

OCCASIONAL
PAPERS

Number 37

**BEYOND THE FRONTIERS
OF NATIONAL SECURITY**

Kofi Bentum Quantson

**THE INSTITUTE OF
ECONOMIC AFFAIRS
ACCRA, GHANA**

**IEA
GHANA**

The Institute of Economic Affairs

BEYOND THE FRONTIERS OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Kofi Bentum Quantson

A Publication of The Institute of Economic Affairs
Accra

The Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) Ghana was founded in October 1989 as an independent, non-government institution dedicated to the establishment and strengthening of a market economy and a democratic, free and open society. It considers improvements in the legal, social and political institutions as necessary conditions for a sustained economic growth and human development.

The IEA supports research, and promotes and publishes studies on important economic, socio-political and legal issues in order to enhance understanding of public policy.

Further information may be obtained from The Institute of Economic Affairs,
P.O. Box OS1936, Osu, Accra, Ghana.

Tel:+233-302- 244716 / 7010714

Fax:+233-302- 222313

Email: iea@ieagh.org / ieaghana@yahoo.com

ISBN: 988-584-84-9

ISSN: 0855-3238

© 2008 Copyright by Institute of Economic Affairs

Printed in Ghana. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be published, used or reproduced in any manner without written permission of the publisher except in the case of brief quotations in critical articles and reviews.

Publication of this work signifies that The Institute of Economic Affairs regards it as a competent treatment worthy of public consideration. The findings, interpretations and conclusions of this paper are entirely those of the author, and should not be attributed to the Institute of Economic Affairs or any organizations that support it.

PREFACE

In this paper Mr. Kofi Bentum Quantson points out that Security is a fundamental pre-requisite for the survival of humankind and should be regarded as the elixir that sustains the stability of society. Without that stabilizing factor, there can be no progress. In his view, any society that cannot develop and progress could stagnate into an awfully dangerous mess that could overtime, implode or explode. Interestingly however, the tendency persists in Ghana to take security for granted so long as things appear normal.

Mr. Quantson examines the importance of security to national well-being and survival, the various threats to national security, the factors that impinge on security intelligence, and the far-reaching effects of organized trans-national and global crime on the security of Ghana. He concludes by stressing that since security is a pre-requisite for the survival of a nation, it should be accorded the needed attention in a people-centred manner.

We hope you find this paper both interesting and informative.

Jean Mensa
Executive Director

SECURITY APPRECIATION

Defining security can be problematic because it is so inter-permeating and therefore so omnipresent that the better option is to appreciate and experience it. At the very basic level, security is invisible or unmanifest. It is only when it is violated that its inevitable destructive consequences are realized. Security is like the air we breathe. Air is invisible to the naked eye. We are confronted with its full reality only when it is transformed into winds, storms, hurricanes and tornadoes. Air is evidently as basic for life as security is basic for stability, development and progress. Furthermore, like security, air has no frontiers. Both are borderless.

The cardinal principle should be reiterated that security in any form, manifestation or dimension, whether global security, international security, national security, human security, food security, and even cosmic security should be appreciated and observed religiously as a way of life and an intimate companion. Security is a way of life. Being part and parcel of our lives, our reactions and responses to security ought to be either intuitive or instinctive because it is structured within us for the survival and preservation of the species in creation. That is the primordial principle in the creative process.

At the very irreducible minimum therefore, security should be identified with four basic concepts. They are: survival, safety, well-being and contentment. People have a need to survive. Having survived, they must be protected to be safe. Thereafter, all the multi-faceted issues that assure their well-being and ultimately contentment should be comprehensively and holistically addressed. Security essence should generate security consciousness, the vital ingredient in every security situation. It is important to contrast well-being with welfare in dealing with security appreciation. Well-being has a more comprehensive, holistic, continuous application whereas welfare may relate to specific with narrow scanning scope. Evidently, well-being should have a more

bonding relationship with human security. The analogy of a nation and a forest is apt here. A forest is basically a group of trees with the attendant fauna and flora. The healthier the individual trees, the lusher, more elegant and vital the whole forest will be. But if the individual trees are unhealthy, withered and wretched, so will the forest be.

It is the same with a nation, which is a collection of people with a common purpose in a geographical location. If the people, as individuals, are safe and secure, then the nation ought to be safe and secure. If the people are at peace with themselves and their environment, then the nation should enjoy appreciable peace and security. If the security needs of the people are not comprehensively and holistically addressed, national security will be at risk. The security needs of the people therefore ought to be identified with their well-being.

James Abram Garfield put it succinctly when he stated that, “*Territory is but the body of a nation, the people who inhabit its hills and valleys are its soul, its spirit, its life*”¹. The operative word here is people, the genesis of human security. Without human beings or people, there can be no nation. Human security and people security should be appreciated in the same way.

The preamble of the 1992 Constitution of the Republic of Ghana underscores the “people base” of governance and security. It states: “We the people of Ghana, in exercise of our natural and inalienable right to establish a framework of government which shall secure for ourselves and posterity the blessings of liberty, equality of opportunity and prosperity”

In the same vein, the preamble of the Constitution of the United States of America also focuses on “people content”. It states: “We the people of United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide the common defence, promote the

¹ The New Dictionary of Thoughts. Page 434. (Section No. 12).

general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.” Again, it is all about people.

But the principles of the Declaration of Independence of the USA are even more germane for the subject under review. The opening states: “We hold these truths to be self-evident”

The self- evident truths are:

“That all men are created equal.

That they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are LIFE, LIBERTY and the PURSUIT of HAPPINESS.

That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men.

Deriving their just powers from the consent of the people.

That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it...”

Prudence indeed dictates that governments long established should not be changed for transient reasons. This tenet encapsulates the current appreciation of national security as the quality survival, safety, well-being and ultimately the contentment of the people. Clearly then, the nexus between the security of the people, human security and the security of the nation or national security ought to be logical, indeed natural and therefore automatic because they are all part of each other and therefore of the whole. It is an interlacing, inter-permeating and omnipresent equation.

National Security should therefore be appreciated as the totality of all the factors affecting or influencing the decent survival, safety, well-being and ultimately the contentment of the people. This means that national

security policies should be people-centred or people-sensitive. Consequently, any national security system that is not people-centred is flawed and should be scrapped or re-tooled. The reason should be obvious. It is for the sake of the human beings of the nation that national security arrangements are instituted. So of what use is the national security system if it does not have human security as its core pre-occupation?

