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Prologue

Obviously, the interrogative nature of the following investigation goes beyond analysis and delineation of events and issues and embraces the difficult task of making evaluations and judgements thereof. However, judgements and evaluations about Africa's socio-economic and political development had in most cases been done without adequate background knowledge about the nature, context and diversity of the continent. And even where one is adequately informed, we fail to draw our attention to context and relationships about the multiplicity of events and conditions underlying those events that are likely to influence our conclusions. One does not necessarily need to study everything about the continent in order to be able to arrive at plausible explanations and draw coherent conclusions. Neither does one need to be a 'resource person' of the issue area in order to have the insights needed for scientific analysis of events and trends in the continent.

At the beginning of the 1990s the change of events in the international political landscape that negatively impacted Africa provided grounds for some to make apocalyptic predictions about the continent. Robert Kaplan's 1994 popular publication, 'The Coming Anarchy' that appeared in the Atlantic Monthly was used to capture military-politico and economic trends with particular reference to the West African sub-region as his departing point of analysis because of the magnitude of crisis in that part of the world. However, that work has been the standard yardstick for many analysts, commentators and observers of African affairs. Despite the crisis that engulfed Africa in the aftermath of the Cold War that took the form of open armed civil conflicts, international focus was diverted away from the continent to the crisis, risks and opportunities that accompanied the tearing down of the iron curtain that signified the end of communism in Russia and its satellite states. While any such judgements and conclusions may partly justify the empirical confirmations of contemporary political events and trends (considering the extent of the African crisis, especially, how disease and child soldiering have destroyed a whole future generations in some countries), mostly a large number of authors who share such perspectives have failed to make any specific predictions about the old continent's future socio-economic and political situation in the context of the said apocalyptic assertions. For example, is Africa going to be enmeshed in a perpetual state of war and insecurity? Or is it the case that political entrepreneurs, warring factions and other interest groups and individuals in areas of conflict might come to enthrone reason and embrace peace and pave the way for development? The fallacy in here is that most authors end up doing their field of endeavour a great disservice, since apart from clarifying the goals of their analysis, description of the trends and analysis of conditions underlying those events and trends, they omit the fact that one of the ultimate hallmarks of political science analysis is, without any doubt, the ability to make predictions about future developments based on current insights on particular issues. Some talk about an apocalypse without telling their readers how it would look like, or giving any concrete future 'worst case scenarios' about it, except the usual categorisation of events as being 'dysfunctional' and 'disorder'.

The point here is not to challenge the conclusions of those authors, but to raise consciousness about the shortcomings of those hasty conclusions and its effects on the state of the art. However, if there is any point in time in African history approximating an apocalypse of the kind and magnitude being claimed by some today, then that particular period would surely had been the dark history of about two hundred years of slavery that enchained the dynamic and vibrant sons and daughters of the continent - the backbone of any socio-economic system - its social capital. A force that was able to
brace up to the economic challenges of the pre-colonial era and constituted an economic force that sojourned and traded the interconnected trade routes of the African continent. Even having that sector of endeavour transformed itself from that era and survived both external and internal onslaughts that had been unleashed against it in the course of time, it has been branded an informal sector in its economic undertakings in almost all the economies in Africa, despite the great contribution that sector makes to the national economies. That is the genesis of the long process of decimation, denigration and degradation of the social forces in Africa, a fact of which had transformed itself from slavery through colonialism and post-colonialism till the end of the Cold War.

The oppressor here is the leadership conundrum, rooted in the dehumanising treatment of slave subjects by the slave master (within and outside the continent), further undergoing transformations in the form of fragmentation, balkanisation and exploitation by a colonial leadership that operated with greed, impunity, brute force and violence. Following that logic of greed and exploitation we have witnessed a post-colonial breed of leadership cloaked in brutal dictatorship guided by exclusions and self-appropriations and gross self-indulgence while bearing full semblance of the configurations and power structures of its colonial predecessors. Even some of the leaders of the immediate post-colonial era, having been trained in the use of violence by their colonial masters, and having seen the application of violence at first hand during that era, relied solely on brute force and violence. The art of statesmanship was not necessarily a sine qua non for leadership. In the profile of most military leaders in the African continent, hardly did any handful of them have any standard schooling. Their elite counterparts on the other hand, filled with fear and egoism excluded all rival political entrepreneurs from their fold, only to breed social polarisation and antagonisms of all dimensions. It is this dark past of African socio-political structure that has now aroused consciousness about its vital role in Africa, almost after four decades of political independence. Thus, throughout the greater part of the history of the continent, leadership in its external and internal dimensions had not been fair to the peoples of Africa, especially, south of the Sahara. It is on the basis of this leadership deficit that there must be a new beginning and self-renewal, and the end of the Cold War provided the space and time for a take-off.

In all its ramifications, the ultimate goal of ongoing transformations and integration in Africa since 1990, without any doubt, is geared towards mobilisation of the long neglected social forces of the continent and how they could contribute their quota to national development. Today, what is ‘social’ seems to capture all the points of analysis regarding Africa's socio-economic and political development. By the formation of the OAU in 1963 the regional body had three key objectives covering unity, security and development, apart from the core goals of achieving decolonisation. Even to the non-observer of African affairs it is quite easy to discern how woefully the regional body failed in fulfilling the African dream of emancipation and development.

The OAU after almost four decades of accommodating a leadership of tyranny that systematically and overtly denied their citizens any voice and participation in the system of government, hurriedly at the fringes of its demise held a civil society conference in conjunction with the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and the Inter-African Group in order to map out strategies for integrating the social forces of the continent in the transformation and integration processes that had gained momentum in the aftermath of the Cold War.

In the long history of the continent the concept of civil society had eluded the social forces that had been denied the public space for harnessing the liberties and creative energies of private individuals and groups in the African continent. Colonial strategies of domination, appropriation and exploitation, post-colonial methods of exclusions and
ethnic engineering, all combined to destroy the functioning of an appropriate civil society in Africa. The application of the changing concept of development that is now captured as "people-driven and people centred" had reinforced that particular shift and focus on civil society perspectives. On the basis of that previous neglect of the social component of development may lie the foundations of any possible assertions of rhetoric by African leaders, and even today the success or failure of development policies in the continent would be judged squarely by the degree of involvement of citizens and civil society at large and the impact thereon.

Beyond the leadership and civil society puzzle, however, there are still a wide range of externalities that do bear directly on the African continent and does influence issues and their outcomes. The international political economy has tilted permanently in favour of some countries and regions, while many others including Africa still struggle to make it presence in areas such as global trade, investment and finance. Devoid of such basic ingredients for economic development, such as requisite resources, entrepreneurial capabilities, efficient market structures, sound policy infrastructure (legal and commercial) and international economic presence, why then did African leaders under the banner of the OAU make pledges and commitments about self-reliance and self-sustaining development? Combined with the harsh realities and risks of the prevailing international political economy, one could make sense of the fact that the regional body had by the end of the liberation struggle (at which it was relatively successful) become "ideologically bankrupt" and institutionally powerless in confronting the newly emerging crisis of Africa that began to reach its heights in the early 1980s. Annual summities were thus nothing more than a mere expression of existence. However, part of the explanation is rooted in the failure by the political leadership and policy makers alike to appreciate the political realities and the adverse consequences of risks that came to characterise the international political system and the global economy. That the continent had moved from confrontation with the West in the context of the Cold War, sprinting even over co-operation to close partnership with the industrialised countries, symbolised in the gestures made by the G8, is a clear testimony of how a particular prevailing international system might positively or negatively influence outcomes in the continent. The ongoing third "scramble for Africa" whereby new actors such as Brazil, China and India have joined the trail of traditional centres of powers has sparked much heated debate across a broad spectrum of state and society. The effects of the current scramble on the African integration project, good governance and sustainable development has occupied the thoughts of many Africans, who are increasingly questioning the benefits of external actors rush for the continent's natural resources. Beyond that the global war on terror in the "post-9/11 era" led by the United States and its "coalition of the willing" also has far-reaching implications on collective strategies as big powers may interfere in African affairs in one way or the other to safeguard their national interests.

But intensification of partnership with the West and the rest of the world does not erode the risks of the global economy and Africa's place in it. On the contrary, it increases the degree of risks on the face of proliferation of actors and transactions by both state and non-state entities in an international environment where production centres are easily relocated, and where capital and services flows rapidly across national, regional and international borders in the context of globalisation.

This boils down to the fact that under stable international conditions Africa can make a great leap forward towards socio-economic development through restoration of confidence in its social forces by way of empowerment and development of the wider human resources that is able to contain and manage the risks of globalisation in order to reap whatever opportunities it may offer for Africa. This paper holds the conviction
(among others) that even the identification of financial resource gap regarding the New Partnership for African Development (NePAD) cannot in anyway override the crucial importance of the role played by the respective countries socio-economic forces. Wherein lays the efficacy of external financial flows without a commensurate competent, knowledgeable and innovative human resource base!

But the changing nature of leadership had not reached its full cycle to warrant a safe environment that would enable Africa's socio-economic forces to reassert their creativity and ingenuity in the struggle for economic emancipation. Insecurity, hunger, disease and poverty are still issues of compromise for a gain in political power, and access to the forces of repression, suppression and intimidation by some. At the same time however, a large section of the collective African leadership have become aware of the effects of conflict on development, and the year 2003, for example, witnessed an unprecedented African inter-state efforts in bringing relative peace to once war torn countries such as Liberia, Burundi, the DRC, Equatorial Guinea, Ivory Coast, and more recently Angola, a country once a hot spot of the Cold War and its uncompromising belligerents. This is where the new realism in Africa begins, ending conflict to pave the way for development. Despite the setbacks and reversals of the 1990s that created fertile grounds for Kaplan to prophesise the anarchical future of West Africa for example, Africa, and for that matter the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) took the unprecedented step and intervened in Liberia while the international community was then focused on the war in the Balkans. Hence, under prevailing circumstances, part of the success of the collective African leadership could be their ability to show bravery and courage in adhering to the principles of the Peer Review mechanism they had pledged themselves to, and indeed to be part of a wider effort in addressing the leadership conundrum and ending conflict and war. Leaders must even go beyond that and break the taboos behind the close doors diplomacy through which they handle issues regarding individual leaders deviant behaviour.

The difficult task for making scientific probe on African issues is at times exacerbated by the fact that our conclusions might be vulnerable to the 'brutal images', and lopsided reports that have come to characterise the Global Media's approach of presenting Africa in the news. A growing concern among many Africans is that after peace had been restored in previously conflict societies they hardly receive any international media attention on their reconstruction and rebuilding efforts. If this lopsided Media coverage in conflict and post-conflict societies is to continue, how are the affected countries going to make it in attracting crucially needed Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) for their reconstruction efforts? This is where the role of images and perceptions about Africa as a ‘high risk’ region negatively impacts her development. But the African crisis did not emerge overnight. It bears its peculiar causes and course.

Hence, the discussion will survey the pre-colonial, the colonial, the post-colonial and the current, delineating and analysing the main issues affecting the structure of governance, leadership/state and society relationship, state and the economy, elite preferences and the choices they make, the key dynamics of regional and sub-regional policies, while evaluating and drawing conclusions from the outcomes of those relationships and how they impact the twin processes of transformation and integration, security, external relations and the struggle for economic emancipation that has been spearheaded by the OAU/AU in Africa. The identification of any rhetorical strategies cannot be done by studying any individual variable, but by revealing the interconnectedness of relationships and contexts that are encapsulated in multiple events and trends, while showing a penchant for interdisciplinary analysis. It is only then that one could make a credible and objective judgement about what constitute a visionary strategy, or a rhetorical strategy.
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Method of Work

Given the choice of topic, the diversity of the African region and multiplicity of its actors at the national, sub-regional, regional and international levels, use of case studies of specific events at those levels would be applied, which fact also offers tangible reasons to adopt a comparative perspective in the same regard. For example, the OAU’s intervention in Chad in the early 1980s, as well its diplomacy regarding events that led to the Rwandan genocide in 1994 does provide cases for analysis and comparison in crisis intervention as a regional policy. The idiosyncratic nature of the dual African transformation and integration processes characterised by size, ramify identities, and disparities in wealth offers a discursive comparison of the diverse and complex political, economic and social structures that are shaping the twin processes. However, this is not tantamount to saying that every unit of variable and actor would be considered in this case. The point is to emphasise and identify the role of state and non-state actors, analyse key issues and reveal their possible outcomes that may have enduring impact on the transformation process initiated by the OAU/AU member states. In addition, the constellation of variables chosen for analysis (economic, social, political and historical) impinges on one to hold steadfast to the epistemological logic of interdisciplinary thinking and analysis. This choice is rooted in the conviction that it stands to provide us with deeper insights about the subtleties and networking that characterise political and economic transactions in the process of bargaining and negotiations in transformation and integration processes. This approach will in the long run help accommodate research ‘shocks’ that may come the way of the researcher. For example, how would one explain rising concerns about the fate of Labour Organisations criss-cross the African continent? The Labour Movement has always championed the cause and course of Pan-Africanism, but has been sidelined in current discourses on the transformation and integration processes. Is the resurgence of neo-liberal development strategies criss-cross the continent now sidelining labour welfare and political consciousness?

One of the underlying facts of the ongoing discussion is that, the end of the Cold War had deeper impact on Africa and this had compelled leaders to adjust to the prerequisites of a new international order whose range of issues are cross-cutting, embracing development, security and strategic issues, human rights, conflict management, shaping relations with the rich industrial countries of the northern hemisphere, co-operation with international organisations and multilateral financial institutions, and above all adjusting and rationalising state institutions.

The latter issue in particular challenges not only the African leadership, but researchers as well. The OAU’s emphasis on civil society, liberalisation and democratisation, and articulation of human rights, including efforts for ensuring participation of the African citizenry in its activities brings to bear on the research community to give equal attention to institutional analysis and normative issues at the same time. Hence the regional body and its member states would be evaluated and judged not only according to its performance as an organisation, but also equally in the realm of political legitimacy, democratic performance, political accountability and the level of responsiveness shown to their respective citizens. The injection of these principles in the Constitutive Act of the African Union (CAAU) and its re-articulation in the NePAD document justifies any such academic endeavour. The swift towards reform by African leaders at the end of the Cold War had not matched their performance
thereto. After almost thirteen years of transformation the African political praxis exhibits high incidence of neo-patrimonial traits wheeled on a vibrant clientele relations between the rule and the ruled. The organisation's ability to create the political space for participation in politics by its citizens, political representation and open contestation to political office, all would go a long way to demystify the regional body as a club of heads of states.

This broader picture, however, does not miss core objects of analysis in international relation discourses, namely pertinent issues affecting sovereignty. The dual processes of transformation and integration do bring questions of sovereign rights into the political praxis. It will be a wishful thinking, at least at its initial stages to expect African leaders to make large scale compromises for the sake of overcoming Africa's socio-economic and political crisis. And even more so given the fragility of the continent's new democracies, some leaders might still feel comfortable behind the sovereign shield to justify their de facto cling on to political power. The cases of Mugabe of Zimbabwe, Eyadema of Togo, and Mubarak of Egypt may still guide us to choose the path of guarded optimism. However, if there are any points of variance then it is not much about form but substance of African international relations issues, which given the peculiar characteristic of its state formation, is naturally loaded with colonial and post-colonial discourses thus compelling us to give due consideration to structural factors. The very notion of Post-colonialism impinges on the research methodology an interdisciplinary approach that is theoretically historical in approach, and fundamentally cross-cutting distinguishing its peculiar mode of analysis that moves along the path of "objective material condition with detailed analysis of their subject effect". In a similar vein, the rapid transformation of the international system and the 'new order' it had ushered in the past decade has refocused analysis on organisations striving to promote human rights and development across Africa, but situated in a broader framework of a structural environment such as globalisation. The responses shown by many member states of the OAU at structural adjustment and reforms gives a compelling reason to analyse structural phenomenon such as globalisation in order to investigate whether such reforms are the results of pressures of globalisation. In this particular case the decissions and actions of the Subregional Economic Groups (SREG's) would be analysed within the context of globalisation. Another realm of variance with traditional international relations analysis in the African context is growing emphasis that had been assigned to ethnic politics and ethnic coalitions cloaked in nationalism. This is also related to the nature of the African state, since nations are just "imagined concepts" in the African context. Hence at the subregional level it is worth identifying and analysing points of convergences, compatibilities, conflicts and even rivalry within the framework of broad elite perception, interaction and communication grounded in a broader regional integration project. In that vein a brief exploration of state of the art in regional integration will be tackled to provide the needed guide for analysing Africa's current wave of regional integration.

But how do we capture precisely developments in a regional organisation that had most of the time been the exclusive prerogative of the African leaders without their citizen's participation, adequate media coverage and academic focus? Given past evidence of lack of congruence between the leadership and the ruled, a philosophical epistemology would be required to investigate the structure of behaviour, interaction and communication of elites in the continent. In order to understand why African leaders are taking decisions in the way that they do, we must be able to investigate what they intend to accomplish and their beliefs about the means of realising or translating those intentions into action. But above all, we may also be positing about how the leaders beliefs and intentions have given rise to the decisions and actions in question.
Does the logic of their reasoning bear any intelligent action on the total African crisis and how it might be remedied? And more importantly does their decisions, choices and actions bear the requisite rational preferences in an era of globalisation characterised by competition and search for new knowledge? In the same vein, do the leaders' knowledge about global economic and political order and the actions they are taking thereon actually reflect the true trappings of contemporary political reality? In the final analysis, however, the objective will be to investigate whether there is an irreversible awareness about political responsibility of leadership at the national, subregional and regional levels.

By virtue of the fact that the African process is ongoing makes analysis, judgements and evaluations about economic, political and security issues in the continent an arduous task for any research undertaking. Many of past policy documents had escaped time series regarding their timely implementation, and the situation has not changed at the present as well. This consequently makes timely explanations of events and developments cumbersome. In order to contain that deficit this work would also place premium on text and discourse analysis to probe into the policy intentions, beliefs and expectations, shared knowledge about the world, and the context of actions of the collective African leadership. This particular choice would go a long way to help avoid making any surreal analysis and drawing conclusions that might be overly futuristic.

In his analysis of foreign policy issues relating to how the concepts of nations/states, Europe as a region, security and the nature of international relations, applied to Britain and France, Larsen argued that the main import of a language approach is that the researcher has the obligation to study the terms and arguments used in texts rather than searching for the positions taken by actors and agents or what is said in real terms. The main goal therefore is to identify relevant written or spoken “utterances in the political sphere” related to concepts and issues the researcher is working with. Hence, in addition to traditional analysis that had been known to focus on a relatively myopic political contexts, such as, “debates in parliament, speeches by ministers, party programmes and reports from select committees…, the discourse approach could, for example, draw on reports from think-thanks related to a political party, the editorials of newspapers and academic writings because these could be considered part of the debate in the political sphere and in a wider sense part of the discourse or a rival discourse”. In here, matters of discourse are described as the “rules and values in the language” used in relation to key concepts in a political science research work.

On another plane, given the fact that the root causes of many economic crises are political, Africa's regional policy documents in the past, present and future would be subjected to political risk analysis (PRA) in order to make predictions about the said policies. The motive here is simple. In a rapidly globalising world characterised by multifarious actors it has become imperative to rethink the predictive power of economics alone in assessing and predicting early warnings about economic disasters. Risk in a globalised world is not limited to any particular region or states. Hence it makes sense of capturing risks in a “dual sense”, in relation to the “economic interests of Western countries, and Africa's regional development” policy objectives thereby ensuring that equal attention is placed on risks in its domestic and external dimensions. In the absence of a plausible theory for the task, PRA had been conducted based on the stock of knowledge accumulated by political consultants who had observed regimes for a long period of time and had managed to produce credible forecasts about political changes in a specific area. Other risk managers and experts have most of the time relied on an organisational approach whereby key political resources of a country such as leadership structure, institutions, government ministries and oppositions are
systematically observed and assessed. Given the role of international organisations on
Africa's development issues this approach would enable African policymakers and
stakeholders to put in place a mechanism for adopting, reviewing or rethinking their
strategy of development in case of systemic crisis that has direct impact on
commitments and intentions of their external partners. But the Author believes that
proliferation of actors also require that African countries, and for that matter the sub-
regions coordinate their risk management research and information within a
recommended framework of an *Integrated Political Risk Analysis* (IPRA). The objective
of IPRA is to integrate the knowledge of risks experts with that of other specialists into
the governmental policy decision making apparatus in a proactive manner. In brief,
political risks are first identified, put in a particular context, analysed, assessed and
communicated into the policy infrastructure with a feed-back effect from the political
praxis back into the policy structure, and at the tail end offers recommendations for
further action.

It is under the above circumstances that a pure and consistent devotion to formal
logical reasoning and a rigid penchant for categorisation, including the traditional
scientific urge to understand situations and events in *absolute* linear terms of cause and
effect might not be all sustaining in analysing ongoing transformation and integration in
the African continent. The nature, form, content, context and hybridity of politics in the
continent impinge a sense of malleability on existing cognitive process. In this state of
affairs, thinking more interdisciplinary and paying more attention to context and
relationships, and also relying more on experience based knowledge that embraces a
consideration for background environment, all could embellish existing thoughts on
African politics, and political science methodology. In this regard perspectives on the
general African condition should go beyond traditional syntagmatic mode of analysis
(understanding situations in linear terms of cause and effect) by attempting to inject
some sense of paradigmatic consideration (giving due attention to context and
relationships mentioned above). For example, an explanation of the 'African condition'
cannot be fully explained by using the post-colonial state as a starting point of analysis
and reference without considering the politics of colonial domination, control and
appropriation. In this sense, both methods, (*a syntagmatic mode of analysis* that
envisages pure and consistent devotion to understanding situations in linear terms of
cause and effect, and *a paradigmatic mode of analysis* that gives due consideration to
contexts and relationships) would be mutually reinforcing.
Part I Background to Analysis
Against the background of a steep and deepened socio-economic and political crisis: maelstrom of internecine civil wars, sustained refugees crisis, widespread poverty, disease, socio-economic injustices and iniquities, myriad and complex diversity; coupled with institutional immobility and inaction, inexorable pressures to combat global economic and political marginalisation and entrenched dependency; overwhelmed and strained by pressures of globalisation: ever-widening digital divide, dwindling external financial and development assistance flows, sustained decline in the terms of trade with the rest of the world; sidelined by the rapid changes that have taken place in global multilateral arrangements such as the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 1994, and a deepening feeling of collective guilt among a broad spectrum of the collective African leadership of being neglected and left behind in the global comity of nations, African leaders’ resolved in the year 2000 to systematically transform the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) into African Union (AU)/Economic Community of Africa (ECA)² with accredited Pan-African institutions, such as, a Court of Justice, Parliament, Central Bank etc., to enable the continent cope with current national, regional and global challenges.

Whether this historical move is in itself a panacea to the bleak background and uncertainties that loom over Africa, presents a test of not just time, but the tide of history. The move is also the results of inspiration from other regions, such as, the European Union (EU), a region once an abode of beligerent nation-states full of bellicosity has provided for other troubled regions such as Africa whose breed of current leaders now seem to believe that closer and genuine co-operation towards economic and political integration would lead to progress, prosperity and peace in their crisis laden continent. The inspiration drawn from the EU does not necessarily amount to blanket import of the European model as claimed by some. For example, existed on its own terms, functioned along its own path, encountered its own ups and downs (though more downs than expected), and its ability to survive even astonished its observers and critics alike. Notwithstanding the different and differing socio-economic and political context of both regions, however, one common strand of thinking in the minds and hearts of policy and decision makers is shared in both regions, namely, crisis as an impetus for action, despite their incommensurable forms, contents and substances. ³ It is the spectre of crisis in all its dimensions and manifestations that accounts for the hybrid nature of the transformations and integration processes in Africa, covering not just economic issues, but political and security challenges, human security, socio-cultural issues, environmental challenges and normative issues affecting governance – international law, values and norms, representation and participation of citizens.

The step taken in the African continent, though not quite unprecedented in inter-state African relations, finally epitomized in a declaration at an Extraordinary Summit of the OAU in Sirte, Libya on 2 March 2001, whereby the Heads of States of the OAU unanimously decided to establish the African Union.⁴ After a 36th member of the OAU (Nigeria) had submitted its instrument of ratification of the Constitutive Act of the African Union (CAAU) to the OAU General Secretariat thus concluding the two-thirds legal requirement for adoption, the Constitutive Act entered into force on the 26th of May 2001. By the opening of the OAU Lusaka Summit on 9-11 July 2001, the Constitutive Act had been signed by fifty-one countries. The Constitutive Act establishing the African Union thereby replaced the nearly four decades old OAU
Charter, operative after a transitional one-year period. On 9 July 2002 the CAAU came into force, and the African Union was finally and officially inaugurated in Durban, South Africa, accompanied by a brilliant display of pomp and pageant.

Current developments in the African continent presents more questions, though answers to all of them might not be easily fetched. Why are African leaders turning the tide this time around? What propelled decision-makers to seek unified solutions to their complex and diverse problems? Are the reasons to be attributed to the pressures exerted by globalization and competition on the old continent? Is it an attempt to salvage Africa’s image and bail it out of obscurity and neglect? Or is it a tactical ploy to ‘attract development aid’, which had been put under scrutiny by the turn of the 1990s by the donor community? Has the OAU now reach the bottom line of bankruptcy as critics have always argued, for it now to be technically disbanded only to be re-masked to suit the economic and political trappings of a new era? Or is it the case that a new African leadership with not just foresight, courage and vision, but action is emerging in the 21st Century? Have the transformations that had taken place in the last one decade or so laid a genuine foundation and created an enabling environment for integration at all levels?

Are there any engines for moving the African initiative forward? Has the new South Africa emerged as the fulcrum of Africa’s economic development and security architecture? Is the depth and magnitude of the African crisis itself a catalyst for the ongoing transformations and integration in Africa, or are current developments the results of externally induced strings from the hands that be? Does the coalescence of various policy blueprints and ideas in the aftermath of the Cold War in Africa constitute the quantum leap forward for Africa’s recovery, or is it just another version of the popular academic jargon, "plus ca change, plus c’est la même chose" syndrome that had eclipsed policy and action in Africa since independence? Or to the critical mind, are the changes taking place in the continent a covert attempt by the powers that be to subcontract Africa’s politics on the face of increasing marginalization, fragmentation and desperation? Last but not the least, in what perspectives, and by what perception does the Western industrialized countries, the donor community and private foreign investors (all the bearers of global capital and technology) capture Africa in the post-Cold War era? At the end of the day, however, we would also be making a legitimate interrogation whether Africa could realize the targets set by the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)?

Search for most of the answers is rooted in the impact of the political landslide that shook the international political terrain in the last one-decade or so, and the change and transformations that had taken place in the African continent there from. Other critical perspectives in relation to some of the above questions could also be made by delving critically into the nature of the post-colonial state and its relationship with the international system, as well as the hybrid nature of domestic politics grounded in Africa’s complex diversity. The end of the Cold War has brought in its trail concepts that were hitherto not quite significant in African political analysis: Globalization, civil society, social networks, non-governmentalism, gender and environmental issues etc. And within the African continent the state system had been systematically transformed, shedding some of the old traits such as neo-patrimonial rule, dictatorship, personal rule, while others such as, ethnicity and ethnic coalition and identity group formation seems to endure in an environment of democracy and rule of law, constitutionalism, conflict prevention, management and resolution, regional and territorial wide integration, among others. Hence, seeking answers to the bulk of questions above demands the use of an approach with hybrid components of explaining and applying concepts, rigorous empirical analysis using classic and recent case studies, which also offers a tangible reason for comparative analysis within the African continent. The above questions,
However, also do not *easily* succumb to the scientific methods of inquiry since the processes that are taking place in the continent evades definite *time series* and *sequencing* in relation to envisioned policies and strategies and their timely implementation.

Africa's response to the changes that occurred in the international political and economic system, be it re-democratisation and the institution of rule of law, or economic deregulation, had been too slow, lukewarm, or even in some country-specific cases we have seen elites unyielding to the forces of change by clinging on to their political trump-cards. Thus the transition process in some regions and countries have become either deadlocked due to sustained conflict, such as in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Congo Brazzaville, Somalia, Burundi and Rwanda, or contradictory as is the case in many countries where incumbents have hijacked the process by altering the national constitution in furtherance of their rule. Togo and Zimbabwe are glaring examples.

The background to the transformations taking place in the African continent can be traced to the rapid changes that occurred by the end of the Cold War in 1989-1990, and the subsequent series of policy re-orientations the OAU introduced. Some of the steps taken to inject new dynamism in the OAU even dates back some two decades or so, but for reasons of multiple constraints and lack of a sense of direction and appropriate leadership, some policies ended up between the heads of state and the gate post of their conference halls till the end of the Cold War and global changes and challenges began to weigh heavily on them. Africa's share of the impact of the changes thereof - further pauperisation and marginalisation, unprecedented explosion of intramural conflicts and civil wars, wide spread poverty and social injustice, the catastrophic consequences of the Aids/HIV pandemic, financial predicament, institutional and democratic deficit etc., compelled African leaders to adopt the *Addis Ababa Declaration of The Assembly of Heads of State and Government on the Political And Socio-Economic Situation In Africa And The Fundamental Changes Taking Place In The World* (1990). The gist of this declaration was a crucial response given the fact that it was capturing global and domestic events by stating that „in the light of the rapid changes taking place in the world and their impact on Africa”, and the leaders realising the urgent duty to act now, resolved „to promote popular participation of our peoples in the process of government and development... to guarantee human rights and the observance of law... to recommit ourselves to the further democratisation of our societies”.

Also prior to the end of the Cold War, however, The Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU at their Sixteenth Ordinary Session held in Monrovia, Liberia from 17 to 20 July, 1979, had proposed a convention entitled „*African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights*”, which was adopted on June 27, 1981, and finally entered into force on 21 Oct. 1986. By this Charter the leaders were „Considering that the enjoyment of rights and freedoms also implies the performance of duties on the part of everyone...that it is henceforth essential to pay a particular attention to the right to development and that civil and political rights cannot be dissociated from economic, social and cultural rights.” and thereby saw to „Reaffirming their adherence to the principles of human and peoples' rights and freedoms contained in the declarations, conventions and other instruments adopted by the Organisation of African Unity, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations; Firmly convinced of their duty to promote and protect human and peoples’ rights and freedoms taking into account the importance traditionally attached to these rights and freedoms in Africa.” In what was also dubbed the *Monrovia Declaration of Commitment on the Guidelines and Measures for National and Collective Self-reliance in Economic and Social Development for the Establishment of a New International Order* (1979), the Heads of
States and Government declared that „we commit ourselves, individually and collectively, on behalf of our governments and peoples, to promote the economic and social development and integration of our economies with a view to achieving an increasing measure of self-sufficiency and self-sustainment”.

A year later, in 1980, the OAU Extraordinary Summit adopted the Lagos Plan of Action, followed by the Final Act of Lagos, constituting the foundation of any future steps towards achieving the goals of integration and development in Africa by the year 2000. The main plank of the Plan was a self-reliant approach designed to empower and mobilise internal forces and resources in order to put the continent on a path of a socio-economic transformation and reconstruction to enhance its recovery, development and economic growth.

To bolster their commitment to the hard realities of international political and economic developments African leaders again adopted the Abuja Treaty in June 1991 whereby the Heads of State and Government signed a treaty establishing the African Economic Community (AEC), which had been operative since May 1994. The Monrovia Declaration and the Final Act of Lagos were indeed the culmination of the decisions in Abuja. Indeed, the Abuja Treaty constitutes the policy bedrock and guideline for attaining the African Union through integration in the economic and non-economic sectors with a long term development strategy that upholds democratic principles grounded in Africa’s rich cultural heritage. It is articulated around the concepts of solidarity and collective self-reliance; a self-sustained and endogenous development strategy; and a policy of self-sufficiency in basic needs, promotion of human rights, environmental safety, accountability, economic justice and popular participation in development. Its core programme embraces multiple goals that include the integration of African productive capacities and infrastructure; the eradication of poverty and ignorance; the building of genuine Pan-African institutions; and the establishment of new relations between Africa and the wider world.

Also, at the core of the whole new socio-economic and political strategies for development of the continent is empowerment of the various Sub-regional Economic Communities (SRECs) within the African continent. In West Africa there are the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) and the Mano River Union (MRU). In Central/Eastern Africa they include the Economic Community of Central African states (ECCAS), the Central African Monetary and Economic Community (CEMAC---Formerly known as the Central African Customs and Economic Union-UDEAC), the Economic Community of the Countries of the Great Lakes (CEPGL---Commutité Economique de Pays des Grand Lacs) and the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD). In North Africa exists the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU). In Southern and Eastern Africa are the Southern Africa Customs Union (SACU), the Common Monetary Area (CMA), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the East African Community (EAC). The Abuja Treaty obliges the various sub-regions to promote inter-regional trade and investment, enhance free mobility of peoples and factors of production, co-ordinate and harmonise policies to achieve growth and development. A Protocol on Relations between the AEC and regional Economic Communities was adopted on 25 February 1998 and signed by COMESA, SADC, IGAD, ECOWAS and ECCAS/CEED (in October 1999).

The new and unique focus on Sub-regional Economic Communities (SRECs) cautions us to the semantic flaws that might be associated with application of concepts such as regional integration as pertains to other regions. Size, ramify identities, different resource base, disparities in individual state capacity and highly differentiated levels of economic and political development, justifies any such caution at least at the initial
stages of the African process. Identification of the SRECs in the Abuja Treaty and its re-articulation in the Constitutive Act establishing the African Union as the main engines of integration in Africa gives the African process a peculiar and unprecedented characteristic in the short history of regional integration since the post war years. In the past the African region had been so designated collectively because of their common historical struggle against colonialism. Today the galvanising principles are economic, social and political, but rooted in that common historical experience that had fostered solidarity and common voice in international fora. The logic of the focus at the sub-regional level is due to the fact that no single African country (except perhaps South Africa) can alone withstand the impact of global competition due to reasons of small size, vast diversity and the vivid socio-economic and political disparities that exist between the sub-regions, and even between the member states that constitute a same region. This peculiar context also renders individual African state actors powerless in dealing with issues of global and international concerns at the level of bargaining and negotiation. Though geographically, culturally, socially and in terms of efficiency starkly differentiated, almost all of the countries in the region, be it platitudinal to say, have only one purposive goal of integration designed to empower the sub-regions to overcome some of the major social, economic, political and security constraints that had hamper Africa's development since independence.

Regarding regionalism as a concept, the „region” is defined by the OAU as constituted by the division of Africa into five regions namely North Africa, West Africa, East Africa, Central Africa, and Southern Africa. They are further ordered along „sub-regions”, which are also constituted by at least three states of one or more regions. The role of the sub-regions had been well articulated in the Treaty establishing the AEC, captured as „building blocks” that would facilitate regional integration in a continent of a size such as Africa. The overall geographical arrangements had the African „condition”, as well as the African „crisis” in mind. Aware of the effects diversity, conflict, war and prevalent insecurity have had on development; the efforts of the African leadership could not by-pass the increasing need to address security issues on the continent.

In the security realm the OAU at the fringes of its demise also proposed and adopted a declaration to create a Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution during its Twenty-ninth Ordinary Session in Cairo between 28 and 30 June 1993. Given the intractable and protracting nature of civil war in Africa, and the OAU’s incapacity to resolve them in the past, this was long overdue, and can be counted as a step to instil some fresh conceptual and institutional dynamism into the far too long dormant Commission of Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration that had been originally established for conflict resolution by the Charter by the birth of the organisation. To embellish the existing mechanism, the OAU/AEC summit in Lomé in 2000 adopted the Report of the First Ministerial Meeting of the Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-operation (CSSDC) in Africa, held in Abuja from 8 to 9 May 2000, and declared thereof to create a synergy between the various policies and paths that had been undertaken by the OAU in areas of peace, security, stability, development and co-operation. The low record of success of the OAU in conflict resolution at some hot spots in Africa, such as the Western Sahara, Chad, Rwanda and Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, had not just cut a slur on the image of the organisation, but questions its legitimacy and efficiency as well. Indeed, the organisation’s success story if any ends on the boundaries of peaceful resolution of conflicts concerning territorial and secessionist claims. Even in this sphere the long simmering crisis in the Western Sahara involving Morocco and the Frente Popular Para la Liberacion de Saguia El-Hamra y Rio de Oro (POLISARIO - Popular Front for the
In addition to these major decisions by African leaders there are also a bulk of decisions and protocols that had been given low profile in contemporary political discourse, but equally relevant to the transformation process taking place in the world and in the continent. These include:

(i) African Declaration on Co-operation, Development and Economic Independence – May 1973, constituting the first comprehensive document adopted by the Heads of State and Government of the OAU.


(ix) The Framework for an OAU Response to Unconstitutional Changes of Government (2000), and the Cairo Plan of Action: Africa Europe Summit under the Aegis of the OAU and the EU (April 2000).

The fact about this long list of decisions and policies is that, they all address key areas of human life, the absence of which might affect a peaceful development of a nation or a region, implying that the break ups and lack of continuity in implementing them also attest to how far African leaders had failed the peoples of the continent on the crucial question of development.

Propelled by the changes and challenges in the decade after the Cold War, African leaders unanimously adopted the ‘New African Initiative’ at the Lusaka Summit on 11 July 2001. The new initiative represented a merger of policy blueprints between the Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Programme (MAP) and the OMEGA Plan initiated by Presidents Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, and Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal respectively. The background developments to this merger and consolidation of ideas began in September 1999 during an OAU Extraordinary Summit held in Sirte in Libya, where the Heads of State and Government mandated Presidents Mbeki, Wade, Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria and Bouteflika of Algeria to secure a coherent new initiative for addressing the development chasm in the African continent. In another related development during the South Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of 77 held in Havana, Cuba in April 2000, the delegates mandated Presidents Mbeki and Obasanjo to convey the concerns of the South to the G8 and the Bretton Woods Institutions on matters relating to debt relief and other pressing issues affecting North-South relations. In a similar development during an OAU Summit in Lomé Togo in July 2000, African Heads of States once again mandated the three presidents to formulate new initiatives with a view to develop a constructive partnership with the developed North to enhance the rejuvenation of the continent and put it on a path of recovery. The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) complemented their efforts, which presented a New Global Compact with Africa upon
the request of African Ministers of Finance during their 8th Summit in Addis Ababa in November 2000.

In the early months of the following year the OAU had recognised the synergy and complementarities of the various works being pursued for the recovery of Africa, and thereby called on their initiators to integrate them. This was also reasonable since multiple, uncoordinated initiatives could compromise the credibility and responsibility of the African leadership in the eyes of their partners in the developed north. Under the working name - New African Initiative the consolidated programme of action was presented to OAU Summit of Heads of State and Government on 11 July 2001 in Lusaka, Zambia where it was enthusiastically embraced and unanimously adopted by the summit in the form of Declaration 1 (XXXVII). In the spirit of that commitment the summit instituted and mandated a Heads of State Implementation Committee (HSIC) to move the process forward. The newly accredited body agreed on the name New Partnership for Africa Development (NePAD) in its meeting on October 23, 2001 in Abuja, Nigeria.

Soon after its inception, African leaders recognising the institutional deficit the OAU had left in its trail speeded up the decision-making machinery of the Union on wide range of treaties, Conventions, Protocols, Charters, Decisions and Declarations that are crucially needed in the areas of conflict resolution, defence and security, terrorism, human rights and operationalisation of the various protocols relating to the institutionalisation of the new regional body. The following are some of the key ones.

Figure 1: Treaties, Conventions, Protocols and Charters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaties, Conventions, Protocols and Charters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitutive Act of the African Union</td>
<td>Lomé, Togo 11 July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU Charter</td>
<td>Addis Ababa, 25 May 1963. Abrogated and replaced by the Constitutive Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU Convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism</td>
<td>Algiers, Algeria, 14 July 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa, 10 July 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol of the Court of Justice of the African Union</td>
<td>Maputo, Mozambique, 11 July 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decisions of the Assembly of the African Union, Second Ordinary Session, 10-12 July 2003, Maputo, Mozambique

<p>| Decision on the Situation in Madagascar | Assembly/AU/Dec.6 31 (II) |
| Decision on the Elaboration of Code of Conduct on Terrorism | Assembly/AU/Dec. 14 (II) |
| Decision on the Operationalisation of the Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council | Assembly/AU/Dec. 16 (II) |
| Decision on the Establishment by the European Union of a peace Support Operation facility for the African Union | Assembly/AU/Dec. 21 (II) |
| Decision on the Protocol of the Court of justice of the | Assembly/AU/Dec. 25 (II) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Resolution Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/59 (II)</td>
<td>Declaration of the Heads of States and Government of the African Union on the Fifth WTO Ministerial Conference</td>
<td>Assembly/AU/Decl.4 (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/61 (III)</td>
<td>Declaration on Maputo Declaration on HIV / AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>Assembly/AU/Decl.6 (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/37 (III)</td>
<td>Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa</td>
<td>Assembly/AU/Decl.7 (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/38 (III)</td>
<td>Declaration on the Implementation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NePAD)</td>
<td>Assembly/AU/Decl.8 (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/36 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Third Ordinary Session of the Executive Council, 4-8 July 2003, Maputo, Mozambique</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec20 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/41 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Situation in Angola</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.39 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/42 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Situation in the Central African Republic</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.40 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/43 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Situation in Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.41 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/44 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Situation in Liberia</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.42 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/45 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Proposed International Conference on the Great Lakes Region</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.43 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/46 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Situation of Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.44 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/49 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the First Ordinary Session of the Labour and Social Affairs Commission of the African Union</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.45 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/58 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Draft Protocol of the Court of Justice</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.46 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/59 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on Integration of NePAD into the Structures and Processes of the African Union</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.47 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/66 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the Report on matter related to the Operationalisation of the Women Gender and Development Directorate</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.49 (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX/CL/74 (III)</td>
<td>Decision on the African Council for Sustainable Development (ACOSHED)</td>
<td>EX/CL/Dec.50 (III)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By this coalition of ideas and their adoption thereof by the collective African leadership, it had become significantly clear, at least theoretically that there is an emerging common vision and shared conviction among them to eradicate poverty, create an enabling environment for sustainable growth and development, break dependency and empower African countries to participate in world economy in a new relationship of partnership founded on realisation of common interests, mutual benefits and equality. By taking these steps the leaders also expressed their commitment to good governance, democracy and human rights, while further empowering the existing mechanism on conflict resolution to prevent and resolve situations of conflict and instability on the continent in order to create conducive atmosphere for investment, growth and development.

Indeed, the transformations in Africa explicated by the series of policies indicated above since the aftermath of the Cold War is unprecedented in the short history of post-colonial Africa. It revisits the prescient vision of the late Dr. Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana who had exerted much energy, time and resources to build a future for the African continent that places the African peoples at the helm of their own affairs. But all is easier said than done. Given the failures of early 1960s for similar visionary policies we may pause to interrogate the collective African leadership and ourselves whether they now have the organisational machinery for operationalising such visionary policy today. The visionary policies of the Africa Union as explicated by the NePAD policy document in particular and its articulation in the context of instability and prevalent political violence in most of the sub-regions also demands us to question whether the African leadership could translate that vision into an implementable programme of action in order to bring the continent on the path of recovery and development. Like in any other policy task, the crucial question of support and the ability of the architects of that vision to mobilise the collective African citizenry behind that vision, would also be quite challenging. And even in the contemporary global political and economic setting the success of a visionary project such as NePAD in particular and the transformation process in general would as well require a genuine international collaboration for the African cause situated in the context of globalisation. Hence Africa's relations with her external allies would be a barometer for measuring success or failure in current efforts at transformation and integration in the continent.

The transformations that have occurred in the security, economic, social and political spheres combine integrative and multilateral co-operation initiatives that have been ushered in by the end of the Cold War, which gives current developments in the continent a peculiar character: a twin process of transformation and integration. A transformation necessitated by the fact that in more than forty years of political independence, state, society and institutions in Africa have been left to decay, stagnate or rendered immobile and inefficient. The necessity for integration into the global economy, including integration at the regional and sub-regional levels have also been leashed by decades long confrontation and defiance within the framework of the Cold War. The end of the Cold War and the accompanying changes that occurred in the international system affected Africa in several ways. The period witnessed mounting pressure from the donor community on African leaders to promote political liberalisation, adopt economic stabilisation measures and reduce budget deficits, institute structural reforms, trade liberalisation, deregulation and privatisation. Indeed, the main purpose was to put in place in Africa a free-market oriented system of economy and democratic governance that conforms to the prerequisites of the global
capitalist economy. In the domain of political transformation however, the pace of the process had been slow, at times with cases of elites unyielding to the pressures taking place within and outside the continent in response to the wind of change blowing across Africa. In the economic sphere, strategies that had been mapped out at the national, sub-regional and continental levels are rhetorically loaded, either there are no clearly defined sources of finance from within and without, or they have no bearing on the resources of member states, and accredited institutions at the various levels of activity. Beyond that perspective however, the most nagging issue is not the twin processes that are taking place in Africa, but the rapidly changing contents and boundaries of African politics situated in a context of a rapidly changing world designated by globalisation and the gaps, divisions, fragmentation and whatever opportunities it tends to create, as well as the frantic responses it receives from its agents, actors, organisations, institutions and even ‘victims’, especially, for the latter’s efforts to achieve at least the global presence and its attendant so-called benefits. Hence, since the early 1990s it had been the nature and implications of a changing international system characterised by globalisation and competition juxtapose on an opening region such as Africa (at multivariate levels, local, national and regional) that had presented challenges to actors at those levels and thereby shaping outcomes, both predicted and unintended. The responses received there from are also an indication of an ongoing coalition of political intervention seeking to find solutions to challenging outcomes of globalisation.

How do we perceive and understand the concepts and categories (both implicit and explicit) that are propelling Africa’s transformation and integration processes in a rapidly changing 21st Century characterised by globalisation? And even for a research project of this kind the core issues of African transformation and integration (apart from its traditional focus on institutions, the OAU/AU and the sub-regional economic blocks) have to be identified and examined within contemporary political debate that envisages contending questions of allocation and use of power and authority that impacts the legitimate nature of prevailing political order and, how Africans capture the foundations, dynamics and even dilemmas of the community they are striving to attain. It is hard, if not impossible to delete issues of power and authority from the processes taking place in Africa given the fact that the nations in the continent are new, still burden with crucial questions affecting sovereignty, state building and national identity.

Also, of crucial significance is the highly malleable notion of African identity politics that had been subjected to a long history of reconsideration and redefinition from pre-colonial, colonial, post-colonial and neo-colonial transformations. This has been facilitated by the fact that in the past external actors succeeded in subjecting the continent to their own political and cultural designs. The emergence of new coalitions and power constellations after the Cold War succinctly summarises contemporary African politics at the level of civil society, the nation-state, sub-regional and regional levels as the main constituencies for defining and calculating interests and pondering over options that are coterminous with national and state identity. It will also rest on the shoulders of African leaders to negotiate desiderata of new symbols and shared meanings towards constructing political realities about on-going processes of transformations and integration. In this perspective, for the political scientist therefore, one of the cardinal duties would be to discern gaps and vacuums, or linkages that may occur between what constitutes a vision, capabilities and resource gaps, state capacity, efficiency and political will, action, political rhetoric and other related rhetorical strategies, as well as tracking the structures, processes, ideas and values underlying on-going transitions and integration in Africa. In addition, that perspective would open for the researcher the desired frame of analysis to discern the contradictions of the processes taking place in Africa, especially in that particular case where there is possible
elite tendency towards an alleged vision and pragmatism in their day to day political enterprise. The two are indeed unmatched pairs.

What then are the motives, interests, and structures that are driving these processes of change in the African continent? By the nature of changes in the international system by the turn of the 1990s and the enormous changes that have characterised politics and economics in Africa: imposition of economic and political conditionalities, the strive for democracy; global premium on Human Rights issues, development and poverty reduction strategies; the 'increased autonomy' gained by the United Nations and intensification of her engagements in Africa; the emergence of South Africa as the fore runner of African diplomacy and the continents' economic power house; the external dependence for financing the transformation and integration processes led by the G8, the US and the EU; the active involvement of trans-national co-corporations, growing interests by private investors and active presence of Non-Governmental and Civil Society Organisations, all combine to give the African process a peculiar label. A network of these various groups, state actors, transnational actors, International Organisations and private investors drives it. The process exhibits a hybrid liberal and social democratic values anchored on transnational linkages and networks enmeshed in regionalism and globalisation, national development values, intergovernmental interaction, political institutionalisation, elite's preferences, interest coalitions in the context of making hard choices on the face of dwindling resources. From within the African continent, African leaders have responded to the multifarious actors influencing politics on the continent via a global policy advocacy grounded in partnerships with willing actors. For the researcher it is pertinent to notice that the plethora of extra-regional actors such as, the EU, the G8, and several international financial institutions tends to give the African process a character of international relations thereby overshadowing its internal political dynamics of power, politics and even 'institutions'. These concerns are legitimate on the grounds that the new African leadership constitute a conglomeration of not just power and authority, but ideas bearing-coalitions (i.e. the architects of NePAD and the new AU) situated in a regional forum trying to chart a new course for African emancipation and development within the framework of a rapidly changing world powered by globalisation, information, science and technology. On the face of those multiple interactions emerges the difficult task of managing the complexities, contradictions and collisions of ideas and values that might emerge in the course of those twin processes the ultimate objectives of which are: peace, order and stability, development, solidarity and human security (social justice and equality).

But does Africa possess the requisite transformative and integrative capacities; technological innovation and resources to make the expected headway African leaders have set their minds on? To what extent is Africa’s already strained capacity going to be over-stretched? One obvious and commonly held view in the debate and discussions of solutions to the African crisis is the supremacy of the economic factor and how dominant paradigms such as globalisation wheeled on supremacy of the market and global capital would help alleviate poverty and install economic well-being for all. The effects of long decades of dictatorship and personal rule, mismanagement and wrong priority setting combined to put constraints on Africa’s efforts at capacity building, technological advancement and improving the human resource base. It should also be noted that the penetration of those forces of parochial economic determinism into the fragile new states and economies of Africa risks not only disintegrating Africa’s communal solidarity, indigenous potentials for development and growth and her highly variegated identities, but would also contribute to (due to the social divisions and forms of fragmentations it creates) deepening the myths about those forces of globalisation in the mist of poverty and squalor, deep-rooted social injustice and deprivation of all forms
identifiable within the African continent. Without advocating the overthrow of economics, Africa’s current situation demands high intensity awareness about Good Governance: Democracy (planked on Africa’s communal and solidarity context), the Rule of Law, Social Justice and Human Rights. Under those conditions of active and rapid political engineering, hitherto weakened African states would be gradually empowered to be partners in development with strong global forces instead of being subordinated to the whims of those forces with possible disastrous consequences in the form of fragmentation and disintegration of existing African socio-economic hierarchies. The frustrations experienced daily by ordinary Africans are not so much about known flaws of whatever prevailing system of rule, but more so about whom ordinary people must turn to, when and where, when confronted with crucial issues affecting individual, group and communal interest. The crux of the matter in the African context in particular can be identified as decades of neglect of the potential of civil society in national development programmes, small size of the national economies and dwindling share of global trade and finance including the lack of ability to catch up in scientific research and the application of modern technology. Their absence therefore compels governments to make commitments to transformations and integration which in turn exerts strains on their meagre resources.

As had already been noted, of the policy re-orientations that have characterised Africa’s transformation process, the Abuja Treaty in particular with its emphasis on sub-regional economic blocks for socio-economic and political integration makes the ongoing transformation and for that matter integration of African states different from other regional integration projects in the classic sense of the word. Another step to rejuvenate Africa’s integration reflects the recent OAU-Civil Society Conference in Addis Ababa on 13 June 2001. As part of the transformation process the OAU envisaged close partnership between government and civil society, especially women’s groups, youths and the private sector geared toward building a robust solidarity and cohesion of the African people. This is in due recognition of the great contribution and sacrifices that grassroots and civil society organisations have made and are making in the continental struggle for socio-economic and political development over the years. After the 1990s the struggle by civil society and individuals have become evident than any point in time in the African struggle for freedom and liberty. To this end, the once rigid relationship between state, society and political activity has given way to transformation of the state system in Africa and the relationship it bears to society has gradually, but also radically been transformed in the realms of democratic empowerment, increasing role of media and communication and the proliferation of social movements. In this direction the monolithic nature of the state in Africa is now set on a course of shedding its totalitarian, dictatorial and oligarchical features. The novelty of the African process is that it exhibits a character of embeddedness incorporating the region, the sub-region, the nation-state, local government, society and the individual citizen.

The emphasis on sub-regional Economic Communities, local government, Non-Governmental Organisations/Civil Society Organisations and the private sector is a direct response to the principle of subsidiarity¹⁸ which has become the main preoccupation of European integration today in its frantic search for solutions for reaching the citizens of the union, building legitimacy and promoting participation and representation. In this sense Africa’s approach to regional integration does not necessarily need to meander through all the difficulties that the EU may have gone through. The challenging duty for African leaders would be their ability to provide the requisite political will, create appropriate conditions and timing for integration in order to enhance their capacity to transform words into deeds.
The time-frame for the transformation process is explicitly stipulated in the Abuja Treaty, which set up modalities for establishing the AEC. In all, a thirty-four year time-span of transformation with variable durations has been set up, operative from 1994 the time of signing the treaty. This consists of six phases covering strengthening of existing SRECs and creating new ones when and where appropriate within duration of 5 years. The second phase projects the establishment and stabilisation of tariff and other barriers to regional trade to bolster sectoral integration particularly in the field of trade, agriculture, finance, transport and communication, industry and energy, including co-ordination and harmonisation of the SRECs (8 years). The third phase envisions the establishment of Free Trade Area and Customs Union at the level of the SRECs (10 years). At the fourth phase activities will be concentrated on co-ordinating and harmonising tariffs and non-tariff systems among the various SRECs intended towards establishing a continental wide customs union (2 years). At the fifth phase, it is projected that conditions shall be ripe for the establishment of the African Common Market and the adoption of a Continental Customs Union (ACM). The sixth and final phase shall take grasp of the task of consolidating and strengthening the structures of ACM such as free movement of peoples and factors of production, establishment of a single domestic market and Pan-African economic and monetary union, African Central Bank and a single African currency. Envisioned within that broad initiative is to help create the enabling environment to establish an African Economic and Monetary Union, and set up a Pan-African Parliament (5 years). To facilitate the effective implementation of the objectives of the AEC, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) was created and accredited as the principal, specialised technical and policy-making organ to that effect. The total transformation period should not exceed forty years, effective from the date of signing the treaty. For the ordinary African and observers of African affairs alike this is not the first time African leaders have taken the task upon themselves to place Africa’s image and position in an appropriate place within the comity of nations.

At the dawn of dismantling colonialism, African states made frantic efforts to establish a legitimate forum for solidarity, cohesion and co-operation among the newly independent states born out of divergent colonial heritage principally of Francophone, Anglophone and Lusophone background. The prevailing international security architecture and international political and economic conditions lent credit to these efforts. That most African state shared a common suffering and aspirations cannot be denied. The common agenda was to speed up decolonisation and fight against apartheid, fighting neo-colonialism and imperialism, and last but not the least to struggle for a nuclear free world as the necessary condition for everyone, every nation, every people to attain maximum development and make positive contribution towards world progress and civilisation. Apart from a common agenda as unifying force, most of the leadership and personalities of the period was the product of a diasporic intellectual movement that spearheaded the struggle for de-colonisation and political independence in Africa. Hence issues and actors within and outside the African continent were quite homogenous (in terms of contact and face-to-face interaction, collaboration and exchange of ideas, and not geography) in contrast with the heterogeneous interests of African states and elites today. The diasporic intellectual movement later produced politically conscious young Africans who later spearheaded the independence movement in Africa. Names such as, Leopold Senghor of Senegal graduated at the University of Sorbonne, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya studied in London and Tom Mboya spent a year in Oxford, Julius K. Nyerere of Tanzania (Tankanyika) graduated at Edinburgh University, Dr. Hastings Banda of (Nyasaland) attended the Universities of Fisk, Chicago and Edinburgh, Nnamdi Azikiwe of Nigeria, Kwame Nkrumah, Jones Quartey, George Padmore all studied in the United States, with Nkrumah furthering his
studies in England. Kwadwo Botsio of Ghana obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree at Oxford. Obafemi Awolowo studied and became a barrister in England, J.B. Danquah and K.A Busia of Ghana obtained doctoral degrees from Cambridge, and Oxford respectively. All these names are synonymous with the independence struggle and the immediate period in Africa, especially, south of the Sahara.

But, the seemingly unflinching wind of unity and close co-operation across the continent did not sustain a common cause for a common action. The issues were either the newly independent states should transcend the colonial boundaries for a continental union or maintain the colonial boundaries bequeathed to them at the Berlin conference of 1884-85. Three groups emerged along these lines, the so-called radical Casablanca Group (Established 7 January 1961: Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, United Arab Republic, and the Provisional Government of Algeria), the more conservative Anglo-American puppet Monrovia Group (established 8 May 1961: Liberia, Ivory Coast, Cameroon, Senegal, Malagasy Republic, Togo, Benin, Chad, Niger, Upper Volta, Congo-Brazzaville, Central African Republic, Gabon, Ethiopia and Libya) and the Brazzaville Group constituted predominantly by countries of former French colonial territories (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo-Brazzaville, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Gabon, Mauritania, Upper Volta, Madagascar, Niger, Senegal and Chad). In the end, the conservative and Francophone minded movements prevailed and thereafter the Pan-African idea has expressed itself in terms of solidarity and co-operation between sovereign independent states in a multilateral arrangement instead of a continental wide political integration championed by the Casablanca Group of countries. Sub-regional economic groupism was to be the main concept and engine for co-operation among African states. This view was adopted and led to the establishment of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) on 25 of May 1963.

At the dawn of another historical moment African leaders have once again decided steering the continent towards another framework of co-operation inculcating more actors this time but with SRECs still as the main axis for growth and development. Considering the fact that Africa has sank into oblivion in global affairs fresh and far-sighted socio-economic and political strategic initiatives are urgently needed to move the continent out of global obscurity, poverty, civil strife and insecurity of all forms.

For some observers the steps taken by the OAU were not new, as the past four decades of its establishment had always seen the annual summities and political fanfare ushering in visionary declarations without the corresponding prop roots for putting words into deeds. Such failures are deeply grounded in internal inhibitions and structural constraints of one kind or the other or external vulnerabilities, which are beyond the control of individual African states. In a nutshell, some of the OAU member states were, and are still economically defunct, financially cash strapped, democratically indebted to the ruled, and morally bankrupt.

While not pretending to print a pessimistic view of the on-going transformation process, such awareness brings us to the point of whether a wholesale integration is an appropriate decision. Even though the Constitutive Act establishing the African Union has given enough time frames for transition to be made, such an approach kills competitiveness as to who is to qualify for membership. The salient point in here is that at the time of epochenumbruch in 1989 and afterwards, African states were, and had been, at various stages of economic and political development, recovery and stagnation. Even those states that seem to have been on a similar course were doing so at different levels of speed, intensity and commitment. The spring of democratisation onto the political agenda of African states at the end of the Cold War is a glaring example to this point, and President Mugabe of Zimbabwe’s political grip on to power through ‘emergency powers’ (short before the 2002 presidential elections) empirically confirms
this case. African states responded differently to the systemic change after 1989, implemented varying political and economic reforms to stabilise their countries, which consequently put them on a transition course that has gradually necessitated a continental wide integration. The transformation process therefore, is a complicated one, due to certain lack of ground levelling at many levels of analysis.

However, one pertinent issue is that most states have suffered long periods of dictatorships and personal rule, war, civil strife and other forms of political violence and are now reconstructing, stagnating, have shown no sign of recovery, or are gradually slipping to the brink of civil and religious strife. Somalia, Rwanda, The Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Nigeria, Liberia and Sierra Leone and even the Ivory Coast once an icon of peace and stability, order and development in the continent are all examples of this current situation in Africa. Hence, it is the seeming lack of accession treaty that may in one way or the other reinforce zero commitment and de-motivation alike. The African process suggests a strong partnership between African states and the donor community and it would be wishful thinking to expect that the industrialised countries would treat all African countries in the same way. Hence the various policy blueprints shaping ongoing processes in Africa would remain avenues for selectivity and even fragmentation by outside partners so long as they do not contain any serious qualitative measures and criteria for participation. From one angle of analysis it is „recipe for selectivity‟. The UK Foreign Office Minister for Africa, Baroness Amos, was perfectly right when she referred to NePAD as „enhanced partnership with selected group of countries‟. Again, a wholesale process makes analysis and compilation of data and statistics cumbersome as war torn and conflict laden member states may mirage the results of any well-meaning research project of the African process. In the partial absence of an accession treaty and principles thereof the AU must put more pressure on the many countries lagging behind in economic performance and bedevilled by conflict to catch up. Else the remaining option would be a moral obligation on some selected African leaders and their willing external partners to steer Africa out of its current state and regain its image and place in the comity of nations.

While it has been difficult to reconcile politics with morality the plight of Africans living below the poverty line and the overall international neglect of the continent have left „a scar on the conscience of the world‟ especially those members of the international community which have one way or other contributed to Africa’s historical, social and economic distortions. But how does one reconcile the preparedness to heal scars within an international environment full of double standards and hypocrisy that combines to slowly milk Africa to death? The depth and magnitude of this problematic is difficult to overcome since that alliance of hypocrisy also includes internal collaborators whose political ideologies have hijacked the dignity of ordinary Africans. It is in this sense that a kind of a moral crusade to rescue the continent would be appropriate and timely. But in the end Africa’s success or her doom to failure would be in the hands of Africans themselves.

But if the African crisis has reached a point to warrant a moral remedy, what then is actually propelling the continents leaders at this juncture, to put through an agenda for Africa’s social, economic and political development? What are the motives and purposes for an African Union embracing deeply divergent nations and ethnicities, states and subregions with disparate economic and political development? What are the integrative mechanisms and the strategies for realising an overall accelerated economic growth and political development? And above all, what are the underlying political dynamics and underpinnings shaping a continental-wide political and economic union?
Even though thorough answers may not be necessary at this stage, an attempt would be made at this introductory stage to throw light on some of the possible reasons and motives for integration in the continent.

Any probing attempt to seek explanations for ongoing transformation and integration of the African continent begins with the premise that there is a change in attitude in the way, at least, some African leaders now perceive and act on matters of politics and development. That new thinking is grounded in the realism that regional integration is captured as a strategic model for the transformation and modernisation of African economies. This wind of change in perception has been clearly delineated in the Vision of the African Union and Missions of the African Union Commission promulgated in March 2004. The document outlines eight key ideas covering transformation of the post-colonial African state to enhance its capacity to confront modern challenges taking cue from the role played by the state in development in the Asian experience. In a addition, given Africa’s long neglect of its citizens in the development process the AU’s vision also embraces the framework for empowering the peoples of the continent in order to create a sustained and legitimate Union that includes multiple stakeholders, such as those of the private sector and civil society at large. In its revolutionary parlance, the document of the vision for transformation and modernisation revisits the prescient ideas of Nkrumah for a achieving a political federation or confederation in the long term. Hence, according to the document political integration should be the *raison-d’être* of the African Union. This also implies that there is now an unprecedented focus on the state as the locus of transformation and integration interacting within a sub-regional and regional integrative framework. The vision also goes further to streamline development perspective in the continent now captured as human-centred. It is also this particular fact that has contributed to addressing the issue of equality and social justice in development in Africa. In another vein given the long period of subjecting some of the continent’s youth to child soldiering, the vision of the AU sets about creating the enabling environment for enhancing the creativity and energies of the youth through provision of better education, health and basic infrastructure in rehabilitating post-conflict societies. Having the OAU neglected in the past, the new African Union sets premium on mobilising and harnessing the resources of the diaspora in the domains of science, technology, finance and expertise to complement the role of the African Union Commission. It must be noted however that, in the broader sense, and from an analytical point of view, the path that African leaders took, or purported to have taken entails more than what has been listed above.

Hence, first and foremost, African states from the point of view of their common historical struggle for political independence from colonial domination and economic emancipation in a postcolonial era have most of the time sought a common voice in that regard. Today, this common historical bond has once again bestowed it upon African leaders to strengthen, unite and empower African peoples from all walks of life to salvage the continent from economic and political doldrums. The end of the Cold War and turn of a new millennium has given a new whole impetus for a Pan-African idea that embraces a differing actors and impulses from within and outside the African continent. This is nothing new in the long history of Africa’s experience with the outside world. Before the imposition of Islam, Christianity and colonial rule the peoples of Africa had peacefully co-existed with sojourners from afar doing lucrative trade with their African entrepreneurs based on mutual respect and dignity. Today, changing paradigm of co-operation, development and diplomacy, and prevailing global advocacy characterised by a subtle network of actors shaping political and economic policy outcomes makes it imperative for African leaders to seek a coherent, unifying framework for engaging the rest of the world. Africa has always posses the unique
capability of interaction and co-existence with others in the past. The onslaught by outsiders on African lands, the main life-wire of the African extended family system, moved the prior peaceful relationship away from co-operation to confrontation and at times war in the period prior to the dawn of independence.

Another pertinent issue that has rallied African leaders towards integration is the prevalence of insecurity that has engulfed African states from Senegal to Somalia and from Cairo to the Cape. Internecine ethnic conflicts, economic marginalisation and despondency, disgruntled and frustrated youth, elite discontent, dissent and fatal power struggle, institutionalised corruption, cross-border arms trafficking have combined to produce insecurity at both micro and macro levels. Hence, regional integration fostered by constitutionalism and the rule of law, justice and respect for human and minority rights would go a long way to create efficient framework for conflict prevention and peace building, restore peace and security, which would provide the requisite conditions for economic growth and development, all things being equal.27 As pointed out earlier on, the urgency for security matters on the African continent has committed its leaders to form linkages in that realm that led to the establishment of The African leadership Forum, formed in May 1991. Prioritisation of security by the forum resulted in the establishment of a Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-operation in Africa (CSSDCA). Its first Ministerial Meeting was adopted by the OAU in Abuja from 8-9 May 2000, acknowledging the crucial need for integrating CSSDCA with the broader OAU/AEC framework.28 Up to now the greater part of the debate about moving Africa out of her current situation had concentrated on alleviation of poverty, as if poverty-free societies are not conflict prone. In order to avoid the temptation of putting the cart before the horse, current efforts must engage the precarious issue of conflict across Africa to create a sound and peaceful environment for economic development and poverty eradication. It is in this light that intellectual focus should be channelled towards enlightening ordinary Africans about the creeping dangers of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism, ethnic animosity and antagonisms and the at times senseless elite power struggle that had in the past most often ended up in civil strife and ethnic war with huge human and economic consequences. That apart, political integration would galvanised African states to adopt a common foreign and security policy that would enable the continent wrestle its place in global and international politics, as well as provide the requisite conditions for the collective African leadership to come to grips with prevailing conflict situations on the continent.

The causes of conflicts in Africa are also inherently connected with economic marginalisation, exclusions and deprivations of all forms unwittingly or unwittingly engineered by national governments. Amidst scarce natural and economic resources disadvantaged groups then begin to compete and at times fight for their share of those resources, especially in cases where ownership of natural resources is territorially and culturally linked to the existence of a particular cultural and identity group. Even beyond that point, identity groups which suffers long decades of exclusions would one day rise up against the system in order to seek redress for restoring their human dignity. The demands of the rebel group in the Ivorian crisis fits just in this perspective. They are seeking not just power, but raising the plight of millions of Ivorians in the north of the country to the attention of the international community. The crisis is the results of decades of politics of exclusion and marginalisation grounded in ethnicity and religion. In this light, an African Economic Community pursued through a just social and economic policy would improve standard of living of most people and also reduce the level of insecurity and distrust among competing social groups and prop up the position of African states in the international economy in particular and globalisation as a whole.
However, it is also the results of the enormous challenges and risks that globalisation in all its manifestations has produced that Africans have awakened to the need for a political and economic framework that would enable Africa to think regional, but speak and act globally. The issues in international politics have metamorphosed so greatly to produce outcomes that no one African country, small or big or even a sub-region could single handed master. The issues may range from a common trade policy vis-à-vis other regions and institutions, such as, the EU and the World Trade Organisation respectively, ecological safety, human rights, crisis intervention, combating the HIV/Aids pandemic and gender issues. Even beyond providing capacities to cope with challenging global issues, the African process, as had been indicated, captures not just state institutions, but the well being of society in all its facets.

The relevance, and for that matter, the litmus test of integration is the ability of pursued policies to trickle-down to society at large. This is perhaps what the OAU Secretariat had in mind when it convened the civil society conference in June 2001, in Addis Ababa. The improvement of social and working conditions in individual sovereign states would in turn create conditions for unity, cohesion and unimpeded social mobility. Free movement of people, goods and services across culturally divergent territories would equally facilitate inter-territorial dialogue and co-operation. This would in one way or the other minimise the 'us' and 'them' dichotomies that have slowly eaten into the canker and fabric of most African societies. These noble objectives that are associated with inter-state co-operation and integration are not easily realisable, especially under circumstances and conditions such as exists in Africa.

Caught between Afro-optimism and pessimism, young Africans today would like to ask themselves, how their leaders are going to make the tortuous journey towards integration. Under what conditions and with what strategies are they going to see the light at the end of the seemingly unending tunnel? Who is doing what, when and how? Indeed, who is going to make things happen the way it should be and for that matter it must be. The statistics and other empirical confirmations make the debate critical, divisive and even at times confrontational and emotional.

Considering the size of Africa and its 10% share of global population the continent has fared dismally in global trade and finance. The continents’ share of global trade in the year 2000 for example was 1% having decline from 3.5% in 1980 and 2.7% in 1990. Global Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flows to the continent fell to its lowest level in the 1990s reaching 1% by the turn of 2000. Poor domestic macroeconomic policies, high inflation, poor capital and factor mobility, poor infrastructure, small size of internal markets, high cost of transportation, non-transparent judicial systems and political instability have combined to make Africa unattractive for foreign investors. The figures from the 2000 UNDP Human Development Report do not print any positive image of the economic status and standard of living of most African states. Thirty-four of the Forty-nine countries currently classified as least developed in the world and all but six of the thirty five countries in the low human development category are in Africa. The situation has not change in subsequent publications. The ever-increasing debt burden of African States has put a tight grip on economic and social development programmes. Political corruption has become part and parcel of almost every governing body in the continent. Democratisation processes are elitist-engineered and ethno-strategically driven such that we have at times democratisation without genuine democratic change of power. Also, of the fifty three sovereign states in the continent approximately seven of them are involved in ‘open’ conflict in one form or the other, be it ethnic conflict, secessionists movements, rebel insurgencies, religious strife, violent local chieftaincy/Kingship and land disputes, or the state is thriving on shaky peace deals etc. Western Sahara, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Burundi, Somalia, The
Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, the Ivory Coast, Northern Nigeria, Angola, Uganda are all factual confirmations of insecurity in the continent. By the end of the last millennium disease and poverty have achieved convergency in Africa. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is destroying not just the continents productive forces, but is also uprooting the foundations of affected families the most immediate institution of any nation. The combined effects of poverty, increasing population unaccompanied by agricultural production, increasing desertification, diminishing resources have also laid their toll on Africa's ecological system. The situation is even exacerbated by unscrupulous investors capitalising on weakened bargaining position of some governments by using their host countries as pollution save havens thus worsening an already fragile eco-system. Criss-cross the continent the effects of illiteracy, ignorance and resignation have permeated not just society, but also the political apparatus in the sense that any sound system of governance requires an educated and enlightened citizens. In the absence of this some young democracies in Africa still remains to be elitist and not broadly based.

Under the above circumstances, how do African leaders deal with the problem of awareness and solidarity about ongoing political project? The essence of education cannot be overlooked in any integration process anywhere, irrespective of the level of development of the region. When one of the founding fathers of the EU, Jean Monnet, a French political economist was asked what would be his starting point for establishment of the EU when given the chance once again he replied, „education“. It is indeed, needless to say, the life wire of any country's human development. The centrality of education for one of the architects of European integration was based on his conviction that the forces that will finally move and shape the course of any integration process are without doubt social in kind and not necessarily the inter-governmental interactions which seem to overshadow the influence of that latent force. To this effect one of his popular epigrams goes „Nous ne coalisons pas les états, nous unisons des hommes“ 31 But what kind of education does Africa need to enable her foster a common identity and unity among her citizens apart from developing the continent’s human resource base? Would governments be willing to commit themselves to the financial support for educational campaign for awareness among the African peoples as to what the integration process entails? And even then since actors involved in the transformation and integration process are many and varied, how are African leaders going to put across their agenda to the international community, especially private investors, since Africa's image has of late not been conducive for most investors, donors and other international actors alike? And given Africa’s low level of science and technology and innovation, who is going to bear the huge cost of building Africa’s capacity in that realm? And finally, is the proliferation of actors in the transformation process in the end going to compromise a genuine Pan-African identity?

