

**The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), Profits and Poverty:
Historicizing A Persisting Dilemma**

*****Charles Okeke Okoko**

Department of History and International Studies, Evangel University,
Akaeze, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

Benson Romokere Mgbowaji

Department of History and International Studies, Akwa Ibom State
University, Obio Akpa, Nigeria

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0374>

Published December 23 2023

Citation: Okoko C.O., and Mgbowaji B.R. (2023) The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), Profits and Poverty: Historicizing A Persisting Dilemma, *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: History, International Relation, Political Science and Administration*, 4(6),1-22

ABSTRACT: *This paper surveyed the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), its agenda, strength and weaknesses vis-à-vis the raison d'être for its establishment. It appraised the gains accruing to Africa in contradistinction to that of the developed world which discerned a yearning disparity. For Tony Blair (a former British Prime Minister), this partnership was not just about aid in its totality, it was not only about what we give, Africa needed our support and we needed Africa to succeed. It was how altruistic the likes of Tony Blair were that necessitated the review of the activities of NEPAD and its effect on Africa that claimed its patent. This was against the background of a persisting underdevelopment, especially the economic, of African countries and the poverty of their citizens. The manipulative operations of International Financial Institutions (IMF, World Bank-IBRD, among others) opened up African economies to exploitation with the unarguable connivance of rich multinational corporations and consultancy firms who maximized their profits from Africa's misery and helplessness. The paper concluded that Western corporate power in Africa was a monster with a thousand stomachs, insatiable for profits. For Africans, this was a hard stuff to swallow - but corporate greed knew no limits. The comparative and the analytical were adopted.*

KEYWORDS: New partnership, African development, international, financial, institutions, monetary fund, multinational, corporations, manipulative, peer-review, mechanism.

INTRODUCTION

The hopes and misgivings inspired by the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) have been as a result of the fact that Western countries, corporate multilateral companies, consultants and oligopolistic contests have exploited African nations

tremendously. These have been achieved through premeditated colonial strategies which spawned into neo-colonialism in the post-independence period (Adesina, Graham and Olukoshi, 2006, vi–viii). According to Regina Jere-Malanda (2007: 11):

The manipulative operations of International Financial Institutions have opened up African economies to exploitation by rich multinational corporations... maximizing their profits from Africa's misery.... [and] insatiable for profits. For Africans, this is a hard stuff to swallow - but corporate greed knows no limits.

This paper surveys the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), its agenda, strengths, weaknesses and the *raison d'être* for its establishment nexus other existing regional and sub-regional organizations, their successes and failures. It will appraise the gains accruing to Africa and the developed world. It is not all about what Europe can give but the need for a fruitful inter-relationship between them and Africa (Sharon Stultz-Karim, 2002, 7). It is how altruistic the intentions of the West are that has necessitated the review of the activities of NEPAD, economic growth, underdevelopment and persistent poverty among African nations that claim its patent.

The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD): What is it?

Baring other initiatives, NEPAD is unmistakably a pan-African collective response. African governments, irrespective of their sovereignty, agreed to enter into subordinate bilateral relations with the countries of the North, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and other lending agencies; and most importantly to have each other peer reviewed through the establishment of a peer review mechanism. This was a well thought out process for Africa to develop through integrating it into the global economy in order that western aid and investments would be attracted. Some commentators have, however, admonished the authors of NEPAD that while taking Africa into a neo-liberalized global economy unwittingly renewed its 'we cannot help it' stance, thereby a renewed neo-imperialism.

Other scholars insist that NEPAD has encouraged investment and attracted aid to Africa; yet, it has not enriched her citizenry. In a United Nations (UN) estimate, the West which controls 70% of world trade and her multinational corporations has been indicted for implementing unfair trade rules. African countries are, thus, denied about \$700 billion annually (Jere-Malanda, 2007). NEPAD is a reaction to her colonial heritage, underdevelopment and poverty vis-à-vis an ever-growing world economy, which has for the past five decades marginalized her in the global marketplace. It requires, however, maximum unity and solidarity among African leaders to overcome the crisis of sustainable growth, poverty and social exclusion (Jere-Malanda, 2007).⁵ Like earlier initiatives, such as The New African Initiative (NAI) and the Millennium African Recovery Programme

(MAP), NEPAD sought to promote long-term agenda for African economic growth and create conducive conditions for development by ending conflict, improving economic and political governance, and strengthening regional integration. This will put an end to Africa's human and economic marginalization through financial investments from her overseas partners.

Consequently, and as expected too, African nations will be granted better trade access and more debt relief. There will also be developed the political will by Africa's leaders to improve on their infrastructure, embark on agricultural diversification and not depend on single products such as oil as is the case with Nigeria; and human development through improved health schemes and education (Ravi Kanbur, 2002, 1).

Engrossed in its determination to achieve the eight points of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to which all developed and developing countries, the United Nations, IMF, World Bank, OECD, G8, and G20 are signatories, some commentators have been skeptical about the West's willingness to cooperate with Africa's leaders in order to unlock her economic potentials (Stultz-Karim, 2002, 7). The three core issues on the NEPAD agenda are:

- i. Peace, security, democracy and good governance;
- ii. Economic and corporate good governance; and
- iii. Sub-regional and regional approach to development,

These three have further been broken into five policy areas, namely:

- i. Democracy, governance, peace and security;
- ii. Economic and corporate governance;
- iii. Infrastructure and information technology;
- iv. Human resource development (notably, health and education); and
- v. Agriculture and market access (Stultz-Karim, 2002, 7),⁸

They have equally been broken down into principles and objectives, namely:

- i. African ownership, responsibility and leadership of the initiative;
- ii. Making Africa attractive to both domestic and foreign investors;
- iii. Unleashing the vast economic potential of the continent;
- iv. Achieving and sustaining an annual GDP growth rate of 7 per cent for the next 15 years;
- v. Ensuring that Africa achieves the International Development Goals (IDGs);
- vi. Investing in human development;
- vii. Promoting the role of women in, all activities;
- viii. Promoting regional and sub-regional economic integration;
- ix. Developing a new partnership with the industrial world and multi-lateral agencies;
- x. Strengthening the capacity to lead negotiation on behalf of the continent at different development forums that require continent-wide coordination;

- xi. Ensuring capacity for accelerated implementation of cooperation agreement and approved projects; and
- xii. Strengthening Africa's capacity to mobilize external resources (International Peace Academy, 2002, 2).

