

1-1-2012

Theology, Culture and Sustainable Development in Africa

Joseph Ogbonnaya

Marquette University, joseph.ogbonnaya@marquette.edu

Theology, Culture and Sustainable Development in Africa

Joseph Ogbonnaya, PhD

University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, Canada

Abstract

En face des dangers de la globalisation qui menacent les cultures et les peuples et en raison de son accent sur la dignité humaine, cet article présente la Théologie comme un outil véritable pour la préservation de l'identité culturelle. En utilisant des termes de développement dans l'enseignement social catholique pour dialoguer avec les théories contemporaines de développement, ce travail critique la toile de fond anthropologique et philosophique du développement comme une simple croissance économique. Il suggère en outre une structure de développement intégral qui s'intéresse à l'échelle de valeur afin de fournir des plans répétitifs pour le bien du développement de la personne humaine. Il examine aussi son implication pour le développement intégral en Afrique.

Introduction

Considering the general understanding of development as having to do with economic issues and

the making of profit, one might wonder why and how this should be a subject matter for theology, which is generally assumed as concerned with the study of God and of God's relationship with creation. In other words, what has theology to offer in the contemporary development discourse? And in what ways can theology, by humanising globalisation, stop the erosion of cultural values and its consequences on human well-being? With particular reference to Africa, how does theology promote holistic and sustainable development?

Contemporary development discourse encapsulates various viewpoints on how to further development in order to promote human well-being. Since it impacts various aspects of human life, namely technological, economic, social, political, cultural, personal and spiritual, contemporary development must take note of the anthropological constitution of human beings, in terms of their historical consciousness as potentially open to progress, with the possibility of decline and capacity for restoration and redemption. As a human phenomenon, development affects values, common meanings and the institutional structures of society. It is not exclusively economic but includes all aspects of human life.

Theology moves beyond this social historical consciousness to reflect on common grounds of human existence: meaning, truths, and values, uncovering the universal in the particular that provides unity and intelligibility to life through its transcendental analysis.

Theological studies, while acknowledging transcendental reality and its grounding of the human condition, pay attention to the social historical condition of human existence. Thus, theology and religion have much to say about development, on what is right and wrong development, on the impact of development on people's lives, and on development as helping or hindering religious ends and spiritual fulfilment of human beings. Religion, as the conscience of society and theology as reflection on religions and a guide to the formation of human conscience and an aid to the living of virtuous life, must critically assess contemporary development discourse to ensure that human well-being is achieved through the various development methodologies.

Trajectories of Development Discourse

The major trajectories of contemporary development discourse spans through the various historical epochs of western agrarian/industrial revolution. This includes the *traditional period* articulated by Marx Weber (see *Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*, 2003). The *mercantilist period* characterised by government control of the economy saw the creation of colonies and extraction of their resources for the benefit of the mother countries. This is true of Africa when in 1885 in Berlin, Germany, various European powers divided the continent among themselves and in the following decades through colonialism and neo-colonialism, scooped many of her human and natural resources for their own development.

In the *classical period*, the idea of free market economy based on Smith's (1937) idea of self-interest gave birth to liberal capitalism and neo-liberalism characterised by among other features privatisation and reduced government expenditure on welfare schemes. The consequences of neoliberal policies will be treated shortly but suffice it to note that in spite of their benefits, they have wrought much hardship, especially on the poor whose well-being they claim to promote.

Modernization theory - captured in W.W. Rostow's (Hite and Roberts, 2007:47) stages of growth theory - holds that progress and development follow a similar pattern "...lying within one of five categories: the traditional society, the preconditions for take-off, the take-off, the drive to maturity, and the age of high mass-consumption." It emphasises the need for big companies, access to large amounts of capital and modern social organisation values as necessary for the developing countries to catch up with the West. Dependency theorists tie world poverty, especially as it affects developing countries, to the colonial era around 1500. This is the period of mercantile capitalism during which natural and human resources of Africa, South America and Asia, were exploited by the rich countries of Europe and North America.