Well-being and National Security:

References have been made above to the distinction between welfare and well-being with indication that well-being has a more elastic dimension and indeed a more penetrating correlation. It is this aspect that underscores the pre-eminence of human security in the broad spectrum of security – be it personal, organizational, institutional, national – all the way to international and global security. Human security should therefore remain the pivotal aspect of national security for as long as people, that is, human beings, continue to inhabit geographically demarcated areas that are called a nation. This fact should be comprehensively understood. It is only in the overall appreciation of national security that the objectives of human security can be achieved. The reason should be clear. Human security is not and cannot be an autonomous self-referral entity floating in the universe. It is part of and dependent upon the other factors in the entire security matrix.

Indeed, it is only in this holistic context that talking about human rights and civil liberties makes sense. Practically speaking, of what use are human rights and civil liberties if a person has to battle poverty as a daily ritual? Or, if a person has no decent affordable roof over his/her head? Or, if the majority of the people face the dilemma of dimensional insecurity? That certainly creates a huge crisis of national in-security that subverts stability, development and progress.

If without controversy, security is at the base of survival, safety, well-being and contentment, then why is it that in many countries, particularly

developing and autocratic or totalitarian states, and even in some developed countries, “security” is not a welcome guest especially where the expression “for security reasons” is so skewed and twisted to fit into scenarios that must not fall into the security classification at all. It is worse when and where people regard security rhetoric as a sinister violation of their human rights and civil liberties for parochial political objectives.

One main reason is that there is the unfortunate tendency, contrived or inadvertent, for many people to confuse national security with regime security. There is a clear difference. As has been explained above, national security is about survival, safety and well-being of the people in its wholesomeness and totality. It has also been stated above that security policies ought to be people-centred. That obviously contrasts with regime security which tends to tilt towards the survival of the regime in power and its officialdom. In practice, regimes regard their survival as the prime objective to the likely disadvantage of the overall interest of the nation.

The situation can be exacerbated when the national interest and the regime interest come into conflict. When that happens, the temptation for political parochialism and the Machiavellian politics of expediency that thrives on the-end-justifies-the-means to over-ride good governance can be irresistible. The invidious operational excesses and abuses can lead to a bastardization of the security system. That situation provides the breeding grounds for impunity, intolerance, arrogance and the panicky suppression of genuine dissent. There is no need stressing how these tendencies can create the security irritants that cumulatively jeopardize human security, thereby undermining the well-being of the people.

The National Interest and National Assets:

This paper introduces the term national interest into the security scenario. There is the crucial need to appreciate that between human security and national security is the omnibus factor of the national

interest. Without that, the nation remains purposeless, even rudderless.

Every nation worth its name must have a national interest. Only failed states have none. It is the identification, recognition, preservation and defence of the national interest that demarcates clearly between national security and regime security. It is important to fully understand whether as a paradox or an enigma, that it is the constitutional responsibility of the regime in power to ensure that the objectives of national security are achieved. If it cannot, then the regime itself ought to be classified as a security risk. The security implications of such a scenario are very grave. In the past, there have been problems because governments have failed to isolate their regime interest from the national interest.

The national interest may best be appreciated as not only the totality of factors that give identity as a nation but also interlaced with all that is required to sustain its people. The continued survival, safety, well-being and contentment of the people depend on this condition. It comprises the people – the critical human resource of the nation, the forests, mineral and marine resources, the ecological resources, and the cultural and indeed the spiritual resources. The totality of these resources constitutes the national assets on which the well-being of a nation depends.

It should be stressed that economic instability can be a constant threat to developing nations, especially those with fragile dependent economies. The twinning relationship between national security, national interests and national assets should be recognized. Any vandalization of the nation's assets should constitute a danger to its well-being.

When the former United States Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, made that famous statement that “America has no permanent friends; it has permanent interests,” he was expounding a profound politico-security reality. Events worldwide confirm that America will go to any obsessive lengths to protect her national interests. Of course, that obsession has created global problems with serious security

repercussions on the human security of other nations. Yet, that is what America considers as the motivating factor for patriotism. It is also recalled that on a visit to Libya in September of 2008, US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice reinforced the Kissinger dictum by her declaration that, “America has no permanent enemies.” At the time, America's geopolitical interests dictated that Libya, once classified as a pariah state and categorized as a sponsor of global terrorism, be positively rehabilitated.

This underscores that pivotal role the national interest plays in determining the national security agenda. The fact should be emphasized that the bonding relationship between the national interest and national security should be kept in active focus. Appreciating national security threats should be done within the strict boundaries of the national interest. It means, in effect, that anybody who or anything which undermines the national interest should constitute a national security risk because that affects the foundation of a nation's survival. It is important therefore that the regime in power stays actively committed to the protection of the national interest from internal and external threats.

In detailed operation, it means that at the political level, any government which does not protect the national interest and the national assets subverts the security of the people in terms of their quality survival, safety and well-being. Similarly, any political leadership that sacrifices or compromises the national interest by pandering or kowtowing to any foreign leaders, governments and institutions to the detriment of the nation could be courting treason. There should therefore be no dichotomy between the nation's domestic policies and its foreign policy. Foreign policy should be the natural extension of the domestic policy in the realization of the nation's strategic interest.

SECURITY THREATS

One of the worrisome things about globalization is that a nation's security can be affected by external factors, some totally outside its control. The following is a review of some of the issues that can, in context, threaten Ghana's national security from both internal and external sources.

- i. The inability of states, the traditional custodians of authority, to provide security for themselves and the people. That is a major problem because then the state itself becomes a big source of insecurity.
- ii. The threat posed by failing or failed states along the borders of neighbouring countries.
- iii. The failure of security service institutions to achieve the objectives of protecting the nation and her people for reasons that include disloyalty, incompetence, incapacitation and corruption.
- iv. The failure of politicians to be guided by the national interest in addressing national issues.
- v. The harsh corroding impact of globalization on the well-being of the people.
- vi. The slavish application of economic policies that are manifestly ineffective or have actually failed.
- vii. Ethnic or tribal tensions that can explode into armed conflicts.
- viii. Inter-party and intra-party political rancour that can generate tensions and violence.
- ix. The strangulating conditionalities imposed by foreign financial bodies and institutions.

- x. The African version of what former US President Eisenhower referred to as the “military-industrial complex” that thrives on wars and global hostilities. Ghana now has the “security-industrial complex” where “security” has become the sponsor of a multi-million dollar lucrative enterprise for warmongers, arms dealers, drug dealers and money launderers, among others.
- xi. Narco-Dollars “Monecracy” undermines the whole democratic process.
- xii. Crime from national, cross-border, trans-national and global sources.
- xiii. Corruption that frustrates good governance, probity and accountability.
- xiv. Bad governance that spawns impunity, intolerance, arrogance and perfidy.