That the players are many in Africa's integration process is also a fact in itself given the long history of the African crisis and its attendant external interventions. The trajectory of external actors has its roots in the long history of contact with colonialism and the Cold War super-power politics, the interventions of the Bretton Woods Institutions and private donors, the surge in non-governmental humanitarian activities and the increasing role of the UN-system and its agencies. Internally, the failure of the post-colonial state to live up to its task have encouraged civil society such as private organisations and churches to get involve in developmental efforts in the fight against poverty and ‘underdevelopment’. The proliferation of participating actors in the African process leaves one to question with caution whether they would be able to co-ordinate their activities and share information in order to achieve qualitative and sustainable development for the recipient countries. This is because the total struggle by African states is also a struggle for eradicating underdevelopment that had been bequeathed to
Africa through colonialism which left in its trails mass poverty, illiteracy and exploitative and unequal trade relations with Africa. No wonder, the intellectual movements of the post-war period set its energies and time on revealing the effects of dependence and exploitation that had been instituted in the world capitalist system to the disadvantage of the periphery. The reasons for the presence of multiple actors in Africa are not far-fetched.

Firstly, the role of former colonial powers in pauperising and marginalizing the periphery set in motion clarion-calls in the 1960s by the former colonies to redress their lopsided relationship in trade and investment as it became increasingly evident through the development/underdevelopment debate championed by the Dependency School of thought. Though this school has 'lost' some of its main academic and intellectual force and conviction, it was through its explanatory tools, namely the centre-periphery economic and political interaction that revealed the complex process of expropriation, exploitation and accumulation to benefit the centre and sectional interests in the periphery. In response to that economic aid and other forms of supports from the former colonial powers were then seen as a moral palliative to the economic plight of the periphery. Aid therefore established the grounds for relations with the former colonies, which even at times were used to influence their behaviour. A clearer example of this form of assistance is the European Union’s controversial Preferential Trade Agreement (PTA) with its former colonies in Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific regarding stabilisation of exports receipts on wide range of agricultural products, thus creating conditions for the former’s sustained engagement in the ex-colonial territories.

Secondly, superpower Cold War rivalry in Africa also paved the way for ideological patronage, thus implanting closer co-operation between some African countries and their Cold War allies. The vestiges of those ties between the US and some African countries have existed till today. Egypt, South Africa, Senegal have maintained a sustained co-operation with the US, with Egypt still the largest recipient of American aid in Africa. It must however, be emphasised that American foreign policy did maintain irregular pattern of aid pinned on its Cold War geo-strategic and political interests. In the broader sense however, the carrot and stick tactic saw its hey days in Africa during that period. In the post-Cold War era the US engagement in Africa has been juxtaposed on individual African countries commitment to the liberal democratic tradition constituted on the principles of human rights, minority rights protection, respect of individual liberty and the rule of law. Despite Russia’s ideological bankruptcy and weak economic edge, it still maintains trade, technical and cultural ties with most African states.

Thirdly, the end of the Second World War witnessed the establishment of the Bretton Wood institutions specially designed for reconstruction and stabilisation of the world economy, especially in Western Europe and Japan. From the 1950s onwards the World Bank Group, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have become actively involved in the developing world economies due to the increasing conviction that the economic crisis and slow growth in the Third World is inextricably interwoven with economic growth and prosperity in the industrialised countries. In this direction the World Bank had by the end of the 1960s become actively involved in Third World economic issues such as poverty eradication, human needs approach to development and human resource development. Despite its controversial programmes and the dominant role of the US in its decisions, the IMF still remains the lender of last resort for most cash-strapped economies in Africa and the rest of the developing world. The winds of reforms during the epochenbruch in 1989 have included IMF Structural Adjustment Policies (SAP)
and the prevailing strategy for poverty reduction for Highly Indebted Poorest Countries (HIPC), including strict macroeconomic policy and fiscal discipline. The IMF’s engagement in the Third World represents a major shift in its policy content as a traditional international monetary stabilisation institution and manager of balance-of-payment crisis. It is by these interventions since the past three decades that the sister institutions have become ‘partners’ in development in Africa and elsewhere, though not always wholehearted in the eyes of recipient countries.

In addition, for reasons known to be the failure of most African states to deliver the public good and the inability of those states to empower civil society and develop a civic democratic culture, private and Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) were seen by the developed world and other private donors as the efficient channel for reaching the poor and the needy. By their supposedly non-political approach to problem solving, they are comparatively quite able to promote trans-national interactions and economic and technological development. At the end of the Cold War they have become watchdogs against human rights abuses and other forms of injustices in their locations of activity. But this act of bypassing the state is not without frictions and controversies. Political elites in most African countries perceive this as usurping the power and authority of the state and worse of all, undermining its political unity, loyalty of the people, as well as eroding its ethical role. The most worrisome of all is that political elites are increasingly becoming irritated by the astronomical increase in the financial budgets of some NGOs, which amount to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of some smaller states. A significant number of states have even taken farther steps to control the activities of NGOs in as far as those organisations ability to reach civil society with swift and efficiency threatens the very survival of the state in an already fragile situation. Such state actions have most of the time been explained as an attempt to co-ordinate the often chaotic, uncoordinated and duplicated NGOs activities, so as to circumvent dissipation of resources and time.

Lastly, the United Nations and its agencies have a long history of economic, social, educational and cultural co-operation with member states and regions as stipulated in the Charter under its relations with regional arrangements. On the African continent the last decade has witnessed increased commitment and vigour to regional integration by the UN and its agencies under the auspices of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). At the helm of UN efforts at the regional level in this direction is the Economic Commission of Africa (ECA), supplemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environmental Programme, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and specialised agencies such as the World Health Organisation (WHO), International Labour Organisation (ILO) and United Nations Educational, Scientific Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). To bolster sub-regional co-operation, the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) has established Sub-regional Economic Councils in all sub-regions on the continent with the common objective of promoting regional integration and strengthening the already existing sub-regional economic communities. The overall policy in this regard is an integrated United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa (UN-NADAF), which is under the joint responsibility of the Office of the Special Co-ordinator for Africa and the least developed Countries (OSCAL), the ECA, and the Department of Public Administration (DPI)/Africa Recovery Unit. The UN-NADAF implementation duties falls under the administrative umbrella of the UN System-wide Special Initiative for Africa (UNSIA) 32. In furtherance of the above objectives the UN under the auspices of UNECA boosted African efforts by organising the Millennium Partnership for the African Recovery Programme (MAP) whereby the UN and African states committed themselves to peace, security, governance, investment, export promotion and
diversification and developing financing mechanisms to cater for the New African Initiative\textsuperscript{31}

In a more ambitious programme the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in particular has gone a long way to propel African decision-makers and policymakers to work in partnership with willing global actors in the areas of poverty reduction, improving education and enhancing environmental sustainability. All these goals chime with Africa's internal initiatives set within NePAD and the broader integration framework adopted by the African Union. The goals set in the MDGs are depicted as follows.

**Figure 2: Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals and Targets of the Declaration</th>
<th>Indicators for Monitoring Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal 1: Eradicate extreme Poverty and Hunger** | 1. Proportion of population below $1 (PPP) per day  
2. Poverty gap ratio (incidence x depth of poverty)  
3. Share of poorest quintile in national consumption |
| **Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education** | 4. Prevalence of under weight children under-five years of age  
5. Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption  
6. Net enrolment ratio in primary education  
7. Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach grade 5  
8. Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds |
| **Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women** | 9. Ratios of girls to boys to in primary, secondary and tertiary education  
10. Ratio of literate females to males of 15-24 year-olds  
11. Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector  
12. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament |
| **Goal 4: Reduce child mortality** | 13. Under-five mortality rate  
14. Infant mortality rate  
15. Proportion of 1 year-old children immunised against measles |
| **Goal 5: Improve maternal health** | 16. Maternal mortality ratio  
17. Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel |
| **Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases** | 18. HIV prevalence among 15-24 year old pregnant women  
19. Condom use rate of the contraceptive prevalence rate  
20. Number of children orphaned by HIV / AIDS  
21. Prevalence and death rates associated with malaria  
22. Proportion of population in malaria risk area using effective malaria prevention and treatment measures |
| 23. Prevalence and death rates associated with tuberculosis |
| 24. Proportion of tuberculosis cases detected and cured under directly observed treatment short course (DOTS) |
| 25. Proportion of land area covered by forest |
| 26. Ratio of area protected to maintain biological diversity to surface area |
| 27. Energy use (metric ton oil equivalent) per $1 GDP (PPP) |
| 28. Carbon dioxide emissions (per capita) and consumption of ozone-depleting CFCs (ODP tons) |
| 29. Proportion of population using fuels |
| 30. Proportion of population with sustainable access to safe drinking water |
| 31. Proportion of urban population with improved sanitation |
| 32. Proportion of households with access to secure tenure (owned or rented) |
| 33. Net ODA, total to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/DAC donors’ gross national income |
| 34. Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation) |
| 35. Proportion of bilateral ODA of OECD/DAC donors that is untied |
| 36. ODA received in landlocked countries as proportion of their GNIs |
| 37. ODA received in small island developing States as proportion of their GNIs |
| 38. Proportion of total developed country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and LDCs, admitted free of duties |
| 39. Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries. |
| 40. Agricultural support estimate for OECD countries as percentage of their GDP |
| 41. Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity |
| 42. Total number of countries that have reached their HIPC decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative) |
| 43. Debt relief committed under HIPC initiative, US$ |
| 44. Debt service as a percentage of exports of goods and services |

### Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability

#### Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.

Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction - both nationally and internationally

#### Target 10: Halve by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water

#### Target 11: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

### Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

#### Target 12: Develop further an open, rule-based, and predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system

Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction - both nationally and internationally

#### Target 13: Address the special needs of the least developed countries

Includes: tariff and quota free access for least developed countries’ exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction

#### Target 14: Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states

(Through the programme of action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly)

#### Target 15: Deal comprehensively with the debt problem of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term

Some of the indicators listed below are monitored separately for the least developed countries (LDCs), Africa, landlocked countries and small island developing States

#### Official development assistance

33. Net ODA, total to LDCs, as percentage of OECD/DAC donors’ gross national income

34. Proportion of total bilateral, sector-allocable ODA of OECD/DAC donors to basic social services (basic education, primary health care, nutrition, safe water and sanitation)

35. Proportion of bilateral ODA of OECD/DAC donors that is untied

36. ODA received in landlocked countries as proportion of their GNIs

37. ODA received in small island developing States as proportion of their GNIs

#### Market access

38. Proportion of total developed country imports (by value and excluding arms) from developing countries and LDCs, admitted free of duties

39. Average tariffs imposed by developed countries on agricultural products and textiles and clothing from developing countries.

40. Agricultural support estimate for OECD countries as percentage of their GDP

41. Proportion of ODA provided to help build trade capacity

#### Debt sustainability

42. Total number of countries that have reached their HIPC decision points and number that have reached their HIPC completion points (cumulative)

43. Debt relief committed under HIPC initiative, US$
| Target 16: | In co-operation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth |
| Target 17: | In co-operation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries |
| Target 18: | In co-operation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication. |
| 45. | Unemployment rate of 15-24 year-olds, each sex and total |
| 46. | Proportion of population with access to affordable essential drugs on a sustainable basis |
| 47. | Telephone lines and cellular subscribers per 100 population |
| 48. | Personal computers in use per 100 population and Internet users per 100 population |


But these efforts do not stand in a vacuum. Indeed they are backed by a plethora of policy documents such as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NePAD) endorsed by all fifty three African countries. NePAD is an integrated framework for achieving Africa’s vision in collaboration with her international partners in development. NePAD is an emerged acronym from policy engineering of an original policy document called the New African Initiative (NAI), adopted by the OAU Summit of Heads of State and Government on 11 July 2001. But as different leaders from differing corners of the continent had at the same time prepared similar policies with same orientation, scope, and objectives, it was considered practical to fuse their various ideas for a common African blueprint for development. Hence, as already noted the end result was a final policy document incorporating the ideas enshrined in the Millennium Partnership for Africa’s Recovery Programme (MAP) by the South African president, Thabo Mbeki, and the Omega Plan by President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal. NePAD finally emerge out of the OAU policy grid on 23 October 2001 after endorsement by the Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSIC). At the core of NePAD is fostering and sustaining a high level policy dialogue with African leaders and willing members of the international community committed to the African cause for poverty reduction and promoting economic development and growth to help close the increasing gap of inequality between Africa and the rest of the world through partnership, collaboration and fair trade rather than dependence and aid. At the global level NePAD is linked to several policy initiatives and processes such as the UN Millennium Declaration listed above, the G8 Okinawa Declaration, the Copenhagen Declaration, the Skagen Declaration, the Cotonou Agreement, the EU/Cairo Plan of Action, the Sino-Africa process etc. Japan has taken the lead to mobilise the donor community for a collective action to resuscitate Africa's economy by declaring the Tokyo Agenda for Action. This has resulted in a series of conferences dubbed the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD) I and II on December 3-4 2001. The conference envisaged $64bn of annual investment flows to the continent. But we should not lose sight of the fact that these new orientations in policy take place in a prevailing atmosphere of doubt and scepticism. At the time of campaigning to sell NePAD to the World Economic Forum, donors as well as the investor community, existing and festering events in Africa places heavy challenge on African leaders, especially South Africa’s President Mbeki who has become actively involved in the integration process. This is also logical considering South Africa’s global economic and political outreach. Those events include the Zimbabwean political and land reform crisis, the Congo crisis influenced by ethnicity and competition for natural resources (which attracted six countries to its fold) and wide spread corruption across the continent. Externally, a combination of perceived insecurity in the eyes of investors had an effect on investor confidence in Africa. The statistics provided by the African Development Bank in the realm of economic aid is also a pointer to the aggravating economic downturn in Africa. The total economic aid in
Africa in 1999 was $14.2 bn compared with $24.2bn a decade ago.\textsuperscript{34} The coalition of actors for Africa’s development has several implications.

It is not difficult to discern that the issue of external sources of finance has become the life-wire of the total transformation process, which makes its realisation a complex one indeed. Is external financial dependence going to dictate the pace of Africa’s transformation and integration processes? How committed is the donor community given the unpredicted and unstable nature of politics in many African states? The answers to these questions may not be far fetched. Given the high ratio of GNP allocated to debt servicing and trade deficits, Africa's debt burden has known to be one of the major constraints on economic and social development, hence the indispensability of FDI, Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) and aid flows to colossal number of countries in the continent. But the crucial issue at stake is how financial allocations to African states that are at incommensurable levels of economic development, as well as various stages of re-democratisation and democratic consolidation going to be carried out? It is in this regard that African leaders are obliged to do their homework in a speedy and co-ordinated manner. It must also be noted that Africa's financial predicament is not situational. It is rooted in the long and crooked history of its political economy.

Analysis of Africa’s political economy of underdevelopment/development has transformed itself from the radical structural theory of authors such as Walter Rodney’s work, on How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, the views of Amilca Cabral, and Andre Gunter Frank’s „The Development of Underdevelopment”, through to the liberal model assumptions and interpretations of authors such as Anthony T.K. Gadzey. Rodney’s interpretations explore how colonialism's use of brute force smothered pre-colonial states and economic structures. Conforming to Rodney's perspective, Cabral emphasises the imperialists highjacking of the historical process of the colonised territories thus breaking their autonomous and endogenous path of development. Frank converges on these views through Dependentist interpretation of the centre and periphery relationship to benefit sectional interest in both spaces, especially the former. Gadzey on the other hand, traces Africa's crisis, as predominantly the outcome of neglect of the continents development needs, the independence struggle, the leadership conundrum, and the neglect of „grassroots capitalist transformation” due to over centralisation.\textsuperscript{35} Gadzey's argument on over centralisation is correct, but there are instances of over centralised governments and economies that owe their economic prosperity rather to long periods of political stability and continuity enmeshed in a centralised political system. Asian economies such as, Singapore, China and Indonesia have exhibited high levels of centralisation of one form or the other without automatically jeopardising national economic and development programmes. Lack of continuity and stability in Africa had long manifested itself in precolonial Africa through expansionist policies of relatively powerful Kingdoms and Empires for territorial and mercantilists' purposes. The Ashanti, Fulani, Buganda, the Kongo kingdom and the Almoravids invasions of the Maghrib regions of North Africa are all cases in point.\textsuperscript{36} Colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialists designs, the effects of the Cold War have all had their toll on Africa's stability and continuity deadlock

Externally, the colonial interventions posed as the most destabilising force, which orchestrated and perpetrated a long period of instability and discontinuity in Africa. It is the lack of these two ingredients of stability and continuity that have undermined Africa's development and empowerment till the end of the Cold War. The missing link here is that the interpretations ignores the dynamics of pre-colonial political economy to enable us identify elements of discontinuities after that era that have hampered the continent's socio-economic and political development. Thus Africa's political economy
cannot be mono-causally explained (i.e. through the colonial-post-colonial nexus) unless a linkage is made to the political and economic underpinnings of pre-colonial Africa and contemporary Africa. But the argument does not rest on who does what in a particular era, but the nature of the economic system that emerged and sustained itself or remained to be distorted and abandoned. In this sense it would be unhelpful to concentrate on actors alone without fathoming the mode of organisation and production, accumulation of capital, investment, as well as political culture, of which stability, continuity and peaceful change may be crucial factors. This does not amount to harbouring any over ambitious plans to solve all the nagging questions of the pre-colonial era, including the controversial issue regarding the mode of production, but to throw light on the state of the debate. It is only then insights could be drawn to straighten the complex contours of African political and economic development.

Hence the question could justifiably be asked, why despite the application of the liberal model in trade transactions, labour organisation and capital accumulation during the colonial period Africa failed to live up to the capitalist creed? And what prevented post-colonial Africa from at least approximating to a capitalist system of production after almost five active decades of exposure and contact? The more intriguing and may be the compelling question relate to the failure of the alliance between foreign capital, local capitalist classes, organised labour, and the state to forge a comprehensible development oriented system of production. The essence of any enquiry of this sort emanates from the fact that there is still an on-going debate as to the ideal form of economic foundation on which Africa's development should be based given the fact that most economic activities in the continent are predominantly rural with low capital base.

But the economic foundation of any society is also pivoted on the socio-politico system and how it relates to it. This issue constitutes a major strand of argument as to the role that governance plays in the developmental process of a nation. In the case of Africa, the political landscape from the pre-colonial period to the end of the Cold War has always exhibited forms of exclusions and extreme centralisation that have been detrimental to an autonomous and endogenous economic development. The greater part of large scale inter-African mercantilist activities before the advent of Europeans was restricted to Kingdoms and dominions that controlled and regulated trade and investment. Under colonialism trade was directed to the metropolis while colonial territories remained suppliers of raw materials and labour. Under post-colonialism the state system had become the main engine of development and growth, sidelining private initiatives and ventures. Externally, the intervention of outside forces symbolised in colonialism acted to deepen the already existing fragile socio-politico relations among Africa's diverse group identities, and finally distorted them. The scramble for, and partition of Africa terminated prevailing expansion of empires, kingdoms and other political entities from achieving territorial-wide political organisation which would have strengthened Africa's position to gradually achieve congruency in common values, norms and ideology for internal development and enhance its capacity for external bargaining and negotiation. Notable are the Tukulor, Samori's, Ashanti, Fulani, Maravi, Sokoto, Luba Empires, Kingdoms of Dahomey, Buganda and a plethora of political entities and principalities such as Fula, Fon and Yoruba, Kanem-Borno, Kordofan, Bakongo, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Egypt, etc. Since this period however, Africa's political economy has undergone greater changes in the form of neo-colonialism, dependency, globalisation and the ever-widening digital divide between Africa and the rest of the world.

It is because of the complex nature of the transformations that have taken place in Africa's political economy since its exposure to outsiders and the legacies they left on Africa that current analysis needs to link and trace Africa's political economy from its
historical foundation in order to draw plausible conclusions on current socio-economic and political transformation and integration taking place in Africa today. Hence, Part I of this work (the periphery cannot hold) has been partly committed to this purpose.

Part II will focus on economic and political developments in Africa prior to the emergence of the OAU manifested in the Pan-African vision at the dawn of political independence from colonial rule. The early nineteen sixties were turbulent years in African political history. Indeed, it was a period of decision for Africa. African Leaders who were fearful of a new Africa slipping into Balkanisation and fragmentation from within and without advocated a Union Government of Africa as the only solution to the continent's fragile socio-economic and political conditions.

During that period, on one hand, the Cold War had then gained momentum, apartheid had been intensified through new segregation laws than ever before, and the Algerian war had escalated beyond control, plural nationalities and territories waited with a growing sense of anxiety as to how political boundaries were to be drawn. Those anxieties were justified given the fact that territories such as Somaliland had been divided and ruled under British, French and Italian colonial administrations, there were Masai also demarcated between Kenya and Tanganyika,38 the Ewes in West Africa were cut up into three territories under French, German, and British rule namely, Ghana, Togoland and Dahomey (Benin), portion of the Akan enclaves (Sanwhi) in Ghana were politically dislocated in the Ivory Coast etc. The Great Lakes region, covering (Belgian) Congo, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, as well as other turbulent spots such as Nigeria and Sudan were all conceived candidates for potentially dangerous ethnic, religious and antagonistic political dichotomies. But history seems to have proven sceptics wrong. Despite its numerous political borders, Africa's colonial political demarcations have not produced the scale of possible worst-case scenarios that overburdened Africa's political thought at the dawn of political independence. Low-level border crisis did resurface, however. Ghana-Ivory Coast, Nigeria-Cameroon, and Ethiopia and Somalia over Ogaden, and Ethiopia-Eritrea border disputes, the Western Sahara are all contemporary examples. The spectre of ethnicity that dominated political and social discourses during that time did not produced the conjectured outcomes (massive ethnic mobilisation) but rather resurfaced as a political resource, especially during periods of elite's frustration and insecurity. Furthermore, the metropolitan colonial powers had no timetable for the thorny issue on settler colonies, such as, Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe), Namibia, and a huge uncertainty loomed over the fate of Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau where the iron hand of colonialism had shown no signs of compromise.

On the other hand, independence for the bulk of African countries was a virtual reality. Criss-cross the continent there was a wind of optimism that with the will and commitment of those nations, which had achieved independence, the wave of freedom will gradually creep into the rest of Africa. Today, disillusionment and disappointment have taken the seat of that optimism. African leaders were increasingly becoming conscious of issues of identity, power and sovereignty. The Francophone-Anglophone dichotomy also ate cancerously into the fabric of the political leadership in contrast to the Pan-African spirit that had greed and propelled the independence movement to that stage. The formation of the OAU was in one sense a modus vivendi of the political wrestling that besieged Africa at the dawn of political independence.

What is Pan-Africanism about and why had it failed as the vehicle for African emancipation and development? Have the last four decades and its attendant crisis brought the OAU to political and moral „bankruptcy”39? Is the ongoing ‘U’ turning a face-saving manoeuvre, and a bid to attract foreign aid that has been subject to critical review after the Cold War? What role are the politics of identity and the perturbing issue
of sovereignty going to play in the transformation process? In all, how effective did the OAU respond to major crisis within its jurisdiction in Africa? Did it live up to expectation on the Polisario, Chad-Libya, South Africa crisis and other issues of conflict resolution in Africa such as Liberia and Sierra Leone, and the DRC? What did the OAU do to diffuse tension in the fourth Congo crisis where a six-nation war loomed on the head of Africa? These and other probing questions would be investigated and evaluated in order to make valuable judgements about the path that the current leadership, and for that matter Africa has taken toward economic and social improvement. This is because transformations require relative degree of recovery for a take-off to enhance sustained development, which fact scarcely prevailed in the continent by the end of the Cold War in 1989.

In Part III a concise historical review of key developments in the Cold War era that militated against African unity and thereby negatively influenced its socio-economic and political development would be tackled. Beyond that era, and within the framework of the changes that had taken place in the world in general and Africa in particular - the main political dynamics of the transformation process, the Constitutive Act of the AU, NePAD, relations between the Sub-regional economic groupings and regional institutions, and the effects of globalisation on current endeavours may require in-depth discussion and analysis.

During the Cold War the super-power ideological rivalry produced outcomes that were inimical to domestic stability and continuity. Internally it resulted in polemic elite interactions reflecting external loyalties to either one of the ideological blocks. Non-alignment failed to deliver optimum results for Africa despite its popularisation among African leaders. Even the attempt by some African leaders purporting to shape their own versions of Afro-socialism did not fail to warrant perceived threats in the eyes of the other ideological adversaries. Nkrumah of Ghana, Sekou Touré of Guinea, Samora Machel of Mozambique, Eduardo Dos Santos of Angola, all failed in their own versions of socialists and Marxists experiments not principally because of its internal inherent weaknesses, but the real threat they were perceived to have posed to the liberal democratic creed. Time, energies and resources were sapped in favour of proxy wars in Africa during the Cold War. Coups and counter-coups orchestrated and at times financed through the ideological purses or through proxies became the order of the day. Violent change of governments and acts of destabilisation in Africa became synonymous with abrupt abandonment of development programmes. The general insecurity that engulfed some rulers made them lose their conscience by taking hostage their nation's wealth. Corruption pervaded the very fabric of societies without the least sense of accountability in so far as the ruler was capable of hanging on to political power through super-power economic and military aid, including financial benefits for co-opting internal opposing and dissenting voices.

The end results of ideological rivalry coupled with ideologically laden development aid was political inaction on the part of ruling elites in Africa. The Cold War period (1947-89) will without least doubt enter Africa's domestic political history as the most fecund period for grooming dictators and for that matter destroying Good Governance and democratic development and promoting human rights abuses which the West claims to stand for. One reason was that a dictator or a rebel leader could be tolerated as long as he conforms to either one of the ideological credos. Presidents Mobutu Sese Seko of former Zaire, and Jonas Savimbi of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), a rebel movement in Angola, were staunch allies of the West without necessarily upholding the tenets of Western liberal democracy. Savimbi once had a red carpet reception in 1986 at the White House when former President Ronald Reagan welcomed him and praised his efforts in the fight against the evil empire of
communism. At the same time communist support for the ruling MPLA government under Eduardo Dos Santos resulted in stationing about 40,000 strong Cuban troops on Angolan soil to offset rebel infiltration and secure communism. In its four decades of pre-eminence and predominance in Africa the Cold War period was guided by the old dictum „the enemy of my enemy is my friend” that was grounded in proxy and covert actions of the leading powers, only to produce disastrous consequences for Africa. In another vein, a large number of countries were sympathetic towards socialist’s ideology only as admirers of that ideology and not genuine practitioners so long as they did not exercise the capacity and self-sufficiency over factors of production.

When the Cold War finally came to an end that turbulent period of African politics was put into disarray with overwhelming consequences as the withdrawal of the superpowers left in its trail power vacuum, which had to be filled-up. However, in some of the most vulnerable and fragile states „the devolution of state power led to collapse, fragmentation and violence”. In general, apartheid cracked, crumbled and in the mid 1990s finally dismantled. Indeed, a long dream had been fulfilled. Majority of South Africans could vote after four hundred years of being denied the ballot box. If South Africa had been a dream come true, Liberia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia have been the continent’s nightmares during the last decade with the Democratic Republic of the Congo still looming as a political time bomb. Yes indeed, the end of the Cold War has seen winners and losers, but too many casualties bed ridden with protracted civil wars which are challenging not just the stability of these countries and the region but also global security and stability as well.

The transition from the Cold War to democratic governance was smooth than had been expected, not because African elites wholeheartedly embraced democracy but principally because for the first time the carrot and the stick were combined by leading Western countries to produce intended positive outcomes that were in the interest of the ruled in Africa. Development aid that had been given to leaders on ideological basis now was eligible only on the basis of the recipients democratic and human rights performance. During the post-Cold War era new thinking championed by grassroots movements for human rights and democracy were emerging that places the individual at the centre of development and not the state. In the policy realm there was a new realism that had contributed to important linkages between human rights, democracy and development. It is in this connection that the Cold War remains one of the causes of instability in Africa. The process of democratic empowerment was, however, accelerated by the long struggle by internal forces for democratic change all over Africa.

The political inaction produced by the Cold War can be substantiated by the following argument. By the formation of the OAU the defeat of supranationalism meant that the Heads of state and Government had then accepted the Sub-regional Regional Economic Communities (SRECs) as the main engines for political and economic integration of the continent. But what happened after the formation of the OAU in 1963? Regional integration experiments boomed and slackened. It took some regions fifteen years (ECOWAS) to get their acts together. Some sub-regions established their economic communities only for it to be abandoned (East African Community - 1967-77, reborn in 2001). The Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) that was formally ushered in April 1980 was downsized to a political bulwark against apartheid in the height of the Cold War only to be re-packaged and renamed the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Some remained a mere paper work to reflect economic-politico agenda of the OAU Charter for the establishment of the SRECs (Arab Maghreb Union). The Customs and Economic Union of Central Africa founded in 1966 and later reconstituted to join the establishment of the Economic Community of the States of Central Africa (CEEAC) are examples of abortive attempts
at integration in Africa. And the most disappointing of all there were no strategies for co-ordination and harmonisation of policies among them as can be seen in the Charter of the OAU.

The Cold War alliances tamed the course of politics in Africa creating dependencies and loyalties while smothering autonomous drives for genuine sub-regional co-operation. It is therefore not surprising that concrete policies for serious and committed co-operation and integration by the OAU have only taken place in the post-Cold War era - the adoption of the 1990 Declaration on the Socio-Economic Situation in Africa and the Fundamental Changes Taking Place in the World, the 1991 Abuja Treaty on the establishment of the African Economic Community, and the 1993 Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, needless to say, are all products of the post-Cold War era. An era characterised by drive for democracy and the rule of law.

The rapid wave of democratisation in the early 1990s in Africa was not without problems. Like the colonial transitions of the 1960s most states were ill prepared. Some had enjoyed long periods of dictatorships, institutions for market reforms were inadequate, and in some cases states were inexperienced to the task. In the political realm, established power configurations were unwilling to be inclusive by embracing those groups which either because of their different political ideology or ethnic affiliations had been at the fringes of national politics for several decades. In Nigeria, for example, dictatorship went on course to defy international pressure until the controversial death of its final architect, Gen. Sanni Abacha. In Mobutu's former Zaire, Kenya, Ethiopia, Somalia, Togo, Liberia and Sierra Leone where dictators had shunned political and economic reforms, the transition to democracy opened the floodgate for resistance, instability, war and general insecurity, thus undermining legitimacy of the states, freedom and sovereignty of the people, the very core ingredients of democratic culture.

Such is the challenge facing Africa in the post-Cold War era: - the dire need for sound economic, social and political reforms to put Africa on the path of recovery. It is only a fully recovered continent from the wrath of dictatorship, economic malaise, violent political conflicts, poverty and disease that would enable peaceful transformation and integration across the length and breadth of the continent to enhance Africa's capacity to reap her share of global wealth. This is no easy task!

The gigantic task ahead for African leaders would require vision, bravery, imagination, determination, and above all, the political will and men of innovation and action, to enable them go beyond the frontiers of political rhetoric and annual summitry rituals that have infested diplomacy on the African continent. With that colossal sum of Africa's population bereft of hope and dignity, coupled with increasing awareness among civil society, elite's performance will be judged and evaluated not on the basis of ethnic affiliations, corporate interests and associations, but efficiency and performance grounded in the ability to deliver the public goods. It is this and other challenging duties that have strongly pressured the current leadership to find enduring solutions to Africa's centuries long underdevelopment, marginalisation and poverty.

Given the role being played by various international actors in ongoing processes in the continent, Part IV would be assigned for surveying the profile and strategies of global key global actors such as, the Bretton Woods sister institutions, the United Nations the EU, the G8 and the large presence of proliferate Non-governmental Organisations. The investigative point here is to find out whether their roles in the African transformation and integration processes are overshadowing the authority and power of the African states, their national independence and sovereignty.

And emanating from that constellation of actors in a global context is the observation that some of the explanations for policy failure in Africa are externally
induced. There had been failure by African leaders to appreciate and grasp the realities and risks involved in engaging global actors, including the harsh international economic environment. Part V would therefore explore the continent's policy infrastructure, delineate and analyse some key policy documents on African integration endeavour since the early 1980s while attempting to reveal risks and uncertainties associated with making policy commitments under harsh international economic environment. In the context of risks and uncertainties are there any likely impulses for moving the African initiative forward?

What then are the main political dynamics of the heating momentum towards integration in Africa? Is the pressure for catching up in the globalisation race the suspect? One common strand in the processes that were set in within the African continent at the end of the Cold War was the incredible hope and optimism expressed by the ordinary peoples reminiscent of the independence era. Over forty years later Africans have still not seen the fruits of their freedom, casting doubt about the role of national leadership in the African struggle for development. Hence for the new cream of leadership on the continent one of the main pressures for action apart from the one from outside is the unprecedented awareness about holding power and the attendant responsibility for delivering public goods, be it at the national, sub-regional or regional level. In this way, the crisis that had bedevilled Africa now constitutes the main catalyst for speeding up a rescue plan for the continent in a new century. In addition, the imposition of political conditionalities and other forms of standards on the leadership has created competitiveness among the African leadership regarding their striving for scarce resources from the donor community. In this light it can be argued safely that the main dynamics of the African process are from within as well as from without the continent.

But observers of the transformation process are likely to be sensitive not to the economic and social aspects of it but the political component of it since lessons from history may guide their judgement. The second half of the last century has taught us the possible results of ill-conceived strategies for integration. The bitter memories of the Nigerian federal ambitions and the outbreak of civil war, as well as national antagonisms that emanated from the defunct East African Community bears testimony to this case. The failure of these attempts was, among other factors, the results of complex political conditions existing in the newly independent states and territories. Although African politics has gone a distance from there, and lessons might have been learnt, the calibre of politics and political systems of some African countries leaves much to be desired. Even where democratic rule has been confessed, constitutional dictatorships and forms of emergency rule seem to be the order of the day (Moi’s Kenya, Mugabe’s Zimbabwe and Eyadema’s Togo). Hence at the national level the political will to be responsible, accountable and transparent does not exist to shore up support for continental projects. It is these fundamental questions of the nature of politics, leadership, as well as close identification with the people that would measure the capacity to deal with larger political issues such as national interests and balance of power (in bargaining and negotiations), cultural and identity issues, economic disparities, in order to facilitate search for common political grounds for common action in global politics. Theoretically this has been the objective of the Pan-African dream, which the OAU had half-heartedly approached during the last four decades without success, despite intensive and consistent inter-governmental dialogue. In brief, this abortive attempt is the results of politics devoid of the corresponding will for action.

Based on that dismal record in the past, are the OAU member states now scratching behind their rhetoric of the immediate past century, or they are once again in the limelight to play rhetoric with the lives, dignity and future of over 600 million people?
The wind of change after the Cold War went beyond the state system to affect regional institutions, which fact compelled the OAU to succumb to reforms and adopt realistic measures to reflect national and continental aspirations of the member states. Events of the last decade or so including lessons drawn from the West African sub-region manifested in the long civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone, combined with tragic events in Rwanda and Burundi, through to the debacle in Somalia, had bludgeoned the OAU to re-examine its policies in the area of conflict and resolution. Thus during the 29th Ordinary Session of the OAU in Cairo, Egypt in June 1993, the Heads of States and Government unanimously supported the Secretary General’s proposal for the establishment of the Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution (MCPMR) and an African Crisis Response Initiative (ACRI), the latter with active support of the United States and the former with European support. These initiatives were not new to the OAU. It had known them for four decades, but had also ignored them for same period of time. Crisis response or intervention force was advocated in the 1960s by the first President of Ghana in the form of an African High Command to deal with regions of fissiparous and instrumentalist ethnic nationalism and tensions that could jeopardise the unity and coherence of the newly post-colonial states and their attempts at nation-building.

At this juncture, what has propelled the OAU to discard the four decades old Charter that had governed the organisation's inter-state relations and diplomacy until 9 July 2002? What are the key fundamentals of the Constitutive Act that makes it (or refuses to make it) a legal blueprint for Africa's development in the twenty-first Century? The core objectives and principles of the Constitutive Act of the African Union (CAAU, henceforth the Act) are stipulated in Articles 3 and 4 of the Act respectively. The Act maintains semblance of the OAU Charter such as issues of sovereign equality and independence among member states, respect of political borders existing on achievement of independence and non-interference by any member state in the internal affairs of another. Despite the traces of nostalgia of the OAU Charter, the Act breaks new grounds by way of identifying with the popular masses, establishing a common defence policy for Africa, peaceful resolution of conflicts, respect for democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law and good governance, condemnation and rejection of unconstitutional changes of government. The most novel is the right of the Union to interfere in a member state upon a decision of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government on precarious matters such as war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. That apart, it sets out detailed strategies for co-ordination and harmonisation of integrated policies at the national and regional level.

The relations between national, sub-regional and regional institutions will therefore be crucial in the bargaining and negotiation processes that would emerge in course of the transformation and integration processes. How is this tri-lateral interaction going to influence actor's perception about nagging questions of national interest and issues affecting sovereignty? Are the differing capacities and resources of the various Sub-regional Economic Communities (SRECs), as well as the melange of big and small countries going to bolster continental wide integration or act as a brake on wider integration? How do the UN-system, NGOs, civil society organisations and private organisations fits into this broad but tight framework? While it may not be easy to capture ready-tailored answers, comparative analysis in the form of the various sub-regions constituting the AU may help broaden our analytic horizon to visualise the diversity and complexity of transformations member states of the various sub-regions are going through within the broader context of existing and emerging global challenges after the end of the Cold War.
Regional Integration in Africa: Some Explorations of State of the Art

In this section what is assumed to be a path-finding discussion would attempt to explore the contours of ideas, concepts, and generally accepted frameworks for analysis that have flooded academic debate about inter-state co-operation and integration that had dominated Africa's political and economic landscape since the post-independence era. It goes beyond traditional theoretical precepts on integration to embrace problematic associated with structural phenomena such as increasing global trade, finance and production, consumption and related environmental issues that now poses tremendous challenges to African leaders today. In any such novel debate we must avoid concentrating or focusing on exclusive approaches, evaluating situations, initiatives and strategies solely on their goals, content and methods, and we must be conscious of the actors involved, including the conditions and environments in which they decide and act politically or otherwise. In the African context for example, the nature of the transformations taking place and the structures and processes (at the local, sub-regional, regional, international and global levels) that have emerged bestows on the research community the daunting challenge to observe and analyse multi-level events in order to be able to sort out their interconnectedness and how they influence outcomes. Apart from existing and established thoughts on the field, one important, but indispensable factor must not escape our memory. The delineation of the African process can well be discerned by emphasising Africa's political context and how it function in inter-African relations, international political and diplomatic relations, and how it shapes outcomes at the various levels of interaction.

In the contemporary debate on integration two waves of integration are differentiated. The „old regionalism” that emerged in the aftermath of the Second World War and took expression in the formation of regional politico-economic entities such as the European Community, the OAU, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), for example. A politico-ideological environment characterised by superpower rivalry, proxy diplomacy, war and interventions of various forms dictated the context of their formation and evolution. It was an environment that could scarcely promote a purely economic regionalism, as is evidenced by the shattered East African Community (1967-1977), SADCC (1980-1992), and the EC. The global economic order was split between the industrially rich countries of the North and the 'least developed' countries of the South. National and regional economic strategies for development were structured along ideological paths designed to commit the poor South to self-reliant strategies that would enable them break their dependence on the industrialised countries. Protectionists's strategies, import substitution and other inward-oriented strategies prevailed under those circumstances. The Ghanaian experiment of the immediate post-independence period under President Kwame Nkrumah is a glaring example.

A tour d'horizon of integration attempts in Africa reveals that the continent had experienced integration arrangements dating back to the colonial period under the auspices of the metropolitan powers with the common objective of achieving co-ordination and harmonisation in common services between the partner states, as was the case between Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Thus, by 1927 the colonial government had constituted a common market for East Africa (Part III). Also under French colonial tutelage the Union Douaniere de L’Afrique de L’Ouest had also been established with similar objectives. In all, the overall strategy was to create conducive conditions in the colonies that would lay the foundation for a deeper and enduring economic relations
with the metropolitan economies. In the 1960s however, the achievement of political independence opened a new chapter in regional integration symbolised in the formation of the OAU in 1963. The daunting task of the period for the OAU was to promote unity among the member states who had been balkanised and fragmented by a long period of colonial rule and exploitation, uproot colonialism from the continent where it still operates and fight against apartheid. Aware of the task of economic emancipation and development, African leaders created the African Development Bank (ADB) in 1963 to tackle the problems of development financing in the newly independent states. The motives for integration impetus of the immediate period of independence were both economic and political. In economic terms, there was growing realisation in the early 1960s of failure of import substitution model of development during the early stages of independence, and therefore sought viable and fresh alternatives. In addition, by virtue of the fragmented artificial borders of African states the national economies that emerged there from were not viable in economic sense, while lack of structural complementarities in terms of wide range of similar primary commodity export products and basic minerals constrained development of economies of scale. The consumption pattern of the states was also skewed towards imports of intermediate and final goods thereby enmeshing them in a perpetual state of dependence on the metropolitan industrial countries. As indicated by United Nation Development Indexes in the past decades, the continent's share of global trade had stagnated for a long period hovering around a meagre 1-2 per cent which fact raises legitimate concerns in policy circles in Africa. In the political realm, the ideals of the Pan-African movement for continental unity, common identity and coherence also acted as catalysts for integration on the continent.

It was against this background, combined with several socio-economic and political bottlenecks that the collective African leadership within the framework of the OAU viewed regional integration as a vehicle to market expansion, economies of scale and diversification of the economic base. The outcome was creation of many and varying regional integration bodies that mushroomed in the immediate aftermath of the independence period. By the early 1980s some of these decisions and efforts have been implemented and consolidated. A PTA was established in 1981, which was later transformed into COMESA in 1995 as a Common Market in which capital, labour, goods and services and non-factor services flow freely among the partner states. An Economic Union also took shape and expression in UEMOA involving fiscal and monetary policies among member states. The list had already been referred to in the introduction of the discussion.

But given the intensity of the African crisis, and already saddled with political tasks at independence it was no surprise that the regional body had by the dawn of the 1980s scarcely made any inroads in the economic field as it had originally committed itself in its Charter (Part II).

However, integration developments heralded by the second wave of integration in the 1980s and beyond, in its international dimension, were partly in response to developments elsewhere in the realm of regional integration. Examples abound: the Asian-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC), the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). With intensification of globalisation and the scramble for global share of trade, some regional blocks are even now promoting intra-regional co-operation. The EU has opened new chapter in its relationship with the African Caribbean and Pacific Countries, while making new gestures to Mercosur. Its relationship with the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and US had assumed the highest significance than ever before. The causes for a rapid spring in regionalism could be explained by variety of factors, some factual, some due to growing anxiety about evolving global multilateral
arrangements and its ability/inability to stabilise global trading arrangements. The fact was that the EU had then taken a symbolic step in the form of the Single European Act in 1986 that introduced far-reaching reforms for realising the goals of a common internal market. This was followed in 1993 by the signing of the Maastricht Treaty envisioning a political and monetary union, common foreign and security policy and expansion of the authority of the European Parliament. These developments sent signals to other regions of an emerging „Fortress Europe“ that would thrive on protectionism. Even more overwhelming was the rapid developments of globalisation wheeled by global financial and information technology which some poor regions of the world could hardly influence, hence the resort to regionalism as a safety valve against any possible onslaughts by globalisation that is dominated by powerful states and regions whose decisions and actions are influencing current global trends.\(^44\) However, before we can delve well into the current state of the debate we would have to rake up some of the core lines of existing thoughts on the subject, including the new wave of regionalism that is sweeping across the length and breadth of the globe participated by both big and small powers, the rich and the impoverished.\(^45\) The reason for exploring the wider integration debate is quite simple. It is to offer insights about the path that African countries have taken, revealing its complexities and idiosyncrasies in relation to what is pertaining elsewhere, especially in the EU where most of the current literature has been focused.

We can set off by positing that there is no eclectic and coherent body of causal mechanisms based on explicit, comprehensive assumptions that reflects prevailing empirical events on political strategies for integration ever since the classical attempt to formulate approaches in that domain in the post-World War II era failed. Among notable approaches and notions are Federalism,\(^46\) Functionalism,\(^47\) „Security Community“,\(^48\) Neo-functionalism,\(^49\) Constructivist Approaches,\(^50\) and Multi-level Governance Analysis.\(^51\) All of these and subsequent theories developed within the framework of the European integration process, and caution must however be taken not to make wholesale import of the ‘theoretical precepts’ of that transformation to the African context. The 1970s saw a resurgence of interest in integration theory and thinking, but sought to establish rigorous principles to explain elite interactions and decisions due to the lessons drawn from the failure of neofunctionalism. For reasons of those lessons learnt in the past, current thoughts on integration must be general, explanatorily plausible, and multicausal, but this point of departure does not provide a coherent, enduring thoughts and general formulations to replace classical approaches on integration. This might be due to lack of empirical confirmations in European integration process on which those projected approaches were based. Or it can also be argued that the efforts of the research community in constructing theoretical grids for explaining ongoing events in integration have done little to seek dual knowledge from significant theories and approaches, and empirical processes in the political praxis.

However, as the European Union was given a boost by the Treaty of Rome, and establishment of the Single European Act in 1986 which brought in comprehensive reforms, extension of the original treaty, and completion of the internal market as a common policy, things have changed in favour of comprehensive thoughts about integration. These developments enabled scholars to refurbish their theoretical tools to embrace issues of the past decade, such as, theories of foreign economic policy, interstate bargaining, and international regime formation, which eventually crystallised into rationalist perspectives on integration, based on the analytical notion its proponents called Liberal Intergovernmentalism (LI).\(^52\) The general debate of this school of thought is pivoted on the conclusion that „the primary source of integration lays in the interests of the states themselves and the relative power each brings to Brussels“.\(^53\)
framework was rooted in EU decision-making structure on the principle of unanimity, to enable a coherent and predictable analysis of member states decisions and the choices they make. It proceeds by categorising EU decision-making process into three stages, namely, preference formation, interstate bargaining, and institutional delegation, each configured on different explanatory planes.

National preference formation for example, seek to investigate the underpinning factors that influence states decisions to support or opt against common policies through the medium of integration, without full recourse to externalities, such as, geopolitical considerations playing secondary role. Considerations for externalities or full cooperation will depend on the degree of vulnerability that member states may find themselves being subjected to. At that level of interaction interstate bargaining produces outcomes that reflect the relative capability of member states with or without necessarily adhering to supranational sentiments. Institutional delegation describes a situation where states are conditioned to make credible commitments, devoid of ideological and technocratic influences. However, it must be noted that international relations theorist may not pardon the marriage between two contradicting assumptions of a liberal theory of national preference formation and intergovernmentalist approach of interstate bargaining and institutional creation.

But specific theories of preferences, bargaining and institutional choice reveals that three outlined stages are the foundation and not the end results of LI. The functioning of institutionalism and decision-making is bounded by the problem of implementation of interstate decisions for and against policy co-ordination through integration. There is indeed no uni-dimensional path in the bargaining and decision-making processes, but a broad network of coalitions and interactions that results in policy outcomes through integration. Emphasising the role of other actors and processes in integration, alternative views have brought to the fore the increasing role played by interaction, interdependence, and above all supranational pressures that create conditions for interstate bargaining, and even the unintended potentials of the transformation process that are brought to bear on governmental decisions and actions.

As an extension of LI Gary Mark had rejected some of the basic assumptions of LI and advocated a theory of Multi-level governance regarding decision making in the EC. While adherents of multi-level governance accept that integration encompasses intergovernmental bargains, they are also quite convinced that individual governments were not in control of the process. Gary and his co-authors put three counter arguments against the intergovernmental view, that the very notion of collective decision-making also entails a loss of control for the governments of individual states participating in that particular interaction; that decision-making competencies in the EC are shared by a proliferation of actors interacting at different levels, and are thus far from being under the monopoly of any single governments; and lastly the political systems of member states are not separate entities but exhibits degrees of connectedness. Based on the foundation of those critical arguments, the advocates of multi-level governance delineate at least three core features of the state: that the state is constrained in its behaviour to control the outcomes of collective decision-making; that the state is not a unified actor; and for that matter are not monolithic political arenas, but are part of broad network of connected interactions. On that contention Gary Marks wrote of:

The emergence of multi-level governance, a system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers - supranational, national, regional and local.

In addition to the above, a consideration should be given to the contextual background of the author’s observations that of course enrich our analytical tools in significant ways
as international political and economic environment do affect decision-making and policy formulation at those various territorial tiers.

The above survey of the various contending approaches for explaining integration reveals to us that there is indeed one particular condition (among others) in industrialised societies that is hardly present in the African context. The analysis of European integration since the early 1960s has been juxtaposed on the basic assumption that West European state system has had its own contours of history, which makes it what it is today. Its ability to function, its capacity to initiate and implement policies, as well as mechanisms that drives its institutions are all peculiar to its particular historical context and political experience that had been accumulated over generations. The background of fissiparous nationalism and inter-state rivalry, two World Wars, deepened mistrust among neighbours combined to give European integration efforts an unprecedented security dimension. The complex history of the post-colonial state in Africa, proliferation and stark presence of external state and non-state actors on African economic and political issues, the fragile African state system, and even the crisis that has engulf Africa since the immediate post-independence era, all combine to give integration in the continent its particular label. Its points of analysis are situated in a nexus of African inter-state multilateral co-operation and international economic and political relations designed to eradicate poverty, resolve conflict, strengthen political and human security, and enthrone democracy and the rule of law.

Hence, the end product of this explanatory grid of thoughts winnows the debate to the boundaries of two contending approaches, the international relations theory and comparative politics. On one hand, the nature of African integration that exhibits a high degree of co-operation with external actors (EU, US, Japan, UN, OECD and multilateral donor agencies, such as, the Bretton Woods Institutions) in an international environment where states are relatively pluralist, rationalist, and at times exercise their relative capabilities to influence outcomes, makes sense of the fact that international relations theory will have a key role to play in the transformation process in Africa. One principal issue is how African leaders will be able to steer diplomacy, co-operation, bargaining and negotiation to secure the requisite financial and technological flows to enhance their capacity for realising the aims and objectives that they have set for themselves and the continent.

On the other hand, the role that institutions: sub-regional, regional and global, as well as values and norms will play makes it expedient to study integration from the point of view of comparative politics. In this regard the African context provides no grounds for frontal collision of approaches and explanations, but offers an environment for re-sharpening our conceptual tools within the context of cross-disciplinary and cross-cutting inquiry to help capture contemporary dynamics of interstate decisions, choices, including the complex flow of ideas and information as important points of causation in an increasingly globalising world of finance, high-tech and power.

But the challenges in the path toward integration goes beyond research methodology of this kind to embrace other more complicated concepts such as power, sovereignty and national interests, and how they reconcile pressing demands for sub-regional and regional integration in the African continent. For both old and new nations these concepts have undergone many changes ever since the modern state system came into limelight through the Westphalia peace of 1648 in Münster and Osnabrück. Sovereignty had sojourned through the Westphalia arrangements that in its embryonic stages legitimised the old Holy Roman imperial order, metamorphosed into a secular concept of international relations by recognising the de jure power of all forms of governments based on the principles of freedom and toleration, raison d’état, and balance of power. In contemporary parlance, sovereignty is a refined product of
political and linguistic engineering use to accommodate not just power, authority and rights of states but responsibility as well.63

On one hand, in most of the discourses on integration in Western Europe, the debate was how the old states would give away some of their sovereignty to foster supra-nationalism and increase the momentum for economic and political integration. In the new nations as in Africa, the principle of sovereignty has not passed the test of our time. We have seen sovereignty being collapsed, and states becoming irreversibly irresponsible. Even for those cases where the state machinery still functions, some have lacked the requisite institutional mechanisms for realising the full potentials of being sovereign. Either they have been rift apart by long periods of civil strife or have been taken hostage by constitutional-dictatorship under the false canopy of democracy and re-democratization, while in reality most of these states are impoverished and defunct. It is this state of affairs in the African context that integration is welcomed as life-saving device or safety valve for defunct and incapacitated states, some too small to go it alone, and some too big and vulnerable for us to be indifferent to the possible effects of their being astray. The current situation in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the DRC and the Ivory Coast reflects this argument. For those states, the transfer of sovereignty to a supranational authority in the form of the African Union would be more of a gain than an infringement on national sovereignty and sovereign equality given their fragility, highly fracturing and failing nature. In this discussion sovereignty would encompass states ability to create capacities for representation, transparency, accountability, responsibility and reasonable application of coercion and use of force. In this connection therefore, the inclusion of a broad spectrum of stakeholders, private and civil society groups and NGOs in the transition and integration process in Africa would constitute one of the major political and institutional dynamics. In the final analysis those states that are at the brink of both sovereign collapse and facing severe legitimacy crisis would be rescued.

In another sense, given the OAU’s realisation of the imperative for participation of the citizenry and the adoption of the multi-dimensional approach to integration thereto, which incorporates civil society and NGOs, the ideal definition for our analysis would be Karl Deutsch's comprehension of the concept. Deutsch juxtaposes integration on communication theory arguing that integration:

"Even of the pluralistic kind, requires a very high degree of integration of the social fabric"; and in addition to that "We can no longer drive any substantial minority or any major ethnic or social group, to desperation"; and last but not the least "Dependable co-ordination cannot be built by deterrence and bargaining alone. A world of deterrence powers, a world of bargaining powers will, as a total system, be ungovernable. There will be no invisible hand to keep the system together, to move it any where".62 This interpretation resonates the situation of governance in Africa underlined by extreme forms of exclusion that creates dis-congruence between state and society. Hence, it is only an integration that captures social dialogue in contemporary Africa that can create cohesiveness in the long term to ensure sustainable development, growth and prosperity, and human security for the inhabitants of the continent.

Even on that score the concept of integration still exhibits a high degree of semantic contagion in a manifold manner. Under any one integration process there is no one-dimensional causative factor among the myriad forces that may be shaping a particular process of convergency. It is this research logic that one is compelled to spell the concept in all its manifestations, formal integration, informal integration, political integration and social and economic integration. According to Wallace, formal integration embraces a broad process of consciously designed bureaucratic policies that enhances the rule-making capacity of policy-makers to create common institutions for
their interaction that is geared toward regulating, monitoring, fostering, or even controlling social and economic impulses underpinning the integration process, with the ultimate objective of achieving common goals. It is a complicated process that exhibits speed and immobility at times, as it proceeds by treaties, decisions and regulations. Wallace on the other hand, captures informal integration as those aspects of interaction devoid of governmental decisions within the framework of markets, technology, communications networks and social exchange, covering the role and influence of religious, social or political groups and movements. This informal process has the capacity to be stable for a long period, while showing discontinuities when the core elements of flows and exchanges decline. In the African context, the OAU’s Declaration on the role of Civil Society in June 2001 is a far-reaching step to boost Africa’s large informal sector to contribute its quota to on-going transformation and integration process.

Beyond those two lines, formal integration can be further distinguished as either proactive or responsive. The former constitute a designed political objective to shape informal flows into intended outcomes as against those produced by market forces or social impulses without bureaucratic intervention. Nation building, the elimination of certain barriers and advocating others, encouraging some processes and creating disincentives for others or “even forbidding others”; all falls within formal proactive integration strategies. The latter consists of a purely intergovernmental co-operation that makes deliberative adjustments in broad policy domains that are ripe for changes, rule making and regulation. Political integration is grounded on the notions of identity and loyalty reinforced by shared values and reciprocal trust among once historical belligerents and adversaries (distrustful neighbours striving to wither fear and distrust). Writer’s italics added. Social integration encompasses that broad and peaceful interaction among identity bounded groups or among communities, deliberately directed towards the path of political integration. Economic integration is a co-ordinated effort for harmonising autonomous and territorially separate economic units and their transactions for the purpose of achieving growth and welfare for an envisaged larger community. Some of these inter-related but non-identical concepts relates to the African reality in terms of its artificial borders. The peoples of the continent have not just experienced long periods of social and economic inflows across their national borders, but are still sharing historical and familial ties that may make a formal and informal integration more cohesive than other regions.

Others have gone beyond abstract conceptual delineations to place integration in inter-regional perspectives that reveal different spatial and semantic constructions of meaning and reality. This effort was motivated by the ever-widening gap in terms of factors and conditions that exist between the developing and the developed world. Even the aims and objectives of integration in the developed and developing regions may differ in scope and content. It is in this vein that Asante has opined that regional integration within the context and conditions of the developing countries has to be perceived as an ‘approach to economic development rather than a tariff issue’. By this approach underdeveloped production structures and infrastructure problems must be addressed by free trade to enhance the creation of sector efficiency. In another vein, given the dismal record of intra-regional trade in Africa, a genuine and committed focus on market integration with special emphasis on the linear stages to Free Trade Area, Customs Union, Common Market, and finally, and in theory, an Economic and Political Union would without doubt set the pace for speeding up the integration process. In his later assessment and perspectives on the subject, Asante, however, identifies the emphasis on trade liberalisation and market integration as ‘defective’ based on the fact
that countries that have little to trade should not be simply cajoled by the promises of the advantages of liberalisation. Hence African integration schemes must be geared towards development of the capacity to produce and to trade before embracing full-scale trade liberalisation and market integration. But whichever approach is chosen there are inescapable stumbling blocks on the path to integration irrespective of the socio-political environment. While there may be a catalogue of differences between developed and developing regions, some core features that are relevant to integration and are likely to show differences may need mentioning. A sound industrial base capable of achieving sectoral and regional linkages, modern infrastructure, low dependence, an efficient bureaucracy, good governance founded on the rule of law, national consciousness, social mobility, debt management less of a burden, may all be crucial considerations in this case. The bulk of African states may not pass the test of comparison of these indicators, and if efforts were not made to correct these imbalances integration would to remain an infinite dream for Africa.

Hence, developments in the continent presents a challenging task for drawing the boundaries towards achieving objective analytical tools, clarifying methodology and the key and salient benchmarks for tracking the structures and processes of regional integration in Africa. In terms of scope, given the broad context of integration in Africa it is imperative to focus on major sectors by critically examining overall performance across countries and sub-regions, while at the same time giving equal attention to the multifaceted international linkages that might propel quantitative and qualitative changes in ongoing socio-economic and political processes.

But, at the end of the day, as a result of the peculiar nature of developments in Africa we would have to focus on major issues affecting development in all facets of the term. Asante had this in mind as he attempts to redefine the purpose of economic integration in developing regions by concluding that the prime purpose is to achieve rapid economic growth among integrating nations. The outcome of these observation convinced Asante to call integration in the developing nations "developmental regionalism". It must however be noted that the challenges of globalisation and internationalisation of politics, as well as shifting paradigm of development as a concept dictates that the goals of integration must go beyond the boundaries of development in the classical sense of the concept. In this sense, other spheres of integration, such as, common policies on the environment, fight against money laundering, measures for controlling cross-border crimes, child labour and human trafficking, issues affecting food security, should all be given equal attention in any regional integration project in a rapidly changing world.
The Periphery Cannot Hold

The political economy of Africa’s underdevelopment and dependence is symptomatic of century's long insecurity and exploitation both internally and externally induced, thus depriving Africa of a stable and continuous endogenous development. Even more pertinent is the continent's failure since her exposure to the global economy to capture a true agricultural and industrial revolution needed to put her on a genuine path of recovery and development. The objective of this section is to trace the historical roots of Africa's current socio-economic and political predicament, which has been put under the rubric of dependency and underdevelopment in a segment of formal academic and political discourse, namely the dependentist school of thought.\(^6\) The essence of any historical survey of this kind is grounded on the basic knowledge that if Africa no longer counts in global terms and has therefore lost its sense of direction, ordinary Africans are at least aware of how far they have gone and need not be taught where they are now. It is this critical self-examination, which would ultimately provide the basic impetus for self-renewal and action as well in our fast changing international political economy wheeled by globalisation - modern technology, capital, knowledge, ideas, including the rapid regional trends towards integration and harmonisation of territorial-wide policies.

Subjects such as integration and globalisation are no novel concepts. However, the way and manner as regards usage of those concepts produces at times meanings that partially negotiate the realities of contemporary international political economy thereby de-linking it from the long historical process it has transformed itself from the pre-colonial, colonial, to the present complex trappings of neo-colonial economic subordination and dependency. The trajectory of this historical transformation, considering its socio-cultural and even racial context resulted in jumbling facts and myths making it difficult to capture that process in its real terms. Thus, the discussion of political economy of Africa would consider the implications of pre-colonial long distance trade and the gradual evolution of 'market economy' before the imposition of colonial rule and Africa's subordinate involvement in the capitalist world economy, the post-colonial state and its elite construction of ideas and contribution to development or underdevelopment, the role of global financial capital and technology and its implications for transformation and integration processes, and finally how, these themes combines to impact Africa's efforts for breaking new grounds to combat underdevelopment and dependence, poverty, political immobility and global marginalisation.

Pre-Colonial Africa

The myth about pre-colonial Africa has mostly been substantiated on the grounds that there is no history of the existing societies prior to arrival of external powers on the continent. It is this distortion about Africa’s history, and culture that bred straightjacket views, which eventually prevailed in early historical discourses on Africa. Wittingly or unwittingly, acts of denigration and aspersion about Africa's achievement cost her dearly in terms of the African space, time and image, steered mostly in the early intellectual movement under the rubrics of Anthropology and Ethnography, thus inventing instead of knowing and describing Africans in their own terms.\(^6\) This is but not disclaiming the vital role Ethnographic research had played in the past and continues
to play in contemporary social science and cultural discourses, but to attempt to expose here the often at times lopsided and self-centred perspectives of the other. Modern historical research has however revealed that the notion of ‘timeless African structures or institutions is a historical myth with no real substance’.  

The fact is that before the advent of European economic and political adventure in Africa, traditional societies have developed their economic and trading networks across the length and breadth of the continent. Notable among that long distance trade was the Trans-Saharan Trade, which connected southern parts of West Africa (the Ashanti, Dagomba, Dahomey, Tukulor, Yatenga principalities) with the Savana Belt, (Jene, Timbuktu, Gao etc) North Africa (Marrakech Fez etc.) and the West Sudanic Empire (Dunkula), and farther eastwards to the Horn of Africa (Massawa, Senar etc). From Cairo to the Cape a major trade route along the Nile through Kordofan run southwards to Babua, Southwest to Bagongo, Lunda and Katanga. From Babua in Central Africa, a bifurcated trade route southeastward and a west eastward from Bagongo, Matamba and Kasanje and again eastward converged around the Lake Tanganyika region creating a vibrant entrepot, which finally projected into Zanzibar on the East African Coast. From the East African coast of Kilwa long distance trade zigzagged across the southern region through Katanga to South West Africa in Benguela and Po, further southwards to Lozi and back to the coast of Mozambique in the southeast. The inter-connectedness of these trade routes does not automatically lend itself to a uniform volume and value of economic activity, however. The Senegambia-Upper Guinea and the Gold Coast, for example, were comparatively vibrant in economic terms than South West Africa due to their relative accessibility to European traders. Some of the main items of trade were gold, cowries, cola nuts, salt, spices, sea food, vases, leather products, textiles from Yoruba land, which intermittently changed hands from the north to south and west to east for products such as cotton and textiles resold in the Gold Coast (now Ghana) by European traders, utensils from Europe obtained either directly from Europeans or their Maghreb middlemen in North Africa. That apart, there existed local architecture and artistic innovations, craft (basketry and weaving, blacksmith), manufacturing and industrial processes (fishing, agriculture and stock-breeding, gold, iron, copper and silver work) based on division of labour, though the levels and intensity of those economic activities differed from one region to another. The development of commerce was associated with rising states and empires as already mentioned. The intervention of expansionist forces (Portuguese and Spanish) by the turn of the eighteenth century haltered these lucrative and productive enterprises and introduced in its stead what Diagne has called ‘predatory economy’.

Combined with forceful religious conversions to dominant religions (Islam and Christianity), the conquered territories lost not just their material and basic technological innovations but their spiritual identity as well. Thus religious tensions and strife now engulfs Africa creating an atmosphere that erodes local and foreign investor confidence is no surprise. The essence of this historical insights is that it provides us with valuable information that link Africa’s past enterprising spirit for free market and free trade tradition with little or without state controls. Even today this vibrant sector of Africa’s economy is categorised as informal, when people become incapable of explaining the complex evolution and endurance of that important field of human endeavour. Even in cases where militarism had paved the way for mercantilism, military forces were not stationed in conquered territories for long periods. Instead, the swift withdrawal of the military was replaced by tax collectors along trading posts under the control of the ruling order. The relationship between the Asante in the forest region and the Fantes of the coastal region of the former Gold Coast exemplify this fact. Of the series of some of the wars between the two regions, the root and immediate causes were attributable to
infringements on treaties binding them on trade and commerce and not their ethnic
differences as we see of conflict in Africa today, especially infringements that related to
access to the main trade routes leading to the coastal region where commercial activities
with Europeans were relatively intense than in the interior regions. The Ashanti
dominion also extended northwards into the Savannah belt by establishing strong trade
relations with the intermediary territories and trade centres such as Ouagadougou and
Timbuktu.

In the interior of central Africa, southern Katanga had occupied a very important
commercial position in the pre-colonial economy. It was a convergent centre for a
complex system of inter-regional trade covering the Kasai region to the Zambezi Rivers
and the Great Lakes area. Through the system of interconnecting trade routes, copper
from Katanga appeared in the Indian Ocean trading system and beyond as far as China.
The trade in copper had significant effects on the economic and political system of the
region. The Kazembe for example, built powerful military and economic structures
which enabled them extend trade links to the Kuba, and the Lunda trade routes which
began to import copper, with the Kuba establishing further regional networks westward
to the Lelle.\textsuperscript{74}

The complexity of pre-colonial long distance trade cannot afford us space to delve
into detail every corner of the continent, but suffice it to say that Africa's integrative
forces had a long history of experience in their development, the evidence of which
exist today, manifested in the ability of social and economic groups and networks to
make cross-border transactions under rigid controls by national governments and
corrupt immigration officials who profit from their movement by extorting illegal fees
from them. It is this vibrant so called informal integration force, acting through a free
market environment and context if carefully supported and redirected by national
governments, will emerge to constitute one of the main engines for growth and
development at the national and sub-regional level. In this direction, national
governments should create production bases for those exchanges of goods and services
while at the same time educating Africans to support the domestic market.\textsuperscript{75}

Market institutions developed through long distance and inter-regional trade in the
pre-colonial era were symbolic of popular cities such as Timbuktu, Kano, Salaga and
Mombassa. In addition, the presence of cross-border familial businesses wedged in
social networks could be transformed into economic networks to facilitate the expansion
of small businesses across national borders. In the end this slow process would help
bury Africa's artificial borders, at least in the mind. But the question still remains
whether if there had been no colonial intervention long distance trade and interregional
trade would have been harnessed by rivalling and competing Kingdoms, states and
Chiefdoms for any purposive cause for the attainment of common economic benefits?
The evidence for a harmonious territorial economic co-operation and peaceful co-
existence with external powers in Africa can be traced to the aftermath of the abolishing
of slave trade and the interlude before the advent of colonialism. As Boahen has
observe, the abolishing of slave trade ushered in a period of transition that created the
conditions for stability and development, which could have thrived for positive gains
had it not been the imposition of colonial rule. Worthy of mention among these factors
were the relative peace and stability that emerged, the gradual commercial unification of
African economies into the global capitalist economy in the form of cash crop
production, centralisation of political authority and state formation, and attempt at
modernisation and constitutional experiments.\textsuperscript{76}

The cessation and abrogation of slave trade meant that economic monopoly shifted
from control by the ruling aristocracy and powerful entrepreneurs to embrace a broad
based economy participated by urban and rural dwellers alike. The diffusion of wealth
from centres of ruling aristocracy and privileged mercantile families boosted cash crop production such as cocoa, palm fruits and peanuts, at least on peasant basis, thus sowing the seeds of rural capitalism. Between 1880 and the dawn of the twentieth century this process had resulted in the commercial integration of regional trading networks in Africa, which later affected social, cultural and linguistic growth. Socially, new powerful classes and elites emerged that challenged old aristocracies. Swahili culture and language ramped through East Africa into eastern Zaire and the copper producing regions of Katanga in modern day Zambia.

Even more significant was the political evolution that set in during the period. The state system in Africa experienced a backward and a forward movement. Former powerful states such as Ashanti and Oyo empires in West Africa and the Luba Empire in Central Africa lost their political significance and gradually disintegrated, while the Sokoto and Tukulor Empire of Masina resurfaced into greater prominence. At the level of the state system Ethiopia, Madagascar, Egypt, Buganda and Bunyoro had all become centralised by the period under consideration. Some novel aspects of developments in the state system were the emergence of Sierra Leone and Liberia founded by the British and Americans in 1787 and 1820 respectively. The resettlement was motivated by a mixed humanitarian, abolitionist, and at times for reasons with racist undercurrents to reduce the number of coloureds in North America after the abolishment of the slave trade. The melting effects of political and material culture with British, American and Nova Scotian traits had on the intellectual and missionary movement in Africa from these two states, especially Sierra Leone were quite enormous.

However, if there is any development in the political sphere that had a positive impact on the intellectual recourse to the pre-colonial past as a point of reference for a possible political development of Africa, then the unique attempts at modernisation and constitutional experiments that took place in the continent during the period under review must be accorded its place in the current debate on the subject. These developments are based on the assumption that the scientific, industrial and technical breakthroughs that occurred in Europe in the nineteenth century due to the industrial revolution may have had a profound impact on Africa to the extent that by 1822 and 1841 Egypt and Portuguese Luanda respectively, had established their first printing presses. Commercial modern mines had also opened in Algeria and Ghana in 1843 and 1870 respectively. In Egypt textile and cotton mills, wood mills, glassworks and paper mill got established by the reign of Mohammed Ali. Ethiopia and Tunisia carried out public construction works, and the Barbary States updated their monetary system to reflect contemporary economic and financial needs. The militaries in some North and West African states were successfully modernised in organization, training, equipment and recruitment. Military establishments were put up at Fez in Morocco that trained engineers, artillerymen, surveyors and cartographers. Even Ahmed Bey, a renowned ruler and architecture of Tunisia restructured his military by inculcating Western techniques in training and organisation, as well as production methods in guns and arms. Menelik of Ethiopia and Samori Ture of West Africa also adopted similar reforms and restructuring techniques in their countries. Prior to that, the complex state organisation machinery of the Ashanti Empire and the military prowess that came to be associated with it bears testimony to the wave of modernisation during the period under consideration.

At the level of constitutional development, the Fante Confederation was formed in 1868 in Ghana; the Egba United Board of Management (EUMB) was formed in 1865 in Nigeria, and the Kingdom of Grebo in Liberia. The Fante Confederation adopted for the first time in 1871 a robust and formidable constitution that set out a clear and very efficient division of power with the office of the King-President and Vice President, the
Executive Council, Representative Assembly, Legislative body and a court of appeal. Also embodied in the constitution were visionary development plans designed to modernise the provinces of the confederation, covering security and defence, improvement of standard of living, infrastructure, housing, agriculture, mining and education. However, the major breakthrough for the Confederation was the meticulous and intelligent manner in which the authority of traditional rulers and educated elites were harmoniously enhanced for peaceful co-existence, co-operation and development. Unfortunately, however, under British politics and diplomacy of division and sowing discord to entrench indirect rule, the Fante Confederation was bound to be smothered right at its embryonic stage in 1873. Constitutional experiments carried out by the EUBM took firm root in 1865 with the main objective of harmonising and co-ordinating contemporary traces of traditionalism and emerging elements of modernity, that is promoting Christianity and backing commerce with modern rules of protection of wealth and property, as well as embarking on development projects covering postal services, education, sanitary reforms and revenue collection. By 1874 the EUBM had ceased to exist due to similar reasons that brought about the demise of its contemporary counterpart the Fante Confederation. Hence, as Boahen had noted:

“On the eve of the colonial conquest and occupation, Africa was far from being primitive, static, and asleep or in a Hobbesian state of nature. On all fronts – economic, political, social, and even intellectual – Africa was in a mood of change and revolution, accepting new challenges, showing ability at adaptation and modification, fighting back against racist doctrines, and above all changing its economy and politics to suit the socio-economic realities of the day.”

But the determination and vision shown by the new elites and their traditional counterparts criss-cross the continent by the advent of colonialism did not survive, as Europe too was rapidly transforming itself that required new ideologies, resources, technologies, capital and other incentives to enable it keep pace with contemporary changes and challenges. It was those challenges and realities that dictated Europe's iron ideology in the form of colonial rule and exploitation.

Colonial Bureaucracy, Appropriation, Alienation and Underdevelopment.

Contending debate about the reasons for the imposition of colonial rule has produced views and opinions that do not serve well the complex but short period of colonial rule that left in its trail profound impact on the social, cultural, economic and political life of the peoples of the continent of Africa. In any delineation of that sort it should however be borne in mind that Europe's engagement with Africa began with a period of contact, co-existence, co-operation, confrontation and colonial domination and control. On this basis, by assigning reasons exclusively to conditions in Europe or Africa may constitute an intellectual oversight given the practical realities of the time, especially with events before 1880 and afterwards as a point of reference and analysis. It is true that most of the discourses on colonialism had been written from rigidly Eurocentric perspectives that at times drawn conclusions that were out of the African context.

The long period of co-existence and co-operation between Africa and Europe suggests that the outside powers had by the last quarter of the nineteenth century became convinced that existing power relations had absolutely tilted in their favour, since the existing African empires and states were not homogenous, which fact yielded a high preference for conquest and subjugation by the colonialist when the appropriate time emerged to do so in the course of their relations with African traditional political systems and entities. The fact of the matter is that Africans and Europeans differed on
their conceptions about domination and control, which are also some of the basic inherent characteristics of acquisition and use of power. This is however, no attempt to relativise every aspect of those complex relations since there are other issues that may not automatically yield results from that point of perception and analysis. On the one hand, African empires and states gave relative autonomy to their subjects provided they conform to the norms and principles that governed the relationship between the conqueror and the conquered. Of major concern was conformity to the rules of allegiance and annual homage expected of subjects.

