

Review of: "Donald Davidson's Theory of Action in Relation to Responsibility: Addressing Crisis of Social Development in Africa"

Ndivhuho Tshikovhi¹

¹ Durban University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract – The authors juxtapose Davidson's theory and the African "predicaments" they claim. Fair enough, but the abstract should reflect a rational, methodological approach and some teasers for readers on what was found. This abstract extends the rationale discussion, which hinders the subsequent component of a good abstract. I would advise the revision to a typical old-day abstract style.

Introduction – continues the rationale on the African predicaments without following or justifying the argued underdevelopment by "themselves" equation. This leaves one to ponder if the authors deeply understand the global institutions that govern the socio-economic, political and, to a lesser extent, environmental structure before we zoom into Africa. Be that may, it might be wiser to read a bit further on the formation of the post-World War II institutions and the wealth of nations to the economics of inequality.

Donald Davidson's Standard Theory – is rather well developed and argued, but less so to do with the African predicaments, except for the last paragraph that tried to justify the section concerning Africa, which was not done throughout the theory discussions.

Donald Davidson's Standard Theory and Africa's crisis – "The blame game for Africa's backwardness in mental and physical development" This statement and many made in this paper are scientifically unfounded.

1. Define Africa – 54 member states, some of the fastest growing economies, extremely diverse in nature and resources, culture, and languages, forming social norms, values, etc.
2. The development case is baseless if one looks at the development of Timbuktu, Mapungubwe, Edo (known today as Benin City) and many more developments.
3. A case in point argued about leaders and their greediness; this goes way back to the days of Kings and Queens that still prevail in some nations these authors may not call "backwards". The point is that throwing stones living in a glass house is well placed in opinion pieces, not academic discourse. I would refer the authors to why nations fail not African countries, not Middle Eastern, Asian, or African, but failure to provide jobs, basic needs, and infrastructure is a common dilemma not ordered by Africans as claimed in this paper by African emerging scholars.

In conclusion, – I did not expect any better. The authors extend their arguments, bringing new ideas instead of concluding

and recommending a way forward with no substantial evidence of their ill-informed views under the pretence of academic discourse.

Nevertheless, it is an interesting read that provokes an intellectual understanding of being and how to leverage scientific tools to bring about information to share, build and strengthen worldwide institutions.