From the foregoing, human security has been positioned as the primordial requirement in every security appreciation because that vividly assures the existence of “people-centeredness” in security. One can therefore agree with that principle captured in two African Union documents – the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-operation in Africa (CSSCA) and the Common Africa Defence and Security Policy (CADSP). It states: *“The concept of security must be seen in its wholesomeness and totality. It must be taken beyond the traditional definition which is largely military consideration. The security of each country and of the continent must be taken to include the security of the people to live in peace with access to basic necessities of life, fully participating in the affairs of their society, freely and exercising their fundamental human rights.”*²

² Quoted in background paper for discussion by Professor Eboe Hutchful at the Conference on National Security at the Accra International Conference Centre, October 4-7th, 2005.

The problem, however, is the recommendation that human security should form the basis of a new security doctrine. It should not be a new doctrine at all. Human security is a natural survival imperative structured within us for the preservation of human-kind and all that human-kind requires for quality survival, safety and well-being. The trouble is that over the years, politicians and the military in some countries have, in the pursuit of power, relegated human security to the background. One tactic has been to sacrifice the national security interest for regime security interest, in which case, the interest and safety of the government in power can become a pathological obsession to the possible doom of human security. There is no doubt that the “old” definition which appreciated “security” largely in terms of the threats posed by the military blinded African leaders for a long time. Inevitably, security appreciation was influenced by the coup-phobia mentality.

In this country, that problem did persist so governments went the extra mile to ensure that the military were held in tight control or made comfortable so that they would not nurse disaffection against the government. Since independence, the country has experienced five encounters with the military. The first was in 1958, barely a year after independence, when the word “coup” entered the political lexicon. The brief facts are these. Following intelligence reports that some elements in the opposition parties were plotting to overthrow Dr. Kwame Nkrumah's CPP government and assassinate him, a Commission of Enquiry was constituted, comprising three eminent personalities and chaired by Justice Gilbert Granville Sharp, Q.C., an Appeals Court Judge. Other members were Nana Sir Tsibu Darku II, Omanhene of the Assin Attandansu Traditional Area, who had at some point in time, served in the Governor's Colonial Executive Council, Mr. Justice M. A. Charles, a member of the Commonwealth Overseas Legal Service, who was then serving as a Senior Magistrate. These eminent persons could not have been Nkrumah enthusiasts. They were part of the colonial system. This is a point of illuminating political significance in appreciating the credibility of the Commission's report.

The unanimous decision of the Commission was that Messers R.R. Amponsah and M. K. Apaloo, key members of the opposition, were indeed involved in subversive conspiracies since June 1958 “*with the objective of carrying out at some future date in Ghana an act for unlawful purpose, revolutionary in character.*”³ In furtherance of that subversive purpose, they had procured military accoutrements, stored in the Republic of Togo.

From the national security standpoint, two things are significant. First, it signified the first conspiracy between the military and politicians to overthrow a constitutionally elected government. Secondly, 1958 was just a year into independence, so what was the national justification for that coup plot? That certainly introduced a dangerous dimension into the security equation because in later years, sinister parochial political interests subverted national stability and cohesion. Since then, there have been five different military incursions into the nation's politics with various motivations, objectives and consequences. Whether the objectives and ultimately the results were in the national interest should be the major talking point in our effort to establish a sustainable democratic governance.

Two conclusions should be noted. First, as an institution, the Ghana Armed Forces has not on its own ever staged coups. Rather, in Ghana's history with coups d'etat, it is sections of the Armed Forces which initiated military action and then cajoled or bullied the military establishment to support them.

Tribal Cleavages:

The coup of 1966 was staged by then Col. E. K. Kotoka and his men, who diverted their training programme from Ashanti to Accra to overthrow Dr. Nkrumah's CPP government. There was some resistance from units of the President's Own Guard based at the Flagstaff House, the residence and office of the then President but they were overcome by the invading forces. The point to emphasize is this: As an institution, the military did

³ Omari, T. Peter. (2006). Kwame Nkrumah. (Millennium Edition). Published by Sankofa Educational Publishers Ltd., Accra. Pages 137-139.

not counter the coup. Pertinent questions were therefore raised as to their loyalty and competence.

The next significant coup attempt was in 1967 when a young officer, Lt. S. B. Arthur and some 120 officers and men from their base at Ho in the Volta Region came to stage a coup in Accra, where the military is headquartered. That coup had interesting aspects. Although the coup failed to sustain, it is important to recognize that the invading troops captured all their strategic objectives – the Flagstaff House, the Castle, Broadcasting House and the Airport. Again, like the coup of 1966, the military establishment did not suppress the 1967 coup. At the Castle, the seat of Government, the Chairman of the ruling National Liberation Council (NLC) was chased into the Atlantic Ocean, from where he swam to safety. For reasons outside the scope of this work, the coup attempt literally fizzled out. The military command became disorganized. A number of reasons too detailed for this paper accounted for that. One thing however appeared certain. If the coup had succeeded, there was no doubt whatsoever that the military command would have pledged support. That was worrisome. It was the second time the military had failed to defend the Constitution and their own Commander-in-Chief.

One striking consequence of that coup was the unfortunate tribal cleavages it exacerbated. The young officers who led the coup – Lt. Arthur, Lt. Yeboah and Lt. Osei Poku – were Akans. Significantly, the chief casualties – Lt. General Kotoka, Captain Avevor and Captain Borkloe – were Ewes. Then in another compounding twist, the officer who announced the failure of the coup, Captain Sowu is also an Ewe. Was this tribal dimension calculated, incidental or accidental? At the time, the issue of incipient tribalism came to security notice and the ruling NLC was briefed. Although there was no concrete evidence that the abortive coup of April 17 was tribally motivated, the scenario described above did fuel tribal tensions which were fast becoming a security headache for the NLC; which basking in the success of overthrowing Nkrumah, ignored the warning.

Then there was the coup, staged by then Lt. Col. I.K. Acheampong, which brought into power the National Redemption Council government (NRC). Again and again, these coups were not staged by the military authority but by a section of the military. The recurring disturbing trend was that the Ghana Armed Forces did not or could not stop the coup. As in previous situations, the Armed Forces ritualistically supported it. This important fact needs to be kept constantly in view. Prime Minister K. A. Busia was briefed about activities of Col. Acheampong, which suggested that he was up to something subversive. Surprisingly, Dr. Busia treated that report in a strangely subjective way. He could not believe that an Akan officer could overthrow his government, perceived to have big support from Akans. No wonder he was shocked when the reality of the coup hit him.