It is the assumption of the authors of NEPAD that Africa will attain sustainable development if the above principles and objectives are dutifully and conscientiously implemented. NEPAD, in global context, remains Africa's last hope to reverse its slide into complete marginalization and irrelevance (Kempe Ronald Hope Sr. 2006: 203). Although an African patent; it finds meaning and elaboration within the international development document, such as the United Nation's New Agenda for the Development of Africa and the World Bank-led Strategic Partnership for Africa and Poverty Reduction, among others. NEPAD is more aligned to the neo-liberal side of the global consensus on development, epitomized by the International Financial Institutions (IFCs), such as the Bretton Woods's institutions and creditor cartel countries, than it is to the UN bodies. Unlike the UN's MDGs set goal of debt cancellation, NEPAD wants "accelerated debt reduction for heavily indebted African countries", concomitant improved debt relief strategies and assist in developing the capacity of Africans to sustain growth at levels required to achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development through the provision of infrastructure, capital accumulation, human capital, institutions, structural diversification, competitiveness, healthy and good stewardship of environment (Adesina, 2006: 36-38).

Implementation of NEPAD Policies

As mentioned earlier, NEPAD chose for emphasis, the health and education sectors, the environment, agricultural and infrastructure development, the international community, persistent poverty, emigration of skilled human capital, weak governance systems, and capacity deficits which have posed serious challenges to African development. It has made efforts through its integrated programme with the World Health Organization (WHO), the joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. But these efforts have been hampered by capacity deficits in the health sector, namely, dearth of qualified personnel and infrastructure. This is evidenced by the increasing rate of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and that a child dies every 30 seconds from malaria (Ronald Hope Sr., 205).

Through its Education Action Plan, NEPAD hopes to achieve the MDGs 2015 target of Education for All (EFA). In line with the African Union's 2003 Declaration on Agriculture and Food security, African governments have been urged to allocate at least ten percent (10%) of their annual national budgets to agriculture for a period of at least five years. This is against the background of persistent food insecurity and excessive dependence on imported food items.

NEPAD has also created the African Infrastructure Consortium (AIC) and earnest support by the European Union (EU), World Bank and hosted by the African Development Bank (AfDB), on the need to modernize infrastructure in Africa, such as roads and transport, an inter-regional gas pipeline in West Africa, electricity interconnectivity and an African water facility. These do not just affect the growth of enterprises but prevents “global production networks” from setting up facilities in Africa (UNIDO, 2004:125).

It seeks to enhance Africa’s human and institutional capacities to be able to tackle environmental challenges, such as land degradation, inappropriate and overlapping mandates of the sectoral ministries of government and essentially the non-inclusion of environmental issues in the national policies of most African countries. Consequently, NEPAD, through its Environment Action Plan embarked on a capacity-building programme in conjunction with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) (Hope, 2006: 218).

Generally, there have been bilateral and multilateral interactions which equally caused the enunciation of certain agencies, such as the European African Commission with its pledge to assist in reducing poverty in Africa, the G8 countries with their Africa Action Plan for debt relief and cancellation, the UN’s 2005 World Summit which reaffirmed that its policies will be based on the NEPAD initiative, the pledge by the World Bank to boost capacity-building in such areas like health, education and infrastructure and the European Union’s Commission of European Communities’ (EU-CECs) commitment to assist African countries to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These efforts will be channelled through the Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) and the Organization for Economic Corporation and Development (OECD).

More endearing to the global community is the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), which is an organ of the NEPAD and approved by the African Union (AU) to monitor the activities of assenting African countries to the NEPAD document. Consequently, the African Partnership Forum (APF) agreed in 2006 for a Joint Action Plan (JAP) that will publish annual reports that will record and monitor pledged assistance to Africa; how much that have been, and would be, delivered, and what changes have been made by African governments through good political, corporate and economic governance under the NEPAD initiative (Hope, 2006: 218).

Impediments to implementing NEPAD Policies

Distrust is easily the noticeable impediment to the implementation of NEPAD. Lesser opportuned countries regard it as a trade-off between some African countries and the West, donor and multilateral institutions. But this trade-off will make for greater Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) flows, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), market access for African goods, and debt relief and cancellation in exchange for Africa’s governments holding each other politically and economically accountable for responsible governance.

Yet, the West has hinged their relationship and contributions on the provision of security, peace and good governance by African leaders even when they know that corruption, financial mismanagement and the dereliction of democratic norms are the order of the day. The west's commitment vis-à-vis NEPAD is obviously insincere since they continue to impose high tariffs in agricultural products. They grant very little access to European markets when 70% of African populations are farmers (International Peace Academy, 2002: 8). The situation is even worsened by the dumping of agricultural surpluses by Western countries, thereby, distorting her domestic markets and the profits of African farmers.

The African Peer Review Mechanism

The need for good governance, with emphasis on the areas of democracy and governance, led the African Union (AU) at its July 2002 Summit to approve the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) to enhance the effectiveness of NEPAD. In fact, the APRM provided the needed proof that some African leaders are committed to the NEPAD initiative. Reasonably, the West has anchored the fulfillment of their promises on the responses of African leaders to good political, corporate, and economic governance. Thus, it became necessary for African leaders to ensure that participating states conform to the codes and standards of the policies and practices contained in the declaration on democratic, political, economic and corporate governance that was approved by the AU Summit in July 2002 (International Peace Academy, 2002: 8). The APRM is intended to systematically examine and assess the performance of a state by other states, with the ultimate aim of helping the reviewed state to improve on its policy making, adopt best practices and comply with established standards and principles (Hennie Kotze and Carly Steyn, 2003: 109).

The APRM is voluntary and applicable to all AU member countries that have signed the NEPAD Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance. They agreed to submit to periodic peer reviews after eighteen months of joining the mechanism and to be subjected to mandatory reviews three to five years after by a Panel of Eminent Persons drawn from member countries. The terms of reference, which are carried out in five stages, for the panel are:

- (i) The analysis of the governance and development environment of signatory countries;
- (ii) Country visits by peer review mission teams;
- (iii) The preparation of mission findings of the peer review;
- (iv) The discussion and adoption of the peer review reports by the NEPAD structures; and
- (v) The formal and public tabling of the APRM reports in key regional (for example ECOWAS) and sub-regional (AU) structures (Kotze and Steyn, 2003: 110).

The West and multilateral agencies ably support the APRM as the best in establishing good democratic cultures, political, economic and corporate good governance. In fact, the G8 in

its Africa Action Plan contends that the African peer review process is very innovative and potentially decisive element in the attainment of the objectives of NEPAD.

