

Rethinking the Culture of Peace in Global Politics: From Liberal Democracy to Afrocracy.

NALIONGE Maxmillianus EWOKO

Executive PhD in Organisational Leadership, Ecclesian Theological University, Nigeria

Master in Political Philosophy, The University of Yaoundé 1, Cameroon

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600703>

Received: 14 June 2026; Accepted: 19 June 2026; Published: 03 July 2026

ABSTRACT

In the face of global political crises and persistent challenges of political governance in Africa, there is a pressing need to rethink traditional models of governance. This seismic shift requires the exploration of alternative approaches rooted on contextual political world views. Liberal Democracy from the unipolar perspective of globalisation is erected as the paradigm but has visibly failed to establish the culture of peace in Africa. This is empirically illustrated by persistent political crisis in the continent. In this paper, I contend that there is need for Africa to re-actualise consensual democracy in different forms. One of these modes of consensual democracy is what I refer to as “Afrocracy”. Through a comparative analysis of both Western and indigenous African democracy, we hereby recommend a new model of governance called “Afrocracy”. We argue that this hybrid of liberal democracy and African democracy by consensus, could serve as a panacea to violence that hamper political governance in Africa. It is our hope that political theoreticians and technocrats will reclaim the notion and components of “Afrocracy” in the conceptualisation and construction of governance in Africa void of violence. Hence, this article critically evaluates the limitations of liberal democracy within selected African contexts and proposes Afrocracy as an Afro-constructivist framework that synthesizes indigenous traditions of consensus governance with contemporary democratic principles in the pursuit of peace, inclusion, and nonviolent political transformation.

Keywords: Afrocracy, democracy, federal democracy, democracy by consensus, nonviolence.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, political crises and conflicts have become increasingly pervasive, highlighting the limitations of traditional models of governance in addressing complex challenges. Nowhere is this more evident than in Africa, where persistent issues of poverty, inequality, and conflict continue to undermine development and stability for over 60 years. This failure of the traditional model of governance in Africa stems from the root of ignoring the traditional African political setup with all its communalistic and socialist values. The hypothesis that Africans did not have a history pertaining to them was the actual motive for disregarding the role of history and for tracing African historico-political awareness only in the colonial era. It is from this background that Nabudere posits that;

African historical political forces were dislocated from the real roots of African political development and ignored in favour of new forms that were superimposed on newly created colonial states that were in fact inorganic. One of the first African scholars to address this grievous distortion of African political systems was Cheikh Anta Diop.” (Dani W. Nabudere, 2024, p.16).

Cheick Anta Diop (1987) in his book *Pre-colonial Black Africa*, attempted together with some African-American scholars, to reposition Egypt in the Black African world from which the “Aryan Model”¹ and the theories of 18th and 19th century European racial scientists had disconnected, which has led to the actual socio-economic and

¹ Under the caste system, Aryans divided people into castes, or groups, according to their occupations. Aryans created four main castes; the top were priest, kings and warriors, the lowest caste was made up of workers who served the higher castes.

political dungeon of the Africans who have long been seeking an escape from the neo-colonialist captivity far-off their traditional political organisations masterminded by the spirit of Ubuntu, Harambee, and Ujama'a. In the face of these existential quagmires over the political condition of Africa, there is a growing recognition of the need to rethink political structures and explore alternative approaches rooted in indigenous wisdom and universal principles of nonviolence.

In a world where democracy is often hailed as the pinnacle of effective governance, a new model is of utmost necessity that challenges this entrenched belief which has reigned for decades with lots of quagmires especially in Africa. The concept of liberal democracy, implicitly termed by Hannah Arendt (1972) as federal democracy in *Crisis of the Republic*, which advocates for a system of government that shares power and decision making between a central authority and the individual states, has been seen as a successful model for promoting stability and progress in many countries. However, as we enter an era of growing cultural diversity and an increasing interconnectedness of global communities, promoted in most epistemic works as “*glocalisation*”, it is becoming apparent that this traditional model may no longer be sufficient for addressing the complex issues and challenges of our time. It is important to elucidate that African traditional governance refers to the systems of governance and leadership that have existed in various African societies before the introduction of Western forms of government. These systems reflect the socio-cultural and political values of the different African societies and have been passed down through generations, wherein, we inevitably observe the fact that the political landscape of Africa has long been marred by conflicts, violence, corruption, egocentricity and other socio-political ills. By examining the failures of liberal democracy in addressing the unique challenges faced worldwide, particularly through the lens of the crisis in Africa and most especially Cameroon's north-west and south-west regions, we hereby advocate for a new model of governance that prioritizes dialogue, reconciliation, and cultural empowerment. Through a comparative analysis of African authors such as Desmond Tutu, Nelson Mandela, Chinua Achebe and Achille Mbembe, alongside figures from other continents like Martin Luther King Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, and most especially Hannah Arendt, this work explores the principles and practices of nonviolence and peaceful leadership. By merging diverse perspectives and experiences, we seek to contribute to the discourse on transformative governance and promote a culture of nonviolence in Africa and beyond, through a growing movement towards a new model of governance known as Afrocracy.

This study adopts a qualitative and interdisciplinary methodological approach grounded in political philosophy. It principally employs critical analysis, comparative hermeneutics, and Afro-constructivism as complementary methods of inquiry. Critical analysis is used to examine the theoretical assumptions, strengths, and limitations of liberal democracy, particularly in relation to its application within African political contexts. Comparative hermeneutics facilitates a contextual reading of Hannah Arendt's *Crisis of the Republic* (1972) alongside selected African political philosophies, including Ubuntu, African democracy by consensus, and indigenous traditions of communal governance. Through this comparative framework, points of convergence and divergence between Western democratic thought and African political realities are identified and critically evaluated. Furthermore, the study adopts Afro-constructivism as its guiding philosophical orientation. Afro-constructivism proceeds from the assumption that African political challenges require solutions that are neither purely traditional nor entirely imported from external models. Rather, governance systems should be constructed through a creative synthesis of indigenous African values and universally relevant democratic principles. Consequently, the concept of Afrocracy developed in this article is not presented as a nostalgic return to precolonial institutions but as a normative and practical reconstruction of governance that seeks to integrate decentralization, consensus-building, cultural legitimacy, social justice, and nonviolence within a contemporary political framework. Hence, let's first have a reminiscence on the taxonomy of the forms of government in politics.

The Taxonomy of Various Forms of Government in Political Philosophy.

In Book VII of *The Republic*, Plato classifies forms of government into Aristocracy, Timocracy, Oligarchy, Democracy, and Tyranny (Larson, 1979). Aristotle on the other hand, uses the quantitative and qualitative elements to classify forms of government into the positive and the perverse. After a scrutiny of forms of government, he asserts that;

In our first inquiry into constitutions we analyzed them as follows: the right constitutions, three in number – kingship, Aristocracy, and polity - and the deviations from these, likewise three in number - tyranny from kingship, Oligarchy from aristocracy, democracy from polity. (Aristotle, 1981, p.239)

In the modern context, a government is the State and its administration, viewed as the ruling political power, and equally the management or control of a system. The power owned by a government is applied in relation to the structure and the source of its obtainability. This posits that the two fundamental forms in which a government manifest its power are through power structure and power source. The forms of government by power structure are the overall organization or configuration of a State applied by a ruling entity which is guided by its laws as the macro. It is under the power structure that the forms of government by power source are exercised and regulated. This therefore necessitates a brief conceptual clarification of these separate governmental entities for the proper understanding of federalism's roots especially for thinkers like Arendt, her thesis and international thought acting as a fuel to our hypothesis.