Modern globalisation was facilitated by the imposition of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) on developing countries by the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Key features of SAPs were

devaluation of developing country currencies and the opening of their markets under World Trade Organization rules and treaties. SAPs foisted neoliberal policies down the throat of heavily indebted developing countries. This had the consequence of transferring the sovereignty of these countries to transnational corporations who used privatisation to influence government policies. Pointing to Ghana as a case study, Kwame (2003:42) warned:

It is dangerous for African development if the philosophy of the current contraction of the state embedded in neo-liberal orthodoxy is not reversed. It is an incontrovertible fact that active government intervention is crucial, especially in building up social capital and physical infrastructure in education, health, housing, transport, communication and other related government services... In essence, the central lesson that we can learn from the NICs [Newly Industrializing Countries] is that 'there is no alternative to the state.'

This is especially true of Africa, whose philosophy and world view prioritises community life and protection of the common good. The person exists because the community exists; the community exists because human beings live together in it. The person who exists in isolation from the community atomically is an anomaly in the African societal structure. Kenyatta (Gyekye, 2003:298) writes that, "According to Gikuyu ways of thinking, nobody is an isolated individual. Or rather, his uniqueness is a secondary fact about him; first and foremost he is several people's relative

and several people's contemporary." Mbiti (1969:109) observes that for Africans, "Whatever happens to the individual happens to the whole group, and whatever happens to the whole group happens to the individual. The individual can only say: 'I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am.' This is a cardinal point in the understanding of the African view of *mán*." Thus the wealth and poverty of the person is equally the wealth and poverty of the community. The Igbos of South-eastern Nigeria say, "*onye aghala nwanee ya*" ('nobody should abandon his brother/sister') - implying that in modern statecraft, the State is indispensable in protecting the common good against the greed of self-interest.

The activities of multinational corporations are also threatening the sustainable use of natural resources. This has prompted warnings from environmentalists about environmental crises such as global warming. Sustainable development has been the subject of many conferences, including the Bruntland Report, '*Our Common Future*' (1987), the Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro (1992), the World Summit on Sustainability in Johannesburg (2002); the Kyoto Protocol (1997); the Climate Change Summit in Copenhagen (2009) and the Durban Conference on Climate Change (2011).

Appraisal of the Discourse

To assess the impact of sustainable development, more so in Africa, is challenging. This is because invariably such assessment ends up as analysis of the

impact of globalisation. Globalisation appears not to have realised the basic goals of reducing world poverty, achieving global food security and delivering improved services to improve the human condition. However, suffice it to mention that contemporary development discourse pays attention to some aspects of the human good but oftentimes neglects other aspects. According to Pawlikowski (2007:363),

To the extent that globalisation process enables us to break down cultural, ethnic, and religious barriers and brings us into increased human understanding and solidarity, it is a good thing. Insofar as it becomes a generator of cultural and economic hegemony by rich and powerful nations over other peoples, it deserves strong condemnation.

Despite its achievements, globalisation has been largely “A generator of cultural and economic hegemony by rich and powerful nations over other peoples.” According to Escobar (1995:44), “Development was – and continues to be for the most part – a top-down ethnocentric and technocratic approach, which treated people and cultures as abstract concepts, statistical figures to be moved up and down in the charts of progress.” The Lisbon Statement of the Interreligious Peace Colloquium (1977:233) sums up the domineering tendencies of neo-liberalism and consequent underdevelopment of peoples:

Underdevelopment, therefore, is not simply national or cultural backwardness of people ... It comes rather from

an exploitative global system and development models imposed by the North. So Southern underdevelopment is the ugly by-product of Northern industrialization for selfish nationalist goals.

This is evident in Africa where the post-colonial political structure, characterised by statism and arbitrariness, reduces politics to accumulation of power and is thus not structured to promote development but underdevelopment. As Ake (1996:6) observes,

...at independence the form and function of the state in Africa did not change much for most countries in Africa. State power remained essentially the same: immense, arbitrary, often violent, always threatening. Except for a few countries such as Botswana, politics remained a zero-sum game; power was sought by all means and maintained by all means. Colonial rule left most of Africa a legacy of intense and lawless political competition amidst an ideological void and a rising tide of disenchantment with the expectation of a better life...

Thus, for most of Africa, *ab initio*, there was actually no development policy in place to start with.

