merely as sources of information. Spradley then goes on to compare the ethnographic interview to “speech events,” such as a friendly conversation, and points out that it is similar in form but more directed in purpose.

Our combined ability to also communicate fluently in the language of the participants especially Dagbani created an immediate bond. While for Buli and Gonja, our jerky attempts at speaking Buli and Gonja often drew laughter from participants who then enquired about me. I used such occasions to introduce myself and then explain why I needed such information.

This frantic attempt to find a common source of bonding by strangers, reminds me of Gyeke’s (1966) observation that when strangers have occasion to meet, they normally ask about the origin, clan, relatives, and other details, but with a view to creating a brotherly relationship.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The nature of the underlying political values of these three chieftains being studied, are the reasons that give traditional institutions the potential to contribute to Ghana’s democratization process. It is likely that the more traditional political values converge with democratic principles in their dispensation, the greater would be their potential to contribute to democratic transformation of the country (Economic Commission for Africa 2004). Though it is always risky to generalize about Africa (Ghana’s), traditional institutions of governance because of their diverse nature, the fact still remains that most common political values and practices in the decentralized political systems include;

- Decentralization of power;
- Direct participation in decision making;
- Resolution of conflicts by narrowing differences;
- Respect for dissent and protection of minority views and interests by requiring consensus;
- Narrowing the gap between the rulers and the ruled through direct participation of all adult males in making and enforcing rules;
- Shortening the term of service of office holders; and
- Equitable access to land.

These values listed above, certainly contradict claims by the neo-liberalist that political culture tends to be vertically organized in rural African societies (Yoder 1998). Most of these values our research revealed are widely held at the grassroots level in most chieftaincy systems. As a result, they are African political values rather than political values limited to a specific type of a political system.

The chieftaincy system among the three study areas practice devolution of powers. In the case of the paramount chief, he delegates powers to his divisional chiefs to manage their areas of jurisdiction because of the large sizes of some of these chiefdoms. In the words of Mahama (2004), “the government of the king Dagbon is decentralized. The state is divided into four provinces, each province, having a right to manage its own affairs as long as that is not in conflict with the central administration” (Mahama 2004, 51).

Besides, the Ya-Na, who is the overlord of Dagbon is the head of state. He presides over and directs the affairs of the Council. This notwithstanding, he is assisted by a Council of chiefs made up of two types of office holders: paramount and divisional chiefs and elders. This Council served as an advisory Council of Elders who will normally sit with the paramount chiefs in the State Council.

The kingdom is further divided into administrative set up of Divisional and Sub-divisional areas is a microcosm of the administrative machinery at Yendi. Every paramount or divisional, or sub-divisional chief, has an executive, a judicial and advisory councils. The elders play similar roles under their chiefs. At the village level, the headmen have similar systems though they are not as elaborate as one finds at the upper echelon of the society (Mahama 2004). The same system applies to the Gonja traditional area under the Yagbonwura and the Sandema traditional area under the Sandema “Naab.”

The next feature worth discussing is the direct participation of the citizens under traditional governance in decision making. According to von Trotha (1996), chiefs and village heads would normally constitute a forum where local interest issues (laws/decisions) are debated and articulated. In so doing, the people own these laws they have participated in promulgating and thus will do everything to protect and respect these laws.

The traditional system of government has unique ways of resolving conflicts by narrowing differences between protagonists. Unlike in the modern judicial system of adjudicating cases where one party emerges victor and takes everything, which system breeds animosity, the traditional system would rather narrow the differences between parties thus each party ends up a victor. There are many innovative ways of resolving conflicts in these kingdoms. Indeed, the key principle of resolving conflict in these kingdoms is the principle of the ‘Rule of Law’ where the law is seen as supreme regardless of anybody. The laws are unwritten just like some parts of the British constitution but are embedded in the customs and traditions of the people. These laws are therefore well known before actions and inactions are subjected to interpretation and judgement. For example, having carnal knowledge of a man by a man is sacrilegious, however, offenders are presumed innocent are sent through the trial processes with appeal processes inbuilt in the trial process. For example, a case that is tried in the Kpembe

tradition area of Gonja involving both civil matters such as chieftaincy could be appealed to the king of Gonja, the Yabonwura who had and still has the power to overturn a verdict presided over by a paramount chief. This appeal process is hardly used because in most of the cases, there are some level of discretion that the paramount chief exercises.