The other military incursion worth considering was the June 4, 1979 revolt that resulted in the establishment of the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) under Ft. Lt. Jerry John Rawlings. The distinctive feature of this military incursion is that it was fundamentally a revolt by some junior officers and other ranks against a military that had mortgaged its honour and integrity to greed, moral decay and institutional malfeasance. The ruling Supreme Military Council was briefed by the Intelligence Community, but they played the deaf and blind game. Typically, the Ghana Armed Forces could not quell the revolt. They could not, in the main, because the very military personnel they could deploy were essentially those in arms against them. Major-General N.A. Odartey-Wellington, the then Army Commander made a heroic attempt to do that but it was a futile effort. The reason should be obvious. Nevertheless, his was a commendable action by an officer determined to live by his military oath of loyalty. Many others evidently chickened into cowardly hiding.

Then there was the military action on December 31, 1981 again, by Ft. Lt. J.J. Rawlings, whose AFRC had peacefully handed over power to the government of Dr. Hilla Limann's People's National Party (PNP). This coup exposed the total impotence and incompetence of the entire Ghana

Armed Forces. Ft. Lt. Rawlings had been retired from the military in 1979 by the government of President Limann. How and why a retired middle level officer with just a handful of soldiers could overthrow the constitutionally elected government would remain an enigma that borders on the mysterious. Again, typically, the Ghana Armed Forces did nothing effective. Instead, as ritualistically as before, the military institution pledged and supported the new government of the Provisional National Defence Council (PNDC).

The great security talking point has been: Of what use then is the Ghana Armed Forces if it is not capable of defending the Constitution and protect the people? Indeed, but for peace-keeping operations, what essentially would the Armed Forces be doing? This is against the backdrop that there is no way the nation is ever going to wage any successful war should the need ever arise. Our neighbours – La Cote d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso and Togo – are all Francophone states with defence arrangements with France. In any armed hostilities, they would most certainly receive support from their former colonial master. How would Ghana fare? So where-in lies the wisdom in a large Armed Forces anyway especially where it becomes the source of political instability?

During the rule of Dr. Busia's Progress Party government, the issue of the proper role of the Armed Forces in a developing country engaged his attention and he was consolidating views on how to make the Armed Forces an integral part of the national developmental strategy, especially in the areas of infrastructure and agriculture. This proposition would of course entail a drastic restructuring of the forces to make them internally productive.

Although not clearly articulated, it came to security notice that the hierarchy of the military did not smile at these developments. Indeed, there were some indicators that this was one of the reasons why the military pledged their full joyful support for the overthrow of the Busia regime by Col I. K. Acheampong because that meant keeping the status quo undisturbed. It is recalled that in his coup broadcast, Acheampong

did lament that “even the small amenities they were enjoying had been taken away from them.”

It is a fact that many knowledgeable people have observed that there is the need to do some active thinking on the future of the Ghana Armed Forces against the backdrop of modern developments. It has been emphasized that there is a continuous war to be waged on crime in all its aspects. Furthermore, there is a war to be fought against ignorance, diseases and poverty. Can our forces be re-oriented to become active partners in this war? This question keeps resurfacing: But for peace-keeping operations, what productive activities would the Ghana Armed Forces be occupied with?

In this respect, it is crucial that the coup mentality is exorcised. We are striving to establish a democracy that should make the quality survival, safety, well-being and the contentment of the people the inflexible objective. If good governance, probity, accountability and transparency are made the pillars of our political system, and if negative traits like corruption, impunity, intolerance, arrogance and rancour are interdicted, there should be no cause or space for any unwarranted military adventurism into our politics. Whether as a nation we can achieve these objectives would determine the success to keeping the military out of politics. But if they stay out of politics and the political and economic rot predominates, then, we must brace ourselves for a people's revolt. These are times when the people would not like to be fooled by a greedy and corrupt political system.

Civil/Political Instigators of Coups D'Etat:

The following need to be stressed with regard to coup d'etats in Ghana. First, all the coups and attempted coups by the military have political components in the civil population. Political parties and politicians have played significant subversive roles in instigating military action. Except for the June 4, 1979 uprising, which was essentially a revolt, all the others have firm political roots. The 1966 coup had a strong connection with the opposition United Party of Dr. Busia and his local political allies and

foreign sponsors. This is evidenced by their robust influence over the National Liberation Council (NLC) which succeeded the toppled Nkrumah government.

Mr. Dan Lartey of “Domestication” fame and founder of the Great Consolidated People's Party (GCPP) asserted that he financed Col. Acheampong's coup.⁴ Actually, after the coup, the politicians who immediately occupied key positions at the Castle had strong Convention People's Party (CPP) credentials. One such person was Mr. Kofi Badu, a strong Nkrumahist and one time Editor of the Party Press national daily, *The Ghanaian Times*. He later established the *Spokesman*, a newspaper which he used effectively to hound Dr. Busia out of office. A fortnight or so before the coup d'etat, the headline of an article which boldly exclaimed, “*GO BUSIA, GO*”, tactically heralded the exit of the Busia government.

It is instructive to observe that reasons, real or ostensible, for the coups reflect the socio-political problems confronting the country. They include corruption, maladministration, abuse and capricious use of power, tribalism, and nepotism, looting of national resources, impunity, arrogance and intolerance.

In Ghana's determination to keep the military out of politics, one must ensure that these negative and subversive tendencies do not create the conditions that can be exploited by scheming politicians. Lord Palmerston's dictum, popularized by US President John Kennedy, should be recalled. “*If you make a peaceful change impossible you make a violent one inevitable.*”⁵

Linked to this dictum is the unrealistic posture that democracy is all about free, fair and transparent elections. This is a tranquilizing illusion. Evidently, people's faith in elections per se as an end appears to be misplaced. If there are no solid institutional mechanisms to ensure that the President performs in accordance with the national interest as

⁴ He made this disclosure to the author during a private conversation.

⁵ Kennedy made this reference in ex-tempore speech.

opposed to personalized political agenda, then an election is meaningless.

Additionally, if parliamentarians do not honestly and effectively represent the people's interest, then Parliament itself becomes a cumbersome institutional baggage that must not be shouldered indefinitely. This is especially so where it is unceasingly perceived as a brotherhood of politicians more concerned with benefits and privileges, or bonded appendages of the Executive. Crucially, if the Judiciary becomes riddled with corruption and becomes a tool or victim of political manipulation, then definitely elections become a deceptive smokescreen for acts that undermine the national interest. Such a situation cannot be endured endlessly, considering the heightening political consciousness of the people.

