THE word 'governance' has assumed emotive power since the last decade of the last century. I have often wondered why this should have been so and came to the view that its universal application throughout the West, of which our Caribbean is a part, may well be an acknowledgement of the flawed workings of 'government' defined in terms of elections, parliamentary debates, constitutional procedures and the rule of law. What happens outside of these formal ritualistic offerings has in many cases left the mass of the population, the ordinary man and woman, out of the process of decision-making that determines the destiny of such people. And the consequences have not always been the best for the human condition, worse still when certain kinds of decisions taken in the name of 'the people' have served to diminish their very humanity which these decisions purport to protect or promote. Nazism, Fascism, and Marxism Leninism have been the 'people-creeds' which have resulted in genocide and death camps, in gulags and other political grotesquerie denying to millions some basic freedoms.

Before we indulge the triumphalist posture which the West has assumed since the disintegration of the Soviet Empire, let us recall the agony of McCarthyism in what is supposed to be one of the world's greatest democracies and the acute racism against persons of African ancestry in that same Republic, followed by succeeding apartheid regimes of South Africa. We need to recall, as well, the ethnic cleansing sagas of the Balkans and Rwanda as well as the authoritarian military regimes of Spain, Portugal, Latin America and parts of post-colonial Africa.

We in the Caribbean have escaped somewhat, but only somewhat! For there have been the Haitian experience, the miscalculations of Grenada leading up to the tragedy of 1983 complete with assassinations and foreign invasion, the continuing uncertainty of Cuba made no better by the United States embargo and the proven attempt at destabilization of the tenacious Castro regime, and the aberrations of government in Santo Domingo and pre-Caricom Suriname. All these facts and features of the region's
post-War 20th century history have given cause to take a serious look at how governments function or ought to function and the implications for governance. The Commonwealth Caribbean, which is the most recent to enter the Independence mode and therefore to take full responsibility for the administration of transferred power, has had little reason to feel exempt from such reflection. Corruption, the continuing immiseration of the mass of the population, clumsiness in the handling of public affairs, free and frequent, admittedly, but less than fair elections, and doubts about public probity in the conduct of public affairs, are reasons enough for us to look beyond the nicely stated procedures of Westminster governmental operation and to invoke the principles of good and acceptable ‘governance.’

For those of us who now have in our control the recently transferred power from the Mother country, the term ‘governance’ signifies the dynamics of interaction and interrelationships between the governed and the governor, between the people and the persons they elect/choose to administer their affairs as fiduciaries, and the institutional and operational frameworks that guarantee the perpetual presence of the people who are the proffered beneficiaries of government organised and run in their interest. Government for and by the people is memorable rhetoric. In praxis, it is not infrequently memorable anguish for a great many people.

Yet in fairness to the Commonwealth Caribbean, the pledge to have decency inform its public affairs persists with a vengeance. In affirming the democratic traditions of the Caricom, Heads of Government in its twelfth intersessional meetings in Barbados in February 2001, declared in its communiqué: Heads of Government considered the issue of governance and democracy in the Region. They re-affirmed their commitment to democracy and popular participation as enshrined in the Charter of Civil Society and adopted by the Conference in 1997 as well as the Kingston Declaration on Democracy and Popular Participation adopted in July 1990. They pledged to work together to maintain and strengthen the institution and processes essential to democratic Government and in this regard, enjoined their citizens to pursue all of their just economic, social and political objectives within the framework of the Region’s deeply cherished democratic traditions.... They stressed that the Region had a long-standing tradition of respect for the will of the people, as expressed through free and fair elections on a regular basis. They were confident that this tradition would be maintained in the forthcoming processes and called on all concerned to honour this tradition and respect its results. They pledged their continued support to those processes, through the provision of election of observers where requested.

The contemporary Commonwealth Caribbean is now shaping a society, besides building nations, to ensure that a way forward will co-incide with the perceived intentions of the system of government we have all inherited. In some instances the inheritance has been safeguarded with an obstinacy that some would regard as a sign of that great need for our liberation from mental slavery. That none but ourselves can free our minds is seemingly hardly understood by many such persons. The monarchy in the form of the House of Windsor along with all its heirs, still receives oaths of allegiance from most of the
ministers of government in the Commonwealth Caribbean. A Caribbean Court of Justice is a matter for serious controversy since a good many of us are of the view that the idea of a Caribbean jurisprudence is a contradiction in terms or that people of our ilk cannot administer justice, not being fit to rule or fit to govern. The new phenomenon of globalization receives inadequate scrutiny depriving too many of us of the eyes to see that it is much of old wine in a new bottle - and that the hegemony of the rich of the world persists in the concentration of money-power and trading-options in the North Atlantic where imperial power has resided for the past half a millennium.