Forms of Government by Power Source

There exist various forms of government by power source practiced by many nations worldwide, from antiquity to the contemporary period, according to their convergence realities. Totalitarianism, as defined by Giovanni Amendola and Carl Schmitt, is a system of government where the people have virtually no authority, and the state has absolute control. This term is synonymous with dictatorship, which refers to a government that exercises autocratic rule. Autocracy (from the Greek *auto* – self, and *cracy* – rule) is a form of government where unlimited power is held by a single individual, often referred to as supreme power or absolute monarchy (Graham, 1999). Monarchy, derived from the Latin *monarchia* (from *mono* - only, and *cratia* - power), refers to a government in which sovereignty is embodied within a single person, typically considered a hereditary head of state. In contrast, authoritarianism involves a governing body with absolute or nearly absolute control, often maintained by force with little regard for public opinion (Heywood, 2007). Another form of government is Plutocracy, where the state is ruled by the wealthy, often referred to as argentocracy, capitocracy, or tycoonocracy. In such systems, the rich (the few) are the ones with the right or opportunity to govern, closely linked to Oligarchy (from Latin *Oligarchia*; *olig* - few, and *archia* - rule), where power is concentrated in the hands of a small privileged group (Tilly, 2007). Some declare that the dominant form of governance in Africa is “*Karkistocratic² Kleptocracy*”, the government of the worst or mediocre, and the government of thieves. Thus, a government ruled by the worst thieves or mediocre who exploit the resources of the people and make them become the corn-loving chicken as propounded by the Cameroonian Philosopher Godfrey B. Tangwa.

In addition, Timocracy is another form which comes from the Medieval Latin *timocratia* (from *timo* meaning honor or valuation, and *cratia*), and according to Plato, it is a form of government motivated by ambition for honor, power, and military glory. Aristotle, on the other hand, defines it as a government where civic honor or political power increases with the amount of property one owns (Plato, 1992; Aristotle, 1984). Lastly, Democracy, perhaps the most popular form of government, was venerated by former American President Abraham Lincoln as “*the government of the people, for the people, and by the people.*” Etymologically, it comes from the Latin *democratia* (from *demo* – people, and *cratia*), referring to a government under the direct or representative rule of the people of its jurisdiction, where the people rule themselves (Lincoln, 1863).

Forms of Government by Power Structure

The forms of government by power structure entail Federation, Confederation, and Unitary State. Primo, in a unitary form of government, all the power rests in a central government. The country may be divided into states or other sub-units, but they have no power of their own (Heywood, 2007). For example, England depends on its Parliament, a legislative body, to create and enforce laws in the country. The leader of the nation, the Prime Minister, is a member of the Parliament and does not have more power than its members. As such, a unitary government can be likened to one big chair, with all of the government's power sitting in one place (Riker, 1964). In fact, there exist unitary republics and unitary monarchies, making up a total of 167 unitary states in the

² From two Greek words “*kakistos*” meaning the worst, and “*cratia*” meaning government. It is the government ruled by the worst or mediocre as pinpointed by Isabelle Barth.

world (CIA World Factbook, 2023). Segundo, the confederal form of government is an association of independent states. The central government derives its authority from the independent states, and power rests in each individual state, whose representatives meet to address the needs of the group. America briefly tried a confederal system before writing an entirely new constitution, which proved ineffective, as the states did not give the central government enough power to perform its role (Bickerton & Keeler, 2009). A confederation of states is like a bunch of different chairs grouped together. They hold power independently but work collectively, as seen in countries like Canada, Belgium, Serbia and Montenegro, Switzerland, and organizations like the European Union (Tilly, 2007; Eurostat, 2022). Tertio, a federal form of government splits power between independent states and a central government. The power rests in both places, and each gets its authority from a governing document, like the U.S. Constitution (Elazar, 1987). Independent branches inside the central government may also share power, which means the states and central government must work together and balance each other, like a set of chairs around a table.

“Glocalized” Governance: Western Democracy and African Traditional Governance.

Despite its predominant position amongst the existing forms of governance practiced for decades, democracy isn't a form of governance full of roses as it records many failures betraying the desire of man to have a peaceful and harmonious coexistence void of some ravages especially that of capitalism. In our reflection on rethinking politics and governance, it is essential to acknowledge the challenges and failures of democracy, both globally and locally.

Navigating across the Failures of Democracy in the World

Globally, countries like Hungary, Myanmar and Venezuela, have struggled with political insecurity, totalitarianism, and loss of democratic standards, as well as some local nations like Zimbabwe, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and Nigeria who have witnessed political quandaries fluctuating from electoral fraud to tribal conflicts, undermining the efficacy and legitimacy of their democratic systems.

Specifically, despite holding democratic elections in Venezuela, the Northern South American country, the nation witnessed major political instability, economic crisis, and dictatorial governance under President Nicolás Maduro. Also, in Southeast Asia, the democratic alteration of Myanmar remained tainted by military involvement, tribal conflict, and human right violations, mostly against the Rohingya minority. Last but not the least out of Africa is Hungary, the Central Europe country. The shift to totalitarianism under Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has raised worries about the loss of egalitarian standards, freedom of press, and the rule of law. In similar line of reflection in Africa, the democratic shift in the Southern African country of Zimbabwe following the resignation of Robert Mugabe in 2017 was blemished by claims of electoral fraud, political cruelty, and economic instability under President Emmerson Mnangagwa. In Central Africa, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) has equally struggled with political unsteadiness, corruption, and violence, particularly during the 2018 controversial elections which saw Felix Tshisekedi proclaimed president amidst contentions of electoral fraud. To finish with West Africa, Nigeria has encountered trials like electoral violence, corruption, and tribal conflicts damaging the efficacy and legitimacy of its democratic institutions in spite of being Africa's largest democracy with the practice of federal democracy.

These examples serve as poignant reminders of the complexities and limitations of traditional models of governance or practical challenges of democracy both globally and locally, in contexts predominantly marked by socio-economic inequalities, legal injustices, and political unrest, animated by “necropolitics” and “necroviolence” as propounded by Achille Mbembe (2017). He understands necropolitics to be the use of power to decide who lives and who dies, while necroviolence designates the brutal and methodical violence that supplements this use of power. These neologism and/or ideologies explore the intersection of power and death, principally in the framework of colonialism and imperialism. Achille argues that colonialism operates through necropolitical tools, where certain inhabitants are subjected to circumstances of living-death. As we strive to chart a new course toward more just, peaceful and inclusive societies, it is imperative that we consider alternative approaches that prioritize inclusivity, dialogue, reconciliation, and cultural empowerment. Precisely, the crisis in Cameroon's north-west and south-west regions replicating this concept of “necropolitics” and “necroviolence”, serves as a glaring example of the limitations of democracy in addressing the unique quagmires

mostly faced by Africa. Decades of discrimination and marginalization have fuelled tensions and conflict in most African communities, underscoring the need for a governance model that prioritizes inclusivity and dialogue over centralized authority. This can only be realized from the elements of African Traditional Governance.

African Traditional Governance System or African Democracy by Consensus.

