Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Social Science Research
ISSN 2327-5510
2025, Vol. 13, No. 2

Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme: Perspectives From a Sociological Lens

Joseph Sarpong Arthur

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast Ghana

Alex Somuah Obeng (Corresponding Author)

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast Ghana

Received: March 6, 2025 Accepted: May 3, 2025 Published: June 3, 2025

doi:10.5296/ijssr.v13i2.22702 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/ijssr.v13i2.22702

Abstract

In recent years, Ghana has grappled with significant economic challenges, prompting the implementation of various financial strategies aimed at stabilizing the domestic economy. One such strategy is the Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP), designed to address the nation's fiscal deficits and high debt levels.

This paper seeks to discuss the debt impact of the Domestic Debt Exchange Programme on the domestic economy of Ghana while highlighting the program's unintended consequences, which may inadvertently impede development. The paper seeks to expose the mechanisms of exploitation that are hidden in the DDEP, but on the contrary, do harm and an impediment to development. The paper establishes that the DDEP exacerbates the sickness in the domestic economy of high interest rates, and eroded farm gate prices and hence also affects the health of democracy. The paper therefore calls for a rethinking of debt management in consonance with the demands of the Ghana Beyond Aid Agenda. The paper also calls for changes in the modus operandi of the programme such as the stoppage of nationwide auctioning of DDEP related treasury bills and the tapering of the spread between the Bank of Ghana's treasury bills and those of the DDEP. The paper concludes by commending countries adopting the DDEP instrument for undertaking this daring journey towards economic emancipation and assuring that success is realizable.

Keywords: ddep, ghana economy, debt management, high interest rates, dialectical materialism

1. Introduction

Karl Marx's philosophy, in general, and dialectical materialism, in particular, are of concern for helping our understanding of international relations. Understanding the causes and processes of default on debt becomes quite enriching, particularly during a time of structural adjustment and change in the international economic environment. Ghana's DDEP emerged as a response to mounting debt and fiscal pressures, reflecting broader structural adjustment measures aimed at stabilizing the economy. As global economic shifts and rising debt levels strained Ghana's financial health, the DDEP became a tool to restructure domestic debt, aligning with international strategies to restore economic stability.

This is because the DDEP is concerned with the economy and money. However, it also involves socio-political matters and relationships. In Ghana, rising debt levels and fiscal constraints have necessitated various financial interventions, including the Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP). While previous studies on debt restructuring have largely focused on technical and financial aspects (Jessop, 1990; Jackson, 2006; Muraca, 2020), they often overlook the socio-political dimensions that shape policy decisions and their broader implications. This approach of analyzing events or phenomena objectively makes it difficult to categorize the subjective realm inherent in the phenomena or events studied. As the direct product of economic contradiction, debt is a contradiction, and debt restructuring is a necessary product to deal with the resolution of this contradiction.

Through dialectical materialism, Karl Marx argued that economic laws shape all aspects of society. He introduced two key concepts: class and class struggle. For Marx, understanding economics meant understanding how these classes—the wealthy who own the means of production and the workers who sell their labour—are constantly in conflict. Marx also believed that production has two parts: the systems used to produce goods and the ownership of those systems. Over time, this ownership creates inequalities that drive economic and social change. His ideas challenged classical economic theories by showing that economic relationships are not just about money but about power and control. While economic laws are meant to create prosperity, Marx argued that in capitalist societies, they often deepen divisions and fuel conflict. These insights remain relevant today, especially when analyzing issues like debt restructuring, which reflects deeper struggles over wealth and power.

Sovereign debt restructuring, in essence, is a process where governments renegotiate the terms of their debt obligations to manage financial crises. This includes rescheduling, restructuring, and funded buybacks of sovereign debts, securitization and other conversion schemes, defeasance and segregation structures, and liability management structures used by sovereigns to buy back or reissue debt. Countries like Greece, Cyprus, and Argentina have undergone similar processes, often driven by mounting fiscal pressures and international economic shifts. In Ghana's case, the DDEP reflects not only a financial strategy but also the influence of global economic forces on domestic policies.

Debt restructuring can take various forms in finance, corporate finance, and accounting, but this paper focuses on sovereign debt—the restructuring of debts owed by states to other states or institutions. In Ghana, the Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP) represents a form of domestic debt restructuring aimed at addressing internal fiscal pressures. Unlike debts owed to multilateral or bilateral donors, which often involve adjustment lending tied to policy performance, domestic debt restructuring offers the government more control over its debt management, shaping internal financial conditions to stabilize the economy.

Proponents of the DDEP argue that controlling domestic debt creates space for internal borrowing without crowding out private investment. This approach allows the government to fund public projects even when foreign aid diminishes. By influencing domestic financial markets, the government can stimulate lending, reduce borrowing costs for local businesses, and generate additional liquidity through revenues from public firms and assets. However, critics view this as a form of financial repression, where the state exerts control over domestic markets to finance its agenda. This is often done through measures like directing credit programs, imposing exchange controls, or compelling state-owned banks to provide loans.