Such are some of the manifestations of the crisis in governance. And high on the list of priority-responses is the application of the 'management factor' in political leadership. In the context of the changes at end of century and the beginning of the new millennium, political leadership in countries of the Caribbean is challenged to find new and appropriate form and purpose for government in the exercise of power, to bring to that exercise the skills of management in ways that can maximise the benefits from the dynamic mobilization of the creative energies of the human beings on whose loyalty and commitment the generation of the productive resources depend, and to facilitate the shaping of civil society that will experience a quality of life rooted in freedom from hunger, freedom from disease, freedom from ignorance and freedom from fear - freedoms which appropriately describe fundamental issues of governance in terms of policy-options for a people's satisfaction as a result of an Administration's food policy (a hungry man is after all an angry man), medicare and good health-care delivery (an unhealthy population can neither produce nor develop its minds), an education policy as well as provision for free information (an ignorant society is outside the orbit of the knowledge economy which is a clear guarantee of positive development) and a secure and safe society (i.e., one free of violence from the state or from aggressive fellow-citizens defiant of law and order).

The fervent call for democracy is not always matched by the practice of it. It is as if the inheritance of an authoritarian temper coming out of plantation history and colonialism has left an indelible mark. The replacement of planters and Crown officials by autocratic messianic native political leaders and humourless native bureaucrats, respectively, has not always advanced the decolonisation process with the speed anticipated. So political leaders in many ex-colonial territories have been caught less than fully prepared for the new roles and functions demanded of governments and related agencies not just in Independence but in an Independence that must find for itself a discrete form against the background of shifting paradigms and transforming ideologies.

The statism that in practice went with socialist ideology in its different stages of expression has given place since the 1990s to a free enterprise ideology elevating the private sector to much greater (if not an exaggerated) eminence in the pursuit of development strategies formerly deemed to be the province largely of Governments. Political leadership that fails to heed the pitfalls of swinging indiscriminately with the pendulum from one polarity to the next is not likely to prove effective, however. For as a Jamaican “Report
on Government Structure" averred, "the establishment of market economies and the globalization of production do not imply necessarily less government, but different and better government."

The 'difference' lies in the concept of government as a hub in a network of social/ power partners engaged in the process of continuing interaction for the purpose of policy formulation and implementation. Political leadership in office should now be prepared to find common understanding with all other parties, the business community, trade unions, non-governmental organizations, and other civic bodies on the broad goals of economic and social development as well as on the policy framework through which rules will be established for the management of the economy and the respective roles of each partner in management delineated organisations. Political leadership in this context means strategic 'brokering' in the attempt to reconcile divergent interests among the respective partners and to facilitate the effective discharge of their respective responsibilities.

All of this implies a different style and substance of public management - a change from the 'bully-riding' tactics of the elected-turned-autocratic tincars to the co-ordinate transformational leadership about which so-called progressive managers in the private sector now speak. Here there is no monopolistic claim on the part of political leaders as change agents. Rather there obtains a concept of leadership whereby "power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for a common purpose." The idea that the community and the private sector are 'power centres,' other than the Cabinet and parliament, may be a difficult concept to handle, but the ability to entertain this is a test of political leadership both at this time and in the foreseeable future as part of the way forward. Leaders in the private sector have themselves had to grapple with a similar concept in dealing with organised workers at the shopfloor level whether as trade unionists or as members of staff associations. The core values that political leadership must delineate are the aims and objects not simply of government, but of good governance and social soundness in general. The journey back to first principles is mandatory if the fundamental question of what is needed of Caribbean society is to be, seriously addressed. Political leaders who are not of a mind to ask such a question, are hardly ready to lead, and may well be discouraged from doing so.