INTELLIGENCE CAPACITY

The following section examines the fundamental requirement that is crucial in any discussion of security. It is the intelligence that can be distilled into knowledge that can be further fine-tuned into wisdom to be utilized to achieve two main objectives. First, intelligence provides the mechanism for advance warning to enable pre-emptive and other measures for the maintenance of law and order to be taken. In some scenarios, good intelligence is indispensable for the preparation for, and management of conflicts and disasters. That, of course, is the traditional utilization of intelligence. The other objective is even more important. It provides the tools for the accountable and efficient functioning of governance in order to ensure that the decent survival, safety and well-being of the people are kept under constant surveillance. Intelligence is the lubricant that services the entire security apparatus.

Intelligence is not the monopoly of the security system. As the integral component of the security of the nation and its people, intelligence should be part of our daily lives. Life in the modern world is knowledge-based. There is hardly any area of human activity that can succeed in ignorance. The old adage that ignorance is a curse is still fresh. Indeed, intelligence is so crucial that even business enterprises and corporate bodies would go further, in some cases murkily, to seek information on their competitors, hence the professional expression – “industrial espionage”.

It is imperative therefore that all the institutions and organizations established as security service providers should develop that capacity for professionally collecting data. Furthermore, they should have the skills to transform the data into information and to further distil the information into intelligence which will then in turn be processed into knowledge. Without that capacity, the security apparatus could drift as a rudderless anchorless ship, thereby getting itself entangled in all sorts of abuses and excesses as well as useless operations.

This need for information introduces a very vital element in the provision of human security within the national security agenda. This is in reference to the committed involvement of the people in the information collection efforts since they constitute the bloc human assets in the overall effectiveness of the national security strategy. Significant sections of the public respond to this need. But for that, very dangerous security situations would have arisen due to lack of actionable intelligence.

Bogus Information:

However, there is a destructive aspect that must be recognized because that can afflict innocent people, thereby jeopardizing their human security. This has to do with the activities of some characters categorized professionally as intelligence fabricators and peddlers. In simple terms, they are *bogus informants*. The people who service the security/intelligence system may be called informers, informants and higher in the scale, agents. Some provide information for patriotic reasons. These are decent people who desire to assist in the protection of the nation and the people. Their invaluable assistance is highly commendable. The nation needs them.

However, there are those who do so for financial or material rewards. If they perform honestly, they could be very useful assets. It is when they become crooked that problems are created. Instead of supplying true information, they may fabricate, cookup or distort information. Especially, where besides the rewards they expect, they deliberately mislead the security system into settling personal scores against people with whom they have problems. This category of bogus informant are the most odious vermin that inhabit planet Earth. They cause so much damage to innocent people especially in situations where reports made are not properly investigated before action is taken or when the investigative system is bogus.

In the book, *Bogus Informants: Nation Wreckers*, it is stated that: *“In my experience some of them start their evil trade targeting political*

opponents, personal adversaries, or business rivals, etc. In time, they begin to target persons in political or official positions for really no sensible national purpose. That can be extremely dangerous and totally destructive because the smart ones succeed in getting quite close to the inner circles of the political system. Some may get quite close to the Head of State and may probably secure his trust and confidence; particularly where the fabricator becomes the guy who handles the President's below-the-table financial and business interest and other less honourable amorous escapade.”⁶

Indeed, uncontrolled, bogus informants/intelligence fabricators and peddlers, have the potential to distort the true security situation on the ground. When and where governments become unpopular for various reasons, they develop the negative tendency for wanting to hear only what they consider palatable. They develop the “see no evil, hear no evil” syndrome. They would consider any critical views, no matter how genuine, as the product of opponents. Bogus informants can easily identify this weakness and feed it by flooding the system with rosy but untrue reports which the government might readily accept.

Cases exist in which a government would want to believe the reports from intelligence fabricators and bogus informants more than the professionally analyzed reports of the established security/intelligence agencies. When that happens, it poses a serious risk to national security because then, the government becomes disconnected from the realities of the nation's situation.

The Mass Media:

No meaningful discussion can be made on bogus informants without mentioning the role of the media in the democratic development and the national security equation because they can impact negatively. All throughout the nation's history, the positive constructive role of the media can be chronicled and hailed. But there have also been regrettable situations when sections of the media have performed perfidiously and

⁶ Quantson, K.B. (2004). Bogus Informants: Nation Wreckers. Published by NAPASUIL Ventures, Accra. Page iv.

subversively in response to the proddings and enticements of vested economic and political interests that crudely collide with the national interest. This situation presents a serious security problem considering the propagandist potency of the strategies and the unfortunate gullibility of media consumers.

In National Security: The Dilemma, it is observed that: *“The Press with their unprincipled and unscrupulous performance, of course, impacts very adversely on the nation's political, economic and social life for the way national issues are distorted. That is extremely dangerous because firstly, it prevents a clear appreciation of the performance of governments and the responses of the people. Secondly, it encourages reckless attacks on innocent persons and institutions because, in their twisted view, they consider them as enemies. This has the tendency to harden the political divide, thereby undermining genuine attempts at national reconciliation. Thirdly, and even more sinister, it promotes the culture of blackmail, extortion, corruption, arrogance, impunity and what has been described as 'media terrorism.'”*⁷

Further, Quantson (2004) observed that bogus informants is a phenomenon that subverts the sanctity of press freedom and a huge threat to our evolving democratic system.⁸ Indeed, there are occasions when one should wonder whether the accolade of the press as the purported “Fourth Estate of the Realm” has any current justification in this country. If you have a situation where powerful or vicious economic and political interests can exploit the poverty, inflate the ego, manipulate the vanity, pamper the cheapness, massage the ignorance or the illiteracy of some media people to wage vicious public relations campaigns against their adversaries and opponents, then wherein lies the integrity of the Fourth Estate? It becomes a sham and a classic case of perfidy and perdition at its apogee. The people-centeredness of any security strategy should therefore manifest in the motivated commitment of the people for their human security, by continuously assessing the security threats that confront them.

⁷ Quantson, K.B. (2006). Ghana National Security. Published by NAPSUIL Ventures. Accra. Page 145.

⁸ Ibid

CRIME

Crime is the most virulent danger that ought to be addressed. Contextually therefore, crime should be considered not as a mere violation of law. It should be appreciated in terms of the overall national security estimates, because crime has become a major security problem worldwide. It has become organized, syndicated, sophisticated, cross-border, trans-national and global.

The two instructive observations made by Professor Louise Shelly of the American University Centre for Trans-national Crime and Corruption, Washington D.C. should be noted. They are:

- Crime will proliferate in the next century (21st) because crime groups are the major beneficiaries of globalization.
- No area of international affairs will remain untouched as political and economic systems and the social fabric of many countries will deteriorate under the increasing financial power of international organized crime.