Contemporary development discourse prioritises the basic needs, namely health, shelter, food, clothing and the social values of institutional structures that promote development as economic growth – technology, the legal and political structures aimed at protecting trade and treaties between and among nations necessary for a free market economy. It does not pay sufficient attention to other values necessary for optimum human

life, human flourishing, well-being and happiness. This point is not lost to scholars and institutions interested in articulating the crisis in the global set up. For instance, referring to the inadequacies of the development project, Cormie (1980:61) observed that “Ultimately they call into question taken-for-granted values and the very meaning of life itself. Thus, not only economic and political issues are at stake, but also religious issues concerning human meaning and value.” Goulet (1972:272) makes the same point, that “Culture not economics, technology or politics, is the primordial dimension in development...” Even Novak (1982:31), who is sympathetic to ‘democratic capitalism’, acknowledges its basic flaw, i.e. the undermining of culture, thus: “The ironic flaw ... in democratic capitalism is this: that its *successes* in the political order and in the economic order *undermine* it in the cultural order. The more it succeeds, the more it fails.” Research bodies such as the International Development Research Center in Ottawa, Canada (1995:vi) are dissatisfied with the dominant economic paradigm. It observes that, “The conventional Western discourse to ignore or dismiss the *cultural, moral, spiritual* dimensions of human well-being is either irrelevant to development or so intractably subjective as to be amenable to a “practical paradigm.” For the World Faiths Development Dialogue (1998), development processes will only be successful – even in material terms – if they take into consideration, not only the economic, but also the cultural, social, environmental and spiritual aspects of life.

Impacts on Cultural Values

The scholars and institutions mentioned above point to neglect of cultural value as a consequence of the current development paradigm. The reasons for this are the desire for economic growth and quest for profit through increased production and consumption. For instance, economic globalisation measures growth in terms of Gross National Product (GNP), the sum total of goods produced in a country. But the GNP measurement does not consider unequal distribution of such goods and other non-measurable activities in an economy. The measurement also disregards the other institutions of society which, together with the economy, promote human well-being, progress and development. Thus, for Sen (2000:7) and other economists critical of globalisation like Stiglitz (2002) and Bauman (2000), the importance of the market for any substantial development, “does not preclude the role of social support, public regulation, or statecraft when they can enrich – rather than impoverish – human lives.”

The prevailing paradigm of development as economic growth disintegrates the basic structure of societal cultural value and focuses all human endeavour on the accumulation of capital, profit and consumption, thus secularizing society. For instance, Margaret Thatcher (Braedley and Luxton, 2010:175), a champion of neo-liberalism declared that, “There is no such thing as society. There is only the economy and families.” Such a viewpoint leads to the dehumanisation of the human person who naturally lives interdependently in society. Furthermore,

as Berry (2009) observes, economic globalisation fuelled by industrialization and consumerism is not sustainable. It leads to greater urban migration, reduction in the cost of labour and denigration of human dignity as people become little different from objects, things to be used and discarded at will. It also lays a heavy burden on the environment, increasing depletion of the ozone layer and accelerating global warming. Furthermore, it leads to changes in lifestyle that emphasize freedom from constraint instead of freedom to be responsible for one's life and the promotion of the common good. There is also a shift in the conception of self from *being* to *having*. Thus, individual interest is pursued in the quest for increased economic growth to enable one buy and consume whatever her or she wants.

Some philosophers and theologians are concerned over the loss of meaning. Taylor (1991:10) worries over three dangers facing our society: "...the fading of moral horizons... the eclipse of ends, in face of rampant instrumental reason, and a loss of meaning." Visser (2002:84, 86) following Max Weber sees this loss in terms of being in an iron cage. Unfortunately, she said, we conceive of ourselves no more different than automatons – as not only moving by ourselves, but also "as causeless chance." The consequence according to her is loss of meaning. Various scholarly works reflecting viewpoints such as Weber's *Protestant Ethics* share Visser's view above that neo-liberal capitalism produces guilt, despair, and an iron cage. Soelle (2001) links the numbing of the West to the two interconnected trends

of globalisation and individualization. Globalisation's efficiency in productivity, consumption and profit, she says, leads to the alienation of humankind because people become addicted to technocracy and are made dependent more than ever before. The interdependency of the two trends produces a different kind of human being – impersonal and without feeling. Thus:

