

# The Negative Implications of Adversarialism and Politics of Insult in Ghana: An Overview

Shadrack Bentil (Author)

Department of Political Science, University of Ghana, P.O. Box LG 64, Legon, Accra

Gilbert Arhinful Aidoo (Co-Author)

Department of Political Science, University of Ghana, P.O. Box LG 64, Legon, Accra

## Abstract

The competitiveness of political contest is not in itself a bad thing; but the extremity of it—the “hyper-competitiveness”, in an attempt to attain the ultimate goal of political mandate in order to control the coercive apparatus of the state is both precarious and deadly. The paper sought to identify and discuss the nature of politics (adversarial politics) in Ghana. This article further identified the causes of adversarialism in Ghanaian politics and its negative implications on the future democracy in Ghana. Finally, the write-up proffers some recommendations that will go a long way to enhance the serenity of Ghanaian politics. However, the paper dwells more on the illustrations of the New Patriotic Party (NPP) and the National Democratic Congress (NDC) since they have remained the most dominant in the Fourth Republic of Ghana.

**Keywords:** Ghana, Adversarialism, Politics of insult, Democracy and competition, and Political Parties.

## Introduction

The two key political parties in Ghana namely, the New Patriotic party (NPP) and the National Democratic Congress (NDC) who are on record to have won all the seven general elections held in the Fourth Republic since 1992 (1992, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2016) respectively, usually tend to have different political ideologies or idiosyncrasies and engage in a continual fiercest contestation of emotive exchanges other ideas in their quest for political power; and in so doing turns the whole political landscape and process into a dishonest battle for power. Thus, what matters to the Ghanaian politician is partisan ‘politicking’ and not national interest politics.

“In spite of Ghana’s emerging culture of political stability, it still faces a number of challenges— abuse of incumbency, ethnicity, and overdependence on donor inflow; but in its successes and challenges, several lessons can be distilled for the rest of Africa and indeed the entire South” (Frempong, 2007:2). Research findings of notable scholars like (Gyimah-Boadi, 2004; Frempong, 2007; and Debra, 2008) gave credence to the fact that adversarial politics did exist and is still in existence in Ghana’s fourth republic. For instance, in the 2008 National awards under H.E. President J. A. Kufuor, the then candidate Mills turned down his national honor with impunity due to partisan politicking. Again, when the main opposition party (NPP) was invited by the ruling party NDC together with other parties to meet at Senchi to discuss matters of national interest in 2014 (an exercise which was started under their own watch with former President Kufuor), the NPP blatantly did not honor the invitation; even though there were some legitimate concerns raised about the mode of invitation. Ghanaian politics in this fourth republic has been so confrontational to the extent that the struggle for power begins the very moment the results of general elections are announced.

Further, the situation does not allow the government any room and time space to organize itself well after elections to put its programmes and policies in place. From the inception of office, it has to start parrying all kinds of criticisms of the composition of the Cabinet and how it intends to operationalize the pledges made to the people. Frempong (2007) argues that multi-party democracy makes room for choices of personalities and programmes and nobody can begrudge the critics. However, our body politic is not the best yet. Although there seems to be some sort of respect for the rule of law and minority views and a strong press. Ghana has also received floods of approbation for practicing a vibrant democracy, especially for holding seven successful and peaceful elections over the last 24 years, a lot more needs to be desired. As modest strides are made, it is about time our political leaders collaborated to compete on the political landscape so that the marketplace of ideas will yield the best policy outcomes.

Also, Certain political cultures, arrangements, and systems appear to be more conducive to and promote adversarial politics. The media also influence this type of politicking and thus capitalize on it to make huge news out of nothing. Some academics and political analysts alike suggest that under the Westminster system, the adversary is more glaring. It particularly manifests itself during parliamentary debates, deliberations and question time. This often takes the form of heated arguments with the government and opposition alike normally taking entrenched partisan positions on matters of national interests instead of making a critical analysis of such issues of grave importance to the masses. For instance, adversarial politics serves as a source of sensational stories.

Thus, the media patronize partisan adversarial politicking by offering the politicians a platform to engage in continual partisan emotive exchanges at the expense of discussing developmental ideas/issues of grave national concerns. This seems to suggest that without such baseless emotive political exchanges on their platforms, journalism in Ghana would be worthless and the preparation for news items that might interest the public more demanding (Friday, 2005).