From an initial membership of 17 out of the then 53 countries in 2002, it has risen to 35 in 2013 and has been rising. A very important objective of the APRM is identifying capacity deficits in African institutions and its building. The mechanism is not to be used as an instrument of coercion and sanctioning, but as an organ for “mutual learning, sharing experiences and identifying remedial measures to address real and perceived weakness” (Kotze and Steyn, 2003). The review is guided by the principles of “transparency, accountability, technical competence, credibility, and freedom from manipulation by any party” (Gbenga Salau, The Guardian, Newspaper, November 14, 2013).

The civil society groups must have the capacity to hold their governments accountable for misdemeanors, and insist on the adherence to constitutional democracy, rule of law and principles of the separation of powers, respect the independence of the judiciary and must be stopped from unnecessary constitutional tinkering to extend their tenures in office in their respective countries. In spite of all these, it is an elite/leadership view that the APRM operating as NEPAD’s watchdog under the aegis of the AU upholds the fact that African countries can be relied upon by sister states to improve the economic prospects in Africa.

NEPAD and Discontent

NEPAD is seen in several quarters as a duplication of the AU and previous initiatives, such as the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA). Another worrisome issue is that only few African countries (South Africa, Nigeria, Algeria and Senegal) acceded to the NEPAD document in spite of the fact that optimists see it as Africa’s last effort at rejuvenation. These countries have been accused of selling-out to the industrialized nations behind the backs of their people. The initiative which is intended to liberate Africa from recurring poverty, famine, lawlessness and war, is regarded by some as having been the easiest means of handing over African economies, the production and distribution of its wealth over to a few transnational multinationals like the G8, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO) through the removal of trade barriers (Kotze and Steyn, 2003: 72-119).

The civil society has criticized NEPAD as elitist since the processes of its creation went through was a departure from the ‘down-top’ approach of previous initiatives to NEPAD’s ‘top-down’. This is unlike the creation of the ECOWAS between 1972 and 1975 and the Lagos Plan of Action of 1980 that involved broad-based consultations between the government, the civil society and private sector. It is argued that the civil society and private sector would have contributed to the articulation of the NEPAD document and the implementation of its policies. The initiative is, thus, a self-imposed Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) and opined that African governments lack the capacity to implement NEPAD to their advantage (African Development Bank (ADB), 2002).

Furthermore, NEPAD's framework is subsumed within the Northern globalization paradigm and it is not people-oriented since the people's local needs and aspirations have been neglected. Other knocks on the NEPAD initiative are that Africa has been reduced to a 'begging-bowel status', gender equality has received little consideration and that the issues of safety and security will be given priority by the West over development and welfare of Africans (Kotze and Steyn, 2003: 72). Therefore, a citizen-oriented framework needs to be adopted that will:

- i. Insist on equal partnership with the West;
- ii. Not tie democracy and good governance for functional market for the West;
- iii. Adopt another framework which will not re-impose the disastrous SAP of the 1980s;
- iv. Reverse the NEPAD base document from debt relief to debt cancellation;
- v. Not make people believe that for Africa to escape marginalization, it must be integrated into the global economy;
- vi. Remove conditionalities as the underpinning fact of the relations in the global world and NEPAD's base document; and
- vii. That NEPAD should be seen as an initiative within the AU and not parallel to it (Eddy Maloka, 2006: 86-91).

It becomes pertinent at this stage to discuss the African Union (AU) as it relates to the NEPAD, and properly determine which of the two initiatives should operate under the aegis of the other. Or is it true that the NEPAD is an independent initiative with its headquarters at Midrand, South Africa while the AU is domiciled in Addis Ababa?

NEPAD and the African Union (AU)

The globalization of world economy, the existence of regional and inter-regional organizations, the activities of multinational corporations within Africa and relations with the developing and developed countries necessitated the evolution of sustained economic cooperation and collective self-reliance as the means to self-sustaining growth. This need for economic cooperation and collective self-reliance was re-emphasized during a conference organized on ECOWAS in 1976. It was observed that of the forty-eight independent African states, twenty-eight have a population of 5 million or less and fifteen a population of between 5 million and 10 million. Only two countries have a population of more than 30 million and all countries, irrespective of their population, have very low per capita incomes and underdeveloped and dependent economies. Adedeji (1984: xxiii) consequently advised that:

If the countries of Africa are to achieve self-sustained growth, cooperation in the production and distribution of strategic goods and services on a multinational basis in Africa must be seen by each and every one of the governments of Africa as a necessary condition for the

successful achievement of their respective national socio-economic goals.

It was in response to these reasons that African leaders agreed to form the OAU (now AU) that would serve as a rallying point for Africans. While NEPAD was launched in October 2001 at Abuja, Nigeria, the OAU was renamed the African Union (AU) through a Constitutive Act in July 2002. The AU will, in addition to its functions, as was the OAU promote peace, security and stability on the continent. It also reserves the right to intervene in member states activities nexus the decision of the Assembly regarding grave circumstances, such as war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. It is empowered to condemn and reject any unconstitutional changes of government. Distinctively, NEPAD as a policy initiative ought to promote accelerated growth and sustainable development on the continent. This would, in turn, eradicate widespread and severe poverty, and generally halt Africa's marginalization in the globalization process.

In the proceedings of a workshop by the International Peace Academy (IPA), it reported that NEPAD would appear as an AU plan but they are separate entities, having different secretariats at Addis Ababa (AU - Ethiopia) and Midrand (NEPAD - South Africa). Most of the leaders of both the AU and NEPAD, such as Thabo Mbeki, Olusegun Obasanjo and Wade, are pro-Western in contradistinction to the fact that there is a strong Western enthusiasm toward the NEPAD plan and ambivalence towards the AU. Perhaps, this is as a result of the origins of both plans. For instance, the Libyan leader, Muammar Gaddafi, who initiated the AU (formerly OAU) was a persistent thorn in the West's flesh, (International Peace Academy, 2002: 13).

Therefore, the participants in the workshop contended that both the AU and NEPAD initiatives will not work properly. It suggested a reassessment that would entail the elimination of duplicated functions and a full integration of AU and NEPAD initiatives in order to reach out properly to Africans. The two institutions must be seen as a common strategy and struggle for Africa's political renaissance and economic recovery. NEPAD will be better received by Africans and a curb on Western ambivalence if it is operated as an organ of the AU, and even more successfully since the AU (OAU) was conceived after a broad-based consultation with the civil society and private sector. Consequently, in an inclusive posture, the AU has enlarged NEPAD's plan to include:

- i. An Implementation Committee from its original four African countries of Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa to fifteen in 2002
- ii. A Steering Committee from fifteen to twenty; and
- iii. Employ bodies such as the Conference for Stability, Security, Development, and Cooperation in Africa (CSSDCA), its Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and the Pan-African Parliament to ensure the eventual integration of NEPAD and AU secretariats.