One of the spiritual difficulties in our situation is the inner connection between globalisation and individuation. The more globally the market economy structures itself, the less interest it demonstrates in the social and ecological webs in which humans live, and the more it requires the individual who is without any relationship whatever. The partner that our market economy needs is *homo oeconomicus*. This is an individual fit for business and pleasure, showing no interest in the antipersonnel mines that his car manufacturer produces, no interest in the water that his grandchildren will use – not to mention interest in God (191-192).

Friedman (2000:42), a known propagandist of the benefits of globalisation, warns that the major problem facing globalisation is the challenge of the loss of cultural values. "The challenge in this era of globalisation — for countries and individuals" he says, "is to find a healthy balance between preserving a sense of identity, home and community and doing what it takes to survive within the globalisation system." Ratzinger's (2006) description of Europe as a society that has lost its roots

is also a concrete example of the loss of meaning and the adverse effects of globalisation on human society. The consequence Ratzinger (2006: 73-74) writes, is that relativism which has “become the real religion of modern men” “...penetrating far into the realm of theology, is the most profound difficulty of our day.” Following Lonergan (1967) for whom culture is common meaning, we understand that loss of meaning for a people is loss of their culture, of the pattern of their life, of cohesion, of order and of a system of organizing themselves including production and distribution of goods and services.

The effects of globalisation on Africa and Asia are no less different. While it brings untold hardship to poor people in Africa whose standard of living and life expectancy keeps declining, it also increases incidences of domestic violence among African immigrant families and honour killings among Asian immigrants among other ills. Henriot (1998:n.p.) who has lived many years in Africa asserts:

...Globalisation is not working for the benefit of the majority of Africans today. While globalisation has increased opportunities for economic growth and development in some areas, there has been an increase in the disparities, and inequalities experienced especially in Africa...While neo-liberal economists argue that there may be “short-term pain but long-term gain” in the implementation of SAP, it is increasingly clear throughout Africa that the short-term pain, for example, of social service cuts, ecological damages and

industrial base erosion will in the long-term have truly disastrous effects upon any hope for an integral and sustainable human development.

Globalisation tends to make human community a secondary phenomenon in its quest for self-interest, wealth and power, comfort for a few and domination of the weak. As such it is unable to provide an ideal experience for human fulfilment that goes beyond the merely material needs to be completed by spiritual fulfilment. It sidelines African culture and sees it as an enemy of progress. Because it conceives development as an autonomous process that is true of all cultures and peoples, contemporary development discourse pursues an undeclared war with African culture which resists projects that will not come to terms with it or recognize its impact on the life of the people. As Ake (1996:16) observes,

the more the resistance of African culture became evident, the more the agents of development treated it with hostility; and soon enough, they construed anything traditional, including the rural people, negatively. They castigated peasants for being irrational, un-enterprising, superstitious, and too subjective and emotional in their attitudes. ... Because the development paradigm tends to have a negative view of the people and their culture, it cannot accept them on their own terms. Its point of departure is not what is but what ought to be. The paradigm focuses on the possibility of Africa's becoming what it is not and probably can never be. Inadvertently perhaps, it discourages any belief in the integrity and

validity of African societies and offers the notion that African societies can find validity only in their total transformation, that is, in their total self-alienation.

Consequently, a reorientation of societal values must include an inculcation and promotion of the practice of preferring the common good to one's self-interest as well as a deep respect for the cultural and personal values of divergent peoples. As Onwuejeogwu (1975:278) advises:

Africans should look for those parts of their 'faces' lost during the colonial days. Those parts may still be found in African traditions and cultures. Having found them, they will also discover new inspiration, new imagination, new creativity, new confidence to face the problems of industrialization and modernization. This is what the universities, colleges and schools in Africa should strive to achieve.