Artistic predilections drive me to the analogy of political leadership being like the leadership of an orchestra. The conductor may indeed be the acknowledged and authoritative genius at getting out of the ensemble the right and pleasurable sounds, tone and timbre but accepts that he/she cannot play all of the various instruments himself/herself. The spectacle of a one-man band, besides being clumsy-looking, is limited in scope, however clever the electronic and mechanical contraptions devised. This is the challenge for Cuba's 'maximum leadership' as it is for the 'elected dictatorships' which Commonwealth Caribbean Westminster cabinet governments with their all-powerful prime ministers are cynically said to be.

Prime ministers and executive presidents would do well to appreciate this in coordinating their management teams and they in turn collectively to do likewise in 'leading' the citizenry. Of course there must be room for fully developed technical skills
in the mastery of the craft underpinning the art of performance. But there must also be much imagination, creativity and the kind of flexibility that can accommodate within the overall performance dissonance, variation, improvisation and seeming off-beat indulgence by rebel instrumentalists.

As good managers, political leaders, in and out of office, should therefore be able to identify and hold on to the distinctive edge of government vis-à-vis all the other players in the game. The jargon of the day is filled with such phrases as ‘market driven,’ ‘free enterprise’ and ‘laissez-faire.’ But these are nothing more than scaffoldings to facilitate access to the edifice of sound governance. ‘Management’ has been added to the equation of political leadership for example in Jamaica since 1980 when an entire election was fought on a choice between ‘mismanagement’ and ‘better management.’ Financial wizardry, planning and budgeting prowess, as well as marketing expertise have been invoked as essentials of effective public management by political leaders. It is not enough, goes the argument, for political leadership to be charismatic and inspirational: it needs to be pragmatically effective and action-oriented. Policy options, priorities, investment choices and planning must be managed.

It is of course possible to demonstrate managerial prowess without an appreciation of the contextual realities of the body politic’s wider culture. Such contextual realities in much of the contemporary Caribbean may well turn, inter alia, on the political culture of a marginalized mass driven by ambitions of good education, upward social mobility, material betterment, individual dignity and racial respect.

Caribbean political leadership has long had well-intentioned designs to march different countries of the region into an era of high technology through computer-based scientific management of public affairs. Could these efforts become misguided in the attempt to “make pioneers of the future out of human beings who had not recovered from the memories of a ruined past,” as has been said of survivors of Auschwitz called upon to build a glorious future?" Enforced labour in chattel slavery and its aftermath of continuing disabilities despite clear signs of some progress, coupled with the experience of abused labour in indentureship constitute for the vast majority of Caribbean people a ‘ruined past’ keenly intuited as part of a cultural memory.

From the days of self-government advocacy right into Independence, too many among the region’s top political leadership have shown scant regard for the deep social forces affecting the lives of those who constitute the majority of the electorate and who carry with them a psychic inheritance not only of material dispossession but also of social and cultural marginalisation. This has in turn triggered ‘acts’ of assertion of ‘self’ in many forms as in the unprecedented and spontaneous outbursts of widespread enthusiasm extended by the mass of the Jamaican population to such state visitors as Haile Selassie in 1966 and Nelson Mandela in 1991.

True, leaders like Alexander Bustamante and Michael Manley were in their own time able to bring politics and political followers to levels of emotional intensity which was the envy of rivals. Fidel Castro of Cuba, Aristide of Haiti, Vere Bird of Antigua and Eric Gairy
of Grenada did likewise in their territories as did 'Odo' Forbes Burnham of Guyana and Lynden Pindling of the Bahamas. And the very special Dr. Eric Williams did likewise using dulcet tones to seduce his Trinidad & Tobago citizenry around to national unity in the 'University of Woodford Square.'\textsuperscript{12}

However distasteful such 'populism' may be to political leaders of lesser messianic mein, it has done the major Caribbean leader little good when he fails to connect on an emotional level with the mass of the population whose need for such visceral contact with their leaders is an important variable in the equation of the relationship between leader and led. The Tiberius test whereby one prefers to be feared rather than loved is not recommended in the Caribbean where distrust of authority is second-nature and hate is a prime ingredient of resistance to oppression.

Charismatic leaders should therefore never yield to the temptation of writing off the popular mass as manipulable dependents. Governments have been rejected at the ballot box despite the alleged handouts of largesse by ruling parties to electorates. Voters are known to accept the leaders' money at campaign time and still vote against them.