The concept of Pari Passu, often discussed in sovereign debt contexts, refers to the principle that all creditors should be treated equally. In Ghana's case, the DDEP has sparked debates about whether restructuring domestic debt unfairly shifts the burden onto local creditors while favouring foreign interests. Understanding these dynamics reveal deeper economic contradictions: while restructuring aims to stabilize the economy, it can also entrench inequalities by prioritizing elite financial interests over the working class. Through the lens of Marx's dialectical materialism, Ghana's DDEP exemplifies these tensions, showing that debt restructuring is not just a technical process but a reflection of power, class struggles, and economic control.

The Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP) is one of the tools used to manage a country's short-term debt. Ghana has implemented different phases of the DDEP, with earlier versions occurring between 2005 and 2008, followed by another in 2014 (Debrah, 2014; Van Gyampo, 2017; Adams & Agomor, 2023). The most recent phase was completed in 2023, marking the latest attempt to address the nation's rising debt levels. These successive implementations reflect Ghana's ongoing struggle to balance debt sustainability with economic growth.

The DDEP has sparked mixed reactions among scholars and policymakers. Supporters argue that restructuring domestic debt allows the government to ease fiscal pressure while creating room for local investment. However, critics claim the program is merely a short-term fix, disguising deeper structural issues. Some view it as a scheme to transfer money to investors in the secondary market, likening it to a hidden levy on investments (Hlovor, 2023; Prichard, 2009; Osei & Quartey, 2001). They argue that the program fails to address the root causes of Ghana's debt crisis, raising concerns about its long-term effectiveness.

This paper adopts Karl Marx's dialectical materialism to critically analyze the economic and political motives behind the DDEP. While some scholars consider Marxist theory outdated, arguing that it leans more toward political critique than economic analysis, this study challenges that view. By applying Marx's concepts of class struggle and economic contradictions, the paper seeks to uncover the underlying socio-political dynamics that shape Ghana's debt restructuring strategies.

The study is timely, as no other work has analyzed the 2023 DDEP through this lens. Existing literature has primarily used technical or economic frameworks, such as the catchment area, to assess debt management. Additionally, Tweneboah (2009) contends that the IMF should give countries greater flexibility in determining the proportion of GDP allocated to domestic debt servicing, a perspective that aligns with the need for more context-specific debt strategies. This paper aims to contribute to this growing body of literature by offering a political perspective on Ghana's debt restructuring efforts.

This paper contributes to the ongoing discussions and arguments on debt restricting policies, fiscal and monetary issues and public debt crisis (Prempeh, 2023; Adu-Gyamfi & Dapaah, 2024; Agyei & Frimpong, 2024). The paper seeks to accomplish this by highlighting the key factors that influence the understanding and implementation of the Domestic Debt Exchange Program (DDEP) in Ghana through the lens of Karl Marx's dialectical materialism. This theoretical approach has significant implications for the effective analysis and application of the DDEP. Additionally, the paper contributes to existing context-specific studies across the globe that are currently shaping the emerging trends and issues in debt restructuring (Stallings, 1992; Warwick, 2013; Devlin, 2014). This is achieved by examining the experiential and theoretical challenges surrounding the DDEP from the perspective of dialectical materialism.

In this paper, we apply Karl Marx's dialectical materialism to analyze Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP), exploring the socio-political dynamics behind its implementation. This theoretical framework provides insights into the economic contradictions and class struggles that shape debt restructuring policies, revealing the interplay between local decisions and global economic forces. By examining these complexities, we aim to uncover the deeper implications of the DDEP, particularly its impact on economic inequality and national development. Throughout the paper, we carefully construct arguments to highlight the explanatory power of dialectical materialism in understanding the DDEP's broader socio-economic effects. Additionally, we propose practical recommendations for optimizing the program's implementation within Ghana's unique economic context, offering a perspective that bridges theory with actionable policy insights.

2. Karl Marx's Dialectical Materialism

Materialists assert that the development of society is shaped by human needs and material conditions. Karl Marx embraced this perspective, arguing that social life arises from material realities—the economic structures and productive forces that shape human consciousness and social relations. In contrast, idealists believe that ideas and consciousness drive societal development. According to Agassi, the traditional opposition to materialism is idealism, with thinkers like Hegel asserting that dialectical idealism represents the ultimate truth or the direction toward which the world's spirit evolves (Guo & Yan, 2023). Marx's dialectical materialism, however, diverged sharply from Hegelian idealism. While Hegel viewed history as unfolding through the evolution of ideas, Marx contended that material conditions—such as ownership of the means of production—are the driving forces behind historical change. The dialectic, as Marx adopted it, is a method of understanding societal transformation through contradictions and conflicts that arise from these material conditions.