The expansion of the Ashanti Empire in the pre-colonial era might illustrate this point clearly. Ashanti power and might during the period extended as far as to the western boarders of modern Ivory Coast, to the north in the savannah belt covering parts of present day Burkina Faso, and finally to the east extending beyond the borders of Togoland and covering parts of Dahomey which is present day Benin. The wisdom of the period, which many Africanist and historians have overlooked, is that Ashanti supremacy during the period was purposely designed to defend and maintain Ashanti mercantilist expansion. Hence, military posts were speedily converted into economic centres, and the representatives sent to the conquered territories were mainly tax collectors and civilian diplomats.

Even though, the Ashanti Empire exhibited a highly religious function symbolised in the golden stool, neither her religion nor political system was imposed on the conquered territories. Since traditional African religion is a multi-faceted system of believe, conquered territories continued to adhere freely to their symbols of worship, be it the sea, a virgin forest, the sacredness of particular animals which were forbidden to be trespassed on in peculiar cultures. What the conqueror demanded were reciprocal loyalty to the sovereign authority and economic patronage of the imperial economic system, in exchange for a shelter under the imperial security umbrella. Most pre-colonial African Kingdoms exhibited these liberal traits about control and domination.

If there are any claims to religious freedom and tolerance, then its depository might be that modicum of traditional African culture, as Africa had never known religious crusades in its history. Islam, Christianity and colonialism changed the situation, and are even challenging the very existence of some African states torn apart by religious strife and tensions.

The European conception of domination and control are interwoven with force and deprivation, acculturation and alienation, and the most worrisome of all disintegration and fragmentation. The policies of all the colonial powers, be it the French policy of Assimilation or English Indirect Rule, all exhibited the use of force, and for that matter brute force by Belgian and Portuguese forces of occupation and annexation. For that system to operate efficiently to achieve the desired goal, all the colonial powers instituted bureaucracies to facilitate appropriations in the form of direct and indirect taxation, confiscation of indigenous lands, expulsions, resettlement, compulsory labour, forceful redirection of indigenous socio-economic organisation to suit metropolitan preferences. In brief that moment of colonialism affected almost every aspect of life.

Primarily, however, the colonial strategy was to secure non-interrupted supply of raw materials to furnish growing industries in Europe and establish markets for the sale of industrial goods that Africa has never known. The accidental by-products of colonial policy such as the establishment of peace and order (through use of colonial police forces and armies), courts, infrastructure of roads, railways, telegraph and telephone services, education for Africans to occupy civil service positions, hospitals for European administrators, were all in place to enhance colonial bureaucracy to accomplish its socio-economic and political tasks of 'extractions', 'distortions' and 'dislocations', which created the prop roots of underdevelopment in Africa. And as McCarthy has noted, "This
was an economy in the most basic sense: an organisation of the forms and contents, locations of production and distribution, finance and exchange, in ways that supplied the revenue and order the bureaucracy demanded.  

Others have argued that colonialism was a final product of an evolving capitalist development. The emerging relationship with Africa has been categorised and periodised by Armin, for example, as constituting three phases seen from Marxist perspectives on capitalism, namely the premercantilist period (ending in the seventeenth century) during which Africa and Europe traded on equal basis, the mercantilist period (seventeenth century to 1800) whereby the introduction of slavery speeded up the accumulation of capital, which in turn facilitated the third period (1800 – 1890) for capitalist integration of the colonies. Out of the colonial strategy emerged the balkanisation of Africa into macro-regions for promoting trade and extraction activities. Hence, Eastern and Southern Africa were designated for labour reserves, West Africa, Cameroon, Sudan and Chad emerged as regions for externally oriented colonial trade economy, while the Congo River basin was devoted for explorations and other adventures because of its rich natural habitat for a wide range of flora and fauna. In this connection the impact of the colonial system on Africa in no uncertain terms pervades every aspect of socio-economic, cultural and political life. But there is no agreement on as to the scale and magnitude of those impacts in positive or negative terms.

In the literature on how colonialism impacted development in Africa, empirical work confirms that there is a link between a country’s colonial exposure and its current level of economic development. In Africa for that matter, Bertocchi and Canova have opined that colonization had direct effects on the post-colonial patterns of growth and human and physical development. Recent perspectives also documented that in colonial enclaves of concentrated extractive activities, such as Africa, the institutions governing private property in particular were weak, and thus the current states of affairs of Africa’s poor institutions can be attributed to that colonial legacy.

In this study however, if there is anything vestigial about colonialism, then the culprit must be that colonial relic of externally oriented consumerist life-style picked up by not just elites and the well-to do in society, but what has become idiosyncratic of all and sundry. This consumption without production is exacerbated by the inability to catch up with industrialisation of common manufactured goods. Even today the pattern has changed to the rapidly growing high-tech sector of the industrialised countries, which has seen no signs of growth in Africa, except consumption. It is this trend, which is going to pose greater challenge to Africa as far as the idea of the common market and free trade is concerned. Of the well-developed regional groupings in the world such as the EU, there is greater trading among the members of the Union, and of course trade in what they produce. It is for these and other reasons that current trends in globalisation have to be studied closely to avert any emerging forms of neo-colonial relations that would compromise prevailing development efforts.

The impact of colonialism is complicated, showing a high degree of fluidity, so much so that it is difficult at any point in time to decipher its workings. Perhaps the complex trappings of its working are better captured by Wrigley when he wrote:  

“. . . . That crucial change, probably the most drastic of all the long-term consequences of the colonial intervention, still lay in the future”.

And he writes again:  

“. . . . Histories have to stop somewhere, but an economic history which stops in the middle of the colonial epoch is perhaps especially incomplete”.


Apart from the surface meaning of the above quotation, there is a deeper meaning which emanates from the complex structure of colonial rule with its multi-faceted actors: missionaries, merchants, traders, bureaucrats, and the military whose policies were designed to produce outcomes to benefit the metropolis and create conditions of underdevelopment in the colonial territories. Indeed, the power of colonialism is located in the interconnecting forces of these actors. But the end of colonial rule did not mean the end of such forces to exist and transform themselves to fit contemporary exploitative patterns and arrangements.

Apparently however, Africa can only salvage her retrogressive development trend when the internal dynamics of her own social, economic and political capacities are properly channelled for an endogenous development to break the yoke of underdevelopment which had been ingrained in a cyclical imperialist, colonialists, neo-colonialists, and now globalist's strategies for its perpetuation.

Post-Colonialism: Too fragile at birth or too badly nurtured?

One common strand in the arguments about the post-colonial state in Africa is that the colonies were not adequately prepared for the task of self-government and rule. But given the aims and objectives of colonial exploitation and subjugation, would the colonialists ever have done that? The answer perhaps lies in the late departure of the Portuguese from Angola, Cape Verde, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, and the British from Zimbabwe. Even though the Portuguese and the English were perfectly aware that the days of colonial domination and control were numbered, no systematic efforts were made in good faith to transfer power and government that would ensure sustained peace and stability. The events, and for that matter, the attendant crisis that gripped most African states in the first two decades of independence were enough to have convinced the late departing colonialist to be at least honest to their subjects. Pressured by political developments at home, the Portuguese in particular hurriedly left their colonies without any responsibility, and in Zimbabwe the minority settlers departed from power not on goodwill but only when they had lost the liberation struggle. The hypocrisy of colonialism was even better witnessed during the transition to self-rule in Hong Kong under the auspices of the British in 1997. The British actions during negotiations on the legal status and rights of Hong Kong depicted that a post-colonial Hong Kong deserves better legal and human rights than during the colonial era, as the diplomatic muscle was over-stretched to ensure that all the cohorts of rights in Britain are in place in Hong Kong, at least around this time. Couldn't these same rights had been introduced earlier on to enable the colony acquaint itself to them? Currently however, post-colonial analysis must be differentiated in terms of periods and events shaping particular post-colonial moment. In this connection, a post-colonial period (1960-1989) situated within the environment of the Cold War, and a post-Cold War post-colonial period might be helpful for the purpose of analysis. Both periods are also captured to be situated in a political economic environment of neo-colonial exploitation, domination and control.

The choice is quite simple. The independence period was also a period of heightened tension between rival superpowers, east and west. The trickle down effect was quite enormous on third world politics, particularly in Africa where geo-strategic and political considerations override crucial decisions for some African leaders. In the post-Cold War era the tensions and emotions have cooled down, and even the success of Africa's integration rests solely in the hands of the West, and Western capital and
technology. Democracy, rule of law, human rights and empowerment of civil society, has now replaced the ideologically oriented politics of the Cold War era.

What has featured mostly in the academic debate on post-colonialism in the last two decades are factors relating to the role of the state, its acquisition, concentration and elaborate use of political power, as well as its brute application of the forces of coercion. But from the point of view of its complexity and diversity, the post-colonial state had already been frail and fragile at its embryonic stages. The constraining factors on the newly independent states are many and varied, but suffice it to say in this limited space that the complex issues affecting group identity invented during colonialism were, be it platitudinous to say, to raise their ugly heads in the newly independent states socio-political and cultural relations.

In brief, the threat, and perceived threats posed by Africa's complex diversity varied from one country to another, and even within the same country state responses to that problem varied in intensity and scale depending on how vibrant the threat might be. Pervading the various state responses was the common reason to protect and safeguard national unity for the sake of the newly born states. Behind this curtain, power gradually became centralised in the executive branch of government, while the legal and judicial branches suffered. In some countries such as Ghana, Uganda and Kenya, pre-independence structures guaranteeing regional and local autonomy were denounced as impediments towards national unity. Unity that had indeed never existed in real terms, but had always been confused with a unifying process that seems not completely to have sojourn its long, and perhaps unending path. The threat was that regionalism and regional structures were viewed as conduits for political rivals to challenge the authority of the ruling party.

The move toward centralisation of state power had several implications, including stifling opposition and other channels for political competition, participation and representative governance. The state became the ultimate source of power and influence, which permeated the administration and bureaucratic structure, the legal order, the armed and police forces, and all major public institutions. The boundary between state and society became blurred as some states adopted one party politics, which consequently bred personality cults and neo-patrimonial patronage. Since ethnic diversity is crucial to distribution of a country's resources, the state apparatus became the main medium for elite acquisition of not only power but also wealth. Suspicion, fear and distrust began to sweep across politics and society as more and more people became excluded in politics and the decision-making process. As a sole political actor, the state could not create enough opportunities for the growing middle class after independence, and in the end made itself the only repository for fulfilling individual aspirations, goals and interests. But constrained as it is in terms of resources, the state is circumstantially compelled to resort to non-economic methods such as cronyism, nepotism and especially, ethnicity in the distribution and allocation of scarce resources. It must however be noted that ethnicity per se is not an absolute determinant of politics, but only becomes a matter for policy when elites frustration implodes in moments of political power struggle, and more particularly when representatives of disgruntled identity groups secure their presence in the state army and secret services to use that medium to address their grievances or settle old scores.

Indeed, it is this combined result of politics of exclusion and the consequent over-reliance on the forces of suppression and oppression that created a military-political-oligarchy that overshadowed societal initiatives and impulses for a harmonious socio-political growth. Hence, the military, in a few exceptional cases, was the only post-colonial institution that attained growth without any positive impact on society due to its repressive character. The end product of this negative institutional growth was an acute
discongruence between state and society. This point will be further elaborated in the next subsection of this chapter.

Externally, the post-colonial state in Africa entered the comity of nations lacking the capacity and resources to balance its position in international diplomatic relations, and to handle effectively bargaining and negotiations with transnational actors and organisations. The principle of sovereignty it claimed to have acquired during independence was only a matter of a protocol. In their frustration and at times lack of external orientation, the newly independent states in Africa became either appendages to the colonial metropole or as stooges of superpower ideological rivalry between East and West. The Francophone African countries strong relations provide empirical confirmations for this point. In inter-African relations, at the level of the state system, ideological tug of war produced fear, distrust and even at times animosity between African states, which at the same time professed to be united under the banner of the OAU. On the face of these developments, African states had by the end of the last century became not only extremely fragmented and heterogeneous, but also deeply disunited and divided on common but pressing issues that required a united voice under the auspices of the OAU for sustained and lasting solutions. Hence, the African refugees crisis, indications of poor performance in matters of regional conflict management, sluggish economic performance, poor human rights record, arms trafficking, various forms of cross border incursions and high density political violence are some of the many pertinent problems we still live with today.

The post-Cold War post-colonial state, despite the qualitative achievements it had made in the last decade or so in the realm of democracy and the rule of law, human rights improvements, decentralisation and participation, as well as the partnership and co-operation it had established with other states and regions, is still bereft of the capacity to initiate and undertake projects independently, due to its financial, technological and human resource predicament. That apart, the most vibrant and talented of its populations are now massively leaving their countries at an unprecedented rate for greener pastures elsewhere as their national economies are retrogressing, stagnating or shows no signs of recovery. And the most disturbing and may be the most potential constraint on Africa's growth and development is the deep-rooted taste and preferences of its populations for foreign goods against home produced items. If market begins at home, and home market is also the life-wire for domestic growth and development, then Africa's development philosophy has to be reconsidered.

The intensive attempts to remould African economies by international financial institutions, namely the IMF and the World Bank during the last three decades have made some countries worse off in terms of a broader positive impact on the recipients. The hazards that emanate from the Bretton Woods institutions decisions and choices are most of the time not in congruence with the aspirations of a large number of the recipient country's populations. The most vulnerable have been the non-wage sectors of the economies that are predominantly subsistence farmers, petty traders, small shop owners, indeed, in general the so-called informal sector. As the first decade of the post-Cold War era had shown, the political and economic reforms imposed on Africa did not produce the expected outcomes. Some policy prescriptions targeted growth without taking due cognisance of other human and ecological factors. The timber and mining industries in Africa for example, were injected with huge investment only to results in environmental disasters in Liberia, Ghana, Cameroon, and The Democratic Republic of Congo among others. In what has been dubbed the 'Washington consensus', IMF policy packages are designed and decided upon without active participation of recipient countries ruling bodies. And even after unwillingly accepting the imposed prescriptions, ruling governments further deprived their citizens of their sovereign rights by denying
them any discussion of the policy package for fear of public protest and unrest. At times authoritarian rule even seemed to have been condoned as conducive for implementation of IMF policy.

The reasons for those policy failures are not far fetched. African economies are predominantly primary commodity based and have shown little signs towards diversification, industrial capacity is still low, dependence on aid and technology is also on the average very high, and most devastating of all, African agricultural and manufactured exports rarely find their way into the markets of the industrialised economies due to high protectionists barriers and tariffs on African exports. Even when the US took the unilateral decision to correct the imbalance through the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA), which waived tariffs on African textiles to the US, it sounded too selective as a few African states could fulfil the conditions attached to it, such as, a consistent democratic performance and commitment to human rights, economic liberalisation, etc. Despite its incentive content to entice African states to adhere to those norms, in the mind of the critic it sounds like a whip designed to create discord and disunity among African states.

Unilateral actions of that kind do not constitute the kind of action required to address the continent's acute economic imbalance with the rest of the outside world. If African leaders are to be taken seriously this time, then a modicum of their commitment to find lasting solutions to the general African crisis can be found in the NePAD document that outlines the path, philosophy and strategies for Africa's development. Even though the blueprint contains exactly what is expected of African leaders in order to secure the requisite international financial and technological support, there are no binding commitments on the donor countries to ensure consistent and reliable flow of finance to enable NePAD to at least hold on against the pressures of globalisation. In brief, the success of NePAD is inextricably linked to sustained economic growth and global peace and security in the Western countries, as the events of 11 September 2000 had debilitating consequences on poor nations.

At this juncture, the internal and external conditions that came to shape Africa's economic and political development between the early decades of the post-independence period until the end of the Cold War, produced chances and opportunities in a divided world that could equally have been utilised to salvage the fragile post-colonial state. However, ideological admiration, proxy insurgencies in the internal affairs of neighbouring countries, irrational dependences, elite power struggle concealed under the cloak of ethnic allegiances and patronage, uncontrolled sporadic political violence, corruption of all forms, all contributed in one way or the other to a badly nurtured post-colonial state. The most prevalent of the negative tendencies, wittingly or unwittingly nurtured in the post-independence period is without doubt, the huge deficit created between state and society as would be pointed out in the next section. Thus, the post-colonial state after its invention, had survived more on the forces of repression and intimidation, personal ties and controls than on state institution, energies and creativity of its citizens.

But the most probing and critical question is that, how did the African state crisis emerge, and why is it what it is today? From the above delineation and analysis, and using the precolonial era as a point of departure, lack of continuity in Africa’s state formation process prevented the evolution of solid and coherent territorial wide political organisational structures, at least at the level of common cultural and linguistic points of convergence. This is because, prior to the advent of colonialism, Kingdoms, Empires and political entities such as, Ashanti, Dahomey, Yoruba, Buganda, Zulu, The Fante Confederation, the Akyem dominions of Eastern Gold Coast all bearing their individual and peculiar cultural traits had managed to attain state organisational capacities.
powerful points of state power and economic wealth would have of course provided the
impetus for an internal dynamic for state formation incorporating the less powerful,
economically disadvantaged, and sparsely populated territories. It was that political
vacuum that provided room for outsiders to pawn on proliferate and weakened
principalities after almost two-hundred years of co-existence. The non-accomplishment
of the traditional state formation caused by the colonial intervention resulted in
distortions in the process of state building in most post-independence African states. It
was also this anomaly in the African state and state system, especially, south of the
Sahara, that had shaped Africa’s tilted relations with outsiders. A relatively large
number of countries lack the territorial capacity, human and natural resources to exist as
viable state entities. The above conditions of the African state, coupled with the extreme
nature of its heterogeneity and vulnerability makes it easily penetrable for outsiders
seeking to entrench their interests in the continent.

By and large, the centre-periphery relationship had lopsided in favour of the centre
so much so that the *periphery cannot hold*, thus cutting a slur on her image, while the
conscience of the centre becomes increasingly bruised and scarred in an increasingly
changing and interdependent world, where rights have become so malleable to embrace
the right to a dignified way of economic existence.

It is this delineation of the political economy of African development and
underdevelopment in its past, present, the potential and future forms that provide us
with the analytical insights to enable us delve into the complex relationship between
state, society and politics in Africa in the post-colonial period.
Das Ding an Sich: State, Society and Politics in Africa

„In my view, perhaps the most serious threat to Africa comes from a sometimes poor relationships between the people and their governments...Whatever has been the form of the relationship between the people and the government, the African masses have not by and large, been given adequate opportunities to find an outlet for their creative energies and apply them to development.“38 (Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim, former Secretary-General of the OAU)

The era that was ushered in after 1989 set in a turbulent period not only for African politics, but societies as well. The rapid transformations that took place were characterised by democratisation, liberalisation and deregulation, promoting human rights and the rule of law, freedom of the press and active participation of civil society organisations in African politics. After a long period of subjection to authoritarianism, dictatorship and personal rule, African societies re-emerged once again to collaborate and influence the state system and institutions in the continent. These developments provides insights not only for political science to track the complex contours of those transformations now taking place in Africa, but also creates a wider analytical spectrum by making recourse to sociological concepts to determine the relationships between state and society that was set in motion by the end of the Cold War. As had been pointed out in the introduction of this discussion, the logic of the following argument is grounded in the fact that current developments in Africa exhibits a hybrid features that are beyond what is purely political to the extent that current analysis have turned to embrace sociological concepts and categories such as civil society, social movements, social networks of varying densities, and even individuals furbishing their constituencies and regions with ideas for participation, development and creating awareness on challenging issues ranging from fight against ravaging diseases and poverty to human rights. The actions of actors in the realm of society at large provides further insights for researchers to problematise questions affecting social cohesiveness and how it does influence peace and stability, or otherwise. At the level of the process of integration we also would be interested in seeking answers to problems affecting co-ordination and harmonisation of multiple actors and their actions within the context of that hybrid interaction they tend to exhibit.

However, in order to perceive and draw our perspectives on those post-Cold War era developments that have tremendously affected state and society in Africa, there is also the urgent need to take a retrospective view of events that had taken place in Africa prior to the final moments of the Cold War.

If colonialism had for reasons of national interest, contempt or racism on the part of the colonialist failed to harnessed Africa's vibrant social forces for her endogenous development, post-colonialism notoriously and systematically disjointed its states institutions, organs, and other channels for representation, participation, co-ordination, harmonisation and consultation of the emerging social and political forces in the post-independence period. These structural constraints brought in its trail an acute lack of congruence in the relations between state and society, which finally created room for unconventional and ad hoc methods such as, ethnic coalitions, neopatrimonial rule, military-political oligarchies and military-civilian coalitions that characterised the political transactions and bargaining of the post-colonial state. Under that ethnopolitical, military and at times non-legal-rational administrative framework, African states could hardly made any headway in fulfilling the goals of self-reliance, regional co-operation and the Pan-African dream that had gained momentum in the immediate pre and post-independence period.
The complexity of the matter is not the choice and method of rule that those leaders lent themselves to, but their failure to manage and harmonise the subtle diversity, networking and associations that characterise Africa’s socio-political relations. In this direction, certain ingredients for ensuring aggregation of political demands and their possible articulation, such as participation, support and control all became deeply grounded in cultural, military, ethnic, class, association, religious, or racial terms, which consequently undermined broad based governance in the African continent. As a far as there are rarely nations in Africa, about two thirds of African states finds themselves in this awkward situation in one form or dimension.

Out of that fragile political grid emerged large-scale exclusions and marginalisation that produced growing opposition and dissent. On that basis the options opened to most African heads of states was recourse to illegitimate styles of control and coercion in order to restore ‘political order and stability’. Under those circumstances the military and the secret services became the main instruments for silencing dissenting voices and antagonised groups.

In order to create the impression of unity and cohesion in environment of fear and distrust, most ruling African elites resorted to mass mobilisations to reinforce support and solidarity to cloak their narrow ethnic, class, or racial orientations. Such regimes, be it under the rubric of authenticité style of rule in former Zaire under Mobutu, Niger under Tombalbaye, neopatrimonial style of rule in Ivory Coast under Houphouet Boigny, Liberia under Tolbert, or a socialist-populist regimes in Burkina Faso under Sankara, Ghana under Rawlings, or even benevolent dictators flirting capitalist ideals, such as Kenya under Arap Moi, Senegal under Abdul Diop, all of them in one way or other combined force and coercion with incentives for co-opting rival groups and individuals into their political folds, while eliminating or neutralising intransigent elements or forcing them into compulsory exile. The crux of the matter is that the strengthening of the political centre along parochial ethnic, class, or racial lines bred alienation, apathy and stifled social initiatives thereby contradicting the drive for unity and social cohesion that most leaders pretended to be promoting at the national, sub-regional and continental levels under the auspices of the OAU. Political affiliations to the ruling order became the main channel for securing employment, services, opportunities and other kinds of advantages. The state system therefore remained the sole initiator of economic and development policies, which gradually balloon the public sector with huge expenditures. But how those systems managed to survive for a long period can be attributed to the blind eye the West kept on Africa during the Cold War era. Given the economic vulnerability and overly dependence of most African states, the West, under the framework of the Cold War gave a blessing hand to the ills of personal rule and dictatorship in Africa through ideological laden forms of aid and other kinds of assistance.

In the post-Cold War era a new window of opportunity emerged for domestic political forces and citizens who had spearheaded the struggle for political liberalisation, freedom, justice and competition across the political spectrum under harsh political environment, before even international pressure on dictatorial one-party and military regimes mounted the platform for transitions to democratic governance. The rise of new social and political forces since the beginning of the 1990s is gradually levelling the political landscape to facilitate free and fair competition and participation by the broad masses of citizens across the length and breadth of the African continent. Among the plethora of political novelties in the continent after the Cold War also include the emergence of a new breed of democratically elected African leadership committed to the needs of the electorate, promoting the basic tenets of democratic governance, such as, free press, functioning judicial and legal institutions and the cohorts of rights
associated with liberal democratic pluralism. It is this new category of responsiveness defined within an environment of scarce resources, and widespread poverty that would eventually create a dynamic relationship between the rulers and the ruled and thereby give an impetus towards democratic consolidation, continuity, peaceful change, stability and development which the African people had been struggling to achieve since independence from colonial rule. Thus by being responsive to the ruled, the African leadership are in one sense voluntarily submitting themselves for transparency and accountability which would in turn prop up public confidence in national leadership, thereby achieving the ultimate goal of not only a democratic culture but, above all, legitimacy of the political system.

At this stage, by capturing the transformations that have taken place in African societies we are attempting to give credence to the „multiplicity of social spheres and public spaces“ that are not subject to the complex and rigid logic of any all-embracing principle. What is at stake in the social realm for the researcher is the flexibility for assessing developments in the African continent neither as an integrated whole bearing the trappings of 'supranationalism', nor an 'aggregation' of the member states that constitute the African Union. The idea of inculcating the social helps us to perceive the African process beyond its totality, by capturing it in terms of an „overlapping networks and diffuse power centres“.

Hence, in the foregoing analysis, the importance of healthy and vibrant relations between state and society for the general African integration process in an era of globalisation cannot be ignored. Indeed, it may constitute the very catalyst for moving the process forward, including creating conducive conditions for any future politico-economic and social strategies for achieving full-fledged political integration for the continent. Most of the core strategies that had been adopted in the recent past by the OAU/AU, such as NePAD with its ramify components all point to the crucial role globalisation with its accompanying social actors and ramify stakeholders may play in the African integration and transformation processes. Indeed, they are processes that are contingent on hybrid stakeholders and actors who are purposive, self-conscious, reflexive, rational human agents, the analysis of whose actions are neither given, a priori, nor static, but open ended, contingent and highly malleable. Against the background of that rapid social transition it is likely or even justifiable to conclude that African politics have also sojourned the difficult contours of 'high politics' in the Cold War era now to embrace 'soft issues' (economics and developments matters) bounded by actors rational calculations towards maximising cost and benefits relating to crucial national economic interests.

In Part One of this discussion an attempt had been made to delineate the historical origins of Africa's prevailing socio-economic and political predicament. Colonialism and its imperialistic ideology had left a legacy that cannot be surmounted overnight. This is because the colonial process is also transformable, changing only form without any changes about its content and ideology. That is why the trend is followed by other forms of historical legacies such as the Cold War and the harsh international economic system that perpetuates the same ideology while still bearing its past traits in the form of neo-colonialism. Under these conditions the post-colonial African state had scarcely the room to manoeuvre to take up the challenges bequeathed on them by colonialism. In a larger context, post-colonialism produced collaborators and agents; formed outward partnerships with their external counterparts; thereby aiding the capacity of the system of exploitative relations to transform itself rapidly to the detriment of the peoples of the former colonial territories. It had been this tendency to form outward linkages with external agents of exploitation and appropriation that had disengaged the leadership in the continent from the citizenry. Some African governments have easy or faultless
telephone connections with their metropolitan elites in the industrialised countries than they do with their constituencies. Under those circumstances it becomes highly impossible to find alternative self-reliant and endogenous solutions to existing and emerging challenges and problems.

Hence, part of the solution to the continent's socio-economic and political predicament rests on recognising the vital role civil society could play in transformation and integration processes that are now taking place. At times ordinary Africans make fun of the fact that what should be given priority is the social, and not technology! Their conviction: the enhancement of the energies, capabilities, creativity and ingenuity of civil society would automatically lay the foundation for Africa's technological take-off!

Having African leaders failed the continent at the various national levels, could the OAU had done any better under those circumstances by working with member states leaders who had lost congruence with the rule?
Part II Organisation of African Unity (OAU)
The OAU's Labyrinth Path to Continental Unity Security and Development

The OAU was a multipurpose organisation the range and scope of whose functions are characterised by multifarious inter-state engagements in multiple spheres, security and economic co-operation, political interaction for aggregating and articulating common interests, and promoting social cohesion and unity among member states and peoples of the organisation. Based on their common struggle against colonialism and the heritage bequeathed on them thereof, the formation of the OAU was also an attempt to go beyond the relics of colonialism and promote institutionalised behaviour among the member states in order to secure a common African voice on matters of international politics, global challenges affecting the African continent, and above all, act collectively to remove all the vestiges of colonialism from the continent, further the cause of the liberation struggle and emancipation of the African peoples from political and economic subservience.

Among the goals set for the OAU by the Charter, unity, development and security occupy a great deal of focus and attention, so much so that no research project passes by these three goals when examining the organization. Be that as it may, in its teething years the organization had already shown traits of incapacity in fostering these goals, to the extent that its role in the development sphere, for example, had been abandoned by the end of the first decade of its formation only to be taken over by the UN Economic Commission for Africa. Unity on the other hand became a matter of rhetoric without taking cognizance of Africa's infinite, but rich diversity. Saddled with the political realities of the Cold War superpower rivalry, deep rooted external loyalties, fear, distrust, zero commitment and internal political squabbles among member states, security matters affecting the continent also remained a mere protocol. Civil conflicts and the enduring African refugee crisis are as old as the regional body itself.

Article 2, 1 (a) of the Charter establishing the OAU as regards unity firmly and unambiguously states „to promote the unity and solidarity of the African states; and (b) to co-ordinate and intensify their collaboration and efforts to achieve a better life for the peoples of Africa“. Contrary to these noble ideals, the OAU in its almost four decades of existence fared badly to promote unity among the member states, nor effectively co-ordinate the national, sub-regional and regional level collaborations of the member states. Obsession with newly won freedom and sovereignty, distrust and fear about each other and the failure of African leaders to vividly capture the realities and practicalities of the African political, economic and social crisis, all contributed to the failure to lay solid foundations for national, sub-regional and continental unity in Africa.

By the dawn of the 1960s the spirit of Pan-Africanism that had been ushered in by the late 19th century by blacks in the diaspora as a cultural and political movement for colonial reform and retrieval and revalidation of the African cultural heritage, despised and tarnished thereof, assumed new and fresh dynamism for self-determination, strives for industrialisation, inter-African co-operation, and last but not the least, provided the impetus for complete decolonisation via the armed liberation struggle. While the first phase of the Pan-African engagement succeeded in raising consciousness among emerging African intellectuals and elites about colonial rule with its accompanying disastrous cultural, social and economic effects, and thus culminated in the demise of that obnoxious rule, the second phase of the Pan-African struggle for continental unity, among other things, contrary resulted in balkanisation of the same spirit that had gained momentum and coalesced into a political force in the early Twentieth Century. In other words, if Pan-Africanism succeeded in bringing under its fold diverse sons and
daughters of the black race in the Diaspora, it woefully failed to unite black people on the African continent. At the heart of the success at the extra-continental level was the common purpose to resist racism and alienation, and fight against deprivations of all forms that had become synonymous with colonial rule. On the African continent, however, the attainment of independence and enthronement of the modern state system with all its attributes: popular sovereignty, sovereign equality, freedom and liberty, territorial sovereignty and jurisdiction, and above all imperial allegiances to the former colonial powers and the politics of the Cold War, all contributed to the defeat of the Pan-African dream after the 1960s. But the immediate blow towards continental unity could be traced from the African continent itself. This fact is permanently inherent in Africa's complex diversity and lack of cohesiveness exacerbated by the divisions and dichotomies implanted by colonialism in the continent that makes questions of unity and co-operation a daunting task.

However, Africa had produced dauntless sons and daughters. In the year 1965 during a 95-minute Sessional Address marking the ceremonial opening of the Fifth Session of the parliament of Ghana, the first President of the Republic, Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah declared that year „a year of decision for Africa“.

He was quite optimistic that the impending conference of the OAU to be held in Accra in September of the said year would witness the birth of Continental Union Government for Africa. This prescient vision of the man who broke the back of colonialism was envisioned toward creating a start-off point in the African struggle to raise the image of Africa in the world, and seek the requisite political framework within which the continent could complete decolonisation and achieve automation to promote efficiency through the elimination of drudgery, to develop her human and natural resources and improve the standard of living of the peoples of the continent. Indeed, this new spirit among a cross section of the African leadership reflected the revolution captured within the realm of Pan-Africanism, the liberation struggle and African emancipation. The plank of that revolution entailed an open revolt against foreign rule in Africa in order to achieve self-determination and independence, fight against racism in all its ramifications, promotion of the principle of Universal Adult Suffrage, and of course formation of a continental union government and rebuilding of Africa's economic structures to enhance indigenous capacities for economic development to achieve self-sufficiency.

In the debate that ensued in the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, it became apparent clear that many of the newly independent states were extremely conscious of their new won freedom and liberty, and was thus diametrically opposed to the creation of any union government of Africa or supranational government. Notwithstanding that fact, neo-colonial forces were busily at work to undermine any African collective endeavour that might jeopardise continuity of economic dependence and the exploitative relations that had been structured and entrenched under colonial rule. In addition, some African countries drive towards socialism in the immediate period after independence, coupled with the imperatives of the Cold War rendered any African initiatives for a continental unity unrealistic, as East and West covert insurgencies divided the rank and file of African revolutionary forces. That apart, the second phase of decolonisation involved settler colonies (Rhodesia, Angola, Guinea Bissau, Cape Verde, Mozambique, South Africa and Namibia) the perpetuation of which system was facilitated by an international coalition of Western capitalist states (especially Anglo-American support for South Africa and sympathy for Portugal's hold on to her colonies as long as some of those territories such as Mozambique and Angola provided a buffer zone against armed liberation fighters, and alleged communist infiltration that endangered the apartheid regime). It was these conditions of the
immediate independence era that stymied the inter-African debate for a truly continental political forum.

Instead of unity, which had brought the Heads of State and Government to the conference establishing the OAU in Addis Ababa, supra-nationalists minded individuals and groups were rather given non-manageable divergent views, concepts and even movements, as to how the new Africa should be. The Monrovia Group under the strings and influence of Anglo-American interest opted for a limited body inter-African institution. The Brazzaville Group under active French influence strongly supported sub-regional groupings as the main axis of inter-governmental co-operation. The Casablanca Group Algeria, Ghana, Egypt, opted for supranationalism as the ultimate path towards unity, self-determination and self-reliance. The mixed results of those differences and dichotomies were a compromise that finally gave birth to the OAU in May 1963. From the onset, however, former colonial powers did not directly, or openly opposed the idea of an African effort to unite, but showed a common irritation about the form and content of such unity, especially issues relating to supranational inclinations of the African leaders. Indeed, mindful of the political and ideological conditions of the Cold War, they were extremely concerned about Africa sliding towards communism, given her vast natural and strategic resources, and particularly her geo-strategic location as the locus of the Cold War. Hence, within that context, the West in general desired an OAU devoid of revolutionary elements, but full of conservative African elites and leaders committed to serve the imperialist order, based of course on their unwavering loyalty.

The outcome of the profound divisions among African leaders at both the dawn and immediate post-formative period of the OAU, therefore, was fragmentation and groupism along the lines of Africa's colonial heritage (Francophone vs. Anglophone), and geo-political diversity. The short lived Ghana-Guinea-Mali Union, one of the most politically oriented of the groups was dissolved in 1963 shortly prior to the formation of the OAU in the interest of a common continental union offered within the framework of that body. The Francophone countries spearheaded by Houphouet Boigny and Leopold Senghor created the Organisation Commune Africaine et Malgache (OCAM) in Feb. 1965 to promote and co-ordinate their common economic and technical links. Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda moved by common historical, economic and linguistic imperatives formed the East African Common Market in 1967 only to be disintegrated in 1977 after a decade of struggling to survive. A free-trade zone, the Union Douaniere des Etats de L'Afrique Centrale (U.D.E.A.C.) was also established by Gabon, Cameroon, Congo-Brazzaville and the Central African Republic in January 1966. That the proliferation of regional bodies in itself was a rejection of supranationalism was unambiguously in the minds of the intergovernmental elites.

In the end, even within the Casablanca group, Nkrumah was finally isolated, but uncompromisingly defending the idea of continental political union to the end. His major concern was a politico-legal desiderata: a constitution that would commit the newly independent states to the expressions of declarations and resolutions adopted thereof, an ideological blueprint that would set the path and course of African social and economic development, and the insistence on the inseparability of economics and politics, in that the complexity of the total African liberation struggle, cultural re-assertiveness and development process are all dictates of that logic.

That it took the OAU about four years after its establishment to take a formal position regarding sub-regional arrangements (though a weak one) attest to the prescient visions of Nkrumah about the dangers of driving Africa without any coherent and co-ordinated politico-legal guidance. The Charter establishing the OAU also failed to capture the African reality in the praxis, existing only to the whims and caprices of
the member states that were only prepared to flout the Charter and ignore crucial resolutions passed by the organisation. It deems fit to opine that the OAU Charter fell short of firmly grasping the fathom of diversity of the continent and the kind and intensity of management it might require. It is this failure at managing the continent's diversity coupled with other reasons mentioned above that had ultimately put brakes on African security and development initiatives.

If distrust, fear and internal squabbling prevailed over African unity, lack of institutional capacity, imperialists and neo-colonialists loyalty, Cold War ideological rivalry and super power overt and covert insurgencies, lack of logistics, finance, and lack of politico-military acumen and finesse, all combined to thwart any inter-African initiative for continental security framework. Of the purposes and principles of the OAU as enshrined in Articles 2 and 3 of the Charter, the quest for peace, stability and security seems to occupy not just much space but utmost linguistic and diplomatic nicety. Article 2, 1 expresses the members states commitment „to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity and independence”; and Article 3, (4) „peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or arbitration”. Paradoxically, however, if there are any fields of endeavour that the OAU had failed to live up to expectation, then the same security realm may be second to none.

Why is it that despite the robustness of the Charter on security issues (including extra-regional aggression), and the diplomatic attention attached to conflict resolution and settlement of disputes, the OAU remained institutionally immobile and diplomatically inefficient in this capacity? Does the spirit of unity and collective defence, assertions of common historical bond, occasional declarations of solidarity, and geographical propinquity really cuts up the African reality, or is it just a rhetoric to appease acts of irresponsibility and failure? Why the organisation did lend itself to reactive diplomacy and ad hoc problem-solving strategies instead of being proactive?

The reasons may be many, but also varying in the sense that the African states are marginally incapacitated by the prevailing capabilities and dynamics of the international political context that gave room for large scale extra-regional interventions in almost every facet of activity that African states were engage in. Even more excruciating is the exiguous attention the African leadership accorded institutional building capacities to transform the words enshrined in the Charter into deeds. It is in the context of these external and internal constraints that the OAU's capacity for conflict settlement and resolution, and collective defence has to be evaluated.

By the nature of the Charter, one can perceive that the founding fathers of the organisation were more conscious of inter-state conflict (territorial disputes including territorial claims and border differences) and 'unconsciously' relegated intra-state conflict (internal wars of secession like the Nigerian civil war, the Eritrean secessionist movement, and internal power struggle that had resulted in hold ups) to the background. On the basis of maintaining the territorial integrity and independence of the member states the OAU instituted norms and principles safeguarding national independence, prohibiting intervention in the internal affairs of member countries, non-alignment in the superpower politics of the Cold War, and gave their political blessing to the sanctity of the colonial boundaries they had inherited. At the institutional level, the Commission of Mediation Conciliation and Arbitration was established as one of the principal organs, and a specialised commission, the Defence Commission, to manage and resolve conflicts among member states of the organisation. But who was to do what, when and how? The fallacy of priority setting by the organisation was that the role of the commissions created to deal with conflict were overtaken by the supreme organ of the OAU, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government as well as the Council of Ministers. Preoccupied as they were with other duties the members of the Assembly and
the Council at times delegated their missions to *ad hoc* committees mandated to handle inter-state conflicts at specific periods of time. Glaring examples to this end had been the Algeria-Morocco conflict in 1963, the Somalia-Ethiopia conflict in 1964, the Tanzania-Uganda conflict in 1978, The Congo Crisis in 1964, the Biafra secession war in 1967-76 and the Ghana-Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso) conflict. But it should be noted at the same time that those actions were made with a modicum of 'intent' to inculcate an African mode of mediation, conciliation and arbitration set within African customs and laws grounded in *consultation* and *consensus* building at the grass root, instead of the *adversarial justice system* of the West premised on win-lose basis. But was this approach solely committed to inter-state conflict robust enough to pass the test of time and the tide of history?

Perhaps the mind set of the framers of the Charter including the context and reality of African politics, the Herculean task of nation building sums up to neglect the possibility of intra-state conflict. Issues of ethnicity and other sources of would-be potential conflicts were perceived as backward and counterproductive for a solid and cohesive state formation and 'modernisation' of the newly independent African states. In this direction, when ethnicity and diversity turned out to be favoured instruments of conflicts by dissenting political forces, the OAU was woefully incapacitated for the task of conflict resolution and management, especially at the intramural level. However, ethnicity per se assumes meaning and transformability when considered within social and political context of change, which then gives it the modern character, it has today. Even under colonial rule, imperial preferences of control, domination and system of rule were juxtaposed on a form of local or regional *ethnic engineering* to elicit loyalty to the imperial authority. Hence, the British and the French, for example, through their respective instruments of rule, *indirect rule* and *assimilation*, were able not only to entrench political control of the colonies, but also to facilitate colonial exploitation of resources, promote imperial mercantilism and enhance appropriation and accumulation of wealth, including selective policies for citizenship, especially in the case of French policy of assimilation. One ultimate result was putting into disarray pre-existing internal hierarchies of the colonies. Hopes for altering this trend after political independence of the colonies faded with time, only for ethnicity to be utilised under the cloak of the modern state system in the post-colonial era.

Why did a neglected concept re-emerge after few decades of independence in Africa? That the Cold War tamed and bred ethnic animosity between social groups through their ethnisisation was not accidental. The superpower support for their surrogates in Africa had also implied propping up illegitimate and dictatorial forms of rule. This situation was further compounded by internal complexities of scarce resource allocation and distribution, which had favoured social groups with ethnic leanings to the ruling elite. It was this and other socio-economic pressures that compelled the holders of political power to shift towards neo-patrimonial rule in the context of changing social and political relations in order to secure and maintain their power bases and attendant privileges. The by-products of these strategic shifts were ethnic coalitions and pockets of sub-nationalists groupings with differing political capabilities within ruling parties. It was also this conglomeration of ethnic coalitions and affiliations that came to shape state institutions and policies of most African states. Such conditions created fertile grounds for political dissent and coup d'états, especially, when members of excluded ethnic groups, disadvantaged elites and frustrated intelligentsia or their surrogates find their way into top echelons of the military, Chad, Rwanda, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Benin etc had exemplified this trend in the not distanced past. It was tensions from these sources, which if became instrumentalised, imploded and brought proliferation of conflicts to Africa. It even made the existence of the OAU outlive its
usefulness. The organisation was helpless when civil war broke out in Nigeria in 1967, when general insecurity and ethnic tensions led to genocide in Rwanda, and when armed civil conflict occurred in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Chad, Somalia, as well as the political siege in Madagascar due to electoral manipulation and fraud. Even in the Chadian conflict where the OAU decided to intervene militarily for the first time in the history of its existence, the member states failed to commit themselves to the contribution of troops, logistics and finance, without which the whole peace-keeping operation failed. But was the picture different at the extramural level?

Observers of African affairs have always fancied the way Africa has managed to survive on her fragile artificial borders since independence from colonial rule. Without any doubt the credit has most of the time been given to the OAU. But beyond that point, are the existing power structures (both economic and political), and military capabilities of Africa countries strong enough to prosecute and win wars ignited by territorial differences? Was it also perhaps not the case that former colonial powers and the West in general, being always concern about a stable Africa during the tense period of the Cold War (protection of the continent's natural resources and against communist infiltration) were rather at the helm of affairs when cross-border skirmishes and secessionist claims reaches the point of escalation? The involvement of external powers (The United States, Britain, France, Belgium and the Soviet Union) in the second and third Congo crisis of 1964 and 1977 respectively, and the Ethiopian-Eritrean crisis illustrates this point. We should also not lose sight of France’s special military relations with its former colonies.

Despite the awareness that inter-state conflict could be imminent, the international political context exhibited by superpower rivalry of the Cold War era, military dependence on external powers and loyalty to former colonial powers combined with institutional incapacity and lack of political will compromised the OAU's principles and norms of sovereignty and non-intervention as pillars against extra-regional aggression. The provisions of the Charter on extra-regional aggression was also feeble, non-binding and offers no commitment by the member states to stand resolutely to the other when attacked by external forces.

Looking at the issue once again from within, the OAU fell short of instituting the requisite institutional mechanisms for establishing a stand-by force, creating an information gathering unit and early warning systems, co-ordinating the various bodies among the principal institutions of the organisation, such as, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the Council of Ministers, the Commission of Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration and the Defence Commission. By the time of its establishment, the OAU was gradually sowing the seeds of its own demise. By 1967 the organisation had failed to live up to its principles and norms exemplified by the Israeli occupation of Egypt's Sinai Peninsula, and the siege by mercenaries of the city of Bukavu in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Portuguese invasion of Conakry in November 1970. In addition, as regards internal conflicts, extended external linkages, patronage to former colonial powers, allegiances to either one of the superpowers in the framework of the Cold War, lack of constitutional provisions to sanction military intervention by the OAU, all these conditions combined to provide conflict parties with different possibilities of choosing preferred peacemakers and peace facilitators, while combatants in an internal civil war were able to secure multiple sources of external military assistance, thereby compromising any African initiative for conflict resolution. The intractable wars in Angola, Liberia, Sierra Leone, the Congo and Somalia are quite reminiscent in our memory. With that dismal performance at resolving intramural conflicts, and the inability to handle crucial security matters at the
extramural levels, and thus failing to secure peace and stability for Africa, only the time and the tide of history could subject the OAU to self re-examination and reform.

By the turn of the last decade of the last century, as a result of the political landslide that occurred and brought an end to the East-West superpower rivalry accompanied by the explosion of pockets of conflicts and civil wars on the African continent, the OAU finally decided to overhaul its norms and principles that had guarded her shaky existence for several decades. By the end of the Cold War, the overprotection of the African state system by legal and political instruments to the neglect of domestic issues was challenging the very foundation and legitimacy of the organisation in the eyes of critical minded member states and individuals. The immediate and most challenging task before the OAU against a background of horrible civil wars and genocide (in Rwanda) was to develop a realistic framework for conflict management devoid of its archaic principles of non-interference and non-intervention. By this period it had also become increasingly evident to the member states that the links between democracy, human rights, peace and development are inseparable.

In pursuance of that objective, a cross section of the African leadership moved by developments in the Liberian civil war, and influenced by the global discussions to enhance intervention in events of state failure and open political violence, state irresponsibility and large scale humanitarian disaster caused by political expediencies, the OAU rallied within the African Leadership Forum spearheaded by former Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo to create a Conference on Security, Stability, Development and Co-ordination in Africa (CSSDCA) in May 1991. At the level of the OAU's Secretariat, the Secretary-General took steps to inject fresh conceptual and institutional dynamism into the organisation's conflict management mechanism and thereby presented a proposal to establish an OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution to the summit in Dakar, Senegal in June 1992. In the following year the Assembly of Heads of State and Government at its twenty-ninth ordinary session in Cairo, Egypt, between 28 and 30 June 1993 made a declaration that established the mechanism. With this institutional breakthrough, the OAU had by way of implication, sacrilegiously shifted focus, time and energy to intramural conflicts and civil wars by sacrificing some aspects of its anachronistic principles and norms on sovereignty, non-interference and non-intervention.

What then constitute the organisation, concept and instruments of the mechanism? The elaborate concept and instrument of the mechanism clearly suggest a departure from reactive responses to conflict situations by the OAU in the past, „for once since its creation, it was being given a proactive role which required it to go beyond the adoption of platitudinous resolutions which merely appealed to the good will of the conflicting parties to exercise restraint”. The institutional apparatus of the mechanism has at its apex a „Central Organ”, which is also answerable to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government. Its decision-making process is base on the principle of consensus and steered by the Secretary-General and his Secretariat with the support of the newly established office for Conflict-Management. Under the auspices of the „Central Organ”, the Secretary-General was empowered to „take initiatives in situations of emergency or actual conflicts” by consulting parties to the conflict in order to prevent, manage and resolve hostilities among the parties. In order to keep his office abreast with conflict situations in the continent, he was expected to „research and monitor situations in advance with the objective of getting and analysing information and thus establishing an Early Warning Network”, and he must be able to „deploy appropriate measures in cases where conflicts have reached an advanced stage”.
realm along the provisions of the new framework was no wonder not without scepticism.

The provisions of the mechanism covers roles such as „anticipation and prevention of conflicts“, „peacemaking“ and „peace-building“, while remaining ambivalent on peacekeeping for an alleged financial and logistical reasons. However it seems apparent that the member states of the OAU are having an infinite honeymoon with sovereignty, non-interference and non-intervention, for the obvious reason that in the African continent power matters, and the principle of balance of power is only a dream, since size, economic and military resource base of African countries are extremely incommensurable with each other. The only compromise reach on intervention was purely humanitarian in instances of total breakdown of law and order and massive dislocation of civilians to neighbouring countries. Preventive measures would also be allowed in situations where tensions between conflicting parties are proved beyond reasonable doubt by the offices of the Secretary-General and his conflict management team. Comparatively this step was a bold departure from security in the classical sense and how it was applied in the African context.

The extensive emphasis on classical security concerns in Africa designed to protect the integrity, stability and independence of the newly independent states, by way of non-aggression and deterrence, serving the ends of the security dilemma and balance of power, all with the objective of upholding and maintaining the international economic and political system, was indeed flawed in the African context. By the nature and magnitude of the African crisis, the continents leadership failed to go beyond the classical meaning of security to encompass issues such as poverty, deplorable state of the education and health systems, unemployment, economic strangulation and the looming environmental disaster in Africa. In other words, security in its entire ramification: personal security, food security, economic security and social security. Old states in the international system, particularly Western Europe never abandoned these crucial areas of society and politics, but endeavoured to ensure an equilibrium, so that the system as a whole can stick together to ensure cohesion and stability. Hence the sporadic bits of welfarisms and other forms of human security in their socio-economic systems.

It was concerns about the flaws in security systems of developing areas in particular that opened the academic and intellectual floodgate for reconsidering modern security in the post-Cold War era. Towards considering a new framework for security, the main focus in our contemporary world concerns question that are „socially constructed“ as against the old approach by which security is seen objectively in terms of the threats it poses among actors which are mainly states. In this vein, security is regarded as a „specific form of social praxis“ captured as „a quality actors inject into issues by securitising them, which means to stage them on a political arena and then have them accepted by a sufficient audience to sanction extraordinary defensive moves“. In the African context, on the one hand, given the high level of economic dependence and being neatly woven into an unequal international system of production and exchange; and burdened by debt, marginalisation, unemployment and increasing social polarisation, efforts at securitization would obviously embrace issues of laying strong foundations for the national, sub-regional and regional economies to cushion the continent from the brutal onslaughts of globalisation and other hawkish internationalist exploitations. On the other hand, given the wide spread poverty and deep-rooted social injustices, securitization would also include measures to alleviate poverty, and install human security by focusing on basic human needs and equal distribution of public resources. These indicators chime with the precepts of the twin processes of
transformation and integration that have taken place in Africa since the end of the Cold War. Since the last decade the OAU has also taken bold steps and decisive decisions to enable the member states revamp their economies, which have been in doldrums for decades long.

Even though from its inception Article 2 (2c) of the OAU’s Charter stipulated that the member states „shall co-ordinate and harmonise their general policies“, especially in „Economic co-operation, including transport and communication“. (among others), the organisation as pointed out already, remained dormant in this field of endeavour only for her role to be taken over by other international actors, namely the UN and its agencies and the Bretton Wood Institutions. By focusing on security issues at the expense of the economic, (though justified within the context of decolonisation and the liberation struggle as well as a bipolar superpower rivalry of the Cold War era) the OAU by one way or the other stymied regional innovation and competition, failed to support Africa capture her share of the global market place, fell short of bolstering the region’s economies to secure relative gains from international trade and cushion her from protectionism and dumping. It championed the cause of a regional security framework without the innovative, economic and technological foundations to enable Africa take her role in the international political economy.

But if the OAU exerted much time and energies for continental unity and security without expected outcomes, it had by the late 1960s virtually abandoned her commitment to development issues affecting the African continent. Without any coherent economic blueprint for the continent, and divided by prevailing international ideologies of East and West, the individual states experimented and toyed with development ideologies that bore no rationality to the practical requirements of African economic needs. Socialists and capitalists experiments in the continent were fashioned along elite preferences and loyalties to the ideological blocks with no anchorage to local, sub-regional and regional socio-economic imperatives. On the same scale, African leaders who pretended to offer local solutions to their countries economic problems through the so called African socialism ended up instituting cronyism, nepotism and sinecure economic foundations grounded in neo-patrimonial rule and patronage, or a bureaucratic-authoritarian states, as was the case in Uganda under Armin, Ghana under Acheampong and Zaire under Mobutu. Their economic and political philosophies exhibited a hybrid of both categories.

Notwithstanding the different economic ideologies (capitalist or socialist-oriented) embraced by post-independence African states, both ideological niches of groups of countries were constrained by common factors in the execution of their economic policies. Their dependence and integration into the harsh environment of the world capitalists trading system where they have little control and influence represent that shared fate. The main foundations of their national economies are export-oriented, and the major items of export subject to price fluctuations in the international market. Internal sources of capital accumulation by both state and businesses are woefully inadequate, thus creating conditions for dependence on external sources of finance and investment. Against this complex and contradictory background, post-independence African economies assumed a mixed character that oscillates between pressures for attracting foreign investment, and domestic demands for participation in the national economy, as well as the delivery of basic socio-economic needs such as jobs, moderate cost of living, affordable housing, cost effective education and modern infrastructure.

In the case of capitalists-oriented experiments, countries such as Ivory Coast, Kenya, Senegal and Nigeria openly embraced foreign capital and unwittingly or unwittingly submitted their national economies to external dependence and control with little local control and participation. The injection of foreign capital was directed toward
big cocoa and palm fruits plantations in Ivory Coast, coffee and tea in Kenya, groundnuts in Senegal and oil extraction and manufacturing in Nigeria. In the first three countries the Tourism industries also attracted heavy injection of capital from abroad with little indigenous presence in that sector. However, despite the dislocation of indigenous presence those countries had been solaced, at least, with infrastructure relating to those sectors, which other centrally planned economies of the time may not easily boast of.

At the other side of the coin, a large number of post-independence African countries searching for new identities and self-reliance wholeheartedly embraced socialists economic philosophy as they were compelled by circumstances to be enmeshed in the complex and contradictory world capitalist system where they were bound to suffer the share of the inherent crisis of capitalism: global inflation and financial crisis, recession, fluctuations and slowdows, speculation of the world capital markets etc. Those group of countries included, Ghana, Benin, Guinea, Mali, Congo Brazzaville, Guinea-Bissau, Ethiopia, Somalia, Mozambique and Angola. Combined with domestic constraints and inadequacies, such as the low level of state or party power for mobilisation and raising consciousness, little or no dedicated and trained cadre, political cost of managing resistance in the way of ideological transitions, lack of resources and elite consensus, all played their part in defeating African attempt at socialist experiments. Neither did the adoption of scientific socialism in the second wave of socialism's resurgence in the mid-1970s based on Marxist-Leninists precepts paved the way for a genuine socialist transformation in Africa. Countries that embraced State-Capitalism were no less exceptional to the fate of failure and disillusionment. Africa's hybrid politico-economic philosophies could not escape the constraints of the world capitalist's economy.

The gist of the foregoing argument is that the OAU as a continental body that had resolved in its Charter to guide African development was in no way capable to that task. In the final analysis individual African states and the regional body had fallen prey to the whims of the complex and contradictory politico-economic and ideological milieu of the international system. By the dawn of the 1980s the dismal record of African economic performance manifested by the pervading symptoms of underdevelopment across the length and breath of the continent awakened the OAU and the African leadership to reconsider Africa's development requirements and the corresponding strategies needed to salvage African economies from downward slide into economic doldrums. Out of a series of dialogues and meetings between the OAU and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa UNECA, recommendations were made during the first Economic Summit of African Heads of States and Government in Lagos, Nigeria in 1980 where the Lagos Plan of Action emerged as a new blueprint for Africa's development running through to the year 2000. The main plank of that strategy was „self-reliance and self-sustaining development‟; which at the same time welcomed external assistance to complement internal efforts. The implications of poor economic performance in the 1980s were direct negotiations with international multilateral institutions of the Bretton Woods system, which many African countries had abandoned a decade earlier (not without opposition on the part of UNECA). The subordination of vulnerable and weak African economies to that arrangement is indeed, one of the crucial and contradictory issues that create a form of perpetual dependence in Africa's economic development efforts.

At the end of the day the policies and so-called blueprints of African governments seeking to achieve self-sufficient and internally integrated development designed to curtail the creeping effects and vulnerabilities of the harsh international capitalist system ends up being under the control of the holders of foreign capital, the rich capitalist
countries of the West. And for logical reasons that these countries do not act in a voluntary capacity, the goodwill contents of African policies as well as the good intentions of the African leadership are subjected and subordinated to the ideologies, national interests, external models of political development and economic modernisation and culture of the holders of foreign capital. The Lagos Plan of Action of 1980, the Abuja Treaty of 1991 had all been enmeshed in these complex matrixes of the global capitalist system. Even NePAD as the core document of the current transformations and integration in Africa has become more dependent on external capital than the two previous documents mentioned above.

Given the long period of disengagement between the two camps grounded in diametrically opposed and non-convergent ideological positions, it was not surprising for observers and practitioners to have concluded that the Bretton Woods institutions had by the end of the 1980s failed Africa. At the end of the day, instead of self-reliant and self-sustaining development the African nations-states realised that dependence, subordination, non-manageable debt burden and alienation had deepened, if not become permanently entrenched.

Internally, African leaders also recognised the flaws of past politico-economic and ideological experiments, and assumed responsibility for not doing enough to boost structural transformation that would have enabled them to diversify their economies away from inherited colonial economic structures. Their common observations were made vivid in the Africa's Priority Programme for Economic Recovery (APPPER) submitted to a special session of the UN General Assembly in 1986 which outlined some of the main shortfalls as public sector mismanagement, financial mismanagement, low savings, resource misallocation and waste and over blowing military expenditures.

By and large, by the end of the Cold War, and a decade after, the OAU had made a dismal performance on her three-pronged policies at continental unity, security and development. The steep and deepened nature of the total African crisis demands fresh injections of realism and dynamism into the political processes that are shaping the course of Africa's future. The weakness or strength of that regional organisation had much to do with structure of its organisation as a body of independent sovereign states that bent that organisation to their whims than empowering it to be what it was founded to be. The trajectory of that failure was also a political reality, rooted in Africa's ramify identity politics, diverse social and economic conditions that had metamorphosed to what it is today. This is also what the next section is about.
Political Reality Identity Politics and Pan-Africanism

Observed from the point of view of the final debates leading to the establishment of the OAU, the would-be member states had concentrated more of their efforts and energies on the idea of a Pan-African movement either in its defence or otherwise without critically examining Africa's diversity and myriad national, sub-regional and regional identities and how it should be managed to enhance continental unity and coherence. Not surprisingly therefore, shortly after independence, mostly a large number of the newly democratic nation-states gradually traded their democratic structures for exclusive and parochial structures of rule promoting the interests of a particular class, ethnic group, or an alliance of a politically and economically strong groups with external support to prop up and entrench their dictatorial rule. Under the pretext of shielding themselves from accountability, probity, integrity and responsibility, some leaders instituted a rigid neo-patrimonial rule of patronage and rewards seeking justification in a falsified attempt at Africanisation of politics. Liberia, Niger, Ivory Coast, former Zaire, Malawi, Guinea provides good examples for thought. Against this background, the antagonistic political coalitions that emerged either for, or against Pan-Africanism instrumentalised their positions, and even some went that far to justify their fears and discontentment drawing on support from the myriad identities that colonialism and neo-colonial forces had bequeathed them.\textsuperscript{31}

In a similar vein, when post-independence Africanists, began to storm academic discourses on imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and post-colonialism, the contents of some of their writings carried a forceful, but a legitimate attack on the inhuman dimensions of the brutal systems the African continent had encountered, without sufficiently addressing the political realities and internal trappings of those systems and the corresponding issues of interests and identities, and their impact on the continent. Even in cases where much work might have been carried out, the realised political consciousness remained elitists and ended up on University campuses without developing any mass appeal. The brilliant works of Kwame Nkrumah on 'Consciencism' and the 'African Personality', which captures the complex hybrid colonial legacies, the African condition and its multicultural diversity that had been reengineered to suit colonial interests and its complex by-products bequeathed on the continent, and his unwavered attempt to seek a synthesis that can be anchored on the African reality is a glaring example.\textsuperscript{32} Added to the intellectual movement in search of the African identity was Senghor, who also like Nkrumah using Marxism and socialism as starting points recognises the role that external, cultural, political and economic forces had played, and attempt to intervene in that process by reconstructing a new identity based on the myriad experiences that those forces had impacted the African. His concept of \textit{négritude} embraces the notion of an African communal entrepreneurship devoid of antagonistic class differences and open exploitation, but which in its modern environment seeks to be adaptive and innovative to contemporary realities.\textsuperscript{33} Both thoughts, among others, were great philosophical grand projects, which failed to trickle-down to society to coalesce to form the ideological revolution that must have constitute the prop roots of a truly African revolution for a new socio-economic and political order.

No wonder, currents and voices for change or reform had many at times emanated from discontented groups and individuals from the metropolitan industrialised countries. The picture even becomes clearer in the era of globalisation where mass discontent and disaffection are once again not so phenomenal in the South where the state system is battling to survive on the face of the brutal onslaughts of globalisation, and also where
peoples and cultures are undergoing extreme malleability to the whims of the forces of
globalisation. The signs of helplessness becomes even worrisome where the developing
South, and in this case Africa had failed to put forward competent and conscientised
experts to represent her interests in the global game the rules of which are reached at
consensus elsewhere without her participation in the decision-making processes. This
dominant relation thus constitutes the genesis of how African states were carved without
any consideration to her internal mechanism for growth and adaptation.

The political realities of Africa's encounter with foreign systems of control and
domination, without doubt, begins with the scramble for Africa that reached its zenith in
the 1880s and resulted in the partition of the continent during the Conference of Berlin
by 1884-85. The territorial designs of the colonial powers (French, British, German and
Portuguese) at Berlin that was reached through a neatly woven diplomacy and political
bargaining reveals exactly not only the economic expediencies of their actions, but also
power politics and considerations of prestige as well. The subsequent imposition of
colonial rule and the socio-economic and political relations that emerged and existed
between the colonial territories and the metropolitan powers for eighty years resulted in
the disintegration of existing internal hierarchies and national identities thereby
weakening endogenous capacities for growth and development in the colonial
territories. These artificial territorial designs accompanied by some cases of ethnic
inventions and impositions whereby certain ethnic and identity groups were recognised
and preferred, or created by the colonial administrators, were all non-negotiable political
realities constituted to facilitate colonial administration that had become the main
engine for appropriation and extraction.

In the post-independence era the new nation-states in Africa began to battle with
the task of reconsidering and redefining their identity and interests on the face of the
new attributes that had been given them by their statuses as sovereign and independent
entities. That apart, the legacies of colonial rule through different metropolitan
ideologies, systems of rule and control, education and religion all combined to influence
a synthesis of multiple identities the values of which came to represent categories
labelled by the Francophone, Anglophone and Lusophone constellations. Internally, the
differing nations and ethnic groups that had co-existed under colonialism (especially
under the British policy of indirect rule where local institutions were empowered to
facilitate colonial rule) came to compete with the newly post-colonial states for
recognition, identity and new roles in the modern nation-states. In the mindset of the
new breed of post-colonial elites, this competition was in one sense diabolical to the
developmental requirements of modernisation. In the realm of religion, the long history
of Arab and Islamic influence that had been established on the African continent by
the advent of colonialism and subjugated under colonial rule, re-asserted itself in some
nation-states in the post-independence era which had gradually led to the imposition of
Islamic states in multi-ethno-religious territories such as Libya, Mauritania, Sudan, the
Comoros and recently in Northern parts of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, while it
became pre-eminent in nation-states such as Chad, Guinea, Mali, Senegal, Tanzania,
Egypt, Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia.

Also in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, the chilling relations
between the West and the Soviet Union, which gradually culminated in the Cold War,
came to have its place in African politics. Given the geo-politico-strategic, and strategic
mineral importance of Africa (especially, the Horn of Africa, the Congo Basin and
South Africa), the continent was rapidly dragged into the Cold War, and in the end even
became the main object and symbol of superpower rivalry for ideological supremacy
and strategic resource control. In struggling to counter each other’s influence on the
continent, covert wars and insurgencies of all forms, nationalist and secessionist
movement with external support from either one of the ideological blocks resulted in widespread destabilisation and political violence in the African continent. The absence of peace and stability further compromised Africa's development efforts in a continent already engulfed by diverse constraints for achieving the goals thereto. Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, the former Zaire and Rhodesia, the whole of the Horn of Africa and Liberia became active theatres for Cold War military and political power jockeying. In another sense the Cold War contributed to Africa's democratic deficit and disregard for human rights as individual leaders were supported irrespective of their democratic credence and human rights record.

The interwoven identities at the level of the nation-state, inheritance of colonial identity dichotomies and Islamic influence, all became a reality that came to shape the course and contours of African political order. In the post-Cold War era, the abolishing and dismantling of apartheid has also brought issues of emerging identities in the Southern African sub-region as modern South Africa struggles in search of an identity that is rooted in a common Pan-African spirit which it had long been denied of. At the national level, black and white South Africans including other ancillary identity groups are also leaving no stone unturned in order to give their country a new outlook that reflects contemporary cultural and political realities of post-apartheid South Africa.

As already indicated in the course of this discussion, the Francophone-Anglophone divide had by the founding stages of the OAU became an impediment to the supranational project. This was evidence by the anxieties expressed by the former colonial powers, which on no occasion expressed support for the supranational project strongly advocated by the Casablanca Group. In the Francophone camp supranationalism sounded a counter attack on all that imperial French ideologies manifested by the policy of Assimilation and La Francophonie had achieved till that period of time: French overseas identity grounded in special relations in the fields of culture, Education, economy, domestic and foreign politics, defence, and above all the adoption of French citizenship in French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa. These relations were more enduring and pervasive in Francophone Sub-Sahara African than say in North Africa, where the spectre of long armed liberation war in Algeria compelled France to recede her hold in that region. The crust of the argument in relation to French presence in Africa boils down to the extent and rapidity at which Africa's crisis, especially political, military and security aspects becomes easily internationalised. But the most enduring aspects of Franco-African relations are the historical and cultural ties that had been developed under colonialism through to the post-independence era, and which had now been institutionalised in the form of annual Franco-African summit. Bolstered by the fundamental revolutionary ideals of 1789 - Liberté, Egalité and Fraternité, France had taken a view of a mission civilisatrice, which is rigidly embedded in her imperial expansion and rule in Africa. In the politico-diplomatic and economic praxis French policies have been underpinned by a series of defence pacts and military co-operation, common monetary union linked to the French Francs with Francophone African countries (except Guinea), not just for the protection of those client states, but serving the cause of French foreign policy interests than any humanitarian considerations. Even current transitions in the European Union, such as, the Monetary Union and the at times French pessimism on the quest for a new Europe reverberate in the overseas dominions including Africa. In the African context, the contradictions of French positions in Europe and how it relates to Africa has been manifested by the introduction of the Euro and the departure of the 600 hundred years old French Franc, which French West Africa, for example is still holding on to. Current initiatives in West Africa by ECOWAS to adopt a common monetary policy causes many to raise an eyebrow on French initiative that had extended the economic utility of
the Euro to Francophone countries which had been associated with the French Franc till today. Whether this will constitute a hindrance in a future West African monetary Union or facilitate such a move is still a matter of debate.

To what extent does France still harbour fears of losing her special relationships with her former colonial territories in West Africa? And, how is Francophone West Africa’s deep-rooted loyalty to France going to impact on-going transformations and integration in the West African sub-region and at the continental level? In the first case France’s politicians and policy makers would have to realise that an economically vibrant, and politically independent Africa would be in her own interest, as the US perceived European integration not as an erosion of her economic power and dislodgement of her competitive edge, but supported integration for a prosperous, peaceful and a stable Europe. In the long term a self-sufficient and less dependent Africa accompanied by a changing French, and for that matter European perception would help curtail the increasing flood of immigrants both legal and illegal that are attracted to Europe in search of greener pastures. Africa in turn would have the opportunity to halt the brain drain and utilise the energies and creativity of her educated sons and daughters for her human and socio-economic development.

In the second case, Francophone African countries would have to strive to reconsider and possibly redefine their identity and interests to chime with continental goals and aspirations based on a common Pan-African project. It is by this process of self-renewal that would in turn winnow down the prevalent and decadent distrust that states perceives their neighbours, which many at times drives them to seek external protection when frustrated by domestic political events that may yield cross-border repercussions. In the general sense however, the impact of the wider African crisis demands that African states develop a deep sense of a collective and stable identity rooted in their common struggle to break dependence, alleviate poverty, promoting democracy and human rights, and enthroning social justice. It is the broad manifestation of the African crisis itself (in all its myriad subtleties) that could create a beleaguered but a determined ‘we’ identity struggling for progress within an international community of privileged self-sufficient ‘they’ identities. In other words nation-states in Africa should judge their performance and efficiency in terms of positive developments else where in other regions in order to help bail the continent out of her obscurity and neglect. New meanings on acquisition and use of power would have to be invented and predicated on responsibility and efficient performance by holders of political power and authority.

However, there is a window of opportunity in facing the task ahead for reconsidering and reconstructing African identity in the post-Cold War era. This task could be facilitated by South Africa’s leading role in the sub-region and on the continent because of her unique drive towards forging a future devoid of its negative past. Even though apartheid does not bear any semblance to the vestiges of colonial identities found elsewhere on the African continent, the idea of a new era, new ideas and new beginning should encourage the rest of Africa to break some of the negative relics of colonialism, dependence and loyalties that inhibits her drive toward an autonomous and endogenous development.

At a certain level of analysis of the African crisis, one could easily discern that lack of harmonisation of Africa’s ramify identity has been one of the major sources of inter-state and communal distrust, fear and anxiety about other identity groups and states. Hence, often at times communities and states frustrated and frightened by each other may seek overt or covert external military assistance, material, human, diplomatic and other forms of support in order to keep imagined as well as possible threats posed by the other at bay. Even beyond that the complex nature of African identity politics bears
semblance to the myriad trappings of the African crisis itself, which had seriously hampered a genuine, solid and coherent Pan-African forum for transforming the continent from the complex contradictions of her colonial heritage.

The issues of identity and divergence become even more acute at the structural level of analysis. One problematic and reality which African leaders have persistently shunned is the continents Afro-Arab geo-political dichotomy. The geographical location of North Africa, the diverse ethno-religious identity of its inhabitants, the underpinnings of their external political orientation, combines to create a deeper divergence in their commitment to continental projects within the then OAU and the current African Union. Apart from their internal divergence northern African countries external relations, the conditions of their political praxis, security concerns all do challenge the regional policy drives of the former OAU and the current African Union.
The OAU and the African Crisis

How was the African crisis created and evolved through time, centuries, eras and epochs only to challenge modern theories and approaches for resolving them? In their working definition of the concept *crisis* to explain the sources of conflict among nations, Snyder and Diesing had attempted to locate conflict situation „at the nexus between peace and war”, while using the complex international political system as the „logical starting point for theorising about it”. They further opine, „Despite such occasional ambiguity, we simply stipulate that cases of large-scale violence (war) lie outside the class of events we call „crises”, although war may be a consequence of crises. The distinction corresponds closely enough to ordinary usage and to empirical reality.” Others such as Coleman and Sklar writing specifically in the context of the African crisis (in the Cold War era) refers to the concept as „a situation of acute tension and/or armed conflict generated and precipitated by local indigenous factors, interacting with external influences, which threaten to engage, or have actually engaged the involvement of the United States and the Soviet Union either directly or through their surrogates” Each definition provides us with at least a uni-dimensional point of locating the source of crisis, the latter the international political system, the  former focusing largely on internal factors that generates conflicts that invites superpower involvement. The latter definition also opens up the possibility of going beyond the political to embrace other fields such as the economic and ecological crisis which might not necessarily invite superpower actors but other kinds of actors with motives devoid of the politico-military intentions associated with superpower politics. As indicated already, the movement across the board would indeed expose us to the frontiers of the empirical reality referred to by Snyder and Diesing. The first definition also focuses on the primacy of the international system in its malleable time and space as the main theatre for crisis with possible domestic repercussions.

The nature, complexity, magnitude and the capacity of the African crisis to evade even the notion of *time* for its conclusion or resolution suggests, however, that we equally complement the strong emphasis of the international with domestic and local causes of crisis in Africa to ensure at least that the multifaceted nature of the African crisis is properly dusted and put under a microscope with the capacity to identify the multiple linkages that may inhere the overall African crisis. The ongoing discussion also whittles down to the argument that the investigative positions taken on the African crisis enables us to adopt a comparative approach using multiple case studies that have challenged the OAU as a regional organisation. The advantage with this approach is that it sharpens our analytical perspectives to outreach any cumulative knowledge that might be up there in the African crisis to stimulate future research. In this case the classic example of intervention in Chad, and the Rwanda genocide may be preferred because both case studies exhibits peculiar points and sources of escalation from within both countries that prompted international intervention or immobility.