The way forward for governance in the contemporary Caribbean turns in no small way, then, on government's and the political leaders' reconsidered role in a new configuration of 'partnership' and 'participation' involving the major stakeholders - the people - in the enterprise of shaping a new society. Back in 1992, I had the opportunity to share with others the following:

There is a clear need for Government to be put in perspective. There is need to ensure that the Government and people regard themselves as different but complementary parts of the same whole; that Government and its supporting bureaucracy are not seen as millstones around the necks of a powerless citizenry; that Government is not encouraged to continue projecting itself as sole Provider and Deliverer in a messianic dispensation that nurtures paroxysms of excess leading to the celebration of a saviour one week and his crucifixion the next; that distrust, disintegrative tension, and cynicism do not continue to inform the relationship between the governors and the governed; that the citizenry does not feel deliberately deprived of information critical to the understanding of economic change in the world at large and to the ability for the individual to cope with the deep social forces operative in a society. The mass of the population has historically suffered economic disabilities and harbours to this day, a particular sense of being deprived and wronged. This in turn leads to an endemic commitment to 'beating the system' (presided over by Government) or to making things not work.\textsuperscript{13}

Historical factors, contemporary realities (including the perceptions of the problems relating to the structure, operation and output of Government) and the wider issue of governance suggest a response in the way Caribbean governments should function if they are to not only install an economy designed to achieve economic growth, stability and a capacity for on-going development but also attain civil society based
on the democratic principles of liberty, equality, social justice, the rule of law and the empowerment of the citizenry.

‘Privatisation,’ ‘deregulation,’ ‘liberalisation’ are indeed mere means to such ends rather than ends in themselves. To have them make sense against the background of the region’s history, political culture and current perceptions of the ends of Government, they must serve the ends of ‘empowerment’ of the mass of the population along with all others, whether by way of promoting worker share ownership, broadening the economic base of owners in the society, instituting land reform, or releasing the creative potential of a far larger number of private citizens to have them participate on a ‘level playing field’ once dominated by the state (through state and para-statal monopoly enterprises) and a small elite group of corporate owners in the traditional private sector, despite the countervailing force of strong trade unions and other workers organizations advocating workers rights since 1938.

The aim should now be the unleashing of entrepreneurial energy for the development of the productive forces, with greater emphasis on facilitating private capital accumulation as a major instrument of economic production instead of having the state as the prime player. The proven inadequacy of the state’s ability to deliver justifies its withdrawal from this sphere of economic development. But the no less proven tendency of a concentration of oligarchic economic power when capital accumulation and production are left unregulated in the hands of private monopolies, advises caution and dictates the forging of appropriate, innovative, flexible and responsive mechanisms to mitigate the excesses of greed and cynicism and to temper unbridled enthusiasms for rapid bottom-line success at any cost.

The New Role of Government

What, then, is the role of Government in such a dispensation? Apart from the traditional functions of law and order, defence, security, and foreign affairs, we envisage new nuances with respect to the role of Government in the economy. The establishment of market economies and the globalization of production do not, however, imply a shift to a system of laissez-faire. What it does imply is, indeed, not necessarily less government, but different and better government - a clue to the way forward for Caribbean governance.¹⁴

First of all, facilitating, regulating and monitoring, sensitively and creatively pursued, become major functions of Government in the open economy. An open economic system requires sensitivity in order to allay fears of bureaucratic clumsiness and oppression against the citizen in his/her daily pursuit of practical affairs, and creativity so as to be able to apply flexibility in the implementation of public policy that turns on the facilitative, regulatory and monitoring functions of Government. The system however cannot be so open that it runs amok, negating the very aspiration of empowerment because of the absence of agreed-on well articulated regulative principles delineating the parameters of action.

Secondly, the Government should conceive of itself as the hub of a network of social partners engaged in a process of
continuing interaction for the purpose of policy formulation and implementation. Efforts should be made to reach a common understanding among political parties, the business community, trade unions, NGOs, and other community-based bodies on the broad goals of economic and social development, and on the policy framework through which rules will be established for the management of the economy, and the respective roles of each partner in management would be delineated.

Thirdly, the Government has yet another catalytic role to play in strengthening the knowledge base of the society by way of improving systems of education and training, and stimulating research and development, including the development of information systems for use by the different actors in the economy. World production and trade are being more and more driven by new and emerging technologies in fields such as biotechnology, telecommunications, civil aviation, new materials sciences, computer hardware and software. These are affecting the competitiveness of industries across all sectors of the economy, and leading to the opening up of new avenues for international trade, especially in the field of services.