Marx credited Heraclitus, a Greek philosopher who lived around 450 BCE, with introducing the idea that change is constant and driven by opposing forces. However, it was Hegel who refined the dialectical method, which Marx then reinterpreted through a materialist lens. In works such as Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 and Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie, Marx applied this method to analyze the contradictions inherent in capitalist societies, particularly the tension between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Karl Marx's dialectical materialism was shaped by a rich intellectual heritage, drawing inspiration from both ancient Greek and German philosophers. While Marx admired Greek thinkers like Heraclitus, who first proposed that change is constant and driven by opposing forces, it was Hegel's dialectical method that profoundly influenced his theory (McCarthy, 1992). Unlike Hegel, who viewed history as the evolution of ideas, Marx reinterpreted dialectics through a materialist lens, arguing that material conditions—such as economic structures and class relations—drive societal change.

Marx's collaborator, Friedrich Engels, further emphasized the materialist interpretation of history, asserting that what distinguishes humans from animals is their consciousness, shaped by their interactions with the material world (Marx, 2021). In this view, economic forces and resource pressures—often driven by population growth, competition, and scarcity—give rise to conflicts between social groups, gradually dividing society into opposing classes: those who control the means of production and those who do not. Marx identified these classes as the bourgeoisie, the wealthy capitalists who own the means of production, and the proletariat, the working class who sell their labour. The bourgeoisie maintains dominance by exploiting the labour of the proletariat, creating a system of inequality that fuels class struggle. As exploitation deepens, the proletariat becomes increasingly aware of its oppression, leading to rising tensions and demands for change. For Marx, this class struggle is the engine of societal transformation. He argued that the contradictions inherent in capitalism would eventually lead to its downfall, as the working class seeks to overthrow the bourgeoisie and abolish private property, paving the way for a classless society.

The study of political science through the lens of political party ideologies is invaluable for understanding a country's system of governance and its economic policies. Political ideologies shape government policies, influencing decision-making processes and economic strategies. Understanding these ideological underpinnings helps to align politicians' promises during election campaigns with their ability to implement those promises once in power. From a Marxist perspective, these political ideologies often reflect the interests of dominant economic classes, shaping policies that either reinforce or challenge existing power structures.

The divide between microeconomics and normative economics has long been a subject of debate among political economists, with heterodox scholars seeking to bridge the gap by examining the socio-political forces behind economic policies. The new political economy approach links these paradigms through methods of public choice, analyzing how individual actors respond to economic problems caused by external factors. In this context, Marxist theory provides a valuable framework for understanding these dynamics, revealing how political ideologies and economic policies are products of deeper class struggles and material conditions.

Dialectical materialism, central to Marx's analysis, offers insights into these processes by interpreting societal change as driven by economic contradictions. As contradictions emerge—such as those between state policies and the interests of the working class—they create pressure for transformation. Concrete developments arise from these tensions, shaping future political and economic models. Through this lens, understanding Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP) requires an analysis of the political ideologies and economic forces that influenced its creation, as well as the class struggles it represents. This perspective not only clarifies the motivations behind such policies but also sheds light on their broader implications for governance and economic development.

3. Historical Context of Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme

Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP) was introduced by the Economic Management Team (EMT) under His Excellency John Agyekum Kufuor's administration and economically formulated by Professor Paul Acquah, then Governor of the Bank of Ghana (BOG). The program aimed to: (1) ease the interest payment burden of the public sector; (2) refinance the government's high-cost debt with cheaper domestic debt to achieve medium-term cost savings and lower debt risks; and (3) develop the domestic capital market to support long-term economic growth. Additionally, the program sought to improve financial conditions for private sector investment by reducing the government's reliance on short-term borrowing, which often crowded out private credit.

To implement these objectives, the Bank of Ghana, in collaboration with the government, issued foreign exchange-denominated seven-year fixed-rate bonds. These bonds were exchanged for temporary treasury bill holdings on all government overdraft accounts abroad, as well as assets in the Temporary Assets Accounts (TAA) at the Bank of Ghana. The TAA was used to manage funds related to short-term government obligations, providing a mechanism to streamline debt management.

At the time, Ghana's local debt profile was heavily dominated by short-dated, high-cost government financial instruments. This structure created persistent challenges with debt servicing and rollover risks, making it difficult for the government to sustain long-term fiscal stability. The DDEP was therefore seen as a strategic intervention to restructure domestic debt, alleviate mounting interest payments, and create a more stable environment for private sector growth. However, the program sparked debates over its long-term effectiveness, as some viewed it as a temporary fix rather than a comprehensive solution to Ghana's fiscal challenges.

