

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

David Sotola¹

1 University of Nottingham

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article provides useful insights into the development and underdevelopment conversations in Africa and serious attempt was made to explain the African development conundrum using Davidson theory of action in relation to responsibility. The central point seems to be on the links between individual action and state development outcome, and how individual actions are important determinant of state development outcome. There are few comments and suggestions:

- 1. That Africans are responsible for the state of African development, and by implication should take responsibility for her development, is not a novel argument, and there are existing theories, arguments and perspectives across many fields, especially social sciences. These existing theories are insufficiently recognised in this work. I will suggest the article should briefly highlight few of these theories. The goal of the brief discussion is not to supplant your argument, but to show and recognise their existence and that despite having considered them, your point still subsist and your work is contributing and updating this debate.
- 2. The author should be careful of overgeneralisation. In a couple of places, the article seems to be overstretching its point. For instance, in the paragraph starting with, the point under emphasis, it said, 'Because the majority of them lack this mental and ideal understanding of development, they have through the exercise of their political powers, kept Africa in darkness but would in turn keep blaming the African predicaments which Africa should have started showing liberation from them for a long time ago'. In this context of this paper, this may be stretching into other things, leadership, 'darkness'. This is not the only place.
- 3. I will suggest the need to add example and/or cases to buttress the main point to make it more clearer. The Edo State example discussed does not speak to the central point of the article and in my understanding of it, does not provide clarity as to what point it supported. Secondly, the article is focused on Africa going by the title, but the only example mentioned is Nigeria and for a subnational government (Edo state). I will suggest you include other countries' example or make it a Nigeria study.
- 4. Lastly, in few places, there are writing errors or writing mistakes. For instance, in the last paragraph, first line, "I" as used is confusing, seems one author personalising the article/paragraph, "What I have tried to contribute following Okolo is that development also entails dignity of the human person". I can notice there are two authors for the article. Please look into this.