### **The concept of Adversarial politics**

There is no universally standardized definition of the concept “adversarialism”. Both scholars, analysts, and practitioners alike define it to suit the purpose of their discussion or study. However, it would suffice to consider the following definitions in this paper's context. In the words of Whitefield, “Adversarial politics exists when the proposals put forward by the government are routinely criticized by opposition parties” (Whitefield, 2009). As such, any stance taken by government is automatically opposed, regardless of the merits. Similarly, adversarial politics in the view of Friday (2005) takes place when one party (usually not in Government) “takes the opposite (or at least a different) opinion to that of the other (usually the Government) even when they agree in principle with what the Government is trying to do” (Friday, 2005). But for political expediency, they vehemently and blatantly oppose such views in the open.

According to Mattes and Gyimah-Boadi (2003), “adversarial political system is a source of “crossness” because inherently, it involves dishonesty and at times absolute deception”. This aims at winning or scoring “cheap political points” even if that requires taking an opposing position that is inconsistent with previous positions or policy, and in the process demeaning or humiliating the opponent. All observers of the political process applaud informed and vigorous debate that teases out the issues and ensures sound decisions are made. But is an adversarial approach required to achieve this end? Some might argue that it is, but certainly, most reasonable people would disagree.

However, the anti-adversarial School of thoughts contends that the double standardized posture of politicians in the heat of adversarial politics make one wonder whether the boiling issues are factual or they are just riding on the whims of party lines. Thus, adversarial politics to these scholars, concerns itself with a mere disparaging and intolerant, with ‘winning’ the driving principle versus attempting to establish the truth. Invariably politics are ensnared by ‘struggle for victory’ in such a way that the ideals that brought them into politics in the first place will be ‘thrown to the dogs. Adversarial politics is further frowned upon by critics on the grounds that it diverts electorates’ attentions to unnecessary things and increases the apathy level during voting due to the confusions created in their minds.<sup>1</sup>

The “pro-adversarialists” on the other hand, have argued that when adversarial politics is played in a constructive and measured manner, it helps put the government and its machinery on their toes. This helps expose corrupt and other malfeasance in governance as vibrant opposition groups and free vibrant press are there to serve as watch-dogs to check abuse of offices and power.

### **The Politics of insult and Adversarialism in Ghana**

In adversarial politics exaggerated language is used to “embarrass, put down, demean or diminish an individual’s credibility” (Astra, 2008)<sup>2</sup>. It is designed to give the user a ‘win’ or an advantage over the others. The very translation of democracy in the Akan parlance creates a platform for adversarialism “ka bi na me nka bi” directly transliterated to mean “say what some and let me say what some” or in other words ‘permissively free to say anything one feels at any material time’. It is therefore not misplaced for Ofori (2013), to opine that, “while opposition politicians in other jurisdictions such as Canada and the UK use words such as ‘Back-flip’ and its colorful variants, ‘backflip with double pike’, ‘back-down’, ‘about-face’, or the more benign ‘about turn’ or ‘U-turn’ to indicate a change of mind or a different approach, opposition politicians in Ghana result to politics of insult when they are opposing the policies of the ruling government”.

The pre-independence political activities were characterized by boycotts, backbiting and the use of abusive languages by government and opposition parties. Though, the adversarial nature was highly informed by parochialism and ethnocentrism, it was couched under the guise of fighting for federalism (Ofori, 2013). For example, the decisive victory of CPP—72 out of 104 seats in the 1954 general election, push the opposition to agitate for a federal government. This led to the formation of National Liberation Movement (NLM) formed with the sole intention of promoting and protecting Ashanti interest).<sup>3</sup> The campaign of this movement was characterized by violence and ethnocentric acts. The Convention Peoples Party, CPP members, therefore, described them as stooges, imperialist agents, arch-reactionaries, and ‘cocoa season politicians’.<sup>4</sup> The subsequent paragraphs paint a picture of politics of insult and adversarialism in Ghana.

<sup>1</sup> World Heritage Encyclopedia: *Adversarial Process*. <http://central.gutenberg.org/article/WHEBN0000169163/Adversarial%20process>.