Towards a Theology of Sustainable Development

"A Theology", Lónergan (1990:xi) writes, "mediates between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of a religion in that matrix." In our contemporary society that is way past the classicist notion of culture, theology reflects on culture empirically as "the set of meanings and values that informs a way of life." What is needed today is a reorientation of the set of meanings and values that inform contemporary development discourse. Amidst the enormous changes taking place in the world and which call for radical responses, theology as reflection on religion, has an important place as the determinant

of human motives and action. According to Robert Bellah (1977:149), "... meaning, belief, spirit, faith are the ultimate determinant of human action and ... socio-economic changes will be judged by those determinants, humanized by them, or the outcome will be failure or disaster." Theology provides the criterion for a critical assessment of themes in development discourse by emphasizing the cultural, personal and the religious value which contemporary development discourse often neglects. "It calls in question all the assumptions of the world and challenges us to rethink our presuppositions and redirect our energies."

Implementing the principles of Catholic Social Teaching is one of the ways the values of contemporary society can be reoriented. Catholic Social Teaching emphasizes integral human development that respects the dignity of human beings as created in the image and likeness of God (*Populorum Progressio*, 1967:no.14; *Caritas in Veritate*, 2009:no.30). It stresses the right of each person to optimum development from the resources of the earth (*Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*, 2005:no.172). It critiques development seen merely as economic growth as promoting a dehumanized form of development (*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 1987:no.46). It points to a hierarchy of values upon which human life should be organized (*Populorum Progressio*, 1967:no.18). Its theological anthropology is holistic without neglecting the socio-economic as well as political, cultural and spiritual dimensions of human existence (*Caritas in Veritate*, 2009:no.11). The principles of

Catholic Social Teaching include the common good, the universal destination of the earth's goods, solidarity and subsidiarity, etc.

The principle of common good insists on the promotion not only of one's own good but also of the good of other members of one's community and of humanity as a whole (*Mater et Magistra*, 1961:no.65; *Centesimus Annus*, 1991:no.58). The principle of the universal destination of the earth's good states that the resources of the earth belong to everybody and therefore should nourish every human being (*Centesimus Annus*, no.31). It restates the right of every human being to benefit from these resources. The principle of solidarity emphasizes the fact of human interdependence and therefore of the need for mutual support of one another for the realization of the human good, the happiness and well-being of each other (*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 1987:no.39).

The principle of subsidiarity states that it is not respectful of human dignity to prevent people from expressing their membership in community by preventing them from participating fruitfully at any level in the life of their community. This principle opposes the two extremes of socialism and neo-liberal capitalism in the running of government. In socialist regimes government takes unto itself the provision of people's needs and thus robs people of creativity and denigrates their human dignity to be responsible for their lives. Neo-liberal democracy on the other hand - in its defense of free-market economy - reduces government involvement

in the provision of social services. The principle of subsidiarity states that the role of government should be (*subsidium*) helping people realize themselves and not take over the running of their lives (*Quadragesimo Anno*, 1931:no.79). At the same time also there is no alternative to the State in the provision of social services. For example, the case of the 33 trapped miners in Chile (2010) and the spat between the government and the mining company *The San Esteban* over payment of their monthly salary while they were trapped and over who actually should be responsible for them showed once more that the logic of a free market economy without government intervention is a farce.

These principles are based on a theological anthropology that emphasizes the dignity of the human person. It insists on integral human development that must benefit the human person as a whole, personal, social, economic, political, and religious, and help the human person realize his/her potential as well as promote social well-being. In his encyclical *Populorum Progressio* (1967:no.14), Pope Paul VI states: "The development we speak of here cannot be restricted to economic growth alone. To be authentic, it must be well rounded; it must foster the development of each man and of the whole man." Pope Benedict XVI (2009:no.18) agrees with Paul VI: "Authentic development must be integral; that is, it has to promote the good of every man and of the whole man." He adds, "The truth of development consists in its completeness: if it does not involve the whole man and every man, it is not true development."