Although the issue of autonomy continues to rear its head, it is advised that the APRM should form part of the CSSDCA and a gradual well-planned merger of the AU and NEPAD to be implemented. This is very urgent if the claim of ownership will be sustained (International Peace Academy, 2002: 13).

Disarticulation of African Economies

Disarticulation or contradictions in any economy could originate in diverse ways. The cash crop export economic orientation of African colonies, no planning by the colonial rulers and the deliberate policy of Indirect Rule, patient progress and self-help adopted by the British caused disarticulations in the colonial economy and this has continued to reverberate after the independence of African countries (G. I. Nwaka, 1982: 9).

The colonial economy had disarticulated the agricultural and industrial sectors of the African economies. There were, and still are, no backward and forward linkages in their economies. The various sectors of any country's economy should be complementary and reciprocal. While one region specializes in agriculture, another would supply the agricultural sector with manufactured goods. When an industrial centre has demands for coal, it makes the exploitation of known reserves of coal economic. This way there is a backward linkage. Whereas, when the establishment of an iron and steel industry stimulates the local manufacture of bicycles there is forward linkage. A coherent economy needs these linkages vis-à-vis its regions and sectors, as there will be complementary and reciprocal exchanges between them (Claude Ake, 1984: 43).

Incoherence is noticeable in the transport and agricultural sectors, where the rail lines linked only places where raw materials were obtained, and the production of processed commodities for export to satisfy the need of international capital. The British government and its monopolies dominated the agricultural and mining industrial sectors of African economies. This was the state of African economies during colonial rule and has persisted ever since independence. One can confidently say that disarticulations in African economies took root during the colonial period.

Gamuts of programmes, policies and initiatives have been mentioned, inclusive of NEPAD, all aimed at revamping Africa from economic stagnation and decay. They are also meant to put Africa on a sound footing in a neo-liberal globalizing world economy.

The International Financial Institutions (IFIs) such as the IMF, World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO) have become the self-appointed agents of economic globalization. It is not in doubt that these agencies have contributed to the development and growth of some African economies, but to what extent? These institutions have given their "blessings to multinational corporations who maximize so much profit from Africa's misery". In the words of Malanda (2007: 12):

World Bank, IMF and regional development Banks such as the African Development Bank (ADB) ostensibly provide loans, grants and technical support to developing countries for the purposes of national development and poverty reduction, significant portion of their operations are directed towards boosting the private sector.

The emphasis on private sector development has further impoverished the masses whose major hopes of a better welfare are predicated on subsidies from their national governments. One of the key requirements for NEPAD is market access. This would be a two-way access to open up western markets for more African products and for the west to have unrestrained access to African markets, which it already controlled from the colonial period. To this end, it is hoped that a free market policy will be an effective strategy for ending world poverty. This is obviously an inversion of reality since African countries are becoming poorer by the day.

While the NEPAD is an African initiative, an own initiative, it is open knowledge that African countries must meet certain conditions, which have been mentioned earlier. Accepting these conditions has forced open poor African countries markets to Western corporate and financial interests and this has in turned weakened African governments. These corporations have perfected means and ways of exerting undue influence on African governments and over their economies (Chibuzu Ogbuagu, 2012). They often bribe to influence political decisions and employ subversive means to also influence public opinion. This is in the African front. In the Western front, these corporations have perfected the art of lobbying their governments. As stated in the New African Magazine, there are over 30,000 corporate lobbyists in Washington and Brussels, completely out numbering the US congress and European Commission staff that they lobby. The majority of the lobby groups represent business interests, which spend billions of dollars annually advocating their main cause, which is market access in emerging economies and poor African countries (Jere-Malanda, 2007: 12).

The activities of Western Corporations, who in fact are meant to partner with African countries, in this neo-liberal globalization initiative, are only seen to be doing so. Government corporations in the United Kingdom (UK), for instance, the Common Wealth Development Corporation (CDC) which were to fund public and private sectors in developing countries have upgraded to limited liability companies, from long-term lending to direct equity investment in the private sector of African countries. These government owned corporations, like the UK government Department for International Development (DFD) are now in competition with multilateral and multinational corporations for the soul of Africa. They, in conjunction with the International Finance Corporation (IFC), have extended their activities into the public sector through privatization of public services especially in health and education in most African countries.

The Democratic Republic Congo (DRC), one of the richest countries in natural resources endowment is also one of the most impoverished in African. Thirty-two (32) Western corporations control its economy, all grappling at her mineral resources. These corporations employ all sorts of tactics to protect their investment against the nationals and even the government of the DRC. In a similar vein, the International Finance Institutions, such as the World Bank and IMF, have created lucrative opportunities for Western corporations, for instance, when they muscled the Ugandan government to privatize water supply and sanitation systems. The Ugandan government, although given short notice unwittingly withdrew subsidies to these sectors thereby denying the ordinary/poor citizens access to clean water. There was, as a consequence, a rise in diarrhea which killed many Ugandan children.

This neo-liberal partnership, which is seen as the end-it-all measure for developing world economies, has been antithetical to NEPAD's objectives. Western countries through the financing of development in developing countries, have invested greatly in corporations that reap great dividends from privatization efforts. The US has tied its aid to developing countries to the fight against terrorism especially since after the September 11, 2007 attack on the World Trade Centre. According to Bush, "we fight against poverty because hope is an answer to terror". Against the move to a multi-polar globalized political economy of the post-Cold War era, the US directs its aid more to its strategic allies in the Middle East, Israel and Egypt. According to Sharon Stultz Karim (2002: 6):

Instead President Bush continued to use aid and the annual review of eligibility for trade preferences, extended to African nations that comply with Washington's definitions of good economic and political governance.

The AGOA and stress on trade liberalization, as means of attracting foreign investment is seemingly altruistic. The American logic is that an open market policy would lead to reduction in world poverty, therefore, terrorism. This logic is flawed by the facts that while the West has unrestrained access to African markets, international markets are not open to Africans, rich countries spend billions of dollars on subsidies where developing countries have comparative advantage, for their nationals' interests, for instance, in agriculture, processed foods, textiles and clothing, and light manufactured goods.

African countries' exports continue to be concentrated on vulnerable primary commodities farmed from the colonial period; and where there are significant increases in US imports from developing countries, the emphasis is on oil and energy-related products. As has been projected, things will get worse for African countries which economies depend on oil and exports to the United States of America that has continued to look for alternative sources of oil and energy. Out of the five goals for partnership with Africa by the U.S, only the one that concerns expanding US trade and investment with Africa and to stimulate economic development that it assumes would improve the well being of Africans is uppermost. The

West through some of its policies consistently ignores African input in this partnership. If it is not a two-way affair, the implication is that the developing countries will always be on the losing side.

