NEPAD AND AFRICA'S POLITICAL CRISIS: A CASE STUDY OF COTE DIVOIRE

BY

OCHEME OGABIDU

MIAD/SOC.SCI/28464/2001 - 2002

A thesis submitted to the Post Graduate School of Ahmadu Bello University Zaria in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the degree of Masters in International Affairs and Diplomacy.

Department of Political Science
Faculty of Social Science
A.B.U. Zaria

June, 2003

DECLARATION

I declare that this work is entirely a record of my own research work and has not been part of any presentation for any other qualification. Information derived from the published and unpublished work of others has been duly acknowledged in the text.

DIGITIZED

OCHEME OGABIDU.

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled NEPAD AND AFRICA'S POLITICAL CRISIS: A CASE STUDY OF COTE D'IVOIRE by **Ocheme Ogabidu** meets the regulation governing the award of the degree of Masters in International Affairs and Diplomacy of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Supervisor — Date: 27/06/2003

Coordinator of the Programme — Date: 28/06/2004

Head of Department — Date: 10-3-2004

Dean, Post Graduate School — Date: 8/11/06

DEDICATION

To my Wife, Ada and God's bundle of joy to us, Ori.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am deeply grateful to all the people that have been instrumental to the success of this work. I am particularly indebted to my Supervisor, Dr. Y.A. Yakubu for his patience, and encouragement as well as his illuminating suggestions and modifications without which this dissertation would not have seen the light of day.

I will also like to acknowledge the insightful contributions of my friends/classmates, especially Esdee, M.B. Maude, John and Babawo.

My thanks also goes to the trio of Dr. E.M. Okonkwo, Dr. A.S. Agbaji and Mr. B.N. Yabaya all of NARICT Zaria for their encouragement and confidence in my ability

This dissertation in its present form could not have been possible but for the pains-taking efforts of Mrs. P. Ekele, Mr. A. A. Sani and Mr. D. Akubo all of NARICT, Zaria who ceaselessly and patiently laboured to bring the manuscript into print.

Finally the entire effort would not have been possible without the support and understanding of my wife and daughter, Mrs. A. V. Ogabidu and Miss Ori Ogabidu, coupled with the special grace of God.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Declaration	i
Certification	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	vii
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background to the study	1-4
1.2 Statement of the problem	4-5
1.3 *Research Questions*	5
1.4 Propositions	5
1.5 Objectives of the Study	6
1.6 Significance and Justification of Study	6
1.7 Methodology	6-7
1.8 Scope and Limitation of study	7
1.9 Organisation of the Work	7 –8
Endnotes	9
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
2.1 Literature Review	10-13
2.2 Theoretical Framework	14

2.2.1 The Political Economy Perspective (Marxian Methodology) 14-16

2.2.2 Discourse of the Political Economy Mode of Analysis within a Neo-Colonial Context 16-19

Endnotes 20

CHAPTER THREE THE NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT (NEPAD)

3.0 NEPAD: Background 21-22

3.1 Historical Imperatives 22-23

3.2 Previous Programmes to tackle Africa's Development Crisis 24

3.3 The Origin of NEPAD 25-26

3.4 Salient Features of NEPAD 26-28

Endnotes 29

CHAPTER FOUR AFRICA'S POLITICAL CRISIS: THE CASE OF COTE D'IVOIRE

4.0 Introduction 30

4.1 Globalization and Africa's Political crisis 30-34

4.2 The Character of Africa's Political Elite 34-36

4.3 Political Crisis and AU/NEPAD 36-41

4.4 An Examination of the Ivorien Political Crises 41-43

Endnotes 44

CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary 45-47

5.2 Recommendation 48-49

5.3 Conclusion 49-50

Endnotes 51

Bibliography 52-54

ABSTRACT

Regional economic cooperation and integration such as ECA, OAU, Lagos Plan of Action and the Final Act of Lagos since the past four decades have remained the central pillars of African development strategies. Although, most of these past policies were marked by false shorts and failures; due to reasons which include amongst others lack of political will, lack of capacity and outside interference, the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) has been launched and is being implemented as 'novel initiative/strategy to resolve Africa's continental crisis of development'

But given the similarity in the philosophical underpinning of NEPAD vis-a-vis the previous failed efforts, one is tempted to argue that it was designed to fail.

Using the political economy approach, a content analysis of the NEPAD document was undertaken. On this basis, the case of Cote d'ivoire political crisis ascertains that NEPAD, as currently packaged, is merely a symbolic policy initiative put in place by its originators to advance their own interest and perpetuate themselves in power.

It becomes glaring from the work that unless Africa adopts a new approach to its political economy it will continue to replace one set of inadequate development strategy with another.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The grave development experience confronting independent Africa for the past four (4) decades has generated a plethora of reactions in terms of analysis, prepositions, policies and programs, on the probable causes of this apparent continental crisis of development and how best to get out of the dilemma.[1]

This socio-economic cum political crisis has haunted almost every African state/regime since the early 1960s, shortly after they gained formal independence from the colonialist. This seeming intractable problem of poverty, hunger and diseases has therefore led them to evolve and try a variety of development strategies. Among these strategies have been attempts made to tackle (albeit without success), Africa's grave development crisis through the concepts and models inherited from Western capitalism with emphasis on economic growth and paradigms such as national income, gross domestic product etc. Also, the application of the reformulated economic development models (emphasizing balanced growth and development) and the redefined concepts for the promotion of economic cooperation and integration for accelerated development among African states have met with limited success. While these strategies showed some initial prospects, they were marked by false starts and failures which is indicative that the strategies were either conceptually inadequate or practically ineffective to address Africa's underdevelopment. Reasons advanced for this failure include among others, lack of capacity, lack of

political will, outside interference and lack of resources. It is apparent that these reasons border on the capacity of the state, which primarily exists to provide and ensure the availability of the enabling environment for wholesome development. The nature of the State has a crucial role to play in the success or failure of any development initiative and /or strategy especially as socio-economic forces (represented by the state) and public policy structures/programs are linked in a complex and never ending process and pattern of mutual causation[2].

However, most African states are today faced with crises of governance. Africa's development crisis it seems, cannot be resolved except the all pervasive political crisis epitomized by series of intractable crisis of governance (as well as the intra-state and inter state conflicts) confronting African states are resolved. Simply put, economic development and sustainable development are not possible without a good political climate. The spates of political crisis in Africa today is therefore an impediment to the realization of the objectives and goals of the New Partnership for Africa's Development, NEPAD, as a new initiative in Africa's continuous search for an end to its development crisis. In other words, economic development cannot be divorced from its socio-cultural and political settings. As Sandbrook noted, it is the socio-political factors in particular, which place severe limitations on economic development. Hence any development strategy which ever its economic advantages must be politically viable [3].

The development crisis in Africa has often been seen as resulting from obvious economic failures in economic performance. The development strategies so far promulgated and often adopted has tended therefore to

focus on strictly economic aspects. The question of the political preconditions for the success of these strategies has often been left untreated or at best taken a back seat. Africa's experience(s) with the ECA/OAU Lagos plan of Action and Final Act of Lagos, World Bank Agenda for action on accelerated development in sub-saharan Africa (the Bergs Report), African Priority Programme For Economic Recovery (APPER), African Alternative Frame work to Structural Adjustment for Socio-economic Transformation (AAT-SAP) and the UN Programme of Action for Africa's Economic Recovery and Development (UN-PAAERD) as tested development strategies typifies this perspective.

NEPAD as a new strategy of developmental regionalism exhibits similar philosophical underpinnings with previous landmark efforts such as the ECA/OAU Lagos plan of Action and the Final Act of Lagos (LPA/FAL). One is therefore tempted to assume, as rightly articulated by Claude Ake, that African leaders have either by commission or omission (emphasis mine) failed to understand that the crisis of development in Africa, which instruments such as NEPAD have been adopted to resolve, is essentially political in origin and character; its economic consequences are serious as we know, but they are nonetheless incidental [4]

To this extent therefore, one would want to conjecture that NEPAD as enunciated represents only a nominal commitment by African leaders to a new development orientation for Africa. Thus, the preposition that NEPAD is a symbolic policy initiative.