Pope Benedict's encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* – Charity in Truth – *On Human Development in Charity and Truth* (2009), is the latest attempt at articulating Catholic Social Teaching on integral human development. Written in the context of the changes arising from globalisation, the encyclical urges adherence to transcendent values like respect for human dignity, justice and the common good as "... not merely useful but essential for building a good human society and for true integral human development." This vocation to authentic development requires responsible freedom of individuals and respect for the truth of the common humanity of human beings in love, which effects a transition from neighbourhood to brotherliness. He further writes (no.19):

As society becomes ever more globalized, it makes us neighbors but does not make us brothers. Reason, by itself, is incapable of grasping the equality between men and of giving stability to their civic coexistence, but it cannot establish fraternity. Fraternity, brotherly love, originates in a transcendent vocation from God the Father, who loved us first, teaching us through the Son what fraternal charity is.

Amidst the powerful force of globalisation, the Pontiff cites the need for the guidance of charity in truth without which the human family will face unprecedented damage and division (no.33). Hence charity and truth confront us with an altogether new and creative challenge, one that is certainly vast and complex. It is about *broadening the scope of reason and making it capable of knowing*

and directing these powerful new forces, animating them within the perspective of that “civilization of love” whose seed God has planted in every people, in every culture.”

Applying the principles of gratuity, solidarity and justice (commutative, distributive and social) to the free-market capitalist enterprise, the encyclical advocates a new way of doing business that takes cognizance not only of the interest of the proprietors but of all the stakeholders in the business enterprise: workers, customers, suppliers, community. Since business is built on trust, the principle of solidarity and of the interdependence of peoples is a *sine qua non* in the new world order and business enterprise.

Furthermore, “A reformed market is one that permits the free operation, in conditions of equal opportunity, of enterprises in pursuit of different institutional ends: profit-oriented private enterprise, public enterprise, and commercial entities based on mutualist principles and pursuing social ends.” (no.38). Business should also promote the common good of peoples and ensure that the interest of individual proprietors does not override the common good. It is in this spirit that the role of the State in protecting citizens through laws that promote just redistribution of wealth is emphasized. Thus, while the State should allow every citizen to participate in the process of development, it must intervene in the process to set rules that protect citizens from various forms of abuse from agents of globalisation like transnational corporations (TNCs).

If integral development is implemented, one sees that globalisation in itself is not deterministic but promotes global networking requisite for progress and development, one that promotes cultural, social, personal and religious fulfilment in its provision of the basic needs of life. Globalisation's success lies not only in acknowledging the interdependence of humanity in the present world order towards the promotion of a free-market economy, but also in the appropriation of the interdependence embedded in the principle of solidarity. This means promotion of integral human development is in the overall common interest of humanity as whatever happens in one part of the globe affects other parts as well.

In order to establish a truly Christian humanism, founded in charity in truth, theology must promote conversion of mind and heart, a deep turnaround from a development founded on materialist principles to one that is founded on God as source and foundation of development. There is need for psychic, intellectual, moral and religious conversion to balance the experience of development. For instance, where intellectual conversion is lacking, controversies arise between naïve realists, empiricists, idealists and critical realists. A flawed anthropology like that of the present debate of development as economic growth that conceives of human beings as *homo economicus* fails to comprehensively account for the cultural, personal and religious implications of development. Absence of moral and spiritual conversion leaves one unclear with regards to the distinction between satisfaction and values in

one's decisions and choices. It leaves contemporary development discourse stuck in vital and social values of immediate need to satisfy hunger and maintain socio-economic and political structures while ignoring the broader aspects of human meaning and value the human spirit earnestly yearns for dignified living. One encounters a worst case scenario when religious conversion is lacking as one not being grasped by ultimate concern is steeped in short-sighted practicality and left in the dark as to the meaning of other-worldly falling in love; thus lacking total and permanent self-surrender without conditions, qualifications, reservations thus incapable of self-transcendence. Little wonder, Smith's (1937:14) proposition that "it is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we can get our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest" still prevails and continues to influence public policy and shape world political economy under the World Trade Organization rules and strategies.