The poor structure of Ghana's domestic debt contributed to high interest rates, which had adverse effects on both the private sector and national development. Commercial banks, which operated by borrowing short-term or demand deposits, held large portions of the government's domestic debt, primarily in the form of treasury and finance bills. This crowding out of private sector credit limited access to affordable financing, stifling business growth and economic development. From a Marxist perspective, these economic conditions reflect deeper class struggles tied to debt management and financial policies. Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) introduced as part of economic reforms further exacerbated inequalities, expanding the lower stratum of the working class. As economic hardships intensified, the burden of debt repayment and high interest rates disproportionately affected workers, particularly those in the industrial and agricultural sectors.

Analyzing these socio-economic conditions necessitates a closer examination of the major social groups in society—workers, students, agricultural labourers, the intelligentsia, and the petit bourgeoisie, among others. This investigation focuses specifically on the working class, whose experience under these financial conditions offers insights into the potential trajectory of Ghana's socio-economic development. The industrial working class, historically at the forefront of struggles against economic exploitation, continues to play a crucial role in resisting oppressive financial structures. In this context, the debt crisis becomes more than a fiscal challenge; it symbolizes the ongoing tension between economic policies and social equity

Previous studies on Domestic Debt Exchange Programmes have analyzed the links between public debt management and the role of the Debt Management Consultative Committee (DMCC) in shaping Ghana's fiscal policies. The DMCC played a crucial role in overseeing debt management strategies, balancing the government's budget through the medium-term budget policy framework, and encouraging positive savings in private profit-driven commercial banks. This approach aimed to stabilize macroeconomic conditions while mitigating inflationary pressures and reducing structural imbalances.

One significant objective of these debt management efforts was to align fiscal policies with Ghana's broader development agenda, including the realization of the National Development Plan (1971–80). Additionally, the program sought to gain donor support through initiatives like the IMF's Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF) and Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF), which provided concessional financial assistance contingent on government performance in implementing structural reforms. In pursuit of these goals, Ghana took bold steps to strengthen its presence in international capital markets. For instance, in May 2003, the country mobilized \$80 million through a 10-year Eurobond with a 9.50% coupon rate, facilitated by Lehman Brothers and Morgan Stanley. This issuance marked a significant milestone, showcasing Ghana's ability to access global financial resources while signaling fiscal discipline and credit worthiness.

Moreover, the implementation of fiscal restraint preserved the credibility of Ghana's privatization process, reinforcing investor confidence and enhancing the nation's standing in international markets. These measures were designed to create a sustainable path toward debt management, but they also sparked debates over the long-term implications of relying on foreign capital and the pressures imposed by international financial institutions

In examining the government policies that led to the accumulation of public debt in the post-Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) era, it becomes clear that these policies often catered to the interests of the power bloc, prioritizing financial stabilization over broader socio-economic equity. Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP), which began in 2002, was introduced as a measure to manage the country's rising debt-to-GDP ratio. The primary objective was to reduce the annual principal and interest payments by 2003, thereby freeing up resources for developmental projects and easing fiscal pressures.

To encourage public participation in the DDEP, the Bank of Ghana (BoG) played a crucial intermediary role, facilitating the exchange process and ensuring smoother transactions between the government and domestic debt holders. The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning oversaw the program's implementation, acting as the central authority in managing public funds and coordinating debt restructuring efforts.

While the program aimed to create fiscal space for development, critics argue that the policies surrounding the DDEP largely reflected the priorities of the economic elite, protecting financial institutions while shifting the burden onto ordinary citizens. The restructuring process, influenced by international financial institutions, reinforced existing power structures, further entrenching economic inequalities.

In conclusion, Ghana's DDEP serves as a lens through which broader economic contradictions and class struggles can be analyzed. The policies adopted reflect a balancing act between managing debt sustainability and catering to the interests of powerful financial actors. As Ghana navigates its economic future, understanding these dynamics is crucial for shaping more inclusive debt management strategies that prioritize equitable growth over elite-driven financial restructuring.

4. Theoretical Frameworks in Economics and Political Science

Economics and political science are distinct fields of study, yet they share several common theoretical frameworks that enhance our understanding of complex social phenomena. Mozaffar and Scarritt (1999) argue that examining political consequences enriches economic analysis, as political science inherently navigates the complexities embedded in applied economics. While the two disciplines employ different theoretical tools, they both aim to explain human behaviour in decision-making processes, particularly in shaping public policy.

Interdisciplinary issues such as dietary differences, carbon emissions, peace settlements, economic inequality, and conflicts of interest exemplify areas where economics and political science intersect. Lynch (2006) highlights that comparative social science relies on the concept of embedded index variables to analyze such complexities. Applied economics often employs econometric models and other quantitative methods to identify causal relationships, while political science tends to focus on indices and dichotomous variables to capture political dynamics. Despite these methodological differences, both disciplines benefit from interdisciplinary approaches, especially in comparative studies where political and economic factors are deeply intertwined.