Another, important feature that is worth pointing is the fact that in traditional leadership, there is respect for dissent especially in palace meetings which can be compared to cabinet meetings and protection of minority views and interests by requiring consensus on decisions. The majoritarian system of democracy currently being practised is a system which excludes the opinion of the minority except in jurisdictions where a conscious effort is made in the form of proportional representation such as in Canada. As the cliché goes, the minority will have their say but the majority would have their way. This system has led parliament to pass very obnoxious laws or very bad laws, to the detriment of the people they represent.

Also, there is the feature of narrowing the gap between the rulers and the ruled. Unlike government appointed administrators, low-level chiefs and village leaders live in conditions largely similar to their communities. They share common interests and think like their people. As a result, the traditional leaders are better equipped to represent the interests of their communities than the government appointed administrators, who are sometimes only accountable only to the political élite (Economic Commission for Africa 2005).

V. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, in spite of all the attempts by those scholars who are anti-chieftaincy will want us to believe, i.e. that chieftaincy is anachronistic, it promotes gerontocracy and hereditary and therefore limited to a few privileged people, the chieftaincy institution/traditional governance believe is democratic nature. This stems from the fact that traditional governance is based on the custom and practice of the people because since time past, and case-by-case governance which led to the regulation of human behaviour and rendition of justice based on moral values and customary laws than on what Sirna (2012), describes as hypothetical laws enacted by a parliament. Again, this school claims that traditional governance is akin to consensual (deliberative) democracy in which place people are the ones who decide who will hold power as opposed to the rule/decision by single elected politician (Koelble T. 2005: 14-15). In deliberative democracy, minority rights are not vetoed by the majority rather they are accommodated.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adjei, M. O. (2001). *Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Good Governance in Ghana: The Traditional Akan Socio-Political Example*. An Institute of Economic Affairs Publication.
- [2]. Agyeman-Duah, B., (ed.) (2008). *Ghana: Governance in the Fourth Republic*. Digibooks Ghana Ltd., Tema, Ghana.

- [3]. Dake, M.J. (1996). *Reflections on Party Politics and Impact on Democratic Development in Ghana* in Drah, F. and Oquaye, M. (eds). *Civil Society in Ghana*. Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- [4]. Diop, C. A. (1974). *The Origins of Civilization: An Afrocentric Analysis*.
- [5]. Gyekye, K. (1996). *African Cultural Values: An Introduction*, Sankofa Publishing Company, Accra, Ghana.
- [6]. Kargbo, S.B. (2007). *Sierra Leone Human Development Report*. UNDP Report.
- [7]. Mahama, I. (2004). *History of and Traditions of Dagbon*. GILLBT Press.
- [8]. Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizens and Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [9]. Millar, D., Aniah, R., Abatey, S., Dakora, J., Yahaya, S. (2011). *Our Sciences: Indigenous Knowledge Systems of Northern Ghana*.
- [10]. Ntsebeza, L. (1999). 'Democratization and Traditional Authorities in The New South Africa', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, XIX [1]: 83-93.
- [11]. Ntsebeza, L., (2005). *Democracy Compromised*. Cape Town: HSR Press.
- [12]. Oyugi, W. O. (1988). *Democracy Theory Practice in Africa*. Kenya, Heinemann.
- [13]. Parekh, B. (1993). *The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy*. In *Prospects for Democracy*.
- [14]. Pobe, J. S. (1979). *Toward an African Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- [15]. Pobe, J. S. (1992). *Skenosis: Christian Faith In An African Context*. Gweru Mambo Press.
- [16]. Schott, R. (1977). *Sources for a History of the Balsa in Northern Ghana*. *Paideuma* 23, 141-168.
- [17]. Simiyu, V.G. (1987). *The Democratic Myth in African Traditional Societies*, In Oyugi W. O. and Gitonga, A. (eds). *Democratic Theory and Practice in Africa*. Nairobi, Heinemann Kenya.
- [18]. Sirna. Z.T., (2012). *Ethiopia When The Gadaa Democracy Rules in a Federal State: Bridging Indigenous Institutions of Governance to Modern Democracy*.
- [19]. Trotha T. (1996). *From Administrative to Civil Chieftaincy: Some Problems and Prospects of African Chieftaincy in The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, Vol. 28, 1996-Issue 37-38.
- [20]. Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural Universals and Particulars*. Indiana Polis: Indiana University.
- [21]. Yoder, J. (2002). "Good Governance, Democratization and Traditional African Philosophy: The Example of the Kanyok of the Congo," *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 36, No. 3, 1998: 483-507.