The main concern of this work therefore, using the Cote d'Ivoire Political crisis, is to identify the theme of symbolism in the NEPAD

initiative as a tool by African leaders to perpetuate their interest and dominance in power, given the apparent limitations the existing political crises in Africa imposes on its success.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The New Partnership for Africa's Development, better known as NEPAD, has been described as the collective vision of African Leaders to resolve the crises of government and development in the region in the 21st century[5]. NEPAD, as set out in the document, is said to be Africa's response to the historical impoverishment of the continent of Africa which was accentuated primarily by the legacy of slave trade, colonialism, the cold war and the workings of the International economic system, neocolonialism and the inadequacies and shortcomings in the policies pursued by many countries in the post independence era[6]

Faced with the reality of the dominant issues of the 21st century (especially after the cold war era) in the form of democratization and liberalization, information and communication technology and globalization, African leaders have been awakened to a new reality, which is the urgent need and resolve to take head-on the crises of governance and development in the region so as to ensure a prosperous future in a dignified life and a more equitable share of global wealth.

However, given the philosophical underpinnings of the NEPAD initiative as enunciated in its document vis-à-vis the objective political realities of African states, NEPAD can at best be considered a nominal commitment by African leaders to a new development orientation for Africa.

Using the Cote d'ivoire political crisis, this study therefore is an examination of the extent to which the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), is an extension of the symbolic policy creation (symbolism) of the African ruling elite aimed at resolving their crisis of governance, thereby perpetuating themselves' in power.

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study addresses the following questions:

i. Can the philosophical underpinnings of NEPAD sustain the current dynamics of globalisation?

ii. Why NEPAD now?

iii. Can NEPAD succeed without the African union, the realisation of which is beset with the problems of Wars and conflicts, Crisis of governance, Language barriers, Uncommon currency, Trade and fiscal barriers etc?

iv. Why does the Cote d'ivoire political crisis persist?

1.4 PROPOSITIONS

The main propositions in this study are:

i. The philosophical underpinnings of NEPAD cannot sustain the current dynamics of globalisation.

ii. NEPAD is necessary in order to supplement the efforts of ECA and AU in providing the desired development for Africa.

iii. NEPAD cannot succeed without the African Union.

iv. The Cote d'ivoire political crisis persists because NEPAD is a symbolic policy creation of African ruling elite to perpetuate their interest dominance in power.

relevant aspect is undertaken to validate or repudiate our propositions. The political economy approach is adopted for the analysis.

1.8 SCOPE AND LIMITATION

The scope of the study covers the period between July, 2001 – June 2003. This timeframe covers the immediate period preceding the launching of NEPAD and the eruption of the Ivorien political crises which is the 'newest' major regional conflict after its enunciation. Thus, presenting itself as the first litmus test to evaluate the initiatives sense of purpose and direction in handling the issue of political crises insecurity and conflict in Africa.

However, as a new development initiative our study is restricted to the examination of NEPAD'S philosophical underpinnings and strategic plans vis-a-vis the practical realities of Africa's development crises. On the face of it, this may appear restrictive for any generalisation to be made on the theme of 'symbolism' with regards to NEPAD, our analysis are meant to provide pointers and empirical insight as to why the resolution of the numerous political crisis in Africa and the adoption of new approach to her political economy remains the key to her development.

1.9 ORGANISATION OF THE WORK

This study is organised into five chapters.

Chapter one introduces the work. It starts by giving a background to the study and the statement of the research problem, the propositions, research questions, the objectives of the study, the significance and justification of a study, the methodology adopted as well as the scope and limitations of the work.

Chapter two reviews existing literature on NEPAD and also situated the theoretical framework of the study on the political economy perspective.

Chapter three gives a general overview of the NEPAD document highlighting relevant historical experiences which engendered the need for the previous programmes and now NEPAD, to tackle Africa's development crises. It also traces the origin and highlighted the objective and salient features of NEPAD.

Chapter four focuses on the analysis of the NEPAD document in order to ascertain the validity or otherwise of our statement of research problem. However, our analysis is considered within the context of our research propositions on globalisation, the orientation and interest of Africa's political elite as well as the inadequacy of the African Union to provide the motive force for NEPAD. A referential analysis of the Ivorien political crises is undertaken to illustrate the interconnectedness of these propositions to political crises in Africa.

Chapter five summarises the work on the basis of which our recommendations and conclusion were made.

ENDNOTES

1. Asante, S.K.B: (1991), African Development: Adebayo Adedejis Alternative Strategies p xiii
2. Alan, B. Amey & D.K Leonard (1979), "Public Policy, class and inequality in Kenya and Tanzania" in Journal Africa Today, Vol. 26 No.4 p3.
3. Richard Sandbrook, (1987), The Politics of Africa's Economic Stagnation p.12
4. Claude Ake (1987), How Politics Underdeveloped Africa
5. Aluko Olokun (2002) How Public Private Sectors Partnership Can Work in Guardian Newspaper, 23/5/2002.
6. Aluko Olokun (2002): NEPAD Document p 4.
7. Asante, S.K.B. (1991): African Development: Adebayo Adedeji's Alternative Strategies. p.59

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Literature Review

Being a relatively new initiative most literature on NEPAD are derived in the main from critiques of the document on NEPAD as enunciated in its policy framework which was finalized on 23rd October 2001. However, a survey of literatures reveal a broad spectrum of perspectives or viewpoints, which we may categorize into two. One viewpoint expresses cautious optimism about its success, especially because of the antecedents of previous initiatives, development plans and programmes of action.

The other perspectives celebrate NEPAD as an authentic alternative strategy for Africa's development. According to Aluko Olokun, NEPAD is a holistic, comprehensive integrated strategic framework for the socio-economic development of Africa. The document provides the vision for Africa a statement of the problems facing the continent and a programme of action to resolve these problems in order to reach the vision. It is a plan that has been conceived and developed by African leaders with a commitment to the African people and the international community to place Africa on a path of sustainable growth; through the accelerated integration of the African continent into the global economy, based on a framework of a new partnership with the rest of the world.[1]

From this perspective, it is obvious that unlike previous cooperation relationships especially between the industrialized West and Africa where the partnership is vertical and therefore unequal, under NEPAD the partnership is based on mutual benefits,

commitment and shared responsibilities (that is, cooperation from a position of independence and autonomous power).

Past development initiatives, for example the Structural Adjustment Programme, SAP were allegedly conceived abroad by the various Bretton wood institutions, but NEPAD is a product of indigenous efforts offering African methodology and solutions to African problems. Sharing in this optimism, B. Akinterinwa, put it lucidly thus, "NEPAD is " a new technique of political and economic development conceived by African leaders. As a copyright, it is owned by Africans. As a development programme it is African led. Infact, NEPAD is specifically designed to be a catalytic strategy in Africa development process" [2].

Extolling the virtues of NEPAD which has been dubbed the "African Marshall plan" by some, Gambari, submitted that if properly implemented the peer review process, which African governments have signed up to under NEPAD for monitoring progress on political governance and economic probity is potentially revolutionary in the non interventionist context of Africa's post independence international relations[3].

Expressing cautious optimism, Adebayo Olukoshi, argues that the main thrust of the NEPAD ideas and ideals as well as the economic governance framework within which they are defined are lacking in the kind of basic social anchor that can ensure that the democracy and governance proposals that are made are moved from the realm of the pro-forma and technocratic to the area of the political as a living experience marked by contestations and negotiations among the bearers of competing interests[4].

480624
DT
21.4

Others criticized NEPAD'S 2-gap model, which believed that massive injection of foreign capital is the best route to Africa's development. Adedeji, had this to say; "to postulate in the 21st century more than four decades after the unsuccessful effort at promoting development on the basis of the neo classical model propagated by the operators of development merchant systems that the deus ex machina is massive injection of capital particularly foreign capital is to ignore completely all the lessons of experience [5]

Capturing this position more graphically, Abdulraheem Tajudeen, simply sees NEPAD as "repackaged neo-colonialism" because it relies on the 'dependence' relationship with the developed world for its success. He contended that there are three basic flaws intrinsic in the NEPAD 2- gap model. First, there are no indications that the G8 powers are willing to surrender their unfair advantages and rigged rule of global finance and trade because of their new love for Africa. Two, African leaders have limited their strategy to the G8 alone without reference to other significant areas of the world like India or China. Thirdly, and the most fundamental flaw is the subscription to the neo-liberal hegemony of the market as the greatest fixer[6].

To others, the political characters of African leaders represent the major impediment to the success of NEPAD. There is this belief among African leaders that every government holds the monopoly of wisdom over and above the people for whom governance is held in trust. As such for NEPAD to flourish, the old habits of our present without leaders must die. For instance, the partnership was designed to work with the citizens yet it was ratified and adopted public

consultation. Thus, Yahaya Mahmood, contend that NEPAD as an African document prepared by Africans for Africans must therefore be engaged with zeal and determination by African leaders and the African peoples through critical examination, engagement and active participation as direct stakeholders and to harness resources internally to generate a sense of attachment and ownership of the programme [7].