<sup>2</sup> Astra, A. (2008) Is adversarial politics damaging our democracy

<sup>3</sup> Kofi B. Kukubor: *Demagoguism: An Analysis of Politics of Insults in Ghana*

<sup>4</sup> *ibid*

First of all, the National Liberation Movement in the build to independence party contestations called the Convention People's Party supporters as "people who belonged to no family or clan, those who are strangers, not properly trained to appreciate the value of the true and noble Akans" in order to vindicate their political agenda.<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, on April 5, 1955, the Opposition led by Dr. Abrefa Busia and Modesto Apaloo thespian a walk-out of the National Assembly, after a Motion to a Select Committee to examine the subject of the federal system of government had been seconded because the Select Committee, comprising of some CPP parliamentarians were "some homeless tramp and jackals" who are inept to manage national affairs (Ofori, 2013).<sup>2</sup>

Thirdly, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah was also found culpable by referring to the Ghanaian chiefs as "stooges and sycophants" and even went ahead to threatened to and actually dis tooled some of the chiefs who had dissenting views of the admiration. For instance, in Nkrumah's words, the "Chiefs will run away fast and leave their sandals behind"<sup>3</sup>.

### Contemporary Illustrations

Since 1992, our political democratic landscape has been the adversary in nature. This got to its lowest ebb when two Presidents (now former Presidents) openly engaged in verbal insult in the media in 2005-2008.<sup>4</sup> Agyekum Kufuor referred to Jerry John Rawlings in the Akan language as a "Sasabonsam"— a devil, and as "That Thing" which should Not Have Been There as Ghana's President. Jerry John Rawlings responded to this by calling Agyekum Kufuor to "Atta Ayi"— "a notorious armed robber now in prison for his criminal activities". Between 1992 and 1996, the late Professor Adu Boahen openly stated that he named his dog after Rawlings because he claimed that his dog was very stubborn just like Rawlings (Ofori, 2013).

Additionally, the political landscape of Ghana has been besieged with such name calling as "Kookoo ase Kuraseni", thieves, fruit cake, cocaine barons, Shit-Eating-Human-Animal, womanizer, Junkie Parasite, chimpanzee, war monger, weed smoker, stupid fool, Arsonist, homosexual, ill-health ridden president, Professor do Little, and a "confused and blindfolded President who is walking in the forest without direction". These adversarial political tactics by government communication machinery and opposition parties have not only robbed the nation of the relevance of the President's vision but has also deprived the people of Ghana the opportunities therein.

Further, in 2007, while in opposition, the late president Mills called Kufuor's government "corrupt" on so many occasions.<sup>5</sup> No one can say this amount to an insult but Johnson Asiedu-Nketiah blatantly and harshly referred to the 17 men who were vying for the position of flagbearership to lead the NPP into the elections in 2008 "17 thieves contesting to elect a senior most thief" without an evidential value. Ursula Owusu, an NPP parliamentary was tagged by John Jinapor an Aide to the then vice-president Mahama, as a whore. Deputy interior minister, Kobby Acheampong also called NPP's general secretary, (a.k.a Sir John) as "a villager from under a cocoa tree". On the side of NPP, we have heard many people describing President Mills as a sickly man who could fall dead anytime soon (Frempong, 2008; 2012)

Furthermore, a party representative of NPP on a campaign platform in Kasoa described Asiedu-Nketiah (the General secretary of the NDC) as being "wretched and unkempt that if he ever gets sent to negotiate for any loan deals abroad, he would be thrown out by the hosts". In another instance, a member of the NPP communication team outrageously called the late that President Mills and his adviser, Ato Ahwoi as gay partners.

More so, in December 2010, the former President Flt Lt. Jerry John Rawlings called the administration of the late President John Evans Fiifi Ata Mill been surrounded by "greedy bastards", "non-performers", "arrogant" and "corrupt" and for that matter, must be sacked.<sup>6</sup> In a similar vein, Former President Rawlings called on the administration of President Mahama to sack some ministers he described as "babies with hard teeth" to restore the sanity in the party.<sup>7</sup>

Last but not least, Lamptey Vanderpuye at the Cape Coast stadium in their campaign launch declared that "no short man in glasses can become the President of Ghana" by way mocking the NPP presidential candidate. This notwithstanding, the NPP has also attacked the President Mahama and his administration on several platforms. He has been called names such as a womanizer, incompetent, thief, corrupt, Mr. Dumsor, Job killer (Ogu ndwuma), Chief borrower, liar and a deceitful leader who never fulfilled any promise made to the citizens of Ghana, among others.