Theoretical frameworks play a crucial role in scholarly research by offering structured perspectives for analyzing phenomena and situating them within broader paradigms. According to King, Keohane, and Verba (1994), theories function as belief systems about causality, guiding the interpretation of social processes. Sartori (2005), as cited in Abbadi and

Al-Khater (2014), further asserts that theories serve as interpretative schemes, shaping the way researchers understand and organize knowledge. Importantly, theories do not exist independently of their fields but emerge from the topics they aim to explain, helping scholars interpret data and uncover deeper insights. In sum, economics and political science, though distinct, share a disciplinary arena that necessitates collaboration in cross-disciplinary studies. Theoretical frameworks provide the intellectual tools to navigate these intersections, offering richer analyses of complex socio-economic and political phenomena.

5. Application of Dialectical Materialism in Economic Analysis

In applying dialectical materialism to economic analysis, nature serves as the foundation upon which human aspirations and economic activities depend. However, nature's inability to provide for all human needs without effort creates resistance, pushing society into a continuous process of adaptation and change. From the primitive mode of production to today's complex capitalist structures, the evolution of production has been marked by constant transformation. This ongoing change has generated contrasting outcomes: while some enjoy relative prosperity, others experience worsening poverty and economic hardship. These contradictions form the basis for dialectical analysis, which seeks to understand historical trends and the resulting stratification of society into those who control the means of production and those who provide labour.

Dialectical materialism offers a framework for understanding these dynamics by focusing not merely on individual wealth but on the broader systemic contradictions inherent in capitalist economies. As modes of production evolve, so too do the relationships between capital and labour, with wealth accumulating in the hands of a few while the majority remains subject to exploitation. The rise of these class divisions—between the bourgeoisie, who control the factors of production, and the proletariat, who sell their labour—underscores the material conditions that shape society. Rather than concentrating on the motives or power of individual financiers, dialectical materialism encourages economists to analyze the aggregate activity of society. It is within these collective actions that economic contradictions become visible, offering a clearer understanding of the forces driving societal change.

Dialectical materialism holds that every phenomenon contains internal forces that drive its development and external forces that create resistance, resulting in constant change and movement. Nature itself is in a state of continuous contrast and transformation, where progress unfolds through a process known as the negation of the negation—a cycle in which each stage of development gives rise to its contradictions, eventually leading to further change.

In economic analysis, this framework begins with the understanding that human behaviour is driven by the fundamental need for survival. To meet this need, people require material necessities such as food, clothing, shelter, goods, and services. However, natural barriers limit human capacity to independently satisfy these needs. As a result, humans engaged in collective production, organizing labour and resources to overcome these challenges.

Over time, this drive for survival and production led to the gradual development of society into distinct economic sectors: agriculture, manufacturing, and services. Initially, societies depended heavily on agriculture for subsistence, but advancements in tools and techniques allowed for surplus production, giving rise to trade, specialized labour, and eventually industrialization. The services sector emerged alongside these developments, providing support functions that facilitated complex economic activities

Marx's dialectical understanding of class struggle profoundly influenced the political theories of renowned communist revolutionaries such as V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Chairman Mao, and Amilcar Cabral. Each of these thinkers applied dialectical materialism to explain the concept of the revolutionary vanguard party—a disciplined political organization tasked with leading the working class in its struggle against capitalist oppression and counter-revolutionary forces. For them, the vanguard party served as the driving force behind revolutionary movements, guiding the masses in dismantling the capitalist system and establishing socialism.

Marx argued that class struggle is inherently confrontational, as the ruling capitalist class will not relinquish power willingly. In the pursuit of uprooting capitalist regimes and replacing them with socialist structures, revolutionary action often requires force to break the grip of the bourgeois state. Lenin, for example, emphasized the necessity of smashing the existing state apparatus and replacing it with a dictatorship of the proletariat, where workers would assume control of political and economic power. Similarly, Mao's concept of protracted people's war highlighted the role of peasants in resisting capitalist exploitation, while Cabral focused on the liberation struggles of colonized nations, advocating for armed resistance as a path to independence.

The use of force, however, was not merely about violence for its own sake. Marxists believed that revolutionary energy must be channelled into dismantling oppressive structures and creating new institutions grounded in the worker-peasant alliance. This process required unwavering discipline among revolutionaries. The "golden rule" of revolutionary discipline, as seen in Mao's Mass Line, asserted that the party's policies should reflect the will of the masses, ensuring that the party operated as an integral part of the people's movement.

One of the key contradictions Marx identified lies in the state and its relationship with society. While the state may appear to represent the collective will of the people, Marx argued that it operates as an instrument of the ruling class, enforcing economic and political structures that serve bourgeois interests. In this sense, the state plays a crucial role in maintaining the exploitative superstructure, perpetuating the dominance of the capitalist class over the working masses.