Aptly summing it up Dan Nabudere, argued that NEPAD provides a good illustration of the historical contestation that exists and continues to take place between forces in Africa seeking self determination in their development efforts and those forces that seek the continuation of the exploitation of the continents resources upon which their wealth depends [8]. As such the industrialized nations upon whom NEPAD depends cannot be genuine and benevolent development partners as that will negate the very of their capitalist existence.

The consensus that may have arisen from these view points are certainly that the NEPAD document at the conceptual level may have been based on a faulty understanding of the African development crisis which of course would impact negatively on its success; no matter the optimism its introduction may have generated. The objective reality of Africa's situation shows that Africa's underdevelopment which must be examined and understood from a political economy perspective cannot be resolved through reliance on the benevolence of the perpetrators, as that would negate the very basis of their socio-economic existence. As such a conceptual framework of analysis which would enable us understand more fully the political implication of Africa's development problems must be adopted.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Having highlighted some of the analysis and writings on NEPAD, it would seem that a framework of analysis which recognizes the peculiar character of Africa's development within its broader historical context of neocolonialism could contribute more towards a fuller appreciation of NEPAD as a deliberate symbolic strategy by the political leadership to dominate and mystify society especially when viewed against the democracy and political governance component of the document/initiative.

The theoretical framework of this study will therefore be derived and premised on class analysis (dialectical historical materialism) or the political economy perspective. This framework of analyses seems to be favoured for two (2) principal reasons. First, it will help to explain and point out the class dimension of NEPAD within a framework of neo-colonialism especially as representing the politics of survival by African leaders. Secondly, it will also provide an insight as to how state actions flow in a purposeful manner from the decision makers definition of the situation to reflect their interest.

2.2.1 The political economy perspective (Marxian Methodology)

The class analysis or political economy perspective (Marxian methodology) exhibits four major principles with varieties within them for confronting reality, namely; the principles of inter-connectivity of things, unity of opposites, contradictions and struggles as a source of change, the transition of which development and history are complex forms. And that all these principles are fundamental properties of the observable world [9].

The Marxian analysis argues that the way an individual believes, thinks, political inclination, perceptions etc are determined by his economic relationship (that is, economic interest impacts on all decision). In politics therefore, any political decision is a reflection of the economic interest. The economic base and superstructure are coterminous. The economic base determines the superstructure (culture, politics etc). Political choice is therefore determined by economic interest. Simply, the Marxian approach believes that material existence is a major determinant of social and political interaction. Historical materialism goes further to assert the interdependence of politics and economics arguing that political institutions and political decisions are always the efforts of economic causes (factors), as there are no political facts which are not at some level of explanation economic facts. Politics and Economics are therefore interwoven. At the political level, all economic decisions are made through the political process. And it is the synthesis of politics and economics (thesis, antithesis and synthesis) that is political economy.

Simply put, this framework of analyses emphasizes that the economic base (the dominant mode of production) determines the superstructure (that is the social relations of production) and that each dominant mode of production has its attendant ideology and dominant class. And that given the internal contradictions within each mode of production, change which is inevitable occurs. And to delay this eventual change, all kinds of chicaneries, manipulations, machinations and even violence are employed. Using this premise, Marx analyzed

the dynamics of capitalism which has its highest stage in imperialism and manifest itself in neocolonialism.

2.2.2 Discourse On The Political Economy Mode Of Analysis Within A Neo-Colonial Context

Based on the political economy perspective, one can argue as follows:

First, a neo-colonial state exhibits peculiar characteristics. Second,the state system in Africa is neocolonial and extensively linked with the developments of monopoly capitalism which consequently leads to class formation. Third, the consequent changes in the economic apparatus forms the basis or the creation of a correlative state apparatus capable of submerging any comprehensive criticism of the emergent system.

A mature neo-colonial state is therefore characterized by the following:

High degree of penetration of foreign capital;

Multi-nationalization of transnational in the colony;

Consequent emergence of an indigenous bourgeoisie which takes charge of the affairs of the state;

Expanded petit bourgeoisie and working class;

Proletarization of the peasantry;

Development of peasant and working class consciousness; and

The Development and intensification of class struggle[10].

The issue then is, if the African state system exhibits these characteristics highlighted above then it is neocolonial and thus linked with monopoly capitalism.

The post-colonial states of Africa liberated themselves from the clutches of colonialism as a result of the contradictions that imperialism itself set in motion. Imperialism cannot allow the complete transformation of pre-capitalist society but contrarily exists on the basis of hindering their transformation and can only subject these societies to the need of monopoly capitalism.

The introduction of capitalist relations and competition in the colonies created a basis for the neocolonial class formation. With the export of capital products to the colonies a national bourgeoisie (in a reality a petit bourgeoisie) serving the process of colonial production emerges.

As result of this internal development in the neo-colonies where under the new strategy a social class transformation has taken place these classes through capitalist production relations help to perpetuate a neo-colonial state (with a section of the petty and comprador bourgeoisie as their governing representatives). However, monopoly capitalism has to ensure that these indigenous bourgeoisie rely upon international capital to sustain itself both economically and politically. This strategy gives the bourgeoisie a semblance of independence, while it sticks increasingly on populism to maintain its support from the neocolonies. But, these classes play their true role as agents of monopoly capital through the monopoly control of management and production process, the governing class (agents of monopoly capital) ensures the actual running of the enterprises and corporations in society. In addition, their clients and agents, in form of government functionaries introduce mechanisms and institutions to perpetuate this dominance[11].

As a result of this development, the governing class transforms from a colonial type administration to that of a post colonial state and develops a sophisticated array of instruments of control (including of course a form of state monopoly). This class as part of the metropolitan bourgeoisie has a way in which it fulfils its functions as agents to achieve this suppression. It expands not only her repressive apparatus, but also attempts to increase her clientage mostly found in the bureaucracy. The indigenous bourgeoisie thus builds a strong social base, in addition to or as a substitute for the classes that dominate society. As a follow up, depending on her dealing with her metropolitan allies, she determines the varieties of manipulative instrument it wishes to use in mystifying and subsequently, exploiting the country to their own interest and that of her allies.

Correlative to these changes in the economic apparatus the State evolves specific ideological apparatus to submerge any relevant and comprehensive criticism of the neocolonial state system. Such therefore is the basis for the creation of such a development strategy as NEPAD, especially, that the political encumbrances have not been addressed. This has to be because as a result of the inherent contradiction of the neo-colonial state a pattern of indirect or direct challenges to the very basis of the essence of the neo-colony emerges. These challenges take a variety of forms and it is associated with the growing cynicism of the entire nature of the system. To relieve itself form her own trappings and contradictions and to delay its inevitable death, the governing class and their representatives embark upon ventures aimed at misinforming society (symbolism)[12].

As Richard Harris, succinctly noted, the present structure of under development in Africa stems from the incorporation of the continent into the expanding capitalist system over a period of some four centuries [13]. Under colonialism the basic features of the present political economy of Africa took form. Colonialism provided the context within which the "development of underdevelopment" took place. It was during this period that the dynamic sectors of the colonies were aligned with the interests of the dominant classes in the metropolitan countries. This phenomena created within each colony the political and social conditions necessary to sustain and reproduce the relationship established under the colonial system. This process was so successfully maintained and nourished that political independence did not lead to a radical change in the relationship between former colonies and metropolitan interests at least not at an economic level. Almost all the African states today show a continuity in the process of the metropole relationship in most sectors. And the major consequence arising from this neocolonial system which is inimical to the development processes in Africa is the establishment of a close alliance between the indigenous ruling classes and foreign interests neither of which has any fundamental interest in the transformation of the local political economy.

Given the forgoing situation, and the pervasiveness of the neocolonial structures in Africa and the entrenchment of the established modes of cooperation between the national and international forces, it has become increasingly difficult for most of the present ruling classes on the continent of Africa to respond positively to demands for radical restructuring of Africa's political economy or a radical change that might alter the status quo [14].