Finally, in 2016, the following commentary have been made by some political aspirants being it parliamentary or Presidential. First of all, the founder of the Ghana Freedom Party (GFP), Madame Akua

<sup>1</sup> ibid

<sup>2</sup> <http://ghanaconscious.ghanathink.org/node/387>

<sup>3</sup> Nkrumah 1957 page 120 as cited in Ray (2003) Book section in Critical Perspectives on Politics and Socio-Economic Development in Ghana edited by Wisdom J. Tettey, Korbala P. Puplampu, Bruce J. Berman.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel Tinyogtaa Adama; politics of insults; Ghanaweb. Accessed 22 July 2015

<sup>5</sup> <http://atokd.com/blogContent.aspx?blogID=437>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/JJ-Mills-Meet-Over-Greedy-Bastards-200033>

<sup>7</sup> <http://edition.myjoyonline.com/pages/news/201208/93053.php>

Donkor made an unfounded allegation that the NPP's Presidential candidate had stolen a ship and in a statement, describe the former first lady Nana Konadu Agyemang Rawlings as behaving as though she is the wife of Nana Addo Dankwa Akuffo Addo. The vice President, Paa Kwesi Amissah-Arthur made the mockery of the Presidential candidate of NPP, Nana Addo Dankwa Akuffo Addo as not being able to see the developmental projects of the current administration because he is "Short". In a similar fashion, he called those the opposition party who criticized the government openly as "people who cannot think far". Again, the President Mahama, himself made a response to an earlier criticism made against his government, mocked the NPP presidential candidate of "sleeping whilst on tour", thus his inability to see the good road infrastructures in the western region ([citifmoline.com](http://citifmoline.com); [ghanaweb.com](http://ghanaweb.com); [peacefmonline.com](http://peacefmonline.com); [myjoyonline.com](http://myjoyonline.com); [graphicoline.com](http://graphicoline.com)).

### **Causes of Adversarial Politics in Ghana's Fourth Republic.**

First, the experience under the fourth republic has shown the costly dimensions of losing an election (Abotsi, 2013:6). Typically, a political party which loses an election loses its material and resource base, as contributors would be cash strapped-having been cut off privileges through contract annulment and cessations of appointments. The Electoral defeat also comes with the loss of influence and the diminution of the capacity to win the next election resulting from the depletion of its resource base (Abotsi, 2013). He further argued that the overall impact of a loss, therefore, surpasses the mere fact of not having the chance of prosecuting the party's agenda, but goes to the question of the very survival of the party, its adherents and its capacity to ever reclaim power.

Second, Opoku-Mensah (2009) expressed that, the overbearing influence of a government and persistent claims of influencing electoral officials appointed by it, have meant a political party losing elections sees itself as being potentially blocked out of the prospects of recapturing political power. He further noted that the complex mix of mistrust, institutional inefficiency and electoral practices by political parties among others meant that, the stake at each election becomes higher than and it's apparent from the structure of the governance framework.

Third, the massive cost-benefit imbalance during elections has meant that elections have become nothing but a must win the event with the alternative not being a reasonable option worthy of consideration. This according to Abotsi (2013) has culminated to adversarial politics in Ghana where the main opposition party opposes any policy of the ruling party whether it is in the very interest of the nation as a whole. The unquenchable taste for political power by the main opposition party, therefore, would force them to embrace the adversarial political tactics of discrediting and constantly scolding the ruling party for whatever policy they may embark on whether it will inure to the benefit of the majority.

Fourth, as observed by Abotsi (2013)-the phenomenon of "winner takes all" politics practice in Ghana's Fourth Republic, promotes and reinforces risky incentives towards results of elections. Opposition politicians have become overly motivated because they share different ideologies to reject any policy proposed by the ruling government they know that losing the election is unbearable.

Consequently, the exclusion from the share and distribution of national resources and entitlements, and being further sidelined in the area of political influence, opposition parties turn to reject and oppose the ruling party even if the country is on sound footing (Debra, 2012). Also, the phenomenon promotes implicitly legitimizes corruption by creating impressing entitlements in the minds party loyalist who come to think of exploitation and use of national resources and position as privileges obtained from victory at the polls and in respect of which they are not accountable (Fridy,2006). This dangerous psyche feeds into other issues like rent seeking, nepotism, and cronyism, ceaseless political bickering that engulfs our governance dynamics in-between elections.