This is the human management pattern specific to Africans from their core values of communalism and Ubuntu, engulfing principles of consensus-building, inclusivity, and communal decision-making. This could be profoundly apprehended from their ultimate features and some local examples. The fundamental characteristics of African Traditional Governance are; *collective decision making, joint ownership and responsibility, respect for elders, role of chiefs and traditional leaders, emphasis on customary law, inclusivity and consensus building, spiritual and cultural beliefs* (Haller & Merten, 2019). Firstly, decision making in African traditional governance is a collective process which involves the participation of various stakeholders. This includes elders, chiefs, community leaders, and sometimes ordinary citizens. This ensures that decisions are made with the input and consent of the community. Secondly, African traditional governance is equally based on the principle of communal ownership and responsibility. This means that resources, land, and other assets are collectively owned by the community and individuals have a responsibility to contribute to the well-being of the ecosystem. Thirdly, elders hold a special place of respect and authority in most African societies because they are seen as the custodians of tradition and are responsible for passing down knowledge and wisdom to younger generations. Their opinions and decisions are highly valued in traditional governance systems, clarifying why chiefs and traditional leaders play a crucial role in African traditional governance. They are responsible for maintaining order, resolving disputes, and representing their communities to external authorities. Another central physiognomy of African Traditional Governance is the emphasis on Customary Law. This is a set of rules and norms that govern the behaviour of individuals in traditional African societies, often based on the customs and traditions of a given community and is enforced by traditional leaders. Closely linked to this feature is that traditional governance systems in Africa place a strong emphasis on inclusivity and consensus building. This means that everyone in the community has a voice and decisions are made through dialogue and discussion rather than through force or coercion. Lastly, most traditional African societies have strong spiritual and cultural beliefs that are integrated into their governance systems. These beliefs provide a moral and ethical framework for decision making and guide the behaviour of individuals within the community.

From the above characteristics of African Traditional Governance Systems, we can deduce four (4) structural examples of this indigenous political organisation as; *Chieftdoms, Councils of Elders, Tribal and Clan Systems, and Monarchies*. Chieftdoms are a form of traditional governance found in many African societies wherein a chief is the ultimate authority and is responsible for making decisions and maintaining order within the community in line with the laws of the land, buttressed by the council of elders. These councils are made up of respected elders who are responsible for making decisions and resolving disputes within the community. It should be recalled that in many African societies, governance is based on tribal or clan systems where decisions are made by a council of elders or traditional leaders from a particular tribe or clan. Lastly is monarchies, which still prevail in our contemporary society. Some African societies have traditional monarchies where a king or queen holds absolute power and is responsible for making decisions and maintaining order within the community. Thus, vital afrocraic ingredients like the case of the Bamoun in Cameroon (Njoya, 1990).

Pragmatic African Traditional Governance Systems

The Lamidat:

This is a decentralized governance system synonymous with a local administration and indigenous development authority aimed at empowering indigenous peoples and encouraging grassroots involvement in policymaking. The *lamidat* functions on values of inclusivity, transparency, and community commitment, via a chain of participatory procedures. Practically, it is designed as a setup of interrelated councils representing particular groups or localities within a given region or nation, comprising voted representatives such as community leaders, elders, women, youth, and marginalized groups from different backgrounds (Achebe, 1958). These representatives frequently meet to deliberate local problems, ranging from infrastructural development to social

welfare (*Gandhi, 1927*). Glaring examples are town hall gatherings where members of the community meet to express their worries, exchange ideas, and recommend solutions. These gatherings create avenues for dialogue and consensus-building, permitting inhabitants to play active roles in determining the policies and priorities in areas disturbing their lives (*Martin Luther King Jr., 1964*). Furthermore, the *lamidat* accentuates indigenous knowledge, traditional governance organizations, collective and collaborative decision-making, and resource apportionment (*Mbembe, 2001*). Visualize a transparent budgeting procedure where funds are apportioned based on municipal wants and priorities, with efforts from both elected representatives and community members. Also, perceive councils incorporating traditional customs, values, and practices into their decision-making processes, honouring the traditional legacy of local societies while adapting to modern realities (*Soyinka, 1999*). This ensures equitable and effective distribution of resources to address local challenges. Thus, the *lamidat* serves as an active platform for local governance that promotes democracy, communal ownership, and involvement. It embodies the idea that ecological progress and real governance start at the grassroots phase, where people are most closely linked to the topics that impact their daily lives.

The Bakweri People and their Indigenous Governance System:

The Bakweri people are a vital ethnic group of West Africa, located on the slopes of Mount Cameroon in the south-western part of the Republic of Cameroon with a traditional governance system deeply rooted in community values, kinship, and social hierarchy. Amidst the diversity of historical narratives about the veracity of the varied genealogy and origin of the Bakweri people, that of P.M Kale and Edwin Ardener elucidates more. According to Kale (1939), the Bantu from whom the Womboko (Bomboko) are an offspring, are believed to have originated from the Nile and the Congo river basins. Mbedi was the head of the group that migrated from the banks of the Congo river, and settled at the Wouri estuary. Those who settled at the mouth of this river wouri were called Bona Mbedi (children of Mbedi), but was later changed by European explorers to Bonaberi. Mbedi had six (6) sons named; Duala (founded Douala, profoundly Bonaberi), Kole (founded Bokoko), Ewond (founded Ewondo), Nkossi (founded Bakossi), Njongo (founded Bonjongo, though the people of Wonjongo – *Bonjongo* – also claim to have descended from Njonje – *a man from Ewonji or Ebonji*), and Kudi (founded Bakudi, later changed to Bakweri) (Esanja, 2000: 24).

Thus, the formation of villages by the Bakweri people was masterminded by the migration movement of individuals for the search of fertile lands for hunting, fishing, farming and human habitation in conducive areas where they settled with their families from the immediate coast to the foothills of the Fako Mountain. Some of the villages were named after the founding fathers³ or some dominant activity in the area⁴. Some villages merged with others in times of epidemic like it was the case with the *Liongo* and *Bokwai* people who joined lower *Muea* and *Maumu* villages respectively. So, migration due to war which was almost absent in the history of the Bakweri people can partially be explained by the fact that there was relatively abundant fertile land in the area. The pre-colonial Bakweri people had about ninety-six (96) villages of varying sizes and population, making up the Lower Bakweris (*the Ewota or Bota, the Bombokos of the West Coast and the Isu*) and the Upper Bakweris founded along the foot of the mountain from *Mapanja* in the West to *Ekona Lelu* in the East (Ardener, 1956: 17). As they settled in different autonomous villages in the present Fako Division, they developed a vibrant indigenous democratic system which they maintained until the coming of the colonizers. Thus, the epicentre of the Bakweri society like that of the Duala (both forming the *Sawa* –coastal people – ethnic group) is firmly held by the spirit of Ubuntu and Ujama'a, knotted by a common history, mythology, and a unique daily lifestyle, which epitomizes the afrocratic values of leadership.

In the same line of reflection, Ardener (1956) elucidates that the Bakweri political structure is predominantly organized around village units, each governed by a chief and a council of elders. The Bakweri political organization is not a unified kingdom in the strict sense but rather a collection of loosely affiliated village communities, each with its own leadership yet destined by shared cultural and kinship links. Chieftaincy is the governing system of the Bakweri people with the chief of each village holding political, spiritual, and judicial

³ Villages that fall under this category include Bokwaongo (*children of Kwaongo*) and Bonakanda (*children of Nakanda*).