END NOTES

1. Aluko Olokun: NEPAD Document p.2
2. Bola Akinterinwa (2002): NEPAD in This Day Newspaper 19/3/02 p.15.
3. Ibrahim Gambari, quoted in The Guardian 18/7/2002, p.2
4. Adebayo Olukoshi (2002): NEPAD: Marrying Politics with social development in Daily Trust (22/7/2002) p.16.
5. Adebayo Adedeji: Quoted in The Guardian of 18/7/2002 p.2.
6. Tajudeen Abdulraheem: NEPAD Repackaged Neocolonialism in Weekly Trust of 12-18 July 2002 p.29
7. Mahmood Yahaya: NEPAD Whose Partnership, New Nigerian Newspaper 5/7/2002.
8. Dan Nabudere (2002): Will NEPAD Bring about an African Renaissance in Daily Trust 26/6/02 p.16-17.
9. Eskor Toyo (1999): The Galbenkian Commission Report on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences: A Rejoinder in The Nigerian Social Science Vol.2, No.2 p.25.
10. Wang Metuge (1980): The Dynamics of Nigerian Politics Today p.3-4.
11. Ogabidu Ocheme, (1981): The Ombudsman: A case of Benue State Public Complaints Commission (An unpublished B.Sc. dissertation) p.7-8
12. Ibid, Ogabidu Ocheme p.9
13. Richard Haris, (1975): The Political Economy of Africa: Underdevelopment or Revolution in the Political Economy of Africa (Ed) p.10
14. Asante, S.K.B.(1991), African Development: Adebayo Adedejis Alternative Strategies p. 71.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

3.0 **NEPAD:** Background.

A general over view of the NEPAD document is under taken in this chapter in order to highlight its salient features. As indicated earlier the New Partnership for Africa's Development better known as NEPAD has been described as 'the collective vision of African Leaders to resolve the crisis of governance and development in the region in the 21st century'[1]

But any meaningful discussion of the concept and programme must out of a sense of history commence with at least a panoramic highlight of the traumatic experiences of Africa and its people. First, was the 'Macabre Project of Slave Trade' which to all intent and purpose was not only an epitome of man's inhumanity to man but an act of criminality against the African continent[2].

Secondly, the 1884 Berlin Conference partitioned and arbitrarily dismembered the continent into different political units among European powers without justification and thus, created the basis for the constant wars and conflict between African countries.

Then, the continent experienced various bloody revolts against colonialism and racism leading to the emergence of modern African States.

Fourthly, neocolonialism has continued the marginalisation of Africa through the various Bretton Woods Institutions and the lopsided policies of World Trade Organization which severely weakened African economies thereby thrusting the continent into a vicious circle of debt and ever worsening levels of poverty[3].

The cumulative effect of these events logically led to the 'depopulation of Africa and the eventual deprivation and destruction of the

African economy as well as the traditional political structure. Having been brutally de-linked, the continent became helpless to cope with and manage the technological revolution of the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries[4], which today poses a big challenge for sustainable development.

In order to take this challenge head-on NEPAD as a development strategy was designed as a product of indigenous efforts offering African methodology and solutions to African problems[5]

However, we shall proceed by looking in detail at the historical imperatives which impinged on the growth and development of Africa to warrant the NEPAD initiative, previous efforts to ameliorate or tackle the problem of Africans impoverishment (programmes) as well as the origin, goal and objectives of the new initiative and how it represents a departure from the former approaches.

3.1 HISTORICAL IMPERATIVES

Africa has remained the poorest continent despite being one of the most richly endowed regions of the world in development terms. For centuries the continent has been integrated into the world economy mainly as a supplier of cheap labour and raw materials. This meant the draining of Africa's resources rather than their application for the continent's development. Intrinsically therefore, the continent lost the drive to develop manufacturing industries and the highly skilled labour force to sustain growth and development. There was no infusion of wealth in the form of investments which created large volumes of wealth through value added exports as was the case in other continents. As such, Africa lost the self sustaining drive to harness her vast resources to create wealth for the well being of her peoples.

Colonialism further subverted the existing traditional structures, institutions and values and made them subservient to the economic needs of the imperial powers. The development of an entrepreneurial class as well as a middle class with skills and managerial capacity was retarded. Post colonial Africa therefore, inherited weak States and dysfunctional economies, and the weak capitalist class and rather few professionals could not strengthen the accumulation process to jumpstart the development of their States. This was further aggravated by poor leadership and governance. This situation which hampered development was worsened by the divisions caused by the cold war which led to a series of conflicts and wars.

Given this scenario, most African States could not empower their people to embark on development initiatives to realize their creative potentials. One of Africa's major challenges today therefore is how to strengthen the capacity to govern and develop long term policies particularly as these weak States remain a major constraint to sustainable development.

Africa's experience shows that the role of capital accumulation in the post independent period has not been sufficient to rebuild societies in the wake of colonial underdevelopment or even sustain improved living standard. Thus, the political process has been chaotic and sustains patronage and corruption.

The cumulative effects of these processes has been the entrenchment of a vicious cycle in which economic decline, reduced capacity and poor governance reinforce each other relegating Africa to a peripheral and diminishing role in the world economy, and thus marginalised[6].

NEPAD was therefore considered as a response to the herculean challenge of sustainable development.

3.2 PREVIOUS PROGRAMMES TO TACKLE AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT CRISIS

The African political and economic landscape before NEPAD had been replete with quite a number of initiatives, development plans and programmes of actions tailored towards resolving her development crises. Aluko Olokun, put the figure at about thirty seven (37), after about four (4) decades of independence.As such, Africa's identification and recognition of her structural impediments to growth and development has never been in doubt except that they were marked perhaps with false starts and failures.

Regional Economic Cooperation and Integration has in the past 40 years remained a central pillar of Africa's development strategy. Worthy of note are the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS – 1975), the preferential treatment area for Eastern and Southern Area (PTA – 1981) which later Transformed into COMESA and the Central African Economic Community (CAEC – 1983). There were also the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA, 1980), the Final Act of Lagos (FAL, 1980) and the Abuja treaty establishing the African Economic Community (AEC, 1991). However, all these efforts have been hampered by many factors including, lack of capacity, lack of practical will to implement treaty obligation, outside interference and lack of resources.

But the latest initiative in NEPAD is said to be in tandem with World wide consensus and the economic imperative that, integration has become necessary, if the continent of Africa is to achieve accelerated development. The launching of NEPAD therefore is definitely suggestive that there is now a dissatisfaction with these past programmes and the introduction of a novel and different initiative is therefore imperative.

3.3 THE ORIGIN OF NEPAD

The mandate for the New African Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) has its genesis at the OAU Extraordinary Summit held in Sirte, Libya during September 1999. The Summit mandated President Mbeki of South Africa and President Bouteflika of Algeria to engage Africa's creditors on the total cancellation of Africa's external debt. Following this, the South Summit of the Non-aligned Movement and the G-77, held in Havana, Cuba during April 2000, mandated President Mbeki and President Obasanjo of Nigeria to convey the concerns of the South to the G-8 and the Bretton Woods institutions.

Realizing the correlation between the two mandates and the fact that debt relief forms but one critical aspect of the overall development agenda for Africa, the OAU Summit held in Togo in July 2000 mandated the three Presidents to engage the developed North with a view to 'developing a constructive partnership for the re-generation of the Continent. Following from this, the three Presidents raised the issue of a partnership with the leaders of the G-8 at their Summit in Japan during July 2000. The work on developing NEPAD (at that stage referred to as the Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Programme (MAP) then began in earnest and a process of engagement on a bilateral and multilateral level was pursued.

During the 5th Extraordinary Summit of the OAU held in Sirte, Libya from 1 to 2 March, 2001, President Obasanjo made a presentation on MAP, while President Wade of Senegal who presented the OMEGA plan. The work being done by the four Presidents i.e. Presidents Mbeki, Obasanjo, Bouteflika and Wade, was endorsed and it was decided that every effort should be made to integrate all the initiatives being pursued for the recovery and development of Africa, including the ECA'S New Global Compact with

Africa. In reaching this decision, the Summit recognized the synergy and complementarily that existed between the various initiatives.

An integration process of the various initiatives followed, and on 11th July 2001 NEPAD (or the New African Initiative (NAN) as it was temporarily known at the time), was presented to the OAU Summit of Heads of State and Government in Lusaka, Zambia, providing the vision for Africa, a statement of the problems facing the continent and a Programme of Action to resolve these problems in order to reach the vision. NEPAD was enthusiastically received and unanimously adopted in the form of Declaration 1 (xxxvii) as Africa's principal agenda for development, providing a holistic, comprehensive integrated strategic framework for the socio-economic development of the continent, within the institutional framework of the African union.[7]

3. 4. SALIENT FEATURES OF NEPAD

According to the NEPAD document, the goals of NEPAD are to

(i) eradicate widespread and severe poverty

(ii) promote accelerated growth and sustainable development

(iii) halt the marginalization of Africa in globalization process, and

(iv) restore peace, security and stability

The major strategic issues and key developmental challenges confronting African leaders were identified as follows:

(a) Restoration of peace, security and stability

(b) Entrenchment of good governance

(c) Resumption of accelerated growth and sustainable development

(d) Reduction of poverty and income inequality

(e) Consolidation of democratic gains and strengthening of democratic institutions and structures

(f) Rehabilitation and construction of infrastructural facilities

(g) Redefinition of relationship with partners

(h) Reconciliation of global financial architecture, and

(i) Bridging the digital divide between North and South

In order to reduce the population of Africa living under the poverty line by half by 2015, the GDP must be 7 per cent per annum on sustained basis. This International Development Goals (IDG) is to be the bench mark for African countries in other areas such as health, education, gender equality and environment.