Crime is the most dangerous threat to national security and gets in the way of success in establishing a sustainable democratic system of governance that should render the pathological obsession with military coups needless. The following are examples of crimes:

- i. Armed robberies and other violent crimes that not only deprive people of their property, but also, even more dangerously, terrorize and traumatize them.
- ii. Terrorism: The war on “terror” and its global consequences on human security.
- iii. Drug dealing.
- iv. Gun running.

- v. Money laundering.
- vi. Currency counterfeiting and trafficking.
- vii. Cyber crimes.
- viii. Economic and financial crimes that chew at the underbelly of the economic stability of the nation.

Regarding economic and financial crimes there should be a clear understanding that in developing countries with fragile, even debilitating economies, these crimes constitute a huge threat to the well-being of the people. The cumulative effect of the crimes listed above should underscore the nexus between crime and security. It is unfortunate that this obvious fact has not been seriously appreciated, hence the lack of sustained attention accorded.

There has been a rather regrettable reason for this situation. Basically, crime, as a national security issue has not been properly understood over the years. Consequently, resources required to combat the problem aggressively on a sustained basis have been skimpy. For instance, during the rule of General I. K. Acheampong of the National Redemption Council (NRC), at the time when the Police needed simple enforcement resources like finger print slabs, ink, handcuffs, stationery and vehicles for patrols, the government, claiming there was no money, considered it wise enough to order amphibious armoured vehicles to equip the Armoured Car Squadron of the Ghana Police Service so that they could counter any military threat to overthrow the government.

That was a bizarre situation. First, the NRC was for all practical purposes a military regime and the military should have been able to protect its own baby. Second, of what use were amphibious armoured vehicles? What rivers were they going to cross to discharge their functions? Third, it was a strategic absurdity that the Ghana Police could confront the Military in any encounter where the Military was really serious about

overthrowing the government. That was a reckless case of regime security versus national security. The national security need was for the police to be adequately resourced in order to efficiently perform its duties in protecting the people from criminals and criminalities that threaten their quality survival, safety and well-being. This seriously conflicted with regime security needs of protecting the NRC and its officialdom. In plain terms, the regime considered its security to be of more importance than the security needs of the nation as a whole.

If one does not appreciate the implications of the crime problem on the safety of the people, a ready and effective response will not be provided. That situation will be unfortunate because it will represent either a flawed intelligence appreciation or a stubborn refusal by the authorities to respect intelligence estimates. If it is the case of flawed intelligence, then the probability is that the intelligence system itself is flawed. A flawed intelligence system is a major threat to human security and by extension, national security because the security-intelligence mechanism is incapable of presenting reliable intelligence to the authorities. On the other hand, credible intelligence presented to the authorities may be ignored or subjectively appreciated, creating a dangerous scenario with serious security consequences. Over the years, the nation has suffered calamities because of this situation.

Dr. Kwame Nkrumah was advised against embarking on the fateful trip to Hanoi, North Vietnam because there were strong indications that security was likely to be seriously breached in his absence. He did not heed the advice. He was overthrown before he reached his destination. The successor, the NLC government, was warned of the security consequences of the burgeoning tribalism splitting the nation. They ignored that and typically elected to rely upon cooked up information from their own bogus informants. The result was the abortive coup of April 1967 in which Col. E.K. Kotoka, the officer who led the coup against Dr. Nkrumah's government, was killed. Similarly, Dr. Kofi Abrefa Busia was advised about the subversive activities of then Lt. Col. I.K. Acheampong, who eventually overthrew his government.

Dr. Busia's was a tragic case because he had no sound reason for ignoring the intelligence reports. The facts were luminous. Without a doubt, our leaders have still a long way to go in the objective appreciation and proper utilization of professionally sourced intelligence.

Drug Abuse and Trafficking:

In dealing with drug abuse, it is pertinent to ponder upon the view of Perez de Cuellar, former Secretary-General of the United Nations and the incisive author Reisslaer Lee III. At the Special Session of the United Nations held in April 1990 which addressed the growing global problem of drug abuse and illicit trafficking, Perez de Cuellar made this statement: *“We are assembled here today in response to the threat posed by drug abuse. Let us not underestimate this threat. We are talking about personal tragedy, severe damage to health, the destruction of society, economic breakdown, the undermining of democratic institutions, corruption, violence and death. Let us resolve that at this special session of the General Assembly, words lead to action and that action leads to success. Drug abuse is a time bomb ticking away in the heart of civilization. We must now find measures to deal with it before it explodes and destroys us.”*⁹

Rensselaer Lee III, a brilliant expert on the cocaine industry in South America stated in his highly rated book, *The White Labyrinth: Cocaine and Political Power*, *“...however, when a criminal organization as large as the cocaine industry searches for protection, corruption is spawned on a massive and unprecedented scale. Cocaine traffickers have bought into the political system and can successfully manipulate key institutions the press, police, military, and judiciary.”*¹⁰

Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar's pronouncement is so profound and so holistic that it needs no comments. Likewise, Reisslaer Lee's statement is so explicit that it will be superfluous to offer any comment except to say that it demonstrates the huge threat posed by drugs to good

⁹ U.N Report on the Special Assembly Session on Drugs. (1990). United Nation's Publication

¹⁰Rensselaer N. Lee III, (1989). *The White Labyrinth: Cocaine and Political Power*. Page 9. Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick (USA) & London (UK).

governance and human security. Indeed, if drug traffickers can successfully manipulate crucial pillars of a democratic system – press, police, military and judiciary – then the whole process will be reduced to a useless farce at the mercy of criminals. They will rule the country, using politicians as compromised pawns more concerned with protecting the interest of their criminal masters who finance their political campaigns and other expenses, than the national interest. It is a simple case of he who pays the piper calling the tune.

It needs to be repeated that when the national interest is sold out, national security itself stands the risk of disintegrating into impotence. That can be a tragic situation because if in the long run the people realize that politicians have deceived, betrayed and fooled them, they will react at the opportune time because you cannot fool all the people all the time. It is the question of time and opportunity, and the manner of their reaction. Would it be a peaceful or a violent reaction? Circumstances will dictate.