⁴ A classic example of such an area is Buea. The story is that *Eeye*, the founding father of Buea always did hunting in this area (forest) and realized that the place was very fertile as far as hunting was concern. After each successful hunting expedition in this area, he usually declared hysterically that "*na ma Gbea*" meaning "*I have done it*". As time unfolded, he then progressively settled in the place and called it "*Gbea*" (today known as Buea).

authority within his community. Mostly hereditary, his duties encompass mediating disputes, overseeing religious ceremonies, and acting as a representative of the ancestors, which integrates political authority with spiritual obligations. For effective leadership, the Chief is buttressed by a Council of Elders, which is a body composed of respected senior members from various families within the village. This council serves as a central decision-making unit, guiding the chief and ensuring that his decisions align with community values. These elders perform an essential role in interpreting customary laws, arbitrating conflicts, and accentuating on social cohesion. Kinship and lineage greatly influence the political matters of the Bakweri community as each family has roles to play within the political setup with family heads as fundamental actors in local governance and resource management. This kinship ties strengthen collective decision-making and accountability, with each lineage contributing to the governance and protection of the community. In addition, to Ardener (1956) secret societies like the “*Ekpe*” society in the Bakweri land serves as a form of social and judicial overseer. They are regulators of community conduct, intervene in conflict resolution, spiritual rites, acts as auxiliary to the chief’s authority and administers the laws of the land. It is worthy of notice that the Bakweri villages uphold casual coalitions, enabling collective decision-making in times of external threat or inter-community conflict. Chiefs may assemble to address matters affecting the bigger Bakweri population, though this is generally limited to precise matters. These coalitions reveal a form of decentralized governance, where unity is attained via shared customs and kinship bonds rather than a centralized kingdom. Ardener (1956) presents the Bakweri political organization in *Coastal Bantu of the Cameroons* and *Kingdom on Mount Cameroon* as a malleable and resistant system that balances authority among chiefs, elders, kinship networks, and secret societies. This structure has allowed the Bakweri people to adapt to changing socio-economic and political contexts, preserving cultural continuity while responding to alien influences.

Hence, African traditional governance systems are diverse and reflect the cultural and social values of different African societies. They have played crucial roles in maintaining order and promoting collective welfare for centuries and continue to coexist with modern forms of government in many African countries. It is in this line of reasoning that the Cameroonian bioethical philosopher Tangwa (2009) mixes traditional African values with modern ethical issues, particularly in healthcare, underlining that human dignity and well-being arise from our interconnectedness. Against this backdrop, the concept of afrocracy emerges as a compelling alternative, drawing inspiration from African cultural values and indigenous governance systems. By embracing principles of consensus-building, inclusivity, and communal decision-making whereby afrocracy offers a pathway to address the unique Africa challenges, while contributing to the discourse on global transformative governance. As we reflect on the failures of democracy and the urgent need for innovative solutions, it becomes unavoidable to regard the historical lessons and draw inspiration from diverse perspectives and experiences. By reimagining politics and governance through the lens of Afrocracy and nonviolence, we can work towards building a more just, peaceful, and prosperous future for all. The traditional model of liberal democracy may no longer be sufficient for addressing the complexities of our modern world. As we move towards a more diverse and interconnected global community, it is time to rethink our system of governance. Afrocracy proposes a new ideal that embraces diversity, equality, inclusivity, collectivism, and seeks to create a society that valorises differences more, actively works towards better promoting nonviolence and harmony, and rethink a healthier cosmopolitanism.

Rethinking Governance: Towards an Afrocratic Democracy for a better “Glocalized” Peace and Stability

Afrocracy: Hybrid of Liberal Democracy and African Democracy by Consensus.

In a world where democracy has been venerated as the pinnacle of effective governance but with lots of shortcomings and increasing nature of violence, though still the ideal form of government amongst the known, we are compelled to emerged with a new model form of governance herein called “Africracy or Afrocracy”. From the union of “*Afro...*” or “*Afri...*” denoting of *Africa*, and “*cratia*” meaning *ruling*, Afrocracy or Africracy offers a compelling substitute to liberal democracy or the “federal democracy” proposed by Arendt (1972), emphasizing on collective management and cultural empowerment symbolizing the canons of democracy by consensus. The term “*Afrocracy*” was originally introduced by B. I. C. Ijomah in 1988 to describe a partyless democratic system designed to enhance national stability. While drawing inspiration from the notion of African-centered governance, the present study expands the concept to encompass political, epistemic,

cultural, and developmental self-determination within contemporary Africa.⁵ Afrocracy or Africracy could also be termed “Kamitism”, inspired by the ancient African civilization of Kamit, which recognized the interconnectedness of all aspects of life, including politics, which is also a sort of pan-democracy as termed by Mazadou (2012). Afrocracy hence signifies governance grounded predominantly in African experience rather than in foreign imposed replicas. It should be underlined that Afrocracy is not recommended as a rejection of modernism, democracy, constitutionalism, or human rights. Nor does it advocate for a nostalgic return to precolonial political systems. Rather, it seeks to address a central question: can Africa govern itself according to principles derived from its own intellectual traditions while remaining fully engaged with current global realities? The suggested answer here is affirmative. Afrocracy resides on the belief that sincere political independence necessitates more than autonomous boundaries and electoral bodies. It entails the ability of a people to outline their own priorities, create their own standards of legitimacy, and develop institutions that reflect their collective values and aspirations.⁶ The philosophical inspiration for Afrocracy may be found within several components of African thought, including Ubuntu, African Humanism, Negritude, Pan-Africanism, Ujama’a, Consciencism, and contemporary theories of consensual democracy. While these ideologies differ in scope and features, they share a common commitment to human dignity, communal responsibility, social harmony, and collective prosperity.⁷ Different from liberal political theories that begin with the autonomous individual, Afrocracy begins with the community and focus on the eco-bio-communitarian⁸ well-being. It is in the same line of reflection that in *Well-being in African philosophy: Insights for a global ethics of development*, another Cameroonian Philosopher, Mosima (2024: 173) thinks that well-being in Africa “... is embedded in the communitarian philosophical values that are cherished by Africans, and so one cannot talk about well-being in isolation from the communities or societies that take it to be their core value.” This holistic view of society promotes the idea that political decisions should take into account socio-cultural and environmental factors, rather than simply focusing on economic gains. This is a crucial aspect that sets this model apart from traditional forms of Western democracy, which often prioritize individual rights and material progress over communal well-being. The pillars of Afrocracy are built upon the culture of nonviolence, which is deeply ingrained in the African tradition. This philosophy promotes the resolution of conflicts through peaceful means, such as dialogue, negotiation, and reconciliation, rather than resorting to violence or repression. This is in glaring contrast to the current political climate in Africa, and most especially Cameroon, where protests and unrest have been met with heavy-handed tactics from the government, resulting in needless loss of life and a deepening political crisis.

Africracy presents a revolutionary approach to governance that goes beyond the traditional federal democracy proposed by renowned political theorists like Hannah Arendt. This new model offers a promising solution to the political crisis in the world, in Africa, and especially in Cameroon. Drawing from Arendt's *Crisis of the Republic* (1972), this study employs a comparative hermeneutic reading of her political thought in dialogue with African traditions of consensus governance, thereby generating the conceptual framework of Afrocracy. Arendt's work, although revolutionary, was heavily influenced by her Western perspective and may not fully capture the complexities of the African context (Arendt, 1972). By adapting her ideas to the African reality and visualizing future challenges, Afrocracy proposes a fresh and relevant interpretation of her work, making it more applicable to the current situation in Cameroon (Mamdani, 1996). Arendt's *Crisis of the Republic* identified the erosion of the public realm and the rise of a culture of consumerism as major threats to democracy (Arendt, 1972). Similarly, the political crisis in Cameroon can be attributed, in part, to the lack of a vibrant public sphere and the prioritization of material gains over the common good (Lambi, 2012). Afrocracy seeks to counter these challenges by placing a strong emphasis on community participation and the collective responsibility for societal well-being. This encourages a more inclusive and participatory democracy, where citizens are actively involved in decision-making processes and hold their leaders accountable (Nkrumah, 1964). It is worthy of notice that Afrocracy also incorporates principles of Ubuntu, Harambee, and Ujama'a Socialism, African philosophies that

⁵ Benedict Imeagwu Chukwumah (B.I.C.) Ijomah (1938-2020), Nigerian sociologist and political theorist, introduced the concept of *Afrocracy* as a partyless democratic model intended to promote political stability in postcolonial Africa in his work *Afrocracy: Basis for National Stability* (1988).