Some of the major elements of the development strategy include the following:

a) Ensuring the ownership, management and leadership of the New Partnership process by Africans.

b) Ensuring that the partnership between Africa and the rest of the world is based on mutual benefits and accountability, mutual commitments, shared responsibilities and well defined obligations.

c) Securing long-term capital flows to close a huge resource gap estimated to be $64 million per annum or 12 per cent of the GDP of Africa.

d) Demanding an Overhaul of the Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) relationship, an outright cancellation or substantial reduction of Africans debt and increased market access in the industrial economies.[8]

The adoption of NEPAD has therefore been considered as one of the most important development of recent time for its conception of a development programme placing Africa at the apex of the global agenda[9].

END NOTES

1. Aluko Olokun (2002): 'How Public Private Sectors Partnership can work' in the Guardian Newspaper, 23/5/2002.

2. Steve Itugbu (2002): 'Foreign Policy Issues that shaped NEPAD; in Daily Times Newspaper 27/5/2002 p.5

3. Mohmood Yahaya (2002): NEPAD, Whose Partnership, New Nigerian Newspaper, 5/7/2002.

4. Opcit, S Itugbu p.45.

5. Bola Akintariwa (2002): NEPAD, in This Day Newspaper of 19/02/2002 PP 15

6. Aluko Olokun NEPAD Document 2002 pp.4 – 6.

7. Crusoe Osagie (2002): NEPAD urged to prioritize small scale Family Agriculture, in This Day of 9/7/2002 p.30.

8. Aluko Olokun – NEPAD Document pp. 1 – 3.

9. Opcit, Crusoe Osagie, p.30.

CHAPTER FOUR
AFRICA'S POLITICAL CRISIS: THE CASE OF COTE D'VOIRE

4.0 INTRODUCTION

Taking Cote d'voire as a case study this chapter undertakes a synoptic overview of the political crises in Africa with a view to ascertaining the extent to which NEPAD is an extension of the deliberate symbolic policy creation of Africa's ruling elite to perpetuate their dominance and/or retention of power especially because of their seeming failure to address in concrete terms the obvious crises of governance confronting them in their various states. It is however pertinent to consider globalisation and Africa's political crisis, the character of Africa's political elite, political crisis and AU/NEPAD before examination of the Ivorien political crisis.

4.1 GLOBALISATION AND AFRICA'S POLITICAL CRISES

One of the major objectives of NEPAD is to "halt the marginalisation of Africa in the globalization process". The question then is, can the philosophical underpinning of NEPAD sustain the current dynamics of globalization which emphasises the principle of liberalisation (state restriction), sustainable growth and democratic governance? Our analyses here shall focus on the economic and corporate governance as well as the capital in-flows initiative of NEPAD as enshrined in sections 85 – 88 and 147 – 155. This is imperative because it will assist us to fully appreciate the reluctance of the present ruling class in Africa to respond to the demands of radical restructuring of Africa's political economy. The treatise is simply

that, political choices and decisions are usually determined by economic interests.

The Economic and Corporate Governance as well as the Capital Inflows Initiative(s) outline that the State has a major role to play in promoting economic growth and development and the implementation of the poverty reduction programme. To achieve this, especially the estimated 7 percent annual growth rate needed to meet the International Development Goals (IDG), particularly the goal of reducing by half the proportion of Africans' living in poverty by 2015, Africa needs to fill an annual resource gap of 12 percent of its GDP or US $64 billion. This it intends to achieve through the role of the state in increasing domestic resource mobilization, Debt Relief, seek increase in the Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) flows and increase private capital flows to Africa[1] albeit through the free-market Mechanism.

It is obvious from the above that NEPAD paradigm and model does not depart fundamentally from previous programmes designed by the World Bank and the IMF, especially SAP. The Structural Adjustment Programme exposed the institutional and structural incapacities of most Africa states in their exercise of political power to manage their nations affairs, thus, creating despondency and crises of confidence in these regimes. A critical analysis of the Structural Adjustment Programmes and how the global economy reinforces Africa's marginalisation should ordinarily therefore have constituted the point of departure for any novel development initiative by our NEPAD originators since it has continuously aggravated their political economic crises.

It is instructive to note that the current global reality continues to reinforce Africa's role as a provider of raw materials in the global division

of labour. Globalization means the growing interdependence and interconnectedness of the modern world[2]. Managed wisely, according to its advocates, the new wealth created will create the opportunity to lift millions of the world's poorest people out of their poverty. But the stark reality show that an expansion in global trade along the line advocated by agents of globalization will not solve the problem of poverty; if any thing, the expansion of trade and investment will only enhance the profit of TNCs. What globalization seeks to do is to break down whatever barriers are left in economic relationship between the metropolitan countries in the grip of TNCs and their former colonies. A recent report from Ports Alegre (Brazil), meeting shows that World trade has expanded 17 times more than it was 50 years ago. Within this period, Africa's share of World trade has fallen from 8 percent to 2 percent[3]. There are in existence quite a number of structural impediments to sustainable development. These structural factors include, the continued dependence on imports of manufacturing in return for exports of raw materials and massive inequalities in the control of productive assets. Many African States are facing crippling external debt whose repayment is diverting resources for economic and social development.[4] And these structural impediments are sustained by the existing relationship between Africa and developed Western nations necessitated by globalization which Samir Amin refers to as "a new phase of the imperialist expansion of capital, a fig leaf to hide imperialism".[5] Yet, our African leaders with NEPAD, will rely on the benevolence of the West imperialism to garner resources to develop itself. It is baffling or intriguing that African leaders have accepted this neo-liberal ideology and are willing to become gatekeepers for multinationals. The only reason must be that, it serves their strategic interest to do so. As rightly argued by Nabudere, Africa is already part of the global

economy, as such, it does not need to seek partners with global corporate dictatorship as a method to transform its economy. The marginalisation of Africa does not lie in its being excluded but in its being the most exploited. In any case, it has been argued by Development Economists that there is no necessary casual linkage between capital flows and growth nor is there any casual linkage between growth and development.[6] Globalization, (new imperialism) cannot therefore create a genuine and benevolent development partner in industrialized nations as that will negate the very basis of their capitalist existence. Infact, the recent G.8. Summit in Canada to present the NEPAD's agenda showed exactly how the West really would react to the problems of Africa's search for sustainable development and eradication of poverty. Africa got a paltry US $1 billion debt relief and some US $6 billion USA and European aids that could only materialize as from 2006. There was nothing on trade barriers. Interestingly, the aids represent just ten percent of the required US $64 billion annual estimated capital flow required to implement the NEPAD objectives.

From the foregoing, it becomes clear that NEPAD is vague and ambiguous as to how its goals would be achieved. It has set for itself, a limited vision for the state in the economy. The state is seen solely as creating an enabling environment for capital, especially foreign capital, by protecting rights and providing social and economic infrastructure. This limited vision contradicts NEPADs own admission that the state is a central driver of development. Also, it seems it is biased towards fiscal restraints, which is similar to the various SAP conditionalities, which denied most African States the requisite resources to lead development and address poverty, lack of infrastructure and social and economic development[7] Secondly, globalization (imperialism) which it seeks to benefit from will

480624

only exercebate the present unfair global economic structures which in the first place accounts for Africa's underdevelopment. It is obvious from the onset that the philosophical underpinnings of NEPAD cannot sustain the current dynamics of globalization as a benefactor; because it serves the strategic interest of the industrialized countries to keep Africa as the supplier of cheap labour and raw materials in the global division of labour.

African leaders acknowledge this much when they said NEPAD amongst other reason is set up to halt the continent's marginalisation in the globalization process. Notwithstanding this acknowledgement, African Leaders have gone ahead to design its novel(?) development initiative to rely on the paradigms and models which in the first place makes it the most marginalised continent. Therefore, one cannot but contend that the initial intention of NEPAD is not to develop Africa but a mere survival strategy by its leaders to use the theme of development to entrench themselves in power.