In the struggle for class emancipation, Marx contended that the working class must dismantle the bourgeois state, which acts as a tool for suppressing revolutionary forces. The revolutionary class, led by a vanguard party rooted in the proletariat, must "smash" the formal state machinery and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat—a transitional phase aimed at suppressing counter-revolutionary forces and redistributing power. This process involves confronting the violent contradictions inherent in capitalism with revolutionary energy, using force when necessary to dismantle oppressive structures and pave the way for a classless society.

Central to this revolutionary movement is the role of the vanguard party, composed of individuals drawn from the working class and armed with revolutionary theory. This party serves as both the ideological guide and organizational force behind the revolution, channelling the collective will of the proletariat toward the dismantling of capitalist power structures. Through this process, the working class asserts its political authority, ensuring that revolutionary efforts remain aligned with the needs of the masses.

As Marx famously declared, “The emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself.” This dictum encapsulates the belief that only through collective action and class consciousness can workers overthrow capitalist oppression and create a new socio-economic order rooted in equality and justice.

In some countries, as Doughty and Summers observed, governments increase their expenditures in ways that align with their development goals. In Ghana, however, the issuance of higher-yielding treasury bills as a tool to attract domestic savings created a unique dynamic. The resulting interest-rate-driven portfolio withdrawals affected various institutions, including the provident funds of the general public and the Ghana Cocoa and Coffee Boards. These boards, whose mandates include acquiring and exporting substantial quantities of cocoa and coffee—predominantly for private sector consumption—found their financial operations directly impacted by shifts in domestic debt policy.

The primary purpose behind Ghana's issuance of these financial instruments was to regulate inflationary pressures stemming from the government’s need to finance public projects. Instead of relying solely on traditional tax revenues, the government sought to shift a significant portion of domestic savings into treasury bills, effectively redirecting financial resources from real economic activities into government debt instruments. This move aimed to strengthen the government’s balance sheet through an in-kind mobilization of funds, creating a pool of resources to support national development strategies.

Crucially, this approach relied on the government’s ability to use income generated from these special debts to align domestic financial markets with broader development goals. By narrowing the range of available financial asset options, the government influenced private sector borrowing, investment, and savings behaviour, directing financial flows toward projects consistent with national development priorities.

Doughty and Summers further noted that while the Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP) is not strictly a fiscal instrument, its implementation requires tight public finance control. Without such oversight, the additional revenue generated through the program could lead to excessive government spending, risking economic overheating and further destabilizing macroeconomic conditions. In this context, Ghana’s DDEP highlights the delicate balance between managing debt, controlling inflation, and steering the economy toward long-term growth.

6. Marxist Perspectives on Debt and Finance

Marx's critique of political economy extended beyond the study of capitalism and the money economy; it also addressed key aspects of banking, finance, and debt. Central to Marx's analysis was the idea that the capitalist's drive to accumulate wealth stems from the private ownership of capital, where money serves as both the primary motive and the ultimate expression of power. In this system, money appears to generate more money on its own, with the capitalist class hoarding wealth and using it as a tool for further accumulation through lending and credit. This cycle reinforces inequality and deepens economic contradictions, as financial capital becomes increasingly detached from productive labour.

While Marx did not use the term "finance" in its modern sense, his analysis of capital flows, credit, and interest laid the foundation for understanding the rise of financial capital. He argued that industrial capital, in its most advanced and alienated form, transforms into financial capital—a form of capital that prioritizes speculation and debt-driven growth, ultimately fueling economic crises. In this view, finance is not merely a tool but a mechanism through which capitalist contradictions intensify, driving the system toward inevitable downturns.

In recent years, Marxist scholars have expanded on these ideas, exploring the growing dominance of financial markets and their role in shaping global capitalism. Albritton, Spier, and Finelli (2009) highlight that the terms "finance" and "financial capital" emphasize the importance of analyzing capitalism through the lens of money, credit, interest rates, loans, and financial markets. They argue that understanding capitalism's monetary processes requires examining how debt and finance are wielded as instruments of power and exploitation, perpetuating inequality and economic instability.

Today, Marxist research on finance and debt is closely intertwined, as scholars seek to uncover the structural forces behind financial crises and the perpetuation of inequality. The Marx-Engels critique continues to provide a powerful framework for understanding these dynamics, offering insights into the deeper contradictions of capitalism and the role finance plays in its cyclical crises.

7. Integrating Dialectical Materialism with Economic Analysis

Dialectical materialism, as conceptualized by Marx and Engels, offers a distinctive framework for analyzing economic structures, particularly in understanding class struggles and systemic contradictions. This study draws on dialectical materialism as a guiding perspective to examine Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP), providing insights beyond conventional economic analyses. Rather than adhering strictly to formal theoretical models, the study adopts an analytic and descriptive approach, ensuring logical consistency while incorporating reasoning rooted in both deductive and inductive methods. Throughout this analysis, the essence of Marx's dialectics in explaining the fundamental structures of economic phenomena remained central.