The British government recognized in 2002 the need for partnership with Africa's more than 750 million peoples, as a veritable market. Tony Blair while underlining a globalized world economy as the imperative for partnership, underlined prosperity as a consequence of global security. Yet, Britain successfully encouraged its government-owned corporations to participate in the privatization of public services in Africa through its Department for International Development (DFID). In the first years of Blair's government, five major international consultancy/accountancy firms were given contracts to the tune of \$118m in consultancy fees alone (Jere-Malanda, 2007).

While the growth of the private sector is seen as a way to sustainable economic growth and development, it also provided valve for Western countries and corporations to milk Africa. The UK government through its DFID channels large sums of its aid budget every year to multinational corporations such as Pricewaterhouse Coopers and KPMG as arrowheads in the privatization of public services in developing countries. The money Western countries spend in consultancy alone in the partnership with Africa is more than the money given in aid. The emphasis on good economic and political governance, and democracy are undermined by the conditions imposed on developing countries by donors. The recognition of this made the British to come out with a new set of partnership conditions in 2005, which is that the privatization of such public services as electricity and water will no longer be a condition for aid. Western aid to Africa is still dependent on harmful conditions. Rehearsing an NGO named the **War on Want**, private sector consultancies have established themselves as indispensable partners in the international privatization program.... And these consultancies earn huge sums of money from these contracts even though developing countries, such as those in Africa, can provide their own consultants and experts (Jere-Malanda, 2007: 13).

Therefore, development efforts in developing countries are characterized by dramatic failures such that privatized companies keep investments below necessary levels, resulting to further marginalization of the rural communities and urban poor from access to essential public services and capital. Although NEPAD insists on a new partnership, the old regime that spawned from colonialism to neo-colonialism still prevails in the energy sector. Regina Jere-Malanda (2007) says that of Africa's less than 3% share of the world's Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), almost all goes to extractive industries – oil, minerals, (gold, diamond, coltan, platinum), and timber. Two-thirds of American capital entering Africa goes into mining and petroleum. But to label this 'investment' badly distorts the concept.

In a United Nations Economic Commission for Africa's (UNECA) opinion, apart from the oil companies which grow fat from the natural resources of developing countries, citizens of host countries go without light, clean water, good health facilities and jobs. Jere-Malanda (2007) further stated that the majority of foreign companies in Africa pay little or no taxes, increase corruption by bribing their way to their objectives, build no lasting infrastructure, pay starvation wages, destabilize communities, become involved in local conflicts, leaving behind an environmental and social disorder.

Within the context of diplomacy, national and foreign policy thrusts, the activities of Western countries and donors are excusable, but Africa, as it did during the slave trade era are losing not only its natural resources and cash, but its best, brightest, healthiest, and most productive people which have been trained with Africa's meager resources ostensibly from foreign aid for capacity-building to train professionals who end up in Europe and North America.

This section of the work is not intended to discard the NEPAD initiative as the same-old-song. It is only pointing out the contradictions inherent in whatever efforts the West is making. The authors of NEPAD must be congratulated for their efforts in attempting to integrate Africa properly into the global economy with its much-touted liberal policies. The responses of the west to this avowed partnership smacks of a double standard. The West bandy capacity-building as a necessary factor in development, and it has given aid to this effect, yet Africa cannot meet the WHO minimum standard of 250 health workers per 100,000 people, while the brain drain continues to "suck doctors and nurses out of Africa into the developed world.

In rehearse of another NGO, the **Trade Justice Movement** (TJM), world trade rules rob poor (African) countries of about \$1.3bn a day that is 14 times what they receive in forms of aid. Altruistically, Tony Blair opined that they give pennies with one hand and take pounds with the other. The African continent is routinely forced to play to the rules of free trade rules that are imposed by Western governments and their corporate cohorts (Jere-Malanda, 2007:14).

Even in agriculture where Africa stands a chance of improving itself has met a brick wall. The WTO Agreement On Agriculture (AOA) which was established in 1999 to protect developing countries through the reduction of western subsidies on some of its produce which in turn will encourage and expand African exports. The AOA has since had adverse effects on African agriculture. African governments have liberalized her local markets and consequently their farmers are now faced with severe competition from imports artificially cheapened through subsidies to agro-businesses by western governments. African countries are flooded with cheap and highly subsidized European products sold at very low prices by western farmers. In the *New African* report, Regina Jere-Malanda (2007:16), insisted that OECD countries spend \$3bn per annum in agriculture subsidies to mainly to large agricultural businesses more than the combined income of the world's poorest 1.2 billion

people. This protects Occidental farmers and makes it virtually impossible for African products to gain a foothold in their (foreign) markets.

It is estimated that 2% of world's farmers own two-thirds of trade in agriculture. EU governments and United States of America spend more on subsidies on its agribusiness than they give as aid to African countries. An NGO, the **Christian Aid**, reported that sub-Saharan Africa is currently \$272bn worse-off as a result of the free trade policies forced on it by western donors and amplified in the NEPAD initiative. According to **Christian Aid**, the situation is so deplorable that every European cow receives \$2 per day from government while 1.2 billion people in developing countries, such as in Africa live on less than \$1 per day. In 1992, poultry local farmers supplied 95% of Ghana's markets, but it has dwindled to a mere 11%, to the extent that European raised chickens are cheaper, after export, than Ghana-grown chickens. It becomes obvious that this pattern of relationship between Africa and the developed world results to substantial losses to Africa, and her local industries have been forced to close shop.

Another much touted facility is the Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) which is lumped together as aid. Western countries build ODA into their annual budgets, but how much is disbursed is subject to verification. Even when disbursed it is tied to the purchase of goods and services from the donor. It is common knowledge that goods purchased when tied to aid is 40% more expensive than that obtained through open market transactions. A major disarticulation is in foreign exchange transactions. Western multinational and transnational corporations borrow in dollars on the international market and their customers in Africa pay in local currency with higher exchange rates. When local currencies weaken, consumers must pay more. Rehearsed by Jere-Malanda (2007), the opinion of an organization referred to as **Share the World Resources** (STWR) insists that of the 100 largest economies in the world, 52 are corporations and only 48 are countries. Many of these uncountable corporations have a greater turnover than the GDP of most countries such as the Congo Democratic Republic, among many.

The activities of these corporations have become so pervasive that they can move their operations from one base to another in the developing countries where wages, costs and taxes are much lower, and stipulations in the NEPAD document and regulations almost non-existent, and WTO's open market access in all countries to resources, services and intellectual property.