It is relevant to recall the cocaine scandals that rocked the nation a few years ago. Botched security operations on the high seas to arrest drug-carrying vessels, the disappearance of the infamous 77 parcels of cocaine, the vanishing of drug exhibits from the reportedly well-guarded (physical police guards and close circuit television) police exhibit store, the substitution of cocaine with *Kokonte*, and so on would feed into the situation described by Reisslaer Lee in the White Labyrinth: Cocaine and Political Power.¹¹

¹¹ Ibid

BASIC CONCLUSIONS

The following section presents some conclusions that should place the foregoing discussions into sharp relief and enhance the appreciation of the problems:

- i. Security in any form, at any level or dimension remains a non-negotiable fundamental pre-requisite for the quality survival, safety and protection, well-being and contentment of the nation and its people. Security has to be appreciated religiously as a way of life because it is integral to life. Our Creator structured security consciousness for the preservation of the species in creation. So humans toy with security at their own peril.
- ii. This means that people, institutions, organizations, governments and nations can remain stable and safe only if they recognize this basic fact because it is this conclusion that should create the congenial environment for development and progress so the people's continued survival, safety and well-being can be provided and guaranteed.
- iii. That being the case, human beings, that is, people, and all that they require for their well-being, should be the focal point for every security strategy. It is the constitutional responsibility of the government in power to ensure that this objective is achieved. If it cannot then it becomes a national security risk.
- iv. This should underscore the imperative need to abandon the obsolete and restrictive appreciation of security from the purely militaristic standpoint. The concept of security must be appreciated in its “wholesomeness and totality.”

- v. That should underpin the absolute necessity to draw a keen difference between regime security and national security so that regime security objectives are not camouflaged as national security to the detriment of the people's interest.
- vi. That in appreciation of national security objectives, the national interest should be the sole determinant. This should be non-negotiable. This means that anybody who or anything which undermines the national interest should constitute a national security risk and should be dealt with as such.
- vii. The national interest and the nation's assets should be properly aligned so that those who loot or dissipate them are dealt with as economic saboteurs and nation-wreckers.
- viii. The institutions and organizations established to deliver security service to the people should be made to perform with clear assessment benchmarks. There can be serious consequences of disloyalty, incompetence and abuse if the accountability mechanisms in place are not enforced because then the people will be the victims of an incompetent and flawed system.
- ix. That oversight bodies should be held accountable for poor service delivery. That should be the way to assure probity, accountability and transparency.
- x. That civil population should recognize their huge potential and assert their commitment in ensuring that the arms of government – the Executive, Legislative and Judiciary – perform in the national interest. That way, national security can best perform its delicate and

diversified functions.

- xi. That the people themselves should be effectively sensitized so that they do not countenance acts of commission or omission that compromise or endanger their own security.

It is important to recognize, however, that after all said and done, national security, human security, social security, food security, ecological security and cosmic security, among others, should be seen as the means and not as an end in themselves. That end should be peace and stability to provide a conducive environment in which development and progress can occur. If that end is not achieved for whatever reason, then the whole security apparatus becomes useless and should be re-tooled. It is the bounden duty of civil population to demand that and hold the government to account. A useless security apparatus is a national calamity.

But civil population cannot perform this function effectively if opinion leaders and vocal identifiable groups and institutions are corrupted, compromised and weakened to be manipulated by the political machinery to sacrifice the interest of the people. This can be a dangerous situation because over time the people will wake up and reassert themselves peacefully or violently, if need be because you cannot fool all the people all the time.

Politicians and National Security:

Very pertinently, there is another crucial issue that ought to be factored into the security equation. It is justice. A just society has strong security stabilizers. There can be the best of constitutions and/or the best of security policies and structures. However, if the end product does not assure justice for all, national inevitably, insecurity will spring up and thrive to the detriment of human security.

There can be no peace and stability when there is no manifest justice

especially where there are suspicions, perceptions, or the reality that the injustice being inflicted has vindictive political colouration. Therefore security without justice itself can breed national insecurity. That is the security logic. It has to be recognized that at the basic level, politics is all about not only the acquisition of power, but even more importantly, how that power is exercised. That is the great security talking point. If that power does not assure justice for all because it is used capriciously or whimsically, there is bound to be reaction that generates security tensions and the consequential actions and reactions in the interplay of power and politics. In all these, our politicians remain the key actors for better or for worse. The honesty, integrity, sincerity and selflessness they manifest can influence the national efforts towards peace and security.

On their current dispositions, it is doubtful whether politicians in Ghana have fully comprehended the enormity of their responsibility. Significant sections of the society have rightly argued that many politicians have not, otherwise they would not be fouling the security environment by acts of corruption, plain thievery, intolerance, impunity, arrogance, greed and selfishness. The situation might translate into seeing themselves as categorized plastic professional politicians out there to hawk their political talents for maximum personal or parochial gains. In which case they stand disconnected from the national interest, thereby becoming potential security risks, especially where the pursuit of their personal interest collides with the national interest. The insensitive hankering for personal gain, can, if replicated across the broad socio-political spectrum, be a real dangerous trend that should be stopped with vigour. Politics should not be the wide avenue for wealth and prominence.

The political campaigning for the 2008 Presidential and Parliamentary Elections threw the searchlight on why some people seek political office. It was as revealing as it was disgusting. The stereotypical reason was that what motivates them is their desire to serve the nation.

Evidently, this explanation is obsolete. Indeed if this argument is vigorously pursued, it has the dangerous likelihood of insulting the people's intelligence. Consider the vast sums of money expended on "do or die" strategies, some of them diabolical. In many cases, the colossal monies spent in insensitive, lawless, arrogant ways made nonsense of any claim that the motivating factor was the desire to serve the people. Those whose money was from personal or genuine sources and who lost the election would be cursing themselves secretly. Even those whose resources emanated from dubious, even criminal sources, would still be moaning and wondering whether it was sensible to have wasted that much cash in that obscene way. Which sane persons can be persuaded to believe that all that was done out of the desire to serve the people? Many cannot.

Added to this indecent financial commitment to politics are the violence and vicious atrocities that supporters of candidates unleashed on the political environment. In some cases, not only were dangerous implements used to attack opponents, fire arms were actually employed. Does all that brutal violence support any political claims that they want to go into politics to serve the nation? Definitely not! Why would you brutalize people you want to serve and expect them to empathize with you when you gain power? It does not make practical sense.

The plain fact is that many people are entering politics to make money fast and big and enjoy affluence and status. Politics has, without a doubt, become the shortest way to wealth, prominence and all the joy and enjoyment that political office confers. The distinct impression is growing that the personal and selfish agenda of politicians seems to have superseded the national interest and because of that, many genuine patriots have been critical of some of the decisions taken by parliamentarians. The wonder has been whether in fact, the parliamentarians are really serious about protecting the national interest.

This is especially so where certain agreements ratified are so painfully against the national interest. The most topical and typical agreement was

the Vodafone agreement approved in the twilight of the last Parliament. Just fancy that the agreement actually had a clause virtually indemnifying corruption! In other words, nobody is to be held accountable if any acts of corrupt practice pop up in future. That certainly was a piece of crazy business. How do you provide for the legal protection of people likely to be involved in any corrupt practices in the sale of Ghana Telecom, a vital national asset, to Vodafone?