4.2 THE CHARACTER OF AFRICA'S POLITICAL ELITE

The critical questions of why NEPAD?, why now?, and what is the value added? have remained imperative in any assessment of this development initiative.

The proponents have argued that, many fine initiatives have been developed in the past such as the Lagos Plan of Action and the Abuja Treaty, but have failed due to three major reasons; timing (cold war paradigm), lack of capacity for implementation and lack of genuine political will. But, at this point in history, a critical mass of leadership has developed both in Africa and abroad that are genuinely committed to the regeneration of the continent and that, Africa's advances in recent years, the convergence of agreement on International Development Goals (IDG) and a common agenda for Africa, illustrate this.[8]

This convergence of agreement theory advanced by proponents of NEPAD only helps to reinforce our contention of the existence of an important historical linkage between the African elite and their International allies. An analysis of the incorporation of powerful African groups into the dominant value system of the technologically advanced world may after-all prove to be of crucial importance in explaining the selection of the development goals and strategies as well as the extent to which the African ruling classes have allied themselves with foreign interests which provide aid for the survival of their regime[9] The political and ideological bases (the philosophical underpinnings) of NEPAD perspectives on development helps to validate this contention. The present structure of underdevelopment in Africa stem from the incorporation of the continent into the expanding capitalist system over a period of four centuries. Colonialism gave form and context to the present political economy of Africa under which this under development took place. During this period, there was an alignment of interest between the dynamic sector of the colonies and the dominant classes of the metropoles. This created the political and social conditions necessary to sustain and reproduce the relationship during the struggle for independence and post colonial state between these African countries and their metropolitan allies[10] Arising from this neo-colonial system a close alliance between the indigenous ruling class and foreign interests neither of which has any fundamental interest in transforming the local political economy became entrenched. The responsiveness of the post-colonial state to foreign economic interests has been heightened with Africa's worsening economic plights and heavy dependence on foreign loans to sustain its economies as well as to sustain its survival.

Given this situation therefore, African political leaders, no matter their pretensions, cannot as a matter of their strategic survival, design and / or implement any programme that may "upset their rather comfortable relationship with the external estate" or alter Africa's present political economy radically.[11]

Simply put, the dramatist personae in position of leadership in Africa may have changed since the immediate post-colonial era, but given the pervasiveness of the neo-colonial structure in Africa it is suicidal for them to attempt a change of status-quo. However, since they have to contend with the internal contradictions demanding change and development which often manifest in political crises, they adopt the theme of development with such policies as NEPAD, to survive and reproduce their domination.

To further attest to the rather sinister motive of NEPAD other than that of development, is the fact that much of the discourse on it has taken place with the industrialized nations without much as introduce not to talk of discussing it with ninety nine percent of its target beneficiaries. Aluko Olokun who is one of NEPADs' top technocrats agreed this much when he said in an interview with New Nigerian Newspaper on May 20th 2002, that, "Many Africans including some leaders will still have to learn and know more about NEPAD'. Yet, it is being acknowledged as an African led, African managed and African focused programme.

4.3 POLITICAL CRISES AND AU/NEPAD

Our analysis shall focus on the peace, security, democracy and political governance initiative of NEPAD, which emphasizes that African leaders have learnt from their own experiences that peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights and sound economic management are preconditions for sustainable development. They have therefore gone ahead

to propose a process of targeted capacity building initiatives with which they hope to either strengthen and / or reform existing national, regional and sub-regional institutions in the key areas of conflict prevention, management and resolution, peace making, peace keeping and enforcement, post conflict reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction and the combating of illicit proliferation of arms as well as ensuring good governance processes and practices.

However, it is quite confounding that only a vague and passing reference was made to the critical issue of the existing conflicts in Africa, which is directly or indirectly being perpetrated by a large proportion of the current political leadership through their desire to hold on to power.

Rather than face their numerous socio- economic problems with nationalistic zeal these political leaders resort to undemocratic and extra-judicial means to crush, coerce or submerge all forms of agitation's. These tactics either completely submerge any agitation or reinforced conviction of those who feel marginalised; thus leading to all forms of sectarian conflicts; instability and insecurity. In playing the survivalist game by wading through the rough terrain of corporate existence in their various states, African leaders get so engulfed in the search for power. And this concern for the primacy of power and the conflicts arising therefrom, are antithetical to any development goals and objectives as it results in the misuse of manpower, resources, inefficiency and corruption. It also leads to the channeling of resources to unproductive uses, which are both incompatible with the pursuit of development. Coupled with this is the fact that the intense struggle to obtain and keep power results in the militarization of African society, whether under the military or civilian rule. The coercion involved in this

crisis of survival alienates the leadership from the people and thus, breeds distrust, apathy and violence.[12]

A survey of Africa today reveals this gloomy picture of political crisis and conflicts traversing the continent from Cape to Cairo. The problems of peace in Africa especially in the festering points of Liberia, Sierra Leone, Congo, Somalia, Sudan, Eritrea/Ethiopia, Nigeria/Cameron, Morocco/Western Sahara, Cote d'ivoire etc present a very big challenge to NEPAD and the African Union (AU). Thus, Africa like Mahmood Yahaya (2002) aptly articulates 'finds itself in a catch 22 situation, for instability is a by – product of poverty, lack of education, ill health, etc etc. In the same vein, Africa requires stability to be able to address these issues. Security in itself therefore becomes the greatest challenge to Africa's development. To deal with security means to tackle all development issues collectively and steadily"[13]

It is against this background therefore that we contend that the issue of security, armed conflict and political crises should constitute the fundamental point of departure for any development programme for Africa. 'As at today, one out of every five African actually live under armed conflict[14], which is either within or without his/her state borders. Without peace and security, there can be no development. Economic development is not possible without a good political climate (which encompasses both good governance and, peace and security). While the NEPAD document states this much, one would have thought that the issue of peace and security should constitute the bedrock of the policy, rather than as an adjunct to the economic governance initiative which cannot have any head start without peace and security.

Some analysts have however argued that with the African Union, AU, NEPAD provides the focal point and an important lever in the overall strategic framework for engaging Africa's chosen agenda for development NEPAD is said to be the socio economic development blue print for the AU to implement its objectives[15]

But as we conjectured earlier, the successful implementation of NEPAD even if tied up to the African Union (AU) is problematic, because African Union's success is itself bedeviled with the problems of wars and conflict, crisis of governance, language and linguistic differences, uncommon currency, and Trade and fiscal barriers etc. African leaders agreed this much in their examination of the need to transform the organization of African Unity (OAU) to African Union, when they concluded that the net result of the various subregional efforts [such as the Central African Economic and Monetary Community, CEMAC, (1964) the East African Cooperation, EAC (1977), Economic Community of West African States, ECOWAS (1975), the West African Economic and Monetary Union, WEMU (1994), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa, COMESA, (1995) the Southern African Development Union SADCU, (1992) as well as the Union of Maghreb Arab States, UMA, (1988)] aimed at economic integration have failed. Cross border trade between African countries is only about 10 percent of global trade; while Africa's participation in world trade is two percent[16] The lack of good governance, insecurity and conflict was highlighted as one major reason for the failure of the process of integration.

The question then is, has the Peace and Security situation in Africa changed to ensure unity and will of purpose? The answer is quite obvious. Indeed, the situation is quite confounding as African leaders today are

engaged in high level schemes among themselves to ensure that their countries are used as geo strategic areas to serve the interest of the developed world as was the case during the cold war era, thereby aggravating existing tensions and crises. For instance, Djibouti and Kenya as well as other horn of African States like Eritrea, Ethiopia etc are engaged in subterranean schemes to serve as geo strategic centre for USA and its allies especially in its fight against terrorism.

Apart from this, a plethora of sectarian and clannish inspired crises as well as those arising from resource capture and ecological marginalization span the entire continent. Eritrea, for instance, is at the forefront of the peace initiative to resolve the crisis in Democratic Republic of Congo, while it is locked in conflict with Ethiopia over disagreement relating to environmental scarcity. Meanwhile, the proliferation of small arms in Ethiopia is creating tension in Sudan, which has accused Ethiopia of supporting Southern Sudan in its liberation war against the government in Khartoum. Khartoum in turn is starving its own people and refusing them aids in order to stifle the secessionist demands of the people of Southern Sudan. Similarly, Somalia is only trying to rebuild itself from the clannish and sectarian crises which dismembered the country. Nigeria and Cameron are barely holding themselves back from an all out war over the Bakassi Peninsula. The bloodbath and anguish in Sierra Leone and Liberia seem to have defied any rational thinking. So also is the age long conflict between Morocco and Western Sahara. The world is just coming to terms with the human catastrophe and genocide in Rwanda. The crises in Zaire and Congo are reoccurring, so also are the political transition crises in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Kenya.