It will be stating the obvious that African leaders are corrupt and have engendered poor economic and political governance and they have misused foreign loans given in aid. African governments are known to have used loans to pay for infrastructure that benefited only, and still benefits, multinationals, and on military hardware to protect non-existent sovereignties and foreign investments (Thabo Mbeki, 2007: 29).

The foregoing dissert has been necessary so as to properly assess what hopes Africa has through NEPAD vis-à-vis sustained economic growth and development.

NEPAD, International Agencies and African Development

This section attempts situating NEPAD within the context of African development, appraise its strategies and perhaps suggest ways it could be made more effective other than another valve through which western donors and corporations continue to underdevelop African countries. The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) while engaged in an overall development quest in Africa has laid more emphasis on the economic which, *ipso facto*, is the *raison d'être* for regional and sub-regional integration. The question that has been variously asked is whether Africa can halve poverty by 2015, and the answer, baring skepticisms expressed from some quarters, has been a yes.

From the African angle, the optimism that informed the NEPAD initiative will always elicit yes answers. Yet, on the side of Africa's international partners, Thabo Mbeki has admonished that our actions speak louder than our words. This comment was necessitated, at the 62nd session of the UN General Assembly held September 25th, 2007, by the glaring facts that are undermining common efforts to achieving the MDGs. Thabo Mbeki said (2007: 29):

Indeed, even as we agree on the important programmes that should bring a better life to billions of the poor, the rich and the powerful have consistently sought to ensure that whatever happens, the existing power relations are not altered and therefore the status quo remains.... Until the ideals of freedom, justice and equality characterize this premier world body, the dominant will forever dictate to the dominated, which are those of the majority of humanity, would be deferred in perpetuity.

Clare Short (2002: 25), on her own, underscores the challenges to NEPAD, when she said that poverty is deeper and more entrenched in Africa than anywhere else. Half the populations of Africa are dollar-a- day, poor. This means that they have to survive on the equivalent of what a dollar could buy them. The population of Africa is growing faster than its economies, which means that unless something changes, the continent will grow steadily poor.

Efforts toward the economic development of the African continent should originate from within. Our challenge is to create conditions that will give people of Africa a better future. Africa must put its house in order, otherwise the imperatives of nationalism and citizenship diplomacy forecloses that Western countries should dwell more on African development at the expense of their nations.

This internal reformation must start with realigning and situating previous regional and sub-regional efforts, for instance the ECOWAS and SADC, within the continent, and such earlier initiatives like the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA) with its Final Action Plan (FAP). Most importantly will be the streamlining of NEPAD into the AU. The most glaring difference between NEPAD and the AU is that the former lacks a constituency. In its policy recommendations, the International Peace Academy (IPA) insists that to make the NEPAD plan to work, it must become a full-fledged programme of the African Union. The two are still seen as separate organizations, especially, when NEPAD has its Headquarters at Midrand, South Africa and AU's at Addis Ababa.

The AU already has a broad-based constituency of the civil society and private sectors who were duly consulted at its inception. The two must not be seen as competitors clamouring to achieve same objectives. NEPAD would then become the AU's international watchdog. The AU, on its part, is expected to build up the capacities of its institutions such as the Peace and Security Council, the Pan African Parliament and the Economic and Social Council (ECCOSOC), to achieve the objectives of its constitution, which on the long run would make for good economic and political governance (International Peace Academy (IPA), 2002: 16).

An Aljazeera correspondent Nazanine, covering the AU 2013 summit at Addis Ababa, regretted that the AU, to all intents and purposes, remains a toothless bulldog. The West and China finance a greater percentage of its budget. Since the AU cannot finance its budget from internal resources, it cannot influence major decisions of events in Africa except in sending peacekeepers to war-torn zones (www.aljazeera.news 25/05/2013).

The Chairman of the African Foundation for Development (AFD) Gibril Faal said that with concerted effort from NEPAD and propped up by the AU, a bit of the economic structure of mercantilism and market segregation could be changed. Otherwise, why would China send low quality products to Africa and quality ones to Europe and North America? (www.aljazeera.news 25/05/2013) Sequel to the ineptitude of NEPAD and AU is the obvious lack of commitment by African leaders. There is a general lack of political will by Africans and their leaders to altruistically identify with NEPAD, although most African countries, who were not among the very few that championed the creation of NEPAD, feel excluded. In Nigeria, for instance, a Bill to establish the NEPAD Commission has only passed second reading in her Senate. Senator Simeon Ajibola, the sponsor of the bill regretted that since Olusegun Obasanjo left office in 2007, the NEPAD structure has remained weak (www.channelstv.com/nepadcommission 26/03/2013). If the AU, to which all African Heads of State subscribed, cannot provide an overall policy framework, the possibility of NEPAD executing its programmes for African development will remain a mirage.

In a bid to convince the global community of its preparedness to implement the NEPAD plan and partnership tenets to the letter, NEPAD's African Peer Review Mechanism was created, which as stated earlier, will assess the commitment of African leaders to monitor each other's performance in good economic and political governance. The findings of the mechanism will now be referred to the AU. Peer reviews, while carried out by eminent Africans, is beleaguered by the fact that not all African countries that are members of the AU are signatories to the NEPAD document and the APRM. Moreso, African states have not resolved whether and how they should impose sanctions on errant states. Those African countries that acceded to the APRM have received certain benefits and their consequent multiplier effects to the continent. More African countries have eventually signed the NEPAD document, especially, since the G8 hinges their support for the NEPAD plan on the "ability of African leaders to keep their commitments to economic and political reforms" (IPA, 2002: 17).

While Africa is beset with myriad problems, the issues of leadership and capacity deficits are rather prominent. Although the sum-total of Africa's poverty cannot be blamed on poor leadership, it is part of the problem. Though the section on disarticulation discerned the bad from the good, it is certain that no amount of anti-Western bashing for colonialism can heal Africa of inertia. The West is still at the helm of affairs. Globalization has torn down trade barriers and thrown the world markets open to all buyers and sellers. Regional and sub-regional efforts will not achieve much if our leaders do not stand on their feet. W. F. Kumuyi (2007: 18) insists that what Africa needs for its redemption is servant leadership instead of the self-serving governance that the continent is famed for. Our leaders should add the servant hood attitude to their attributes and demonstrate that their primary motivation for seeking to lead the people is rooted in a deep desire to serve and help out.

Leadership must not be seen as a money-spinning business venture or an opportunity to feather ones nest, bequeathing all to their offspring and not the governed. That Africa has had some good leaders in the moulds of Nelson Mandela and Seewoosagor Ramgoolam, is consoling enough for others to imitate them. These leaders must have the political will to forego aspects of their sovereignty and forge regional and sub-regional alliances.