A large part of technological advances has to be supported directly or indirectly by Government funding. In both developed and newly industrializing countries, research and development (R & D) are becoming significant claimants on public resources. It is evident that the region has to follow this pattern, since there is a dire need to improve the technological sophistication of existing lines of production, and to identify possibilities where such sophistication can be applied to new lines of production. Here again, the Government and the Private Sector will have to work very closely together.

The Science and Technology Policy adopted by Governments in the region sets out a number of clear R & D priorities. These include biotechnology, especially plant tissue culture, marine science, energy, environmental management, disaster control, remote sensing, and mathematical modelling. The execution of such a programme will require considerable resources of trained people and money. Governments should aim to collaborate with the Private Sector in the development of the necessary human resources, in mobilizing the financing required, and in encouraging utilization and commercialization of the research results.

Fourthly, the Government has a specially distinct role in encouraging the growth of small business development and diffusion of entrepreneurial skills throughout the economy, and in supporting the participation of as many citizens as possible in the ownership of, and control over, assets. For example, in sectors such as agriculture and tourism, it should be particularly sensitive to the needs of the small operators for finance and technical assistance. Here, again, it should increasingly play the role of a broker and arranger rather than that of a direct provider.

Fifthly, in the field of international trade, Governments have to work continuously to improve access for their country’s exports of both goods and services, as international competition is intensifying across the globe, and new regional groupings are emerging which could place non-members of those groupings at a disadvantage. Here work must continue in the strengthening of CARICOM, so as to develop trade and economic relations
with the non-English-speaking Caribbean and Latin America, among others.

Such catalytic work on the part of governments is not confined to the negotiation of inter-governmental trade agreements though the Regional Negotiating Machinery is arguably the most progressive initiative taken collectively in this regard. Governments need also to work very closely with the Private Sector in ensuring the fullest possible flow of information on exports, technology transfer, investment and financing opportunities. Differential information capacities is one area which separates developed from developing countries. The catalytic role that Caribbean governments through collective action can play in promoting an adequate flow of economic and financial information is, therefore, of cardinal importance. The Private Sector will increasingly take over more of the responsibility for that function, but it should be noted that even in the most advanced economies - Japan is a case in point - Governments continue to act as strategic brokers in identifying international export opportunities, and in supporting improvements in the overall international competitiveness of a given country in trade, economic and financial transactions.

Sixthly, given the current situation in the region, and its historical antecedents, Caribbean Governments must inevitably pay more direct attention to alleviating the situation of under-privileged groups. Economic development will not achieve its ultimate purpose of improving the human condition, if deliberate measures are not taken to provide a social safety net for disadvantaged citizens in areas such as basic education, health, child nutrition, affordable housing, and social welfare services. Here, the Government should increasingly focus on determining policy through the widest possible consultations, and channeling resources in a dynamic partnership with the Private Sector, and voluntary organizations.

Seventhly, it has also to be borne in mind that a whole new range of social problems have emerged which require action by Governments nationally, regionally and internationally. These include the spread across national boundaries of environmental degradation, communicable diseases, (the high incidence of HIV-AIDS is particularly disturbing), crime, drug trafficking, illegal migrants, and refugees. In one way or another, these could pose a threat to economic and social stability. All Caribbean governments together and individually must play their part in schemes of, and arrangements for, regional and international cooperation to mitigate the negative impact of these trends.

This leads to a related point. Given the transcendental nature of the changes taking place over the globe, and the volatility which tends to accompany them, it would not be advisable for countries to adopt a static view of what the role of Government should be. That role should be perceived in a dynamic context, where countries need to respond in an adequate and timely manner to current and emerging problems. This calls for a Government which is flexible in both structure and operations, which is well-endowed with technical expertise including information systems, and which is working in harmony with the Private Sector, and the entire community. In other words, Government should conceive of itself as constituting the nexus of a new social partnership, in which there is shared responsibility for establishing...
the goals of the society, for identifying the problems that have to be solved, and for tackling them.

Eighthly, by virtue of the overall leadership role which the citizenry has reposed in it, a Government has a basic responsibility to help the country reach its full potential, in the process encouraging standards and values that would make everyone proud of their country and its heritage, and would endow them with each other, and with people in the rest of the world.