Indeed, political crises and conflicts which leaves in its trail, violence, death, diseases, hunger and starvation as well as refugee problems bestride the continent like a Frankenstein.

4.4. AN EXAMINATION OF THE IVORIEN POLITICAL CRISIS

Our intention is to illustrate the interconnectedness of our proposition to political crises in Africa as well as to provide empirical evidence of 'symbolism' in the NEPAD initiative. Our choice of the Ivorien crisis for a more detailed study is informed by the fact that it is the latest in the series of Africa's festering point after NEPAD was launched and thus, poses a test case to show case the initiatives sense of purpose and direction.

Cote d'ivoire under the leadership of its first President, Houphouet Boigny, was known for its religious and ethnic harmony, as he assured all major ethnic groups including settlers to participate in the governing process. After independence, from France in 1960, Houphouet Boigny stressed the need for economic growth and good relations with France which still maintain a 500 strong force in its base in Cote d'ivoire [17] With a population of 16 million and an average life expectancy of 40 years , its economy was about the most developed in Africa. In fact, for more than three (3) decades after independence, Cote d'ivoire under Felix Houphouet Biogny was known for its inclusivity. All major ethno-regional [18] quantities enjoy democratic space in all spheres of the Ivorien national life, even within a one party state arrangement. But after his death in 1993, his immediate successor, President Konan Bedie failed to conserve this heritage. Through the combination and interplay of the factors of tribal hegemony and the

concept of Ivoirite (to hold on to power), the deepening economic crisis (arising directly from the IMF/World Bank SAP programme), constitutional manipulations, 'the Alassane Quattara factor, religion and super power[19] influence, Presidents Konan Bedie (1993 – 1999), Robert Guei (Dec. 1999 – October 2000) and incumbent Laurent Gbagbo created the basis for the various upheavals which culminated in the September 2002 military insurgency; leaving in its trail the death of thousands of innocent people, destruction of properties and the general reign of terror and insecurity.

However while the immediate reaction to the insurgency led by soldiers protesting their imminent demobilization from the army was that of general condemnation, the Ivorien government rebuffed moves by Nigeria, Ghana and Togo to assist. Meanwhile, France which has a military base there beefed up its forces with an additional 200 troops to protect its citizens and other foreigners.[20] Nothing in concrete terms was however heard from the African Union, AU. This reaction exemplifies the lack of trust and commitment among African leaders which according to Dr Kolawole Raheem, African Refugees Foundation Adviser 'has been the bane of the continents development. He wondered how the AU/NEPAD could work without prompt attention by leaders to attend to a member's urgent need or when a member is in crisis. AU should think ahead in any affairs concerning African Affairs. It should not wait for EU or US. – African leaders should make the new AU work.[21] This statement summarizes the inherent weakness of the AU/NEPAD initiative. African leaders themselves do not believe in the efficacy of a structure they themselves have set up. African leaders jettisoned their much flaunted Peer Review Mechanism and the Committee on Peace and Security for a trip to Paris to discuss and

resolve an African crisis under the leadership of France, former colonial masters of Cote d'ivoire

The Ivorien Government and rebels who would not listen to any entreaties from fellow Africans in a dramatic move signed an agreement which was rectified on 24th January 2003 in Paris. President Gbagbo agreed to share powers with the Prime Minister, reorganise the army and allow a regional peace keeping force to monitor the process of reconciliation.

The above scenario thus clearly illustrates the dilemma of AU/NEPAD in fulfilling its role as a tool for entrenching peace and security in Africa, which as we have already stated is a sine-qua-non for development. Africa's political renaissance, which is not possible without peace, security and good governance therefore poses the greatest challenge for development.

Aware of these limitations therefore, one is at lost as to why African leaders would consider it as a mere adjunct to its economic governance initiative. NEPAD/AU therefore cannot but be seen as a symbolic policy creation of African ruling elite aimed to perpetrating their interest and dominance in power by using the theme of development to mystify society.

END NOTES

1 Aluko Olukun, NEPAD Document pp. 19, 36 - 39.
2. Chindo Onumah (2002), 'Globalization and its victims' in African World Review April – May 2001 p.29.
3. Ibid, C. Onumah, p.30
4. Extracted from Report of OATUU – ICFTU/AFRO meeting held on 30th June – 2nd July, 2002 in Umhalanga Durban pp. 2 – 3.
5. Opcit, Chindo Onumah, p.29.
6. Dan Nabudere: Will NEPAD Bring About An African Renaissance? In Daily Trust of 26/6/2002 pp. 16 – 17.
7. OAUTU/CFTU/AFRO Reports p.2.
8. Aluko Olukun (2002), NEPAD Document (Highlight) p.16.
9. Asante. SKB, African Development Adedejis Alternative strategies p.70.
10. Ibid, Asante SKB p.70.
11. Ibid, p.71.
12. Ibid, Asante SLB pp. 71 - 72
13. Mohamood Yahaya (2002): NEPAD: Whose Partnership? in New Nigerian Newspaper of July, 5th 2002, p. 9
14. Aluko Olokun NNN Interview of 20/5/2002 p.17.
15. Aluko Olokun, NEPAD Highlights p.10.
16. Mohamood Yahaya (2002), Goodbye OAU, Welcome AU in New Nigerian Newspaper, 12/7/2002, p.8.
17. Francis Obinor (2002), Blood Bath. Anguish in Cote'd' Ivoire, Guardian Newspapers 23/9/2002 p.17
18. Hudu Garba (2002), in The Ivorien Political Crisis by N S Akanji (pp. i-iii)
19. See N.S. Akanji (2001), The Ivorien Political Crisis, Francophone Institute p.13.
20. Obinor F. p.17.
21. Quoted in Obinor F. Blood-Bath, Anguish in Cote 'd' Ivoire.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.1 SUMMARY

The seeming intractable problem of poverty, hunger, disease and sustainable development confronting African States and how best to get out of the dilemma has remained the pivotal theme in all discourse of what is today referred to generally as the 'continental crisis of development'.

This study discovers that earlier policies, projects and programmes formulated to resolve Africa's development problems have had notable failings especially because of their reliance on models and paradigms inherited from capitalist perspective, which see development strictly from the economic aspects. The issues of the political preconditions for the success of these strategies often take a back seat if and when at all addressed.

It has been established in this study that the grave crisis of development facing Africa cannot be adequately understood, let alone be resolved, if our leaders fail to understand that the crisis is essentially 'political in origin and character, its economic consequences are serious as we know, but are nonetheless incidental[1] . Indeed, development is by its very nature a political issue, any development planning must begin 'within the political process and an understanding of the limitations imposed by that political system'.[2]

The concrete and objective realities of Africa show that the condition of dependence and foreign domination and underdevelopment combine with other factors to negate the possibilities of growth and development.[3] Therefore, Africa's continuous underdevelopment must be examined and understood from a political economy perspective and that reliance on neo-

liberal ideology of the market as the greatest fixer[4] can only aggravate the marginalization of the continent: NEPAD which was launched only in July 2001 as a new initiative in Africa's continous search to put an end to its development crisis unfortunately relies on the models and paradigms premised on Western capitalist tenets. The political and good governance initiative of NEPAD is seen as a mere adjunct of the economic governance component which is modeled after the World Bank and IMF Structural Adjustment Programme, except that this time, it craves passionately for the benevolence of the G.8 to be its development partners. But if as Sandbrook noted, and also acquiesced by NEPAD originators that, it is the socio-political factors in particular which place severe limitations on economic development [5] One is at loss as to why the philosophical under pinning of NEPAD is premised otherwise.

However, as enunciated, the NEPAD document, especially when viewed against our propositions on globalization, the character of African political leaders and the incapacity of the Africa Union (AU) to handle political crisis in Africa, readily exhibits its nominal commitment to any new development orientation for Africa. - Notwithstanding the acknowledgement by African leaders that imperialism (globalization), makes it the most marginalised continent in the world today, it still went ahead to design its novel (?) development initiative to rely on the paradigms and models which in the first place makes it the most marginalised continent.

Also, given the existence of an important historical linkage between the African elite and their international allies especially within the neo-colonial structure in Africa, the dramatist personae in position of leadership in Africa cannot as a matter of their strategic survival design and/or

implement any programme that will alter Africa's present political economy radically.