Over the decades, mainstream economic approaches have largely overlooked dialectical materialism as a tool for solving economic problems. In Ghana's context, this study applies dialectical materialism to better understand the complexities of the DDEP and its broader implications for economic development. By exploring the contradictions within the debt restructuring process, this framework sheds light on the power dynamics that influence economic policy and the structural imbalances that perpetuate inequality.

The study also builds on Milton Friedman's dichotomy of market functioning, linking his inside-out and outside-in perspectives through the lens of Marxian dialectics. According to Friedman, central order and coordination are essential for the functioning of an economic society. Even in competitive markets, performance depends on several factors, such as formal rules, informal norms, political forces, and strategic actions. These elements shape market inputs, influencing participants' understanding of constraints and opportunities. From this perspective, markets operate within a broader socio-political matrix, where governance and economic performance are mutually reinforcing. Integrating this view with dialectical materialism allows for a more nuanced analysis, revealing the interplay between political power and economic outcomes in Ghana's debt management strategies.

By applying this integrative framework, the study highlights the limitations of compartmentalized economic thinking and emphasizes the need for a holistic approach that accounts for the socio-political context in shaping economic policy.

8. Analysis of Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme Through Dialectical Materialism

Communal interest plays a crucial role in shaping economic policies, yet market forces often prioritize profit maximization, creating tensions between individual gain and collective well-being. In capitalist systems, the pursuit of profit tends to overshadow broader social responsibilities, contributing to economic inequalities and corporate social responsibility challenges. As Marquardt explains, trust is a vital component of corporate governance. Shareholders, despite owning large portions of companies, entrust directors with managing operations, expecting them to act in the company's best interest while ensuring solvency and sustainable growth. However, in reality, these trustees often operate under pressures that align more closely with profit-driven motives than communal welfare.

In the context of Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP), the Bank of Ghana played a stewardship role, supporting the Ministry of Finance and the Ghana Stock Exchange in implementing the program. The successful execution of the DDEP restored a degree of market confidence, but participants in the stock market remained primarily motivated by the pursuit of higher returns, showing little regard for the program's broader implications on national development. This aligns with Marx's view that capitalist systems inherently favour those seeking to accumulate wealth, often at the expense of communal progress.

To better understand these dynamics, dialectical materialism offers a powerful lens for analyzing the underlying class struggles and economic contradictions present in debt restructuring processes. For example, Bruce Campbell's analysis of Zimbabwe's peasants and shifting state policies illustrates the use of dialectical materialism in understanding economic power relations. In Zimbabwe, the antithesis of colonial legal systems imposed by White settler governments revealed the deep contradictions between exploitative economic structures and the resistance of the oppressed. Similarly, Theda Skocpol's study of Iran's peasant revolts demonstrated how Western-backed economic policies failed to address the socio-economic realities of Eastern peasants, further exposing the disconnect between capitalist development models and local conditions.

Applying these insights to Ghana's DDEP reveals a similar pattern: while the program aimed to stabilize the economy and restore confidence, the underlying power structures continued to prioritize financial elites over communal welfare. Through the lens of dialectical materialism, the DDEP can be seen not just as a financial maneuver but as part of a broader struggle between profit-driven motives and the pursuit of economic justice

According to Saito, Engels distinguished between dialectical understanding and superficial observation. Engels viewed dialectics as the art of comprehending processes in their entirety, revealing the deeper contradictions that drive change. He questioned whether dialectics could be useful in understanding nature, asking: "Will the method be useful in our cognition of nature?" His agnostic response highlighted the complexity of natural and social phenomena, pondering whether human thought alone could fully grasp the intricate workings of nature and society.

From a personal perspective, dialectics can be understood as the art of employing logical reasoning to uncover the underlying processes in nature, human social activities, and historical development. From a materialist standpoint, it serves as a method of inquiry that explains social activities through the lens of scientific analysis. Marx's dialectical materialism goes beyond pure formal logic, arguing that human progress is driven by material forces and class contradictions rather than abstract reasoning alone. As Marx asserted, purely logical interpretations of human development rest on "wrong premises" because they overlook the material conditions shaping societal change.

In the same vein, Marx critiqued technological determinism, dismissing the notion that historical advancements in machinery alone could explain societal progress. He believed that early technological developments were shaped by metaphysical thinking, reflective of the socio-economic conditions of their time. Thus, understanding history required analyzing the material conditions that gave rise to technological change, rather than attributing progress solely to human ingenuity.