Implications for Sustainable Development in Africa

In the new world order, Africa is caught in a web of privatisation of the State and increasing consumerism which makes her susceptible to varied forms of abuse, manipulation and exploitation. The duo of democratic freedom and accumulation of capital upon which neo-liberal democracy is practised is lacking in some African countries. As liberal capitalism cannot function without a functioning democracy, privatisation of the State by some African leaders separates politics from economics. In order to secure loans for the bloated governments

resulting from the privatisation of the State, many African countries have adopted neo-liberal capitalist policies at the micro-economic level by cutting welfare spending and opening their markets and at the macro-economic level by allowing mobility of capital. These measures deepen the poverty of citizens because the absence of transparent democratic systems gives free rein to corruption. The loans secured may end up in the private purses of government officials or may not be properly accounted for.

Leaders of Africa must re-appropriate the communitarian societal structure that respects and promotes the common good embedded in their cultural values. Privatisation of the State as a family or group property must give way to a transparent democracy where people are respected and government is accountable to the people. Here the principles of common good, solidarity and subsidiarity become meaningful and promote true integral development. In order to achieve this, a reorientation of statecraft and the functioning of public institutions as directed to the provision of human good for the common good is necessary. This must also be accompanied with education of the civil society on their power and role in democracy and government. This is important because often people in sub-Saharan Africa treat the State as distant and with little or no connection to their well-being and therefore as an institution to be exploited for self-enrichment. Catholic universities must prioritise this education if holistic sustainable development is to be achieved in Africa.

Conclusion

One of the ways for Africa's development is gradual reintroduction of the communitarian structure that works for the common good. To do this, Africans must begin to appreciate the authenticity of their cultural values and re-embrace the sense of community.

There is also need to free Africans from the inferiority complex ingrained subconsciously in them and which affects their sense of self-worth to think that "to be is to have." The educated class must change their value system from consumerism and materialism to an appreciation of the work of their own hands and to living simpler lifestyles. This will stem the tide of corruption that wrecks Africa's efforts towards integral development. The educated class must promote a new attitude towards the State as a structure for the common good and whose existence depends on the contribution of each person. People must understand that any corruption has a ripple effect on the whole structure. The elite must lead the way in the re-education of the masses by a clear and good example.

Sustainable and integral development in Africa cannot happen if the superstructure of culture does not look inwards and begin to appreciate the traditional technology that goes into the making of simple hoes, cutlass, clay pots, etc. This will be the stepping stone of Africa's industrial revolution: the traditional technologies that produced the Igbo-Ukwu, Ife and Benin bronzes, and the famous Zimbabwe empire now in ruins and other culture centers. Re-education on the superstructure of culture should lead to the restoration

of self-confidence. Then technological systems can be applied to local situations and the varying ideologies of statecraft can be adapted to the cultural value system of Africa for the common good and the progress of Africa towards integral development.

To achieve this, theology for integral development in the context of globalisation must be a theology that is at home with the praxis of the people of Africa. While at home with tradition, it must move beyond mere classicism to an appreciation of the historical condition of Africa and address the abuses mentioned above. The principles of Catholic social teaching - which are in consonance with the communitarian societal structure of African cultural values - must address the loss of meaning confronting African peoples as they face various forms of decay in their institutional structures. African liberation theology must emphasise conversion: intellectual, moral, psychic and religious for African peoples and leaders of government so as to guard against the group bias that leads to privatisation of the State, endemic corruption, ethnicity, violence and wars that plague Africa and rob her of opportunities for integral development. It must speak up against structures of sin in international relations and trade that deny Africa the benefits of globalisation. Here, the principle of the universal destination of the earth's good, of solidarity and subsidiarity and the common good must be brought to bear to remind the rich countries of the North and their collaborators in Africa that we are all brothers and sisters and that promoting integral development is in our common interest as human beings.

References

- Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and Development in Africa*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bellah, R. (1978). "Faith Communities Challenge – and are Challenged by – the Changing World Order." J. Gremillion, and W. Ryan. Ed. *World Faiths and the New World Order: A Muslim-Jewish-Christian Search Begins*. Washington: Interreligious Peace Colloquium, 1978, 148-170.
- Berry, W. (2009). "Inverting the Economic Order." *Communio: International Catholic Review* 36:3, 484-485.
- Cormie, L. (1980). "The Sociology of National Development and Salvation History."
- Gregory Baum. Ed. *Sociology and Human Destiny*. N.Y: The Seabury Press, 1980, 56-85.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Falk, R. (1978). "Satisfying Human Needs in a World of Sovereign States: Rhetoric, Reality and Vision." J. Gremillion and W. Ryan. Ed. *World Faiths and the New World Order: A Muslim-Jewish-Christian Search Begins*. Washington: Interreligious Peace Colloquium, 1978, 109-139.
- Friedman, T. (2000). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goulet, D. (1972). *The Cruel Choice: A New Concept in the Theory of Development*. Atheneum Press, New York.