The focus on the international system, for example, enables us to trace the historicity of the African crisis which without any doubt started in 1884-85 in a multi-polar international structure whose actors were obsessed with grand territorial designs and thirst for industrial raw material and markets for manufactured products, and the matrixes of whose actions largely ignored domestic social, cultural and identity peculiarities of other cultures and identities such as in Africa. The consequence as we all know had been the delicate issue of nation/state-building for a large number of post-colonial states in Africa. How were the power politics, interests and security calculations of the major powers affecting the peace and stability of the multi-polar
international system that it had by the beginning of the last quarter of the 19th century necessitated a regional conference in Berlin? Though as simple that may sound, how did those decisions of the then competing and rival powers affected the colonies and their future? The imposition of colonialism and the subsequent reluctant and ad hoc approaches toward decolonisation on the part of the colonialists gave the OAU an unpleasant heritage that nearly cost the demise of the regional body. South Africa, Angola, Ethiopia and Somalia, the Western Sahara and the intense armed liberation struggle on the African continent, especially, in the former Portuguese colonies were all patterns of decolonisation that erupted into international crises with catastrophic consequences in terms of human life, deep human suffering, destruction of property and the future of a whole generation of children. The 30 years civil war in Angola in particular which erupted as results of the failure to create a common platform for the nationalists struggle for independence has caused about a million dead, 4 million injured and displaced, and the country now being one of the most land-mined in the world.40

Hence, the logical starting point for analysing the African crisis is to delineate its historical trappings that were deeply inherent in the structure, interests and perceptions of the superpowers and the perceptions and images they had on Africa by the turn of the 20th Century and afterwards. In this way we would be attempting to situate the African crisis in a systemic, and most probably in a particular era or epoch to identify how each systems' or era's power configurations and interests contributed its quota to the African crisis through convergence and interaction with domestic and local factors. As Crawford Young had noted on the problematic concerning decolonisation in South Africa, „the roots of conflicts can ultimately be traced to the catastrophic British mistake of transferring power to an exclusively white regime in South Africa in 1910.“41 In that particular instance imperial security designs dictated that general sovereignty, land, power, economy and the bureaucracy must be the exclusive domain of the English and Afrikaner communities while the majority African interests were restricted to colonial sovereignty over Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland protectorates.42

In line with its charter's Article 2, paragraph (d) the OAU committed its self to the eradication of all forms of colonialism in the African continent. Article 3, paragraph 6, and reinforces this commitment by solemnly urging the member states to adhere to the principles of „absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African Territories which are still dependent“. In this direction the organisation channelled a large amount of her inter-African and international diplomatic resources, moral, military and financial support to champion the cause of ending apartheid in South Africa, and decolonisation in Rhodesia, Namibia, Angola, French Somalia (the territory of the Afars and Issas) Spanish Sahara, the Comoro Islands, the Canary Islands, the Seychelles, and a plethora of Islands surrounding the African continent under foreign rule. To facilitate its organisational and diplomatic activities, the Liberation Committee was established and headquartered in Dar-es-Salaam to co-ordinate its mobilisation and strategic efforts, but remained under the confines of the Council of Ministers which made recommendations to the Assembly of Heads of States. Even though the entire Southern African region was enmeshed in a broad decolonisation programme under the OAU, the South African experience with its international linkages and consequences deserves comments here.

The crises point in South Africa (SA) began in 1948 when apartheid and white supremacy was established. In order for it to be spared any isolation SA assumed a new role for herself as the bulwark against communism in order to lure American support, which fact also motivated the former Soviet Union to be sympathetic towards the frontline states (Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and Zambia) and thereby provided her an effective diplomatic cover up in the Southern Africa region. Apart from those strategic considerations, SA was also growing in importance to the US in
economic terms because of her rich strategic mineral resources. But of crucial interests were Washington's international political interests in issue areas likely to affect world order, and linkage politics that may affect America's relations with third parties within and outside the African continent. In the domain of world order, South Africa's control over Namibia in contravention of the International Court of Justice and Security Council decisions raised an international outcry about American commitment to international institutions, which had been a major instrument in her foreign policy. Indeed, this double standard in relation to international institutions had not change in any significant way even in post-Cold War era. The second pertinent issue that in mainstream American security calculations could have had negative reverberations on world order and thereby raised American foreign policy concerns was apartheid South Africa's accumulating nuclear capability and her intransigent refusal to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and other commitments relating to international inspection of her nuclear facilities and uranium possessions. So long as South Africa was seen in American security calculations as a countervailing force against communism the country's nuclear accumulation did not constitute any threat to security in the region and in the international system as whole.

How did these developments affect and influence the decisions and actions of actors within and outside the African continent? By the end of the 1950s and mid 1960s at the steaming points of the Cold War, Soviet military security and political interests began to mould in order to offset any possible gains to its rival superpower the US. Soviet strategy was to support the MPLA government of Angola backed by heavy armed Cuban Soviet surrogate forces in defence of international communism against the pro-American and South African backed UNITA rebel forces in Angola.

By the birth of the OAU in May 1963, African states, ideologically as they were divided, could not mount any common platform within the organisation to advance African interests. This was because of US policy towards South Africa. At least while the US could influence the decisions of her African allies to turn the course of state of affairs on matters of African interests, the Soviet Union could not muscled the support of African countries that were sympathetic of the communist cause to significantly further their opposition to the South African regime. In the final analysis all that could come out of OAU's diplomatic bandwagon was the declaration of the Lusaka Manifesto that stipulated among others that 'South Africa should be excluded from the United Nations.... it should be ostracized by the world community'. Linguistically powerful as it was these statements were captured in the minds of power holders in Washington as rhetoric that can in no uncertain terms carry a modicum of action. In the course of its existence the OAU had been confronted with specific local hot spots with large-scale international interventions, and even at times inaction. Chad, the Western Sahara, the Rwanda Genocide and the Congo Crisis are all quite reminiscent in our memories. The consequences of this crisis in terms of destabilisation, instability and wide spread civil wars and an out-blown refugee crisis challenged the OAU throughout its existence, with the new African Union still grappling with the task of conflict resolution and management.
Some Case Studies

The Chad Crisis

The Chadian crisis presented a classic challenge to the Charter of the OAU in her first major experiment at crisis intervention in the form of a peace-keeping operation touted as a move to surpass her traditional methods of conflict resolution which had always taken the form of ad hoc committees, conference diplomacy, good offices and presidential mediation. It was a crisis rooted in the failure to achieve nation building, which had been jeopardised by rival local factionalism generated by internal politics of colonialism and exclusive ethnic and parochial nationalism. In its external dimension, the Chad conflict offered the bastion of interests for Cold War superpower rivalry and allied pre-eminence, portrayed the vivid expressions of French colonial impact and neo-colonial hegemony, and an opportunity for sub-regional territorial grand designs by a Soviet backed Libya. It is under these circumstances that the Chad crisis offers its complex character, and does not lend itself to any reducible set of circumstances and reasons, and even particular set of causative factors. This case study would identify domestic ethnic factionalism, tribal and religious diversity and complex political intricacies that had insidiously accumulated at independence to warrant tension and civil war in the immediate but teething years of a newborn nation. Also at stake for analysis are the political conditions and prevailing events that finally prompted the OAU to move beyond her traditional mechanisms for resolving conflict to peacekeeping. But, in all, the sixty-four thousand dollar question would be, how did the OAU lived up to this task?

Internally if one juxtaposes the structure of political power, the state bureaucracy and parochial nationalism on the ethno-political and religious diversity of Chad, then the crisis that came to engulf the landlocked West African country was quite ominous. The extreme diversity of Chad lends it self to the observation that even nature, and in this connection geography had added it toll to it. As already noted, it is landlocked by six neighbouring countries, Libya, Sudan, Cameroon, Nigeria, The Central African Republic and Niger, the last two of which also do not have harbour facilities. Chad's natural landscape is predominantly located in the Sahel and Sahara Desert thus affecting the economic utility of much of its territories. This economic utility factor, combined with the country's southern blacks (majority of whom are Christians and animists) enterprising industry, compelled the colonial administration to give investment preferences to the Sara people of the south, referring even to the region as le Tchad-utile (the economically useful south). Though the development of the region and its infrastructure was not so dramatic, it was in sharp contrast to the general economy of the northern region which is clamped and referred to as BET (Borkou, Ennedi and Tibesti) inhabited by Muslim Toubou and Arab nomads who intransigently resisted early attempts at 'modernisation' which they had suspiciously eyed as an onslaught on their tribal traditions and Islamic culture. In terms of 'education and literacy', the southern inhabitants who had opened up and expose to 'Western education' far exceeded their counterparts in the North. This had great consequences for colonial rule and post-independence state structure, bureaucracy and politics.

Naturally balkanised as it is, when the French first conquered Chad, the most challenging task was fostering unity among the socially, culturally and religiously diverse northern, central and western parts of the country and establishes a strong and viable central government to secure the internal order and stability needed for the country's economic and political development. French dominance of politics was quite
pre-eminent until the early 1950s. Local party politics was appendage to the Assembly of French People via the Chadian Democratic Union (Union Démocratique Tchadienne (UDT), renamed later in the 1950s as the Chadian Social Action—Actions Social Tchadienne (AST) that represented a combination of French commercial interests and cohorts of traditional leaders predominantly constituted by Muslim and Ouaddian nobility. The colonial bureaucracy instituted a system of administration based on favouritism and patronage to lure civil servants under its umbrella while purging or frustrating opponents through dismissals, or transfer to unpleasant distance posts. It had been recorded that Francois Tombalbaye (who later became the country’s first president) suffered a similar fate by losing his job as a teacher and ended up doing awkward jobs such as laying bricks by hand due to his unionist activities and staunch opposition to the UDT which he challenged through his Chadian Progressive Party (Parti Progressiste Tchadienne (PPT)).

In the course of the early 1950s European dominance gradually waned, paving the way for PPT to come to the limelight of Chadian politics. Its first leader, Gabriel Lisette was a black colonial administrator from the French Antilles and was transferred by the French colonial overseas administration to Chad in 1946, which appointment also enabled him to secure a seat as a deputy to the French National Assembly. After suffering a series of setbacks at the polls and in local politics involving French colonial officials, the Chieftaincy and Muslim Arabs, he finally regained his political foothold in 1958 and became the country’s first prime minister. Under his Presidency the PPT was restructured along Marxist leanings and gave it a popular identity. At the inter-territorial level Lisette identified the party to African Democratic Assembly (Rassemblement Démocratique Africaine (RDA) to which he later became the Secretary-General. By this stage, the PPT had become a full-fledged territorial branch of the RDA representing the countries non-Muslim intellectuals and bureaucrats. Following successive electoral competitions in the 1950s, the political landscape of the country was reflected in a constellation of power blocks represented by the AST, the PPT and allied groups of militant Muslim fundamentalists led by Ahmed Koulamallah from the Chari-Baguirmi and Kanem prefectures. Along these lines the political power poles became easily identifiable, with the PPT emerging as the main political vehicle for the South, while the Muslim inhabitants of the sahelian belt favoured the AST. This posture was short lived as events tilted to favour PPT domination through the policies and methods of one person, Francois Tombalbaye, a union leader who joined Lisette’s PPT after the Second World War. By the end of the 1950s he had rose to the territorial assembly, but not without opposition from the colonial administration, which deplored his radicalism and unionist leanings.

The crumble of Lisette’s coalition in the late 1950s had been captured in political essays and discourses as the first major “coup d’état by telegram” in Africa, as Tombalbaye replaced the former as prime minister without necessarily resorting to any violent means, but by way of preventing Lisette’s return home after a visit to Israel via a short telegram. This palace coup was legitimised by the Chadian National Assembly, which gave their vote to his election as head of state and head of government. The fact of the matter is that the end of Lisette’s political career in Chad was not so much of any policy fallout between himself and members of the PPT, but his alien origin. As the country’s first President, Tombalbaye’s political strategies and organisation tactics were an anathema to Chad’s socio-political structure and religious diversity. To consolidate his power base and freedom of action, Tombalbaye banned all political parties in 1962 thereby making the PPT the sole vehicle for political action with himself as head of a rigidly controlled presidential form of government. He systematically purged his opponents by establishing special criminal courts to try opponents who were
falsely charged for constituting threat to national security and unity. In addition, under the cloak of Africanising the country's civil service and security forces, Tombalbaye rather tactically utilised that opportunity to strengthened his personal power base and gave privileges to his fellow southern citizens giving appointments to higher civil and political offices as they (the southerners) were relatively better educated than the northerners. In a nutshell, what non-African observers saw as a laudable effort toward Africanisation of national institutions was indeed behind the curtains a tactical ploy to entrench southern dominance and control of state, society and politics by means of a well-orchestrated neo-patrimonial system of rule. By these methods and policies Tombalbaye woefully failed to achieve greater ethnic and regional balance through reasonable power-sharing mechanism that could have secured Chad the peace and stability crucially needed for her post-independence development. It was also this political false starts that created fertile grounds for dissatisfaction, discontent and dissent, which operated across the length and breadth of the country only to erode legitimacy of the ruling clique and erupt violent political uprising and rebellion. 

From 1965 onwards, as results of socio-economic and political mismanagement, including improprieties in tax collections regarded by many as unrestrained abuses by the government, series of riots erupted in the northern and central-eastern provinces where traditional authorities increasingly challenged the authority of the central government in N’djamena, the national capital. By 1969 government authority in the north had been restricted to only four garrison towns, Faya Largeau, Fada, Bardai and Ounianga. By the same period dissent groups with numerous self-styled “liberation fronts” had grown into pockets of rebel cells around neighbouring Sudan and Libya, all of them claiming leadership over the politically charged internal groups fighting to liberate the country from southern dominance and control of state, society and politics. Even though most of these groups were loosely organised, the Front de Liberation Nationale du Tchad (FROLINAT) founded in June 1966 by Ibrahim Abatcha had a broad appeal among the inhabitants of the east-central and northern provinces of the country. FROLINAT did not cohere during its formative years as it was schismed along personal, philosophical and ethnic differences which finally resulted in splinter groups with one in Khartoum and the other establishing political bureau in Algiers and Tripoli. After the death of Abatcha a series of leadership struggle occurred within the FROLINAT, and Abba Siddick who had survived those leadership intrigues could not achieve the needed coherence of the various factions of the rebel group. The emergence of Goukouni Oueddei and Hissein Habre from the north catalysed the process of fragmentation and factionalism, which culminated in a deep-rooted schism within the FROLINAT with both men breaking with Siddick.

The decision to crush the rebels instead of negotiating with them backfired, and the government was compelled to call in French troops under provisions of military treaties signed earlier on in 1960. The French presence restored a period of relative calm between the late 1960s and early 1970s as Tombalbaye reluctantly put through administrative reforms to retrain the army, reorganise the civil service and introduced comprehensive tax reforms. In the political realm, the government restored the judicial authority of identifiable and locally recognisable sultans in their areas of jurisdiction including the power to collect taxes in exchange for 10 percent of the revenue. As a token of good gesture in his campaign of national reconciliation, about 7,500 political prisoners were released, and Muslims and northerners were embraced into the government. But the withdrawal of French troops due to domestic pressure was to undo the achievements of the late 1960s. 

The period 1970-75 witnessed the culmination of certain internal and external developments which finally resulted in the fall of the Tombalbaye government.
Internally, there was what one can generally represent as Chad's *creeping catastrophe*; serious financial crisis, worsening drought, elite infighting, power struggle, political purges and frequent reshuffling of the top ranks of the military, civil unrest in the seat of government, and finally the ill-conceived decision to impose the harsh physical and psychological *yondo* initiation rites for all southern males and any non-Muslim between sixteen and fifty years aspiring to enter the civil service, government and higher ranks of the military. This latter policy, which was originally conceived to shore up support from the southern Sara, rather resulted in extreme social and religious antagonisms and deep cleavages among civil servants, army officers and students. At the external front, Tombalbaye temporary severed relations with Libya accusing the latter of supporting dissident insurgencies into Chad, while giving moral and material support to anti-Qadhaafi dissidents with bases in Chad. The Libyan leader retaliated by recognising FROLINAT formally for the first time, and offered logistics and other forms of support. But what finally broke the back of the camel was the synthesis of the above factors which had produced discontent among the junior ranks of the gendarmerie and the military on one hand, and his own southern citizens who were no exceptions to the harsh socio-economic and political crisis that had come to engulf Chad on the other hand. In the midst of this heated domestic criticism and attendant disaffection and discontent, the country's gendarmerie assassinated Tombalbaye under direction of junior military officers on April 13, 1975.52

On that same day Colonel Felix Malloum who masterminded the coup was ushered in as the new President of the Republic and became chairman of the newly established ruling Supreme Military Council (*Conseil Supérieur Militaire* (CSM-1975-78) that had embraced more Muslims than the previous government. Lacking the political, administrative and the reforming acumen to steer Chad out of her creeping disaster, Malloum's regime could not utilised the popular authority and legitimacy they had gained during the change of government to avert civil war which had become quite ominous by then. The failure of the Malloum government can be attributed to its lack of political experience to manage the tensions and instability that had engulfed state, society and politics alike. The evidence is not far fetching. Lack of support from the radicalised unions, students and urban dwellers, growing discontent within the rank and file of the military and disgruntlement among the intelligentsia all attest to the government's lack of capacity and organisational skills to mobilise the centrifugal forces for national reconciliation and development. The most fatal of CSM political calculation was its complacency with the rebel groups to which no concrete effort was made, either to pursue the war with them or set a peace process or dialogue in motion, for the simple reason that the rebels no longer had any *raison d'être*. Even on the extreme end of that regime's performance, ordinary and politically conscious Chadians did not miss the fact that the overthrow of Tombalbaye had just meant 'a dictator go, a dictator come', a once common phenomenon in African politics. The regime also failed to punish former government ministers, officials and functionaries for corruption and other forms of abuse of power. The few positive overtures that the government made were to persuade a handful of eastern rebel elements to join the new government and open the door for the return of exiled Chadians. The *derde* of the north, Oueddei Kichidemi was an illustrating example, made to return in August 1975.

The peaceful gestures made to the rebels did not bear any fruit for the simple reason that the FROLINAT had by then become deeply schisised along ethnic lines with fragmented groups representing parochial interests. For example, by 1972 Habre and Goukouni, both Muslim Toubou (but from two different clans) had formed a splinter group, the Command Council of the Armed Forces of the North (*Conseil de
Commandment des Forces Armée du Nord (CCFAN) out of the FROLINAT to represent solely the interests of groups and individuals from the north.

The demise of the Malloum government, however short lived it was, was the culmination of a series of interactions with France, Libya and the FROLINAT. The bone of contention of that tripartite constellation revolved around negotiations to ensure the release of the hostage French archaeologist, Madame Claustres, whose husband François Claustres was also captured while negotiating the release of his wife. The French government, backed by German authorities, bypassed the Malloum government and transacted the release directly with Habre who had demanded a ransom of money and non-military supplies. 54

For France and its allies, notably the US, however, the key issue was not Chad as sovereign state per se, but how possible escalation of the crisis may affect the stability and peace of the neighbouring countries, while expressing worries about Libyan adventurism under the guise of soviet ideological insurgencies in that part of the world. French concerns went beyond those boundaries to include her commitment to avert the anxieties of Francophone African countries in the OAU, such as Senegal, Ivory Coast and Zaire all of which vigorously opposed Qadhafi's militaristic approaches in the Chad crisis. In reaction to his being sidelined in the release of the hostages, the Malloum government ordered the pull out of French troops from Chad at a time when Libyan expansionist designs were rapidly growing. To fill that vacuum, Libya orchestrated the military balance of power in favour of FROLNAT by making available substantial amounts of weaponry and logistical support unprecedented in his relations with the rebels. Within a short period of time the rebels made large-scale advances as Faya Largeau was besieged twice in 1976, and a year later the CCFAN captured Badai. 55

It was this increasing Libyan involvement and the circumstances surrounding the release of the hostages, which sparked off internal power struggle between Goukouni and Habre and finally led to the latter's split in 1976 to form the Armed Forces of the North (Forces Armée du Nord (FAN). The reasons were not far fetched. The two men shared diametrically opposing views on the relations with Libya and release of the hostages. On the one hand, Habre opposed Libya's territorial designs on the Aouzou Strip and remained intransigent on the hostage crisis with intention of using it as leverage even after some of those demands had been met. Goukouni on the other hand, saw Libya as a strategic ally whose assistance is crucially needed in order to topple the neo-colonialist Malloum's regime in N'djamena. As a far as the hostage crisis was concerned, Goukouni had by then became convinced that the imbroglio had run it purpose and their major task was to concentrate on the war against the CMS.

It was these developments, which also gradually changed the alchemy of the centrifugal forces that determined the dynamics of the Chadian crisis until at least 1976. From then onwards the ethno-religious content of the crisis waned, and the fate of Chad was gradually played into the hands of two men with asymmetrical, and at times diametrically opposing views, but convergent on unseating the Malloum's CSM government in N'djamena. Under the spates of undulated violence that characterised the Malloum government between 1976-78, the government hurriedly made reconciliatory gestures to the rebels (about eleven factions in all), but intransigently refused to share power with the then rapidly growing number of internal political entrepreneurs that had characterised the Chadian political landscape, and also ignored calls for granting regional autonomy to facilitate a broad representative government and mass participation of the ruled. The ruling government's strategy was to integrate or absorb opposing groups and individuals into the mainstream political centre under the control of the CSM, with the hope to mollify their thirst for political power in N'djamena. A fortiori, the CSM followed this path of philosophy till it was hardly cornered at the
negotiating table during one of the series of attempts to making peace overtures to his political opponents.

The final product of those negotiations was the formation of a Government of National Union in late August 1978. In that arrangement Malloum was made the head of state, and Habre became a Prime Minister under the provisions embodied in a Fundamental Charter that came into being on August 29 1978. Instead of peace, stability and development that many Chadians had hoped for, the two leaders allowed their energies and time to be sapped by internal squabbles, quarrels over allocations of appointments to ministerial and government councils and power struggle. Second to Malloum as a looser in that arrangement was Goukhouni who secured neither, political gains nor, made any significant inroads on the military field. This was indeed a humiliating defeat which drew Goukhouni slowly into the expansionist hands of Qadhafi. In the meantime the power sharing arrangements between Habre and Malloum took a turning point after a along period of personal squabbles and power struggle, when the former made offensive moves against the national army after mass strike by students which denounced the CSM government. It was this precarious political situation, which offered Goukhouni the much-awaited opportunity to make military gains, which were made possible by military and diplomatic reinforcements of Libya. Weakened as it was on both fronts against Habre and Goukhouni forces, the humiliating defeat of the national army compelled Malloum to hang his gloves and take refuge in Nigeria. His departure from the political scene as the last Sara politician ushered in a new era in Chadian politics characterised by northern dominance and political control. The immediate period after his abdication was followed by a period of general insecurity, fear and distrust, not just among Chad's diverse ethnic and religious groups, but also among existing and emerging factions all striving to make their political presence felt and recognised in N'Djamena, the central seat of power and authority.

Within the African continent, there was growing sense of anxiety among Chad's neighbours about spill over effects of general insecurity in the country. Nigeria, Sudan, Libya, Cameroon all in one way or the other offered peaceful initiatives to reconcile the various factions involved in the conflict, though with different ambitions as far as their national interests were concerned: Libya's territorial designs on the Aozou strip, and the desire for Islamic pre-eminence in the country by both Libya and Sudan. Neighbouring Non-Islamic states such as Nigeria, Cameroon and other countries in the region were extremely concerned about the spread of Islamic fundamentalism under the banner of Libyan Islamic extremists, which could jeopardise the already precarious relations between Christians and Muslims in the sub-region, especially in instances of deep-rooted dichotomies pit along a majority-minority nexus. It was at this stage of the Chadian crisis that its regional, sub-regional and international conciliators realised the crucial need for lasting peace after series of truces and attendant cease-fires had been broken. The irony of Chadian politics was that none of the plethora of belligerent factional groups did command broad legitimacy, but were intransigently hard on sharing power with other competing political entrepreneurs, which fact dragged the conflict from the immediate post-independence period till the 1980s. The conviction then among both regional and international mediators was to erect an all-inclusive mechanism that recognises the many and differing factions.

However, it is also worth pointing out that the long duration of the conflict had by the 1980s gradually paved the way for fatigue and wear-out to set in among the various factions. Some of them weakened as they were, formed alliances, especially, with Goukhouni not because of any politico-strategic reasons, but for their simple abhorrence of Habré’s past record: the kidnap of the Claustres and the subsequent imbroglio, the murder of Major Galopin, and above all his authoritarian temperament and peremptory
posture, and arrogance, all of which combined to arouse anxiety among Chadians of a possible future Habre regime that might likely be a return of the brutal dictatorship of Tombalbaye in the 1960s and 70s. This relative period of alignment and re-alignment opened a window of opportunity for neighbouring countries led by Nigeria acting as a regional power and peace broker to put through negotiations aimed at bringing the warring factions together.

Four of the series of conferences held in Nigeria assumed the name of the northern Nigerian city of Kano (Kano I-II, held on March 10-16 and April 3-11, 1979 respectively). The first of the two of the initiatives exposed weaknesses and lapses of the peace process itself, as well as the incapability and inefficiency of the mediating neighbouring African countries to put through a robust and enduring peace in Chad. Lagos I-III followed this in May, August and December. The aims and objectives of these conferences were clouded by incompatible and peculiar designs of the participating countries whose postures were a blend of peacemakers and power brokers. In the first place, Nigeria and Libya on their part were influenced by their parochial national interests cloaked in the acts of promoting their surrogates into an already fragile „Government of National Unity“.

Secondly, France the former colonial power and a major actor in the Chadian conflict theatre was sidelined to her own diplomatic discomfiture. Nigeria also put through a dominant decision to send her troops to Chad while giving overt support to one of the factional groups, the Third Liberation Army. Libya also on her part saw to it that the series of peace negotiations remained absolutely mute on her occupation of the Aozou strip. And the mediating countries did not seriously pursue the most sensitive of all on the negotiation table, the future structure and role of a national army to the conflict.

From within Chad itself one of the salient contradiction to the series of negotiations was the factional leaders decision to form a provisional state council on March 24, 1979 without the least modicum of regard to the legal and political provisions of Kano I & II, an act combined with lost of influence by Nigeria as she was sidelined by her own protégé, and vehemently resisted by both Habre and Goukouni, thus compelling her to withdraw her contingent of troops stationed in Chad. The final in the series of the Nigerian initiatives was clouded by Goukhouni’s acquiescence to Libyan expansionism in the form of a merger between the two countries, which the Libyan leader assured its neighbours as a purely mutual-defence initiative propped by humanitarian, moral and legal motives, but behind the curtains secretly justifying her military designs on Chad. It was this expansionist posture by Libya that finally opened the floodgate of furore and acrimony against Libya's intentions on Chad, notably its Islamic undertones. It was also the same reason that finally ignited the OAU from its dormancy and condemned the Libya-Chad merger as an open violation of Chad's sovereign right to exist as a state.  

At this stage, the failure of African initiatives, combined with Qadhafi’s military intervention brought France once again to the centre stage of the Chadian crisis. This time around however, France had in one sense reshuffled her cards, giving high priority to her image among the Francophone African countries in whose eyes French policy had flip-flopped in west-central Africa. Until that stage too, France had been the sole Western protégé in Chad due to historical reasons and the subsequent bond that had been built between Francophone Africa and France. But whether French positions on the crisis were quite genuine was another question, given her vast economic interests in terms of Libyan oil supply on proximity, and Libya's dependence on French Military-Industrial Complex. French ambivalence on the crisis to this stage triggered increasing American anxiety, especially regarding Libya's expansionism. By 1983 this particular factor had convinced policy makers in Washington as being the prime cause for protracting the
conflict in Chad, which fact contributed to a rapid change in American perspective of the crisis in its broader regional context. These concerns were vividly expressed by the signing of a Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement in June 1983 between the United States and Chad. The provisions of the agreement allowed American supply of military logistics, support and training of personnel. An American ally from the bulk of factional groups was clear, someone with an uncompromising stand on Libya's expansionism, and the choice was right, Habre. With non-African states - the United States, Russia and France now engaged in the conflict in one way or the other, the conflict then became a full fledged international crisis, which development drew African concerns about seeking African solution to the crisis, and the OAU did just that being the only legitimate forum for voicing Africa's positions on issues with international dimensions and which are also beyond the capability of a single African state.62

The OAU's Intervention in Chad

As had been indicated above, the emergence of two factional-political entrepreneurs of northern tribal stocks, Goukhouni and Habre transformed the Chadian political landscape by ending decades of Sara domination, and gain of northern control of the country's politics. This transformation was given political legitimacy by the interlocutors of the negotiation process which took the form of a Transitional Government of National Unity (GUNT) on the 10 of November 1979, with Goukhouni Weddeye as interim President, Colonel Wadel Abdelkader Kamougué, a strong man of the south and leader of the Forces Armeé Tchadiennes (FAT) as vice-president, and Habre as his Defence Minister. The formation of the GUNT and the immediate period after it revealed to the observer of Chadian politics how elite opportunism, personal aggrandisement, factional power struggle, personal vendetta and drive for territorial largesse combined with external power interests took a whole nation and its future generations for ransom. The GUNT never exhibited any traits of cohesiveness, trust and co-operation among its political entrepreneurs in order to facilitate any positive steps towards national reconciliation, unity and development. Instead, short-sighted inter-factional loyalties and alliances sapped the energies and time of the local actors to the conflict to the extent of compromising Chad's existence as a state.

At this point, it is also worth mentioning that the OAU's silence and inaction on the Chadian conflict only as legitimizer to previous conferences was broken by giving her blessing to one in the series of agreements reached in Nigeria, namely, Lagos II, under the provisions of which the OAU agreed to sponsor a pre-matured peace-keeping force that did not even lived to identify and demarcate the frontlines for interlocking the factional forces for a cease-fire.

However, it must also be noted that the organisation's lack of bite on the conflict was also a political reality grounded in constitutional immobility on her decisions for intervention in internal conflicts of member states, the legalities of which are stipulated in Article III of the Charter. Also the financial position of the organisation had never provided a viable support mechanism for effective engagements with crisis laden individual member states. Constitutionally and financially beleaguered as it was in the past (and even till its transformation into the AU), the OAU on the face of the conflict in Chad turned to the UN for a constitutional face-saving and financial rescue. Prior to backing down on her stand for seeking African solutions to African problems, the organisation had resisted any attempt to give the external powers and actors, including Western powers, and even the rich Arab countries the chance for undertaking any concrete actions on Chad, which act could have at least overcome the financial hurdle
which had by then crippled the OAU. The organisation's intransigence was however 'justified' on the grounds of political expediency, that it had prior to, and during the intervention in Chad suffered losses on its credibility, legitimacy and authority as a regional body, and was thereby bent on demonstrating its capability to the outside world, however limited that may be.

On the constitutional plane Article 53.1 of Chapter VIII of the UN Charter recognises regional *engagements* under the auspices of legitimate regional bodies and agencies to intervene in the internal affairs of individual states if the said crisis or conflict constitute a „breach of the peace‟, „a threat to the peace‟, or „constitute an act of aggression‟ of existing global order and stability. In addition to seeking legitimate international support through this recourse, the OAU also sees in the UN a reliable forum for mobilising financial and logistical support and expertise, especially in areas where the regional body is comparatively disadvantaged.

Despite these constitutional, financial and logistical limitations, one galvanising point among African countries and non-African powers, as already mentioned, was Libyan expansionism seen as being under the cloak of Islamic fundamentalism in the broader context of Libya's policy towards her neighbours. This common platform shared by both African and non-African countries paved the way for hardly needed contributions from France and the United States in the form of cost sharing and logistical support. On the African side, Nigeria, Senegal and Ivory Coast made pledges to contribute to a Pan-African force for Chad, the Inter African Force (IAF), with figures broken down along 8,000, 2,000 and 1,500 respectively.

The mounting focus on Libyan presence in Chad by Western powers produced mixed results, which were quite devastating to both sides. For Libya the inability to bear diplomatic pressure backed by military threats, compelled her to withdraw her troops from Chad, which action echoed deep surprise and strategic concerns for the OAU and the GUNT as the Libyan forces had by then became the sole provider of security for the transitional government. This exerted a great deal of pressure on the OAU to hurriedly put in place an interlocking force to put the armies of the GUNT and FAN at bay. These concerns and fears were evidenced by break out of hostilities between the forces of Habre and Ahmat Acycla a staunch ally of Goukhouni on 11 November 1981 in the eastern provinces of the country.

To this effect, and to warrant the creation of any political limbo of the proposed force, France hurriedly convened a meeting in Paris on 14 November 1981, which finally led to the signing of a Status of Forces Agreement between Chad and the intervening actors. The agreement highlighted not only the composition of the force, but also devoted much of its content to its mandate, election monitoring and rebuilding of the Chadian national army and police force. By spearheading arrangements and determining the venue of the signing ceremony (Paris), France was captured in the eyes of some African countries as hijacking a Pan-African project, the effects of whose actions were seen to weaken African Unity and efficacy of the proposed force, and for that matter in a deleterious psychological frame of reference. The chain of command of the proposed force was designed along UN traditions by which the force was to be placed directly under the command of the Secretary-General aided by his personal representative on the ground. The personal representative also headed a monitoring committee of member countries all of whom were accountable to the Secretary-General. In the Chadian case, an Ethiopian, Gebre Egziaber Dawitt was appointed the personal representative, while members of the monitoring committee were selected from Benin, Congo, Guinea and Kenya. The signs of weakness of the force started right from the beginning at the stage of constituting its number. Earlier pledges could not be fulfilled. Nigeria's pledge of 8,000 men was drastically reduced to a handful of soldiers.
numbering just 2,000, and disappointedly in the end only Senegal and Zaire added men to the Nigerian contingent, which brought the total to 5,000 troops. The country was then divided into three zones, north, east and central Chad to facilitate deployment of troops.

The proposed contingents were mandated to constitute an interlocking force between the two most prevailing and active of the factions in the civil war, namely, GUNT and the FAN. To this end, the northern zone covering the territories around Faya Largeau in the BET region was put under the control and command of a Zairian peacekeeping force. The Nigerians occupied the eastern territories with a command post at Abeche closing in to the eastern Sudanese boarders, while the Senegalese contingent was stationed in the central region with Mongo as the main command and operational post. Right from its inception the intended objectives of the OAU’s intervention force was ill-conceived and was bound to be a failure given the non-predictable background conditions within and outside Chad, including the organisation's own financial, institutional cum organisational and logistical predicament. In assigning any reasons to that failure, however, it should also be fairly considered that the external environment, namely the Cold War rivalry and Libya's intransigence on creating a bastion of the Jamariya's revolutionary and Islamic influence in Chad, all combined with local conditions in Chad and institutional and financial bottlenecks of the OAU to stifle any long-term commitment for seeking durable solutions to the conflict.

That the conflict in Chad got wedged in a Cold War superpower rivalry was not a surprise to local and international observers of political affairs in that landlocked West-Central African country. Libya's revolutionary ideals have always drawn the former Soviet Union's support and sympathy based not exactly on any principles of the communist revolutionary ideal, but purely on politico-strategic and economic reasons. This fact is discernible on the basis that the fundamental ideals of the Jamariya Republic's revolutionary expansionism were wheeled by Islamic fundamentalism, which does not bear any semblance to the global communist agenda during the Cold War, hence the Russians choice of Libya, a sworn enemy of the West, and the United States in particular. The Soviets also found in Libya a buoyant market for the Soviet Military-Industrial-Complex, as well as a sphere of political influence to counteract American influence in Africa. The Americans on the other hand having always gauged communism as a threat to capitalism and liberalism, pounced on the factions in Chad which were ark enemies of Libya and to some extent of Soviet influence, and Habre fell squarely into this spectacle, thus opening the door for US logistical and financial support to neutralised Libya-Soviet 'revolutionary' onslaught in Africa.

As already pointed out, even France the former colonial power which should have exercised more political leverage on Libya to back down on her covert and overt insurgencies in Chad was more cautious in dealing with Libya due to the mutual economic interests that exists between both countries. In a similar vein, Chad's neighbours who got actively involved in the peace process became more concerned about cross-boarder spill over of the conflict than internal peace in the country, and it was this fact that made their positions more of containment than peacemakers. Some of them ended up taking sides in the conflict by allowing their national boarders to be used as conduits for weapons and other forms of logistics crucially needed by the landlocked country. Sudan's overt support for Habre and provision of bases for the AFN in this direction is worth mentioning. This double loyalty of the neighbouring states to the factions and the organisation at the same time weakened the latter's political leverages on the parties to the conflict. And also within Chad itself the proliferation of factions involved in the conflict hampered long-term commitments to resolving the conflict and in its stead the belligerents concentrated their energies and resources on short-term
political gains. In other words, as Pittman had noted, the shifts in alliances in the nature of the conflict including the general lack of unity among the actors, denied the OAU, or any would be intervening actor absolute control of its mediation efforts.\textsuperscript{71} Hence, it was the interplay of these internal contextual situations of Chad, and the inherent weakness of the OAU as a regional organisation that shattered diplomatic efforts for seeking durable political solutions to the conflict at a time when peace was most desirable.

Be that as it may, the organisation's Pan-African ideals for unity, security and development were compromised on the face of the crisis in Chad, and consequently the prestige and credibility of the Pan-African body within and outside Africa. Critics of the ill-prepared intervention set their arguments from the point of view of a defective conceptual clarity by pointing out that for the OAU to have tailored her force and the chain of command along the patterns of the UN was in itself a disaster. First and foremost, given the rigid nature of the military, political, cultural and religious postures of the warring factions there was no peace to keep in Chad, once all of them were not concretely committed to the cause of the OAU. Hence, the whole project was bound to be a failure. In addition, the factions and the frontlines were not easily identifiable for demarcations needed for an obstruction force\textsuperscript{72}, and worse of all, the imitation of the UN's command structure demands a high co-ordinating mechanism and administrative skills, which were all non-existing, and as such the OAU was not up to the task.

Even more so, from the point of view of institutional critics, the OAU lacked the constitutional pre-requisites for a novel and unprecedented venture like peacekeeping. The vision of some of the founding fathers like Nkrumah for an African High Command to forestall possible future crisis and challenges associated with the fragile post-colonial state were allowed to be ditched by external loyalties structured and deepened along the Francophone-Anglophone divide. The Charter had also remained silent on intervention into internal affairs of individual sovereign states, and the organisation's accredited organ for peace-making, the Defence Commission and its affiliate committees could not live up to the challenges posed by the conflict in Chad.

From the inception of its birth, if there is any one predicament that had always compromised the organisation's goals, then the obvious one is the financial. Despite their gigantic number, majority of the member countries constituting the OAU have economies with low GNP. The sum total of the whole continents total GNP is not even equivalent to that of one of the smallest economies in Europe, Belgium. The depreciating trend of the organisation's annual budgets reflects the deteriorating trend that had gripped African economies during that period, to the extent that the 1980s could be dubbed the „lost economic decade“ in Africa. Empirical evidence abounds on Africa's gloomy economic performance. The debt crisis had gradually put brakes on the continent's socio-economic and human resource development. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Reports throughout the 1980s and 90s revealed a plethora of African economies lagging behind on the global economic index scale.\textsuperscript{73} The end results had been evident by the receding value of the OAU's annual budgets from 1986-1988, which had been $25M, $23.5M, and $23.2M respectively.\textsuperscript{74} The estimated cost of the peacekeeping operation ranged from $150-$300M, which was extremely not in congruence with the financial realities of the organisation. Financially defunct as it was, the organisation's poorer member states, which had originally made pledges to contribution of troops and were as such dependent on the OAU for liquid cash could not honour their promise as long as the expected financial support from the OAU was not forthcoming. Togo and Guinea fell victim to the OAU's financial predicament as they could not obtain the cash for financing troops deployment under those circumstances, thus jeopardising the first ever attempt by the organisation to find regional solutions to African problems - the then emerging concept
..try Africa first". If there are any convincing arguments to the effect that the whole operation was ill-conceived and ill-prepared then the financial reason would without any doubt be the prime one, since the efficiency of any modern international organisation is dictated by not only its organisational structure and administrative efficiency, but its ability to operate freely within its own financial means.

These perennial handicaps apart, the organisation lacked the corresponding and accredited political and military bureau with skilled manpower to live up to the challenges posed by the conflict in Chad and the planned interventionary scheme. Even if the afore mentioned conditions and factors were to be within the reach of the OAU, the basic and real problems concerning logistics could not have given the organisation any free hand for manoeuvre. Scarcely do African armies possess equipment such as transport planes, personnel carriers and up-to-date telecommunication gadgets needed for modern military operations. Hence, the OAU was compelled to rely heavily on France and the United States to offset that particular handicap. But even in that regard, how swift were the Western powers prepared to make those facilities available at the disposal of the OAU, given the problems of distance and bureaucracy? For example, it had been documented that the Zairean contingent had to be on the waiting for over one month just to be transported to their designated zone of operation in northern Chad. To make matters worse, the OAU’s lack of capacity to grapple with technical problems, such as, issuing a clear mandate, convincing the factions for a comprehensive cease-fire agreement, and demilitarising the factional frontlines with swift and efficacy created room for the factions to reorganise for the final onslaught. That the forces of Habre, for example, managed to make military gains under the nose of the Inter-African Force on 15 March 1982 by taking over Oum Hadjer in the midst of intervention is a clear evidence of the OAU’s incompetence to the task it had taken upon herself. But was Chad a necessary and sufficient test case for the OAU to amend her defence and security architecture and conflict resolution strategies to forestall future crisis?

The Rwanda Genocide

The Prelude

The Genocide that occurred in Rwanda in April 1994 and the wider crisis it had brought in its trail in Central Africa had most of the time been presented as a human tragedy, thereby overshadowing its real political trappings. The crisis of the whole political process began almost four hundred years ago, was deepened under colonialism and took a decisive turn in the immediate post-independence period, and by the last decade of the last century it had gone a full cycle for it to have its ‘rationale response and purpose’. The killing of over half a million people within hundred days was indeed, the results of a long history of migration and demographic trends, poorly managed elite power struggle, fear and distrust among identity and social groups, deep-rooted external economic dependence, exploitation and mismanagement, coupled with a regional organisation that had been disengaged by institutional immobility, rhetoric and inaction, and an international comity of nations that decided to be a bystander to one of humanity's cruel acts. In a nutshell, the events of April 1994 was a by-product of a badly managed democratisation process in the post-independence period which tilted in favour of majority rule that empowered political entrepreneurs engaged in an old conflict, and who saw their survival through instrumentaliztion of a colonial-tailored ethnic constellation of Hutu-Tutsi dichotomy. Hence development of events in Rwanda during the colonial era, through the period of independence presented greater challenges to its political entrepreneurs, who could not peacefully steer the open and deadly encounters offered by their political system, only to respond by non-political methods.
The complex contours of history, culture and even religion, the people of Rwanda are quite homogeneous, speak common language, *Kinyarwanda*, a Bantu language spoken by all Rwandans, practice the same culture and share the same traditional religious values. The pre-colonial political system of Rwanda exhibited a centralised monarchical order, but the social and class structure of which was not quite ‘manifest’. The origins of Rwanda’s three main tribes, Twa, Hutu and Tutsi have been subsumed under myths and ‘emotional facts’. The Twa constitute about one percent of the total population and are believed to be the pioneers as far as immigration into the region is concerned. The largest proportion of the population are Hutus, who are traditionally farmers and trace their origin from Bantu tribes further to the western parts of the country, while the Tutsis are said to have migrated into the region around 14th or 15th century from the Northeast. The origins of myths and emotions begins with that element of *externality* involve in tracing the sources of migration. Labelled as concocted and designed to substantiate racist theories of the early 20th century, the problematic of origins in Rwanda was to remain a thorn in the flesh of generations yet unborn. Despite those grim areas of tribal origins, existing social and power relations had been well established before the advent of colonialism.

Existing social and power relations were underpinned on a deep-rooted economic system of exploitation and dependence propped up by rituals and symbols. Under this hierarchy, the Tutsi’s whose ancestry is traced to thousands of years of Hima pastoralist migration induced by their pastoral occupation in the wider Great-Lake region assumed the position of holders of political and military power. During that period Tutsis and Hutus peacefully co-existed under a patron-client system (*ubuhake*) which according to oral tradition even created opportunities for subordinate lower classes to move up the social and class ladder by way of achieving economic excellence.

Even though colonial rule compromised the political power of the King and the royal family, the system was partially perpetuated by the Germans, and later on the Belgians, whose administrative structure utilised existing traditional system as the conduits for control and domination of the colony. The colonial administration dependent as it was on the King and the royal entourage, selectively provided education and distributed posts in administration and the economy to the Tutsi’s. They went further to institute chiefdoms in areas where they felt there was power vacuum with Tutsi’s as heads, thus securing a quasi monopoly by Tutsi’s in those spheres of life. Similar opportunities accorded the Hutus in the course of time opened up channels for upward social mobility. Under this system, a Hutu could become a Tutsi under a latent process of ‘Tutsisization’ to acquire power and other social privileges. The strengthening of this principle of rising through the social structure became so established, so much so that the percentage of Tutsi’s rose from 3% before the advent of colonialism to 15% during Belgian colonial rule.78 This increase had economic consequences, as a decreasing Hutu farming community (however insignificant) had to toil for an expanding upper class and the colonial administration through taxation, while an increasing upper class and an expanding colonial regime also put pressure on privileges over land in favour of the latter group in the socio-economic constellation of relations. The colonial onslaught on existing social and economic hierarchies did not end on this note.

If there is anything fateful that colonialism bestowed on Rwanda, then that is European ideology on race and superiority. Preferences for specific existing social groups politicised and polemised those groups, thus deepening an already precarious
situation. Based on „nilotic-hammitic“ racial theories, the physical appearances of the ruling monarchy and Tutsis in general became a yardstick for judging superiority, social highness and excellence, while Hutus and the Twas were degraded as slaves by birth.\textsuperscript{79} By the 1920s, and by way of propaganda, this racist ideology permeated political policy whereby it was further elaborated and systematically applied under colonial rule in the media, political thought and official national documents. In the decade between 1925 and 1935 the colonial administration introduced social and political reforms that for the first time grouped the population along ethnic lines. From then onwards national identity cards, administrative and even academic documents mentioned ethnic origin. The perilous nature of the whole development was that this policy was perpetuated by categorising it under the rubric and pretext of a so-called „Politique de L’équilibre Ethnique et Régionale“ (the policy of ethnic and regional balance) with the purpose of carrying out admissions into schools and promotions in the civil service and other employment opportunities in the post-independence regime under Habyrimana. The objective was to secure Hutu presence and power in important spheres of social, economic and political endeavour.\textsuperscript{80}

The Turning Point: Revolution, Resistance and Independence

The demise of colonialism, coupled with the political landslide that occurred in favour of majority rule, created conditions of fear and threat of existence for the Tutsi minority who bluntly reacted by resorting to the colonial racial ideology to impose their pre-eminence on the Hutus once again. Then conscientised under the banner of a political force, Party for the Emancipation of Hutus (PARMEHUTU), the Hutu resisted and reacted by alienating the Tutsis by making declarations which by implication striped the later of any Rwandese national identity. These developments catapulted into a revolution by the dawn of an all Saints Day in 1959, and ended by a referendum under UN supervision on 25. Sept 1961 that ended the rule of the monarchy and introduced parliamentary election.

The political consequences of these drastic and decisive transformations were quite enormous and far-reaching. For the Monarchy and other Tutsi notables this shift on the political landscape meant lost of political power and control of the government machinery as a whole. In an unprecedented defensive move the monarchy founded a political party, the UNAR with the sole aim of derailing the democratic process that had been set in motion. Under the leadership of Grégoire Kayibanda, the Hutus on the other hand began to mobilise and organise themselves along socio-ethnic lines to facilitate the struggle for representing their interests in the new era that had emerged.\textsuperscript{81} The demands of the Hutus were quite straight forward: full recognition of Hutus base on the democratic principle of their being the majority, limit the power of the monarchy, including transformation of the dominant Tutsi hierarchy that until then had constitute part and parcel of the prevailing colonial administration. By 1958 the patron-client relationship \textit{(ubuhake)} had gradually been abolished, and between Feb. 1957 and Nov. 1959 the control of local administration had tilted away from a total Tutsi domination to an all Hutu control.\textsuperscript{82}

The democratic wind of change that swept across the length and breadth of the country opened the gateway for more people and groups to organise themselves to brace for the challenges ahead. In this direction, the PARMEHUTU apart, other parties such as the APROSOMA (Association pour la promotion de la masse) also representing Hutu interests and the RADER (Rassemblement Democratique Ruandaise), representing Belgian interests and public opinion emerged. The issues were quite clear and loud on
the agenda of the majority Hutu who sought to end monarchical rule, and sought to sort out an ensuing political power struggle between the Hutus of the north and south. Without doubt the transition process was tainted by colonial racial ideologies with Tutsis claiming political control because of the racial blessing that had been bequeathed on them during hey days of colonial rule. It was this tense situation, which sparked off clashes in the late 1950s and early 1960s between Hutu organisations and Tutsi military forces with a huge human toll on both sides.83

It was also these delicate and potentially dangerous developments, which finally culminated in the abolishment of the monarchy on 2 Oct. 1962 and the declaration of a new constitution. The landslide electoral victory of the Hutus under the banner of the PARMEHUTU brought Kayibanda to the presidency under a first republican constitution.

Right from it inception Rwanda's infant democracy under a first republican constitution was denied the requisite dynamism and peaceful atmosphere for growth and adaptation in its new environment. The peace, stability, social equity and justice and development that many Rwandees had expected gradually became disillusioned in the early years of Kayibanda's presidency. By the fifth year of his second term about eight-armed incursion for the restoration of the monarchy had been recorded. An already precarious situation got deteriorated due to developments in neighbouring Burundi where a Tutsi majority government targeted the minority Hutu and was systematically eliminating its opponents. By these acts of repression and secret elimination of political opponents from both ends of the ethnic spectrum in the two neighbouring countries, the young democracies of both countries had already been infested with a benign, but potentially dangerous cancer. Violence and counter violence oscillated with serious destabilising consequences.

Apart from these negative extra-territorial effects on democracy, internal conditions neither provided the important ingredients for a peaceful transition nor for democratic development. In an environment of deteriorating economy and scarce resources, distribution of national resources was rigidly subjected to the dictates of ethnic affiliations, favouritism, cronyism, and nepotism and family ties. Deep-rooted as it was, corruption captured the minds and hearts of even parliamentarians and other government functionaries whose existence depended on the flow of external development aid.84 In the end, corruption and the whetting desire to hang on to political power, combined with an attempt to change the constitution to enable a third term, brought Kayibanda's rule to an end in July 1973, in a bloodless coup led by Major General Juvénal Habyarimana.85

The Second Republic: A Long Fateful Path to Genocide?

Habyarimana's long rule in the second republican government (1973-1994) was exhibited by brutal military dictatorship, establishment of a one party state, the problem of Tutsi immigrants and refugees, the invasion of the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), belated attempt at democratisation and the final and frustrated option for genocide. The new government's major political strategy was to strengthen and consolidate its political power base through reorganisation and mobilisation of the masses under the banner of a new party named the Mouvement Révolutionnaire Nationale pour le Development (MNRD) as the country's sole legal political entity that cuts across the ethnic divide. In consonance with heightened ethnic tensions, the party's manifesto was carefully chosen to reflect the increasing expectation of the masses in order to draw the needed support.
Hence the goal then was national unity, eradication of all forms of discrimination with particular reference to ethnic antagonism and racism.\footnote{86}

The calamity of the new political era that was ushered in Rwanda after independence had its roots in elite's negligence and ignorance of the pertinent questions concerning national identity and nation building. In contrast to these fundamental and crucial prerequisites for any new nation, the Habyarimana era consciously or otherwise, brought to the political spectrum old but refined ethnic engineering that created new social and political classes and forces whose interests and demands brought pressures on an already strained state apparatus. The government further exacerbated the precarious situations due to her over reliance on the military as an instrument for sustaining dictatorial rule. As Molt has noted, the emergence of a new upper class outside the traditional Hutu-Tutsi dichotomy (though not exclusive) was accompanied by privileges, and in the final analysis the creation of an atmosphere of dependence on the organs of a state whose survival had become solely dependent on international aid and other forms of assistance from the donor community. Loyalty to the government was secured on the basis of rewards to individuals, groups and sycophants who were closely linked to the President, either ethnically or for mere purpose of seeking economic gains for their loyalty to the President. Political opponents and holders of alternative views were either deprived of their positions or forced into exile and detentions without trial. At the same time the national army that had then become the main conduits for exercising political power increasingly became an arena for power struggle among the rank and file of the general corps.\footnote{87} In addition, as already noted, during the period between 1973 and 1990, the Habyarimana regime revived and perpetuated colonial measures such as the quota system for appointments and obtaining other employment opportunities in government and the civil service, including entries of ethnic origins in national identity cards and other documents. Thus, in Rwanda neo-patrimonialism attained a full-fledged ideology in the political praxis. By steering national politics in this direction, ethnicity and various forms of exclusions, economic marginalization of the greater number of the masses and intensifying elite power struggle, combined with a sluggish economy, increasing population and decreasing agricultural production undermined not just the efficiency of the state in Rwanda, but its authority and legitimacy as well. The consequences of decades long economic deterioration was that the system of patronage and reward was weakened and cracked, thus setting in signs of incoherence, social disintegration and apathy in the national fabric. The young republic’s democracy was devoid of the requisite social contract crucially needed for the survival of the state.\footnote{88}

It was the weakening of the state apparatus that also finally opened the flood gate for externally orchestrated insurgencies carried out by Tutsis in the Diaspora and other discontent Hutus who were politically marginalized or deprived of their positions because of their differing political views. By the end of the Cold War these opposition groups had coalesced to produce a military force largely constituted by exiles and refugees in Uganda. When this force under the leadership of Paul Kagame finally entered the capital on 4 July 1994 they were hardly unknown by many. The force that toppled the second republican government was as old as the republic itself. During the political clashes of the late 1950s and 60s many Tutsis sought refuge in neighbouring Uganda. Over there Tutsi are known to have become deeply involved in the internal politics of the country and gave overt support to the dictatorial rule of Idi Amin. When the Amin regime finally collapsed in 1979, Milton Obote's government persecuted the Tutsi and repatriated a large of number of them, about 80,000 to Rwanda, where they were neither accorded the full right of citizenship nor returnees resettlement status. The young generation of the remnants of exiles in Uganda, some of them who were born and
bred there had by the early 1990s become conscious of the extreme alienation and racism that looms in the future for them. Given the hard choices they faced, most Tutsis voluntarily turned to Museveni's guerrilla movement against the ruling government. By 1986 Museveni and his force had succeeded usurping power in Kampala. Tutsis such as Fred Rwigyema and Paul Kagame who later became leaders of the RPF assumed leading positions in Museveni's government in the Ugandan secret service.89

But the turn of events in Ugandan national politics were not all in favour of the Tutsis, as pressure mounted on Museveni to curtail the increasing influence of Rwandese in Ugandan national affairs. It was out of the measures introduced by Museveni to limit Tutsi influence which culminated in the formation of an armed group called the RPF, born with the sole objective of returning to the homeland by the only option open to them, and that is military force. By 1 October 1990 the group was poised for action, and launched a military onslaught on the Habyarimana regime. The Tutsi insurgency had serious political and ethnic consequences. It set in motion a three-year ethnic conflict the final outcome of which was genocide. The invasion produced fear and distrust among the Hutu majority who viewed the RPF advances as constituting a threat to their life, power base and existence. Under these circumstances the population was ripe for ethnic propaganda and xenophobic paroles that targeted the minority Tutsi and even their Hutu sympathisers. The formal demands of the RPF was an unconditional resettlement of all exiled Tutsis, including their full co-optation in a power-sharing government that also integrates non-armed opposition forces in exile. This created a deadlock between the government and the RPF, which then drew the attention of the international community for seeking peaceful resolution to the conflict.

By early 1992, the rapid escalation of the conflict, and the creeping disaster that it bored was not hardly to discern, which compelled the US, EU and Belgium to step up pressure on the Habyarimana regime to set up an all-inclusive government. The French on the other hand remained committed to the ruling government on the conviction that it represented law and order as well as being at the helm of the democratisation process that had been set in motion by the end of the 1990s. In December that year a „National Charter“ that envisioned a new constitution and multi-party politics was published and came into effect on 10 and 18 June respectively in the following year. In all, four parties were formed to compete for elections. They were, Mouvement Democratique Republicain (MDR), Parti Democratique Chrétien (PDC), Parti Social Democratique (PSD) and the Parti Liberal (PL). The first three of them formed a united front to unseat the MRND, which had also restructured itself as Democratic Party. The MDR candidate, Disma Nsengiyaremye, headed the Broad Based Transitional Government (BBTG) that emerged after an intense dialogue between government and opposition forces. While observers from within and outside Rwanda had hoped for a peaceful democratic transition, the RPF on the contrary capitalised on the short period of relative peace to reorganise her forces only to lay a final onslaught on the capital Kigali.

Why did the government fail to defuse the mounting tension that accumulated since the establishment of the regime it had headed for more than two decades? Some observers of the conflict such as Suhrke had opined that the conflict could have been avoided if the ruling government had recognised the right to return of refugees and exiles, which act would have whittle down the legitimacy of the invading force within the exile community at little cost for the government.90 Given the uncompromising stand of the factional groups in the conflict on peaceful settlement among themselves, Rwanda provided another litmus test for the OAU during the Arusha peace process.
The OAU and the Arusha Peace Process: Too little, too slow?

The changes that had taken place in the OAU after the Cold War had been described and explained at the onset of this chapter. By the outbreak of the genocide, the organisation's Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution was then almost one year old. Within the institutional context of the OAU, the trajectory of the conflict and the final invasion had far-reaching consequences, not only on its image as a regional organisation, but also in terms of violations of the constitutional and legal foundations of the regional body, and even international law. The OAU Charter of 1963 proscribes the support of governments for destabilisation forces working to unseat a head of a sovereign state. In this case, the use of Uganda's territory and provision of other forms of support was in principle a contravention of the spirit of the Charter. Legal instruments also exist for recognising and addressing the problems of refugees within the framework of the law short of armed conflict. But could the Rwandan crisis as old as it is like the OAU itself allowed to persist on a dormant Charter and legal instruments of an organisation whose members had at some time in history constituted a club of dictators and military juntas?

Perspectives on the peace have been described as a process that gradually evolved in an incremental manner. This is borne out by the fact that the peace facilitators made up of the French, the Tanzanians and Americans were convinced that the Rwandan conflict constituted part of a protracted social conflict that warrants a systematic revelation of the core issues of insecurity among and within the factions to enable them seek durable and lasting resolution over a period of time. Edward Azar, in his *Protracted Social Conflicts*, including also the writings of John Burton, had made this approach popular in the theoretical studies in the realm of conflict resolution. Based on those theoretical precepts, the Arusha negotiations no wonder became a prolonged process seeking to resolve centuries old political conflict blurred by social and ethnic diversity and deep-rooted antagonisms. Acts of violence and genocide was not new in Rwandese political culture, as it had assumed a recrudescence character since the post-independence era. By the mid-1960s alone the young republic experienced about eight armed insurgencies all of them with disastrous consequences. Hence, instead of the prolonged process, consensual approach that was taken, and evolving outcomes expected by the OAU and other participants, swift action would had been taken on at least the imposition of an inter-locking force on the warring factions to cut off their lines of operation. If this historical knowledge regarding the alchemy of the Rwanda conflict had been at the finger tips of the facilitators in Arusha, and if they had also shown the corresponding political will, optimum decisions and choices would have coalesced to produce outcomes that advocate not only diplomacy, but diplomacy backed by use of military force. In the end what caused the peace in Arusha to falter was limited commitment for raising a robust military inter-locking force to keep the belligerents at bay.

The contours of the path that finally culminated in what came to be dubbed the Arusha peace process was initially characterised by ad hoc but high level summities under the auspices of actors from the sub-region, notably Tanzania whose famous city Arusha became synonymous to the entire process. Summits of that nature took place in Kenya, in Nairobi on 14 October 1990 attended by delegates from the Belgian and Rwandese government. This was followed by a series of mini-summits in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, this time in active consultation with the OAU. By the end of those summits another meeting was held in Gbadolite and Goma in Zaire in October and November 1990 respectively, at which both Uganda and the RPF were invited. On the thorny issue of refugees, presidents Mwinyi of Tanzania and Museveni of Uganda
(resolved in the Gbadolite Communique, 20 November 1990) liaised to organise a preliminary summit of regional foreign ministers in Kinshasa, Zaire on 17-19 January 1991 at which high powered delegates from the OAU and the U.N. High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) attended. The Rwandan Government’s stand on the refugee crisis was quite flexible as Habyarimana made open gestures at the meeting for the return of refugees to Rwanda. Based on that stand, a declaration to that effect was adopted to seek lasting solutions to the five decades old Rwandese refugees’ crisis and finally became a document for action in the impending rounds of the Arusha process (Dar-es-Salaam declaration on the Rwandese Refugees Problem, 19 February 1991, p.1, Art. 5). In a similar diplomatic drive shortly afterwards, Presidents Mwinyi and Museveni used their offices to persuade Habyarimani to sign a communiqué for a cease-fire in order to set the path in search of finding political solution to the old simmering conflict that had engulfed Rwanda since the birth of the republic. The outcome was the Zanzibar Communique of 17 February 1991, which called for a dialogue between all the opposition forces and groups within and outside Rwanda. At these initial stages, the summit diplomacy was overshadowed by rampant clashes between the Forces Arméé Rwandese and the RPF, which development precipitated efforts for finding a negotiated and a binding cease-fire. The departure thereby from summit diplomacy paved the way for the Arusha process.

Indeed, the actors at the negotiating table were many and varied. Apart from the two belligerents, the Government of Rwanda (GOR) and the RPF, there was a team of negotiators from Tanzania, Zaire, Uganda, Burundi and Senegal (whose President was then chairman of the OAU). At the institutional level there were the OAU, the UN and heads of members states of the Communauté Economique de Pays de Grand Lacs (CEPGL). Western powers namely France, Belgium and the United States also sent delegations, while Germany, Britain, Canada, the Netherlands and the EU chose to remain observers to the peace process instead of being active participants.

As a regional body the OAU had certainly monitored events in Rwanda right from the inception of the crisis at the dawn of the 1990s, but got on board the negotiating bandwagon on 29 March, 1991 when the first cease-fire was signed between the GOR and the RPF in N’sele, which was amended later in September of the same year. In its length and breath, the peace agreement contained 11 Articles the protocols of which are elaborated under its Article 3:

First Protocol established a framework for reaching a cease-fire agreement in Gbadolite (16.3. 1991), N’sele (29.3.1991), and Arusha (12.7. 1992),
Second Protocol on the Rule of Law (17 August 1992),
Third Protocol (31 October 1992) established provisions for the creation of a Broad Based Transitional Government (BBTG) based on a principle of power sharing, including modalities for the formation of the Presidency, Cabinet, Transitional National Assembly (TNA) and the Judiciary,
Fourth Protocol highlighted the problem of Tutsi refugees and displaced persons, and arrangements thereof for their return and resettlement in Rwanda,
The fifth Protocol established provisions for demobilisation and disarmament of troops from both sides and their reintegration into a legitimate unified national army, while
The sixth Protocol contained various rules governing the implementation of the general peace agreement.

To ensure compliance with the cease-fire, a Neutral Military Observer Group (NMOG) was created to verify, monitor and control the said cease-fire agreement. This body was placed directly under the authority of the Secretary-General of the OAU to whom the group was obliged to report and update him on acts of violation of the agreement.
Intermediary positions for Assistant Secretary-General for political affairs, and a Special Representative to Rwanda were created to form a link between the offices of the Secretary-General and the NMOG. The work of the NMOG was supplemented by the establishment of a Joint Political and Military Commission (JPMC) headquartered at the offices of the OAU in Addis Ababa. Initially the NMOG was composed of five officers each from Uganda and the RPF, but was later restructured by deleting members from neighbouring countries to embrace ten officers each from neutral countries, namely Senegal, Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Mali, including the original five seats allocated to the GOR and the RPF. In a similar vein the JPMC was composed of five members each from the GOR and the RPF as well as observers of the peace process and the countries that had contributed officers to the NMOG. The JPMC was empowered to oversee implementation of the cease-fire and the impending general peace agreement expected from outcomes of the then on-going peace process. But as Suhrke had noted, the JPMC fell short of the original role assigned to it and remained a mere forum for lodging complaints or accusation of breaches and violations of the legal provisions of the cease-fire agreement without interfering in the general peace process.

When the ground was finally set to move the peace process, certain components of the protocols were found to be extremely controversial, especially regarding the question of the formation of a national army using former combatants from both sides, and the formation and composition of the Broad Based Transitional National Government. The controversy arose from the RPF's rejection of the governments proposal for including the coalition pour le défense de la republique (CDR) not only on grounds of its extremist chemistry, but on the principle that the latter was a political organisation and not a political party, and as such not legible for assuming a seat in transitional national institutions. The RPF's intransigence on this particular question invited criticisms from the French and the host nation, and not surprisingly created fruitful grounds for the tragic events of spring 1994. This was but just the beginning of the RPF cashing in on both the weak aspects of the peace process and the weakened position of the government as it prevailed in subsequent negotiations on allocation of seats to the transitional institutions and composition of the national army. Another teething bottleneck to the peace process was at this stage revealed by the OAU concerning the operations of the NMOG, which was bedevilled by acute logistical and financial shortages, which compelled the organisation to seek external assistance from Belgium, France, Germany and the United States, though inadequate, thus affecting the effective operation of that group.

The OAU's involvement focused inter alia on the refugees crisis by working out modalities for the administration of refugees and internally displaced persons, co-ordinated with the UN to secure a replacement of the NMOG with a Neutral International Force (NIF), and working to commit the warring factions to the Arusha peace process as the only genuine framework for peace in Rwanda. As a token of its commitment to the peace process the OAU's presence to the initial negotiations after the signing of the cease-fire agreement was made by the Secretary-General himself, when the Protocol on the Rule of Law was produced at a meeting attended by a negotiating team from Tanzania led by the Minister for Higher Education, the Foreign Minister of Rwanda, Boniface Nuglinzira and the Chairman of the RPF, Colonel Alexis Kanyanengwe. Their interaction between the period 7 and18 September laid the foundation for the formation of the BBTG.

The duration for the BBTG was twenty-two months to be followed by free elections to choose the government of the country. Another notable controversy on this protocol was the RPF's insistence that the powers of the government reside in the council of ministers rather than with the president and his team of ministers and
advisors, thereby limiting the power of the president to a ceremonial status. The same protocol also catered for the establishment of a Transitional National Assembly (TNA) to replace the then *Conseil Nationale de Development* (CND). The creation of these transitional institutions reshuffled the power centres of the republic in that what emerged out of the institutionalisation process was a balanced parliamentary form of exercise of power which empowers the president to dissolve the Assembly, while the Assembly could in turn censure the BBTG. But the point of difference between the new power centres was the unusual allocation of powers to the TNA to elect the president and the vice-president of the Supreme Court. Apart from restructuring the political institutions, the mammoth task then remained of the composition of those institutions, and as had been indicated already, that aspect of democratic engineering alone derailed the whole peace process.

Not only did the RPF prevailed on the question of excluding the extremists from the MRND, but also succeeded to marginalize the ruling government in the distribution of seats to the BBTG and the TNA, which fact definitely gave her the upper hand for manoeuvring to constitute a forceful opposition to the ruling government. This tactical exclusion of the GOR was further exacerbated by actions of the opposition forces, which rallied to the camp of the RPF in some form of a strategic alliance to oppose the GOR. Added to that was an inexorable pressure from Western powers on the ruling government to accept a democratic framework of governance. Thus, as Suhrke had noted, „members of the Habyarimana regime reacted to the negotiated provisions of Arusha, not as a transition bargain producing real power-sharing arrangements, but as political victories by the RPF which denied them a meaningful share in power“94. The shifting centres of powers was a turning point in Rwanda's political history reminiscent of the immediate post independence era when power shifted radically in favour of the majority Hutus, and also where violence erupted thereafter and caused massive dislocation of refugees to neighbouring countries.

In addition to seeking to establish a democratic framework for conducive political environment in which Rwanda could thrive on her developmental efforts, the OAU also utilised her offices and international edge to co-operate with the UNHCR to adopt a comprehensive document to facilitate implementation of the *Dar-es-Salaam Declaration* on Rwandan Refugees, including a concrete plan of action to be presented to the donor community. 95 As a diplomatic follow up, the Sec.Gen convened an International Humanitarian Conference on Rwanda. At the regional level, a Regional Conference on Refugees and Displaced Persons in the Great Lakes Region subject to an earlier resolution adopted in Tunis in June 1994 was conveyed. But whether the efforts corresponded to the magnitude of the crisis at the refugee camps, especially, after the genocide is another question all together. The acuteness of the refugees' situation was intertwined with the deplorable state of security in all its ramifications, especially on the question of reorganising the national army.

This particular question of army reorganisation and reintegration almost nearly brought the peace process to a deadlock. Initially the GOR had proposed a 15 percent share of armed command for the RPF reflecting the proportion of Tutsis in the total national population. This figure was not only too meagre for the RPF, but they also rejected it on the grounds that it was in contradiction of the very plank of their struggle for democracy for all Rwandese, and thus called for a 50-50 share of the armed command of the army. After a long and intense negotiation, with an interlude of conflicting figures from both ends of the warring factions, the original RPF demand calling for a 50-50 split of the army nearly materialised, whereby the forces were to be drawn from 60 percent from the government and 40 percent from the RPF. Within the higher ranks of the army the RPF was allocated the head of the gendarmerie, and the
government was to retain the control of the head of the armed forces. In the final outcome the two forces were to be integrated into a 13,000 strong army and a 6,000 strong gendarmerie. The elimination of this hurdle paved the way for the Arusha accords to be signed on 4 August 1993, which also envisaged the establishment of transitional institutions within thirty-seven days, for a duration of (22) months that is not later than 10 September 1994. However, at that stage of the negotiation the crucial issue then boiled down to raising a robust interlocking force to oversee the implementation of the peace agreement.

The implementation phase of the general Arusha accords were marred by the slow pace for raising the Neutral International Force (NIF) to help put in place the transitional institutions, to monitor disarmament and demobilisation of combatants as enshrined in the general peace agreement. At the same period the anger the GOR had expressed on their setbacks at the negotiation table, as well as the attendant ignominy of fear and defeat was in itself a denouement of the broader picture of the events of 6 April 1994. Disgruntled extremists systematically acted to whip up fear and insecurity in an already frustrated and terrified civilian population with the intent and purpose to derail the accords, which had been reached at Arusha.

The OAU’s involvement at this stage was quite crucial given the international dimensions of the task of raising an international force to replace the NMOG. As an accredited forum for collective African voice the Sec.Gen requested the UN to support its efforts in Rwanda based on Resolution 812, which had been passed thereto. This request was however not without diplomatic row on the interpretation of the particular resolution. The Sec.Gen of the UN reiterated his concerns about considering the issue not without a concrete peace agreement between the warring factions. It was then incumbent upon the OAU to expedite action on the Arusha accords to facilitate formation of the NIF. In the absence of a timely deployment of the NIF, the Sec.Gen appealed to the Central Organ to extend the mandate of the NMOG, which was by then strained by lack of resources. The delay of deployment of the NIF also impeded a timely formation of the transitional institutions. Even apart from that there was also a growing sense of insecurity in the form of assassinations of political leaders, summarily executions and massacre of innocent civilians. It was the deplorable situation of the security situation in Rwanda that compelled the President of Tanzania to convene a regional summit of the leaders of Rwanda, Burundi, Kenya and Uganda in Dar-es-Salaam on 6 April 1994 to address the security situation in Rwanda in particular. The Sec.Gen utilised his good offices to appeal to the belligerents to respect the letter and spirit of the Arusha accord and comply with the provisions establishing the transitional institutions. At the end of those meetings President Habyarimana of Rwanda, due to security reasons, offered President Ntaryamira of Burundi to fly together with him on board a French government jet manned by French pilots that had been made available at the disposal of the GOR. It was on this return journey that there occurred the tragic death of the two heads of states in a plane crash that sent chilling messages within and outside Africa.

Prior to this event, it must be noted, however, that certain developments had unfolded which tremendously affected the efficacy of the Arusha accords, namely the failure to meet the 10 September deadline to form a transitional government, including the controversial issue to station about 600 RPF troops at Kigali, thus posing an act of balance or dis-balance of military power for the already crisis laden country. And finally the general political and security situation was exacerbated by the inability to mobilise a force to constitute the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) to replace the NMOG to oversee the transitional arrangements. These anomalies in the implementation phase of the Arusha accords coupled with an increasing deterioration of
internal security set forth assassinations and massacres of political opponents and innocent civilians. Even when UNAMIR was finally deployed the intensity of the crisis, and fear of the UN member countries losing their forces, compelled the Security Council to starkly reduce the UNAMIR troops from 2,500 to 270 at the height of the crisis. This action was strongly objected by the African group at the UN, the OAU Sec.Gen., the Non-Aligned Movement and NGOs operating in Rwanda during the crisis. However, when the force was later expanded to 5,500 troops due to a consensus between the then US Vice President Al Gore, President Mwinyi of Tanzania and UN Sec.Gen., Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *diplomacy had done just too little, too late* to save the lives of innocent Rwandese civilians.