At the time this paper was being prepared, there was this very damaging allegation doing the rounds that some members of Parliament were “bribed” with \$5,000 to vote for the Ghana Telecom-Vodafone sale. The significant thing about the allegation was that it was put into the public domain by the anti-corruption campaigner, the New Patriotic Party Member of Parliament for Assikuma-Odoben-Brakwa, Hon P. C. Appiah-Ofori. The venue was at the inter-ministerial committee constituted to investigate aspects of the Vodafone deal. Although the matter is under investigation, some suggestions easily offer themselves. Can there be any links between the \$5,000 bribery allegation and the manifestly bogus Vodafone agreement?

No matter the outcome, the image of Ghana's Parliament has not been enhanced at all by such an allegation. It has been brutalized. Has it been brutalized beyond redemption? Only time will tell. But a lot will have to be done to redeem the bad image that some of our politicians continue to accumulate. The security implication is that if the people's confidence in the parliamentary system is undermined, there can be serious political and security consequences. Furthermore, the whole Vodafone sale scandal has been worsened by the report of the inter-ministerial committee which dumps responsibility on the head of former President John Agyekum Kufour, according to the testimonies of two of his former ministers, as having personally orchestrated the whole sale agreement.

It is about time that politicians are tutored to graduate from being perceived as opportunistic unpatriotic politicians to mature statesmen with the national interest at heart. J.F. Clark clearly distinguishes

between the politician and the statesman. He states: “*A politician thinks of the next elections, a statesman of the next generation. A politician looks for the success of his party, a statesman for that of his country. The statesman wishes to steer while the politician is satisfied to drift.*”¹² The politician is satisfied to drift mainly because a principled position on issues cannot feed into his opportunistic personal interest. In that instance, he/she will have no scruples drifting to where his/her bread would be abundantly buttered, and where the filling of his/her stomach can be guaranteed. Indeed, drifting politicians should best be identified as the apostles of “stomach politics.”

The problem of drifting politicians should engage the serious attention of everybody because it undermines the key democratic pillars of accountability to the electorate. Even a cursory study of the situation would reveal that the interaction between some parliamentarians and the constituents is for all productive political purposes, ineffective in vital areas of information, education and consultations.

The comments of Prof. Kwame A. Ninsin are instructive. He states: “*The Parliament of Ghana has evolved to a point where the majoritarian principle is being applied in an instrumental manner, and without due regard for the interest of the nation as a whole. As was the case with the loan agreements and the agreement with the USA government. The interest of the nation is at best what the party in power defines it. There seems to be little or no regard for divergent views on the floor of the House, especially when Parliament is deliberating on contentious issues. It may be argued that the application of the majoritarian principle by a partisan majority – a parliamentary majority which is also the governing party – that applies 'the whip' ruthlessly to obtain conformity even in secret voting, stifles independent expression by MPs and therefore blocks the articulation of what could reflect the interest of the majority of the citizens in the decisions of parliament. It is incompatible with democratic*

¹² The New Dictionary of Thoughts. (1996). Compiled by Tryon Edwards revised and enlarged by C.N. Catrevas, Jonathan Edwards and Ralph E. Emerson Brown. Standard Book Company, Section No. 12. Page 494.

expression.”¹³

Whereas in properly functioning democracies, Members of Parliament must consult their people and sound their reaction on important national issues that affect their well-being, Ghana's situation appears to be pathetically different. There is no doubt that many vital decisions were taken with the skimpiest of public education and knowledge.

A typical example is the New Economic Partnership for African's Development (NEPAD). It appears that nowhere in the country was this concept effectively explained to the people. In fact, checks did indicate that many members of Parliament had no reliable knowledge at all, resulting in a situation where a vital decision was taken minus the people's involvement. To date, it does not appear that many politicians have fully read the NEPAD document. Yet, year in year out, Ghana is bombarded with assertions of the benefits of the Peer Review Mechanism and/or that it has actually done wonders towards democratization of African leaders.

There are fundamental problems with the concept. Genuine democracy compels accountability of leaders to the people who elected them into office. Power should remain with the people; that is the principle of the people's sovereignty. How does one reconcile this sovereignty with the idea that it is an external institution or group of people, NEPAD, who would hold an elected leader accountable via peer reviewing? What happened to the sovereignty of the people? No wonder many discerning people have read in this a subtle attempt to impose this expensive bureaucratic structure to divert attention from national issues of critical importance for genuine democratic development and economic growth.

If there is any doubt about the principle of the people's inalienable sovereignty, the opening paragraph to the Principles of the US Constitution quoted earlier should challenge one's thinking on the Peer

¹³ Kwame Ninsen. (2008). Executive-Parliament Interface in the Legislative Process (1993-2006): A Synergy of Powers? Published for IDEG by Woeli Publishing Services, Accra, Ghana. Page 64.

Review Mechanism.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident

That all men are created equal

That they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights...

That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men... deriving their just powers from the consent of the people...

That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it...”

Until effective mechanisms are established to hold politicians accountable all the way from the District Assemblies to Parliament, majority of our politicians would continue to gravitate towards selfishness, avarice and self-aggrandizement and corruption to the destruction of the national interest. Politics should not be equated with the acquisition and accumulation of property and wealth at the expense of the people. That is dangerous, especially when money comes to play a destabilizing role in the political process.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

Also Available

The potential for expanded economic activity in the informal sector

Ernest Aryeetey

The criminal law and the health professional in Ghana

H.J.A.N Mensa Bonsu

Education and Democracy in Africa- Preliminary thoughts on a neglected linkage

Cyril K. Daddieh

Dynamics of conflict management in Liberia

Amos Sawyerr

The right to information bill

Justice P.D Anim

The independence of the central bank- Is it feasible?

S.K.Apea

The East Asian crisis: Implications for Ghana

Prof. Bartholomew K. Armah

Enhancing the decentralisation programme- district assemblies and sub-structures as partners in governance

Hon. Kwamena Ahwoi

Development without aid

Frederick S. Arkhurst

The Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative: Processes and issues

Bartholomew K. Armah

Economic growth: Where does it come from?

Joe Amoako Tuffour

Ghost names, shadow workers and the public sector wage bill

Joe Amoako Tuffour

Gender issues in Ghanaian higher education

Dr. Cyril K. Daddieh

For a genuine partnership with emerging Africa

A view from Sweden -Mats Karlson

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

P.O. Box OS 1936
Osu, Accra
Ghana

ISBN: 988-584-84-9



988584849

ISSN: 0855-3238