Finally, Abotsi (2013) opined that, the event of "winner takes all" provides a powerful counter-productive scenario to the prospects of contestants in an election accepting voting results. Even though before the inception of the fourth republic, adversarial politics did exist in Ghana, the current form of adversarial politics could be attributed to the phenomenon of "winner takes all" whereby the opposition parties fear to lose an election because of the entitlements that they would be deprived of.

### **Negative implications Adversarial Politics on Democracy in Ghana**

One of the ways in which democracy triumphs is competitive election. But when competition turns into unbridled adversary and insults, it creates acrimonious and exhibition of insensitive tendencies which defeats the purpose of the democratic contestations. The following are some implications for Ghana's democracy:

First, adversarial politics of insults may result in ethnic conflict. The name calling and misrepresentations of some ethnic groups or tribes such as the Akans, Gas, Ewes, and Northerners, among others may insight them against one another. There has been an instance where a Member of Parliamentary for Assin North, Kennedy Agyapong, on a media platform declared war on ethnic groups in the Ashanti Region of Ghana, inciting them to kill anyone that tries to intimidate them or harm them—"If this is how things will go then the Gas in the Ashanti

Region, we will beat them; the Voltarians in the Ashanti Region, we will beat them.”<sup>1</sup> This is not good for the democratic consolidation of Ghana’s Fourth Republic.

Secondly, it has the tendencies of creating political tensions. Fairly recent, three Men namely, Alistair Nelson, Godwin Ako Gunn, and Salifu Maase (Mugabe) claiming to work for then President Mahama, insulted and scandalized the judiciary of Ghana and reminding of the killings of three high court judge under the Chairman of Flt Lt Jerry John Rawlings (Armed Revolutionary Council) that if they plunch the country into conflict—with one claiming to marry the Chief Justice should there be war or conflict. They further stated that they will not comply with the judgement on the voters register if it does not go in their favor This demeaning attack on the Chief Justice and other members of the Judiciary can affect their free operations and judgement in discharge their constitutionally mandated duties for fear of their lives. However, a functioning judiciary is crucial for the consolidation of democracy in every state

Thirdly, adversarialism may create rooms for political violence. The membership of the two major political parties in Ghana constitutes about 95% or more of the voting population in the country. Thus adversarialism and politics of insults if not managed properly can create avenues for political violence. To illustrate, the late President Mills, then the Presidential candidate for the NDC reminded Ghanaian about what was happening in Kenya, it could happen in Ghana if anyone tries to do the unthinkable. In a similar Fashion, Nana Addo Dankwa Akufo Addo on campaign platform prior to the 2012 election declared "all die be die" calling on the people to do anything possible to for them capture political power. Though sometimes the implicit meanings may not necessarily be the case, people most often than not, interpret base on the explicit meanings and this can harm the democratic credential of Ghana.

Fourthly, adversarial politics in the extreme places party interest over national interest. Instead of the politician coming together to discuss national issues especially in Parliament, they tend to place their party interest above national interest by undertaking unnecessary boycotts. As observed by Frempong (2007: 124) matters that border on “national reconciliation, national health insurance, the extension of the franchise to Ghanaians abroad, and the conviction of one of its members by a court of law”, under the administration of NPP were boycotted by the NDC parliamentary caucus. In a like manner, the NPP whilst in opposition has boycotted several sitting in the likes vetting of presidential ministerial nominees and budgets (prominent among these were in 2012 pending the supreme court verdict on the dispute electoral outcome). In 2015, the NPP boycotted sitting to join the “Won Gbo” demonstration, where ‘Won Gbo’ is translated in the Ga language to mean “we are dying” following the erratic or power crises in Ghana<sup>2</sup>. This boycott business or tradition detrimental development and negatively affect the drive to reap the benefit of democratic governance.

Fifthly, Bofo-Arthur (2006) and Ayee (2007) analysis on adversarial politics conveys how it could affect democratic credentials. Bofo-Arthur that noted adversary politics had “created barriers to building social capital for the nurturing of democratic growth in Ghana” such that parliamentary debate had become a “continuous polemic” before what was seen as the bar of public opinion. Ayee, in support of this bewailed that politics instead of uniting Ghanaians have divided them warned the citizens of Ghana to remember and incorporate the “community service”, “trust”, “reciprocity” and desist from dangerous adversarial politics— “We have, since independence, practiced adversary politics characterized by an antagonistic relationship between the major parties which turn political life into an electoral battle,” and this must cease<sup>3</sup>.