⁶ Kwame Nkrumah, *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization* (London: Heinemann, 1964).

⁷ Léopold Sédar Senghor, *On African Socialism* (New York: Praeger, 1964); Julius K. Nyerere, *Ujama'a: Essays on Socialism* (Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press, 1968); Kwame Nkrumah, *Consciencism* (1964).

⁸ Godfrey B. Tangwa, *Elements of African Bioethics in a Western Frame* (Mankon, Bamenda: Langaa Research & Publishing CIG, 2010), 35-58. Tangwa develops the concept of Eco-Bio-Communitarianism to describe an African worldview characterized by harmonious coexistence among human beings, communities, and the natural environment.

emphasize the interconnectedness and interdependence of all people (Mbiti, 1970; Mbeki, 2004). In practice, this means that the government should prioritize the needs of the community over individual interests and promote a sense of mutual respect and solidarity among citizens. In a country like Cameroon, where ethnic and regional divisions have often fuelled conflicts, Afrocracy offers a unifying vision of governance that could bring about social cohesion and national healing (Lambo, 2015). By recognizing and celebrating the diversity of cultures and traditions found in different communities, this model promotes unity and tolerance, leading to a more peaceful and stable society. This explains why we concord with Mosima et al. (2024: 105) that;

“Human well-being is thus achieved when individual efforts join with the community to advance from the less human conditions of disease, hatred, crime, war, tribalism, poverty, oppression, injustice, corruption, faithlessness, and hopelessness to the more human conditions of health and love, peaceful coexistence, equity, justice, community fellow-feeling, faith, and hope.”

Liberal Democracy and African Democracy by Consensus are two distinct forms of governance that have been practiced separately in different parts of the world. Liberal Democracy (Federalism) is a system in which power is divided between a central government and its constituent states (Elazar, 1987). On the other hand, African Democracy by Consensus places a strong emphasis on traditional and cultural values in decision-making processes, where governance is more community-focused and decisions are made through a collective agreement (Mamdani, 1996). Combining these two forms of governance creates a unique system herein termed Afrocracy, considered by Oumarou Mazadou to be Kamitism, or Pandemocracy⁹, that is well-suited for the diverse and complex societies found in the world (Mbeki, 2004). This hybrid form of governance has the potential to solve some of the persistent challenges facing the world, specifically African countries, such as ethnic and religious tensions, corruption, and lack of effective representation for marginalized groups (Nkrumah, 1964). The key principles of federalism or liberal democracy, such as decentralization of power and decision-making, and checks and balances, can be combined with the traditional values of African democracy by consensus, such as community involvement and consensus-building, to create an inclusive and equitable model of governance (Tilly, 2007). In this system, power would be shared between the central government and its constituent states, but also among different ethnic and cultural groups within each state. This would help to address the issue of unequal distribution of resources and representation, which has often led to conflict and instability in many African countries (Lambi, 2012). At the same time, the emphasis on traditional values and consensus-building would promote inclusive decision-making and allow for the integration of local customs and practices into governance processes (Mbiti, 1970). This would improve the legitimacy of government actions and policies, as they would reflect the needs and aspirations of the entire society, rather than just a select few. The practical viability of consensus-oriented governance is not merely theoretical. Contemporary African experiences provide important illustrations of how participatory and culturally embedded governance can contribute to political stability and social cohesion. Botswana, for instance, has successfully integrated traditional consultative institutions such as the *Kgotla* into its modern democratic framework. The *Kgotla* system allows community members to deliberate on public matters and contributes to a culture of consultation and accountability that has been associated with Botswana's relative political stability and democratic continuity since independence (Sharma, 2004). Similarly, Ghana's coexistence of constitutional governance with recognized traditional authorities demonstrates that indigenous institutions can complement modern state structures rather than undermine them (Ray, 2003). Rwanda's post-genocide reconciliation initiatives, particularly the community-based *Gacaca* courts, further illustrate the capacity of culturally grounded participatory mechanisms to facilitate conflict resolution and social reconstruction (Clark, 2010). These examples suggest that governance models drawing upon indigenous traditions of consultation, consensus, and communal responsibility possess practical relevance for contemporary African political realities. Furthermore, the combination of liberal democracy and African democracy by consensus would also facilitate the participation of marginalized groups, such as women and minority communities, in the decision-making process (Mamdani, 1996). This would help to promote gender equality and social justice, which are crucial for the development and stability of any nation (Mbeki, 2004).

Hence, a hybrid form of governance that combines Federalism and African Democracy by Consensus under the terminology of Afrocracy has the potential to address many of the challenges facing not only African countries

⁹ Terms such as Africracy, Kamitism, and Pandemocracy have been employed by various African scholars to describe related attempts at theorizing indigenous African governance. However, this article adopts the term Afrocracy as the preferred conceptual framework.

but the world at large. It would promote inclusivity, equity, and social justice, while also maintaining a balance between centralization and decentralization of power. By incorporating traditional values and practices into modern governance systems, this model can pave the way for a more progressive and prosperous Africa.

Conceptual Clarification and Justification of Afrocracy as the Preferred Framework.

One of the challenges facing modern African political thought is the spread of concepts seeking to describe governance systems rooted in African cultural values and indigenous political traditions. Terms such as *Africracy*, *Kamitism*, *Pandemocracy*, and *Afrocracy* have emerged within different intellectual circles as attempts to articulate alternatives to the dominant liberal democratic paradigm. While these concepts share certain philosophical foundations, particularly their emphasis on communal participation, consensus-building, cultural authenticity, and resistance to neo-colonial political structures, they are not necessarily identical in scope or orientation. The concept of *Kamitism*, inspired by the civilizational heritage of ancient Kemet (Egypt), generally seeks the recovery of African cultural and philosophical foundations as a basis for political and social renewal (Diop, 1987). Its primary concern is the reconstruction of African identity through a return to indigenous epistemologies and civilizational values. *Pandemocracy*, on the other hand, emphasizes the broad participation of all members of society in public decision-making and seeks to transcend the limitations of elite-driven representative systems. Similarly, *Africracy* has been employed by certain scholars to denote governance models rooted in African traditions of communal deliberation, collective responsibility, and consensus-oriented leadership. Although these concepts make important contributions to the search for alternative governance paradigms, this article adopts the term *Afrocracy* as its preferred conceptual framework. The choice is deliberate and philosophical. Afrocracy is understood not as a nostalgic return to precolonial institutions, nor as a rejection of all aspects of liberal democracy, but as a constructive synthesis between the strengths of modern democratic governance and the enduring values of African political traditions. It is therefore conceived as an Afro-constructivist model that combines decentralization, participatory governance, communal accountability, cultural legitimacy, and the principles of nonviolence within a contemporary political framework. Unlike concepts that focus primarily on cultural restoration or identity reconstruction, Afrocracy seeks to provide a practical and operational governance model capable of addressing contemporary challenges such as political exclusion, democratic deficits, ethnic fragmentation, corruption, and recurring political violence. It proposes a glocalized system of governance that draws simultaneously from universal democratic aspirations and context-specific African realities. Consequently, throughout this article, the term Afrocracy shall be used as the principal concept to describe the proposed governance paradigm.