**Evaluation and Conclusion**

As indicated already if there had been any important and decisive moment for Africa's struggle for emancipation and development since the continent came to limelight in the comity of nations in the early 1960s, then that period of time should be 1965. The former president of the republic of Ghana, Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah had by then dubbed 1965 as the „year of decision for Africa”. During that year, it was his earnest hope that the next Conference of the OAU to be held in Accra, in September would witness the birth of Continental Union Government for Africa. The prescient vision of Nkrumah emanated from the problematic regarding unity itself and how Africa could galvanize its efforts to attain it. The clarion call for unity was born of the common African struggle against colonial oppression, which he had by then identified as the greatest danger facing Africa. Hence Nkrumah saw it incumbent on the new generation of African intellectuals and leaders to take coordinated action to extirpate the last vestiges of colonialism to ensure their economic independence, and to foil neo-colonialist intrigues in all its ramify forms and methods.

Against this background, in the African Unity Charter that had been adopted during the formative years of the OAU, Nkrumah strongly emphasized the need to co-operate and co-ordinate efforts in the spheres of defense and security, foreign policy and diplomacy, the national economy, science and technology. The aims of that convergent approach were twofold, firstly, to overcome the *arbitrarily* fixed boundaries of the newly sovereign states, and secondly, to harmonize the *disparities* between their social and economic development. Conscious of the total African problematic; the multifaceted nature of African social and economic conditions, Nkrumah advocated a revolutionary path for the transformation of the nation state, society and the national economy. At the heart of that project were a struggle for national liberation against colonialism and apartheid, and the struggle for complete independence from neo-colonialism, in order to break new path for *endogenous socio-economic development*. It must however, also once again be noted that the currents of Nkrumah's ideas for a continental union government was quite critical of other contending opinions advocating sub-regional economic blocks as the main fulcrum for a step-by-step approach to a continental-wide government. The envisioned sub-regional organizations were captured by Nkrumah as a possible instrument for neo-colonialist to confuse and confound the ranks and file of the African revolution behind the smokescreen of an unusual readiness to grant economic concessions to sub-regional groupings, thus creating new avenues for maneuvering to derail a vital African revolutionary project.

It is on the basis of these historical insights juxtapose on the prevailing African crisis that one can argue that the OAU missed an opportunity in its formative years. Instead of these visionary ideas, the OAU member states by wit or design created a
bastion of dictators hiding behind the curtain of sovereign rights and principles, while
denying their civic populations democratic and human rights which had been the very
plank of the African struggle for emancipation and development. In its almost four
decades of existence, the OAU remained an organization of heads of state without any
accountability to the peoples and citizens of the member states. Major principles of the
Charter had been designed to protect the ‘monolithic African state’, whose government
machinery became synonymous with personalities, while denying institutional growth to
cater for legitimate political channels to facilitate citizen's participation. To that end, the
organization did not benefit ordinary citizens of Africa, so long as their leaders failed to
collectively solve pertinent domestic issues affecting the lives of their citizens at that
highest level of interaction. Contrary however, citizens became victims of the state
machinery, as dictatorship, personal rule and adherence to shallow ideologies became a
fashion of an era. To enable those leaders keep silent on peer behaviour in their
domestic politics, non-interference and non-intervention became their guiding
principles, and when they even acted collectively, consensus had meant being cautious
of not stepping on the others toes.

Given the structure, character and functions of the OAU, with strong stance on
making the organization a forum for Africans for solving African problems, the only
option left for the OAU was a consensual approach for diplomacy. Throughout the long
period of its existence, however, inter-state interaction based on consensus had also
meant that it had wittingly or otherwise traded off some basic norms of international
relations in the form of rules and principles. Thus, in one sense, the mere absence of a
binding legal-rational instrument for guiding and controlling the actions of the heads of
member states makes the entire continental project a club of personalities seeking to
protect their own power bases. Within that scheme of things the organization's
performance and efficiency did not go beyond questions involving decolonization and
the struggle against apartheid.

Apart from the exiguous attention given to constitutionalism and international law,
the nature of the African state, characterized by hybrid ethnic, religious, ideological and
geopolitical constellations, amidst scarcity and insecurity, provides room for political
entrepreneurs to maneuver their politics in favour of particular regional and ethnic
interests. These domestic conditions in most African states compromise the
representation of most Heads of States, not as legitimate heads, but as presenters of
parochial interests at the continental level. The logical consequence of that kind of
democratic deficit also further compromise the Pan-African dream, whose cause the
organization was founded to safeguard and champion. But the crux of the matter is not
to argue that the diverse nature of the African state per se is the cause of institutional
inefficiency, and even at times immobility. The crucial point is the inability of the
member states to manage and harness diversity to prop up the Pan-African ideal most
Africans purport to cherish and admire. Collective initiatives and management by the
OAU in the economic front, for example, could have helped tap the potentials of
Africa's diverse social and economic resources to bolster economic and human
development. Sound economic positions, on the other hand, could have also helped
improve the fiscal capabilities of the member states to empower the organization in
order for it to be what every concerned African would like the OAU to be.

And as it is not the case in the African context, fiscal constraint constitute one of
the major obstacles that prevented the OAU to function effectively, including her lack of
leverage in influencing the behaviour of recalcitrant and backlash member states. It is
this particular factor coupled with the above institutional bottlenecks, namely, lack of a
binding constitution, low commitment to international law, anachronistic approaches to
conflict resolution through consensus and mediation, fragile domestic political and
economic conditions that had coalesced to characterise dismal performance of the organisation's political and security ventures on the African continent, such as in Chad and Rwanda.

By the unfolding nature of the crisis in Chad, characterised by increasing interests by outside powers of the Cold War, and being committed to the ideals of the non-aligned movement, African leaders driven by rhetoric and frantic attempts at giving the OAU credibility and prestige in order to save her waning image as object of superpower rivalry, pushed the OAU into an ill-conceived political action to intervene in the complex, but also delicate conflict in Chad. Saddled with institutional inadequacies, extreme lack of logistic, financial hangover and lack of political will on the side of member states, coupled with unwillingness of local factions to co-operate fully with the organisation, the whole enterprise of intervention was bound to fail. That the factions constituting the transitional government (GUNT) were still at each others throat at a period of time they were expected to bury the past, pick up the pieces and move the country forward, was an enough signal for the OAU to have reconsidered her position on Chad vis-à-vis to intervene in the conflict. Also why then should an organisation that had long sought to reassert itself from extra-regional powers take initiatives that would further deepen her dependence on those powers, financially and logistically? Was the OAU through her action also wittingly or unwittingly proving to the outside world the neo-colonial traits it had often been accused of bearing? The lines are certainly identifiable with the organisation's failure to discern the political cost associated with rhetoric, ill-conceived action or inaction.

In the final analysis the members of the OAU sowed the seeds of demise of their own organisation. The spontaneous withdrawal of Libyan troops without consulting the OAU, and giving any consideration for the consequences of power vacuum testifies the pre-eminence of individual African states national interests to the broader Pan-African ideas they always claim to stand for. Libya's unpredictable posture was also quite reminiscent of her support to Acyl Ahmat of the Democratic Revolutionary Council, and rival factions of the GUNT, and Goukhouni on occasions when Libya had disagreed with the former on matters of interests. In the same vein, African states such as Sudan, Egypt and non-African states, namely, Saudi Arabia, France and the US were opposed to the intervention behind the scenes and gave overt support to the beleaguered Defence Minister Habre who resumed fighting till his capture of the capital N'djamena on 4 June 1982.

Observed from the point of view of interests of member states, especially neighbouring ones in this analysis, as well as deep-rooted superpower interests and French economic interests, the member states of the organisation were lured by fake promises to lobby the OAU into action without necessarily putting into consideration the ideals that the organisation stood for. After all, what the OAU should be should stand for, and how it should function is determine by the member states and how they go about doing politics within and outside the African continent. Fragmented regional interests coalitions serving extra-regional interests and loyalties on particular issues affecting the continent did the organisation more harm than good. This was more so because of the circumstances and environment in which the crisis in Chad unfolded; a Cold War environment highly laden with superpower realism, and a superpower perception driven by mutual destruction of each other was definitely bound to influence international politics for both 'good and bad' purposes.

How then was the Chadian experience with its complex nature going to affect the organisation's strategies for conflict resolution elsewhere on the continent? It must also be noted that existing conditions and fundamental roots of conflicts differ from each other in scope and depth, and each individual conflict situation has its own
characteristics that demands that each therefore must be resolved on its own merits and according to its particular and peculiar circumstances. However, beyond this noble caution, there runs a common thread in conflict situations criss-cross the globe. In each single crisis the belligerents and factions have their own peculiar historical grievances, be it in Indonesia and East Timor, Bosnia and Kosovo, or within the African continent, characteristics are quite common: state failure and sovereign collapse, ethnic animosity, a leadership conundrum engulf by greed, fear and distrust, unfounded ambitions, and even at times weakness, violent nationalism, oppression of minorities, refugees and internally displaced persons. Hence, if there had been lessons learnt in Chad, how far was the OAU ripe for resolving conflict in a post-Cold War era in which the UN and other international actors have become quite assertive than ever before?

The Rwandan crisis, for example, took place in the context of a changing era in which African countries had become part and parcel of the global transitions that took place after the 1990s. Social and political transitions in Rwanda externally imposed as it was by the donor community, which had then stringently linked democratisation to economic aid, was to result in a remaking of the political landscape. What was idiosyncratic of the Rwandan case was that it was a situation combined with external insurgency force pressurising an already weakened government to accommodate opposition forces it had kept at bay for more than three decades. Also given the intensity of the transition to democracy in Africa, peace facilitators in the Arusha process in one way or the other sympathised with the forces seeking democratic justice in Rwanda, as the final peace agreement depicted a winner-loser in favour of the RPF on the balance sheet.

Several perspectives have been put forward to explain how the Arusha peace process faltered including an argument by Suhrke that „unprovable counterfactual arguments, namely that there were alternatives, that different decisions at different stages could have produced a more viable, sustainable outcome”[101]. These „if” propositions includes, on one hand - if there had been a genuine and a more balanced power-sharing arrangements between the GOR, the RPF and existing internal opposition forces, the ruling government would had been encouraged to participate sincerely and secure the establishment of the transition institutions. Even on the more sensitive issue regarding the army command, the fears and the general feeling of insecurity of the regime would have been whistle down, if the regime’s demands for a larger proportionate control of the army had been taken into consideration. This would in turn assure them of effective political base to offset other losses made in the distribution of seats in the transitional institutions. Another segment of the counterfactual argument goes that - if the hard liners within the ruling government had been included in the „new order” and given a meaningful role to play in the transition institutions, the perpetrators of the genocide could had been dissuaded from planning, co-ordinating and carrying out the genocide. But as events in Arusha turned out against them in the form of marginalisation and loss of power they found the destructive option attractive since the planners had little to lose by undermining the transitional institutions. Beyond these propositional arguments, empirical lessons elsewhere around the world enrich our thoughts in the construction of reality regarding the success or failure of the Arusha protocols.

In this particular case two options were glossed over regarding the likely losers of power under the transition process:[102] The first is inclusion of potential losers in the „new order” to forestall their destructive intentions. A glaring example had been cited of the South African transitional process, whereby minority whites were given high stakes in the political system, thus enhancing the chances of success of the said process. The second option is to exclude groups whose ideologies are inimical to the transition process, but creating a mechanism to ensure that they are incapacitated or even
neutralised of their abilities and potentials to derail the transition process. The case of Haiti whereby the military junta was pulled out of power substantiates this point. This paved the way for a negotiated democracy to be instituted in Haiti after long decades of military dictatorship. So in the case of Rwanda, if the peace facilitators at Arusha had assigned substantial role for the GOR in the transition process, it would have assured it of her power base and encourage it to cooperate with UNAMIR and other accredited bodies involved in implementing the Arusha protocols. However, some Authors including Suhrke are convinced that the most determining factor missed in the various perspectives is the superior military and diplomatic strength of the RPF. The leadership of the RPF capitalised on this advantage to defy pressure from within and outside Africa to push the GOR against the wall at the negotiation table.

A point of departure from these perspectives is that when the UN and some member states, namely, Belgium withdrew their forces and left innocent civilians to the mercy of the death machine of the genociders, any concerned African and observer of African politics and diplomatic history would have felt a bout of nostalgia for the prescient visions of Kwame Nkrumah, who first proposed an African High Command (a multinational African military force) to intervene in possible future hot spots across Africa. The realism of his vision was that given Africa's vast diversity and fragile artificial national boundaries which he believed are the likely causes of conflict may also require a remedy in the form of military intervention not only to maintain peace and stability, but above all to safeguard the integrity and coherence of the fragile post-colonial states invented by colonial powers without any regard to the socio-cultural realities of the continent. In the above-mentioned Haitian case that occurred in September 1994, for example, the transition succeeded not because of the goodwill of the military junta led by Lt.Gen. Raoul Cedras, but surely because of the presence and preparedness of the 30,000 strong US military force stationed off the coast of Haiti willing to intervene had the junta played any political games with diplomats and peace facilitators led by former President Jimmy Carter and Colin Powell at Port au Prince. Also, in that particular case Cedras was pressurised and exiled to Panama to neutralise the potential threat of the core losers of political power and future possible saboteurs of democracy in Haiti. So therefore, the major flaws, and in the end the failure of the Arusha peace process were made possible more because of the fact that diplomacy was not backed by pressure and the ultimate use of force. And in a more precise sense peacemaking was not backed by peace enforcement as the negotiation process was threatened by a defiant party to the talks. Devoid of that the RPF succeeded in gaining the upper hand and put pressure on both the already weakened government in Kigali, and played the frustrations of diplomats to its advantage.

However, the effectiveness or otherwise of any military intervention is facilitated by national, sub-regional and regional institutions that governs the military and its infrastructure. In the case of Rwanda, not only the OAU as a regional body failed, but the UN as well, and for that matter the international community at large. The foot dragging diplomacy of the Security Council, its lack of co-ordination in the chain of command and lack of political will on the parts of member states, especially those bearers of modern military capability, combined to result in that tragic event in Rwanda. In his book, 'Shake hands with the devil, the failure of humanity in Rwanda' (2003, Random House of Canada), the UNAMIR Commander in Rwanda during the genocide, Lt.-Gen. (Ret.) Roméo Dellaire describes how institutional inefficiency, lack of responsiveness, arrogance, neglect, betrayal, naivety and institutionalised racism combined to result in the killings of about 800,000 civilians in a blitz-genocide that occurred on the 6th of April of 1994. Rwanda for some members of the Security Council
was too remote, too small, too poor and too black. It is in this light African countries must rethink their security architecture to reflect emerging challenges.

The failure of the Arusha peace process has added to our knowledge and experience that a robust African peacekeeping force capable of threading new paths wherever they are deployed must be in the position to achieve the ultimate mission during interventions of that nature. The need for it would be even direr under the up and coming Peace and Security Council within the framework of the AU institutionalisation process. This would depend on the political will of the member states of the AU, as well as co-operation and genuine commitment from the international community to bolster the organisation's effort in the form of logistics and fiscal contributions. Only a future AU which is financially sound and equipped with a robust rapid deployment force could influence the behaviour of the member states who might find themselves on the brink of conflict. But the irony of fate is that to be or not to be depends absolutely on the visions and actions of the member states of the AU to live up to their pledges and transform and integrate Africa's diverse socio-economic and political conditions for the advancement of peace, development and eradication of poverty, since the latter point also lies at the roots of conflicts.

And as El-Ayouty had noted, the OAU of the future must be a revamped and restructured organisation in three key areas, namely the functional area, the conceptual area and the relational area. The first may include reorganisation and strengthening of the OAU (AU) secretariat to enhance it operations in crucial areas such as political and peacekeeping assignments, as well as continuous training of its staff to brace for emerging global challenges. In the second area relating to conceptual reorganisation, the OAU (AU) should shift from its over reliance on domestic jurisdiction for solving problems and inculcate the principles of international law in all its ramifications to reflect global institutions such as the UN and its agencies. In the relational area, the growing social deficit between the regional body and the collective African citizenry must be addressed by way of inculcating the habit of consensus making, dissemination of information and creating channels for citizen’s representation and participation. Even though the CAAU and the NePAD policy document have all make room for overcoming some of these institutional deficits and constraints since the inauguration of the African Union, no positive results have been achieved so far. The regional body is still grappling with the old institutional incapacity for reconciling its policy intents with the will for implementation.

The next part of the discussion focuses on Africa's response to the historical transformations that took place in the international political system after 1990 which compelled African leaders to transform and integrate the continent into the global market economy to reflect current global challenges to enable the continent 'reap her share of global trade and investment opportunities'.
Part III African Transformations and Integration Analysis
Epochenwende: Post-Cold War Transformations and Integration in Africa

In the last chapter it was succinctly pointed out how the Cold War super-power rivalry, elite corruption and disloyalty, economic mismanagement, intractable civil wars combined to create hold ups on Africa's political and economic development and succeeded in dividing the elite's common front for collective initiative and action within the framework of Pan-Africanism. In the end, the superpowers politics of entanglement by involving Africa in the Cold War gradually pushed the continent beyond the boundaries of conventional political entrepreneurship, as personalities, friendships and use of surrogates became convenient instruments for superpower assertion and pre-eminence in the continent, instead of priority for institutions, laws and international principles and norms of governance, thereby undermining African democratic systems put in place after political independence. Mobutu's Zaire, Dos Santos's Angola, Mengistus Ethiopia, Moi's Kenya, Qadhafi's Libya, Tolbert's Liberia, Banda's Malawi, Botha's South Africa, to name a few, all in one way or the other became appendages to the Cold War superpower rivalry. By the end of the Cold War however, this relationship had become part of history and obnoxiously anachronistic to a new era. Indeed, in Africa the turn of the 1990s can safely be represented as a silent revolution with attendant tumultuous negative spill over effects. As Molt has noted:

„Since the end of the Cold War Africa South of the Sahara had mutated into the world's crisis continent bedevilled by wars and civil wars, failed states, refugee crisis, disease and epidemic and deepened economic crisis“

Okoth had also captured the decade after the Cold War as „a decade of post Cold War disorder and regional disintegration in Africa“ as epitomised in the escalation of conflict and insecurity, which betrays the „African renaissance“ most Africans have hoped to realise and sustain during the last stages of the 1990s.

By the emerging transformations set in by the end of the Cold War, pressure for political reform and economic restructuring became more intensive than ever before in the history of the old, crisis-laden continent. Conditionalities and aid became intertwined, and the general tools of political and economic leverage on Africa by the West were also tremendously enhanced, thus creating a leeway for state and non-state actors to penetrate hitherto closed African political entities. The collective African leadership had also become convinced that economic growth and development cannot be achieved without a fundamental transformation of the structural distortions and relations that had been bequeathed onto the continent after colonial rule, and inasmuch as they continue to depend on single commodities for export.

At the continental level a regional body, such as, the OAU and its member states realised the challenges and opportunities offered by globalisation, and thus took the requisite steps to restructure, invigorate and instil some degree of dynamism into the crumbling regional body that had been placed under strains by emerging global challenges. The policy changes initiated by the OAU in the aftermath of the Cold War had been mentioned in the introductory section of this discussion.

In this Chapter there would be a twin objective. The first is to delineate the contours of structural transformations in Africa ushered in by the end of the Cold War in 1989. Hence, novel policies and relevant documents such as the Constitutive Act of the African Union, NePAD and a plethora of concepts, such as, globalisation and most of its semantic co-locates and empirical developments taking place in the various SRECs
would be given a closer look. On the basis of the insights accruing from that transformation an attempt would be made to evaluate those transitions to enable us draw conclusions whether those transformations had really put in place genuine structures, processes, conditions, capacities and ideas for a genuine regional integration project as initiated by the OAU in her final days. The second objective would be to delve into the international political and economic environment and examine whether the gains made from the transitions so far guarantees the OAU/AU member states a place in international politics and the contemporary world of globalisation and competition. In brief, are there any gains to be made from global trade by individual African countries? And to what extent is the transformation going to enhance Africa's competitive edge, and her role in global politics?

In another vein, the transformations taking place in Africa addresses a sensitive issue that had been at the core of academic and intellectual debate in international political economy, namely, the relations that exists between Africa and the West. Closer and careful reading of the NEPAD policy document brings to the fore deeper concerns among the African leadership regarding the centuries long lopsided economic and political relations that had existed between Africa and the industrialised world. So the question then follows, would Western industrialised countries take practical, and even the moral initiatives to create conditions that would at least improve Africa's 'comparative advantage' in specific sectors such as agriculture and primary commodity exports, which now constitute the main source of foreign exchange for the countries in the continent? But before we can draw postulates on on-going integration in Africa and the possible inherent capacities of the countries, or lack of it thereof in utilising the suppose benefits of the international economic system, we may require insights from classic case studies of sub-regional integration of which the former East African Community (1967-1977) may show the presence here to sharpen our analytical optic to help make valuable judgements about the past and make convincing predictions into the future.

The developments that took place after the Cold War lend themselves to variety of interpretations and analysis. These insights can be drawn from the nature and interests of the actors and agents and their political context that shaped the course of events by the end of that era. Without doubt, the United States emerged as the only superpower, which was bent on imposing her will and values grounded in democracy, human rights and adherence to the tenets of the free market system on the rest of the world with the objective to securing a more 'freer and peaceful world'. The former colonial powers, the EU and the rest of the capitalist world adopted stringent approaches toward development aid by linking it to democratisation and human rights. The Bretton Woods institutions in addition to their traditional economic strings attached to development aid also added political conditionalities and principles including accountability, transparency, predictability and the rule of law. The post-colonial state weakened as it was, also hurriedly, and at times reluctantly reacted by making cosmetic changes to reflect prerequisites of the newly emerged order, in order to secure their power bases, unhindered flow of urgently needed development aid and other forms of assistance. Further south of the continent South Africa had been systematically and carefully transformed from apartheid to normalcy and joined the 'civilized' international comity of nations.

However, the same transformations taking place after the Cold War have brought fragmentation, stagnation and disillusionment elsewhere in some countries (such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Ivory Coast, Rwanda-Burundi, etc.) instead of democracy and the rule of law. And pro-democracy movements that had been fighting dictatorship and personal rule for long decades have also emerged from the Cold War
seriously afflicted by decay, fragmentation and ‘poverty of ideas’, only to fill power
vacuums by experimentation and new learning. Another novel development is the
emergence of local and foreign owned NGOs in the African political landscape
competing for resources and influence with states in the continent. We must at the same
time bear in mind that the political transitions were taking place under a deplorable state
of African economies that had been subjected to a long period of exploitation and
subjugation under colonialism, retained and deepen by post-colonialist and neo-
colonialist parochial interests and greed situated in a hostile international political
economy.

Under the rubric of the capitalist credo influential actors in the West, in particular
(US, EU, Canada) realised that the end of the Cold War had also meant a loss of
political leverage, and therefore sought new politico-economic strategies for influencing
the behaviour of states in the so-called developing countries. Today such strategies are
purely economic driven under the banner of globalisation, which has also gradually
overshadowed the political role of the less powerful and dependent states at the
international level. This general posture creates an atmosphere of suspicion among
countries of the so called developing world regarding the possible instrumentalization of
American political and economic values for achieving its own interests and realising a
peculiar Western global agenda. Given Africa's socio-economic crisis and political
decay, the West's imposition of democratic values on Africa pushed the fragile state
system in the continent beyond the boundaries of its capacity. No wonder some of the
transition processes were right from the beginning bound to be defective, if not still-
born. There emerged many casualties from those processes. Democracy contributed
greatly to the rapid events in Rwanda that finally resulted in unorthodox methods of
political behaviour on the part of elites who found themselves at the loosing end of a
lopsided political bargaining process. The fallacy, or in this connection the hypocrisy of
the West's strategy was that their staunch allies of the Cold War in Africa were never
implied to adhere to those principles during the steamy days of the Cold War, so long
as they constituted bulwarks against the evil empire of communism, irrespective of how
their own political posture, including African leaders lackadaisical attitude towards
governance affected the continent. Incumbents in the former Zaire under Mobutu Sese
Sekou, Gnassingbe Eyadema's Togo, Samuel Does Liberia, Moi's Kenya, all vigorously
resisted demands for a free and peaceful democratic transition. That fallacy or hypocrisy
apart, the policies and decisions from the West indicated a significant gloss-over as
regards their insights about the true nature of African politics and the mechanisms that
drives it.

The concentration of efforts and energies on elections monitoring, political
education of the ruled and the ruling alike, reform of the various branches of
government, ensuring adherence to the rule of law, and the dispersal of human rights
observation teams all over the developing world and Africa in particular, overshadowed
the role that the military play in African politics. Pressure for instituting democratic
structures failed to be complemented by corresponding acts to convince African regimes
to reorganise their national armies to reflect the democratic wind of change then
blowing strongly across the continent. The urgency of this particular argument is an
open secret as the structure of most of the regimes armies reflected their leader's ethnic
or regional leanings, and was thus the main instrument of repressive rule in Africa. Re-
democratisation unmatched by military reorganisation was more unlikely to be
consolidated and endured. Those sections of the military resurfaced in some countries
such as Sudan (1989), Sierra Leone (1991 and again in 1996), the Gambia (1994), Niger
(1996), Ivory Coast (1999 and again in 2002) points to imbalances in the military, which
disadvantaged groups and ethnicities view as serving dominant ethnic interests. A classic
demonstration of this was how General Ibrahim Babaginda of Nigeria managed his country's eight-year transition by creating more new problems than providing solutions to old simmering conflicts in Nigerian politics and the polity. That regime systematically utilised the state's repressive apparatuses to bludgeon democratic forces by tactically disqualifying or banning rival candidates for no apparent reason, and even went further to annul an election results that had been declared free and fair by international observers, thereby thwarting any meaningful efforts for a genuine transition. That annulation of results was a testimony of the fact that most African military leaders under whose auspices the transitions took place did that not because of any modicum of goodwill. Manipulations of the electoral process, intimidation of political rivals, unfair competition, ethnically biased elections results, came to characterise the African transition process. As Inhoven had noted:

The reality of Africa, is that it is impossible to carry out a viable and credible political restructuring and transformation in a political economy dominated and controlled by the very class, forces and interests which ran down the various economies, accumulated unprecedented foreign debts, repressed and tried to eliminate all popular organisation, mortgaged their respective economies to foreign interests, and showed little concern for the terrible living conditions of the masses.

The military as a state institution, and the personalities who manipulated it to suit their power preferences and choices did not operate in a vacuum, however. The tail end of their non-conventional political behaviour was the end product of the nature and character of the state system in Africa, which colonialism and colonial rule had left in its trail. The nature of the post-colonial state, its structure and characteristics, and capacities had been discussed at length in Part I under the rubric of the section titled, the periphery cannot hold. But suffice it to say here that the post-Cold War neo-colonial state had not shed off much of these characteristics discussed above, especially as regards structural transformation of institutions in the re-democratisation process that was set in motion by the end of the Cold War. This particular point had been emphasised by Akinrinade when he wrote that:

Thus for multi-party elections to become a meaningful exercise in democracy, there must be a structural transformation of the state., and until a democratic transformation of the state occurs, pro-democracy struggles will never produce truly democratic state. Politics will continue to be played or practised as usual, i.e. ‘winners take all’ approach and the capture of state power will remain irresistibly attractive to the players.

These observations apart, the post-Cold War post-colonial state had still not been able to wade through the economic crisis that had accumulated throughout the turbulent decades after political independence. Its inability to be competitive in the harsh international economic system, coupled with internal constraints such as low industrial and agricultural productive capacity, lack of human resources, the deplorable state of physical infrastructure, non-manageable debt burden and externally oriented consumption patterns have combined to thwart efforts at economic development, thus creating distortions in the domestic economies of most African states. It is this economic process of stagnation and retrogression, interacting with deep-rooted corruption of political elites since the immediate post-independence period that had produced disillusionment, resignation and apathy among many Africans. By the turn of the 1990s the West's politics of linkage exposed the weakness and vulnerabilities of most African economies, as economic aid became linked to democratic performance, Good Governance and human rights. The evidence of failed states in Africa after the Cold War is also in one way or the other a pointer to how dictators had survived by living on and sustaining their neo-patrimonial rule through a corrupt economic system driven by
cronyism, nepotism and other forms of rewards using monies that had been earmarked for development programmes. Mobutu's Zaire, Doe's Liberia, Momoh's Sierra Leone, Habyarimana's Rwanda just to mention a few, were all glaring examples of how the Cold War era nurtured and entrenched dictatorship that eventually ruined African economies. These and other conflict laden countries have indeed emerged as casualties of the post-Cold War era thereby tainting the transformation process with negative effects, producing perceptions and images that hamper efforts for laying down the socio-economic foundation crucially needed for regional integration to take-off. A short case study would illuminate this point.

**Deadlocked Transitions: The Case of Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)**

On that particular point of reference the delicate political developments in the Great Lake Region would deserve mention and discussion since it represents a case study of one of several deadlocked transitions to democracy in Africa. Size, and diverse identity of the DRC situated within the context of her vast natural resources makes it a laboratory for testing how far transitions to democratic rule can endure and consolidate, though bearing in mind the differing internal socio-economic and political conditions in the various African countries. The importance of the developments there cannot be overlooked as the colossal number of countries involved in the crisis belong to one or two sub-regional economic group either in the SADC, EAC, COMESA, ECASS, etc., neither can we afford to divert research attention from the region since the interests are so diverse, and the boundaries of alliances and coalitions extremely fuzzy and unpredictable.

For almost five years violent war had been raging on in the DRC that had claimed about 3.3 million human lives, a record high war casualty figure since the Second World War. A whole economy had been stagnated, and infrastructure destroyed. Women and young girls have become victims of rape and all kinds of sexual assaults, while maceration's and mutilation had known no gender and age. As had been noted in the discussion on the Rwandan crisis, the outbreak of hostilities and widespread political violence in the region is part of a wider spasm of events that gripped the region in the post-Cold War era, resulted in the overthrow of the Mobutu regime, but had been sustained due to lack of consensus among the many and varying warring factions within the DRC and other external political entrepreneurs, namely, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi on the side of the rebellion, and Angola, Zimbabwe, Namibia, the Sudan and Chad supporting the Kabila I and II governments. In addition to these are a handful of quasi-politico-military opposition groups from neighbouring countries. Uganda's Alliance of Democratic Forces (ADF), some elements from the All-Hutu militant wing of Burundi's Conseil National pour la Défense de la Democratie (CNDD) and the remnants of the Hutu militias from Rwanda, also called the *Interahamwe*. The actors diverse interests ranges from Rwanda's security concerns that at the same time reverberate in the Ugandan camps, but both deriving substantial economic gains from the conflict at the same time in the form of securing accessibility to the mineral wealth of eastern Congo, which fact had been confirmed by a UN fact finding mission in 2002. Angola on the other hand combines strategic considerations in the form of the threats posed by UNITA bases in the Congo with sympathy towards a reliable ally. Hence Eduardo Dos Santos decision to back Kabila. As far as Zimbabwe is concerned, and as Lemarchand has noted, „Prospects of economic and financial gains, however illusory, have weighed far more heavily in President Mugabe's choice of allies“. Economic and strategic interests combined once again to drive another actor, namely, UNITA, which was in dire need of cash to finance her war with the Angolan government through exports of the country's
diamonds using Kigali, Kisangani and Kampala as entrepot. In sum, the complex structure of actors interests endangers an already volatile political environments of the countries involve, all of which exhibits indicators of bad governance, and are saddled with record high deteriorating socio-economic and environmental crisis since the post-independence era.

By 1996 the failure of the Mobutu regime to respond to re-democratisation and restoration of rule of law made that regime one of the most resisting changing in Africa. The regime's uncompromising political posture created a fertile ground for a radical alteration of the political landscape by insurgent forces from within and without the country. The embryo of the conflict began to develop in the eastern Kivu states in 1996 where the Bayamulenge people revolted against ethnically engineered attempt to deny them their citizenship and recognition as part of what was then the former Zaire. It was this situation coupled with weakened authority and legitimacy of the Mobutu regime, which propelled opposition groups from within and without Zaire to support the revolt. When Laurent Kabila headed those forces under the banner of the Alliance of Democratic Forces for the Liberation of the Congo (ADFL) he was bolstered by the prevailing weakening position of Mobutu to step beyond the original purpose of his revolt in making eastern Congo safe for his Rwandan patrons, and refocused on the removal of that obnoxious regime. The campaign to overthrow the regime was indeed swift, but the capacity for building a genuine post-Mobutu democratic society was an arduous one given the complex character of interests coalitions among the many and varied actors involved in the insurrection campaign. Neither was the revolutionary campaigner in the deep forest of the Congo prepared to succumb to the popular demands of opposition forces once his long dream for wrestling power from Kinshasa had become a reality. His „state of grace” was short lived. He instantly moved away from his position as a liberator of the Congolese from Mobutuism and turned a new autocrat. On the face of growing Tutsi dominance in the internal affairs of the Congo, there emerged simultaneously mounting anti-Tutsi sentiment, which compelled Kabila to dissociate himself from his ‘patrons’ with disastrous consequences.

However, the fact of the matter is that there was growing concern and fear among the core leadership of the government of a possible revolt against Kabila by the Tutsi elements, which exactly happened in 1998. This event saw the surreptitious departure of Deogratias Bugera (Secretary-General of the AFDL), Bizima Kahara (Foreign Minister in 1997-98) all Tutsis from the government. Under those circumstances, Uganda and Rwanda once close allies instantly became Kabila’s disenchansted allies (and later invaders), who later backed the rebellion in the east. With those turn of events Kabila solicited help from Zimbabwe, Angola, Namibia and Chad and thus opened the floodgate for what had been described as „Africa’s First World War”. In the ensuing political tension that engulfed the country, Kabila was assassinated at a close range in his office by one of his bodyguards. The National Council for Resistance and Democracy claimed to be behind it defending the event as heroic act. Why that group? That group had been part of the coalition to overthrow the despotic and corrupt Mobutu regime, and its leader, General André Kisase Ngandu was reported to have been the brain behind the success of that campaign. However, he was one of the first to disappear, and Kabila was suspected of involvement in that murky period of the country's political development. In that period of democratic transition in Africa, one of the continent's mammoth territories was under political turmoil struggling to survive a possible disintegration, and may be balkanisation by outside forces keeping an eye on her rich mineral resources. Kabila’s death was received with mixed reaction in Africa. For some he had been the obstacle to democratic development and peace in a post-Mobutu era in which Congolese deserve to utilise the opportunity to establish a broad
based government that shares power among its diverse political blocs, and not the kind of opportunism that the Kabila regime intended to offer them. His government opposed the Lusaka peace process by obstructing calls for national dialogue as well as complicating the peace process in Burundi under the moral auspices of Nelson Mandela by providing base for one of the warring factions of extremists opposed to the Arusha compromise settlement. His main legacy, if any would be one of the few cases in Africa South of the Sahara where the seat of government had changed hands from father to son after the death of the former in consonance with what has become the trend in the Arab world. The young Kabila would however have to proof to Africa and the rest of the world that the up and coming generation of young African leaders possess the political will and vision to liberate their countries from protracted conflicts and wars, and opt for tolerance and peaceful co-existence within the context of Africa's complex diversity. It is in this vein that the Pretoria Comprehensive Peace Accord must be given the chance for successful implementation, in order to attain final and enduring peace in the DRC in particular, and the Great Lake region as a whole.

But whether peace would prevail over sectional and personality politics would be a matter of time. A conflict that started with conflicting states interests in the regions has now slowly winnowed down to personality conflict involving Museveni of Uganda and Kagame of Rwanda. The withdrawal of Ugandan troops from the eastern part of the DRC has now created a power vacuum that had given way to rival ethnic violence between Hema and Lendu militias. As of now, peace brokers in the region have not succeeded in bringing the one-time allies’ turn-enemies to openly discuss their differences. Not even the intervention of the British Minster for Development in the spring of 2003 could cajole the two men to bury their personal differences for the sake of peace in the region. The UN peacekeepers deployed in the region have still not succeeded in constituting a robust interlocking force on the ground to separate the warring factions and militias that have proliferated after the withdrawal of Ugandan troops from Bunia in the north eastern of the DRC in the Ituri region. The Force, the MONUC, is just a handful of Uruguayan troops that had been dispatched to Bunia where massacres, and even at times genocide had been reported. Recent developments in the form of power sharing among the ruling Kabila II government and various political entrepreneurs under the auspices and transitional supervision of the UN only need time for a valuable judgement and evaluation. The force is limited not just in number, but is handicap by limits in mandate. In May 2003 MONUC was attacked by militias despite the fact that it was protecting unarmed civilians.

The above description exemplifies how sustained dictatorship in a country is difficult to be eradicated, even after the dictator has left the political scene. The long period of rule accumulates varying sentiments, animosities and revenge among the various opposing groups and individuals. In the African context in particular, since dictators represents parochial ethnic and sectional interests, the departure of a dictator is most likely to be replaced by individuals and groups who might harbour the feeling that it is now their turn and for that matter the turn of their kinsmen, not just to acquire political power, but to control the national wealth and resources, which situation sets forth another cycle of political struggle among competing elites. It is this phenomenon, which has blurred the transition process in many African countries in the post-Cold War era. The nightmarish events in the Great lakes region in the post-Cold War era is at times over shadowed by the ‘dream come’ true events in South Africa.
South Africa's Fragile Transition

Further south in the continent the peaceful transition in South Africa had been hailed as a silent, peaceful and at times a negotiated revolution in the media within and outside Africa. The transition to democracy and black empowerment was greeted by many Africans as an opportunity to secure an economic power house to speed up the economic development of the crisis prone continent given South Africa's established holdings in technological innovation and applied sciences. Without any doubt, the dismantling and dissolution of apartheid and the constitution of majority rule is one of the greatest political achievements of our time. But complacency should not overshadow our sense of caution, intellectual awareness, and academic sense of probity. The South African situation of the 1990s we woke up out of our dreams to see is not a given entity of that particular historical moment. It had its crooked history written and now unfolding within its fragile context of antagonistic, acrimonious ethnic and racial diversity, fragmented interests, and a mosaic class and racial consciousness. In brief, the new South Africa was ushered in our era with still some of the negative traits of the former apartheid regime: social peripheralisation, cultural uprootment, economic marginalisation and deprivation, widespread poverty and disease among disadvantaged social groups and increasing crime. One the note of that gloomy picture, and having passed the test of democratic transition and consolidation, and also with an exemplary national reconciliatory effort behind her, South Africa still has the opportunity to deepen and entrench national dialogue for sustaining the fruits of democracy and the rule of law.

The path towards that goal entails the ability of its ruling elites and citizens to accommodate and tolerate each other, promote policies for ensuring social justice and equity, and denouncing exclusions of all forms while learning to be all inclusive in decisions and policies affecting the nation as a whole. The show of will and commitment of any form, however, cannot afford to omit the crucial issues affecting land redistribution to cover the majority of black South Africans who live under conditions of filth and inhumane squatter camps simply because they had been dispossessed of their nature given source of livelihood during the era of one of the most obnoxious regimes on earth. In neighbouring Zimbabwe, where the land redistribution issue was delayed for over twenty years after the independence struggle, that problem has now shaken the fabric and foundation of society and politics with undesirable consequences. In the South African case, however, the show of commitment should entail genuine commitment from the international community to support home grown initiatives for peaceful, but acceptable allocation of land to those who have nothing except ghettos and camps. Only then could the modern South African state genuinely distinguish itself from appalling state system in the rest of Africa. It is on the basis of the foregoing analysis of South Africa that one may pause and interrogate whether South Africa is really well equipped to take a leading role in the processes that are taking place in the African continent. One can confidently opine that political entrepreneurs of South Africa (black or white) scarcely understand the fundamentals of African politics after almost four hundred years of isolation, exclusion and subjugation. The continent's politics exhibits in part a hybrid characteristic, some colonial and some post-colonial ties, some national and some pragmatic, and above all shows very high traits of ethnicism and group identity, which the new South Africa may be hardly at grips with.
The dismal performance of the post-colonial state in Africa at resuscitating their national economies since independence had been attributed to many reasons some of which have been already delved into. In an effort to rescue those economies out of their doldrums, the post-colonial state made recourse to the Bretton Wood Institutions, which imposed solutions on them. Since the early 1980s the Bretton Woods institutions had become active players in restructuring Africa's economies, and by the end of the Cold War become one of the key actors in the transformation process set in motion thereafter. The controversial nature of Structural Adjustment Policy (SAP) and the internal forces of opposition it attracted further deepened the repressive character of the post-colonial state. Zeleza's critical perspectives on the situation captures well the broad picture of how IMF-state alliance denied democratic growth in Africa, evidenced by how African regimes deprived the ruled the right of popular debate and alternative solutions. It was also this posture that gradually eroded legitimacy of those states as the prescribed policies failed to produce expected outcomes.11

It was the scale and magnitude of this failure of IMF and World Bank Policies that the Bretton Woods institutions remodelled their strategies by the end of the Cold War. By this period the donor community had become convinced that the system of governance of recipient countries influences their economic performance positively. By this observation the Bank and the Fund in particular had converged on notions of instability and lack of transparency as the main suspects for the dismal economic output in African countries, especially in countries south of the Sahara. This provides justification for conditionalities, and in the words of a former World Bank President:

The World Bank is not about to involve itself in the internal political affairs of any country or to introduce any new political conditionalities in its work. We are a development institution and we will continue to focus our attention only on those aspects of governance which directly affect development – accountability, transparency, predictability, adherence to the rule of law, and so on. These are not new issues for the Bank. But in a world where the competition for our scarce resources has never been more intense, we will be paying increasingly more attention to them in the years to come. 12

This observation by the Bank-Fund and the donor community raises questions about whether there is an established connection between Good Governance and economic performance. This issue would be addressed in detail in the course of this discussion in this particular section, but suffice it to opine the following.

Comparative surveys around the world may prove us wrong as strong dictatorial governments elsewhere in Asia such as Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, South Korea just to mention a few, all owe their economic foundations and successes to their leaders ability and strong handedness to put through policies irrespective of internal oppositions. That apart, it should also be noted that those countries were able to make their place in the international economic system not because of any internal political capacities to do so, but due to changing economic philosophy and industrial production of the West. Industrial manufacturing as we had all seen had gradually given way to a bourgeoning capital market and a vibrant services sector wheeled by the power of modern technology and finance. Increasing cost of labour in the West also compelled investors to look elsewhere for alternative and cheap sources of labour, and Asia with her comparatively developed human resource and capital base, productive capacity, and high savings rate became attractive to the West, and not because of any existing broad political advantages or conditions. Above all, there was the preparedness by the West to open their markets, and consume industrial products from these countries despite their initial inadequacies to quality standards existing in the West. Many at times the notion of political stability which had been prevalent in some Asian countries and has accounted for much of the success in the
region is reduced, or generalised to imply democratic conditions. Indeed, if there are any
genuine conclusions to be drawn from the region then one can safely mention *sustained
stability combined with prudent state interventionist strategies in the economy*, and the
creation of the requisite institutional framework, and not necessarily any strict
adherence to the tenets of democracy and all the cohorts of liberties that are associated
with it. In this particular case, it is rather sustained economic growth and prosperity that
had gradually paved the way for democratic growth in the region. The case of China's
economic boom throws even more light on the on-going argument.

The political system of Peoples Republic is characterised by absolutism and non-
predictability, which scarcely makes any discussion of stability ridiculous, at least in
theoretical terms. Contrarily to this reality is the Chinese economy one of the fastest
growing in the world, and the highest recipient of FDIs in the developing world. Even in
the extreme form of the on-going argument, the history of development and industrial
growth have no modicum of truth whatsoever that democracy, Good Governance,
human rights and other civil liberties were the hallmarks of industrial societies right
from the beginning. These had been evolved and developed in an incremental manner in
the course of time while trying to give a human face to the exploitative nature of
capitalism. But at the bottom of the argument is one undisputed fact empirically founded
on the financial crisis in Asia during the later part of the 1990s. By 1997 the crisis had
evidently prove to the investor community and recipients alike that ‘capital can fly’ for
safety, always to where it belongs, and do so at its own convenience. The crisis exposed
the vulnerabilities and dependence of the region on the global financial system. Once
again capital went massively to Asia not more because of any existing deep-rooted
tenets of democracy and liberalism, but the states ability to take prudent economic
decisions and act as a legitimate intervener. The Asian success story therefore was the
results of strong *state* policies grounded in liberal market principles juxtaposed on a
domestic environment characterised by high ratio domestic savings, developed human
capital base that in turn attracted uninterrupted external financial flows in the form of
investment.

Even today this is no foregone phenomenon as afar as the so-called developing
world is concerned; the Bank-Fund strategies in the form of Structural Adjustment had
courted the iron fist of dictators in order to put through unpopular policies. This had
been well captured by Zeleza when he writes:

> The process of democratisation in Africa had been aided less by the liberal rhetoric of Western
governments and donor agencies than by their iron fist policies of structural adjustment, whose
implementation has entailed extreme state coercion and massive retrenchment, which have provoked
widespread popular resistance.¹³

This situation produced a doubled standard attitude on the part of Western countries
and the donor community by tolerating non-democratic behaviour by regimes so far as they
were committed to implementation of structural adjustment policies. In Ghana, for
example, where all the popular vocabularies about structural adjustment have become
household names, the West kept a blind eye on how Rawlings used his iron fist regime
to block alternative agendas by imposing a kind of a „culture of silence“ that prevented
the Ghanaian public from discussing structural adjustment policies. His dictatorial
machinations were even vividly exposed during the transition period when he denied the
opposition equal access to state resources and other crucial facilities needed to enhance
their competitiveness in the electoral process. Cases of this nature had been prevalent in
almost all the African countries that embraced democratic transitions after the Cold
War. Nigeria under Babaginda exhibited extreme version of this behavioural posture
when the incumbent military junta cancelled an election that had been dubbed free and
fair by international observers. The Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone, Togo, Cameroon, Kenya and a plethora of African countries were no exceptions to these transitional deficits that systematically weakened internal pro-democracy forces.

However, the gist of the argument is not to opine that dictatorial African states that implemented structural adjustment with a certain degree of initial success is tantamount to positing that the African state is 'capable' of reforming and able to withstand reform shocks in the broader context of the term. The difference between the state system in Asia and Africa in terms of their capacity for pushing through economic reforms is the latter's relatively inherent weaknesses and vulnerabilities in shoring up support for those programmes due to the very complex and diverse nature of interest coalitions, some bearing regional, ethnic, associational and even 'tribal' traits, combined with other bottlenecks that had been already discussed in this study. This is not to conclude that such personal networks do not exist in the Asian context. Ethnic and racial ties are even denser in Asia. The point of departure is the long history of Asians in the diaspora who have managed to establish economic power and networks at home and abroad, and have created special relationships with the ruling elites and other interests' coalitions, thus constituting a reliable source of investment for the state. In the case of the African diaspora, economic ties are still sparse, less of the dense networks and collaboration at the level of government that we see in Asia. Monetary transactions and remittances are directed for the upkeep of families and relatives, housing, and medical care, with little or no collaboration with governments. In the general sense, however, both regions are still striving to be adapted to a purely free market capitalist environment, wheeled by democracy and the rule of law, judicial transparency, protection of private property and individual liberties and rights. Also, in both regions prodemocracy forces are still struggling to gain foothold in national politics.

The premise of the argument pertaining to the weakening of pro-democracy forces in Africa has to be juxtaposed on the long period of rule by regimes to the extent that state institutions are substituted by personalities in the form of front men and cronies thereby blocking legitimate channels for popular participation in political life. The problematic about pro-democracy forces is also factored in their internal diversity that at times contributes to weakening their ideology at the national level. Under such internal conditions pro-democracy groups could not develop any effective means of organisation in order to mobilise and educate like-minded groups and individuals for political action. When the Cold War finally came to an end and the wind of re-democratisation began to blow across Africa, internal pro-democracy forces had by then become a weakened force lacking visionary leadership, political organisational skills and alternative political and economic blueprints to solve the problems and fulfil the aspiration of the freedom thirsty populace whose average but basic economic wants had become non-affordable luxury. Under those circumstances pro-democracy forces could also not escape the deficit that had existed between the decaying dictatorial state and society. They could not identify themselves with civil society to enable them build the requisite pillars to ensure democratic growth and development. The problem of legitimacy had by then became a double-edged issue affecting the credibility of both incumbents and resurgent pro-democracy forces.

On the theoretical plane, the foregoing debate will certainly present difficulties in the form of trying to seek empirical foundations for any such claims thereof. Some of the arguments would be of course oversimplifications, non-representative generalisations, and even mere reductionism in content. The problem had been tackled superficially in this section, but not at the appropriate place. Over here reference would be made to contending thoughts on the democratisation-development nexus that had sparked off much heated debate of late. The debate has even many variants in the form
of how the problem is formulated, and delved into. One postulate in the debate is that levels of economic development and genuine commitment to democratisation are effected and consolidated by actual political organisational capacity. As Harbeson had observed, these cases are derived from experiences of generally middle-income countries in southern Europe and in the Americas and the variables bears no resemblance to Africa and other parts of the developing world where the same variables exhibits degree of discontinuities. In that respect, the argument follows the line of thinking that political parties, civil society groups and interests groups in Africa in particular are inherently weakened in terms of political organisational capacity and even lack the financial resources and political autonomy to sustain democratic transitions. Also, in his authoritative contribution to the debate Huntington has consistently insisted on the importance of political institutional capacity in advancing development. The main strands of those thoughts assume a polity whose membership is not affected by intangibilities, while its political parties and civil society characteristically exhibits high levels of political organisational capacities. In the African praxis however, the debate fails to address the fact that the notion of civil society that had been there since time immemorial, played it due part in the newly democracies in the immediate post-independence era. Even under dictatorship where civil society was castrated of its political dynamism it did not lose its organisational capacity since those groups have the tendency to transform themselves into Associations, and Towns and Cities Fellowships, without influencing national politics in a direct manner. The missing link may be their lack of empowerment in the political and economic arrangements that were constituted under non-democratic regimes.

Now on the pertinent question of whether transitions would be accompanied by the drive to achieve global economic presence, Callaghy's observations have revealed that the external pressures that were imposed on the developing world to adopt political reforms and economic restructuring in the from of structural adjustment did not yield the financial commitments that had been promised by the donor community. Reform showcases such as Ghana, Mozambique, Uganda, Tanzania, and partly Zambia and Mali all did not realise the benefits of promised aid flow, Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and access to the markets of the developed world. What went into the continent was steady but skewed investment in the oil, mining and mineral sectors of some selected African countries, such as Nigeria, Cameroon, Gabon, Lesotho and Angola. Of the total FDI of about $2.9 billion that flowed into Sub-Saharan Africa during the past one decade, just three countries accounted for much of that flow of investment - Angola $657 million, Lesotho $175 million and Nigeria $920 million. Excluding South Africa (as both a recipient and source of FDI), five other countries accounted for another $700 million - Republic of Congo, the Ivory Coast, Equatorial Guinea, Namibia and Sudan, leaving the remaining 40 countries of Sub-Saharan Africa to compete for just $595 million in annual FDI flows. The observation even runs deeper in the mindset of African leaders who have witnessed first hand Structual Adjustment Policies from the negotiation level to its implementation and even failure. Callaghy substantiate his view with statement by a former Ivorian Prime Minister:

Since the early 1990s, many countries in Sub-Saharan Africa...have been implementing sound macroeconomic policies and structural reforms...But despite these reforms, poverty remains widespread, private investment is subdued, and many African countries continue to depend heavily on external assistance.
made at the dawn of independence and afterwards. A decade after another historical moment history has repeated itself, this time under different circumstances, but devouring both leadership and masses indicated by signs of disorientation and disillusionment, especially among the leadership core in the African continent. This current trend across Africa is succinctly described by Callisto Madavo, World Bank Vice President for Africa when he spoke:

Many African governments are already putting in place policies that will boost growth, strengthen governance, and more effectively deliver social services. They are keeping their side of the global bargain. They now need rich countries to deliver speedily on theirs.18

The World Banks' African Development Indicators on social and economic conditions across the continent for the year 2002 reveals that official development aid to Sub-Saharan African countries had fallen to $12.3 billion at the end of 1999 from $17.2 billion in 1990. On the basis of case-by-case studies, the report showed a stark reduction of aid flow to countries at war including governments that had been recognised as implementing sound macro-economic policies and bolstering the tenets of democracy and good governance. Net official development assistance to Ghana for example dropped by almost $100 million in 1999 from the previous year. Mozambique, one of the poorest poor in Africa but making tremendous sacrifices in structural adjustment, saw aid fall to $804 million from $1.04 billion over the same period.19 It was the concerns expressed by many African leaders in this realm, which finally resulted in the Monterrey Conference on Financing for Development in February/March 2002.

At Monterrey the African leadership reiterated their concerns about internal reforms unaccompanied by external commitments. Based on that dismal record and what seems to be open hypocrisy on the part of the industrialised West, emphasis then shifted from talks about aid (though not dethroning aid, but complementing it with trade) to trade for African exports into the consumer markets of the rich North. It is on the question of trade that one really comes to grip with the genesis of Western hypocrisy, 'preaching virtues and practising vices'. Between 1995-1997 running through the first quarter of the following year African economies experienced a three-year record surge in growth of about 4.3 percent, while at the same time Western governments increased agricultural subventions (government-sponsored price-support programmes in the agricultural sectors) thus affecting African exports mainly in the form of farm produce, cotton and textiles. World Bank economic indicators had shown that African access to markets in the rich countries could earn them about $100 billion a year. The report pointed out that the rich industrialised countries of the North gave about US$40 billion to Africa in aid, but paid more than $350 billion to their own farmers in the form of subventions to support and stabilise the price system and improve farmer’s competitiveness in the international market. The report also revealed that cotton exporters in West and Central Africa would have their revenues increased by $250 million if the world's biggest cotton producer the United States were to wave subsidies. Subsidies on cotton paid by just eight countries amounted to $5.4 billion in 1998/99-crop season, with the US accounting for more than $2.0 billion of the total amount.20 The trend is even more disheartening if one gives a retrospective view of what is actually happening in the world of free trade.

For any observer of global economic transactions and free trade, the United States had been known for her intransigence as a champion of free trade, using her economic power to bend others to open their markets for manufactured goods and put a halt to subsidising their agriculture sectors. The big stories revealing American hypocrisy today began in the early 1990s when the US pushed hard for reduced agricultural subsidies in the Uruguay Round of the World Trade Agreement in September 2001, and further
backed other agricultural countries calling for reform of the international trade system and elimination of all forms of trade-distorting subsidies. Later during the WTO ministerial conference in Doha, Qatar in November 2001, the Bush administration renewed its anti-subsidy drive. On May 13, 2002, President George W. Bush signed the *Farm Bill Security and Rural Investment Act*, making available US$248.6 billion to the agriculture sector which constitutes more than 80 percent over the 1996 Farm Bill. Also the EU performance in waiving agricultural subsidies through the Common Agricultural Policy is only proceeding at snail’s pace even though there is growing awareness among leading members of the EU of the distorting effects of state subsidy on international trade and the harmful effects on developing countries such as Africa.

By this approach protectionism of the West in general, and in the agricultural sector in particular has become the core problem in Africa's combat against poverty and squalor. It now even presents a moral dilemma. By opening their markets to African exports the worlds industrialised nations would be indirectly investing in peace without any significant cost, and bring enormous benefits and relief to people desperately in need of steady incomes. African governments would in turn have their financial capacities enhanced through favourable balance of trade receipts and utilise foreign aid to bolster existing social services, such as community projects, invest in education and health and foster issues of gender equality by providing opportunities for women and eventually reduce governments' dependence on global financial institutions to manageable levels. By closing their markets to African exports, the whole concept of the long transformations the continent had gone through will amount to nothing, and tarnish the credibility of the West.

But if we cast our eyes around the globe, do current developments in global multilateral trade talks offer any new hope for Africa and a large number of developing economies of the South? In the aftermath of the Cold War the various powers and influential economic actors began to shift paradigm from hard-core security issues to economic issues. Regional economic blocks and the growth of regionalism then boomed accompanied by increasing trade conflicts which existing institutions within the framework of the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was unable to resolve. Under those set of circumstance there occur an increasing need to preserve the ideals of multilateralism in order to ensure security, stability and predictability in the global trading system in a changing international economic order.

This recognition, particularly among the leading economies of the world, especially the US, led to the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). This shift ushered in an era of trade negotiations and dispute settlement managed by an actual institution with surveillance and enforcement powers as is the case with all other existing international organisations. As an accredited global trade institution to supervise, ensure surveillance and monitor global trading activities, the WTO was created with the intent and purpose to ensure that member countries affirm and adhere to their commitments to eliminate agricultural subsidies, monitoring the application of the treaty in key areas such as observation of international standards on patents, trademarks and intellectual property guarding against indiscriminate dumping. Liberalisation of the financial services market, workers mobility and protection of their rights, and the linkage between international trade and environmental protection are all prioritised by the new body in its future negotiations.

For the first time, by the beginning of the new millennium further negotiations brought the global institution to the doorsteps of its poorest members who had in the past been sidelined in global multilateral trade negotiations. As evidenced in the Declaration adopted at the 4th WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha, in Qatar, in
November 2001, development issues affecting the developing countries are at the heart of the Doha Agenda. For Africa in particular, some of the priority issues touch on market access in agricultural and non-agricultural products, services and also making persistent calls for special and differential treatment given the vast discrepancy between their economies and the major industrialised countries that are the main drivers of the global economy. But a major milestone in WTO is the provision of technical assistance and capacity building programmes for developing economies in order to increase their bargaining and negotiating competence and to enhance their competitive edge in global economic transactions. For example, on the eve of the preparations for the 5th Ministerial Conference in Cancun, Mexico, Ambassadors utilised the technical assistance programme that culminated in the „Maputo Declaration on the Fifth Ministerial Conference of the WTO“ and the „Mauritius Ministerial Declaration on the Ministerial Conference of the WTO“ with ultimate objective to inject momentum into the negotiations that would finally bridge the differences between Africa’s developing economies and their partners, and provide a sense of direction to move the process forward. In the main, the failure to reach agreements on key issues in Cancun gives no room for jubilation by any side of the negotiating blocks; a failure that was pivoted along the lines of demands of rich and poor countries. The main loser, at least in the interim is the ideals of multilateralism and the global mission for ensuring security, stability and predictability in global trading arrangements. The failure to compromise and enthroning reason as the winner rather than any other region or category of group of nations creates grounds for deepening regional sentiments towards regionalism and integration. But the new integration path that had been embarked upon by African leaders by the turn of the new millennium will also fail to yield the expected outcomes if Africa continues to face economic iron curtain from the West.

Is it because of this bleak international political economy starkly characterised by growing protectionism and lack of predictability and other forms of uncountable trade barriers that African leaders decided to integrate their already weakened and disadvantaged national economies as a vehicle to secure their place in the world of globalisation? The drive for continent-wide economic and political integration forms part of the Constitutive Act establishing the African Union and thereby provides the basis for a legal framework for integration. The Act provides detail information on integration in its Articles 13, 14, 15, 19 and 22. It is up to the African leadership to make clear the relationship between the Act and NePAD. However, the concept of integration is not new to the African continent, as it had been hailed, propagated and even at times ‘ritualised’ at different summitry levels on several occasions by the African leadership.

In the early decades before and after political independence from colonial rule the idea of a continent-wide political and economic integration was strongly advocated through a series of Pan-African conferences which finally resulted in the formation of the OAU less of a supranational body which had been championed by Nkrumah and his cream of adherents for continental political and economic union. Under the auspices of the OAU the currents for economic integration continued to ramp the African body politic, which also culminated in the adoption of the Lagos Plan of Action in April 1980 by members of Head of State and Government of the OAU. The policy blue print guided by the principles of self-reliance, inter-state co-operation, collective solidarity and greater unity, committed Africans to establish sub-regional economic blocs to constitute the main axis for establishing an African Economic Community by the year 2000.

Why did Africa fail to make any significant inroads toward this noble goal? Why do we see war, conflict, poverty, squalor, disease, widespread corruption and inter-state rivalry instead of unity, security, development, co-ordination and harmonisation of
common African policies? At this stage of the discussion some of the answers to some of these questions have obviously been outlined, but suffice it to mention here once again that Africa's entanglement in the Cold War superpower rivalry, inherently weakened capacity of the African state to initiate and implement policies effectively, ravaging wars and civil conflicts, poor international image of the African continent, sustained poor records of governance and absence of constitutionalism and judicial fairness, low margins of technological advancement and utility, and last but not the least lack of political will, all combined in one form or the order to thwart, paralyse and smother rich initiatives and policies such as the Lagos Plan of Action. The Plan envisaged five stages of economic co-operation that would finally result in the formation of an African Economic Community: Preferential Trade Area, Free Trade Area, Customs Union, Common Market and African Economic Community.

Even the path to the Lagos Plan of Action was indeed a tortuous one with record high experiments at various sub-regional levels motivated at times by a combination of economic and non-economic factors such as linguistic, geographical proximity, and even based purely on political expediency, such as, the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC), which directed much of its resources and energies to counteract the evil politics of apartheid in South Africa. The list runs as follows:

(i) The former East African Community (EAC), which embraced Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania (1967-1977);
(ii) The Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern African States (PTA) established in 1981 with nineteen member states
(iii) ECCAS (the Economic Community of Central African States), established in December 1983 with ten member states;
(iv) UDEAC (the Central African Customs and Economic Union), founded in 1966 with five member states;
(v) CEAO (the West African Economic Community, established in 1974 comprising six countries;
(vi) SADCC, established on April 1980 with Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe under its umbrella;
(vii) Ghana-Upper Volta Customs Union founded in 1961;
(viii) The Mano River Union, established since 1973, and has Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea in its fold;
(ix) West African Free Trade Area, which embraced Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia and Sierra Leone in 1964.

Their existence, and later abrogation or replacement was deeply affected by political divisions more than by the economic imperatives for which many of them were formed. Added to these are a plethora of recently formed economic blocs, which had been listed in the introduction of this discussion. Given the many and varying number of regional economic blocks with cross-cutting membership and differing ideologies, most of the groups woefully fell short of co-ordinating and harmonising the noble goals enshrined in their respective policy blue-prints for achieving a kind of ‘developmental regionalism’ that was crucially needed to jump-start the regions to be at least competitive at the regional or continental level in pursuance of the OAU's common policy aimed at using the sub-regional economic blocks for achieving continental-wide integration. About 27 countries are members of two sub-regional integration body, 18 belong to 3 groups and one country is an accredited member to 4 recognised bodies. In addition, there had been the insurmountable hurdles created by ramify size and identities. About one-third of African countries have country population of about 6-10 million or less and eleven have
a population of less than 2 million, while some are proportionally too large and densely populated. This phenomenon seems to ramp every single sub-regional organisation in the African continent. However, the reasons for failure, apart from these entrenched ones, are not far fetched as one of the earliest examples of regional economic integration in the east African sub-region may provide empirical foundations to that effect.


The former East African Community was founded in 1967 and embraced Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Historically, it was British colonial rule which sowed the seeds of integration under colonialism. In 1917 a Customs Union was established between Kenya and Uganda, which was reconstituted by the end of 1927 by the colonial bureaucracy to include Tanganyika. In the decade that followed, the colonial government established multiplicity of common services in the areas of postal and telecommunication, administration, meteorology, pest control centres, air services, transportation and higher education. In the immediate post World War II period, these multiple services were cramped under the institutional umbrella of the East African High Commission (1948-1961), which name was not entirely accepted by the member countries who having seen the dawn of independence for Tanzania in 1961 arranged to name the organisation as the East African Common Services (EACSO, 1961-1967). In brief, it was the culmination of a wide range of conducive factors for integration in the region covering geographical proximity, a high degree of social integrative impetus made possible by a common lingua franca provided by English and Swahili. Geographical, cultural and socio-economic impulses apart, there existed a highly vibrant commercial and finance centre in Nairobi, Kenya, a high mobility cross-border labour force, including a wide range of other inter-connected infrastructure services. As Nye had noted:

Though a large majority of the population of each country is rural and illiterate and communications cannot compare with those in Europe, the beginnings of impressive social integration - of the growth of transnational society - exist. Certainly, in transportation, language, education, telecommunication, and news media, the East Africans are more socially integrated than they are with any other countries. 22

Within the economic realm the East African Common Market established thereof, reaped relatively high gains from free movement of goods as well as labour and capital. Economic transactions were enhanced by the existence of a common currency even despite the usual rigid subjection by a Currency Board in the absence of a Central Bank. It had been recorded that inter-territorial trade in the region grew more rapidly after the Second World War than with the outside world, with greater share of the benefits going to Kenya because of her sound industrial base and enhanced capacity for capital formation. The benefits of integration could not however sustain due to long rows over constitutional arrangements aimed at redistribution of industries and resources from relatively rich Kenya to poorer Tanganyika. Ideological and political differences also brought the community members into disarray as to the appropriate form of federation to be adopted. The Ugandan political leadership failed to make any significant achievements on matters of power over monetary reserves, public debts, location of industry, and location of the capital of the community. In the end, the Ugandans advocated a strong and a powerful presidency, a weak upper house and a central government power over Ugandan national resources. Tanganyika dissatisfied with the
status quo because of economic and ideological reasons also opted for a centralised federalised pattern towards achieving the ultimate goal. Conversely, Uganda for political reasons was leaned heavily towards the status quo and showed misgivings about a centralised system of federation. As the major beneficiary of the gains from the status quo Kenya was rationally interested in any political bargaining that would preserve her economic interests and power.

Not surprisingly, by the immediate post-independence period the actions of the member states had gradually culminated in spillbacks thus weakening the prospects for federation. Kenya, the economic powerhouse of the community was disenchanted with its concessions on industrial location. Uganda cautious of the possible implications of loss of sovereign rights over her monetary reserves took steps to establish her own Central Bank, including her decision to withdraw from the sub-regional university scheme. Tanzania speeded up arrangements to obstruct initiatives for a common currency. Despite their failure to achieve political and economic integration, the earlier attempt did lay a strong foundation for future integration in the sub-region.

In the post independence era these existing cultural and socio-economic integrative impulses remained unwavering and gradually culminated in the establishment of the EAC. After only one decade of existence the EAC had collapsed by 1977. Why did the EAC fail to survive despite their rich past experience? The East African classic experience informs us that conducive factors listed above are necessary but not sufficient conditions for successful integration to take place. What then factored in the member states failure to forge ahead in the integration process? Some of the reasons reoccurred in the integration attempts of the late 1960s. They were endogenously and exogenous induced.

One key issue was different economic systems and political ideologies that underpinned the participating countries models for economic development. Kenya followed the path of capitalist development rooted in liberal, private and a market economy. Uganda and Tanzania exhibited high inclinations toward state capitalism and planned economy, with Tanzania going even beyond those frontiers to inventing her own form of African socialism planked on rural and grassroots-oriented mobilisation for development, called the *ujamaa*. In terms of wealth Kenya showed extensive disparities in relation to her neighbours. By embracing capitalist ideology for development, Kenya was comparatively well placed for attracting FDIs crucially needed to boost investment in the national economy and promote trade within and outside the common market. It had been recorded that about 50-60% of intra-community trade was directed to Kenya's economy, and a large number of manufacturing industry were concentrated there, thus causing loss of customs revenue to the other members of the community. Kenya also had the trump card because of its natural attractions for tourism and the tendency for non-Kenyans to resident in the country due to the long period of peace and political stability exhibited by the country's political culture, thereby creating alternative sources of foreign exchange as against the others circumscribed dependence on one or two primary commodities for export. Even when a compensatory mechanism was instituted to avert the rapidly growing imbalance existing in favour of Kenya, the mechanism failed to produce the expected outcomes in the eyes of Uganda and Tanzania due to inherent deficiencies. Foreign corporations and Multinationals could not avoid the temptation of using Kenya as a base to export to the rest of the region due to her relatively developed infrastructure thereby deepening an already lopsided distribution of benefits of trade and investment.

In another attempt at readjusting the imbalance, an East African Development Bank was created to foster industrial development with equal capital bases from the member countries, but in the end a principle of investment disparities was applied by allocating
38.5% to Uganda and Tanzania against 22.5% to Kenya. From the legal perspective of the Bank however, its statuses contained a risk-adverse effects clause, which impinged on her to finance only economically viable projects, the majority of which were located in Kenya thus negating the Bank’s role as a redistributive institution. In the context of poor industrial planning, co-ordination and harmonisation of common policies in the EAC, the Bank failed to live up to its role as a re-distributor of benefits. Neither could tax transfer systems do the job. 

Against that background of politico-ideological dichotomies and irreconcilable economic philosophies of the community members, it was hardly possible to institute any form of appropriate system of governance or create common institutions that would transcend the boundaries of national interest and matters affecting state sovereignty. For example, as trade expanded between the member states of the community, no concrete and committed initiatives were made to establish a common judicial institution for addressing emerging trade, investment and business transaction disputes. In terms of appropriate governance the region had been known to be the harbinger of dictatorship in post-independence African history, as portrayed in the iron-fisted rule of Idi Amin, a fact which does not augur well for any serious sub-regional intergovernmental interaction for common decisions and action. Amin’s regime was not recognised by Tanzania and Kenya. Uganda and Tanzania were also engaged in open hostilities that nearly reached the point of declaration of war, but, however, finally resulted in a cooperative effort that facilitated the demise of the Amin regime, and brought Milton Obote to power.

Conflicting ideologies also provided fruitful grounds for distrust among the member states, compromised important ingredients for integration such as consistency, transparency and predictability in inter-governmental interaction, thus weakening the political will for achieving the ultimate goal. Lack of co-ordination and harmonisation of policies in technical matters, foreign economic policy, community’s development plan, common monetary policy, equal distribution of wealth, combined to weaken the common front. At the end of the day the common aim for achieving integration remained in the hands of individual leaders and their elite who became inclined to subject a sub-regional project to their parochial preferences and choices even without the legitimate concerns of their citizens. Integration and co-operation programmes became the exclusive property of individual heads of states or their ministers who may often at times not even be competent to the task of regional integration matters and inter-African co-operation.

The neglect of the community citizens and the marginal role and lack of participation of the private sector and civil society in the multilateral arrangement establishing the community deprived the initiative of the basic catalysts crucially needed to drive the integration process forward. Indeed, this had been a common oversight in African development policies in the past. The neglect of the private sector and civil society in the African context is indicative of the fact that one is also underestimating the potentials of the so-called informal sector of African economies, which controls about 60% of the volume of daily economic exchanges within and across national borders in the African continent. In the past the main focus in African economic co-operation had been the public sector under the auspices of a conglomeration of parastatals whose rigid bureaucracy scarcely made any inroads in developing initiatives for investment, formulating and implementing home grown policies, share information, and even co-ordinate cross-border policies relating to sub-regional integration and co-operation.

Added to those internal conditions there were also external factors created by the context of the Cold War which facilitated foreign intervention in African affairs on
ideological lines that were inimical to the developmental goals set by the countries in the sub-region. In that particular sub-region the superpower presence was evident by the increasing supply of arms and ammunition, which constituted large proportions of the countries national income to the detriment of spending on social and other development projects. In the arms supply trade, the US and Britain became of course Kenya's staunch allies, while Uganda and Tanzania leaned to the USSR for arms and other military hardware and logistics. This Cold War posture with its ideological content disunited the members of the community and bred fear and distrust among them thus setting brakes on the operational objectives of regional integration initiated by the leaders.

In the end the East African attempt at regional integration collapsed as the participating countries became deeply wedged in matters affecting national interests and sovereignty, and uncompromising on the crucial need for ensuring institutionalisation of behaviour among the members of the community. At this stage of the history of integration in the African continent East Africans should capture their negative past experience in integration as a blessing in disguise since that rich past experience constitutes the repository of lessons for them and the rest of Africa. But that will depend on the ability of the current leaders to discern that past for positive gains for today and the future. Perhaps the leaders had that in mind when they included in the Mediation Agreement that formally dissolved the EAC in 1984 a clause that provides possibilities for exploring and identifying areas for future co-operation. A future that had been enhanced since the early1990s as large number of African countries systematically strive to achieve policy convergence in their economic and political issues targeting outcomes that have continental-wide and global implications for Africa. The new realism at the continental level reflects the transformation of the OAU, which has become the litmus test of the total transformation process in Africa since the end of the Cold War. The declaration of the CAAU breaks new grounds and distinguishes the AU from the OAU.
The Constitutive Act of the African Union (CAAU): Another False Start?