In the area of capacity deficits, African institutions lack the necessary human resources to meet the demands of globalization. Capacity building is both quantitative and qualitative. It is also human and institutional. In the health and education sectors, where though international agencies such as WTO and UNAIDS have contributed much, access to healthcare delivery is still a problem. Infant and maternal mortality is still as high as enrolment into schools is low.

The NEPAD initiative must find ways to combat inequitable and traditional land tenure systems in Africa. Government must invest in rural infrastructure and, in fact, the private sector must be encouraged to participate in agricultural endeavours to generate enough

domestic, and attract external, capital to spur economic growth in Africa. African governments must make and meet the 10% agreed allocation to the agricultural sector in their annual national budgets.

As mentioned earlier, the quantity of infrastructure is low. This has prevented African enterprises from merging into, and tapping from, the global production networks. Thus, Africa needs to align into inter-regional transport network, gas pipeline delivery, electricity interconnections and an African water facility (Hope, 2006: 207). In the face of glaring constraints, like weak institutions, poor healthcare delivery system, civil strife and a crippling debt burden, Africa has to emphasize more on a fruitful partnership with the G8 and other Western donors, especially, since aid is tied to the adherence of African leaders to NEPAD's principles.

Several commentators have pointed out the West's proclivity for not delivering its pledges to Africa. But has Africa kept its part of the bargain? Would the West continue to drain their resources into the pockets of corrupt African political leaders who have consistently, for the past six decades, reneged on their promises to the electorate, regarding their welfare, and feathered only their nests?

However, many bilateral and multilateral development agencies have pledged support for NEPAD implementation. The Commission for Africa has made recommendations on ways to reduce poverty in Africa; the G8 in its African Action Plan restated its preparedness for debt relief and cancellation, and the UN's intention to provide coherent support for NEPAD goals. The World Bank's African Action Plan is committed to assisting Africa in capacity building in the health and education sectors, access to portable water and infrastructure, and strengthening public expenditure management. The European Union (EU) has pledged to help Africa achieve the MDG's through its Commission of European Communities (CEC).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) said in 2005 that if all her commitments to Africa are met, the road to sustainable growth and development would have been blazed. To this end, the African Partnership Forum (APF) agreed on one Joint Action Plan to document all pledges and commitments made towards Africa's development in annual reports to be published starting from 2006. A Google search revealed absolute inconsistencies in plan implementation. It does appear that African countries do not let other into their bilateral and multilateral activities.

The national incomes of African countries are so low and have continued to decline resulting to slow pace of growth in African economies. African economies must diversify and involve in such structural changes that could encourage private sector participation and investment. In the opinion of the International Peace Academy, this will increase the government's capacity to raise domestic resources and be able to make policies that will

lead to sustained growth and development (IPA, 2002: 16). Poverty studies in Africa have shown that about one-sixth of the people living in sub-Saharan Africa are chronically poor and live below \$0.60 per day.

To forestall the emigration of skilled human capital or brain-drain, primarily to Europe and North America, Africa must control the 'push' factors which include bad governance, conflicts, patrimonialism, inadequate pay, lack of respect for skills and accomplishments, and inadequate living standards. The African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) reported in 2005 that Africa loses about 20,000 skilled personnel a year to developed countries. A key task for NEPAD is in the area of weak governance. Rehearsing Kempe (2006: 211-212), weak governance is characterized by a combination of elements, such as poor institutional performance, inadequate parliamentary oversight lack of judicial independence, political instability, nonexistent or insufficient budgetary accountability; no respect for the rule of law or human rights; and rampant bureaucratic and political corruption.

In the report of the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) (2012: 12-19), an agency of the Transparency International (IT), one third of the most corrupt countries in the world are in Africa. The public services in Africa need reforms in incentive structures, employment methods, and updated management policies. These will in turn increase productivity, remunerations and checks through the application of codes of conduct and ethics including income and assets declaration for senior officials. The African legislature must be improved through training in law making, procedural rules, debate techniques, bills drafting, committee structures and roles, among others, for better policy analysis and reviews. African judicial systems must be adequately staffed with competent persons to perform its important role of adjudication in democratic governance.

The local government should have its capacity developed to respond better, as the last tier of government, to the needs of the citizens of African countries at the grassroots level. In Nigeria, inept political appointees who have perfected ways of plundering and lining their pockets with resources meant for the rural and urban poor man the local government councils. The civil society and the private sector are organs that if properly positioned would serve as watchdogs and catalysts to governments and governance. Their roles should be productive, analytical and strategic, and are to be into goods and services delivery, policy advocacy and, in fact, be partners to government. Civil society organizations have been known in developed countries to play important roles in improving the quality of governance (Hope, 2006: 220).

African governments should ensure capacity building in all the institutions that will be at the forefront of implementing the NEPAD policy. NEPAD is an African concept for Africans. But the continuous dependence of Africa on foreign aid and investment are real sources for worry. Aware of the activities of multinational corporations at fast-tracking privatization, often times public services, and its effect on the economies of African states,

makes it expedient that Africa must look for indigenous sources of income. According to the IPA, Africa would have started on a good retrace track if it reduces financial waste, employ better means of managing public assets, utilize resources more efficiently and promote self-reliance. Africa must prioritize key sectors such as education, health, and infrastructure development in order to achieve sustainable growth and development.

An interesting aspect of the NEPAD plan is its APRM, which is the watchdog for good governance. Africa has been blessed with governments that are not accountable to their people. According to Claude Kabemba (2002: 2):

Africa's bad shape is the result of this misguided leadership, systematic corruption, economic mismanagement, senseless civil wars, political tyranny, flagrant violation of human rights, military vandalism and bad policies.

Generally, Africa must put the loans to useful ends. It must use indigenous human resources, generate its funds through local resources and evolve indigenous technology and know-how. Africa should domesticate foreign resources by making it more relevant and appropriate for her situation. The emphasis should now shift from solely producing cash crops to food crops for her population. Since labour intensive mode of production worked for the colonial rulers, it could be domesticated. Most importantly, African countries should interpenetrate each other through trade, investments, aid and other forms of contacts (Ali A. Mazrui, 70-89).

How does NEPAD hope to enforce the implementation of its policies regarding political, democratic and economic governance? It has created the APRM to which not all African countries have acceded. How will NEPAD in concert with the AU react to errant countries? The only discernible way to induce compliance are through the actions of the Peace and Security Council of the AU and such other sub-regional bodies like the ECOWAS and SADC, and the rewards by the G8 accruing from compliance to the NEPAD plans of free markets, democratic policies, and zero conflict situation. Some African countries have been peer-reviewed and an index on governance ranking is in place. Governance ranking is an aspect of NEPAD's APRM initiative aimed at improving the quality of governance and to show the respective African countries the areas they need to improve on. From the IBRAHIM INDEX governance ranking, no country has had an overall good, but only prevarications from high ranking in corruption to low in political and economic governance, and vice versa (Anver Versi, 2007: 12-16).