Afrocracy as a Contextual Model for Addressing Contemporary African Governance Challenges: The Case of Cameroon.

While liberal democracy is a step towards a more participatory and inclusive form of governance, it still relies on traditional structures of power and may not adequately address the root causes of politico-cultural violence. It is important, however, to acknowledge that liberal democracy has made significant contributions to political development across many societies. Principles such as constitutionalism, the rule of law, separation of powers, protection of fundamental rights, and electoral accountability have played an important role in limiting arbitrary authority and promoting citizen participation. Numerous democratic societies have benefited from these institutional safeguards. The challenge in many African contexts therefore lies not necessarily in the democratic ideals themselves but in the difficulties associated with their transplantation, adaptation, and implementation within historically distinct socio-cultural and political environments. Consequently, the critique developed in this article is directed less at democracy as a universal aspiration than at the inadequacy of certain institutional forms when disconnected from local realities and indigenous traditions of governance. Thus, it is essential to recognize the limitations of this model and to adapt it to the unique needs and cultural contexts of different regions. This uniqueness involving cultural context of each region is herein placed under the system termed Afrocracy. This model is based on the principles of nonviolence, community collaboration, and self-determination, surpassing the traditional liberal democracy of thinkers like Arendt. This system emphasizes communal decision-making, consensus building, and a holistic approach to social and political organization. By incorporating these elements, Afrocracy offers a more culturally relevant and contextually appropriate solution to the challenges of violence and political instability in Africa. In this article, we equally suggest a contextual

reading of Arendt's *Crisis of the Republic* (1972) which provides a foundation for the implementation of Afrocratic principles as a panacea to Cameroon's current political crisis.

Firstly, it is essential to understand the pillars of Afrocracy. At its core, this model of governance is based on the African philosophy of Ubuntu, which emphasizes the interconnectedness and interdependence of individuals and communities (Mbiti, 1970). This philosophy values the collective over the individual and promotes harmony and cooperation rather than competition and conflict (Mbeki, 2004). In contrast, Arendt's liberal democracy places a strong emphasis on individual rights and liberties, often leading to a breakdown in community cohesion (Arendt, 1972). Secondly, Afrocracy also rejects the use of violence as a means of achieving political goals. This principle stands in stark contrast to Arendt's view that violence is a necessary evil and secondary tool, as Marx insinuates, in times of political crisis (Arendt, 1972). Arendt believed that violence could be a tool for liberation and change as a secondary role, whereas Afrocratic principles promote nonviolent resistance and negotiation. Arendt (1972: 122) acknowledges this contradiction in her statement that: "*if violence could settle social conflicts, revenge would become the miracle cure for most of our ills.*" In Cameroon, the use of violence by both the government and opposition groups has only perpetuated the cycle of conflict and deepened the political crisis without solving the crux of the problem. Adopting the principles of Afrocracy would promote a nonviolent approach to conflict resolution from parties, creating a more sustainable and peaceful society (Nkrumah, 1964). Thirdly, Arendt's liberal democracy relies heavily on a strong central government, with power concentrated in the hands of a few. This has often led to authoritarianism and abuses of power, as seen in many African countries (Tilly, 2007). In contrast, Afrocracy advocates for a decentralized system of governance, where power is distributed among the people through community-based decision-making processes. This empowers citizens to be active participants in the political process and fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility in the development of their communities (Mamdani, 1996). In Cameroon, where there is a long history of political exclusion and marginalization, adopting Afrocratic principles could promote inclusivity and foster a sense of genuine inclusive and holistic national unity (Lambi, 2012). At the anthropological level, Afrocracy is grounded in a conception of the human person that transcends the liberal emphasis on isolated individual autonomy. Freedom is therefore understood not merely as the capacity for individual self-determination, but also as active participation in the collective life of the community for the realization of a better human condition. In this perspective, being human entails the progressive actualization of one's innate potentialities in ways that contribute to social harmony and ecological balance. Such a vision resonates with the notion of the *ontodunatologist*¹⁰, that is, a being who is simultaneously active, relational, and continuously psychosomatically empowered to confront and overcome physical, emotional, socio-cultural, economic, and political challenges. Consequently, Afrocracy conceives citizenship not simply as a legal status, but as an ethical commitment to communal flourishing, mutual responsibility, and sustainable coexistence.

Moreover, Afrocracy values the preservation of cultural traditions and practices, while Arendt's liberal democracy often prioritizes Western ideals and forms of governance. This has resulted in a clash between the political systems and a disconnection between the government and the people. By embracing traditional values and practices, Afrocracy creates a sense of cultural continuity and identity, promoting a more cohesive and stable society (Mbiti, 1970). In her book, *Crisis of the Republic*, Arendt (1972) emphasizes the role of education in shaping the political consciousness of a nation. She argues that the education system should promote critical thinking and encourage citizens to actively engage in the political process. This aligns with the Afrocratic principle of community collaboration, as it encourages citizens to participate in decision-making processes and hold their leaders accountable. In Cameroon, where there is a low level of civic, moral, and religious education and political apathy, adopting this approach could lead to a more politically engaged and informed citizenry (Mbeki, 2004). We therefore call for a revamped educational policy in Cameroon in particular and Africa at large which teaches Afrocratic values and developmental patterns rooted in African epistemology away from just the veneration of western education. Cameroonian children need to be trained to value indigenous knowledge

¹⁰ Ontodunatologism is a neologism (Onto- / Dunato- / logism), which comes from Greek "ontos", meaning *being or existence* - relates to the nature of being; "dunamis", meaning *power, potential, or capability* - signifies dynamism, strength, or the ability to act; and logos, meaning *reason, study, or discourse* - refers to a systematic study or concept. Thus, Ontodunatologism can be interpreted as "*the study or conceptualization of being as dynamic and perpetually powerful*", emphasizing that existence is not static but continuously evolving through action, potential realization, and transformation.

systems, local innovation, and African epistemological resources like the phenomenon of “*night-flight*”, while remaining critically engaged with scientific and technological advancements.

Hence, the implementation of Afrocratic principles in Cameroon may provide a useful illustration of how culturally grounded and participatory governance mechanisms can contribute to conflict transformation, reconciliation, and democratic renewal within African societies facing persistent political challenges. The crisis in the English speaking part of Cameroon witnessed a shift from the peaceful protests in 2016 primarily about long-term grievances over Anglophone marginalization and cultural discrimination by the Francophone ruling class, to a brutal violence in October 2017 when the Cameroonian government responded with military action over the symbolic proclamation of independence by the separatist groups. Afrocracy offers a new model of governance based on the principles of nonviolence, community collaboration, cultural preservation, inclusive dialogue, holistic forgiveness, sincere regional integration and reconciliation for proper nation building in the world at large and Africa in particular, most specifically Cameroon under the heat of political quagmire.

Afrocracy as a Paradigm Shift and Epitome of a Realistic “Glocalized” Good Governance in the 21st Century

Afrocracy: Model of Governance that Incorporates the Pillars of the Cultural of Nonviolence.