More also, the Rector GIMPA, Stephen Addei (Professor), on September 30, 2005, harangued that the "adversarial tactics" employed by parties in opposition is the biggest obstacle to development in the country. Stating that, the country essentially should move quickly from the state of “stabilization to growth-oriented development agenda and that demands the collective effort of all, regardless of political affiliation”. In another lecture, he admonished Ghanaians and politicians against the negativity of adversarialism, whilst emphasizing that "Sustaining the progress over 20 to 30 years in a democratic dispensation required both sides of the divide to agree on national priorities”, such that the capable and intelligent public servants will not be abstracted to please their political masters. Adversarialism though not always bad can destroy competence and objectivity the human resource of the country especially the bureaucracy and encourage patronage, Clientelism, parantela and prebendalism in the country.

Finally, Frempong (2007) observed that “interpersonal relationships in Ghanaian politics is characterized by low levels of trust because of the high degree of partisan fragmentation and the extent to which political antagonism is carried into individuals' personal lives”. He further noted that this has brought about suspicion among supporters and party officials if a member of their party reasonably disposes to the views of another political party. "This, in turn, affects the political sphere, making people less willing to co-operate politically with their fellow citizens,” (Ayee, 2007) cited in Frempong (2007). This presupposes that adversary if not manage well can contribute to democratic reversal and underdevelopment as well as factionalism in Ghana.

<sup>1</sup> <http://danquahinstitute.org/index.php/829-what-kennedy-agyapong-actually-said-unedited>

<sup>2</sup> [citifmonline.com](http://citifmonline.com)

<sup>3</sup> Ayee, 2006

## Conclusion and Recommendations

Drawing from the above discussions, adversarial politics in Ghana is not limited to only the fourth Republic but rather dates back to the period before independence. The variations, however, borders on the politics of insult. Whereas adversarial politics in the contemporary in caught up in the heat of insults on political platforms and on politicized media platforms, the adversarial politics before the fourth Republic of Ghana, especially the era of Kwame Nkrumah was more of ideological battle though some insult could be traced.

Furthermore, though the adversarialism in the contemporary Ghana sometimes becomes violent, one can claim that the magnitude does not exceed the politics of insult. Politician today finds it easier to resort to name-calling rather than telling the ordinary Ghanaian the policies and developmental agenda they seek to undertake when given the political mandate to run the affairs of the state.

In all, the paper has discussed the concept of adversarial politics, the nature of adversarial politics and politics of insult in Ghana using relevant examples mainly from the NPP and the NDC, and also highlighted some causes and negative implications of adversarial politics and of insults on Ghana's Democracy.

## Recommendations

One significant framework that the governance of Ghana needs to deal with is the nagging issue of political compensation and how to indemnify political actors against losses from investment in seeking public office. Politics and the assumption of public office has been said to be an act of public office for people must not have the expectation of profit. In that, unlike other jurisdictions where money donated for political courses are given without an expectation of personal returns, experience under the fourth republic have shown that politicians have to depend on the investment of private citizen and corporations with the mindset that, a successful capture of political power will result in redistribution and profiteering.

Additionally, the winner takes all political system of Ghana has contributed to this politics of insult and adversarialism in the sense that, parties that are unable to capture power become frustrated due the resources that have been channeled towards the elections and campaigns. The frustration further becomes aggression and sometimes inciting others against the government of the that becomes inevitable. Hence, there is a need for a structural or constitutional amendment to ensure that the proportional political system is adopted. This will go a long way to increasing participation and consensus building on national issues since larger political parties would need the support of the smaller parties in the decision-making process, especially in Parliament.

Also, adversarial politics may not necessarily be negative since it sometimes seeks to compel the ruling government to act meticulously because any act of negligence would be heavily criticized and scrutinized by the opposition political parties. Thus the opposition parties deem it necessary or as their primary responsibilities to make sure that the incumbent government is accountable to the citizenry. This particular system of governance then calls for dialogue between the ruling party and the opposition parties on matters of national interest.