In all of this, the operation of the Government should be conducted in an atmosphere of transparency so that the citizenry can be thoroughly informed, and that some of the circumstances that give rise to policy error, nepotism, and corruption could be avoided.

A well governed polity must have the elected government (at central and local levels) and its support mechanisms of civil service, local government officers, statutory boards and advisory committees at the hub or be the nexus of inter-connected activities involving the Private Sector and community-based organizations as partners. All three partners are to be engaged in a dynamic process of resource management and administration of political decision-making, the exercise of accredited authority in the mobilisation and allocation of resources generated for the growth and development of the entire society as well as the implementation of policies related to all this.

It is axiomatic that the defence of the poor, who still form the vast majority, should be perceived as a major task of Government in a majority ruled democratic system and should be high on the list of things to be achieved. It is expected that Government should therefore be held accountable to its electors for its actions through such mechanisms as:

(a) regular and duly constituted parliamentary meetings offering frank and open debate on all national issues conducted by parliamentarians of integrity, candour and dedication, while making provision for

(b) established procedures of accounting for Government’s stewardship by those who actually formulate policy (i.e., civil servants, executives of public enterprises, political heads of ministries) and

(b) a free Press (print and electronic) with each having access to information about the conduct of the nation’s business and unfettered by censorship imposed by a whimsical political directorate or by any self-censorship that comes in the form of silence and/or sycophancy instilled by fear of political victimization of those who may publicly criticise or comment adversely (but fairly) on the performance of politicians and other public servants. 

(c) systematic self-regulation and self-monitoring by subjecting self to the rule of law, due process and all that signifies that Government is not above the law.
The Private Sector as Partner

The Private Sector in this partnership of governance should regard itself as no less accountable in the performance of its functions to both people (as consumers and workers) and government (a fellow social contractee representing the citizenry at large).

In that partnership-structure the Private Sector should itself help to broaden its base following on the Government’s initiative to empower middle-sized businesses and micro-entrepreneurs without seeking to impoverish the established large entrepreneurs. Not only men but also the large army of women should be encouraged on to the playing field as should West Indians drawn from all ethnic backgrounds. And the workers and their trade unions already in tripartite partnership with employers and Government in administering the industrial relations system have a pivotal role to play in the wider partnership but with full understanding of their own role in this parallel partnership.

The private sector partner should be capable of entrepreneurial activity that extends beyond traditional commission agency concerns to risk-taking, innovation, and a willingness to face competition in an open market, both regional and international. The sector should exhibit the capacity to participate meaningfully in the defining of strategic objectives for growth and should be able to use technology to help create a competitive advantage in funding new commodities for export distinct from the exploitation of traditional natural resources (such as bauxite, bananas, sugar). The sector should also commit itself to corporate responsibility for social development with a view to getting to a consensus or convergence with Government on notions of what is good for the region. The sector will be a better partner in the new structure for showing a willingness to share in governmental responsibilities of social investment for the public good particularly in the inescapable challenge to eliminate unemployment, hunger, ignorance, disease and a fear for one’s personal physical safety as well as for the wider society’s collective security.

The Community as Partner

The Community, as partner, also has responsibilities in the participatory mode. Foremost among these is the commitment the wider society must have to civil society as basis for everyday civilised living rooted in values and maxims of prudence supportive of the dignity, safety and mental health of its members. It must collectively eschew violence as an instrument of conflict-resolution whether between individuals or groups such as political parties, trade unions and their employers, and opposing teams in sport and so on.

The community as effective partner in the participatory structure must be committed to self-reliance in the building, shaping and maintenance of social institutions necessary for stable, peaceful and sound community life with or without the direct intervention of Government (central or local) or the Private Sector. It must also exhibit a willingness to take the initiative, on however limited a scale, in the delivery to itself of primary health care (through the practice of good personal hygiene, the vigilance over occupational health and safety at the workplace, environmental care, etc.); and of education, with parents and teachers taking an active interest in the education of their children at
all levels of the educational system, participating in decisions affecting school life, curriculum development, and cultural orientation in the preparation for employment and the creative exploitation of life and living in adulthood.