Afrocracy is a new model of governance that builds upon the principles of federal democracy but also incorporates the pillars of the culture of nonviolence. The culture of nonviolence, as defined by Galtung (1996), includes three pillars: nonviolence towards oneself, nonviolence towards others, and nonviolence towards nature. These pillars are essential for creating a sustainable and peaceful society and can be integrated into the principles of Afrocracy to create a more holistic approach to governance. In Afrocracy, the concept of federalism is expanded to include not only political states, but also cultural and ecological states. This means that the diversity and self-rule promoted by liberal democracy are extended to all aspects of society, including cultural and ecological spheres. This allows for a more comprehensive and inclusive understanding of governance, one that recognizes the interconnectedness of all aspects of society (Galtung, 1996). Furthermore, Afrocracy emphasizes the importance of nonviolence towards oneself, others, and nature in all political decisions. This means that policies and actions must be evaluated not only for their political implications but also for their impact on the well-being of individuals, communities, and the environment. This requires a shift in mind-set, where the ultimate goal of governance is not just to acquire and maintain power, then ensures stability the way you can (Machiavelli, 1513), but to create a society where all individuals can flourish (Mbeki, 2004). In order to effectively implement Afrocracy, it is necessary to cultivate a culture of nonviolence within society. This can be achieved through education, social programs, and policies that promote empathy, compassion, and respect for diversity. Additionally, structures and institutions must be reformed to ensure that power is distributed equally and that all voices are heard in the decision-making process. Thus, while liberal democracy is a valuable concept, it may not be enough to address the complex challenges of our modern world. By integrating the principles of nonviolence into the model of federal democracy, Afrocracy offers a more comprehensive and sustainable approach to governance. By valuing the well-being of individuals, communities, and the environment, Afrocracy has the potential to create a society where all individuals can thrive and live in peace (Arendt, 1972; Nkrumah, 1964).

Afrocracy: A Practical, Operational, Realistic, and Innovative Transformation of “Glocalized” Governance.

Afrocracy represents a bold and transformative model of governance that draws on the philosophical principles of Ubuntu, the culture of nonviolence, and the wisdom of African thinkers and global peace leaders. It builds upon federal democracy while incorporating elements from the work of key philosophers and activists such as Gandhi, King Jr., Achebe, Mbembe, and Soyinka. These leaders and scholars have long emphasized the need for inclusive, peaceful, and culturally sensitive forms of governance that prioritize the well-being of all citizens and encourage mutual respect, cooperation, and nonviolent resistance.

Practically and purposefully, Afrocracy is grounded in decentralization, community participation, and the rejection of centralized power, values deeply embedded in both African philosophies and the nonviolent

resistance championed by figures like Gandhi and King Jr. Gandhi's philosophy of *ahimsa* (nonviolence) and King's advocacy for nonviolent resistance have influenced the design of Afrocracy, where power is distributed among the people and decisions are made through collective participation (Galtung, 1996; King, 1963). These ideas resonate with the communalism of Ubuntu, which emphasizes the interconnectedness and interdependence of individuals within society (Mbembe, 2017). In practice, Afrocracy would include community councils composed of citizens from various ethnic and cultural backgrounds, all of whom would contribute to the decision-making process. These councils would prioritize peaceful dialogue and consensus-building, as seen in the work of King, who advocated for peaceful methods of social change in his "*Letter from Birmingham Jail*" (King, 1963: 77-100). The model would empower local communities to take charge of their own governance, fostering a sense of ownership, inclusivity, and unity.

Operationally, Afrocracy incorporates both the modern structure of federalism and traditional African governance practices. It advocates for the decentralization of power, ensuring that local and regional entities retain substantial autonomy while working collaboratively with the central government to address national issues. As Mbembe (2017) suggests, Afrocracy recognizes the need to dismantle colonial structures of governance that often concentrated power in the hands of a few, perpetuating inequality and injustice. Gandhi's concept of *Swaraj* (self-rule) is central to this vision, as it reflects the idea that communities should have the autonomy to govern themselves without interference from a distant central authority. Similarly, Achebe's exploration of post-colonial African societies in works such as *Things Fall Apart* underscores the importance of reconnecting with indigenous governance practices and values (Achebe, 1958). Afrocracy would combine these insights, creating a political system that fosters harmony, responsibility, and respect for diversity, while remaining connected to its cultural roots.

From the standpoint of political realism, Afrocracy is rooted in pragmatism because it acknowledges the historical and ongoing challenges facing African countries, including Cameroon, which are often characterized by ethnic divisions, political exclusion, and social unrest. Wole Soyinka's advocacy for a vibrant civil society and his critique of authoritarian governance models align with the principles of Afrocracy, which seeks to dismantle oppressive power structures and foster a participatory and inclusive political environment (Soyinka, 1999). Drawing from Achebe's reflections on the corrupting effects of power, Afrocracy recognizes that governance must prioritize ethical leadership and shared responsibility. The decentralized nature of Afrocracy ensures that leadership is not concentrated in the hands of a few, preventing authoritarianism and encouraging leaders to be accountable to the people (Achebe, 1984). This reflects a realistic understanding of the power dynamics that often undermine democratic governance in African nations.

As an innovative transformation of "*glocalized*" governance, Afrocracy is not simply a return to pre-colonial governance systems but represents an innovative transformation of governance that blends the best aspects of both indigenous African wisdom and modern democratic principles. By integrating the principles of nonviolence (as espoused by Gandhi and King) and African traditions of consensus-building, Afrocracy seeks to complement and improve upon certain limitations observed in the practice of liberal democracy within specific socio-cultural contexts. This new model would encourage leaders to place the collective good above individual interests, ensuring that policies reflect the aspirations and needs of all citizens. Gandhi's notion of *Sarvodaya* (welfare of all) and King's emphasis on justice for the oppressed inform Afrocracy's commitment to social justice and equity, particularly for marginalized groups such as women, minorities, and the impoverished (King, 1963; Gandhi, 1948). Moreover, the Afrocratic approach to governance is aligned with Soyinka's call for a political culture that rejects violence and seeks restorative justice (Soyinka, 1999). By prioritizing nonviolent methods of conflict resolution, Afrocracy offers a promising solution to the cycles of violence and political instability that have plagued many African nations. In Cameroon, for example, the application of Afrocratic principles could help address the ethnic and regional conflicts that have fuelled political unrest and deepen the national unity.

Hence, Afrocracy provides a new, practical, and realistic approach to governance that incorporates both modern democratic ideals and traditional African values. By emphasizing community participation, decentralization, nonviolence, and social justice, Afrocracy offers an innovative and transformative alternative to Liberal Democracy. It is a governance system that not only seeks to preserve cultural identity but also creates a space for peaceful, inclusive, and sustainable development. The significance of Afrocracy lies not merely in its critique of existing governance systems but in its attempt to reconstruct political authority on foundations that are

simultaneously democratic, culturally legitimate, and peace-oriented. By bridging indigenous African political traditions and contemporary democratic aspirations, Afrocracy contributes to ongoing debates concerning the future of governance in Africa and beyond.