Notwithstanding the OAU’s dismal record in promoting unity, security, development and citizens’ participation in that continental organisation, Africans from all shades of life have always been inspired by the noble ideas of the founding fathers of the OAU and later generations of Pan-Africanists unflagging commitment to promote continental unity, solidarity, cohesion and inter-African co-operation. The end of the Cold War and the accompanying multifaceted challenges posed by globalisation in a rapidly changing world deepened clarion calls for a collective and a determined African effort to seek solutions to common problems. The period had also witnessed a new era of intergovernmental interaction in Africa where a new generation of leaders have become increasingly not only conscious, but convinced of the devastating impact of wars and scourge of conflicts that had bedevilled the continent’s socio-economic and political development. Also conscious of the fact that the OAU Charter had become anachronistic, African leaders were for the first time determined to promote and protect human and peoples’ rights, consolidate democratic institutions and culture, and to ensure good governance and the rule of law at all levels. In furtherance of those objectives and the commitments shown thereof, and as had been pointed out already, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU adopted a declaration at their Thirty-Sixth Ordinary Session in Lomé, Togo on 11 July, 2000 to replace the OAU Charter with the Constitutive Act Establishing the African Union (CAAU). Following a year's interlude of debates and consultations the CAAU entered into force on 26 May 2001, thus establishing the legal foundation for the new African Union.28

Given the enormous and far reaching changes taking place in the world, the Act breaks new grounds, and charts a path beyond the horizons in comparison with the previous Charter. It supersedes all the treaties and legal instruments of the African Union, and provides decisions and directives for establishing the organs of the Union. In its initial form the Act has the following provisions with the following principal Articles indicating the points of departure from the previous Charter. In this sense only the novelities of the Act are considered here among the numerous objectives, thus Article 3 a, b, d, e and f of the Act still reflects the Charter respectively on matters of unity and solidarity, defence of sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence, common African positions on issues affecting the continent, international co-operation, as well as the promotion of peace and stability. The Act however, also opens a new chapter in African inter-state relations as it is structured to address emerging challenges in the aftermath of the Cold War: democracy, collective security, human rights, conflict resolution, and economic development thus constituting the road map for a future African Union.29

Article 3

The objectives of the Union shall be:
(c) Accelerate the political and socio-economic integration of the continent;
(g) Promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance;
(h) Promote and protect human and peoples’ rights in accordance with the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights and other relevant human rights instruments;
(i) Establish the necessary conditions, which enable the continent to play its rightful role in the global economy and in international negotiations;
(j) Promote **sustainable development** at the economic, social and cultural levels as well as the **integration** of African economies;
(l) Co-ordinate and harmonise the policies between the existing and future **Regional Economic Community** for the gradual attainment of the objectives of the Union;
(n) **Work with relevant international partners** in the eradication of preventable diseases and the promotion of good health on the continent.”

The principles governing the functions of the Union are embodied in Article 4. Over here too some basic elements of the Charter are vividly re-articulated, namely issues on sovereign equality and interdependence (a), respect of existing borders (b), peaceful resolution of conflicts (e), prohibition of use of force (f), non-interference (g), peaceful co-existence (i), rejection of political assassination and acts of subversion (o). However, the Act breaks new paths hitherto considered ‘taboos’ in inter-African relations.

**Article 4**

The Union shall function in accordance with the following principles:
(c) **Participation of the African peoples** in the activities of the Union;
(d) Establishment of a **common defence policy** for the African continent;
(h) The **right of the Union to intervene** in a member State pursuant to a decision of the Assembly in respect of grave circumstances, namely: war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity;
(j) The right of Member States to request **intervention** from the Union in order to restore peace and security;
(l) Promotion of **gender equality**;
(m) Respect for **democratic principles, human rights, the rule of law and good governance**;
(n) Promotion of **social justice** to ensure balanced economic development;
(p) Condemnation and rejection of **unconstitutional changes of government**.

The organs of the Union are also expanded with novelties reflecting the fundamental objectives of the Union, i.e. economic and political integration. Hence the Organs of the Union Shall be:
(a) **The Assembly of the Union** means the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Union and constitutes the supreme organ of the Union. Its decisions are based on consensus, in lieu of which a criterion by two-thirds majority of the member states of the Union is applied (Art.6, 2). Nevertheless, procedural matters, including the issue of determining whether a matter is one of procedure or not should be resolved by a **simple majority** (Art.7, 1). It is empowered to adopt its own rules of procedure (Art.8). Of its many functions the Assembly is the sole and accredited organ to determine the policies of the union (Art.9, a), „monitor the implementation of policies and decisions of the union as well as ensure compliance by all member States” (Art.9, e), „give directives to the Executive Council on the management of conflicts, war and other emergency situations and the restoration of peace” (Art.9, g), including the appointment of judges to the Court of Justice (Art.9, h), and Chairman of the Commission and his or her deputy or deputies (Art.9,i)
(b) **The Executive Council**, means the Executive Council of Ministers of the Union, which is composed by Ministers of Foreign Affairs or other Ministers or Authorities appointed by the governments of member states (Art.10, 1). Its principal areas of endeavour shall focus on co-ordinating and taking decisions on policies and key domains of interaction that are of common interests to the wider continent, including foreign trade (Art.13, a), matters relating to environmental protection, humanitarian
action and disaster response and relief (Art.13, e), energy industry and mineral resources (Art.13, b) etc. It is placed under the aegis of the Assembly and shall be responsible to it (Art.13, 2), but can delegate any of its powers or function to any one of the Specialised Technical Committees, which shall be responsible to it as stipulated in the provisions of Art. 14 of the Act. Those committees are categorised under a wide range of offices entrusted with separate duties covering monetary and financial affairs; trade, customs and immigration matters; industry, science and technology, energy, natural resources and environment; transport, communication and tourism; health labour and social affairs; and education, culture and human resources. In addition to those numerous functions the specialised committees are obliged to prepare projects and programmes in their respective areas of specialisation for submission to the Executive Council, supervise, evaluate and implement decisions taken by the various organs of the Union, including co-ordination and harmonisation of projects and programmes of the Union, while making reports and recommendations to the Executive Council either under its initiative or upon request (Art.15.a-d).

(c) **The Pan-African Parliament.** Given the focus and attention Africans leaders have placed on the concept of 'the people', and being conscious of their participation and role in the total transformation and integration process, the establishment of an African parliament was a right step in the right direction. By February 2004 thirty-two member states of the AU had presented their instruments of ratification of the protocol establishing the African Parliament. Members to the Parliament are to be appointed by the ruling governments of member states. The Parliament was inaugurated on 18 March 2004. In brief the Parliament shall be the principal judicial organ of the Union, and shall consist of eleven Judges elected by the Assembly of heads of states and government through secret ballot, and by two-thirds majority of its members. In consonance with the Union's commitment to gender issues, the election of Judges must also reflect gender representation. Their term of office would be six years, and may be re-elected only once. In the interim it would function as a consultative forum for the next five years. In the long-term, however it would assume responsibility for passing legislation for the entire continent. Its core aims are to promote human rights and democracy and encourage good governance, transparency and accountability in African governments. Given the rocky contours of Africa’s democratic development the empowerment of the parliament and the commitment of the member states to adhere to its decisions would, without doubt, help inject fresh dynamism into the continent’s search for the democratic peace. In his appointment of South Africa's members to the Parliament, President Mbeki remarked that „the Pan-African Parliament will enable the peoples of Africa acting through their representation to make major contributions in terms of the African Union's objective to promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance‟. 12

(d) **The Court of Justice.** Article 18 of the Act establishes a Court of Justice. Its competence and jurisdiction shall cover all disputes brought by the member states before the union, interpretation or application of the Act, as well as all subsidiary instruments adopted within the framework of the union, including any questions of International Law. It shall also compose of eleven judges. The procedure of election of Judges to the court, the duration of their term of office is same as that of the Parliament.

(e) **The Commission** means the Secretariat of the Union and shall be composed of the Chairman, his or her deputy or deputies and commissioner assisted by a body of staff (Art.20, 1-2). It replaces the erstwhile Secretariat of the OAU. The point of departure from the past is that the Commission has the executive power and authority to set initiatives. Its members are elected and assigned with clear political mandate, and a collegial decision making mechanism. But most important of all the Commission has
also been recognised as the Custodian of the Treaties establishing the Union. Among its
duties are, to act in defence of the interests of the Union under the direction of the
Assembly and the Executive Council. It is mandated to initiate proposals to facilitate the
operations of the organs of the Union, while assisting them to execute the decisions they
have taken in their domain of activity.

(f) The Permanent Representatives Committee. It was originally to be entrusted with the
responsibility of preparing the work of the Executive Council in liaison with sub-
committees or working groups it may find appropriate. It was originally to be entrusted with the
responsibility of preparing the work of the Executive Council in liaison with sub-
committees or working groups it may find appropriate.33

(g) The Specialised Technical Committee. See (b) relating to the Executive Council and
its assisted bodies.

(h) The Economic, Social and Cultural Council. It was established under Article 15 of
the Abuja Treaty. As elaborated in Article 16 of that treaty, it is conceived as the
principal technical policy making organ of the African Economic Community (AEC)
entrusted with all the core issues relating to the implementation of the objectives of the
community. Its responsibility ranges from preparation of policies, programmes, and
strategies for co-operation in the socio-economic field, including the co-ordination,
evaluation and harmonisation of activities and issues in the field of economic and social
integration. In addition, it is designated with the responsibility for examining the reports
of all the Specialised Technical Committees, and „supervising the preparations of
international negotiations, assess their results and report to the AU/AEC Summit through
the Council of Ministers“.34 The determination of the functions, powers and composition
of ECOSOC however, remains within the jurisdiction of the Assembly (CAAU, Art.22,
1).
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(i). Peace and Security Council. Its areas of responsibility embrace the promotion of
peace, security and stability in Africa, working within a framework of preventive
diplomacy. It operational mandate extends further to cover disaster management and
other related humanitarian activities. In this direction it replaces the Central Organ of
the Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution Mechanism established in 1993. A
Panel of the Wise comprising five eminent African personalities assists it in its
deliberations.

(j). The African Court of Human and peoples’ Rights. Its key jurisdiction covers areas
of human rights violation by any state party, intergovernmental organisations and
parastatal organisations. Individuals and non-governmental organisation are eligible for
filing cases for hearing by the Court.

(k). Financial Institutions. Three Financial Institutions are accredited to serve the Union
on economic activities with continental wide implications. They are, the African Central
Bank, The African Monetary Fund and the African Investment Bank.35

Furthermore, the Act makes provisions for imposition of sanctions on matters such
as, defaulting on payment of contributions to the budget of the Union, as well as
contravening or failing to comply with decisions and policies of the Union (Art.23, 1-2).
Moreover Article 19 envisions the creation of financial institutions: an African Central
Bank, an African Monetary Fund and an African Investment Bank, whose rules and
regulations shall be defined in protocols in the course of the transformation process.

The list of organs is opened for reconsideration as regards the creation of new
organs as well as abolishing existing ones, as time and capacity of the total
transformation process may determine. However, the whole process of
institutionalisation of the Union seems to go on at a snail space, which fact does not
augur well for the urgency the crisis continent may require in finding swift solutions to
some of the acute problems facing the continent.

For ordinary Africans and observers of African affairs from within and without the
continent alike, the litmus test of the Act would be the show of commitment and
willingness by African leaders to honour the spirit and letter of the crucial Art. 30 (on suspension) of the Act which stipulates that ‘governments which shall come to power through unconstitutional means shall not be allowed to participate in the activities of the Union’. Whilst this may sound prescient, good and correct in contemporary African politics, the Act does not make provisions for pressurising incumbents governments for creating an enabling environment for integrating marginalized sections of society and the interests and views of minority groups, which fact has always posed the source of challenges to the authority of incumbent governments in Africa, and also constitutes one of the principal reasons for crisis of legitimacy, conflict and civil strife. The emphasis on good governance would not produce any fruitful outcomes if mechanisms are not put in place to monitor and control, and even sanction individual governments’ democratic performance. It is in this light that the references on human rights in the Act should be considered as an element of ‘social praxis’ that reflects the freedoms and liberties of the African peoples as a whole and individual citizens, and not just a mere legal document. Documents of the sort have existed far in the past without having any positive impact on the African peoples, and even the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights has been in existence since 1981. That even within the on-going process of democratic transition and integration in Africa, countries such as, the Ivory Coast, Congo Brazzaville, Rwanda, Burundi, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, including many potential countries thereto, which have become disintegrated on the pertinent issue of governance reflects the urgency of this argument. African leaders must show the courage and go beyond the peer preview mechanism and set genuine standards for constitutional rule that would be regularly articulated in shaping institutional behaviour and elite interactions in the form of peer pressure, bearing in mind the sanctity of the rights of the peoples they are serving. Thus, lessons in the past would teach us that questions on human rights could not be traded for anything else on the continent.

For the critical mind if there is any ‘brain surgery’ to be considered on questions of human rights in prevailing political, economic and social processes, the diagnoses would identify lack of consultation of the African people in the very formulation of the policies and decisions relating to the transformation of the OAU to the AU as constituting an act of gross negligence that bypassed the ‘tumour’ of the said surgery. Once again, even within an atmosphere characterised by the urgency attached to good governance, we are still seeing signs of another bouts of ‘false starts’ in crucial matters affecting the peoples of Africa. At the national level member states failed to debate and inform their public about the integration project. Even in the current efforts being made on integration human rights questions have been relegated to the background as if leaders are waiting for events to take care of it. A case in point is the low profile given to African Court on Human and Peoples Rights whose adopted protocols (1999) even preceded protocols relating to the establishment of the Constitutive Act of the African Union (in Lomé, 2000) but has still not been accorded the expected focus and urgency, except it mere inauguration. The same applies to the African parliament whose role and powers have been restricted to consultative and advisory instead of a full-fledged legislative Assembly. The gravity of the African crisis cannot afford the postponements of crucial institutions needed to address pressing issues affecting the continent.

Human rights issues are still placed under the impoverished Commission on Human and Peoples Rights (CHPR), whose operations and activities are not even recognised by some member states. During the 31st Ordinary Session of the Commission in Tripoli, Libya, (23 April-7 May 2001, the host country while making political gains from hosting the conference also at the same time restricted participation by NGOs through impositions of restriction by Libyan embassies to grant travelling visas and
other relevant travel documents.\textsuperscript{36} By the time of writing, the Constitutive Act is still mute on the relationships between the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights and the African Court of Justice, envisioned in Article 18 of the Act. These developments send messages of distrust, and lack of confidence on the part of African citizens striving for their total emancipation from iniquitous African regimes, which are now harbouring under the cloak of democracy and the rule of law. The concerns of Africans on human rights issues were demonstrated by the mammoth attendance during the 32\textsuperscript{nd} Ordinary Session of CHPR on 17-23 October in Banjul, The Gambia. Present at the Session were twenty-two (22) States Parties represented by thirty-nine (39) delegates, six (6) National Institutions for the Protection and Promotion of Human Rights with a total of eleven (11) representative, one hundred and five (105) African and International NGOs, with one hundred and eight (108) participants and forty-eight other guests. In all, an unprecedented number of two hundred and sixteen (216) participants met, interacted and adopted resolutions on a broad range of human rights issues, including guidelines and measures for the Prohibition and Prevention Measures of Torture and Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Punishment or Treatment in Africa, also called the Robben Island Guidelines.\textsuperscript{37} Impulses from outside the continent on the subject confirm the urgency of the issue.

At the teething stages of the integration process, the EU recognising the importance of human rights in the socio-economic and political development of the African continent based on her own conviction and past lessons and experiences also took a common position on 25 May 1998 regarding matters thereto. This position was defined by the Council on the basis of Article J.2 of the Treaty on the European Union concerning human rights, democratic principles and the rule of law in Africa. Few years prior to that the Community and its Member States also within the framework of African Caribbean Pacific (ACP) and EU co-operation took into account the human dimension based on the aforementioned principles also enshrined in Articles 4 and 5 of the Fourth ACP-EU Convention signed at Lomé on 15 December 1989 and revised by a subsequent agreement on 4 November 1995 in Mauritius. The main objective of the EU is to work in partnership with African countries to promote and consolidate human rights, democratic principles, the rule of law and good governance serving as a framework for actions of the member states of the EU. Recognising the right of sovereign states to choose and establish their own constitutional arrangement grounded on their own history, culture and traditions and social and ethnic composition, the EU initiative was propelled by the successes that had been chalked by many African countries, which fact has also improved the ability on individuals to exercise their human and democratic rights, thus warranting appropriate support from the international community. Article 3 (a) of the common position outlines key points or criteria for action and responses from both partners: „When deciding policy towards individual countries, the Union shall take into account their points of departure and the direction and pace of change within them, as well as the policy commitments of the respective governments. The Union shall give high priority to a positive and constructive approach that encourages human rights, democratic principles, the rule of law and good governance.‟ \textsuperscript{38} However, the consciousness rose about human rights and good governance in Africa does not end on bilateral relationship between the EU and the AU, but constitute the main plank of policy actions across the globe, including the Bretton Woods Institutions, the G8 and a wide range of local and international NGOs, and the United States in particular. It is because of the innumerable number of watchdogs on human rights in this sense that Africa countries cannot trade it for anything else, and the earlier they take genuine and right steps in that direction the better.
At this juncture, given the past negative record of the OAU, and the current slow pace of institutionalisation within the AU, observers of African affairs are showing signs of anxiety and are asking whether the new AU is going to live up to expectation. Of the numerous factors outlined as contributing to the failure of the OAU, chronic financial difficulties, lack of capacity, low commitment and lack of action, external loyalties, all within an environment of insecurity of all forms - war, civil conflict, economic degradation and strangulation combined to thwart any efforts at implementing continental wide policies to improve the lot of Africans. But how far has contemporary Africa been able to master these acute bottlenecks to secure a safer and faster track for moving Africa forward in the 21st Century? The evidence is quite clear. Apart from the positive changes that had been made in political reforms, the crisis situation of the former OAU mentioned above is still raging. In the past one decade the continent had produced more policy documents and blueprints than what was done during half the period of existence of the OAU without any corresponding immediate action.

Does this state of affairs brings us to the popular usage among Africans, *'Plus ca change, plus c'est la même chose'*? The prevalent lack of momentum in the institutionalisation process lends itself to variety of interpretations. In the first place, size, number and low capacities of member states hinders any such rapid responses like signing of protocols relating to the creation of institutions stipulated by the Act, for example. The sub-regions lacks effective, strongly mandated leadership needed to pressure members of the SREC's to honour their pledges as regards the spirit and letter of the Act. Egypt, Algeria, Senegal, Nigeria, South Africa, and may be Kenya and other potential would be sub-regional 'Hegemons', or co-Hegemons lack the incentive and leverage to pressurised the states under their umbrella to opt for a fast track diplomacy and inter-state interaction that would ensure rapid realisation of the aims and objectives the AU. What can we learn from other regions?

The experience of the EU has confirmed how *Rélations Franco-Allemagne/Deutsch-Französische Beziehungen* of the early 1960s had gradually transformed itself to constitute one of the main engines of European integration today. However different the circumstances, at the generic level both Europe and Africa are relatively troubled by nationalism and ethnicity (or a blend of nationalism and ethnicity, Part I), both of which factored greatly in war, misery and fear among the member states of the respective regions. With shared commitment towards eradicating nationalism as the main cause for war, the large number of European countries was almost always prepared to bury the past and construct a new Europe capable of upholding its own responsibilities and destiny. Who is doing what in Africa, when and how? Even though Nigeria and South Africa are quite active in inter-African diplomacy on questions that bears external responses affecting the continent, the old colonial allegiances and loyalties from the African states still constitutes determinants of foreign policy to the extent that it would be quite unheard of to see any one of either South Africa or Nigeria trying to influence politics in a Francophone country without Paris at the forefront, and vice versa without London, though in the latter case such colonial allegiances are quite rare in the political praxis.

Even beyond that intra-Anglophone or Francophone interaction, the size and power of some countries being too large and others too small creates an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust among member states, whereby resort to the principle of sovereignty becomes a comfortable save haven for the smaller and weaker states. The possible effects would be formation of pockets of coalitions and alliances within the AU designed to create a buffer against big power dominance. In the long term diplomacy becomes too slow, and policies emanating there from, also too little, too late. The sheer number of countries within the continent is in itself a reason for the long process needed
to get crucial protocols signed. How does one ensure that 53 countries are on board within a stipulated time frame on matters relating to signing and ratifying protocols? Delays and hold ups on important decisions is also made possible, as pointed out earlier, because of the fact that there is no Treaty of Accession, thus creating a bastion for the large number of the many unwilling making the efforts of the few committed ones wearisome and labyrinthine. After almost two years of inaugurating the AU not much concern and enthusiasm had been shown by individual African leaders to speed up the process of institutionalisation. The relationships between the various institutions at the national, sub-regional and regional levels have not even been outlined to facilitate decision-making at those levels. Neither had the AU been able to identify the modalities and framework establishing the appropriate decision-making linkages and inter-relationships between the various organs. Indeed the twin-challenges of our time on which the Act was constructed (globalisation and integration) as stipulated in the report of the OAU Sec.Gen. on the implementation of the Sirte Decisions on the African Union are still looming on our heads without any concrete direction towards realising the goals of the AU. It is appalling to note that even the meaning, content, scope and coverage of the AU and the possible economic and political implications on citizens of the Union have not been able to trickle down to the common understanding of ordinary Africans, thus like the Charter remaining an inter-state document for heads of states and governments, who too at times does not exercise absolute control on the documents' content and meaning. And even where steps are being taken to sell the Act and NePAD to the public, they are restricted to assigned NePAD Secretariats without proper co-ordination between the accredited Ministry, the national parliament and the general public. Are we now back to square one?

Can the much globally popularised NePAD Document make any significant difference? We should be careful not to omit the fact that the success of NePAD, among other things, would be determined by the robustness of the constitutional and legal basis provided by the Act and the institutions it is able to put in place. This is exactly the path the first president of the Republic of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah had wanted to put the OAU on in 1965. A blueprint committing the member states to genuine economic integration, and finally, political federation of African states under one supranational authority. Unfortunately however, there is neither a perceived linkage nor convergence at the moment between the Act and NePAD, except at the level of decisions and declarations that had been made thereto. The NePAD implementation committee exercises absolute control over its daily business, and reports only occasionally to the AU annual summits. This anomaly seems to have been deliberately given blessing by some 'coalition of willing member states' led by South Africa that want to move the process forward without letting it fall victim to the foot dragging politics and diplomacy of the 53 member states of the AU, some of which may even fall short of the category of 'statehood'. In another sense, the core architects of NePAD are cautious not to subject the initiative to the aggressive Pan-Africanist stand of some member states and heads of governments such as, Libya's Gadhafi and Zimbabwe's Mugabe, among others. This is due to the obvious fact that their polemic and antagonistic political stands may jeopardise the partnership embodied in NePAD between the member states of the AU and the industrialised countries, particularly the G8. Whether the current cordial diplomatic overtures made by the Libyan leader towards Western countries would whittle down his anti-western stand can be judged only with time.

In the final analysis however, the regional body could only prove critics and pessimists wrong by adhering to the democratic principles enshrined in the Act. Its democratic practise and performance including that of the national governments would of course determine the efficiency of decision making structures and rules that would in
turn create the requisite political space for citizens' participation, and a wider political representation. It is these challenges if truly conceived that would put pressure on the collective African leadership to speed up the signing of protocols at the national levels to pave the way for creating the corresponding supranational institutions as called for in the Treaty establishing the African Union and the AEC. This is borne out by the fact that so long as citizens of member states begin to feel the deeds emanating from the words their governments have committed themselves regarding representation and participation, they would naturally of course call for more action in course of their democratic growth and development. Any such forward movements would go a long way in sowing the seeds of legitimacy for the regional body; a political value that eluded the OAU throughout its four decades of existence.

This has research implications. One relevant implication is that it provides sufficient reasons for reconciling institutional analysis of the sort that had been undertaken focusing on the OAU with normative issues such as democracy, participation, representation and citizenship. The contents of the Constitutive Act as delineated and analysed above justify any such investigative endeavour. It is only a sound political environment that could establish the requisite grounds for a take-off for the much-popularised NePAD initiative.
NePAD, Africa's Great Leap Forward?

Since the early 1980s African leaders have made successive collective attempts at developing innovative concepts, policy blueprints and strategies designed for alleviating the economic woes of the peoples of the continent, as well as seeking to ensure regional stability, peace, security and promoting closer economic integration. The various policy documents of the past two decades have been outlined in the introduction of the discussion, but over here it is worthy to note that the effort had unfortunately failed to produce the conjectured outcomes. At this juncture, we naturally of course reflects that the details expatiated in NePAD covering almost every aspect of economic, social and political life in Africa speaks for the fact that past internal and external attempts to rescue the continent out of the doldrums have failed all altogether, especially the dominant Fund-Bank Structural Adjustment Policies (SAP) in the past two decades, and a plethora of internal policies based on self-reliance strategies.

Against the background of that woeful failure, academic discourses on NePAD today are questioning the potency of the document to do what past policies and blueprints could not deliver. The captions of most of the existing literature on NePAD reveal this scepticism. Some of the salient points as regards policy failure had been discussed at length in Part II on the OAU. The politics of the Cold War, lack of state capacity, mismanagement and wanton dissipation of state resources and corruption, lack of political will, all combined in one form or the other to thwart efforts designed to realise the goals of past initiatives. The NePAD policy document admits this failure, and this seems to be well substantiated by the very fact of the document’s repetitive reference to capacity building (as being a major cause of that failure) as precondition for the provision of appropriate support to the participating countries in the new African initiative. And even the very evidence of past failure has gradually increased the number of critics and sceptics about the efficacy of NePAD to chart appropriate path for a just and humane economic development for Africa.

However, ongoing debates and perspectives have also revealed that there is also a large number of groups and individuals who believe that certain aspects of NePAD are good, but the strategy for realising it is yet another sell out for Africa: a neo-colonial strategy driven by the forces of globalisation juxtapose on neo-liberal ideology designed to subordinate poor countries to global trade and finance, the mechanism of whose decisions and operations they can scarcely influence. In one sense the whole NePAD project seems to be the results of the pressures that had been exerted on Africa by globalisation and the accompanying competitiveness for securing its main ingredients, namely, financial resources, information and communication, science and technology, as well as the frantic efforts that are being made to reap the benefits of international trade. To realise those goals however, the architects of NePAD believe that it would be only possible under a new form of arrangement that creates an ‘enhanced partnership’ between the donor community and African states.

In this section, however, in order to avoid drawing hasty conclusions about the debate, the discussion would take a perspective that takes account of the prevailing global political context, the commitments and responses shown within and outside the continent in inter-state co-operation on matters affecting Africa, including the mindset and perception of external actors whose co-operation now seem to determine the success or failure of on-going transformations in Africa. And of course within the continent our judgement about NePAD would take into consideration the leadership question in Africa and determine how far they are up to the task this time around. We should also bear in mind the active role of non-state actors in contemporary African politics (both
local and foreign) from which camp most of the critic on NePAD seems to carry a radical and uncompromising posture. In the final analysis, however, we may also be asking whether the authors and the total leadership’s expressions of sanguine about NePAD actually correspond to the subtle African reality? But in the first place we would of course have to sharpen our understanding about NePAD, what it is, who does what, when, where and how?

In its core programme, NePAD constitute the vision of current transformations and integration in Africa in the 21st Century aimed at promoting sustainable and self-development. It is an all encompassing regional project that lays down the socio-economic and political framework for constructing a new Africa out of its myriad and complex problems with the aim of giving the continent it’s due of the global presence in a comity of nations, and capable of upholding its own responsibilities and shaping its own destiny. It is a vision that recognises the transformation of society, economy and politics, while assigning greater importance to participation of those socio-economic forces constituting that vision.

By the end of the Cold War, the superpower retreat created room for dynamic interactions among regional and sub-regional leaders with the common intent and purpose of seeking common solutions to old problems and emerging challenges. In the African continent a new coalition of ideas emerged with strong regional initiators, the outcome of whose interaction was the NePAD document. The personalities involved are President T. Mbeki of South Africa, President A. Bouteflika of Algeria, President O. Obasanjo of Nigeria, President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal and President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak of Egypt. The policy engineering that resulted in the NePAD document had been discussed in the introductory section of this work. In brief it was the culmination of those various ideas that finally produced NePAD. During the developmental phase of the document a three-tier governing body was created to bring it to fruition: Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee with President Obasanjo as Chairperson, Presidents Wade and Bouteflika as Vice-Chairpersons, fifteen participating African states and the five initiating states. The fifteen states were selected from the various sub-regions with three states each. In order to facilitate its operations a steering committee composed of the personal representatives of the five initiating Presidents was established to develop the content, programmes and projects of the document, and oversee the functioning of the secretariat, which is headquartered in Midrand, South Africa. Its main duties include liaison and co-ordination, administrative and logistical, strategic planning, marketing and communication at all levels, as well as outsourcing of work on technical detail to lead agencies and/or continental experts working to realise the goals of the blueprint. The secretariat is supported by a number of Task Teams that provides detailed projects and programmes in selected priority areas during meetings. Convinced of the threat that conflicts poses to realisation of the objectives of NePAD, a special Subcommittee on Peace and Security was established focusing on conflict prevention, management and resolution. The overall common objective of NePAD, however, is to eradicate poverty and to place their countries, both individually and collectively on a path of sustainable growth and development, and at the same time to participate actively in the world economy and body politic” (para 1). 42

Comprehensive as it is, NePAD recognises the deeper dimensions of the total African crisis in it historicity, and delineates its exploitative mechanisms that had led to an unequal form of relations between Africa and the rich industrial countries. It explicates how those mechanisms had sojourned through colonialism and the legacy thereof, the Cold War, the harsh international economic system, flawed policies and systems of governance in the post-independence era, including how they have
transformed to the current situation. In fact the document casts a very accurate picture about the current African crisis.

"In Africa, 340 million people, or half the population, live on less than US$1 per day. The mortality rate of children under 5 years of age is 140 per 1000, and life expectancy at birth is only 54 years. Only 58 percent of the population have access to safe water. The rate of illiteracy for people over 15 is 41 percent. There are only 18 mainline telephones per 1000 people in Africa, compared with 146 for the world as a whole and 567 for high-income countries". (para 4)

Hence, on one hand, the bedrock of the programme is a call on Africans from all walks of life „to reverse the abnormal situation by changing the relationships that underpins it“ (para 5). On the other hand „it is a call for a new relationship of partnership between Africa and the international community, especially the highly industrialised countries to overcome the development chasm that has widened over centuries of unequal relations“ (para. 8). However, these calls, according to the document, do not amount to any attempt to further entrench dependence through aid, nor is it to secure marginal concessions from the rich nations (para. 5). Another important observation is that the document also recognises the failure of SAPs in the 1980s and 1990s, and points out that while structural adjustment programmes tended to eradicate deep rooted price distortions in some African economies it failed to provide social palliatives, or a cushioning mechanism to mitigate the social cost of adjustment (para. 24). In this regard NePAD calls on Africans to take the opportunity and reflect on the past lessons they have accumulated through those painful experiences to enable them establish new and constructive partnership with the rest of the world, bearing in mind that whatever path of development they would embrace, they should be guided by the fact that „development is a process of empowerment and self-reliance...Africans must not be the wards of benevolent guardians...rather they must be the architects of their own sustained upliftment“ (para. 27).

Against the backdrop of the historical impoverishment of the continent through the very old and weakened presence of the continent in the international economic system, the authors of NePAD, and the collective African leadership are notwithstanding hopeful that positive advantages could be reaped by Africa in the global revolution of the new millennium. Accordingly, the document notes, „While globalisation has increased the cost for Africa to compete, we hold that the advantages of an effectively managed integration present the best prospects for future economic prosperity and poverty reduction“ (para. 28). Of course, so long as competition in the global market place is not done on any goodwill of the other, NePAD at the same time realises the implications of big power influence and their ability to compete effectively than countries in the developing world, which fact also lead to their marginalisation. Hence, conscious of the consequences in stock for less powerful states, the authors of NePAD cautions that „In the absence of fair and just global rules, globalisation has increased the ability of the strong to advance their interests to the detriment of the weak, especially in the areas of trade, finance and technology. It has limited the space for developing countries to control their own development, as the system has no provision for compensating the weak“ (para. 33). The reasons for this dismal performance by the developing world in general, and by Africa in particular are not far fetched in the NEAPD document. Africa's inability to reap her share of the benefits of globalisation is rooted in „structural impediments to growth and development in the form of resource outflows and unfavourable terms of trade“, coupled with bad governance and mismanagement of the national economies, thereby impeding „effective mobilisation and utilisation of scarce resources into productive areas of activity in order to attract and facilitate domestic and foreign investment“ (para. 34). The solution therefore, according
to NePAD, lies in managing global interdependence regarding production and demand, installing a transparent global financial architecture and governance that promotes genuine partnership among members of the international comity of nations (para 41). Added to that are the favourable changes taking place in Africa, which when effectively harnessed could rescue the continent from its present predicament, says NePAD.

The New Partnership for Africa's Development, taking cognisance of the new set of circumstances that are reshaping international relations in a post-Cold War era, especially in the domains of security, the strive toward appropriate and acceptable forms of governance, and an emerging culture of human rights, sees in Africa a new leadership with a new political will. It is the new leadership of the 21st Century hand in hand with the African citizenry shaping, owning and managing NePAD, says the authors of the document (para. 47). Hence, in order to achieve the objectives of the document within appropriate time frame African leaders are called upon to take joint responsibility in areas that are crucial to the overall realisation of the goals of NePAD. This include, conflict prevention, appropriate governance, economic discipline, judicial reforms, improving sectoral performance, building the capacity of the states in Africa, developing infrastructure and promoting industries, diversification of agriculture into agro-industries and manufacturing and gender empowerment to improve the standard of living of women (para.49). The responsibility of the leaders apart, the programme makes a passionate appeal to the peoples of Africa to be united in their diversity and „to take up the challenge of mobilising in support of the implementation of this initiative by setting up at all levels structures for organisation, mobilisation and action“ (para. 56).

The long-term objective of NePAD, therefore, is „...to eradicate poverty in Africa and place the countries, both individually and collectively, on a path of sustainable growth and development and thus halt the marginalisation of Africa in the globalisation process; to promote the role of women in all activities” (para. 67). Underpinning that objective are specific goals, and the corresponding strategies for realising them. Thus the main goal is to „achieve and sustain an average gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate of above 7 percent per annum for the next 15 years; to ensure the continent achieves the agreed International Development Goals (IDGs)” covering issues such as poverty reduction by half by 2015, full enrolment for all children of school going age by the same period, promoting gender equality, and dismantling the disparities that works against the enrolment of women in primary and secondary education by 2005, reduction of infant and child mortality ratios including maternal mortality, rejuvenating the health systems to create access for those in need of reproductive health services, and creating environmental awareness to halt the current trend at which the ecological system has been put under strain.

In the light of those broad challenges NePAD focuses on particular components and selected sectoral priorities, and sets strategies for immediate implementation. The main approach, however, is to prioritise those components and sectors taking immediate action in those fields where it is most needed. For example, in the major components in the domain of governance, security and conflict prevention, NePAD accredited Task Teams would be consulting with the member states to examine and upgrade their mechanisms for selected sectors. By and large, components and sectors outlined for immediate action are, African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), Peace and Security, Capacity Building, Utilisation and Retention, Economic and Corporate Governance, Anti-Money Laundering, Agriculture, Market Access and Diversification, Human Resource Development, Health, Education, Infrastructure, the Environment, Resource Flows, Regional Integration, Women and Gender and creating an enhanced enabling environment for the NePAD. Selected portions of the list would be relevant for the discussion.
In the past two decades, or so, the problem of governance has featured among the many and varying criteria for evaluating and judging Africa’s overall performance, so much so that by the aftermath of the Cold War it had become one of the key political instruments for major powers and NGOs in their interactions with African elites. This has various implications for the African leadership individually and collectively. Saddled with crisis of all dimensions, and under mounting pressure by the donor community, there was of course growing sense of self-renewal among a large section of the collective African leadership to set standards and code of behaviour that would at least convince their citizenry and the outside world that there is a new cream of leadership in the continent committed to the task they had been mandated to carry out. In this direction African leaders for the first time voluntarily established a self-monitoring mechanism, called the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) with the objective to ensure that „the policies and practices of participating states conform to the agreed political and economic and corporate governance values, codes and standards contained in the declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance” (APRM, para. 2). The expectation of this historical move by African leaders is to create an enabling environment in the African continent that would lead to „political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated sub-regional and continental economic integration through sharing of experiences and reinforcement of successful and best practice, including identifying deficiencies and assessing the needs for capacity building” (APRM, para. 3).

Despite the moral obligations, as well as the contractual responsibility one might assume to be associated with the mechanism by ensuring transparency and accountability in office, it is limited in concept in the sense that it does not set measures and strict codes for compliance by the member states, but only to do so voluntarily on agreed set of parameters for good political governance and appropriate economic and corporate governance. The inclusion of the idea of voluntarism in the document as against compliance raises a lot of questions about the intentions and goodwill of the collective African leadership. Even though, however cautious we might be of the different levels of development and diversity of African countries, the major issues that may need immediate action, such as accountability, transparency, credible human rights record, respect for minority rights and ensuring economic efficiency, are all universally bounding for any legitimate and serious government in our contemporary world. They could not be compromised on, traded for something else by any particular state in Africa, neither could they be sub-contracted, nor are they negotiable. In this particular document one visualises ‘a wolf dancing in a sheep’s cloth’ as the language of the text would reveal to the reader by close reading. It has a ‘linguistic nicety and finesse’ that makes broad generalisations without any serious specifics, designed for self-protection and ensuring immunity, for example about human rights abuses and corruption, which are the two contending litmus tests as regards governance in the continent.

In addition, the establishment of a special team of eminent African personalities to carry out the reviews casts doubt about how effective that body might be. Already in the continent there are accredited institutions and bodies that have the resources and capacities to realise the objectives and goals that had been set in the document. The Pan-African Parliament, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights, as well as the Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOC) of the AU could carry out those duties effectively and fairly, instead of the ancillary roles they had been assigned in the review mechanism and processes. For example, it is outlined in the processes and stages
of the review mechanism that six months after the report of the monitoring team has been considered by Heads of State and Government of the participating member countries, then should it be formally presented to the regional and sub-regional structures such as, the Parliament and the Commission on Human Rights, and ECOSOC. There is no one area in African politics today that needs immediate and urgent focus than in the domain of governance, and the earlier African leaders act with swift and action, the more better their being in the position to realise the visions set for themselves in the 21st Century. Experience of the recent past has shown how long it had taken some of the African leaders to yield in to the demands of re-democratisation in the continent.

Hence the pledges they have made cannot be trusted on their mere goodwill, they must be implemented according to laid down principles at the national, sub-regional and continental levels. In the absence of those rules and standards of behaviour grounded in principles and measures to ensure compliance, instead of the co-operative approach of member states proposed by the document, African leaders might find themselves paying lip-service once again to the expectations of the populace. In the end, they would be sowing the seeds once again of their own demise, as the trust and credibility they are endeavouring to restore in the eyes of the international community would not be forthcoming. This is not the space to tutor African leaders, but it should be pointed out that the pledges made in the peer review are intricately connected to their call on the donor community to shoulder some of the cost of financing. Indeed, the peer review and external components of NePAD's finances are mutually reinforcing.

In the final analysis, given the broad alliance between Africa and her external partners in the 21st Century, pressure from abroad in the form of linkages on deviant leaders would go a long way to realise the spirit and letter of the peer review African leaders claims to subject themselves to. The call is based on past experience in African inter-state relations whereby member states of the OAU/AU for one reason or another have almost always remained onlookers when their colleagues abused power and citizens rights. This time they have the responsibility to govern appropriately, to protect the life and properties of their citizens and to deliver the public goods. But at the end of the day the success of the mechanism would also depend on the courage African leaders would demonstrate individually and collectively to reprimand fellow heads of states and governments for inappropriate execution of duties and failure to bear responsibility for their actions in their respective countries, instead of waiting to be judged annually by a team of eminent African personalities.

Peace, Security, Democratic, and Political Governance Initiative

In Part II of this discussion African security issues have been described, explained and analysed to reveal how the concept had been transformed in the aftermath of the Cold War to embrace new dimensions that were hitherto not within the domain of traditional security discourses. Today, human, economic, and environmental security has come to occupy a great deal of attention of the collective African leadership, thus making peace and security the main conditions for sustainable development in the continent. Conscious of that prerequisite, African leaders have pledged to work both individually and collectively to promote peace, security, democracy, good governance, human rights, economic and environmental management in order to attain the goals of sustainable development. Towards achieving these goals, an African Peace and Security initiative has been firmly integrated in the NePAD programme to enable the continent „promote long-term conditions for development and security; building the capacity of African institutions for early warning, as well as enhancing African institutions' capacity to
prevent, manage and resolve conflicts; institutionalising commitment to the core values of the New Partnership for Africa's Development through the leadership” (para. 72). In this regard NePAD focuses on strengthening existing regional and sub-regional institutions to enhance their capacities in “prevention, management and resolution of conflict; peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace enforcement; post-conflict reconciliation, rehabilitation and reconstruction; combating the illicit proliferation of small arms, light weapons and landmines” (para. 74). However, it must be noted here that the overly insistence on conflict resolution as a precondition for foreign assistance and investment might be defective. The argument is that the protracted nature of African conflicts and civil wars demands that investment in war torn societies (in this regard within national enclaves where there is low intensity violence) be considered part and parcel of the overall conflict resolution strategy toward putting those societies on the path of regeneration and possible recovery.

**Democracy and Political Governance Initiative**

Obviously, the most striking feature about the total transitions taking place in Africa can be identified within the domain of governance. NePAD therefore identifies the complementary relationship between development and true democracy, respect for human rights, peace and good governance grounded in global standards (para. 79). The initiative therefore enjoins the African leadership to consolidate the achievements made in the re-democratisation processes and promote and uphold the principles and ideals of good governance at the national, sub-regional and continental levels. On the face of Africa's weak institutional capacity thereto, the initiative recommends reforms in the administrative and civil services, promoting participatory decision-making, adopting effective measures to combat corruption and embezzlement, and carrying out judicial reforms (para. 83). The fact of the matter is that the achievements made in this sector would determine the crucial financial and technological support from partners from the developed North.

**The Economic and Corporate Governance Initiative**

The paradox of the role of the African state in development is that despite its dominant involvement in almost all spheres of political and economic life, it has woefully failed in terms of performance compared to the role of the state in similar domains in most Asian countries that have become the icons of newly developing industrialised countries. This fact did not escape the attention of the authors of NePAD. The document recognises this weakness and points out “the reality is that many governments lack the necessary policy to fulfil this role. As a consequence, many countries lack the necessary policy and regulatory framework for private sector-led growth. They also lack the capacity to implement programmes even when funding is available” (para. 85). It is therefore in this regard that capacity building must be a guiding principle in all fields of economic endeavour and constitute a basic precondition for the provision of corresponding support (para. 87). All things being equal, NePAD encourages the participating countries to draw specific and time-bound programmes that would contribute to qualitative public financial management and corporate governance in the long-term (para. 88). The actions taken thereof must however be in consonance with sub-regional and regional approaches to development. The reasons for harmonising and co-ordinating efforts at those levels emanates from the fact that most African countries are small as regards their population and size of internal markets. The problem is even compounded by the fact that a large number of them are single primary commodity
exporters and are taking no significant steps towards diversifying production into other sectors, thus creating conditions for a sustained lag in global trade and investment. It is against the backdrop of this particular general African condition that NePAD has identified the urgent need for African countries “to pool their resources together and enhance regional development and economic integration on the continent, in order to improve international competitiveness” (para. 94). This step must be underpinned by realignment and rationalisation of existing institutions and framework for economic integration covering projects that is compatible with integrated national and regional programmes, investments policies and practices (para. 95). Key sectors that may need immediate focus and action are infrastructure, especially in information and communication technology to help bridge the widening digital divide between Africa and the rest of the world. Other crucial priorities include human resource development, including education, skills, and promoting measures that would reverse the brain drain. Health, Agriculture and market access have also been identified as areas requiring genuine and committed actions. The long term objective however, is to set goals and strategies for addressing the widening gaps existing between Africa and the rest of the world, especially in the sectors in question, in order to “improve the continent’s international competitiveness and to enable her to participate in the globalisation process” (para. 98). That is indeed a grand strategy. But these noble ideas would remain a dream if the corresponding financial component were not forthcoming.

The most crucial component of the NePAD document relates to the financial aspects, and that is, who is financing what, when and how? Indeed the financial component in the form of Foreign Direct Investments (FDIs) has become the main life-wire of the African vision for achieving desirable growth targets, economic and human development and combating global marginalisation in all its dimensions. In this regard therefore, NePAD has set growth target of an estimated 7 per cent per annum in order to meet the millennium goals set within the framework of the UN-system, particularly the goal of reducing by half the proportion of Africans living in poverty by the year 2015. Under those circumstances “Africa needs to fill annual resource gab of 12 per cent of its GDP, or US $64 billion”. In this regard NePAD introduced to its partners a comprehensive but ambitious Capital Flows Initiative (CFI) to enable Africa meets its policy expectations. The CFI encompasses domestic and external mobilisation of financial resources. From within the continent, according to NePAD, individual national governments should make efforts to increase savings, improve the public revenue collection system, by for example, widening the tax net and combating waste and dissipation of scarce financial resources. The document however, envisages that the greater proportion of financial flows should come from external sources to complement internal resource mobilisation efforts. On that plane, the document focuses on debt reduction, and Official Development Assistance reforms as possible sources of supplementing internal efforts in the short to medium term, while emphasis should be placed on private capital flows as a longer-term priority. By refocusing attention on these sources, the document recognises the negative role aid and other forms of credit have played in accumulating Africa's debt over the past decades. The CFI is base on the reasoning that the achievements made in the domain of Economic and Political Governance Initiatives thus constitute a necessary requirement for increased capital flows (para. 147). The long-term objective of the debt relief strategy outlined in the document is designed to link debt relief with poverty reduction initiatives for Highly Indebted Poorest Countries (HIPC), and the efforts made under the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) by individual countries in co-ordination with international financial institutions, and the Paris Club of donors. It calls for debt service ceilings fixed as a proportion of fiscal revenue, with separate ceilings for International Development
Assistance (IDA) and non-IDA countries. However, these sources alone does not mitigate Africa’s financial predicament, and for that matter any sustainable long-term capital flows initiative is bound to turn to private capital flows to fill the resource gap, according to the authors of NePAD.

But how does Africa attract private capital flows it had been denied in the past due to internal contradictions of national economic policies, and inappropriate systems of governance? What prevailing conditions make Africa more eligible for FDIs today than in the past? The authors of NePAD respond by reasoning that premium should be placed on eradicating the negative perception of Africa by investors as a „high risk“ continent, characterised by lack of security of property rights and juridical protection, poor regulatory mechanisms and dysfunctional market systems. The programme of action also focuses on creation and implementation of a Public-Private sector Partnership (PPP), capacity-building programme through the African development and other development related institutions to be tasked with re-structuring and regulating transactions in the provision of infrastructural and social services. These measures would also include creating robust environments for financial markets to thrive within individual countries, and sub-regions with the ultimate objective to achieve cross-border harmonisation and co ordination of integration via Financial market Integration Task Force, guided by legislative and regulatory principles of standard global financial system operations. Over here too, the expected outcome is anchored on the successes and achievements that would be chalked on key elements of the document, such as relating to „peace and security, political governance, infrastructure and poverty reduction...instituting risk mitigation measures...such as credit guarantee schemes and strong regulatory and legislative frameworks“ (para. 154). In another words, the policy prescribes standards and rules to govern political and economic decisions and actions to help create an enabling environment for achieving sustainable growth and development. At the core of that particular task is „state capacity-building“ being considered a critical aspect for creating the requisite conditions for an overall development to be achieved and consolidated.

However, the sixty-four thousand dollar question is that even if Africa achieves the expected outcome in the form of creating an enabling environment for FDIs, would FDIs automatically follow? The call for capital flows to Africa in the document sounds like appealing for ‘charity’ from an international business community whose goodwill can always be counted upon. There seems to be a consistence oversight, if not a shallow optimism, and wishful thinking in that regard. The fact of the matter is that the actors, agents and partners NePAD is engaging are rationally driven towards maximising gains and profits. Even at the inter-state level, countries of the developed North cannot be counted upon in an unwavering or sustained manner, since their capacity to fulfil their part of the commitments would depend on sustained economic growth, and global peace and stability. The dependence on external capital flow sends the unhelpful message that the pace and speed of Africa’s development is going to be dictated not just by the economic conditions in the North, but also by the choices and preferences of elites in individual countries and regions of the North sharing common views and values. When one carefully dissects and delves the very concept of FDIs, the complexity of the issue does expose the oversimplifications inherent in the capital flow initiatives. That is why this paper recommends an integrated political risk analysis that takes view of not only conditions from within the continent that might affect investors confidence, but also takes cognisance of political and economic conditions in the industrialised countries that may affect donors sustained reliability and commitment that might have adverse consequences on economic entrepreneurship in Africa.
FDIs in its entirety can be explained as a broad financial package in various forms ranging from private or public investment in production, management, goods and services, market knowledge and access, research, and even to finding innovative solutions to emerging business challenges. It does not necessarily connote the physical cash flow it comes to mind on first sight. According to the Economist, “The point about FDI is that it is far more than mere “capital”. It is a uniquely potent bundle of capital, contacts and managerial and technological knowledge. It is the cutting edge of globalisation.”

As it is indeed the cutting edge of globalisation, and Africa after almost halve a century of self-rule has not made any positive inroads in capital accumulation, how is the continent going to break the deep-rooted marginalisation, dependency and the inability to compete in global market place? Some observations around the globe would clarify this point. According to the Global Development Finance report 2002, global economic slowdown was exceptionally deep and broad as the deceleration in growth rates has been equally rapid for rich countries and developing countries. It further observed that many developing countries had a less access to capital, due to global decline in lending, increased uncertainty among the investor community and the unprecedented unwillingness to assume and bear risk. That apart, FDIs flows that had witnessed some form of stability in the recent past changed slightly from the previous year at $168 billion in 2001 remain only $15 billion bellow the peak level of 1999. In addition, net long-term private capital flows to developing countries fell in 2001 for the fifth consecutive year to an estimated $234 billion, which is $30 billion bellow the previous year's level and more than $100 billion less than the peak in 1997. In 2001, total ODA was 20 percent less than in 1990 in inflation-adjusted dollars. The drop of 41% in 2001 FDI inflows fell by another fifth in 2002 – to $651 billion an equivalent of half of the peak in 2000. Those declines according to the World Investment Report 2003 „was steepest in Africa (41%), followed by Latin America and the Caribbean (33%)”.

The overall global downturn is attributed to a spectrum of factors operating at the macro, micro and institutional levels, says the Report. Most of the decline emanated from drastic drop in cross-border mergers and acquisitions (M&A), slumping corporate profitability and slowdown in corporate restructuring and innovative reforms. It must be noted, however, that Africa's share of global FDI (in 1997 terms) was comparatively meagre, with the largest proportion (60% flowing to the OECD countries, and the remainder of 40% flowing to just 20 countries (China being the largest recipient, $45 billion, three times larger than the next larger recipient, Brazil). For more than 100 potential countries for FDIs, the average flow was less than 100 million a year. Herein lays the shallow optimism and wishful thinking in the NePAD policy and strategy for rescuing Africa from the doldrums in the 21st Century! The relevance of this point to the discussion is the possible negative effects fluctuations in FDIs would have on African economies for which NePAD now envisages $64 billion annual flow of capital from that source.

It is noteworthy to observe that the document talk little about alternative sources of internal resource mobilisation efforts before looking outward to cover the so-called „resource gabs“ it claims to fill from that source. The document must go beyond the recommendations it offers individual governments to rationalise their expenditures, but rather put pressure on them to institute anti-corruption mechanisms, either within the framework of the APRM, or at the national and SREC level. This initiative if introduced and genuinely implemented, would contribute about at least a third of the total capital flow expected from external sources from within individual countries.

Another important alternative source for closing the alleged „resource gap“ would be to intensify ongoing efforts to engaging Africans in the Diaspora. That the Diaspora
has transformed itself from the colonial era till today cannot be disputed. It had been transformed from the intellectual movement of the recent past to embrace dispersed Africans around the globe seeking greener economic pastures as their national economies began to deteriorate in the last three decades or so. Even among the African intellectual community it is hardly the case for individuals to survive without combining other lucrative ventures in order to fulfil pressing attendant commitments at home as their relatives and families have always looked up to them for support. The Diasporas' contributions in some African countries have been steadily recorded over the years. In Ghana, for example, remittances to families and relatives had grown from between $200 - 300 million per annum since the early 1990s to a record high figure of $1.5 billion by the early months of 2003, according to a Bank of Ghana report. It had also been noted that a high proportion of cash flows from the Ghanaian Diaspora had been concentrated in Real Estate development over a long period leaving other equally important sectors of the economy requiring similar injections of cash dry. It is under the foregoing circumstances, therefore, that recommendations would be made to harness and utilise cash flows from that particular source.

In the first place, the Ghanaian authorities in particular, and the rest of individual African governments should, for example, organise their citizens at the level of the various embassies abroad and educate them on investment opportunities back home. The plethora of Ghanaian associations in Western cities could offer immediate and effective channels of organisation. The embassies under their capacity as representatives of respective governments should take steps to provide an enabling juridical environment, take confidence-building measures, establish regulatory mechanisms, and provide incentives for would be indigenous investors to redirect cash flows to other vital sectors, such as small scale industries, agro-industries, tourism and small scale businesses. But since the average capital per head of a -would-be African investor is relatively too small, their governments should encourage them to form investment coalitions, of course with the requisite legal backing of those governments. There are no fixed rules for capital formation as economic history may tell us. And Africa's opportunity to have her place in that endeavour has been lying fallow for a long period, but we cannot afford to let it lie idle any further. By this way Africans in the Diaspora, especially, those who had been educated at the cost of the task payer, would be in that direction rewarding the tax payers back home so long as efforts to halt the brain drain has failed to yield concrete results. In addition, if well organised, the Diaspora could constitute formidable force with a voice representing the continent, and their respective countries at the global institutional level, acting as a bridge in an era where information and knowledge have become the main pillars of organisation and transaction at all levels. These recommendations should also be prioritised by NePAD, focusing on resource mobilisation, information gathering, transfer of knowledge to supplement domestic efforts from within, but welcoming assistance from without. By strengthening domestic efforts at resource mobilisation, the continent would be able to negotiate or bargain effectively with her partners to select those aspects of the most needed forms of assistance, such as, in the domain of ICT, technological transfer in its entirety, and cash flow to rejuvenate worn out infrastructure. It is only by achieving and consolidating the gains made from within the continent in the form of structural reforms could African countries collectively, and individually be capacitated to enter into a genuine partnership with the developed countries of the North, based on mutual respect and interests, shared commitments and responsibilities. The initiatives taken in the domains of democratisation and democratic consolidation, sound economic management, conflict prevention, promoting peace and stability, all constitute part of the broad attempt to create an enabling environment for Africa's great leap forward in conjunction with her
partners. In that sense, the thrust of the vision, and Africa's share of the commitment enshrined in the document thereto, would be her ability to negotiate a new, but genuine relations with countries of goodwill on matters affecting Africa's development and welfare in the new millennium.

In the past few years the seeds of that kind of relations had been manifested in both the internal transitions and reforms that had taken place in the continent, including global institutional awareness about the wind of change across the continent. A foretaste of that global show of commitment had been mentioned elsewhere in the discussion. But suffice it to point out once again the efforts being made in co-operation within the framework of the policies and agreements in institutions, regions and countries around the world. The list include, the United Nations Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s, the Africa-Europe Summit’s Cairo Plan of Action, the World Bank-led Poverty Reduction Strategic Partnership with Africa, the International Monetary Fund-led Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), the Japan-led Tokyo Agenda for Action, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act of the United States, and the Economic Commission of Africa-led Global Compact with Africa. Added to the list include several NGOs involved in various ventures with civil society organisations and the public sector in several countries in the continent.

The sheer number of these international and global policy linkages undoubtedly underpins the fact that the Achilles of Africa’s current global partnership is wheeled by the forces of globalisation; a network of state/public and private actors working hand in hand with their global partners in search of solutions to Africa's deep-rooted crisis. However, whether Africa will benefit from that would depend on how the collective African leadership and individual countries would effectively compete for the so-called benefits, as well as their capacity to manage the perils of globalisation itself.

But do African states posses the capacity, resources and mechanisms to accomplish that Herculean task to make NePAD function this time around? Despite the problems of size, economic defunct and failing states, the principle of sovereignty is still firmly adhered to in African political praxis. The inability of most states to deliver public goods, including security, puts a question mark on legitimacy of most African political systems. In the inter-state interactions that finally culminated in the formulation and adoption of the NePAD document, scarcely were the collective African citizenry and accredited bodies consulted, or considered the views and suggestions collated from civil society despite the frequent references made of it in the document. This oversight, unwittingly or unwittingly, denies the general African polity of one of their traditional principles of socio-political bargaining, namely, consensus. The contents of NePAD espouse an intensive co-operation with the international community, and in this connection the responsibility lies in the court of both parties to build and strengthen trust and transparency about their political intentions and goals. The viability of NePAD to proceed and chart the tumultuous path towards peace, progress and prosperity would include recourse to addressing these factors including the endogenous and external obstacles that had been outlined above. Above all, however, in cognisance of the rapid changes taking place in the world, the success or failure of NePAD would also depend on the ability of the African leadership to manage the complex intricacies of globalisation and its multiple actors and stakeholders.

The hope and optimism for positive outcomes from the transition processes in Africa as embodied in the NePAD document is however not without suspicion. Some observers believe that the changes that are taking place are a mere camouflage attempt by the African leadership to perpetuate the old relations with the international community in order to safeguard the transfer of resources from the donor community to
the continent. In spite of that critical observation there is an eye on Africa this time around, and the collective African leadership cannot afford to fail their peoples.
Africa’s Transformations and Integration in the Context of Globalisation

The structural reforms that had taken place in the epoch after the Cold War did not occur in a vacuum. The multi-dimensional pressures of globalisation that came to bear on the old continent, and are still shaping events there, were quite enormous. Globalisation has become a household terminology used indiscriminately as a frame of reference for explaining cross-border exchanges in various human endeavours. Its boundaries are indeed, excessively fluid, crosscutting economic, political, social and cultural spheres of human endeavour. In its general sense, it denotes three things: a marked reduction in the barriers between societies and states, an increasing homogeneity of societies and states and an increase in the volume of interactions between societies - be this in terms of trade, capital, volumes of currency traded or movements of tourists and migrants.51 In the economic domain, as evident by the heights of globalisation in the mid 1990s, the concept refers to trade liberalisation accompanied by increasing tendency for capital to flow steadily across national frontiers.

In the political realm globalisation means increasing need for governments to co-ordinate their common policies for mutual benefits and shared responsibility. It also represents the increasing wave of interaction in contemporary politics among non-governmental groups on one hand, and between them and state actors.

In the cultural sphere, the term explains the spill over effects of increased interaction of cultures, which produces penetrative effects beyond the control of cultural authorities. It has also come to denote the technological revolution and innovations that have taken place in information and communication, and increasing flow of knowledge in the information super-highway. The combined effects of this are increased social mobility and interaction across national borders, regions and continents. If these were indeed the basic elements of the concept, then one would justifiably conclude that globalisation has been with us for a very long time, reaching its apogee in our time. Is it perhaps the zenith of modern capitalism? The surge of ideas, capital, new and scientific methods of production, increased migration and culture all began centuries ago, synonymous with the early attempts to incorporate the rest of the world into a single capitalist system. The drawing line between the past and the present was that in the former case globalisation was “restricted and controlled” by powerful modern nation states whose ideology for sustaining the system was grounded in virulent nationalism that carved the world into areas of linguistic and cultural influence, while maintaining the homogeneity of the centre, thus in the end creating protected domestic economy that thrived on exclusive productive and trading areas.52

In a more current deliberation on the concept, the IMF Managing Director Horst Köhler had the following to say about what globalisation is.

“From my perspective as an economist, globalisation means a process of increasing international division of labour and the accompanying integration of national economies through trade in goods and services, cross-border corporate investments, and financial flows. This integration is boosted by technological progress, in particular in transport and communications. However, there is more to globalisation than mere economics: globalisation also means the free exchange of thoughts and ideas, and greater mobility of people. This is not something that is imposed on us, but the results of forces for change that are deeply rooted in human nature: the drive for freedom and a better life, for new discoveries, and for a broader horizon”.53
Even though Köhler did not elaborate on that 'element of forces' shaping globalisation, the effects of the decisions and actions of those forces are quite tremendous and debilitating, at times even to the extent of compromising the raison d'être of most states. It breeds both opportunities and risks, covering increased per capita income, sectoral advancement such as health, education and infrastructure, as well as creating conditions for deepening poverty, creating vulnerabilities in the terms of trade, and exposing regions and countries to devastating financial crisis, as had happened in Asia, Russia, Argentina and Mexico in the last seven years.

Today, the overwhelming effects of globalisation on the African continent cannot be underestimated. By subjecting the NePAD policy document to Discourse Analysis, a close reading reveals that the document has fifteen references of the word globalisation co-occurring with the word marginalisation with eight appearances, and making recommendation about how Africa should be incorporated into the world of globalisation. In order to reveal the focus the document places on globalisation, one has to subject the document to rigorous text analysis. What is then encoded in the text? The key concepts in selected portions of the text, underdevelopment, marginalisation and globalisation do contain forms of marked sentence cohesion that espouses a logical relationship or some forms of entailment that in turn confirms Africa's current social, economic and political reality. In other words, they are statements with corresponding logical contexts. But the document is not without blemish. There are instances of vagueness on the forms of action. In terms of action, the globalisation the document talks about is a very fluid concept for which the corresponding resources, technicalities and capacities for its realisation are far outside the reach of the continent, and the international economic environment on which the African strategies may depend on to fill the resource gaps in order to realise their implementation is not predictable, or even always reliable. Developing areas have still not grasped the rules of the game: its principles and practices. In this connection, in the real world, the document unwittingly or unwittingly exhibits a high degree of rhetorical strategies, such as, „the need to end underdevelopment and marginalisation; to eradicate poverty in Africa, the global community's readiness to support Africa”, etc. The following selected portions of the text would do great service to provide in part, the empirical foundation required to support the claim that the pressures of globalisation set the momentum for Africa's transformation and integration processes. The following paragraphs cited from the document are evident of this fact.

„The continued marginalisation of Africa from the globalisation process and the social exclusion of the vast majority of its peoples constitute a serious threat to global stability (para. 2). Under that circumstance, the New Partnership for Africa's Development must preserve this common heritage and use it to build a universal understanding of the historic need to end the underdevelopment and marginalisation of the continent (para. 14). While globalisation has increased the cost of Africa's ability to compete, we hold that the advantages of an effectively managed integration present the best prospects for future economic prosperity and poverty reduction (para. 28). While no corner of the world has escaped the effects of globalisation, the contributions of the various regions and nations have differed markedly (para. 31). On the other hand, greater integration has also led to the further marginalisation of those countries that are unable to compete effectively. In the absence of fair global rules, globalisation has increased the ability of the strong to advance their interest to the detriment of the weak, especially in the area of trade, finance and technology (para. 33). In part, Africa's inability to harness the process of globalisation is a result of structural impediments to growth and development in the form of resource outflows and unfavourable terms of trade (para. 34). In this self-perpetuating cycle, Africa's capacity to participate in the
globalisation process is severely weakened, leading to further marginalisation. The increasing polarisation of wealth and poverty is one of a number of processes that have accompanied globalisation, and which threaten its sustainability (para. 35). The imperative of development, therefore, not only poses a challenge to moral conscience; it is in fact fundamental to the sustainability of the globalisation process. We readily admit that globalisation is a product of scientific and technological advances, many of which have been market driven (para. 39). The case for the role of national authorities and private institutions in guiding the globalisation agenda along a sustainable path, and therefore one in which its benefits are more equally spread, remains strong. Experience shows that despite the unparalleled opportunities that globalisation has offered to some previously poor countries, there is nothing inherent in the process that automatically reduces poverty and inequality (para. 40). The new phase of globalisation coincided with the reshaping of international relations in the aftermath of the Cold War. The United Nations Millennium Declaration, adopted in September 2000, confirms the global community's readiness to support Africa's efforts to address the continent's underdevelopment and marginalisation (para. 46). That is why the political leaders of the continent appeal to all peoples of Africa, in all their diversity, to become aware of the seriousness of the situation and the need to mobilise themselves in order to put an end to further marginalisation of the continent and ensure its development by bridging the gap with the developed countries (para. 55). Although long-term funding is envisaged under the initiative, the projects can, however, be expedite to help eradicate poverty in Africa and place African countries, both individually and collectively, on a path of sustainable growth and development and thus halt the marginalisation of Africa in the globalisation process (para. 62). For each sector, however, the objective is to bridge existing gaps between Africa and the developed countries so as to improve the continent's international competitiveness and to enable her to participate in the globalisation process (para. 98).

This and other developments that have dominated Africa's transitions in the political, economic, social and information and communication technology spheres underscores the extent and intensity of the pressures exerted by globalisation on Africa. The policy reforms that have occurred in those spheres, be it re-democratisation, economic liberalisation/deregulation, financial market reforms, intensifying NGOs activities, measures to halt the increasing digital divide (in the context of a rapid spread of the IT revolution), and efforts at regional integration to enhance Africa’s competitiveness in the global economy, are all pointers to that case. Whilst seeking ways of ensuring Africa's presence in globalisation, the authors, and promoters of NePAD have place premium on the key issues that would help Africa bridge the gap between her and the rest of the world. Those important issues are efforts to bridge the digital divide by investing in information and communication, including the infrastructure gap.

It is an undisputed fact that Africa is lagging behind in all these domains in global terms. The objective of NePAD is to address this trend, and put the continent on the path of recovery and consequently global competition. Africa's dismal economic performance in the recent past is due to greater extent on her inability to compete effectively in the global market place. The African leadership has become aware of this deplorable state of the national economies by the dawn of the new millennium. African Trade Ministers during their preparatory meeting for UNCTAD-IX on 14-16 February, 1996 at Addis Ababa, in Ethiopia observed that the risk of further marginalisation looms large before Africa and the continent had already bypassed the positive effects of the globalisation process, and therefore reiterated the urgent need to promote actions that would rapidly integrate Africa into the mainstream of the world economy. At the global
level, the UN General Assembly in its 56th Session from 17-18 September 2001 outlined an agenda called, *Responding to Globalisation: Facilitating the Integration of Developing Countries into the World Economy in the 21st Century*, with focus on enhancing and facilitating access to information and communication technologies for developing countries. At the regional level, the UN Economic Commission for Africa held a high-level meeting at the first African Development Forum, from 24 to 28 October 1999 under the theme „The challenge to Africa of globalisation and the information age“.

These observations were also reiterated by the OAU Assistant Secretary-General, Vijay Makhan, during a forum on the Future Competitiveness of African Economies held in the Senegalese capital Dakar, in 1999. The unanimous response to the onslaught of international competition and the deteriorating economic situation was integration of the African economies in order to attain the goal of effective competition. The reasons for the choice of the path of integration to foster competition were many and varied, but not unknown in African political economy, and most have been stated elsewhere in this discussion. However, suffice it to state once again that small size of markets in Africa, the high incidence of land-locked states, underdeveloped infrastructure, dependence on single export commodity, technological backwardness; have combined to have tolling effects on Africa's performance in globalisation. No single African country (except perhaps South Africa) can stand single handed against the onslaught of global competition. The OAU's Assistant Sec.Gen pointed out exactly the current global trend and Africa's performance thereof. „In particular, the far-reaching technological developments associated with globalisation have exposed the limitations of our commodity dependent economies. The ongoing dematerialisation of production as well as the bleak long-term outlook for commodities suggests a need for us in Africa to take a hard and realistic look at our future competitiveness in the new global world economy”.

The empirical foundations to this observation by the Assistant Sec.Gen are also not far fetched. The continent has experienced decades of decline of its share of global trade, which reached it lowest levels by the end of the last millennium. Makhan said, between 1980 and 1997 Africa's share of world trade declined from 2.3 percent to 1.4 percent. Its share of world exports also fell to below 2 percent. In a further demonstration of the continents' declined performance, he cited the case in 1996 where the Republic of South Korea exported goods worth $130 billion, which was far higher than the $116 billion aggregate for all Africa in the same year. In addition, to the crucial issue of FDIs which had been discussed at length in this discussion, Makhan added that Africa attracts the lowest share of FDIs at the current rate of three percent of global flows, and cited once again a bleak example that the 4.7 billion FDI Africa received in 1997 was about the same as what Malaysia alone attracted that same year. He was even convinced that Africa's failure to overcome the investment chasm is one of the key shortcomings of the structural adjustment programmes African countries have implemented for nearly two decades without realising the predicted outcomes.

The onslaught of the forces of globalisation on the economies of developing countries was even captured earlier at the sub-regional level in West Africa following the events of 1989. The events had several implications for Africa. In the most significant sense it had by then become clear to the collective African leadership in general and the West African sub-region in particular that their dependence on the rich North was being put to question. There was, indeed, a widespread anxiety that given the time and energy, as well as the financial resources the West, and Western Europe in particular had invested in peace in Eastern Europe, it was then logically obvious that focus would be shifted away from other parts of the world towards Eastern European states and economies in order to bolster transitions to democracy and market economy.
This anxiety was expressed during the 13th Session of ECOWAS Heads of States and Government in 1990, where the former Head of State of Nigeria, General Ibrahim Babaginda urged the Western countries not to put all their bread in one basket, but continue engaging Africa. The title of his presentation was quite closer to the overwhelming effects globalisation, and global challenges at the turn of the 1990s were about to inflict on Africa.  

From the point of view of the responses the African crisis has received since the last decade or so (obviously not too much an action-oriented one), one can safely draw on the perspective that there is an ongoing political intervention already referred to in the introduction of the discussion.

However difficult though to discern, the spirit of that intervention was without doubt against that background that African leaders resolved at the dawn of the 21st century to transform, rationalise and integrate African economies with the sub-regions as integrative cores that would culminate in an African Economic Community; a resolve that has compelled African countries to make structural reforms in macro-economic management, governance and creating an enabling environment to enhance the continent's competitiveness in the era of globalisation. As a show of the OAU's commitment towards working constructively with their partners, such as, the European Union, the former organised the Cairo Plan of Action: Africa-Europe Summit Under the Aegis of the OAU and the EU on 3-4 April 2000 that opened the channel for constructive political dialogue in addressing the challenges facing Africa, as well as injecting new dynamism and innovation in their historical relations. But the 'global game' of globalisation is not as easy as it seems to be. In the recent past the perils of the game and the opposing force of its discontents have overshadowed whatever benefits globalisation may offer to its adherents.

The surge in global engagements with the larger part of the non-western world, and their incorporation into the economic and political system of the West has also open the floodgate for forms of vulnerabilities that were hitherto a mater of low profile in inter-state relations. Halliday argues that the end of the Cold War, and the political and economic developments thereafter „has opened up capitalism to much greater scrutiny...For most of the Twentieth Century the capitalist world had an alibi, a claim that whatever its faults, it was superior to its rival, communism...Now capitalism has to be matched against the claims that it makes for itself. Capitalism is on its own. For the first time in history it lacks an alibi” He questions not only the effects of globalisation in the social and economic realm, but also „globalisation's ability to distribute the benefits that modern society produces across the world”. This is also the dilemma of the path that the promoters of NePAD had taken, which isplanked on the benefits globalisations may offer to the African continent, without necessarily producing the ill effects associated with it. So where do we go from here?

The answer may lie in our ability to investigate the major effects of globalisation on society, economy, culture, the environment and politics of vulnerable states and communities. Another part of the answer will emanate from assessments from the process of integration on the continent, and examine how far the challenges of globalisation are impacting the overall performance of national economies and sub-regional economic communities. The investigation could also cover issues such as, the incidence of globalisation on the standard of living. The African state by its nature does share much of the vulnerabilities that may make it fall prey to the onslaught of globalisation. The factors are not new to this discussion, they are both internal and external, ranging from lack of state capacity, institutional policy duplications, misguided domestic policies, widespread conflict to lack of technical knowledge and information, sound technological base, inadequate product diversification; sustained decline in the
terms of trade, lack of representation, participation and transparency in the decision-making processes of multilateral arrangements relating to trade and economic institutions, such as the WTO, IMF and the World Bank, erection of protectionist barriers by the rich Northern economies, among others.

However, once the African state system had been well delved into, efforts will be focused on the impact globalisation has had and is having on the continent, and the responses it is receiving from the African leadership. The responses to the impact of globalisation on Africa has taken the form of partnerships with global institutions, powerful regions and state actors symbolised in a form of Global Advocacy (see Figure 3). Hence external and internal forces are co-operating extensively on a scale that had never been seen on the continent. In the past such kinds of partnerships had been perceived by a greater number of African elites as a milieu, or a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of states in the continent. The end of the Cold War hostilities, as well as the dominant role of the Bretton Woods Institutions during the 1980s and beyond had radically changed the political terrain in the past one decade. In this direction the Abuja Treaty of 1991, the Cairo Agenda, and NePAD, constitute an outstanding part of the policy re-orientation on the part of the African countries to tackle the challenges posed by globalisation. Indeed, all the comprehensive policy directions that had been introduced in the aftermath of the Cold War recognises the importance of the SRECs as the main engines for growth and development in an era of globalisation wheeled by cross-border rapid mobility of resources and competition.

To what then are the SRECs design to respond to, and why their being chosen for this purpose? The focus on regional integration in general and the SRECs in particular encounters some problems here. One of the main threads in the argument is the claim that regionalism has negative consequences on globalisation, while another thread in contemporary thinking on globalisation argues that both processes are still a difficult co-existence. But given Africa's socio-economic and political condition, this work would argue that regionalism provides the appropriate channels for Africa to participate in multilateral arrangements such as the WTO. In that particular sense, the processes of globalisation and regionalism are linked and are mutually reinforcing. Herein lays the paradox of an era! Advocates of the first two strands of thought base their arguments on the distortions regionalism creates in resource allocation on the production side due to preferential treatment of regionally produced goods and the price advantages emanating there from; possibility of states in a regional arrangements resorting to protectionist measures to influence their terms of trade; possible market expansions creating room for autarky thus reducing global activities and welfare. However, in the African context the plethora of linked international efforts in partnership with regional approaches for finding global solutions to Africa's problems constitute a strong counter argument to the views held by adherents of globalisation minus regionalism.