Sports and the arts have already demonstrated how community interest and Private Sector support with Government facilitation, can render ‘community action’ effective, leaving the Ministers largely as ‘cheerleaders’ rather than as controllers in the operation of these areas of activities. The encouragement of basic physical facilities, such as genuine playing fields, recreational halls (community centre buildings) with performing areas or open spaces for training and rehearsing in the performing arts are naturally recommended. The community should also exhibit the capacity to provide leadership at a community level for the identification of problems specific to a given community, for participatory planning with Government (Local Government in particular and business leaders as collaborators), and for the designing and implementation of plans of action for the community’s growth and development as well as the determination of the nature and extent of the linkages between itself and the Private Sector and/or Government.

Conclusion

Governance in the contemporary Caribbean therefore seeks to maximize the benefits of interaction between three major partners in participatory governance - Government, Private Sector and Community. The cutting edge of such interaction signifying the dynamics of the inter-relationship is clearly the investment in human resources. All three partners have a vested interest in the qualitative/quantitative improvement and development of the region’s human resources measurable in terms of such variables as education, productive capacity, health (and its linkage with education and productivity), housing (and its relations to social stability) and cultural certitude with emphasis on the opportunities for release of individual creativity for the building of self-esteem and social confidence among the citizens of the region who are, after all, the main producers of wealth and the real engines of growth.
End Notes

1In September 1991 President Jean Bernard Aristide of Haiti was deposed by the Haitian military. In 1994 the United States invaded Haiti, with support from the United Nations eager to restore the President and end the violence. See Judson Jeffries, “United States and Haiti. An Exercise in Intervention,” Caribbean Quarterly, 47(4) December 2001. For more on the Grenada (1983) Revolution, see CQ, 41(2), Special Issue “Tom and New - The Grenada Revolution.”


Suriname attained its Independence in 1975. In 1980 there was a relatively bloodless coup when Desi Bouterse took over power. In December 1982 there was another coup reportedly planned by the CIA (see Latin American Regional Report, June 1982, also Tom Barry et al, 1984: 360-364).


4The Oath of Affirmation of Allegiance reads: “I……………….. do solemnly and sincerely affirm and declare that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, Her heirs and Successors, according to Law.” Standing Orders for the House of Representatives, Jamaica. Appendix 1: 18th September, 1964, adopted by the House 28th May, 1964. The Law (i.e., the Constitution) does make all Commonwealth Caribbean countries with the exception of Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago and Dominica hereditary monarchies with Britain’s Elizabeth the second as Monarch. Some argue that she should be Elizabeth the first to new independent Caribbean countries. The issue is, however, whether the same monarch who reigned over the colonies should remain the Head of State of the now-independent nations. Others argue that “republicanism” in its pristine “democratic” sense is more appropriate for a modern
polity emerging out of colonialism. Still others regard the pledging of allegiance to the ‘heirs’ of the present monarch as a gamble not worth taking since there is no guarantee that the hereditary principle will allow for inclusiveness in choice of spouses for purposes of breeding which is fundamental to hereditary succession.

5. The debate on the Caribbean Court of Justice as court of final resort has been apace for sometime. An excellent article out of the Caribbean News Agency appeared in the Jamaica Gleaner summing up the positions of stakeholders in the debate and drawing on writings by Simeon McIntosh, Professor of Jurisprudence in the UWI Faculty of Law. The debate should not be unaffected by the “important fact that of the 50 countries that were once members of the British Empire, only 17 currently seek final legal redress from the Privy Council, 14 of which are Caribbean nations.” Apart from being a “disputes settlement mechanism” the CCJ, some believe, will “also give uniformity and continuity to a distinct Caribbean reality.” See article “Proposed Caribbean Court of Justice meets resistance,” - The Gleaner, July 20, 2001.


10. The Jamaican Labour Party charged the sitting People’s National Party government with ‘mismanagement’ (the country experienced negative growth for a good part of the seventies) and presented its own leader as a super manager and a ‘financial wizard’ who could relieve Jamaica of its debt-crisis and the continuing threat of a declining currency. In the 1989 election the PNP was in turn to charge the sitting JLP government with ‘mismanagement,’ since the dollar had further declined, debt was still high and hardships persisted among the poor and the disadvantaged. Expert management, the stuff of private sector existence, had by now become a requirement of good government. The country was in this sense ready for the retreat by the PNP Government after 1989 from leftist statist ideology to the embrace of market-forces ideology. Both parties by the end of the eighties had uttered the dictum that “the private sector is the engine of development,” even if the political directorates sought to retain possession of the driver’s seat. (see Rex Nettleford 1994: 51 (footnote 46).


14 Ibid. (Chapter 2).