CONCLUSION

As we confront the challenges of the 21st century, it is imperative that we rethink politics and governance in Africa and beyond. This has been our epistemic journey in this article to emerge with a new model of governance in the world. By critically examining the achievements and limitations of liberal democracy as one of the dominant political models of the modern era, and embracing alternative models such as Afrocracy, drawing inspiration from African democracy by consensus, philosophy of Ubuntu, the principles of nonviolence and reconciliation, we can chart a new course toward a more just and peaceful future. African authors and leaders such as Desmond Tutu, Nelson Mandela, Chinua Achebe and Achille Mbembe have long championed the principles of nonviolence and reconciliation. Through their works and actions, they have demonstrated the transformative power of love, forgiveness, and dialogue in overcoming oppression and injustice. Similarly, Western figures like Martin Luther King Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, and Hannah Arendt who fuelled our contextual reading through her work *Crisis of the Republic*, have offered valuable insights into the principles and practices of nonviolence and peaceful leadership. By juxtaposing these perspectives, we can assemble valuable lessons for building a more just and peaceful world. Let us heed the wisdom of African and Western thinkers alike and work together to build a world where dialogue triumphs over discord, and unity prevails over division. This political idealism of the Ubuntu, Harambee and Ujama'a vision is enshrined in the blending of the values of the western idea of liberal democracy as proposed by Hannah Arendt to that of African democracy by consensus, to emerge with the new model of governance, Afrocracy, coined by Benedict Imeagwu Chukwumah (B.I.C.) Ijomah and herein contemporarily elaborated. As the world continues to grapple with the limitations of contemporary democratic governance, Afrocracy emerges as a promising normative and institutional framework capable of contributing to more inclusive, peaceful, and culturally grounded forms of political organization to our 21st century political quagmires like violence, political defeat, nepotism, and kakistocracy, for a better "glocalised" governance.

REFERENCES

1. Achebe, C. (1958). *Things Fall Apart*. Heinemann.
2. Achebe, C. (1984). *The Trouble with Nigeria*. Heinemann.
3. Ardener, E. (1956). *The Coastal Bantu of the Cameroons*. Oxford University Press for the International African Institute.
4. Ardener, E. (1996). *Kingdom on Mount Cameroon: Studies in the history of Cameroon coast, 1500-1970*. Oxford University Press, Berghahn Books.
5. Arendt, H. (1972). *Crises of the Republic: Lying in politics; civil disobedience; on violence; thoughts on politics and revolution*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
6. Aristotle. (1981). *The Politics* (T. A. Sinclair, Trans.; T. J. Saunders, Rev. Ed.). Penguin Classics.
7. Bickerton, C. J., & Keeler, J. T. (2009). *American government: Politics and political culture* (3rd Ed.). Pearson.
8. Bolaji, B., Mahmoud, M., Müller, L. F., & Roothaan, A. (2024). *Well-being in African philosophy: Insights for a global ethics of development*. The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.
9. CIA World Factbook. (2023). *The world factbook*. Central Intelligence Agency. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook>
10. Clark, P. (2010). *The Gacaca courts, post-genocide justice and reconciliation in Rwanda*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Diop, C. A. (Ed.). (1987). *Pre-colonial Black Africa*. Lawrence Hill & Company.
12. Elazar, D. J. (1987). *Exploring federalism*. University of Alabama Press.
13. Esanja, S. M. (2000). *Colonialism and the Transformation of an African Democracy: A case study of the Bakweris, 1884-1961* (Postgraduate dissertation). The University of Buea.
14. Ewoko, N. M. (2023). *The Aetiology of Violence in Politics: Analysing Violence and Power in Hannah Arendt's Crisis of the Republic (1972)* (Postgraduate dissertation). The University of Yaoundé I.

15. Eze, E. C. (Ed.). (1997). *Postcolonial African Philosophy: A Critical Reader*. Blackwell Publishers.
16. Fortes, M., & Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1963). *African Political Systems*. Oxford University Press.
17. Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. Sage Publications.
18. Gandhi, M. (1927). *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
19. Gandhi, M. K. (1948). *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Navajivan Publishing House.
20. Gandhi, M. K. (1961). *Satyagraha in South Africa* (V. G. Desai, Trans.). Navajivan Publishing House.
21. Graham, E. (1999). *The Power of Autocracy: A Global Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
22. Haller, T., & Merten, S. (Eds.). (2019). *African Traditional Governance and the Role of Chiefs: Practices, Continuity, and Change*. Springer.
23. Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics* (3rd Ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
24. Ijomah, B. I. C. (1988). *Afrocracy: Basis for National Stability, Partyless Democracy: First Step Towards Evolving a Permanent Political System*. Benin City, Bendel State, Nigeria: Idodo Umeh Publishers Limited.
25. Kale, P. M. (1939). *A Brief History of the Bakweris*. The CMS Bookshop.
26. King, M. L. Jr. (1958). *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story*. Harper & Row Publishers.
27. King, M. L. Jr. (1963). *Letter from Birmingham Jail*. In *Why We Can't Wait*. Harper & Row.
28. King, M. L. Jr. (1964). *Why We Can't Wait*. New York: Harper & Row.
29. Lambi, C. M. (2012). *The Politics of Governance in Cameroon*. Cambridge University Press.
30. Lincoln, A. (1863). *Gettysburg Address*. Retrieved from https://www.archives.gov/exhibits/american_originals/gettysbg.html
31. Machiavelli, N. (2003). *The Prince* (G. Bull, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1513).
32. Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton University Press.
33. Mandela, N. (1994). *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Little, Brown and Company.
34. Mazadou, O. (2012). *La Question du Politique: Une perspective africaine* (PhD thesis). Université de Yaoundé I.
35. Mbeki, T. (2004). *Africa in the New Millennium: Towards a post-traditional renaissance*. University of South Africa Press.
36. Mbeki, T. (2004). *Africa: The Road to Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
37. Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
38. Mbembe, A. (2017). *Critique of Black reason*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
39. Mbiti, J. S. (1970). *African Religions and Philosophy*. Heinemann.
40. Nabudere, D. W. (2004). *Traditional and Modern Political Systems in Contemporary Governance in Africa*. *Journal of African Elections*, 3(1), 11-24.
41. Njoya, I. B. (1990). *Traditional governance and leadership among the Bamoun people of Cameroon*. Yaoundé: Editions CLE.
42. Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization*. Monthly Review Press.
43. Plato. (1979). *The Republic* (R. Larson, Trans.). Harlan Davidson, Inc.
44. Plato. (1992). *The Republic* (B. Jowett, Trans.). Dover Publications.
45. Plato. (1997). *The Complete Works of Plato* (J. M. Cooper & D. S. Hutchinson, Eds.). Hackett Publishing Company.
46. Ray, D. I. (2003). *Rural local governance and traditional leadership in Africa*. University of Calgary Press.
47. Riker, W. H. (1964). *Federalism: Origin, operation, significance*. Little, Brown.
48. Schmitt, C. (2007). *Constitutional Theory*. Duke University Press.
49. Senghor, L. S. (1964). *On African socialism*. Praeger.
50. Sharma, K. C. (2004). *Role of the Kgotla in Botswana's democratic system*. Gaborone: University of Botswana Press.
51. Soyinka, W. (1999). *The Burden of Memory, the Muse of Forgiveness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
52. Soyinka, W. (1999). *The Man Died: Prison Notes of Wole Soyinka*. Jonathan Cape.
53. Tangwa, G. B. (2009). *Bioethics in a Multicultural World*. Rodopi.

54. Tilly, C. (2007). *Democracy* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
55. Tutu, D. (2009). *No Future without Forgiveness*. Easton Press.
56. Wiredu, K. (1996). *Cultural Universals and Particulars: An African Perspective*. Indiana University Press.