Moreover, political instability discourages support for development. Political conflict destroys the foundations of development. The recent history of Africa has very clearly demonstrated that peace and security is the greatest challenge to Africa's development and to deal with security means to tackle all development issues collectively and steadily. The resolution of the various political crises and armed conflict traversing the continent should constitute the fundamental point of departure for any development programme for Africa, especially 'as one out of every five African today lives under armed conflict [6] and instability.

Instability as we know is a bye-product of poverty, hunger and disease etc. But in the same vein, Africa requires stability to address these crises. Economic development is therefore not possible without a good political climate. While the NEPAD document agrees this much, one would have thought that the issue of peace and security should constitute the bedrock of the policy rather than its being made an adjunct to the economic governance initiative, which cannot have any head-start without peace and security.

From the foregone, and as clearly demonstrated in our case of the Ivorien political crisis, we therefore contended that the initial intention of NEPAD is not to develop Africa but a mere survival strategy by its leaders to use the theme of development to entrench themselves in power. Thus, our proposition that NEPAD is a mere symbolic policy initiative by African leaders to mystify society for their own strategic interest.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

For NEPAD to be a viable alternative to Africa's perpetual dependence and continuous marginalisation, the peoples of Africa and its leadership must be prepared to remove the political encumbrances blocking it desire for development. This of course would involve the political struggle aimed at the redistribution of political and economic power from the socio-economic elite [who are tied to the dependency relationship] to the majority of the people who suffer from this perpetration.[7]

After this redistribution of power, Africans can begin to harness their development policy in line with the philosophy and objectives of a true development strategy. Africa cannot hope to achieve genuine independence from foreign control or meaningful socio-economic development without radically restructuring the current structure of their societies. That is, the liberation and development of Africa is contingent upon a comprehensive restructuring of the African political economy, which will "replace the present order with a new order based on a totally different political and economic relationship"[8]

A new political perspective is imperative for setting into motion the process of African progress. A viable development strategy for Africa should be premised on a comprehensive programme of social transformation which require 'vision, resolve and commitment on the part of the leadership as well as the mobilization of greater popular participation both in development and decision making processes by the followership.[9] Simply put, the democratization of the African society and increased accountability of those entrusted with leadership is required for socio-economic recovery and transformation. Development is a collective enterprise. Therefore, to reduce resistance and cynicism, on the part of the ruled, the process must be

genuinely democratic and participatory, which can only be guaranteed through real access to power and resources. Since development can only be engineered and sustained by the people through their full participation, development should be undertaken by people but not on their behalf as is the case with NEPAD. It should be the organic outcome of society's value system, its perceptions, its concerns and its endeavours. "As such, the education, training, health and well being of the populace must be harnessed to enable them participate fully and effectively in the development process. Equity and Social Justice must be the watchword of the development ethics"[10] To begin to even think about development, the African political leadership must resolve to put an end to all the political crises emanating from their inept leadership as well as crisis of poor governance.

Finally, for sustainable development, the political, economic, social, technological, administrative and cultural dimensions of development must be organically integrated so as to optimize development possibilities.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

Adopting the political economy mode of analysis, our study ascertains the symbolic policy posture of the NEPAD initiative, especially when considered against our propositions on Globalization, the incapacity of AU/NEPAD to resolve the political crises and insecurity in the continent as well as the character of Africa's political leadership.

A major shortcoming of the NEPAD document which validate our proposition of the symbolic posture of the initiative is its failure to contextualise development within a political framework. The structure of African politics within African States and the extent to which it is conducive for any new development initiative (notwithstanding its inherent

shortcoming) was considered ephemerally, even though the African development crisis is deeply rooted in a variety of causes that are closely linked to the political economic structures entrenched upon the continent by neo-colonialism as a logical outcome of its dependent relationship and currently being aggravated by globalisation (new imperialism).

Pathe Diagne clearly articulated this situation when he stated that, 'the dependence of African States on the outside world is increasing. Balkanisation has established itself for the benefit of national and foreign capitalism. Formally, power is in the hands of the indigenous ruling class who try to ensure their strength, permanence, stability and privileges through collusion with the industrial countries. This poses a problem which in reality is not economic but political; a problem of an authority able to sever the links of dependence and breakout of the national framework with a view to ensuring a true development which for the time being is "mythical" [11]

We have therefore argued that Africa needs a new approach to its political economy. This should include the redistribution of political and economic power accompanied by effective popular participation in decision making processes and by adequate and effective political accountability in order to resolve the pervasive crisis of governance and general insecurity arising therefrom. Until we recognize that, the problems will not be solved. Unless the right kind of politics and political climate is established, Africa will continue to replace one set of inadequate development policy or strategy with another.

ENDNOTES

1.Claude Ake (1987), 'How politics underdeveloped Africa' - Conference on The Challenge of Economic Recovery and Accelerated Development, Abuja (15th - 19th June 1987).

2. Asante S.K.B. (1991), African Development Adebayo Adedeji's Alternative Strategies. P.59

3. Julius O. Ihonvbere (1995), "Beyond Governance: "The State and Democratization in Sub Sahara Africa" - Journal of Asia and African Studies Vol 5 p.152.

4. Tajudeen Abdulraheem (2002), NEPAD Repackaged Neo-Colonialism, in Weekly Trust of 12th - 18th July 1999. p.29.

5. Richard Sandbrook (1987); The politics of Africa's Stagnation (Cambridge University Press) p. 12

6. Aluko Olokun, Interview with the New Nigerian Newspaper on 20th May 2002. p. 17.

7. Asante, SKB. Opcit, p.75.

8. Ibid, Asante S.K.B. p.75.

9. Ibid., Asante S.K.B. p.70

10.Ibid., Asante S.K.B. p.70

11.See Pathe Diagne in "African Politics by Gonidec, PF (1981). Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, p.304

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

1. Akanji, N.S. (2001); The Ivorien Political Crisis; Realities and Resolutions,Franco Phone Institute, Zaria.
2. Asante, S.K.B. (1991); African Development, Adebayo Adedeji's Alternative Strategies, Spectrum Books, Owerri
3. Bayart, J.F. (1993); The state in Africa: The Politics of the Belly, Longman, London.
4. Gonidec, P.F. (1981); African Politics, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague.
5. Harris, R. (1975); The Political Economy of Africa (Ed), John Wiley, New York.
6. Kayizzi - Mvgerewa, S., Olukoshi, A.O. & Wohlgemoth L. (1998), Towards A New Partnership with Africa: Challenges and Opportunities (Ed), Nordiska African Institutet
7. Nabudere D. (1977); The Political Economy of Imperialism. Zed Press, London.
8. Lenin (1978); Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
9. Mazrui, A.A. (1979); Africa's International Relations: The Diplomacy of Dependency and Change. Heinemann, London.
10. Okwuosa, E. (1976); New Directions for Economic Development in Africa. Africa Books
11. Sandbrook, R. (1987); The Politics of Africa's Economic Stagnation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
12. Tordoff, W. (1993); Government and Politics in Africa, Macmillan Press, London.

KASHIM IBRAHIM LIBRARY

DOCUMENTS/REPORTS

1. NEPAD Document, (7th March 2002)
2. NEPAD (Highlights) 2001
3. OAUTU/CFTU/AFRO MEETING REPORT OF (30th June – 2nd of July 2002.

NEWSPAPERS/MAGAZINES`

1. Aluko Olokun, (2002); "How Public, Private Sectors Partnership can Work' in the Guardian Newspaper, 23 May 2002.
2. Steve Itugbu (2002), "Foreign Policy Issues that shaped NEPAD" In the Daily Times Newspaper, 27th May 2002.
3. Dan Nabudere, (2002); Will NEPAD Bring About An African Renaissance ? *In Daily Trust of 26th June 2002.*
4. F. Obinor (2002), 'Blood – Bath Anguish in Cote d'ivoire' in Guardian Newspaper of 23rd September 2002.
5. Crusoe Osagie (2002), "NEPAD urged to prioritize Small Scale Family Agriculture, in This Day Newspaper of 9th July 2002.
6. Mahmood Yahya, (2002), "NEPAD Whose Partnership, New Nigerian Newspaper of 5th March 2002.
7. Bola Akinterinwa (2002), 'NEPAD' in This Day Newspaper of 19th March 2002.
8. Adebayo Olukoshi (2002); 'NEPAD' Marrying Politics with Social Development, In Daily Trust of 22nd July 2002.
9. Tajudeen Abdulraheem, (2002), "NEPAD Repackaged Neo-Colonialism" in Weekly Trust of 12th – 18th July 2002.
10. Guardian Newspaper of 18th July 2002.

480624
DT
31.4