CONCLUSION

This paper painstakingly reviewed NEPAD and drew reasonable inferences regarding its policies and programmes vis-à-vis sustained growth and development in Africa.

NEPAD as a neo-liberal plan by Africans for Africans, aimed at integrating her into the global stage is commendable. It has also been discovered that NEPAD is the child of previous initiatives like the MAP and NAI, which share similar plans. But NEPAD has the peculiarity of being outward-oriented. It proposed with some militancy the integration of African economies into the global neo-liberal Western paradigm. Africa stands a chance of reaping enough 'goodies' from the global community if it puts its house in order. Clare Short thinks that sharing knowledge, capital and technology within Africa on the one hand, and the West on the other, could overcome the ills of colonialism and the consequent deep-seated historical inequalities (*Corporate Africa*, 2002: 25).

According to the NEPAD plan, it will require strong commitment to reform from African leaders to be able to inspire a real partnership from industrialized and donor countries, and move the initiative away from the implementation stage it has remained for more than a decade. The 'pussy-footing' of African leaders and the disarticulations inherent in this partnership cannot remove from the initiative's intentions, which NEPAD has set out to achieve for Africa.

The multinational corporations have carefully dissociated its managers, who are Africans, from the owners who are Europeans. Corporate industry has established closer relationship with labour, often resulting in the active participation of trade unions in the process of innovation, while undermining the nation as a whole and ostensibly appearing to be cooperating with the government of African countries. In order to achieve control of African markets and sources of supply, and also gain maximum advantage from the differences in taxation, labour and investment policies, the primary objective of multinational enterprise has been to achieve complete freedom in the location of production and systems of distribution. This has resulted to unimpeded development of private capital. As mentioned earlier, these corporations have been backed by the foreign policy orientation of their home governments who have through well thought out people-oriented programmes invidiously opposed the growth of revolutionary movements and centrally planned economies, elsewhere, other than the West. Sequel to the above is the policy of containment embodied in the Truman Doctrine, which espoused maintaining a favourable status quo throughout the underdeveloped regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This was, and is still being, executed through the application of military power and counter-insurgency techniques all in the name of defense of the free world: Understood to mean the protection of uninhibited private enterprises (Joseph A. Camilleri, 1978: 102-104). The Hicken Looper Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 was simply to deny aid funds to countries that will not abide by the established rules of foreign investment (L. Claude, 1962: 206-278).

NEPAD has a lot to do to counter all the well-established strategies of the West in a globalizing world. It must be able to finance itself and encourage participating African countries to evolve the political will to stand on their feet against foreign national interests,

State Departments and military establishments such as the PENTAGON and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), whose interests coincide with those of her multinational corporations, financial agencies and empires.

REFERENCES

- ACTU Newsletter: A Publication of the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2012.
- Adedeji, Adebayo, 1984, "Collective Self-Reliance in Developing Africa: Scope, Prospects and Problems", in A. B. Akinyemi, S. B. Falegan and I. A. Aluko (eds.), *Readings and Documents on ECOWAS, Selected Papers and Discussions*, Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs and Macmillan Nigeria Publishers Ltd.
- Adesina, J. O., 2006, Graham, Yao and Olukoshi, A. (eds.), *Africa and Development: Challenges in the New Millennium: The NEPAD Debate*, London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Ake, Claude, 1984, *A Political Economy of Africa*, London: Longmans.
- Camilleri, Joseph A., 1978, *Civilization in Crisis: Human Prospects in a Changing World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Claude, L., 1962, *Power and International Relations*, New York: Random House.
- International Peace Academy, 2002, "NEPAD: African Initiative, New Partnership?", New York, July.
- Corporate Africa, 2002.
- Jere-Malanda, Regina, 2007, "Profiting from Poverty", *New African*, No. 467, November.
- Kanbur, Ravi, 2002, "New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)", *AFRICA NOTES*, Institute for African Development, Cornell University, New York.
- Kotze, Hennie and Steyn, Carly, 2003, *African Elite Perspectives: AU and NEPAD: A Comparative Study Across Seven African Countries*, Johannesburg: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, December.
- Kumuyi, W. F., 2007, "Nuggets in a Nutshell", *New African*, No. 467, November.
- Kembemba, C., 2002, The AU and NEPAD, inside *Africa Journal South Africa*, Vol.4, August.
- Maloka, Eddy, 2006, "NEPAD and its Critics", in J. O. Adesina, Yao Graham and A. Olukoshi (eds.), *Africa and Development Challenges in the New Millennium*, London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Mazrui, Ali A., (no date), "The Burden of Underdevelopment", *The African Condition: The Ruth Lectures*, Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Mbeki, Thabo, 2007, "UN: A Tale of Three Speeches", *New African*, No. 467, November.
- Nwaka, G. I., 1982, "The Ibibio Union and Colonial Development", Paper presented at the 27th Annual conference of the Historical Society of Nigeria, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, 13-17 April.
- Ogbuagu, Chibuzu, 2012, *Continuity and Change in Nigeria's Development Strategies since 1960*, Inaugural Lecture, Abia State University, Uturu.

- Ota, Ejitu N., 2004, "The Basic Needs Approach As An Alternative Approach for Nigeria's Development", *Uyo Journal of the Humanities*, Vol. 10, July.
- Ronald Hope, Kempe, Sr., 2006, "Prospects and Challenges for the New Partnership for Africa's Development Addressing Capacity Deficits", *Journal of Contemporary Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2, May.
- Salau, Gbenga, 2013, "Peer Review... 2013" where, during the 2nd review of Nigeria, 2013, the former Senate President Nnamani urged Nigerians to embrace APRM. *The Guardian*, November 14.
- Short, Clare, 2002, "New Economic Partnership", *Corporate Africa*, Issue 25, Vol.1, No.888, summer.
- Stultz-Karim, Sharon, 2002, "The Bush-Africa Partnership", *Corporate Africa*, Issue 25, No. 888.
- Symposium, African Development Bank (ADB), 2002, Addis Ababa, May 27.
- Versi, Anver, 2007, "The Ibrahim Index on African Governance", *African Business*, No. 336, November.
- www.aljazeera.news 25/05/2013, 50th Anniversary celebration of the AU, Addis Ababa, retrieved 25/05/13.
- www.channelstv.com/nepadcommission 26/03/2013, retrieved 25/05/2013.