Again, the polarization of Ghana's politics has led to an era of mutual hatred between and among the members of the two main political parties, thus NPP and NDC. Thus, far from considering themselves as collaborators in governance, following the end of an election, the two main political actors see each other as obstacles in their quest to attain political power and one which ought to be eliminated or dealt with accordingly. Finally, the significant change in the cultural pre-disposition in this regard will imply a major change in attitude to power and conceptions surrounding the essence of public office through political authority. A move away from group-centered parochialism in politics to inclusive governance will help harness the talent of all and maximize the return on political energies of Ghanaians. The overall embracing of political inclusiveness would lead to the bipartisan system of governance and enhance the effectiveness of Ghana's democracy.

## References

- Abotsi, K. E (2013) Re-thinking Winner-Takes-All System: The Institute of Economic Affairs: vol 19, No. 4, Governance Newsletter July/August 2013
- Adei, S (2005). Winner Takes All Impedes Development: Ghanaweb.com: retrieved, 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015.
- Arthur Kennedy, 'Ghana: Violence and Intimidation in Our Politics' Ghanaian Chronicle, February 15, 2011, <http://allafrica.com/stories/201102160513.html>
- Ayee, J.R.A (2007). Blame disunity on politics: Ghana at fifty lecture, Graphic online.com, accessed, From the Executive Summary of Report on Ghana Democracy & Governance Assessment Democracy International.
- Boafo-Arthur, K. (2006) "The 2004 General Elections: An Overview", in Boafo-Arthur, ed, *Voting for Democracy in Ghana: The 2004 Elections in Perspective*, Vol. 1, Accra: Freedom Publications, pp. 33-58.
- Debrah, E (2014) Civil Society Organizations and Political Party Electoral Engagements: Lessons from the 2008 and 2012 General Elections in Ghana. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, vol.7, no.3
- Frempong K.D. A. Innovations in Electoral Politics in Ghana's fourth Republic: An Analysis
- Fridy, K. S. (2007). The elephant, umbrella, and quarreling cocks: Disaggregating partisanship in Ghana's fourth republic. *African Affairs*, 106(423), 281-305.

- Gyimah-Boadi E. (2000). "Six Years of Constitutional Rule in Ghana: An Assessment and Prospects of the Executive and the Legislature", in Friedrich Ebert Foundation, *Six Years of Constitutional Rule in Ghana: 1993-1999*. Accra: Gold Type Ltd.
- Gyimah-Boadi E. et al., "What Are the Drivers of Change in Ghana?" Ghana Center for Democratic Development/Overseas Development Institute Policy Brief No. 1 (Accra: CDD-Ghana, November 2005), <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1322.pdf>
- Gyimah-Boadi, E. (2009) "Another Step Forward For Ghana" *Journal of Democracy* 20, No. 2 (April 2009):138-152
- Gyimah-Boadi, E. 2004. *Democratic Reform in Africa: The Quality of Progress*. Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder, Colorado
- Gyimah-Boadi, E. et al. (2005), "What Are the Drivers of Change in Ghana?" Ghana Center for Democratic Development/Overseas Development Institute Policy Brief No. 1 <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1322>
- Gyimah-Boadi E and Brobbey, V (2012). *Countries at the Crossroads: Ghana*, Retrieved: July 15, 2015
- Leslie, F, et al (2011). *Ghana Democracy and Governance Assessment*. (Washington, DC: United States Agency for International Development, 2011).
- Mattes, R and E Gyimah-Boadi.E (2003) *The Quality of Two Liberal Democracies in Africa: Ghana and South Africa*.
- Paper Presented at Conference On "The Quality of Democracy: Improvement of Subversion?" Centre on Democracy, Development, and Rule of Law and European Forum Institute for International Studies, Stanford University.
- Nduom, P. K. (2013), *The fundamental change we need to realize our potential*: Ghanaweb: accessed: 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015.
- Ofori, E. A (2013) *The Use of Insults/Intemperate Language in Political Discourse in Ghana: a Critical Discourse Analysis*. CENTER FOR AFRICAN STUDIES Research Report.
- Olson, D (1980) *The Legislative Process: A Comparative Approach*, Harper & Row, New York,
- Ray, D. I. (2003). Chief in their Millenium Sandals: Traditional authority in Ghana- Relevance, Challenges, and Prospects. In W. Tettey, K. P. Pupilampu, & B. B. J, *Critical perspectives in politics and socio-economic development in Ghana* (pp. 241-278). Leiden Brill
- Whitfield, L. (2002). 'Civil Society as Idea and Civil Society as Process: The Case of Ghana', QEH Working Paper Series 92: 1-28.