The African condition has created decades of constraints relating to capacity building, and technical innovation that seriously hampers effective acquisition of new knowledge, and bureaucratic participation in multilateral arrangements, such as, the WTO. It was this particular constraint in mind that the US government, for example, embedded technical assistance as a crucial component in AGOA to facilitate capacity-building to enhance Africa's competitive edge in the globalisation process, and participate fully in global Multilateral Arrangements. Hence, for Africa therefore, regionalism has become an unavoidable springboard to globalisation, and a legitimate weapon to mitigate the perils of emerging challenges created by it in relation to the instabilities and inequalities emanating there from. In other words, Africa cannot stand outside the globalisation bandwagon and fight the perils emanating there from, nor wait and hope to benefit from it one day. It must be part of the process in fighting the
asymmetries and injustices in global multilateral arrangements, and its large number of states and presence in the UN General Assembly, for example, provides immediate conduit for addressing some of the pertinent issues affecting Africa's economic and political interest. In brief, regionalism may provide easy conduits for fast-tracking decisions affecting Africa in instances where multilateral negotiations become cumbersome and foot dragging. Multilateral issues are not always purely economic, and when politics takes precedent over economics during multilateral negotiations, regionalism provides the bilateral channels for articulating fundamental political or strategic interests and objectives.

By and large, the strategy for realising the visions of NEPAD itself is grounded in a globalisation strategy that is designed to reap the benefits of international trade, finance and technology by way of adopting measures such as structural transformation, rationalising institutions, promoting good, transparent and accountable governments that would create an enabling environment for securing those benefits to be channelled into a wide range of key projects aimed at stimulating regional integration and development, building economies of scale and achieving harmonisation of industries on a sub-regional basis. Empirical evidence during the Fifth Ministerial Conference of the WTO in Cancun in September 2003 validates the urgency attached to globalisation guided by regionalism. Despite the deadlock on reaching consensus on key issues affecting countries of the South, Africans for example, were able to make their concerns clear across the board, exemplified by Benin, Burkina Faso and Chad which presented a sectoral initiative on cotton that met the full support of African negotiators at the conference. Their presence under the umbrella of the African Union raises the clarion call on the rich members of the international community on the harmful effects of subsidies in the broader context of agriculture. However, it remains to be judged whether the policies that had been adopted so far are adequate enough to create a launching pad for Africa's great leap forward in the competitive world of globalisation.

The point of caution for the new African Union is that the wishful thinking of the past OAU must not be allowed to creep into current policy infrastructure. The globalisation and competition we talk about today is not a concept charged with benevolent actors. Africa has continued to remain at the periphery of globalisation ever since the concept became synonymous with global expansion of British mercantilism of the early 19th Century. Even though the main centres of globalisation have tilted to incorporate some countries from regions such as Asia and Latin America, North America, Europe and Japan are still the prime movers of the global game, while Africa's prevailing socio-economic and political conditions continue to perpetuate her peripheral position. It is this particular concern that must constitute Africa's main drive for integration towards catching up in global competition.

Under those circumstances how are the sub-regions that had been designated as main building blocks of a broader regional integration capable of constituting a viable and efficient conduit for achieving recovery, growth and development?
Sub-regional Economic Communities as Integral Cores

The analysis made on the OAU in Part Two revealed among other things that the category Sub-regional Economic Communities (SRECs) is as old as the formative years of the organisation. For reasons of large number, overlapping membership, lack of funding and political will, differing political ideologies, the Cold War superpower rivalry and scramble for influence, combined with the harsh international economic environment and concentration of production on few commodities, member states poor competitive edge in the international market, SRECs never realised their fundamental objective of greater production and intra-African trade and development. Over the past several decades SRECs have been saddled with sophisticated treaties and protocols that committed their member states to over ambitious development programmes that bore no convergence to their resources and capacities. Despite their inherent structural constraints they are still regarded as the building blocks for deepening regional economic and political integration in Africa. The Abuja Treaty establishing the AU clearly elaborates measures to rejuvenate and inject new dynamism into the SRECs in order to bail them out of their dormancy, rationalise their structures, deepen their interaction, co-ordinate macro-economic policies and harmonise their protocols at the national and sub-regional levels to reflect regional goals and objectives. The institutional overhaul apart, developments taking place in the realm of economic and political integration in Africa presents enormous challenges for the academic and research community. Regional integration in Africa is being backed by genuine political commitments for the first time in the post-independence era. However, it is an ongoing process at its teething stage. There is as of now no coherent analytical tools and methods for tracking the complex processes that had been set in motion in a continent of 53 sovereign states. That does not however mean that the research community with focus on established integration projects and processes have always been able to provide answers to probing questions in determining the true path of any integration process. The long contours of European integration and the multiple and conflicting interpretations and analysis it had brought in its trail signifies caution in any new such ventures in other regions. But it should, however, also be noted that the possible emergence of various strands of thought in the debate is also the spirit of that venture in seeking the truth and logic about prevailing events in the African continent.

Indeed, while there have been series of policies on regional integration in Africa, policy makers and political entrepreneurs have not been able to delineate a clear path of implementation in the praxis, as to exactly what should be assigned priority in the context of Africa's peculiar socio-economic and political condition. The question that might emanate there from is whether economics or politics should be given due priority? In his address marking the Third meeting of the African Development Forum in 2002, Adebayo Adedeji noted that:

"...It is now clear that the economism of regional co-operation is principally responsible for the slow progress made during the past forty years. By focusing virtually exclusively on economic co-operation and integration while making the heroic ceteris paribus assumption as far as political and social factors are concerned, has contributed significantly to the lack of progress in the actualisation of the vision. Political fragmentation has brought about the problem of a large number of minuscule states-nations, which with the best will in the world, have no chances of becoming viable, vibrant, dynamic and prosperous. The partitioning and fragmentation of Africa into nation-states without regard for history and culture, without respect for the integrity of different nationalities and ethnic groups has made virtually impossible the task of nation building in Africa. Allegiance to the nation-state has not yet transcended ethnic ties. If anything, there has been a regression to parochialism...In such a nation-state the viability of the national economy is compromised rather than intensive. How can the collective of a group of non-
The above quotation and the history of integration in Africa conveys the empirical conviction that economics has always preceded politics, thus accounting for low political performance we had all known in the continent till the end of the east-west ideological rivalry. The evidence is also manifested in the defeat of Nkrumah in the early 1960s in pushing forth first and foremost a political and constitutional programme on which economic and political integration could take-off in Africa. The citation also reminds us that under those circumstances the nation-state is scarcely motivated to shed off its sovereign rights in favour of integration in a broader context. This also implies that apart from external pressures that are driving African countries to deepen integration, there are no significant and organised countervailing cross-border forces within the African continent to constitute a sort of catalysts on state actions. One potential sector in the African setting that could perhaps constitute that force, namely the so-called informal sector, despite its enormous economic contribution to GDP, is fragmented, unorganised, lacks innovation and the technical know-how either to compete across national borders, or influence state policy. Social movements and other interests groups are also poorly organised and scarcely bears any coherence and common drive for action. This also applies to several organised groups and civil society organisations across the continent that is under funded, or lacks the requisite leadership with vision and action to work towards achieving common African goals and objectives. Even in the much popularised economic sphere, problems of knowledge about the key dynamics of economic integration, and of gathering information and statistics on international and intra-African trade may pose greater challenges for observers and researchers alike in the field. In the most critical sense, that element of economism referred to in the above citation also exposes the desperation of the African leadership to their dependence on industrialised countries, thus compelling them to deepen their economic relations thereto, manifested by uncountable economically-laden conferences, decisions and blueprints that have dominated African political economy of late.

As noted elsewhere, the IMF imposition of political conditionality in the aftermath of the Cold War expresses the shift in the imbalance between economic and political action, so that we are now seeing a kind of simultaneous action in both domains. Despite the long preoccupation with economic regionalism it is still difficult to get oneself informed about the economic dimensions of integration in the African continent.

As of now, the major authoritative source of data on integration in Africa comes from the ECA's Assessing Regional Integration in Africa (ARIA). ARIA's core programme focuses on efforts to establish objective analytical tools, methods and benchmarks for tracking regional integration in Africa. Assist member states, regional integration organs, and other stakeholders in developing their policies and programmes. Within that broad framework it attempts to offer a scope of analysis to assess and examine performance and overall trends in major sectors, national economies, SRECs, and identify critical issues and emerging challenges and explore a way forward in regional integration in Africa. In its last report, ARIA's major indicators for assessing regional integration were both quantitative and qualitative, covering sectoral, national, sub-regional and continental wide performance as major benchmarks for measuring and comparing performance. The report reiterates and reaffirms the widely accepted argument that in order to be effective the SRECs require stringent political commitment and rationalisation. The following description, explanation, analysis, assessment, and examination of the key SRECs focusing particularly on their activities in the aftermath of the Cold War (1990-2003), would reveal their current statuses and performance, and help make predictions about the future. While the ARIA report may focus on economic...
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indicators and benchmarks for analysis, the political transitions that had taken place in the last one decade, including the report's recognition of the role that genuine political commitment play in the process, do provide enough grounds for research on African integration to give equal priority to the political dynamics and social forces shaping events and their outcomes in the African continent. In this direction, inter-state African interaction, co-operation and bargaining at the regional, sub-regional and national levels have to be methodically addressed, taking into consideration the role of power and influence, shifting coalitions and re-alignment, actors points of convergence and divergence, compatibility and incompatibilities, tensions and even rivalry, and how they impact decisions and actions at those levels.

Akin to ARIA is the newly established publishing team for Monitoring Regionalism and Integration in Southern Africa Year Book. Its team of Authors aims at discussing ongoing economic, political and social processes, including institutional efforts for achieving the goals of security in the Southern African rim. Its Authors comes from diverse background and countries of origin including Europe and North America. But in all, ARIA and similar bodies in the continent shares points of convergence in analysing macro-economic trends in the respective sub-regions, tracking the impulses for development and potential for intra-regional trade, identifying key areas for competition and even rivalry, as well as assessing exchange rate policies and FDI trends in the region and national economies. Conscious of the established link between good governance, development and overall security in the integration process, monitors of regional integration have placed premium on these indicators. Hence the impact of crisis on development and integration has come to occupy an important place in the work of monitors, observers and academics who deals with integration matters. In the general African context, however, analysis must focus on NePAD and its potential for the various sub-regional integration blocks, and vice-versa. But there would also be of course points of departure from general indicators for analysis as events and conditions in the differing sub-regions may be peculiar or unique. For example, the burning issue of land reform, in its kind and nature, is almost exclusively circumscribed to the Southern African region.

The problems of methodology apart, the sub-regions in the continent exhibits a high degree of hierarchies and asymmetries in their political and economic structures, so much so that the large number of spokes may even at times constitute a policy headache for the few hubs, such as South Africa, Kenya, Egypt and Nigeria. At the other side of the coin, the self-interest of some hubs in matters affecting trade and wealth distribution may cause frustration and even antagonism from small and less powerful states. And even in a continent where the few hubs in comparison to other regions of the world are so vulnerable in political and security terms, the evidence may suggest that the process of, and the capacity for realising the potentials for economic integration and development in Africa would be a labyrinthine process. The empirical foundations for these general assertions are not far fetched. There is indeed a big gap between protocols and treaties in Africa, and the available effective bureaucratic mechanisms and the political will for ratification and implementation thereto. This incapacity is also partly due to limited financing of institutions in general as a result of member states inability to honour their financial obligation owed them. In August 1999 for example, during the 44th Session of the ECOWAS Council of Ministers in Abuja, Nigeria, the Council on the face of growing arrears and contribution by member states was compelled to adopt a resolution to penalise members owing some US$ 37.2 million thereto. This is a typical institutional phenomenon in African inter-state interaction, which thus constitutes one of the many and varying obstacles for translating policy intentions into action. Most institutions in the African continent including the ECOWAS have no legal backing for
taking action against member states that fail to pay their annual contribution. And so long as there are no enforcing mechanisms at the sub-regional and continental levels for sanctioning defaulting member states on dues and contributions, institutions on the continent would continue be in a limbo. The implications are that policies and blueprints would also end up on shelves and desks at both sub-regional and continental levels if that anomaly were not finally corrected.

Another problematic in the research domain regarding SRECs is their choice for analysis. The AU recognises five out of fifteen SRECs as the main building blocks of the ECA. These are ECOWAS, SADC, AMU, COMESA, the EAC and ECCAS. Despite its large number of member states and progress that had been made so far, some COMESA states are either resolving and managing conflicts or have still not find their economic foothold to make any significant contribution to the integration process. Zimbabwe, Burundi, DRC, Sudan, Eritrea and Ethiopia easily come to mind. Moreover, COMESA’s traditional objectives as an integrating entity is not so much of a cross-cutting unit, especially with her deep focus on economic and trading activities among the member states. Some regions may not have necessarily made any significant inroads in integration, but because of at least their characteristic territorial homogeneity they may be considered appropriate for analysis. The AMU has still no formal relations with the AEC, but the latter still considers the former as one of the main building blocks of integration under the auspices of the AU most probably because of the importance of the territorial representation of its member states to the AU. The rebred ECA may also be quite attractive for analysis due to its past experience, geographical and linguistic homogeneity, and the lessons it may offer to the rest of the SRECs. At the end of the day, choice for SRECs for analysis would be determined by the extent of communication and interaction among the member states elites in not just economic domains, but the attempts being made to achieve political integration in the foreseeable future.
Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)

West Africa's share of the post-independence elite movement for integration was personified in the former Liberian President, William Tubman who championed the idea as far back as 1964. His diplomatic efforts culminated in an agreement signed between Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone in February 1965 committing them to co-operate and interact in order to improve the standard of living of the member states. This attempt did not go beyond the signatorial ceremony of the participating states. In April 1972, the Presidents of Nigeria and Togo, General Gowon and General Eyadema revived and re-launched the idea to the heads of states of the West African sub-region. By 1975 their diplomatic efforts had brought 16 West African countries to their fold, who finally signed a treaty for Economic Community of West African States (Treaty of Lagos) on 28 May of the said year. The protocols launching ECOWAS were signed in Lomé, Togo on 5 November 1976. In the post-Cold War era, emerging challenges in the domain of conflict and resolution, and globalisation in general, compelled the ECOWAS member states to streamline its treaty to accelerate economic integration, deepen political co-operation with the ultimate objective to create an enabling environment to achieve growth and development in the sub-region. In July 1993 therefore, a revised ECOWAS Treaty was signed thereto, which has also injected fresh dynamism in the sub-regional body as far as its aims and objectives are concerned.

First and foremost, ECOWAS member states aims „to promote co-operation and integration in economic, social and cultural activity, ultimately leading to the establishment of an economic and monetary union through the total integration of the sixteen national economies in West Africa“. The treaty also commits the member states to formulate and implement policies „to raise the standard of living of its peoples, maintain and enhance economic stability, foster relations among member states and contribute to the progress and development of the African continent“, taking into account the principal provisions of the Treaty establishing the AEC. The revision of the treaty in 1993 brought in novel ideas and commitments in economic and political co-operation to enable the member states achieve common market and a single currency in cognisance of its economic objectives, while reiterating the need to establish a West African Parliament, an Economic and Social Council and an ECOWAS Court of Justice to replace the existing Tribunal System of adjudication and arbitration and enforce Community decisions. As a result of the political instabilities in the aftermath of the Cold War, conflict prevention, resolution and management mechanism was integrated into the ECOWAS system.

The sub-regional body is structured on the Authority of Heads of States and Government (AHSG) that constitutes the supreme institution of ECOWAS, and whose chairperson is held on rotation principle, meeting once in a year. The Authority is the highest decision making body constituted by heads of state and/or government of member states. Its key responsibilities include determination and direction of the general policy of the Community, oversees its functioning within the confines of the treaty, develops and adopts the rules of procedure and appoints the Executive Secretary. The Council of Ministers is the second highest authority, and consists of two representatives from each member state with chairperson also drawn on the same rotation principle like the AHSG. Among its core duties the Council makes recommendations to the Authority to enhance the attainment of the stated objectives of the Community.

In consonance with the provisions of the revised Treaty of 1993, an ECOWAS Parliament was established to provide a common forum for consultation and consensus building towards achieving the goals of regional integration. A protocol thereto was
signed in Abuja on the 6th of August 1994 but came into force in March 2002. Some of the fundamental domains of the Parliament’s competence include issues regarding human rights and freedoms of citizens and all related matters affecting the Community’s general policy infrastructure and its effective operations. There is also a Community Court of Justice established in 1991. The functions of the Court include the settlement of disputes regarding interpretation or the application of the provisions of the Treaty. Its decisions shall be binding on the member states, the institutions of the Community and on individuals and corporate bodies. Article 19 of the protocol on the Community Court of Justice calls for harmonisation of relationships with identifiable international organisations, such as, the Court of Justice of the European Union at Luxembourg, International Court of Justice at the Hague-Netherlands, and other relevant international institutions of similar status. The Court is temporary seated in Lagos, Nigeria.

The protocol also establishes an Arbitration Tribunal of Community, whose composition and competence are determined by the AHSG, addresses juridical matters, such as interpretation of the provisions of the treaty, and settlement of disputes between member states.

The office of the Executive Secretary is based on an elective four-year term renewable only once. He or she is assisted by Deputy Executive Secretaries. The numerous duties of the Executive Secretary includes promotion of the Community’s development programmes, co-ordinating multinational enterprises in the region, monitoring sectoral projects that are key to the objectives of regional integration in the Community, preparation of meetings of all key organs of the Community including that of experts and technical committees that may need the administrative and technical services of the Secretariat. The Treaty also envisages the establishment of an Economic and Social Council, which have advisory role with membership spanning across representatives of the various departments of economics, and social policy making. The office of the financial controller at the secretariat had been abolished, while two new offices of deputy executive secretaries have been established for economic co-operation and policy harmonisation of individual national economic policies.

Six Specialised Commissions are established to facilitate and co-ordinate policies with the AHSG, the Council of Ministers, the Tribunal and the Executive Secretariat. These are (1) Trade, Customs, Immigration, Monetary and Payments; (2) Industry, Agriculture and Natural Resources; (3) Transport, Communications and Energy ;(4) Social and Cultural Affairs; (5) Administration and Finance; and (6) Information. In the course of its existence ECOWAS has created several Specialised Agencies and Institutions. In 1992 the former West African Clearing House responsible for administering an ECOWAS exchange rate system and for establishing the single monetary zone was restructured to speed up monetary integration and lay the foundation for a sub-regional monetary integration within the broad framework of future regional monetary integration as enshrined in the Treaty establishing the AEC. The Ecobank Transnational Inc., a private regional investment Bank, and the Organisation of Trade Unions of West Africa were both established in 1984. The West African Youth Association, West African Universities Association, West African Women's Association, and the West African Community were all created in 1987 to enhance integration in the sub-region. As is the case with any organisation future events have also been given a space to shape the structure of the sub-regional body in the course of its development.

After almost a decade of experience in conflict intervention, as manifested by the events in Liberia and Sierra Leone, the ECOWAS Summit of December 1999 agreed on a protocol for the establishment of a Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, peace and security with the financial assistance of the European Union.
Constituting the mechanism are Council of Elders and a Security and Mediation Council consisting of 10 members. During the same Summit, the CHSG approved a protocol to establish the Community Court of Justice to address complaints from member states and institutions of the sub-regional body, as well as handle issues relating to defaulting countries and possible free riders. The Summit also agreed to transform the ECOWAS Fund for Co-operation, Compensation and Development into a holding company to be known as ECOWAS Investment and Development Bank, with two subsidiaries (ECOWAS Regional Investment Bank and ECOWAS Regional Development Fund).

At its current status, ECOWAS consists of 15 member states as against 16 in its formative years. This was the result of Mauritania's withdrawal from that body on 26 December 1999 due to disagreement with some of the decisions at the Summit relating to integration of armies and the removal of borders and tariffs. In all, the sub-regional body has a population of about 214 million, with a combined GDP of about US$ 107 billion. Like any other sub-region in the continent, the West African sub-region still exhibits the vestiges of colonialism with full presence in its linguistic identity symbolic of the Francophone-Anglophone dichotomy already elaborated elsewhere in this work (Part II). This particular colonial heritage did not only survived the nationalists independence movements, but has grown and endured in the political life of West African elite interaction, preferences, decision-making and choices, to the extent of constituting a stumbling block for integration in the sub-region. In addition, the sub-regional body is bedridden with endemic ethnic tensions and civil conflicts that have been either abated, stagnated, or waiting to be imploded when politics, ethnicity, and at times religion converges. The general instability and insecurity in the region is even compounded by proliferation and trafficking of light arms and ammunitions that have in turn contributed to high rate of armed robbery, and related crimes. In the economic field a greater number of the member states are highly indebted and have reach the point of defunct, and are now soliciting the IMF and World Bank HIPC relief and assistance programme.

At the level of inter-state interaction, there are both latent and perceived rivalries among some of the member states of the sub-regional body. The Ivory Coast has always perceived Nigeria's size and political influence and hegemonic role as hostile to the sovereignty of the smaller states, and its founding father was no wonder one of the first few African leaders to recognise the Nigerian separatist movement of the late 1960s. Following the discovery of oil reserves in Nigeria, the West African Francophone sentiments about Nigeria went beyond the sub-region to engulf metropolitan French elite concerns thus creating an atmosphere of mutual anxiety for both as regards the West African giant's increasing economic power and political influence in the sub-region. From then onwards Francophone West African states under French cultural and political tutelage have almost always taken alternative paths to collective ECOWAS decisions, protocols and strategies for development and security. The philosophy of strict adherence to French culture, language, history, ideology and political tutelage is however, deeply grounded in the concept „la Francophonie“, which signifies a common bond between France and her former colonies, and the cradle of that civilisation is France itself. It is under the canopy of this kind of cultural imperialism that France's Africa foreign policy had been shaped since the colonial period to the post-independence era.

In the post-Cold War era, however, even though relations between France and her client states began to change systematically, there are aspects of that relationship that had endured since that period. As Martin had noted:

„Elements of continuity include their enduring historical and cultural ties; their informal, intimate, and secretive politico-diplomatic relations, typified by the annual Franco-African summit meetings; and in
fact when all is said and done, the continent remains of great economic importance to France. As for the
gradual process of democratisation which has swept throughout Francophone Africa in recent years, there
is evidence this has been selectively supported by France according to criteria pertaining more to her core
foreign-policy interests in Africa than to ideological, legalistic, or humanitarian considerations.”

Hence if there are any redirections in that relationship then one has to look to the
economic domain, where France has slowly relaxed her economic grip on the
Francophone African countries to embrace other countries in the continent such as,
Kenya, Zimbabwe, South Africa and Nigeria.73 In the case of Nigeria however, French
penetration in that country's economy in the form of trade and capital investment is not
without scepticism, given the form and context of their rivalry. On that note Nigeria
perceives French foreign policy in the sub-region as creating fertile grounds for
encroaching on her sovereignty, thereby deepening dependence and subordination.74 The
Nigeria anxiety about French policy in the sub-region is well captured by Ate when he wrote:

'... the pervasive and tenacious involvement of France in West-Central Africa constitutes a direct threat to
Nigeria's national security and also impedes the natural growth of the country's political and cultural
interests in the region'75

Without any doubt this firm grip on French West Africa by France is not compatible
with prevailing transformations and integration in Africa. Unfortunately, however, there
is no evidence, at least now, that France would turn a new leaf on her former colonies,
and if she happens to rethink her policy towards them one day then that might be
hopefully the unintended consequences of European integration, which would definitely
make French political posture in the region anachronistic to the new visions of a 21st
Century Europe.

In a similar vein, Ghana-Togo relations have always been ditched by accusations
and counter-accusation of each other harbouring dissidents in their respective countries.
That tension only subsided for the first time in over two decades when the Rawlings era
ended during the December 2001 election, which brought the opposition New Patriotic
Party to power. In Togo, the sub-regions democratic deficit still hangs over the country's
President, Eyadema who has managed to secure his third term in contravention of the
Togolese constitution. Apart from a border dispute that had always been the source of
diplomatic row between Ghana and the Ivory Coast, real hostilities between the two
neighbours had been more of a micro phenomenon than the results of macro level
discords. This takes the form of Ivorian civilian and police hostilities and harassment
against Ghanaians resident in the Ivory Coast.76 Their escalations however do affect
diplomatic relations between the countries from time to time.

Further westward in the sub-region there had been a long history of border disputes
between Senegal and Mauritania, whereby farmers and nomads from both sides have
been making territorial claims along their national borders. The conflict between the two
countries is occasioned by civilian harassment of nationals from both sides, state
sanctioned deportations, frequent outbreak of diplomatic rows, and accusations and
counter accusations. In 1989 in particular, the conflicts assumed intensive and
aggressive diplomatic exchanges following a recall of the Mauritania Ambassador from
duty in Dakar as a result of an alleged military mobilisation on both sides. Though less
of direct military confrontation, the two countries bouts of diplomatic thug of war do
hamper any prospects for sustained political and economic development in the broader
West African context. Apart from those bilateral disputes, Mauritania in particular
remained the only Arab country in the ECOWAS that showed greater tendency and
affinity towards the Arab world and the Maghreb countries of Northern Africa than any
show of common identity with ECOWAS countries.77 Her summarily withdrawal from
the sub-regional body on policy disagreement warrant one to opine that Mauritania may be harbouring a deep sense of identity crisis within the ECOWAS, adding to the already fragile Francophone-Anglophone divide in the sub-region.

In another dimension, divisions and rivalry in the sub-region had been concentrated around the issue pertaining to Nigeria's hegemonic designs and policy contradiction that breed fear and misapprehension at times. As indicated earlier on, Nigeria's came into political and thus hegemonic limelight after successfully halting anti-federalists campaign of the late 1960s. That success was further reinforced by the discovery of oil in the Niger Delta, which turned the country into a West African economic hub within a short period of time. By the turn of the 1980s Nigeria's economic miracle was gradually creeping towards the general African economic condition: galloping inflation, mounting debts, increasing unemployment, widespread social discontent and a growing inefficient state machinery, and increasing rate of crime. Few years later the country had taken its share of Africa's lost decade often attributed to the continents dismal economic performance of the 1980s manifested by her global lag in trade, finance and investment. The mounting social crisis in particular brought pressure on the government to deport millions of foreigners who had been making a living in the country since the oil boom. Their crime was that they were the main cause of Nigeria's economic and social problems, especially regarding the issue of organised crime. In the end over 1 million Ghanaians were deported, not for the alleged crime but merely in retaliation for Ghana's Aliens Compliance Order of the early 1970s, which sanctioned the return of hundreds of thousands of Nigerians who had settled in Ghana as farm labourers in the Cocoa sector during the Cocoa boom of the early 1950s till the turn of the 1970s, including their presence in Ghana's lucrative diamond sector. Other foreigners affected were from the former Upper Volta, now Burkina Fasso, and migrant labourers from neighbouring Togo. The expulsion order by the Nigerian authorities of predominantly Ghanaians sent uproar within ECOWAS diplomatic circles as it was in contravention of the sub-regional body's protocol relating to free movement of persons. It also sent messages of breach of trust and confidence in the West African giant's regional designs and intentions. But the most enduring consequence of those expulsions was without doubt the cementing effects it had on inter-Francophone relations and their loyalty to CEAO (Communauté Economique de L'Afrique Ouest). That sense was further deepened by the events and diplomacy that led to ECOMOG's intervention in the Liberian crisis in the early 1990s from which many Francophone states expressed misgivings about the dominant role exercised by Nigeria's leadership instead of a genuine partnership with the rest of ECOWAS member states, or at least taking a co-ordination function.

The above description and analysis of inter-state conflict in Africa in general, and the OAU and the various sub-regional organisations failure to finding peaceful and lasting solution to them raises question about the efficacy of the popularised OAU's mode of mediation of disputes within the continent. Given ECOWAS's unwavering efforts to integrate the sub-region for the past twenty-five years in the context of fragmentation, duplication of efforts, rivalry, budgetary constraints, political and ethnic heterogeneity, and deep-seated rhetoric, what then are the implications of this gloomy background for sub-regional integration?

Could the member states of the sub-regional body put aside their colonial induced political rivalry and differences for economic co-operation to systematically open up channels for genuine political interaction and integration? The dynamics of Francophone-Anglophone power jockeying and scramble for influence in West African integration efforts is as remote as the institutionalisation attempts of the formative years of ECOWAS. At the institutional level this took the form of duplicative rival institutions, mostly of Francophone leanings, against the spirit of ECOWAS, but
apparently designed to neutralise a perceived hegemonic designs of Nigeria. At the end of the day, unfortunately however, what ECOWAS can best deliver are „disintegration and balkanisation” from within its own member states, and as Boafo-Arthur had noted in his interrogation of the existing problems facing the sub-regional body:

„The basic assumption is that ECOWAS is under a serious threat of disintegration because either overtly or covertly, policy measures by some members of the community continuously atomise the group and make it difficult for the realisation of stated objectives. So long as the economic and political fractionalisation of the sub-region continues, the objectives of ECOWAS cannot be attained. (...) the overall development of the sub-region would continue to lag unless serious measures aimed at containing the forces of balkanisation are instituted”.

This manifestation is indeed part of West African political reality, not only a reflection of past inter-state relations, but also an inherent dynamic of past and current developments in the region. The idea of ‘Francophoness’ found expression in the founding of Communauté Économique de L’Afrique de l’Ouest (CEAO) in 1973 comprising Côte D’Ivoire, Senegal, Niger, Mali, Mauritania and Burkina Faso. These countries received the full support of France in the form of annual subventions, and monetary and trade preferences, which in the long run promoted the idea of good and a bad sub-regional blocks, with CEAO of course being the good bloc in terms of its resources thanks French support, and ECOWAS the bad one depending on wavering and meagre Nigerian resources. It must be well borne in mind that by the time of it’s founding, the initiative for ECOWAS was in the pipeline and well known to the leaders of the Francophone camp in the sub-region. On that basis countries favouring an all West African economic union expressed misgivings about CEAO that it does not make economic sense to have competing integrating bodies in the same geographic region and in the bureaucratic sense a sheer duplication of administrative cost. For some economic, strategic, and diplomatic reasons Togo and Benin did not rally around the CEAO initiative, because the former was a co-initiator of the ECOWAS idea while the latter was (and is still) economically dependent on Nigeria. However, the politics of the rivalling economic blocs since their formation had done more harm than good. All that integration minded leaders in the region could hope for was to wait and see one day that CEAO should melt into the structures of ECOWAS.

This hope had once neared reality when the Communauté Financière Africaine and the Co-operation Financière en Afrique Central (CFA) tied to the French Franc was devalued in 1994 after a decision in an extraordinary Franco-African summit meeting in Dakar, on 10-11 January of that year. Until then the exchange rate of the CFA had remained unchanged since 1948. The devaluation was officially estimated at 50 per cent. The obvious economic reason was that the CFA had become too overvalued thereby causing problems of uncompetitiveness for goods and services originating from la zone franc on African markets, thus creating fertile grounds for cross-border smuggling. This hope was also substantiated by the changing international political context in the aftermath of the Cold War that France would loose her grip on former colonies and conform to the standards of relations of established world economic powers with the developing world. It was indeed this particular reason and the increasing burden on the French Treasury in finding solution to proliferate cases of financial bankruptcy among Francophone African states that gradually compelled France to loose her grip and allow international multilateral institutions to play active role in the Francophone African economies. This was well captured by Guy when he wrote:

„In a context of increasing globalisation of the world economy and European integration, France no longer has the wherewithal and the political will to maintain an autonomous African policy distinct from
that of her Western powers. Thus, the devaluation of the CFA franc is likely to result in France’s gradual (but substantial) loss of political, diplomatic, and economic power and influence in the francophone African states. They would probably move towards a long-overdue economic *rapprochement* with the major world powers (such as the United States and Japan), as well as with non-francophone African regional powers (notably Nigeria and South Africa)*.\footnote{78}

Contrary to that widespread expectation among the academic and diplomatic community, the aftermath of the devaluation of the CFA franc rather saw francophone West African leaders rallying around once again to safeguard their francophone identity and unity by converting the structures of CEEAO into the Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest-Africaine (UEMOA) on 15 March 1994. UEMOA consists of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal, and Togo. By all purposes and intent the formation of UEMOA signals a new era of francophone West Africa unifying to face the challenges of the 21st Century on their own terms, thus unwittingly or unwittingly obstructing the effective functioning of ECOWAS, the one and only supra-sub-regional body the collective sub-regional leadership had been endeavouring to institute since the mid 1970s.\footnote{80} As a new sub-regional governmental body, UEMOA did not bring forth the novelties expected to make it hold its own peculiar character. Instead it had been the recreation of old structures from the UMOA (Union Monitaire Ouest Africaine) and the CEEAO, which had been unifying the CFA Franc Monetary Zone for some decades until then. The constitutional treaty establishing UEMOA emphasises the principle of subsidiarity, and a supranational commission modelled on that of the EU. Its main objectives do not however depart from the old structures in any major way. They include:

(i) Harmonising and co-ordinating the monetary policies of the member states towards achieving a common monetary union.

(ii) Harmonising and modernising the judicial systems of the member states to create an enabling environment for foreign investment.

(iii) Overhauling, and harmonising their tax systems to reflect international standards

(iv) Trade reforms, including the elimination of tariff barriers, harmonisation and rationalisation of protective customs, reducing collective external tariffs, and the elimination of customs within the community.

(v) The constitution also obliges the member states to work towards achieving convergence between member states national policies and major community macro-economic policy indicators.; create a common market; co-ordinate sectoral policies; and align national budgetary policies. The member states also pledges to support and create the enabling environment for boosting regional trade and investment in industry, agriculture, transport, communications and energy infrastructure.

Obviously, these objectives break no new grounds, and falls squarely into the common integrative policy grid of ECOWAS. That apart, there are a large number of policy areas in West Africa which exhibits some form of duplication or the other. As Boafo-Arthur had noted:

> The region is plagued by the existence of several regional bodies. It seems every organisation or body in Anglophone West Africa has its Francophone counterpart and vice versa. For instance, in the health sector, the Francophone Organisation de Co-ordination et de Co-operation pour la lutte contre les Grandes Endemies (OCCGE) has the Anglophone West African Health Community (WAHC) as its counterpart. There are two organisations managing the river basins of the Senegal and Gambia rivers. The Mano River Union (MRU) is still in existence. However, the most polarising of the sub-regional organisations or associations is the recently formed UEMOA*\footnote{81}
Despite the differences that debilitating against development and integration in the sub-region, ECOWAS has leave no stone unturned in ensuring that the sub-region has the best of programme for realising its integration and developmental objectives since its formative years. In this particular direction trade issues had been of greater importance to ECOWAS, which had responded to this challenge in over two decades with a series of schemes and programmes relating to the creation of a unified common market. Strategies and policies in this domain have included trade liberalisation, monetary co-operation, free movement of persons, development of regional transport and communication networks, strengthening the production base, and promoting regional economic stability through the harmonisation of macro-economic policies of member states. At the core of its trading policies, and the drive towards market integration however, is the commitment to facilitate increased intra-regional trade, with a focus on the free movement of persons, goods and services. This further entails a liberal immigration policy that envisages an ECOWAS travel certificate, harmonised residence card and permit, and a code of conduct. It calls for a liberalised trade regime with objective to create a free trade area through the elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers among member states with a long-term view of establishing a customs union. This policy is based on a strategy of using the countries with relatively sound industrial bases (Nigeria, Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire and Senegal) as starters for achieving a total elimination of all tariffs on agreed products in the region by the end of 1996. In the monetary sector, ECOWAS monetary co-operation programme had aimed at achieving regional currency convertibility dating back to 1987, envisaging the establishment of a single monetary zone and a common currency by the year 2005.

As time goes by, the West African leadership realised the discrepancies between existing policies and protocols, and inaction thereto. In 1991 the final communiqué of an ECOWAS Summit observed that:

"The Authority (...) expresses its general dissatisfaction at the slow pace of implementation of Community Acts and Decisions at the national level (…) particularly such community priority programmes as the trade liberalisation scheme, trade related programmes and the immigration programme".42

In this regard the ECOWAS summit meeting in 1992 formulated a Minimum Agenda for Action for the implementation of Community Agreements. By mid-1996, the problem of putting words into deeds, and for that matter the West African syndrome of rhetoric strategy became a major preoccupation of the sub-regional leadership, and thereby reiterated their commitment to the integration process while recognising that particular problematic as a major obstacle to integration.43 By the turn of the new millennium a Ministerial Meeting of ECOWAS and UEMOA members in Bamako, Mali from 28-29 January 2000 was convened with sole purpose and intent of finding a convenient remedy to lack of implementation readiness and willingness by the member states. During that meeting the sub-regional body approved a Nigeria-Ghana joint proposal to adopt a 'fast track' approach to the implementation of key and strategic programmes for the acceleration of economic and monetary integration and issues relating to security in the sub-region.44

Basically however, the ability of ECOWAS to overcome her policy hangovers would depend on the willingness of the member states to make genuine transfer of sovereignty to the sub-regional body (however limited). The success of this particular point would also in turn depend on the Francophone countries readiness to desist from treating ECOWAS as a second rate organisation in relation to UEMOA.

In its outward linkages, the sub-regional body was designated one of the five regional pillars of the AEC together with SADC, COMESA and IGAD. In the spirit of
that recognition ECOWAS signed the protocol between the AEC and SREC’s in February 1998. That recognition was based on their progress in the areas of trade liberalisation and facilitation, as well as sectoral co-ordination and harmonisation of policies.\textsuperscript{85}

By the turn of the new millennium the intensification of continental efforts at regional integration boosted ECOWAS’s drive for deeper integration in trade and monetary domains, especially in areas where the traditional Francophone-Anglophone dichotomy seems to challenge a common ECOWAS vision. Hence in this particular regard proposals were made to integrate the eight member Francophone countries of the West African Economic Monetary Union (WAEMU, English version of the UEMOA) with other five West African states (Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea, Sierra Leone and the Gambia) into the wider arrangement of ECOWAS with the objective of establishing a common and unified sub-regional market and a common currency for the 15 member ECOWAS states. In April 2000, in realisation of this ambitious goal, the five WAEMU members of ECOWAS resolved to establish a second monetary zone dubbed the West African Monetary Zone or WAMZ with the ultimate objective of achieving a larger monetary union embracing all ECOWAS member states. The initiative was further cemented by creating the West African Monetary Institute (WAMI) in March 2001 to oversee and co-ordinate the macroeconomic convergence process that had been set in motion among the countries of the WAMZ. The key elements of the convergence criteria focuses on price stability (single-digit inflation), sustainability of the government fiscal deficit, limiting financing of deficit by central banks, and adequate reserves coverage. Added to the list are secondary criteria that covers the prohibition of countries from accumulating new domestic arrears, and their obligation to increase their internal tax revenues collection to above 20% of GDP, maintaining positive real interests rates, and finally ensure stability in the real exchange rate.\textsuperscript{86}

But as the IMF country Report had indicated by 2003, the macroeconomic performance of the WAMZ countries in 2001 was affected by developments in international commodity prices and the combined effects of slowdown in the world economy negatively impacted overall GDP growth, consumer price inflation and current account surplus. Expected compliance as regard the primary convergence criteria had also been limited, while the establishment of the Stabilisation and Compensation Fund (SCF) had extremely been slow. Taken cognisance of these developments the WAMZ authorities decided to postpone their plans for monetary union until July 2005. However, in order to keep the spirit for monetary union alive, the heads of states of ECOWAS in December 2000 declared to accelerate the integration process in West Africa intensifying collaboration between WAEMU and ECOWAS. Since 2001 both institutions have taken measures to harmonise their trade liberalisation schemes towards achieving a single regional market. In the domain of external trade ECOWAS has agreed to implement the WAEMU common external tariff (CET) structure, expected to be in full swing by end of 2007 to facilitate a regional partnership accord with the EU. Findings in a EU sponsored study to assess the fiscal impact of the introduction of the CET revealed disparate performance among the WAEMU countries. While Ghana, Guinea and the Gambia indicated a minimal fiscal impact of adopting the CET, Nigeria and Cape Verde showed a significantly higher tariff structure than the WAEMU.\textsuperscript{85} The performance of the former encouraged them to adopt the WAEMU’s CET in September 2002. In furtherance of their common goals, the two institutions have adopted measures to forge closer co-operation in areas of statistical harmonisation, sectoral policies, and in the recent past have decided to have a common macroeconomic surveillance, all as part of the wider effort for achieving a single ECOWAS market.
In another unprecedented development an ECOWAS Citizens Union was formed in December 2003 by a pressure group made up of West African citizens to solicit the influence and power of civil society to hold government and institutions in the West African sub-region accountable to the spirit and charter of the economic union. It also aims at giving a civil society impetus to regional integration, free movement of goods and services, conflict prevention and resolution. That apart, the immediate concern of the group is to draw government’s attention to malpractices at the various borders within the sub-region, which fact undermines the fundamental objectives of ECOWAS.

At this juncture, however, how has ECOWAS performed as a sub-regional integration body in the context of fragmentation, rhetoric and bouts of inaction? One of the major challenges brought to the door steps of ECOWAS in the aftermath of the Cold War was endemic civil wars that have come to grip the West African sub-region with huge political, security and economic consequences. Indeed, this overwhelmed the sub-regional body since the organisation had no proactive mechanism for conflict resolution. The civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone at the beginning of the 1990s became a test case for the sub-regional body. The ensuing diplomacy, and inter-governmental interaction in the sub-region, though labyrinthine, finally opened channels for restoring peace in the two West African countries. It also awakened the sub-regional body from dormancy to action, when a West African intervention force, Economic Community of West Africa States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), was finally deployed in the two countries. In this test case too West African heterogeneity and fragmentation capped in the Francophone-Anglophone dichotomy came to full swing in the political and diplomatic praxis as far as handling both the causes and resolution of the conflict in that context. The Côte d’Ivoire and Burkina Faso both member states of ECOWAS were proven beyond doubt as providing territory and conduits for arms and other forms of logistics for Charles Taylor’s National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL). In the long negotiation leading to the involvement of ECOMOG which was dispatched to Liberia in August 1991, the Francophone camp of countries adopted a lukewarm attitude toward the whole intervention project, which reflected the contribution of troops as being mainly from Anglophone countries (except Guinea). By way of their political posture, the Francophone countries were expressing dismay about the hegemonic role Nigeria had taken, thereby deepening an already fragile situation. It is also no wonder that since civil war broke out in the Côte d’Ivoire in September 2002 Nigeria had refused to be part of a West African intervention force under the auspices of ECOMOG. Hence the security framework established by ECOWAS in the aftermath of the Cold War is laden with divisions and antagonisms hovering once again along the Francophone-Anglophone divide. Even though ECOWAS successfully negotiated an end to Liberia’s civil war in 1997, a genuine, collective and effective sub-regional security framework would be taken care for not by the leadership, but perhaps time. What lessons did ECOWAS learn from her bitter experience in the two West African neighbouring countries of Sierra Leone and Liberia?

In June 1998 ECOWAS stood powerless during an outbreak of political violence in Guinea Bissau to overthrow the incumbent democratically elected government of Joao Bernado Vieira. The uprising was caused by the armed forces of Guinea Bissau led by a former Chief of Defence Staff. Despite numerous cease-fire agreements between the parties to the conflict, and a speedy formal request by Vieira for ECOWAS intervention, the elected government was finally overthrown. This was a blow to Africa’s re-democratisation efforts, as well as a setback for the sub-region in shaping new security architecture.

The current state of affairs in the Côte d’Ivoire even questions the efficacy of any such sub-regional security architecture. Since the eruption of the Ivorian crisis it took
ECOWAS a long period of time to organise an intervention unit to even assess the situation on the ground. Rather, it was French swift response to the crisis at the initial stages that kept the belligerents to the conflict at bay. The crisis occurred on 19 September 2002 as rebels under the banner of the Ivory Coast Patriotic Movement launched a coup d'état in an attempt to topple the incumbent Laurent Gbagbo government. The rebels claimed irregularities in the elections that brought him to power and expressed their pent up anger to how Northerners in the country had been systematically disenfranchised in the process by banning the candidature of a former Vice President Alassane D. Ouattara, also of a northern stock. However, the Ivorian crisis exhibits a peculiar characteristic in the form of potentially dangerous religious undertones dividing the Christian South and the Muslim North. The demise of the unity, peace and stability of a once West African icon state and economic hub began after the death of the founding father of the nation-state, President Félix Houphouet-Boigny in December 1993. Despite his long reign he failed to groom any of the young and enterprising personalities around him to succeed him, as is the case for leaders who identifies themselves for a longer period than normal with the ruled. And in the line of succession Quatarra would have been the likely candidate. The ignition of the conflict was grounded in his successors repeated reference as to who is an Ivorian. During the rule of Konard Bedié in the immediate post-Houphouet era, the usage *Ivoirite* (a true Ivorian) then came to connote Ivorians of the South, who are also predominantly Christian. The main objective therefore of the rebel opposition forces was to seek redress to the canker that had eaten into the fabric of politics and society by calling for a unified Côte d'Ivoire, with equal opportunities and rights for all.

ECOWAS's effort for achieving peace in the country had been too slow, lacking woefully in any diplomatic and political biting. The ECOWAS Contact Group for the Côte d'Ivoire comprising the heads of states of Ghana, Togo, Nigeria, the Executive Secretary of ECOWAS Mohammed Ibn Chambas, Ahmedou Ould Abdallah, Special Representative of the UN-Sec.Gen., and the Ivorian Vice President appointed within the framework of the power sharing agreement has not produce the diplomatic and political success expected from the negotiating round tables. The peace accords negotiated under the auspices of the UN-Secretary-General, Kofi Annan and the French government, African peers, and representatives from the EU for the warring faction have also faltered, as the government still grapples with 'unpleasant' portions of the accords relating to power sharing. The accords were the results of a meeting between the conflicting parties in Marcoussis, near Paris from 15-24 January 2003. Back home from the peace conference the incumbent Ivorian President Gbagbo in a televised broadcast to his countrymen referred to the agreement as „just a set of proposals‟. The idea of power sharing with the rebel north, and the combined effects of the presidential statement caused uproar and violent mass demonstrations. About half a million people now are displaced within the country and in neighbouring countries. The crisis in the context of ECOWAS commitment to the democratic peace poses one of the main challenges for a functioning West African peace and security architecture.

In the political realm the changes that have been taking place in the world since 1989 have come to bear heavily on Africa in general and opened the floodgate for political and economic reforms. Within the ECOWAS during the 14th Session of the Authority of Heads of States and Governments in Abuja, on 4-6 June 1991, West African leaders declared political principles by reaffirming their commitment for ensuring a stable and secure political environment, and expressed their determination to promote democracy, political pluralism, respect for fundamental Human Rights and the African Charter on Human and peoples Rights. Also, as part of the broader strategy for peace, security and stability, the ECOWAS leadership adopted and signed a protocol on
democracy and good governance as supplement to the Protocol relating to the mechanism for conflict prevention, management, resolution, peacekeeping and security. These steps were milestones in African political history, but once again, are West African leaders living up to expectation on questions affecting human rights and democracy in good faith?

Given the colossal number of policy documents and blueprints for the sub-region that have been lying dormant due to political divisions and rivalry, one seems at times to take solace and hope in the fact that ECOWAS member states would rather co-operate more genuinely on issues of common economic interests when politics divides them. During the ECOWAS Summit of May 2000 marking the 25th anniversary celebration of that body, West African leaders discussed integration and industrialisation including the quest for a new energy security. As a further step in that direction, four West African states Nigeria, Ghana, Togo and Benin signed a treaty on a $500m West African Gas Pipeline (WAGP) to transport natural gas from Alagbado, in the outskirts of Lagos in Nigeria to five cities in Ghana, Togo and Benin. The respective governments are partaking in the project in conjunction with national and foreign consortium that includes the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, Shell, Chevron, Société Beninoise de Gaz (SOBEGAZ) Republic of Benin, Societé Togolaise de Gaz, (SOTOGAZ) Togo and the Volta River Authority (VRA) of Ghana/Ghana National Petroleum Corporation (GNPC). While this is a good sign that ECOWAS can move forward through economic projects of this kind where politics divides the leadership rank, in the long run however, a fast moving integration process would still depend on inter-governmental interaction and the willingness to put their words into deeds. As the example of the EU had provided, sectoral policies alone are not sufficient, but a necessary condition for integration, all things being equal. The fact of the matter is that the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) inaugurated in 1951 following the Schumann Plan proposal could not deliver the main dynamic for integration. A forward movement for any integration project therefore lies in the genuine and committed inter-governmental co-operation among the member states and the full participation of the collective citizenry.

Another principal domain of ECOWAS integration effort, namely trade, has always occupied the centre stage of the sub-regional body's intergovernmental initiatives and policies alike. However, the results there from had been very marginal and even insignificant in terms of economic integration efforts. Much of the hurdles relating to trade are still grounded within the historical Francophone-Anglophone dichotomy. By the end of 2002 the francophone member states of UEMOA had threatened to impose a common tariff on non-members of that organisation. That threat warranted a fast track approach decision during an ECOWAS mini-Summit held in Nigeria on 27 March 2000 to discuss free trade in the sub-region. According to the ARIA 2002 Report almost all the sub-regions had implemented trade liberalisation schemes. The Report however interrogates the scheme as to how gains and losses from trade liberalisation could be reconciled given the SRECs vulnerability to external economic shocks and supply side constraints. The problematic of dominant individual economies also raises concern about intra-state trade.

It further expressed concerns about unrecorded transaction in the informal sectors of the SRECs. ECOWAS's part of that initiative was announced in April 2000 under the auspices of the Nigeria-Ghana fast track economic development approach. In its breadth and depth, the programme was designed towards the establishment of a customs union covering three main products at the initial stages; unprocessed goods, traditional handicrafts and industrial products manufactured within the community. ECOWAS has progressed well on its trade liberalisation scheme programme on traditional and artisan
goods through the elimination of all tariffs, but had lagged behind on industrial commodities, whereby policies regarding tariff reductions are bedevilled with problems. Trade performance in the sub-region therefore, is only the results of intensified transactions in traditional and artisan trade, said the Report. Hence, the report lamented that given the 27 years that ECOWAS has been in existence, neither can this performance be evaluated in any significant economic terms, nor considered satisfactory. The report strongly recommends ECOWAS to intensify efforts on trade liberalisation for industrial goods, and ensure complete harmonisation of transactions and policies between UEMOA and ECOWAS in order to secure a more unified and vibrant West African sub-regional economic market.\(^4\)

On another economic plain ECOWAS has been slow in instituting convergence principles despite the significant headway it had made in establishing parameters for macroeconomic convergence, reforms and stability. The parameters ranges from reduction of inflation rates as well as fiscal and budgetary deficits aimed at debt reduction. The sub-regions average performance from 1994-2000 speaks scarcely of any significant breakthrough in this direction. Inflation stood at 12\%, budget deficit -4.9\%, and FDI inflows from 1994-1999 represented about 2.8\% of ECOWAS's GDP. While the figures may be relatively favourable in inter SRECs comparison, they do not correspond to the cost of time and energy ECOWAS had been investing thereto in the past two decades and more.\(^5\) The Table below throws more light on the sub-regions economic and demographic indicators. Table 1: Economic and Demographic Indicators for the ECOWAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>6.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>11.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ivory Coast</td>
<td>11.717</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>16.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>6.021</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>20.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>7.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>3.163</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>2.170</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>43.540</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>132.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>4.940</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>10.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Total/Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.854</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Economic Outlook September, 2003, a survey by the staff of the IMF; World Fact Book 2003; World Development Indicators database, World Bank, July 2003.
Even more debilitating on integration efforts in the sub-region are inadequate physical infrastructure and networks, especially in energy and transport and communication. The cost of transaction in communication, air transport, and shipping in Africa can be on the average between 250%-350% of a similar transaction in Europe. This particular bottleneck creates constraints for trade, investment and other business transactions across the board.

In addition to the long list of obstacles facing integration in the ECOWAS sub-region there is one particular factor that had gained permanency in the day-to-day operation of the organisation, namely financial constraints. As of September 2000, 10 of the 15 member countries had not honour their contributions. Liberia for example had not paid its annual contributions for the last 20 years out of the total 25 years of existence of the community. The Gambia and Sierra Leone were 11 years each behind, while Cape Verde and Guinea Bissau have been trailing in their contribution for 10 years. At the period under consideration only Mali and Togo had completely honour their contributions, and countries such as Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria had still not paid their contributions though they did not owe the community any arrears. Whether the sub-regional body could overcome this virulent, perennial crisis today or in the foreseeable future is quite difficult to judge under present circumstances.

Needless to say, this goes a long way to decelerate the effective functioning of any organisation wherever it may be. In order to overcome its financial predicament the Community agreed on the payment of a „community levy“, 0.5 per cent on CIF value of goods imported from non-ECOWAS countries. The proceeds are to be paid into an account opened by the Secretariat with Central Banks of the respective member states. Contrary to hopes accompanied by the introduction of the measure as a solution to the irregular payments of contribution by member states, it was later found out that even those who had implemented the measure and applied it do not remit its proceeds to the Executive Secretariat to offset their arrears of payment. Even the few countries such as Ghana, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal and Togo, which have embraced the measure, their performance leaves much to be desired. Others such as Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, the Gambia, Guinea and Mali do asse and collect the levy but pay the proceeds into their respective treasuries and transfer the amounts realised there from into the ECOWAS accounts at their own whims and caprices. Even though the contributions of most economically viable countries, Nigeria, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire constitute about 45 per cent of the total annual contributions, those countries were at the same time singled out as honouring their payments very untimely.

Beset with these myriad difficulties in its backyard, it is no wonder that ECOWAS’s overall integration performance lies below the expectation. ARIA’s first empirical assessment of regional integration based on examination of how each SREC is performing in relation to its goals, the pace of advance and the progress made in comparison with other SRECs depicts a dismal 6.3 score points for ECOWAS. Like any other organisation in the African continent the problems are in the main the results of lack of resources and state capacities for implementation and co-ordination of policies thereto.
The Southern African Development Community (SADC)

On the basis of the political turmoil in the Southern African region, situated in the context of the former Apartheid regime, the frontline states in southern Africa (Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) resolved to form the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) on 1 April 1980 after deliberations among their foreign ministers a year earlier in May 1979 in Gaborone, Botswana. The final decision was a follow up to the adoption of the Lusaka Declaration, which finally culminated in the formation of SADCC in Lusaka, Zambia in the said year. However, on the face of the transformations that took place in the aftermath of the Cold War, the Heads of State and government of SADCC in a conference held in Windhoek, Namibia on 17 August 1992 signed a Declaration and Treaty establishing the Southern African Development Community (SADC) to replace SADCC. The decision was propelled by the fact that SADCC had by then outlived its usefulness as a bulwark against the former apartheid regime. Originally, the mindset of the founding fathers was to reduce dependence of the region on Apartheid South Africa, and to pull local and foreign resources to engage in projects that no single individual country in the region could single handed shoulder. The end of the apartheid era changed that philosophy. Currently SADC has 14-member state covering the following countries, Angola, Botswana, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius (since 1995), Mozambique, Namibia, Seychelles, Swaziland, South Africa (1994), Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

In reflection of the changes that had taken place in the region and in the world, a SADC Summit held in Maputo, Mozambique in August 1999 called for a review and restructuring of the institutions and operation of SADCC in order to accommodate the emerging challenges in the changing world order and domestic transformations. The directive was aimed at an operational shift from the previous sectoral-based approach for achieving regional integration in a co-ordinated and harmonised manner. In order to address national priorities through national action, the previous scheme under the auspices of SADCC allocated its member states the responsibility of co-ordinating one or more sectors. In fulfilment of the recommendations of the Review Committee, the Heads of State and Government of SADC signed an Agreement Amending the Community's Treaty in Blantyre on 14 August 2001 to discontinue the sector-based decentralised approach in favour of a full-fledged regional integration scheme embracing trade issues to reflect continental wide developments. This shift in strategy in the region was a proof of poverty of the functionalist approach to integration in increasing world of interdependence and globalisation with key focus on trade and cross-border investments.

Like any other regional integration body in the African continent the Treaty establishing SADC (Article 21) has cross-cutting objectives directed at achieving development and economic growth, alleviate poverty, enhance the standard and quality of living of the peoples of Southern Africa and support the socially disadvantaged through carefully planned policies targeting the needy and the poor. These goals are set within the framework of a committed regional integration policy guarded by democratic principles and equitable and sustainable development. With these objectives in mind, the member states of SADC have structured their interaction in order to promote deeper economic co-operation and integration based on the principles of equity and mutual benefit, creating an enabling environment for investment and trade and work towards measures that would ensure freer movement of factors of production, and goods and services across national borders. In addition, member states have committed themselves
to common socio-economic and political values and systems that would facilitate enterprise and competitiveness, democracy and good governance, respect for the rule of law and guarantee of human rights, and popular participation. They also recognise and bear in mind that peace and prosperity for the member states could only be realised through robust regional solidarity, security and harmonisation of national policies. In cognisance of these objectives SADC is structured in a way to facilitate effective decision-making and implementation that is desirable within the context of the member states economic and political development.

At the apex of the decision making structure is the Summit of Heads of State and Government (SHSG), which is responsible for the general policy direction, and controller of all the functional mechanisms of the community. The Summit is headed by an elected Chairperson and a Deputy, and meets twice a year. For a speedy and effective implementation of Decisions, Protocols and Acts, the SADC decision structure has adopted a Troika system since 1999 that consists of the Current Chair, Incoming Chair, and the Outgoing Chair. The 2002/03 Troika consist of Malawi as outgoing Chair, Angola as Chair, and Tanzania as incoming Chair.

Next to the SHSG in SADC structure is the Council of Ministers that consists of Ministers from the respective Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Economic Planning or Finance. Their responsibility is to oversee the functioning and development of SADC, especially, regarding the effective implementation of policies. Under the amended treaty, the Council meets four times a year in contrast to the previous twice a year meetings.

Assisting the Council of Ministers is a Standing Committee of Officials that consists of one Permanent/Principal Secretary or an official equivalent in rank from individual member States. SADC has always showed preference for officials from the Ministries of Finance or Economic Planning. Their role is purely one of a technical advisory to the Council.

In pursuance of ensuring active participation by the broad spectrum of stakeholders in the community, SADC had devised National Committees composing notably of delegates from government, private sector and civil society in member states. These committees are expected to inject inputs at the national level in the formulation of regional policies and strategies, including a co-ordinating function and overseeing the implementation of programmes at the national level. Even in policy areas they are expected to initiate projects and disseminate relevant information as an input to the preparation of regional development plans.

Anchoring the various Ministries and Committees is the SADC Secretariat, which is also the principal executive institution of the sub-regional body. It is mainly responsible for strategic planning, co-ordination and management of SADC programmes. It is headed by an Executive Secretary, with its headquarters in Gaborone, Botswana. The core activity of the Secretariat is geared toward achieving the overall objective of SADC with focus on key priority areas. These are trade, finance and investment, enhancing capacity for human resource development, stakeholder participation, gender issues, promotion of SADC image, policy formulation and harmonisation, and strengthening of institutions involved in community building.

Even though the forerunner of SADC concentrated its time and energies on security issues aimed at forestalling threats posed by the former apartheid regime, the end of the obnoxious regime does not however mean that the Southern African rim is now devoid of any such security threats. As evident by the explosion of ethnic conflicts in the continent in the aftermath of the Cold War, and since the sub-region is also home to one of the most ravaging conflicts in Africa, namely the DRC in particular, SADC leaders agreed on the establishment of an Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Co-operation
(PDSC). Its objective is to promote peace and security and thus create an enabling environment for development, progress and prosperity in the region. It reports on regular basis to the SHSG, and headed by a Troika of a Chairperson, Incoming Chairperson and Outgoing Chairperson. The activities of the SADC Summit and Organ on Defence Troika are mutually reinforcing. The functions of the Organ are carried out by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of each member state in the fields of politics and diplomacy. Their day-to-day duties and functions are performed through the Inter-state Politics and Diplomacy Committee (IPDC). The IPDC also provides the forum of interaction for Ministers of Defence, Public Security and State Security. However, only some few months after its inception in 1996 the IPDC was suspended due to reasons of cloud of uncertainty surrounding leadership of the Organ and how it was to relate to the SADC chair, questions affecting the functional autonomy, or otherwise of the Organ, and above all, crucial issues affecting its procedures in conflict resolution as exemplified in the crisis in the DRC and Lesotho.\textsuperscript{[103]}

However, since disputes and procedures for settlement are akin to any regional integration body, a SADC protocol establishing a tribunal was signed in Windhoek Namibia, during an Ordinary Summit of the SHSG in 2000, and amended in Luanda, in October 2002. The principal duty of the tribunal is to ensure compliance and proper interpretation of the provisions of the SADC Treaty and subsidiary instruments, including adjudication of all disputes referred to it.

Given the fragile security context of Southern African multilateral co-operation in the era of apartheid, the forerunner of SADC had by the mid 1970s established an inter-state Defence and Security Committee (ISDSC) as a substructure of the Frontline States constituted by Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia with the sole purpose of handling matters relating to collective security within the framework of the liberation struggle. However, at the end of the apartheid regime, the ISDSC was retained and expanded its membership to embrace all SADC member states with the core objectives of sharing experiences, co-operating and co-ordinating matters affecting member states in the domain of defence, public security and state security. The transformations that took place in the aftermath of the Cold War brought not only changes, but new challenges in the fields of co-operation, diplomacy international relations, peace and security, particularly in the field of conflict resolution, management and prevention. These concerns culminated in the development of the SADC organ for Politics, Defence, and Security in 2001, which co-opted the ISDSC and its sub-committees on defence, public security and state security. This initiative was in response to the increasing need for „flexibility and timely response, at the highest level, to sensitive and potentially explosive situations“\textsuperscript{[105]} in the sub-region. After a relative period of political power jockeying over the chairing of the organ, especially between South Africa and Zimbabwe, a protocol was finally adopted and ratified by six member states by October 2002, out of the required nine signatories. The organ also envisages a Strategic Indicative Plan to identify and respond to the political, security and democratic issues affecting the sub-region.

On that basis a further step was taken by SADC in the mid-1990s with external funding to establish a Regional Peacekeeping Training Centre (RPTC) in Zimbabwe to train UN Command Staff, within the framework of the ISDSC, under the auspices of SADC. This step was in connivance of the OAU Chiefs of Staff recommendation that each African sub-region establishes peacekeeping forces of brigade size for deployment on hot spots in the continent. Even though the initiative was bolstered by the West African example in peacekeeping, the Southern African region had lacked a willing lead nation for realising that goal. However, by the turn of the new millennium, as results of the political and democratic setbacks in Zimbabwe donors withdrew their funding for
the RPTC. By the end of 2002 the sub-region had also not been able to adopt a Draft on Mutual Defence Pact that would obligate the member states to defend any territory within the SADC region from external attack, or intervene in times of political crisis to restore peace and order due to concerns by member states over questions of national sovereignty and control over national defence forces.

How then do the prevailing political and institutional processes and the drive for new security architecture in SADC influence the total integration goals in the sub-region and the wider African context? The end of apartheid and the emergence of a new South Africa took place in an international environment, and in Africa itself, where democratisation and liberalisation have regained pre-eminence and predominance. In the global context there was the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which paved the way for the establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 1994. Globalisation had also by then taken a full momentum, thus making no sense for individual countries and regional blocks to isolate themselves from global multilateral arrangements. In addition, South Africa emerged and incorporated itself into a club of neighbouring African states who cannot match it in any way in terms of its economic and military power, global market accessibility, technological and industrial advancement, literacy and advances in the provision of medical services. At the other end of the scale, conflict still rages in the most populous member country of SADC, namely, the DRC, and political tensions at the brink of conflict gloom over Zimbabwe. These have multiple implications for the member states of the sub-region.

In economic terms there is an existing situation where too many spokes surround a hub. About nine to ten poorer member states have an annual per capita GDP of between US$ 90 and US$ 750. There are also five more developed economies with a per capita GDP of between US$1,400 and US$ 3,800. Foreign trade in the sub-region also do not seem to be attractive and competitive given the low level of economic development, and small size of some states is not prospective for substantially enlarged markets. In addition, South Africa's predominance also takes expression in its GDP with the rest of the member states. South Africa's output of about US$130 billion in 1997 far exceeds the combined output of the rest of the fourteen member states hovering just around US$51.2 billion at the same period. Intra-sub-regional trade is skewed in favour of South Africa with her exports to the rest of the region exceeding imports by more than five to one, with the trend gaining momentum at the turn of the last millennium. In another extreme, some member states of SADC such as South Africa, Angola, Zambia, Namibia, the DRC Botswana and Zimbabwe are well endowed with natural resources and strategic minerals, while member states such as Seychelles, Mauritius, Lesotho, Swaziland, Malawi and Tanzania scarcely do possess any such resources of that dimension. The following table of economic indicators provides even better understanding of what is meant here.
Table 2: Economic and Demographic Indicators for the SADC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>13.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>5.188</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>1.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>5.704</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>53.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>4.532</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>18.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>2.793</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>530a</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>104.235</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>43.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>9.838</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>280b</td>
<td>35.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>5.683</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>10.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>8.304</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>735c</td>
<td>12.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total/Average</td>
<td>163.994</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>828.572</td>
<td>207.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Economic Outlook, September, 2003; a survey by the staff of the IMF; World Fact Book 2003; World Development Indicators database, World Bank July 2003. a. 2002 data not available; ranking is approximate. b. Data refer to mainland Tanzania only. c. Estimated to be low income ($735 or less).

This picture makes the sub-region quite heterogeneous to ensure any speedy integration less of acrimony and discord, especially on the crucial and delicate issue of distributing the gains of welfare accruing from the process of economic integration. South African trade and other forms of economic transaction under apartheid had been relatively oriented outward from the sub-region, and the transition from an era of confrontation to co-operation was a common consensus among a greater number of countries, not only in the sub-region, but the continent as a whole. The member states of SADC were optimistic of the benefits to be derived from sub-regional inter-state collaboration, co-operation and integration scheme under the leadership of South Africa, as a vehicle for promoting economic development and scaling down on the economic disparities existing between South Africa and the member states of SADC. Unfortunately however, the flame of that optimism had not been sustaining as expected. As Gibb once noted:

"...The desire for collaboration into an effectively functioning institutional reality covering the majority of the region’s states is going to be a slow and potentially acrimonious process that can only be understood fully through an examination of regionally specific circumstances and global trends."\(^{109}\)

In other words South Africa’s interaction with members states of SADC was bound to be characterised by a collision of *bilateralism* and *multilateralism*\(^{110}\) within the context of acting to meet the internal demands for special external trade preferences, and pursuing its self-seeking interests, as well as sub-regional pressures for realising the goals of trade and development under a common integration scheme.
South Africa's bilateral impulses cut across even the continent exhibiting a high degree of external linkages across the globe. In the post-apartheid era, South African executives, both black and white, began to penetrate the rest of the continent, moving northwards to purchase struggling Banks, rebuild rundown infrastructure, such as railways and roads, introducing modern technology in the fields of communication, including cell phones, cash dispensing machines, revamping the manufacturing sector, etc. Currently South African companies are the main stakeholders and managers of the national railroad in Cameroon and Madagascar. They are managing power plants in Mali and Zambia; they are brewing local beers in Mozambique and Ghana. They control the provision of services in the cell phones sectors in Nigeria, Uganda and Cameroon; they control Banks and key supermarkets in Tanzania, Mozambique and Kenya.

This development places South Africa in a far better position for reaping the benefits of integration at the extreme cost of the other member states. Its unchallenged domination in trade, investment, Banking and infrastructure is non-countervailing, and if measures are not instituted to correct the growing imbalance the success or failure of SADC would remain in the hands of South Africa. This would portray the country's economic policies as the continuation of the former apartheid regime's aggressive economic onslaught on its neighbours. This is confirmed by its economic performance, combined with her lackadaisical attitude towards assuming a leadership role and responsibility in the Southern African rim in general, and in SADC in particular. The 1994 foreign policy document adopted by the South African government, a „Framework for Co-operation in Southern Africa“ and approved by cabinet in August 1996 has not lowered the huge disparities and inequalities existing between South Africa and its neighbours. This extreme disparity has however not slipped the attention of the South African leadership. In the early nineteen nineties former president Mandela noted that:

„We are sensitive to the fact that any program that promotes greater co-operation in Southern Africa must be sensitive to the acute imbalances in existing regional economic relations. ...It is essential therefore that a program to restructure regional economic relations after apartheid be carefully calibrated to avoid exacerbating inequalities“.

The disparities referred to by Mandela in the early 1990s have scarcely winded down by the beginning of the new millennium as indicated by the ARIA report 2002. Sectoral analysis of economic performance supports this growing trend. Even though SADC lags behind in AEC requirements for achieving a functioning customs union, its trade performance, thanks South Africa, is second to none in the African continent. The member states of SADC have the greatest trade flow among themselves in the continent, averaging 31% for exports and 24% for imports. Contribution to these figures from countries such as Mauritius and Zimbabwe should not however be underestimated. Malawi and Mozambique also fared quite well in direct exports to SADC market. This impressive performance was achieved despite the fact that the SADC member states only began to implement a trade protocol in September 2000. Another contributing factor was that most SADC countries belong to COMESA and there is a high possibility that the existing COMESA trade liberalisation scheme could have facilitated trade flows across national borders in the Southern African rim. In the realm of economic policy convergence, SADC have not established any credible convergence parameters to reduce inflation rates, as well as fiscal and budgetary deficits, and lessening debt burden toward achieving a satisfactory level of macro-economic discipline and stability. Inflation had been estimated at 31%, but could have been 17% and 15% respectively excluding Angola and the DRC, most probably due the problem of conflict in those countries during the period of data collection. Taken for share of external debt SADC's Budget deficit was -4.3%, according to the 2002 ARIA report. FDI represents about
1.8% of SADC's GDP. About 21% of total FDI inflows to the continent were directed to SADC. The sub-region was also commended for her impressive performance in physical integration through infrastructure development by upgrading the energy, transport and communications sectors of the member states. Contrarily to the impressive trade performance growth indexes among the member states, they still exhibit wide disparities. This may invite political discord and acrimony that could likely jeopardise the already fragile political and security context of the integration process in the sub-region.¹³

SADC's political and security challenges have taken expression in the setbacks witnessed in the transition process in Lesotho in the late 1990s, the long simmering conflict in the DRC now subsided by a fragile peace agreement and power sharing, bouts of secessionists sentiments in Namibia, growing political tensions in Zimbabwe, and the internal problems faced by South Africa itself - a post-transition crisis characterised by: increasing wave of migration, crime, public fear and anxiety, growing trends of internal forms of colonialism characterised by elite predominance, and rapidly growing socio-economic inequities.

In 1998 political events in Lesotho raised concerns in the Cape. Political leaders in South Africa were concerned about the spill over effects of political violence and instability in the tiny Southern African state. During that year the incumbent party claimed to have won a landslide victory in elections by securing 79 out of 80 seats. The opposition party repudiated the results outright and called on the ruling Monarchy, King Letsie III to declare the results null and void. SADC's diplomatic intervention in the form of a Troika constituted by Botswana, South Africa and Zimbabwe, however, did not yield any positive results. Following a mutiny in the ranks of the armed forces of Lesotho, South Africa intervened militarily to restore peace and order. In the legal and diplomatic sense the intervention was a breach of the sovereignty of Lesotho in particular, and violation of international law in general. The King of Lesotho, the legitimate head of state, and political entrepreneurs of the country were not consulted. Neither was there any approval from the UN Security Council, and even the SADC consultative Group on Lesotho. This had of course multiple implications on the political and hegemonic posture of South Africa vis-à-vis the other member states of SADC. In the African parlance the most debilitating consequence of South Africa's action may not necessarily be the intervention itself. This is because even if all the political and diplomatic stakeholders within and outside South Africa had been consulted, South Africa would still had been called upon to take the leading role in any form of intervention given her massive military and logistic capabilities. However, if there had been any signs of anxiety and reprehension among Southern African diplomats and politicians at that time, the likely point of discord would have been the failure to seek common grounds for consultation and deliberation. That failure was a breach of one of the salient ingredients of African inter-state interaction. This confirms the point made elsewhere of South Africa's lameness in African politics. It would indeed take some time for the country to re-orient its elites to the realities of African political and diplomatic norms and practices. But such kinds of judgements may not be conclusive. It could also be the case that South Africa was acting on precedence, bearing in mind the crucial element of time, and the complex contours of diplomacy for reaching decisions on intervention. International experiences could support this case, in that efforts in that direction had always been too little too late! Even the West African experience and the deployment of ECOMOG had shown the difficult path of diplomacy within the sub-region itself, which allowed atrocities to be committed by the warring factions during a time when diplomats were shuttling between state capitals of member states of ECOWAS along the West African coast. Hence, the need for an established, functioning
and legitimate sub-regional intervention force in the respective blocs constituting the AU must be taken seriously to avoid any future arbitrary intervention designs in the sub-regions.\footnote{114}

But SADC's political and security challenges goes beyond the political boundaries and events that besieged Lesotho at the turn of the last millennium. Further northwards, the DRC has proven to challenge not just peace and stability in Southern Africa, but global peace as well. The prevailing Congo crisis had been discussed in detail in this particular section (see sub-title \textit{epochenwende}). However, suffice it to add in the context of integration under the auspices of SADC that the sub-region had woefully lagged behind in terms of institutional building and conflict resolution if compared to events elsewhere in West Africa.\footnote{115} Despite the signing of the Protocol on the development of the SADC Organ for Politics, Defence and Security, and a drafted Strategic Indicative Plan for the Organ (SIPO) for identifying the political, security and democratic requirements of the region, there is still no coherent and functioning strategic initiative for SADC. The answer perhaps may lie in the fact that member states of SADC are deeply divided on the crisis in the DRC, due to their strategic and self-seeking interests as pointed out already. That failure for unified action is even indicative of the deployment of a UN multinational force for the DRC under the leadership of France. One point however remains clear despite the diverse interests of the member states of SADC, and that is the leadership vacuum in the sub-region.