Marx's dialectical method drew inspiration from ancient philosophical traditions, tracing its roots back to Heraclitus, who first proposed that change is constant and driven by contradictions. The tradition of dialectical reasoning was later refined in Socratic dialogues, where structured discussions sought to uncover truth through reasoned debate. Marx, however, reinterpreted dialectics to reveal how material conditions—not abstract ideas—shape human history and social structures.

In essence, Marx's philosophy emphasized that understanding the complexities of human society requires more than surface-level observation. Through dialectical materialism, he offered a framework that captured the dynamic interplay of material forces, class struggle, and historical change, providing a lens through which both nature and society could be analyzed

9. Wrapping Up

This paper argues that the advanced state of capitalist production under imperialism has deepened economic inequalities, not only between nations but also within imperialist countries themselves. As Saito explains, the capitalist pursuit of profit manifests in various contradictions: the stagnation of real wages for workers in imperialist nations, the redirection of wealth through foreign aid, increased military spending, and the relentless demand for greater profits. These contradictions threaten the realization of financial capital on a global scale, creating tensions that reverberate across both developed and developing economies.

In Ghana's case, revenue generation took the form of a tension-inducing mechanism. The paper explored the political and economic pressures surrounding Ghana's Domestic Debt Exchange Programme (DDEP) and its implications for national sovereignty. Political tensions arose from conflicting ideologies between free trade advocates and protectionists, debates over constitutional reforms, and struggles for economic self-determination amidst foreign intervention. These tensions reflect broader struggles within capitalist economies, where the need for economic growth clashes with demands for social equity.

The study applied Marxian dialectical materialism to demystify Ghana's strategic move to issue short-term domestic securities as a means of resisting foreign financial control. By issuing these securities, Ghana sought to protect its financial autonomy, avoiding the seizure of assets by foreign creditors and reducing reliance on external debt markets. The Bank of Ghana's stewardship role in this process highlights the country's efforts to reclaim financial independence by mobilizing domestic resources for national development.

Furthermore, the paper elucidated that under imperialism, finance capital has become a dominant force, shaping economic policies and perpetuating global inequalities. Ghana's identification with this dynamic underscore its struggle to navigate a financial landscape controlled by imperialist powers. The issuance of domestic securities and the use of revenue from primary commodity exports for debt redemption exemplify a broader effort to assert financial sovereignty.

In conclusion, Ghana's experience with the DDEP reflects the underlying contradictions of capitalism: the pursuit of profit by financial elites often comes at the expense of national development and social equity. Through the lens of dialectical materialism, the paper reveals that the centralization of banking capital and the drive for profit maximization create economic tensions that resonate far beyond Ghana, embodying the struggles faced by developing nations seeking autonomy in a global financial system dominated by imperialist interests.

References

Adams, S., & Agomor, K. S. (2023). Decentralization, partisan politics, and national development in Ghana. In *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and*

Governance (pp. 2994–2999). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_3843

Debrah, E. (2014). The politics of decentralization in Ghana's Fourth Republic. *African Studies Review*, 57(1), 49–69. https://doi.org/10.1017/asr.2014.5

Guo, Y., & Yan, C. (2023). Paul Feyerabend and Marxism. *20*(2), 77–121. https://doi.org/10.53763/fag.2023.20.2.229

Hlovor, I. K. (2023). The 'Second U-Turn': Domestic Politics and Foreign Economic Policy Choice in Ghana. *The African Review*, 1–43. https://doi.org/10.1163/1821889x-bja10084

Jackson, P. T. (2006). *Civilizing the Enemy: German reconstruction and the invention of the West*. University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.155507

Jessop, B. (1990). *State theory*: *Putting the capitalist state in its place*.

Marx, K. (2021). Ideology: Reading Paul de Man Reading Marx and Engels. *Aesthetic Thinking: Essays on Intention, Painting, Action, and Ideology*, *247*, 81. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004503335_007

McCarthy, G. E. (Ed.). (1992). *Marx and Aristotle: nineteenth-century German social theory and classical antiquity*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Muraca, B. (2020). Possibilities for Degrowth: A Radical Alternative to the Neoliberal Restructuring of Growth-Societies. *The Cambridge Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, *2*, 478–496. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108554558.030

Osei, R., & Quartey, P. (2001). *The HIPC initiative and poverty reduction in Ghana: an assessment* (No. 2001/119). WIDER Discussion Paper.

Panizza, U. (2008). Domestic and external public debt in developing countries. In *United Nations Conference on Trade and Development Discussion Paper* (No. 188). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1147669

Prichard, W. (2009). The politics of taxation and implications for accountability in Ghana 1981–2008. *IDS Working Papers*, *2009*(330), 01–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2009.00330_2.x

Van Gyampo, R. E. (2017). The state of electoral reforms in Ghana. *Africa Spectrum*, *52*(3), 95–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/000203971705200305