Gyekye, K: (2003). "Person and Community in African Thought." Coetzee P. H. and

Roux A. P. J. Ed. *The African Philosophy Reader*. New York: Routledge, 297-312.

Henriot, P. J. (1998) "Globalisation: Implications for Africa."

<http://www.sedos.org/english/global.html>.

Kwame, Bofo-Arthur. (2003). "Tackling Africa's Developmental Dilemmas: Is

Globalisation the Answer." *Journal of Third World Studies*. (2003) 20:1, 42.

Lonergan, B. (1967). *Collection*, CWL 4, Frederick E. Crow and Robert M. Doran, ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967, 1988), 232-2245.

_____. (1990). *Method in Theology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Luxton, M. (2010). "Doing Neoliberalism: Perverse Individualism in Personal Life."

S. Braedley and M. Luxton. ed. *Neoliberalism and Everyday Life*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill Queen's University Press, 163-183.

Mbiti, J. S. (1969). *African Religions and Philosophy*. Heinemann International

Literature & Textbooks.

Novak, M. (1982). *The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism*. New York: Simon and Schuster Publication.

Onwuejeogwu, M. A. (1975). *The Social Anthropology of Africa: An Introduction*. Heinemann, London.

Pawlikowski, J. T. (2007). "Creating an Ethical Context for Globalisation: Catholic

Perspectives in an Interreligious Context." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 42:3, 363-372.

Pope Benedict XVI. *Caritas in Veritate: On Integral Human Development*.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc

Pope John XXIII (1961). *Mater et Magistra, On Christianity and Social Progress*.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater_en.html.

Pope John Paul II (1987). *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis: On Social Concern*.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater_en.html.

_____ (1991). *Centesimus Annus: On the Hunderedth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum*.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-

[ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html).

Pope Pius XI (1931). *Quadragesimo Anno: On Reconstruction of the Social Order*

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno_en.html

Ratzinger, J. and M. Pera (2006). *Without Roots: The West, Relativism, Christianity, Islam*. Trans. Michael F. Moore. New York: Basic Books.

- Ratzinger, J. (2004) *Truth and Tolerance: Christian Belief and World Religions*. Trans. Henry Taylor San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Rosenhaus, Matthew et al. (1977) "A Statement on the Lisbon Meeting by Officers of the Interreligious Peace Colloquium." J. Gremillion and W. Ryan, ed., *World Faiths and the New World Order: A Muslim-Jewish-Christian Search Begins*. 230-238.
- Rostow, W.W. (2007). "The Stages of Economic Growth." Amy Bellone Hite and J. Timmons Roberts, Ed. *The Globalisation and Development Reader*. MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 47-55.
- Ryan, W. F. (1995). *Culture, Spirituality, and Economic Development: Opening a Dialogue*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Sen, A. (2000). *Development as Freedom*. Anchor Books New York.
- Smith, A. (1937). *The Wealth of Nations: An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Ed. Edwin Cannan.: Random House, Inc., New York.
- Soelle, D. (2001). *The Silent Cry: Mysticism and Resistance*. Trans. Barbara and Martin Rumscheidt, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. (2002). *Globalisation and Its Discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Taylor, C. (1991). *The Malaise of Modernity*. House of Anansi Press Inc. Toronto.
- Tyndale, W. (2011). "World Faiths Development Dialogue." Gerrie ter Haar. Ed. *Religion and Development: Ways of Transforming the World*. Columbia University Press, 207-229. New York

Visser, M. (2002). *Beyond Fate*. House of Anansi Press Inc., Toronto.

Weber, M. (2003). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans., Talcott Parsons: Dover Publications, Inc., New York.