Another sensitive development that may overshadow integrative efforts in the sub-region is the political turmoil that had engulfed Zimbabwe in the last three years. The complexity of the crisis, whereby \textit{emotive issues affecting land reform blur democratic transition} renders any judgement of the crisis a premature venture. For any prudentially minded diplomat and politician in Southern Africa the two tails of the Zimbabwean crisis must not be waded against each other, they are mutually exclusive, and their jumbling together may neither yield any durable and peaceful solution, nor offer objective academic judgements. No serious person would condone the prevailing political strategies and tactics of the ruling ZANU-PF. However, the international community was naively expecting a political entrepreneur to lose foothold on two crucial issues namely, \textit{land} and \textit{political power} at the same time. The international community (especially Great Britain) could have made a legitimate and even a moral case against Mugabe if it had had the courage to support a land reform programme that would have made land available to Zimbabwe's landless majority in the immediate period after political independence from British colonial rule. With the land question moving simultaneously with political transition, and with the main opposition party promising to appease minority land owners at the same time, Mugabe was 'pushed too hard against the wall', and in the end tried to justify his non-conventional democratic tactics as the only means of protecting the rights of indigenous Zimbabweans to land ownership. Had a co-ordinated international effort been put in place to handle the question, which was, and still remains the revolutionary banner of the ZANU-PF, democracy would perhaps have survived. Despite the exclusive nature of the political and land questions in Zimbabwe the \textit{mishandling} of one would directly affect the other. There can be no democracy without justice and equal opportunity in one form or the other.

It seems the South African President, Thabo Mbeki is quite aware of this complexity inherent in the total crisis. His diplomatic offensive on the crisis had concentrated on Mugabe's democratic deficit instead of his 'aggressive' land reform policy. This has enabled him to seek continental support, especially in the personality of the Nigerian President, Obasanjo to impose sanctions on Zimbabwe under the umbrella of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Mbeki is quite aware of the looming land
question in his own country, and is taking caution not to incur the displeasure of any interests group there that might affect his political existence, credibility and even legitimacy.

The land question is a colonial legacy created by the British, and the search for any solution must involve Britain and the European Union. They have a responsibility there, but are deterred by getting involved and making commitments because of the financial implications of any political engagement thereto. The sanctity of land in African culture had been emphasised in the course of the discussion. A collective response is needed now, involving of course the affected countries, SADC, the former colonial powers and the international community. In the end the winner of any land reform policy in Zimbabwe or South Africa would ultimately be reason. Some white farmers in the region have realised this practical common sense and have shared land. Others holding firmly on the principle of winner-take-all have abandoned their farms altogether and left the country, since they cannot afford the basic norms of land use in traditional African culture, whereby land belongs to the community and not the individual. And as already noted, Land is shared, and not monopolised. Under the following circumstances therefore the land question has assumed a low profile among African leaders, while it had caused uproar in the Western world. Here is the genesis of cultural relativity on land between Africans and Europeans. However, at the same time African leaders have done little to influence political events in Zimbabwe, perhaps for obvious fears that any tilt on the political landscape in favour of the opposition may postpone the land question at a dear cost in the future.

The impact of the crisis in Zimbabwe on integration in the Southern African region is quite enormous since it resonate a negative image in the Western world whose members are also the holders of capital and modern technology which the region is in dire need of in order to be able to move forward. The gradual crumbling of the Zimbabwean economy evidenced by dwindling FDIs and lack of investor confidence, a crumbling agricultural sector, increasing racial and ethnic tension, intra-party violence, and the ruling ZANU-PF Party's slide into autocratic rule, have all combined to have a negative toll on the country in particular, and the region as a whole. But the Western world would do itself a great disservice if they fail to put the issue in an honest and humane perspective and seek peaceful solution through dialogue, and ensure equitable land reform. After all the democratic culture they all cherish so much is underpinned by a just and 'morally appropriate property ownership'. A majority landless Zimbabwean society would only create fertile grounds for anarchy, dictatorship and obstruct the growth of a democratic culture.

Under those turbulent conditions, the collective African leadership, except some few leading ones such as South Africa and Nigeria, kept low profile on the Zimbabwean crisis, knowing very well that lost of political control over the land question today would only mean a postponement of not just responsibility and justice, but sow the seeds of sustained instability and social incoherence in one of the most important players in Southern African politics and security architecture. During the 2003 Commonwealth Summit in Abuja, Nigeria, the justification for not lifting Zimbabwe's suspension from the Commonwealth was not the popular land question per se, but Mugabe's rigging of national elections in the previous year that resulted in dividing the country along polarised political paths between the incumbent government and the opposition party.

Another simmering hot spot within SADC where trouble may erupt in the foreseeable future if prevailing events are not well managed is the current secessionist tendencies in the Capri and Kavongo regions of Namibia since 1998. The combined effects of conflicts spots in the region have however not impaired democratic growth in
the SADC countries apart from some few deviants' states such as Zimbabwe and the DRC. According to the Southern African yearbook on integration the region has moved towards a higher level of civil liberties and political representation, though not accompanied by any tangible increasing trend in social equity.\textsuperscript{116} Currently, however, the overall security situation is threatened by decreasing agricultural production, especially grain and other main staples due to low rainfall. Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Angola and Namibia are acutely affected. If the region fails to address its food security needs, apart from the natural consequence of hunger, malnutrition and disease, the wave of liberalisation going on would allow countries with competitive advantage to capture the domestic market, which would in turn dislocate local producers when the situation later become normalised.\textsuperscript{117}

Back home the economic powerhouse of the sub-region also cannot escape problems and crisis, which if not effectively managed could also compromise integration and development objectives and goals of the sub-region. Right from the onset of the transition process in South Africa, greater number of the countries white minority citizens, and an insignificant number of other identity groups fearful of political power tilting in favour of the black majority of South Africans gradually moved to other countries such as Australia and Canada. By the end of 1999 an estimated 10%\textsuperscript{118} of the said group had left the country. One important observation about the group was that it constituted a significant proportion of the country's skilled labour force and small-scale entrepreneurs. Even though there is a massive wave of immigration into the country, it does not compensate the wave of emigration from the country. Though South Africa had for centuries been seen as a lucrative ground for migrant labour from the Southern African region, the new wave of migration has come to include illegal migrants from other regions such as East Africa and West Africa seeking greener pastures elsewhere. However varying the projection of their number, they are believed to be between two to eight million by the later stages of the last millennium.\textsuperscript{119} The policy constraints offered by decreasing skilled labour force, and increasing unskilled labour in a country where the latter had been a policy headache for centuries raises much concern for not only policy makers but decision-makers as well. The consequences had been far reaching. It had been documented that a significant number of large corporations e.g. the Anglo American Corporation were relocating their headquarters from Johannesburg to London.\textsuperscript{120} Even though such information was not confirmed, it thus sends an unhelpful message across the board, and spreads a negative psychological current on the policy intention and credibility of the ruling elite in South Africa.

One common observation is that, the reactions of White South Africans, particularly those dominant in economic and business sectors, and the Western World at large was just part of a general anxiety toward black majority rule. An anxiety historically rooted in white perception and image of blacks as incapable of managing themselves, let alone the governing of the state machinery of a developed country such as South Africa. This is because for any genuine and honest observer of the events shortly before and after apartheid, emigration of skilled labour was already a matter of concern among many white minority South Africans fearful of black majority rule. Also the influx of illegal immigrants into the country was a slow process reaching it peak only in 2000 to have affected policy making in the dimensions claimed by some in the immediate post-apartheid period. Hence, the South African handling of the immigration question in particular raised critical comments by some such as Bischoff who wrote that:

\begin{quote}
South Africa's preoccupation with halting the influx of illegal migrants, their treatment, detention and deportation to many is indicative of a xenophobic attitude directed at other Africans. The South African
Beyond that particular aspect of a general post-transitional crisis there had also taken place in South Africa a development, which Good describes as:

"A rapid and steep decline in state capacity across the board, particularly concentrated in social Welfare, Safety and Security, Justice, Home Affairs, Health, and the police services".

He continues to write:

"The fall in state capacity, with its deleterious consequences for the majority, is dangerously associated with the rise of a predominant party system which functions to firmly entrench political elites."

Good's conclusions paint a picture of a post-apartheid South Africa being portrayed as the proverbial Wolf in a sheep cloth:

"The new authoritarianism, built on predominance and power sharing among the elite's, backed by corporate power and the patriotic bourgeoisie has potentially greater permanency than apartheid."

These are not just powerful, but pessimistic statements and views shared by one of the most notable political scientist from the Southern African rim. The author delineates a post-apartheid society and politics predicated on a predominant party apparatus the actions and decisions of whose executive members of government override basic norms and principles of accountability, open, participatory and critical democracy. There is also a growing intra-elitism that operates with secrecy, obscurity, and mystifies important personalities, vital wings of the party, and even organisations from within and outside the party. However, the most relevant of Good's critical perspectives on South Africa and the dominant role played by the African National Congress is his repetitive claim of the self-seeking interests of its elites. Whether this accounts for the lukewarm attitude on the part of South Africa for taking responsibility within SADC cannot however be conclusively explained. But the posture of ANC's elites as substantiated by Good, thus contradicts the ANC's proclaimed agenda for SADC grounded in the principles of partnership and equality so long as its elites continue to be motivated by their own self-interests. The ANC's contradictory claims and egalitarian rhetoric within SADC may have negative implications on the future of the sub-regional body. As Heribert and Melber have noted, the self-seeking interest and general posture of the ANC may compromise future important arrangements such as the regional compensation mechanism. In addition, countries of the region may be less politically and economically motivated for a regional integration project. They further opine that:

"If South Africa is not able to prove its ambitions for leadership, based on the principle of equality, within the foreseeable future, the other countries of the region could be tempted to promote other competing projects."
In another sense South Africa’s non-co-operative posture would contribute to a mounting feeling of fear and anxiety among the member states of SADC which would subsequently compel them to resort to protective measures such as, the above mentioned counter measure in the trading sector. It is always likely that when countries feel powerless under strained circumstances of the kind caused by South Africa, for example, they would naturally seek refuge behind the curtain of sovereignty. The reasons may be straight forward: fear of lost of jobs due to re-alignment of national bureaucracies towards a supra-national authority and possible relocation of industries, ‘trade and welfare diversion’ within the region in favour of the dominant economies. Given her vast industrial base and competitive advantage in several directions, South African trade is largely outward-oriented thereby compromising her multilateral commitments within the region. By the first quarter of 1999 for example, the EU and South Africa under the spirit and letter of the Berlin Initiative had created a free trade that permits South Africa to export about 99 per cent of its industrial products, but only 75 per cent of its agricultural produce duty free into the EU. This is reciprocated by South Africa's granting of duty free access of about 86 of EU industrial products into the South African market, excluding automobiles and textiles.\textsuperscript{127} Other areas of co-operation included the consolidation of democracy in the Southern African region, combating illicit drug trafficking, promotion of investment and combating HIV/AIDS. Resort to principles of sovereignty under such desperate conditions however, would not yield any positive dividends for the sub-region and the continent as a whole. Some of the states are too small, and too weak to be saved by any such actions, while the big ones are inherently fragile, and vulnerable. As had been stated elsewhere in the discussion, African states would have to shed their holdings on sovereignty and co-operate fully toward supra-national projects in the various sub-regions that would lead to co-ordination of policies and their implementation thereto.

Despite slow response of SADC member states toward the trade protocol they had been relatively faster on other sectors such as Shared Watercourse Systems, Combating Illicit Drug Trafficking, Energy, Mining, Transport, Communications and Meteorology, Health and Education and Training, all of which have received the required number of ratification and have entered into force.\textsuperscript{128} But it must once again be emphasised that sectoral integration is a necessary but not sufficient condition for regional integration efforts. Success may also lie in winnowing down existing asymmetries among member states, ensuring competency and rationality, encouraging transparency, accountability,
probity, responsiveness and integrity among the interacting actors, and above all, promoting deeper inter-governmental interaction wheeled by responsible leadership with vision and action. Constrained by a leadership inertia, SADC may found wanting approximating to these basic ingredients for any dynamic, vibrant and viable integration in the sub-region.
The East African Community (EAC)

After lying dormant for over a decade the hopes for reintegration in Eastern Africa was revived and rekindled in 1993 by the signing of an agreement for the establishment of the Permanent Tripartite Commission (PTC) for East African Co-operation on the 30 of November of the said year (1993-1999). This was in fulfilment of the provisions of the Mediation Agreement for the Division of Assets and Liabilities signed in 1984 for the then abandoned East African Community (EAC) in 1977. As pointed out in the case study of the former EAC, the three states (Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania) agreed to explore avenues for future co-operation within a concrete framework for any such co-operation in the said Mediation Agreement. Three years later the new initiative was given further boost by the launching of a Secretariat of the Permanent Tripartite Commission (PTC) at the headquarters of the EAC in Arusha, Tanzania on March 14, 1996. Conscious of the rapid changes taking place in the world of globalisation, the leaders of the region realised the need to deepen and consolidate regional co-operation to enable the sub-region address the challenges thereof. It was this intention at the back of the mind of the collective East African leadership when they directed the PTC at their second Summit in Arusha on 29 April 1997 to embark on a process of upgrading the Agreement establishing the PTC for East African Co-operation into a Treaty. During a blitz summit of the Heads of States of Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda in Arusha Tanzania on 22 January 1999 the leaders expressed their commitment to sign the Treaty re-establishing the East African Community by the end of July 1999. This would mean the community taking over from the PTC, which had until then function as a transitional body for overseeing the reintegration process.

Their resolve was translated into action when the three countries signed the Treaty for the Establishment of the East African Community in Arusha on 30 November 1999. The Treaty entered into force on 7 July 2000 after it had been ratified by the respective national parliaments of the three states and deposit of the instrument of ratification with the Secretariat of the Community by all three participating countries.

Some of the important provisions of the treaty calls for a customs union subject for negotiation in the following four years after ratification, common market and monetary union geared toward an ultimate goal for achieving the birth of a political federation of east African states. Some of the core institutions are an East African Parliament, a regional stock exchange and a joint court of justice. The sub-regional body was officially inaugurated at a ceremony held at the Sheikh Amri Abeid stadium in Arusha, Tanzania on January 15, 2001 presided over by the Presidents of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. President Daniel Arap Moi of Kenya described the launching of the community as an evidence and reaffirmation of the „cultural, political and economic ties, which have been there between the three countries since time immemorial”

The Tanzanian President Benjamin Mkapa remarked that for the community to make positive inroads today the member states should avoid the mistrust of the past that had caused the demise of the former EAC. The new community must strive to forge a positive future through dialogue and „must provide equal benefits for all members”

How then is the community structured and functions towards achieving its goals? The institutional infrastructure of the EAC is built on six core institutions, namely, the Summit of Heads of State and or Government, the Council of Ministers, Co-ordination Committees, East African Court of Justice, East African Legislative Assembly, and the Secretariat. The central organ of the community is the Summit, which consists of the Heads of State and Government of the respective member states of the community. Being the highest authority of the community its main functions include general
direction of the community's policies in reflection of its aims and objectives. It holds an ordinary Summit of Heads of State and Government once a year, but may also consider an extraordinary summit when deemed necessary by the member states. Operating under the authority of the Summit is the Council of Ministers, which is directly responsible to the central organ. Its members are appointed by the individual member states. In all, the Council of Ministers constitutes the accredited policy organ of the community charged with regional co-operation of each participating member states. Some of it core functions include, monitoring and keeping under constant review the implementation of the general policy of the community within the framework of its main goals and objectives. The Council meets twice a year in regular sessions, and may also decide to hold extraordinary meetings depending on the prevailing circumstances. In order to complement and assist the role of the Council, the Council may decide to establish Sectoral Councils to deal with pertinent issues affecting the community, and their decisions would have the same effects as those of the Council. Responsible to the Council of Ministers is the Co-ordination Committee whose members is appointed by the respective participating states, and is designated as Permanent Secretaries responsible for regional co-operation in the member countries. It co-ordinates the activities of the Sectoral Councils established by and functions under the Council of Ministers. There is an East African Court of Justice originally designated for human rights and other jurisdictions, but is also temporary responsible for interpretation and application of the Treaty on matters affecting the attainment of a Common Market. The legal authority of the community resides in the East African legislative Assembly consisting of 27 elected members, nine from each member state, plus five officio members, the three Ministers responsible for regional co-operation, the Secretary-General and the Counsel to the Community. Refurbishing and co-ordinating the various institutions and organs of the community is the Secretariat which is the executive organ of the community. It is headed by the Secretary-General assisted by two Deputy Secretaries Generals and includes the offices of Counsel to the community and other ancillary officers appointed by the Council. The operations of the community’s Secretariat are funded through contributions from the member states. However, the general regional integration goals in the form of projects and programmes are funded through the mobilisation of internal resources, and financial and technical assistance from external partners and countries of goodwill.132

What has propelled decision makers of the sub-region to revive an abandoned old idea this time around? Apart from the rapid changes taking place in the world in the past one decade and more, there has emerged in the region firm believers and carriers of the ideas of free trade backed by the regions strong and collective bargaining power and competitiveness in the form of a robust sub-regional integration platform. On this particular note, Uganda has relatively surpassed her neighbours as evidenced by the structural reforms it had embarked on since the mid 1980s. Convinced by the benefits of free trade for the region, President Yoweri Museveni of Uganda in his address during the inaugural ceremony of the community reiterated the importance of economic integration and pointed out that:

"There is no way we can modernise without expanding our markets. I do not know of any government that has developed without a big market"133

It is in the light of these emerging global challenges that the leaders of the region had resolved to prioritise their common objectives to improve and strengthen co-operation on the basis of the historical and cultural ties that exist between the peoples of the region. In this direction the collective regional leadership have agreed to promote and deepen co-operation in priority sectors such as transport and communication, trade
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and industry, security, immigration, as well as promoting and co-ordinating investment opportunities from home and abroad. The community aims to utilise the potentials offered by the sub-region for reaping the benefits of a single East African market of around 82 million people, and a GNP of US$24 billion. Towards the attainment of that goal the member states had agreed to ease travel restrictions, harmonising tariffs, increasing co-operation among security forces, improving communications, sharing the energy resources of the sub-region, especially electrical power, and addressing issues and controversies relating to the common utilisation of the resources of Lake Victoria. Cautious of the factors that had contributed to the failure of the former EAC (namely, equal distribution of benefits and compensation schemes) each member states would be allowed to extract a maximum of 10% surcharge on some products in order to protect indigenous infant industries, with particular focus on the smaller economies of Tanzania and Uganda. These broad objectives are to be achieved through:

(i) Promotion of sustainable growth and equitable development of the region, including rational utilisation of the region's natural resources and protection of the environment;

(ii) Strengthening and consolidation of the longstanding political, economic, social, cultural and traditional ties and associations between the peoples of the region in promoting people-centred mutual development;

(iii) Enhancement and strengthening of participation of the Private Sector and Civil society;

(iv) Mainstreaming of gender in all its programmes and enhancement of the role of women in development;

(v) Promotion of good governance, including the adherence to the principles of democracy, rule of law, accountability, transparency, social justice, equal opportunities and gender equality; and

(vi) Promotion of peace, security and stability within the region and good neighbourliness among the partner States.

The above goals and objectives are grounded in an East African Community Second Development Strategy (2001-2005) that outlines the 'policy guidelines, priority programmes and implementation schedules'. Hence the sub-region's overall development strategy "emphasises economic co-operation and development with a strong focus on the social dimension. The role of the private sector and civil society is considered as central and crucial to regional integration and development in a veritable partnership with the public sector". Aware of the conditions for realising their development goals the participating countries have also agreed to pull resources together in order to establish a viable and internationally competitive single market and investment zone in East Africa through the development of regional infrastructure, human resource, science and technology.

Since the late 1990s the community has been trying to boost its integration commitment by adopting a series of common initiatives and policies. Aware of their weakness as individual states in matters of foreign policy, the Foreign Ministers of the three countries signed a Memorandum on Foreign Policy Co-ordination to enhance their common capacity in international fora, and assisting each other in countries where they do not have Ambassadorial Missions. The policy implications of the Memorandum is that any one of the three member states can appoint one Mission to represent their national interests on foreign policy issues, including the right to process and issue visas for citizens of the community. In this regard the East African passport was officially launched on 1 April 1999. Also being aware of the role peace, security and stability play in economic development and growth, the community took the unprecedented step to
sign a Memorandum of Understanding on Co-operation in Defence in April 1998 that had been revised in 2001 but had still not been ratified. As a show of its commitment to peace and stability, the community held a summit on the deplorable security situation in the DRC on 18 October 1998 in Nairobi. The summit unanimously agreed to give active support to SADC efforts extended within the framework of the UN and the then OAU. It is only under the conditions of enduring stability that the community can achieve its trade policies, which occupies a central place in the community's general policy infrastructure.

The core programme of the EAC's trade policy agenda is to turn the participating countries into a single trade and investment region with the objective to increase the total volume of trade among them and with the rest of the world. The member states common target is to achieve rapid economic growth and development in order to create opportunities to generate employment to raise the standard of living of the citizens of the community. In the final analysis, the goal is to enhance free movement of the factors of production among the member countries. However, since 1998 the overall trade performance had not been encouraging. The volume of intra-regional trade accounts for only 10% of total trade. Even among the three countries trade was skewed between Kenya and Uganda, the former exporting 15% of its goods (predominantly finished consumer goods) to the later. During the same period, Uganda's exports to Kenya and Tanzania were US$8.2 million and US$2 million respectively. Imports were US$349 million from Kenya and US$7.2 from Tanzania. The figures are quite reminiscent of the asymmetries that had existed between the three countries in the former ECA. The factors that influenced their trade patterns had also scarcely changed under current circumstances. There is still concentration of production around similar goods, especially from the agricultural sector, namely coffee, tea, cotton, and fish. In addition, several non-tariff barriers hamper intra-regional trade.

The dismal performance in intra-regional trade brought pressure on the collective leadership to embark on regional trade reforms to boost trade and create opportunities for growth and development. However, it is interesting to note that what had been achieved so far in the reform efforts had rather come from implementation of COMESA trade reforms and not the EAC per se, though similar policies are in the pipeline from there. Under an existing COMESA trade regime member states are to phased tariff reduction to pave the way for a Free Trade Area (FTA). Shortly after it was launched in October 2000 about eight countries including Kenya reduced their tariff to zero on imports from other COMESA countries, though Uganda and Tanzania fell short of that target by reducing their tariffs by only 80%. The two countries slow response may be due to their anxiety about loss of revenue in favour of more industrially developed Kenya. In another development toward greater economic integration the EAC member countries under the provisions of the revised Treaty agreed to establish a Customs Union by 2004 committing the countries to reduce internal tariff to 0% and institute a Common External Tariff (CET). It also exhorts the member countries to work assiduously toward the removal of all existing non-tariff barriers on the importation of goods originating from any one of the participating member countries. As a step toward realising the broader goals set for them, a EAC trade ministers conference in Nairobi in January 2001 agreed to remove all suspended duties (duties the imposition of which does not need a parliamentary approval once a minister decides so) on goods originating from the region. The member countries response was quite positive as Tanzania quickly agreed to remove suspended taxes on Firestone tires from Kenya, while Uganda and Kenya at the same time agreed to remove taxes on milk products from the region. However, in the wider framework the full gains of regional trade had still not been realised due to different levels of implementation of the 100% COMESA tariff
reduction scheme between the member countries.139 There are also disagreements among member states on the adoption of CET. Kenya and Tanzania advocate a maximum CET of 25%, while Uganda is pressing for a maximum level of 15% tariff rate on non-EAC imports. Despite the obstacles in trade policy among the member states negotiations in Monetary and financial policy co-ordination seems to be smoother than trade policy negotiations.

The EAC Treaty obliges the member countries to co-operate in monetary and financial matters (co-operation in areas of finance, tax, environment and infrastructure etc.) in order to create an enabling environment for macroeconomic stability within the region. The main objective is to „harmonise policies in the EAC and form a single uniform block that facilitates rapid growth in trade among its partners and that can be marketed as a single entity for trade and investment purposes”140. The end goal of such policy harmonisation in monetary and financial matters is to achieve an East African Single Currency by the year 2010. However ambitious that may sound, policy performance in this direction has not been encouraging as macroeconomic convergence targets and performance are quite at variance among individual member states. GDP growth rate in Kenya (-0.3%), Uganda (5.1%), Tanzania (4.9%) is all below the 7% target. Inflation at annual average % ranges from 5.9 in Kenya, 6.3 in Uganda, and 6.7 in Tanzania, all of them faring above the 5% convergence criteria. Average fiscal deficit in % of GDP, and an established convergence parameter of 5% revealed the following performance: Kenya 0.4, Uganda 5.9, and Tanzania 6.8. On current account deficits in % of GDP with a convergence target of 5%, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania performed 1.6, 9.3, and 9.1 respectively.141 The following Table offers other valuable indicators.

### Table 3: Economic and Demographic Indicators for the EAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GDP, 2002 (Billions of U.S.$)</th>
<th>Real GDP Growth Rate, 2003 Estimate (in %)</th>
<th>Real GDP Growth Rate, 2004 projection (in %)</th>
<th>Per Capita GDP, 2002 (U.S.$)</th>
<th>Population 2002 (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>31.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>5.866</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>23.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>9.383</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>250a</td>
<td>35.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total/Average</td>
<td>27.389</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>89.921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Economic Outlook September 2003, a survey by the staff of the IMF; World fact Book 2003, World Development Indicators database, World Bank, July 2003. a. Data refer to mainland Tanzania only.

That apart, the general state of infrastructure development falls short of enhancing trade expansion and rapid mobility of factors in the region. The railway network connecting the EAC countries is inefficient. This creates more problems for landlocked Uganda, which has to pay a higher price for transportation of bulky products across the national borders of EAC member states. Feasibility studies on a proposed EAC Master Power Plan have not been commissioned. Neither had there been any significant progress in the envisaged Mombassa-Nairobi petroleum products pipeline extension project to Kampala, in Uganda. The project is designed to help cut prices for petroleum products to Uganda and other landlocked regions of northwestern Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi and the eastern DRC.142
However, even beyond trade and macroeconomic obstacles the EAC is beset with several problems and challenges that may in the long term compromise some of its vital goals. The revival of East African co-operation even took off with old grievances still hanging on the necks of two of its member states, Uganda and Kenya. The latter still owes the former some payments under the 1984 Compensation Fund Agreement (that saw the end of the former EAC), the repayment of which caused diplomatic row between the two in 1999. There is a high probability that Uganda might revive the legal proceedings to ensure due compensation at any time. The implications of any legal battle thereto, and its effects on co-operation between the two countries should not be underestimated.

The region has also gradually become the target of terrorism, especially since the 11 of September 2001 attack on the World Trade Centre in the US. The bombing of the US embassy in Nairobi, Kenya in August 1998 and an Israeli owned hotel in 2003, all have negative effects on daily business activities. The business climate has even been exacerbated by constant terror alerts in the region by the US and Britain who constantly advise their citizens doing business there, or going there as tourists to weigh their considerations carefully before making any final decisions on their travels to the region. In Tanzania in particular there has been increasing tendency of Islamic fundamentalism and greater potential for terrorism assuming regional wide threat against peace and stability in the region. In the long-term however, the constant terror alert by the US and British security and intelligence services goes a long way to deter would be investors in the region. It should be noted in this connection that establishment of a single entity for trade and investment purposes remains the cornerstone of the regions integration efforts. Also, given the scarcity of financial, and other resources such as logistics, pressures for combating acts of terrorism in the region through training of security personnel and refurbishing the whole security infrastructure would exert pressure on an already dwindling state resources of the member countries of the EAC that would eventually divert some of their commitments away from the regional integration project.

Added to an already fragile situation are the occasional expression of mistrust between Uganda and Kenya. The former had incessantly accused the latter of harbouring some perpetrators of the 1994 Rwandan genocide against calls for their trial before a special tribunal set by the UN in Tanzania.

Even more disturbing is the decades long rebel resistance to Musevenis rule ever since he assumed the reigns of government by winning a guerrilla war himself in 1986. The tactics of the rebel group in the form of sporadic raids, kidnapping of school children, rape, lynching and maiming of innocent civilian all sends an unhelpful message across the business community. Today the rebel stronghold in northern Uganda has become one of the worst places on earth.

In the final analysis, however, the region possesses the advantages of past experience in the abandoned former east African integration project. If the member countries learn properly from their mistakes, and are able to boost and support current integration initiatives through genuine political commitment the goals set for themselves would not be far fetched. The achievements of the immediate past years after its revival suggests that the community is ripe for action this time around and examples abound. One remarkable progress relates to the liberalisation of regional trade. It had been recorded that Kenya had instituted a preferential tariff reduction of 90% on imports from the other two members of the community. The gesture had equally been reciprocated by Tanzania and Uganda, while non-tariff barriers on cross-border trade have been removed. In November 2003 an unprecedented step was taken to establish a full customs union that envisages elimination of remaining tariffs on intra-EAC trade.
The Arab Maghreb Union (AMU)

Regional co-operation in northern Africa began in the mid-1960s during the first Conference of Maghreb Economic Ministers in Tunis in 1964 that culminated in the establishment of the Conseil Permanent Consultatif du Maghreb (CPCM) between Algeria, Libya, Morocco and Tunisia. However, that particular effort was externally oriented as it was designed to foster interregional trade and relations with the EU. The project and even subsequent initiatives have failed to materialise due to lack of political will on the part of the participating member countries, frequent inter-state conflicts, and the delicate disagreement among Morocco, Algeria and Mauritania over decolonisation in the Spanish Sahara, externally oriented economic partnerships, and finally the mercurial and unpredictable foreign policy goals of Libya under Gaddafi who had been caught between Maghreb union and eastward-oriented Arab solidarity focusing on Egypt in particular, and the wider Arab world in general.

The 1980s offered new opportunities for Maghreb co-operation as the countries in the region began to put their political differences apart for the common good. In that spirit a new military regime in Mauritania in July 1978 made peace with the Polisario Front on the question of decolonisation, Algeria and Tunisia revived their political and economic ties by signing a series of agreements including the establishment of the Banque de coopération du Maghreb arabe (B.C.M.A.), adopted a common trade policy toward the EU, and in 1982 Algeria offered to co-operate with Libya in joint ventures to create an enabling environment for economic, social and cultural integration. Tunisia in a similar gesture made peaceful overtures to Morocco, and the two countries agreed to co-operate in some key sectors of their national economies such as in manufacturing, mechanical and agricultural sectors. Tunisia further extended her open policies towards Libya in the form of co-operation on matters relating to commerce, tourism and culture. Indeed, the 1980s had been captured as a period of détente in the Maghreb region.

Another important symbolic gesture took expression in the conciliatory efforts by Algeria with Morocco when the two countries met in February 1983 after almost eight years of diplomatic and political discord. In their historical top-level talks the two nations expressed their willingness to iron out their differences through peaceful dialogue in order to enhance their bilateral relations and open avenues for co-operation in matters of mutual interests. Also Le Traité de fraternité et de concorde was concluded and signed between Algeria and Tunisia in March 1983, and was later joined by Mauritania in December of the same year. Encouraged by these developments Libya and Morocco took the unprecedented step to bury their political antagonism after 13 years of discord. The ultimate effects of these reconciliatory efforts were to deepen Maghreb unity and pave the way for genuine co-operation in the region.

Combined with the spur of the enlarged 'EC' of the twelve by embracing Spain and Portugal, and a possible future enlargement to include some Eastern European countries, Turkey and Cyprus, the Maghreb states began to rethink their economic and political co-operation. This was due to their huge dependence on the EU market and their anxiety of loosing competition in like products from Portugal and Spain in particular. In the spirit of that new thinking the first Maghreb Summit of Heads of State held at Zeralda, in Algeria in June 1988 decided to set up the Inter-Maghreb Commission and various Specialised Commissions to handle matters affecting their common interests. The Commission's efforts finally culminated in formulating a Treaty establishing the AMU. On February 17, 1989 the Heads of State of the five countries (Algeria, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia) signed the treaty in Marrakech. The Maghreb Union is designated one of the main building blocks establishing the AEC.
As stipulated by the Treaty, the main objectives of AMU are „to strengthen all forms of ties among member states (in order to ensure regional stability and enhance policy co-ordination), as well as introduce gradually free circulation of goods, services and factors of production among them.“  

Cautious of the precarious political and security situation in the region, the participating states also reiterated their stand on common defence and non-interference in the domestic affairs of the partner states. The broad strategy is to deepen economic co-operation in „the development of agriculture, industry, commerce, food security and the setting up of joint projects and general economic co-operation programmes“.  

The sub-regional body operates on institutional machinery headed by Council of Heads of States that has the authority to deliberate on matters affecting the union, and make all decisions through a principle of unanimity. Supporting the role of the Council is Council of Foreign Affairs Ministers that meets regularly during pre-conference sessions of the Council to examine policy proposals formulated by subordinate committees and four specialised ministerial commissions (economy and finance, human resources, basic infrastructures and food security). There is also a follow-up committee that exercises the role of an oversight committee and follows the implementation of resolutions adopted by the Council of Heads of State, and submits various studies and suggestions to the Foreign Ministers. It consists of representatives from each member state. Advising the Council of Heads of State is a Consultative Assembly consisting of 30 representatives from each participating state. It meets regularly every year including extraordinary sessions as demanded by the prevailing political situation and general matters affecting the union. Two separate Courts of Justice have been set up in Algiers and Nouakchott. It is composed of two judges from each member state. Its main duty is to settle disputes resulting from differences in the interpretation of the Treaty and other legal instruments. It is accorded some relative supranational status as Article 13 of the Treaty establishing the union stipulates that its decisions will be executive, all binding, and definitive. Supporting the activities of the various institutions is a Secretariat with a permanent seat in Rabat, and is financed through annual contributions by member states.  

Apart from the political and diplomatic rivalry that had characterised the region in the past and present it makes sense however to take note of some economic observations in the region. The region has a population of nearly 81 million with a GDP of over US$130 billion and trade relations with the outside world worth about US$73 billion annually. The region’s trade relations are oriented toward the EU rather than between the Maghreb member states. Internal disparities also exist in their per capita incomes which vary from US$7,000 for oil-rich Libya to US$500 in economically impoverished Mauritania, where about 70% of the population lacks health care services and other utility services, such as, running water reaches only 40% of the people. In sharp contrast with Mauritania, Algeria and Libya are blessed with oil and gas reserves, but it had also been observed that a large portion of the country’s oil proceeds goes to the military-security and political elites to entrench their rule. Libya’s mercurial political posture has earned her a status of an international deviant, only now trying to patch up her diplomatic ties with the Western world considering the crucial need for investment in its national economy and particularly the worn out infrastructure in the oil industry.  

Macro-economic reform success in the region explains the low level of inflation rates in the sub-region. Real GDP growth in Mauritania was estimated to be a strong 4.5% in 2003, while estimation for the same period is 4.3% for Morocco, 2.9% for Libya, and 4.3 for Algeria. Mauritania and Morocco’s inflation forecast for 2003 is 3.0%, up slightly from 2.5% in 2002, Libya 2.5%, and Algeria 1.2%, while Tunisia’s figure is expected to remain low in 2003, most likely below 2%. In the post-11 of September
terrorist attack on the world trade centre in the US the tourism industries, one of the vital sources of foreign exchange for Morocco and Tunisia have been hardly hit. In Tunisia in particular the tourism sector has suffered even more because of the April 2001 terrorist bombing of an ancient synagogue at El Ghriba on the island of Djerba. The following Table provides deeper insights about individual countries economic indicators.

Table 4: Economic and Demographic Indicators for the AMU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>55.666</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>34.137</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3001a</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>37.263</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>21.169</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>149.218</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Economic Outlook September, 2003, a survey by the staff of the IMF; World Fact Book 2003; World Development database, World Bank, July 2003. a. Estimated to be upper middle income ($2,936 to $ 9,075)

Given the fragmented nature of Maghreb politics, and her dismal record at integration despite the economic potential to do so, how then does the region move forward in a world that is rapidly moving closer to regionalism? The slow pace of regional co-operation in the Maghreb has now come to occupy the attention of the region’s political and bureaucratic elites. The Tunisian President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali declared after 11 years of integration attempts that:

"...it is unacceptable that we should be prevented by transitory difficulties from resuming our progress...it is therefore necessary and urgent at this stage that we take our union out of the state of lethargy in which it is, that we compensate for lost time and join efforts to finalise its construction and buttress its foundation."

The obstacles to Maghreb integration are, however rooted in the Western Saharan crisis, her peculiar contradictions of promoting the gains of economic bilateralism (especially with EU), and increasing pressures to construct a common political and economic forum for dealing with the changes and challenges in the world in the context of globalisation, including the regions partial isolation from ongoing integration projects in the African continent itself.

One thorn in the flesh of integration experts in the Maghreb had been the decades-old decolonisation dispute between Morocco and the POLISARIO over the independence question of the Western Sahara. Even though Spanish control of the territory officially ended in 1975 and the International Court of Justice ruled that neither Morocco nor Mauritania should have sovereignty over the Western Sahara, Morocco still claims the territory. Mauritania however abandoned her territorial claims in the south and recognises the rights of self-determination of the Saharawi people by signing a historical peace agreement to that effect in 1979. Ten years later in 1989 Morocco
agreed to a cease-fire agreement between her and the POLISARIO. The OAU’s recognition of the UN ruling compelled Morocco to opt out of the former regional body. By 1990, under the framework of a UN settlement plan the territory was placed under the administration of a UN peace-keeping force MINURSO, mandated by the UN Security Council to organise a poll on the question whether Western Sahara would prefer to be part of Morocco or to be independent. MINURSO did not begin its mission when Morocco began to violate the cease-fire a year earlier in 1989. Since then Morocco had adopted measures such as encouraging its own citizen to be part of the poll, including a hard line policy of moving in new settlers into the territory. In 1992 a scheduled referendum under the auspices of the UN failed to materialise. In December 1999, the UN Security Council voted unanimously to keep MINURSO’s mission. By the turn of the new millennium the Sec.Gen had observe that the core problem of determining who is eligible to vote on the question of independence for the Western Sahara „could...prevent the holding of the referendum” indefinitely. The deadlock has perpetuated a state of war between POLISARIO and Morocco. It is Saharawi question that bred political animosity between Morocco and Mauritania, and Libya and Algeria given the latter’s military, logistical and financial support to the POLISARIO in the past.

Tensions between Morocco and POLISARIO peaked again in October 2001 when the former signed two controversial oil exploration deals, both offshore the disputed Western Sahara territory. A UN ruling as a result of POLISARIO protest to the deal stated that the contracts were not illegal in and of themselves, as long as the proceeds accruing from the venture were to benefit the people of the region. As of mid-2003 no significant strides had been chalked on the future of the former Spanish colonial territory.

For observers of Maghreb affairs may be the success of any future integration efforts in the sub-region is also intrinsically linked to the Western Sahara territorial question. The fact of the matter is that Morocco had been noted for playing countries of the region in particular against another any time there is a decision on the issues against her either in a sub-regional or continental forum.

Whilst normal economic wisdom dictates that the goals of regional integration is to promote trade and co-operation among member states of a particular region, the Maghreb countries are in contrast fragmented by outward trade linkages. As Aghrout and Sutton have observed

„The Maghreb countries have been competitors rather than partners in trade with European Community, and the rivalry extends to attracting tourists and inward investment from European firms or wider-based multinational companies...the Maghreb countries repeatedly compete as suppliers of phosphates, oil and gas, fruits and vegetables, and wines, as well as an increasingly number of manufactured goods, notably textiles and refined petroleum. To some extent, preferential access, tariff reductions or quotas have been negotiated for these exports as ‘associated states’ of the EC, though this status does not extend to Libya“.

This trend had persisted till today. The Union’s lack of willingness in making any genuine commitments to the AEC attests to this fact. Intra-Maghreb trade for 1997 was a meagre 2%. In terms of trade the region can be classified as being more European than African. Morocco’s pursuit of her trade interests resulted in her signing of agreements with the EU on economic co-operation including one establishing a free trade zone for industrial goods covering a 12-year transition period. It had also ratified a protocol on European Free Trade Association that had been operating since December 4, 1999. Morocco even took a further step in 1985 to seek to become the first non-European member of the then EC justifying her claims by the fact that over 60 per cent of her exports is directed toward the European market, and in geographical terms it is more European than Greece. In 1995 a proposed EU-Tunisia Association Agreement went
into effect in 1998 whose provisions obligates Tunisia to dismantle its customs barriers to European goods over a 12 year period. On January 1, 2000 tariff barriers were lifted for EU manufactured goods thus exposing Tunisian consumer goods to EU competition. In all, around 75%-80% of Tunisia's exports go to the EU. This may result in revenue lost if no compensation mechanism exists to address the imbalance there from. Algeria signed a similar agreement coming into effect in April 2002. The partnership agreements also contain provisions for expanding investment base within the region. The trade figures for one of the vibrant economies in the region bring home the role and effects of bilateralism closer to us. In 2001 Algerian imports from the EU were estimated to be over US$5.7 billion, compared to US$63 million from its North African neighbours. Exports figures for the same period were US$12.5 billion with the EU and $227 million with the Maghreb. Algeria and Libya are important producers, exporters and transit points for supplying oil and gas to southern Europe. The two countries have several bilateral agreements with Spain and Italy for new pipelines. However, the region’s trade policies operate against the prospects of a greater potential for intra-state commercial exchanges. Indeed, their trading transactions reveal stronger complementarities, which if properly harnessed could promote deeper integration among the member states of the sub-regional body. The following are glaring examples to this argument:

Morocco exports fresh and tinned vegetables and fruits, as well as super-phosphates, while Algeria imports significant quantities of these products. Tunisia exports foodstuffs such as almonds and olive oil, as well as super-phosphates and certain agricultural equipment, all of which are imported by Algeria and Libya. Finally, Algeria exports crude oil, iron ore, liquified propane and butane, and ammoniac, most of which figure prominently in Morocco and Tunisian imports. The potential for intra-community trade was underscored in inflation ranking of the SRECs by the ARIA Report 2002 in which the AMU placed first with a rate of 7%. The sub-region maintained a same position in budget deficit ranking with just 2%. FDI inflow into the sub-region grew at an annual average rate of about 0.9% from 1994-1999 and drew 5.4% of total FDI inflows into the continent. Pace of integration had been estimated at an average point of 4.6 lagging behind UEMOA, ECOWAS, SADC, CEMAC and CENSAD despite the sub-regions promising economic potential to outperform these blocks. Much of the sub-region's physical integration projects as indicated are external oriented towards southern Europe.

Since 1990 there had been limited attempts at fostering regional integration in the Maghreb. The five countries have since then signed more than 30 multilateral agreements covering diverse economic, social and cultural areas. The enthusiasm to sign protocols is not accompanied by the willingness of the national parliaments to ratify them. All members of the Union have ratified only 5 of the said number of agreements. They include agreements on trade tariffs covering a wide range of industrial products, trade in agricultural products, investments guarantees, avoidance of double taxation and phyto-sanitary standards. The five countries also have a multilateral banking arrangements designed to facilitate inter-bank payments in the Union. Observers of Maghreb affairs are increasingly questioning the willingness of the countries of the sub-region to integrate as they fail to utilise the vast economic advantages for realising that goal. That failure however, also informs us how deep-rooted the member states' political differences are, and conveys to us at the same time too how lack of political will and mutual suspicion may factor in integration efforts wherever they may be. But, in the final analysis we may also be questioning the effects of geographical proximity in influencing the behaviour of integrating actors where stark hierarchies and asymmetries exist between two neighbouring regions. The AMUs
example as regard its preference for bilateralism at the cost of multilateralism entails the factual reasoning that in the context of political acrimony and discord, members of a particular regional arrangements may opt for bilateral relations with extra-regional bodies, especially where the incentives and benefits from outside the region far out weight that from the region. In this connection, and as opined elsewhere in this work, rationality more than lack of political will may explain the behaviour of states in multilateral arrangements.

**Evaluation and Conclusion**

Even though the structural transformations that have been taking place in Africa since the early 1990s have produced genuine outcomes evidenced by some degree of improvement in Africa's hitherto deplorable human rights record, re-democratisation and institutionalisation of the rule of law, deregulation, privatisation and liberalisation of trade, at the same time however, some are questioning the speed at which liberalisation and privatisation for example were carried through. No wonder, the pace had been slowed today compared with early years of the 1990s. Some countries and even sub-regions have realised their lack of competitiveness in the global market place especially, in cases where some small countries have even less to trade. Even within the continent inter-state and sub-regional trading has not improved as expected, and rarely corresponds to the efforts that have been in that direction till today. The sub-regions and individual countries lack capacities for absorbing inputs in the form of external assistance, even after a long period of over a decade of political and economic transitions. Capacity building as part of the total transformation and integration processes has still not been achieved to speed up the pace of those twin processes. Many members of the AU are still saddled with reforms crucially needed to transform their national economies to at least approximate global standards. At the continental level that dismal performance is in part due to the foot dragging attitude by parliaments of national governments at ratifying the protocols their heads of state and government had signed on their behalf with pomp and pageant. By the end of his term as first President of the AU in July 2003, President Tabo Mbeki of South Africa regrettably announced that the many protocols establishing the core institutions of the AU have still not been ratified by many states in order to achieve even the basic legal requirement for implementation. Some of the states are still ravaged by war and instability thus compelling national elites to focus on conflict resolution and management instead of redirecting their scanty resources on sub-regional and continental projects.

At the generic level however, there are also political realities to states performance in integration projects. Sovereignty is still adored and cherished by many states in Africa who are sceptical about the intentions of some major states who have now assume the role of prime movers in African politics. Libya's Ghadaffi and Zimbabwe's Mugabe have question the imposition of the peer review mechanism inserted in the NePAD programme regarding it as imperialist and neo-colonialist instruments now being furthered by local agents such as Presidents Mbeki and Obasanjo of Nigeria. But the argument about both protection of sovereignty and lack of political commitment are grounded in the fact that states actions regarding decisions whether to integrate or not are more rationally driven by considerations about costs and benefits to be derived from regional integration not only in the traditional economic point of view, but even more so based on prevailing political imperatives in the region or sub-region. For example, within the West African Sub-region, the slow progress made towards merging
ECOWAS and WAEMU can be attributed to the Francophone countries believe that it would be irrational to abandon a system that works and opt for anything they had not seen performing in their life time. This point had been emphasised by a former Senegalese leader President Abdou Diouf almost two decades ago. He reiterated that:

"...It is in everybody's interests that if ECOWAS reaches its cruising speed, the CEAO (now WAEMU) should normally melt into the structures of ECOWAS. (...) What we do not want, we members of CEAO, is to be asked to eliminate something that works well, that produces brilliant results - CEAO, while ECOWAS has not reached cruising speed."

Even more debilitating do deep-rooted tensions and acrimony, dichotomy, hierarchies, and asymmetry existing between the states that constitute the various sub-regions. Perhaps it is in part the lack of trust about each other that leads some countries to question their commitment to any regional project of the sort. Some leaders seem to be having differing perspectives about how, and what a Pan-African project should be. For the Libyan leader for example, the Pan-African project should in substance be able to speak with one voice in international relations and aim at constituting an international counterweight to American influence in the continent. Whether the mercurial Libyan leader now mean genuine business with Western countries as indicated in his recent overtures on the compensation of the Lockerbie bombing victims, and opening access for international verification of its weapons of mass destruction can only be judged by time. Mbeki on the other hand though working for a homogenous African political entity wants the members states of the AU to unite around practical needs confronting the continent, such as poverty eradication, promoting economic growth and prosperity, entrenching democratic governance, stability and technological advancement geared towards moving Africa out of her present predicament. It is in this regard that he has focused on selling the NePAD project to the international community, particularly the industrialised countries. But whether states in the 21st Century would allow their national differences to prevent them from forging solidarity among themselves in order to be able to confront the onslaught of globalisation is another question. At this stage, it is rightful and conclusive to argue that Africa should at this level of her struggle for economic emancipation and development had learnt enough lessons to make her great leap forward in global politics and economy.

But any giant step forward could only be enduring if Africa's willing global partners fulfil their part of the commitment needed to bail the continent out of marginalisation and increasing poverty. That commitment may include, among other things, making available to the continent the suitable and adaptable technology and scientific training crucially needed to empower its working force at all levels. That empowerment playing a facilitating role would enable African peoples to shape their own development based on their socio-cultural diversity. It is also a high time that Western investors start rethinking about their perspectives on Africa, which had always been characterised by images and perceptions that are able to jumble a continent of 53 states in a straightjacket view. Conflict, war, poverty and disease do exist on the continent, but there are countries in Africa which have strive to keep these indicators at bay and are flourishing, and could do even better if the investor community make genuine commitments to support those home grown efforts.

It must however be pointed out that whatever contribution external capital could make would depend on African leaders and the local business community's ability to identify areas of their national economies that may need urgent and immediate injection of foreign capital. For example, such priority setting may include the identification of the vital role the agricultural sector in Africa plays, and which fact cannot in any way be underestimated. Surprisingly however, past national policies have not given the sector
the priority that it deserves, a fact that has gradually make the continent a recipient of food aid, instead of a producer of food. The Authors of the NePAD policy document have identified the problem as due to neglect. They are perfectly at grips with the statistics. About 70% of Africa's population is rural and depend heavily on the Agricultural sectors. But bilateral donors and multilateral institutions, and even national governments have paid too little attention to the sector. For example, in the World Bank lending portfolio an estimated 39% of credits went to the agricultural sector in Africa in 1978, but the figure dropped precipitously to 12% in 1996 and even reaching 7% by the turn of the last century in 2000. Can one then conclude on suspicion that the donor community and multilateral institutions rather found food aid cheaper instead of investment in agriculture? Why was there no co-ordinated global action to reverse this downward trend that had only succeeded in causing famine and dislocation of large populations in the continent? Why has most agricultural sectors failed to attract modern technology and innovative techniques despite the potential that it offers? This is not the column to make any judgements on this particular issue. Famine in Africa has always carried the images of the Ethiopian famine, and the disastrous consequences of hunger and plummeting life expectancy. But even in that particular classical instance, global policy is still caught between the Food Aid vs. Agriculture nexus. Food aid to the country is worth about US$200 million, while at the same time a meagre US$4 million is invested in agriculture. An immediate reversal of the trend is in the interest of not only the victims of starvation and hunger, but for political leaders and policy-makers as well, since investment in agriculture would increase incomes and purchasing power of rural dwellers which fact would likely boost their demand for African industrial goods and services. If there is any one particular foundation stone for sustaining and enduring regional integration project in Africa, then that must be agriculture.

By and large, however, irrespective of the diversity and disparities between the various sub-regions constituting the AU, there are some problems that are quite common, and may need common remedies to strengthen them if they are to be the real building blocks of any genuine and committed integration project. Political instability is still prevalent in the continent, either seen from the perspective of conflict and war, or fragility of most of the political systems. Democracy and the rule of law must be deepened, while promoting human rights to protect the rights and dignity of the African citizenry who are also the benefactors of the efforts the leaders claim to be making to improve their lot.

Another common problematic from Senegal to Somalia and Cairo to the Cape is the question of industrialisation and trade. While South Africa may not be industrially handicap, its trading policy does not augur well for the SADC region, due to its outward and bilateral global orientation with other regional groupings such as, the EU. It is imperative to go hand in hand with members of SADC on external trade issues. But in all, industrialisation has to be given a boost in order to enhance increase ratio of sub-regional trade to external trade. This would also imply diversifying the national economies to shift exports from primary commodities exports towards manufacturing sectors. By enhancing the capacity of national economies and sub-regions in this way the collective bargaining power of the sub-regions in particular would be enormously increased. But an industrialisation drive can only be viable if the current state of the continents infrastructure is upgraded to reflect expanding economic activities in trade, commerce and investment.

The task that African leaders have set for themselves is quite gigantic, and the path they have taken towards accomplishing it may be tortuous and even rocky. At the end of the day however, the willingness of the collective African leadership to move the continent forward would be determined by the scale and depth of the African crisis itself
sited in the context of globalisation, in a rapidly changing world. It is this challenge that would ultimately judge their credibility and, even legitimacy. Poverty, technological backwardness, widespread insecurity and disease should not be allowed to constitute an enduring slur on the image of Africa. The African peoples know even better as to what it means. The success or failure of integration efforts in the continent could objectively be judged and evaluated on the basis of the benefits it accrues to the collective African citizenry. The ultimate goal of the African leadership could also be judged by their ability to bail the continent out of obscurity and marginalisation, and put it at its rightful place in the global comity of nations.

In the contemporary African political praxis, however, these aspirations would continue to be hardly anywhere near reality, so long as there continue to exist a gap between the enthusiasm shown for signing treaties and the political will and resources for implementation. On the juridical plane, African leaders must co-ordinate the CAAU and NePAD within a genuine framework of constitutionalism and transparency. The contents of both are mutually reinforcing, the success or failure of either one of them is interdependent on each other. Indeed, the transitions that are taking place in Africa are quite broad, covering every aspect of human endeavour: economic, social, political, security, scientific and technological. They are quite complex and difficult to manage, co-ordinate and be effectively harmonised. This is where the challenge for its success lies. The development debates of the 1960 till the end of the 1980s are quite different from what we have been experiencing since the end of the Cold War. There is indeed a paradigm shift. Contemporary debate hover it on policy makers to structure a linkage between all the facets of the development debate in its economic, social engineering, human development and security, scientific and technological research. And of course the broadening of the debate has wider implications for methods for financing and implementing the current African project. Reliance on the goodwill of the industrialised countries to transfer the requisite capital and technology for take-off brings a colossal amount of risk and uncertainties to bear on the whole project. Under that circumstance an in-depth analysis about political risk analysis, and risk management in general with focus on both the donor and the recipient must become an accepted norm among the various partners working to realise the goals of NePAD. This point will be placed in a detailed perspective in Part V of the discussion.
Part IV Africa in Global Political Setting: Balkanised Marginalized and Subcontracted?
The Role of Trans-National Actors

After a long history of slavery, European scramble and partition, and a Pan-African struggle against colonialism, Africa no wonder came into global limelight in the 1960s through the channels of war and conflict. It made its presence in contemporary global political setting by the first Congo Crisis (1960-1965), as well as the liberation struggle to rid the continent of apartheid and remnants of colonialism. The vestiges of that history left the continent balkanised and fragmented. In the post-independence era however, the forces of imperialism, neo-colonialism and their local agents had largely contributed to further pauperisation of the African condition thus leading to acculturation, marginalisation and a development chasm. The crevices and cracks of the continents fragmentation is evidenced by multiplicity of territorial boundaries erected without any sense of cultural sentimentalities, a wealth of ethnic and linguistic divisions, a diversity of competing ideological and political traditions. And the most enduring of all, the creation of a post-independence African leadership rigidly subordinated to and imitative of the West toying with ideologies without any sense of direction. In the context of that extreme acculturation, political instability, institutional immobility, and even often at times failed states appear the end results. It is indeed the synthesis of these developments that gradually undermined Africa's capacity to innovate. But the crucial underpinnings of the continents' marginalisation in addition to its economic and weakened politico-strategic dimensions remain to be its technological backwardness, and military weakness. But above all, the enduring characteristic remains identifiable with the African state system that had been invented by outsiders in service of their own interests. In the final analysis, Africa's economic and political history lent itself for outsiders to construct images and perceptions about the continent that serves their own whims and caprices and most of which fails to grapple with political realities.

At this juncture, that the African continent had been exposed to too many and varying external powers and actors, some vying for rivalry and political influence, others competing for economic gains cannot be ignored. In the contemporary setting the increasing role of the UN, the G8, influential individual state actors, and the growing number of non-governmental and humanitarian bodies engaged in Africa give its politics and global presence a different label. The continent's politics and economic decisions are increasingly outward oriented determined by foreign policy goals of the industrialised countries of the North, and powerful multilateral institutions such as the Bretton Woods Institutions. Under those circumstances poorer countries in the African continent scarcely have any influence in crucial questions affecting their national budgets and finances, especially macro-economic policies as evidenced by their subordination to structural adjustments programmes under the auspices of the Bretton Woods sister institutions. As indicated already, discredited as it is, the state system in Africa seems to be by-passed, while there is a growing convenience among the industrialised countries and the donor community in dealing directly with non-states actors, and other private economic actors. Thus this section would focus on the power and influence of transnational actors on the sovereignty, political and territorial integrity of African states in general, and how they impact the continents global image, politico-strategic importance, and the drive for a self-reliant and autonomous development path within the framework of ongoing transformations and integration in the continent.
The UN-system: The Role of UN Economic Commission for Africa

Given the scale of Africa's emerging crisis in the 1960s, and the combined effects of the struggle for emancipation and development by the collective African leadership, their weakened global political and diplomatic positions, the UN-system became the main conduit for furthering the African cause. In this particular sense Africa's fragmentation offers her a strong leverage in terms of votes in the UN-system and its agencies. Since its creation the UN has focused on series of programmes directed towards poverty alleviation, gender and environmental issues, human rights, conflict resolution and management etc. In the realm of integration, however, the world body has established regional commissions to contribute to local efforts towards harmonising their policies and improve competitiveness. Within the African continent the ECA was established in 1958 with headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. It is among five of such bodies run by the UN in the various regions of the world. It operates under the auspices of the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) through the Conference of African Ministers Responsible for Economic and Social Development and Planning. Currently the activities of the ECA are focused on some key domains covering “development policy and Management, Economic and Social Policy, gender and development, information for development, sustainable development, and trade and regional integration”.

What role does the ECA play in African integration? Since its establishment the Commission had made significant contributions towards empowering the African continent in terms of institutional building to enhance its integration efforts. The world body's regional arm interests in integration attempts is underlined by focusing it activities in the realm of Africa's industrial future. It had been documented that in 1979, the ECA's Conference of Ministers passed resolution 332 (XIV) on a strategy for the African region within the global framework of the International Development Strategy for the United Nations Development Decade (1980-1990). The conference resulted in the declaration of the industrial Development Decade for Africa. The decision was adopted by the then OAU during a Summit Meeting of Heads of State in Monrovia, and subsequently declared the decade „for the purpose of focusing greater attention and evoking greater political commitment and financial and technical support, at the national, regional and international levels for the industrialisation of Africa”

In this direction the ECA had been responsible for setting up the African Development Bank (ADB), now Africa's leading multilateral development financier. It had supported the establishment of three sub-regional organisations, namely, ECOWAS, the Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern Africa (PTA), now COMESA, the East African Community and about thirty technical institutions to facilitate the socio-economic development of Africa covering areas of endeavour such as technology, banking and finance, minerals and remote sensing and planning and management. Significant among them are, the Eastern and Southern African Management Institute (ESAMI) and the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning (IDEP). As a show of its commitment the Commission had since the early 1980s actively participated in Africa's policy infrastructure towards closer co-operation and integration of African states. It had strongly supported efforts for strengthening the role of civil society groups, NGOs, professional associations and intellectual networks through the provision of technical assistance.

However, the Commission had focused among other things on forging a strong partnership for Africa's development in the form of promoting synergies with African intergovernmental organisations, UN bodies and specialised agencies, donor countries,
African universities, research centres and civil society groups. Its main undertakings have included in the recent past research and advisory services, sponsorship of seminars and workshops, information sharing, advocacy, and rendering assistance in the form of fellowships, internships and lectureship in support of its broader research project. In this regard it serves as a vital bridge between African countries and their development partners. The ECA has also in the aftermath of the Cold War restructured and revitalised itself and committed its leadership and bulk of her human resources to the process of transformation in Africa by serving as a „networker of development expertise, a clearing house for innovative ideas, a leader in consensus-building and for forging common African positions” on matters affecting African collective interests within and outside the continent. The ECA’s five Sub-regional Development Centres (SRDCs formerly known as MULPOCs) has established closer interaction and co-operation between the various sub-regional economic communities constituting the AEC. Under current circumstances of transformation within the continent, the ECA has become crucial to Africa’s integration development. It has the experience, and had always since its formation hold steadfast to her believes that economic and eventually political integration holds the key to Africa’s growth and prosperity. It has thus extended its commitment in variety of domains specifically designed to facilitate that objective.

One of the key results of the commission’s restructuring in the early 1990s was redirection of massive resources on advocacy and policy analysis to encourage requisite policy initiatives and reforms necessary for economic and social progress of Africa. This includes the creation of awareness of the increasing role information and knowledge play in development efforts and thus making her expertise available to African states that lack the capacity to do so. In its external relations the Commission advocacy role is „... geared towards promoting increased understanding of the complexity of the African development context. It is also aimed at informing and sensitising Africa’s external partners about the region’s need for sustained inflows of external resources as supplementary and complementary to the resources and efforts mobilised by Africans on their own”.

The Commission also devotes its expertise in Convening Stakeholders and Building Consensus through conferences, seminars, workshops and ad-hoc meetings of groups of experts. These are some of the well known strategies for ‘sharing norms’, ‘standards and best practices’ with the ultimate objective of constituting a catalyst for African development activities „... by assisting the many organisations on the continent that have common goals to coalesce and co-ordinate efforts”. Another positive contribution by the Commission is its focus on technical co-operation and capacity. As an extended arm of the UN, the Commission is mandated to „assist member states and institutions in developing their capacities to design and implement policies through technical co-operation activities. The technical co-operation, which does not involve disbursement of financial resources takes the form of on-demand regional advisory services to member states and their inter-governmental organisations, training workshops, seminars and fellowships, institutions building, and field projects”. Advisory services are delivered through a competent multidisciplinary team of regional experts and advisors attached to prevalent departments of the Commission. The team’s function, as the name depicts focuses on specific policy and technical challenges burdening the member states and the affordability of which is also scarcely within the reach of the member states. In fulfilment of its objective as regards capacity building, especially in the domain of skilled human resource capacity, the ECA had organised more than 40 high-level training workshops and seminars each year.

But in the final analysis the ultimate goal of the Commission is to enhance the role of the UN in Africa by getting involved and promoting Africa's development within the
UN-system. In one sense it is the co-ordinating organ of the world body in forging synergies between UN programmes and the specialised agencies geared toward the continent's development. Its numerous intergovernmental facilitating units are staffed with experts. They include the following: the Committee on Regional Integration, Committee on Development Information, Committee on Sustainable Development, Committee on Women and Development, Committee on Human Development and Civil Society, Committee on Industry and Private Sector Development, and Committee on Science and Technology and Sustainable Development. This intergovernmental machinery and their experts liaised between strategies and programmes of African countries and the UN, and more importantly between African countries and their external development partners.9

In its external co-ordinating role, the ECA made a notable contribution toward making the NePAD policy document appeal to Africa's external partners. Its policy contribution was embodied in the *compact for African recovery* that promoted the ideas of 'enhanced partnership', mutual accountability, and the mechanism for peer review between Africa and its willing partners.10 Another important step taken by the ECA in that direction is the creation of the African Development Forum (ADF). The forum, which is organised annually, opens up the opportunity for promoting cutting-edge debate and the broadest stakeholder participation towards attaining the goals of regional economic and political integration. Interaction in the forum is crosscutting, embracing Africans of all walks of life, governments, the private sector, experts, international organisations and other stakeholders, to seek consensus and ownership of regional integration in Africa.

Prior to the end of the 1980s the ECA became the main platform for voicing out against Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) that had been imposed by the Bretton Woods Institutions. The then Executive Director of the ECA, Adedeji Adebayo vehemently attacked conditionalities and adjustment policies and offered alternative strategies for African development.11 The 1980s had been dubbed the 'lost decade' in Africa, the SAP economies did not produce the expected results, the continent's external debt soared to unprecedented levels, and the social dimensions of adjustments had had its toll on the most vulnerable in the lower income groups, subsistence farmers and the informal sector. In fact given the damage that sustained *brain drain* has caused in Africa, the ECA and the technical expertise it provides to a large number of African countries has become the ‘lender of last resort’ in that capacity.

Determined as it is in serving Africa better in its capacity as the source of expertise and knowledge, the ECA at the beginning of the new millennium adopted measures for restructuring its institutions in that direction. In April 2003 this step resulted in the establishment of the Trade and Regional Integration Division (TRID) in order to “bring regional integration and trade issues under one umbrella”. The enthusiasm of the ECA on matters of integration and trade in the African continent is based on her conviction that “regionalism and multilateralism are mutually complementary”, and thus constitutes one of the key means to “enhance Africa’s development prospects and international competitiveness”, and above all safeguarding the trading interests of the non-bloc WTO members.12 Underlying this conviction is also the fact that the promotion of trade means intra-African trade and trade with the rest of the world. This inter-relationship require consistency and cohesion, and that is where the role of TRID begins – assisting African countries in promoting such cohesiveness and confront the challenges of the continent’s integration efforts, and globalisation.13

By and large, the ECA has grown up from the competing/rivalling institution of the OAU in the 1980s to a Think Tank for several African countries, which have been slowly milked to death by the brain drain.
The Role of the Bretton Woods Institutions

The gradual cumulative effect of the African crisis in the 1960s running to the opening years of the 1980s was the open up of African economies and societies for several transnational actors including the Bretton Woods Institutions, namely the World Bank and the IMF. Ranging from a combination of wrong and defective domestic economic policies, to deepening international constraints, African economies had by the end of the 1980s captured the attention of development theorists, academics and policy-makers alike. Two strands of reasoning propelled the Fund-Bank focus on Africa. The first was the growing conviction that Africa needed better policies in the light of the global recession of 1979-1982 combined with growing debt crisis in both Latin America and Africa. The other reason was an emerging new orthodoxy by the beginning of 1981 among Western policy-makers aimed at downsizing the role of the state and strengthening market mechanisms. The failure of key projects in the prior decade also convinced the two institutions of how inappropriate economic policy had contributed to the continent's overall economic malaise.

Africa's economic decay in the early 1980s can be attributed to some key constraints that had plunged the continent into a vicious cycle of stagnation. They include decreasing agricultural production accompanied by increasing population growth, deteriorating infrastructure, increasing debt burdens, worsening terms of trade due to lack of diversification of exports and inappropriate governance. The continent's economic crisis had already been discussed in detail in the section on the OAU.

Given the complexity of the African crisis the Bretton Woods Institutions engagement in the continents had moved through various concepts and a long policy contour. The contents of the Bank's first report (the Berg Report) in 1981, Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa placed much emphasis on the internal dynamics of the crisis and identified the agriculture sector as the most affected due to flaws in domestic policies. By the mid-1980s the Bank was criticised for lack of knowledge about the African crisis as evidenced by the Berg Report's overemphasis on internal constraints as being the major cause of Africa's economic woes. It failed to take cognisance of the harsh international economic system such as global recession, high oil prices, neglect of questions affecting poverty, and the international community's mismanagement of aid. In its subsequent reports the Bank shifted focused towards a more broader view of the total African crisis taking note of the negative impact of the global trading and financial system while it called on the donor community to intensify external assistance to the most needy and poorer nations that are implementing policies to resuscitate their national economies. The reports were Sub-Saharan Africa: Progress Report on Development Prospects and Programmes, 1983; Towards Sustainable Development in Sub-Saharan Africa, 1984; Financing Adjustment with Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa, 1986. The effects of the growing involvement of the IMF and the World Bank in African economic policy affairs was the eminent linking of most African countries into the world economy by the end of the 1980s. In 1978 only two African countries were undergoing IMF policy prescriptions. By 1999 a colossal sum of 41 per cent of IMF agreements was with African countries. The two institutions performance in Africa had featured prominently in several academic and journalistic debates and essays. Cash strapped as they were many African countries became dependent on Western loans and got wedged in a complex and difficult debt burden, which made them easily to become subordinated to the decisions and machination of the sister institutions. African states had scarcely any access to the
decision-making processes of the Fund and Bank. Their national sovereignty as independent states was thus washed ashore. Decisions affecting crucial national economic issues were reached in what observers had called the "Washington Consensus", with some even making conclusions about a new form of 'neo-colonialism'. Given the colossal sum of hard-earned foreign exchange African countries utilised to service their debt, hardly were they able to fulfil some of the immediate socio-economic responsibilities of their national populations. Poverty was on the ascendancy, and the sacrifices ordinary citizens were asked to make rarely reflected their standard of living as compared to the pre-reform era. In Ghana for example the gravity of the social dimensions of adjustment culminated in a series of conferences in Rome in 1986 that finally resulted in the institution of a Programme of Action to Mitigate the Social Cost of Adjustment (PAMSCAD) designed as safety net for population groups vulnerable to the negative impacts of economic reform.

Against that background, Fund-Bank strategy in the 1990s focused on Poverty Reduction within a framework of a grand strategy involving state, society and a network of non-governmental organisations and the private sector. The key elements of the strategy for the 1990s included:

(i) Promotion of equitable economic growth underpinned by sound macroeconomic policies that support employment; strengthening the agricultural sector through the introduction of modern farming methods and creating market accessibility and marketing practices;

(ii) Building a sound human capital base through investment, while creating opportunities for scientific education and training to ensure a healthy labour force;

(iii) Assisting small-scale businesses and strengthening the informal sector; and

(iv) Ultimately developing robust policies that would improve data on target groups in the poverty reduction effort.

That particular policy has taken expression in a Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). It is a long-term integrated framework of broad consultative process adopted by the host countries themselves involving civil society in conjunction with other bilateral and multilateral donors and NGOs, aimed at strengthening policy ownership and improving participation to ensure success. Its ultimate goal is to improve aid coordination, macroeconomic and financial stability, and while at the same time improving strategies for reducing national debts to enable governments finance pressing social needs. The latter point had in the recent past taken the form of debt relieve for Highly Indebted Poorest Countries (HIPC), which are making frantic efforts for democratic consolidation, protection of individual and minority rights, and realistic economic reforms. As of May 2003 the IMF had reduced the external debt of 20 countries by US$40 billion, a reduction by two in net present value terms. With the concept of the PRSP the Bank and the Fund had finally managed to cut deep into not just the economies, but also the social structure of their host countries. This absolute control over host countries unaccompanied by the long awaited benefits of adjustment would deeply erode the Bretton Wood’s twin’s legitimacy and credibility in poor economies, of which a large number of African countries are part of it.

It must be pointed out at this stage however that the issues at stake in this analysis are not the depth of the crisis in African economies per se, but the nature of the policies adopted by the Bretton Woods institutions and how deep they are able to penetrate the government machinery of many African states. In the end, given the low capacity of countries under going Fund-Bank policy package the state bureaucracy becomes
strained in terms of both experts and finance. But in all, the crucial fallacy of Fund-Bank policies, especially in the 1980s and early 1990s was the pressure for imposing macro-economic and fiscal policies in the absence of appropriate institutional framework in the host countries. Financial negotiations were made, and cash flows in the form of loans and short-term grants were approved irrespective of the system of governance and administration of the host country. The inherent contradiction is that the system of rule in Africa had most of the time been categorised as neo-patrimonial surviving solely on external transfer of resources. Under those circumstances, it could be opined that initial Fund-Bank support schemes were indirectly directed to prop up dictatorship, and foster conflict and civil war in most African countries. It was no surprise that the Bretton Woods Institutions later in the early 1990s incorporated the principle of political conditionalities into their policy package. (Part III)

How far then does structural adjustment programmes designed along not only economic, but also political conditionalities impact regional integration in the continent? A tremendous aspect of the transformations that had been taking place in Africa since the aftermath of the Cold War were already in the confines and context of Structural Adjustment therapies imposed by the IMF and the World Bank. Countries such as, Ghana, Uganda, Mauritius, Botswana, even had had their share of the bitter pill in the early and latter part of the 1980s. The arguments about the linkage between SAPs and regional integration are however not conclusive, and as of now there is no "intellectual framework, or an operational paradigm which is holistic, coherent and consistent" on the subject. Indeed, the relation between the two concepts has not been subjected to any rigorous analysis. As Mistry had opined, "In theory, these twin pursuits are neither contradictory nor mutually exclusive. In practice, however, they sometimes appear to conflict". But whether the Bretton Wood institutions would have the legitimate, and moral authority to lead in that effort in Africa is questionable, given its role in debt accumulation and social disintegration in countries undergoing SAPs in Africa - a fact that had bred scepticism in the eyes of the African leadership. Under present circumstances if there is any positive contribution to be made by the Bank and Fund in Africa's integration efforts, then it would be prudent for it to assume the role of information and knowledge transfer pertaining to the global economic and financial system that is crucially needed by most African countries. In this particular case the Bretton Woods institutions could co-operate with other notable bodies on the continent already engaged in the integration process. The UN Economic Commission for Africa would be of immediate help in this direction. In the final analysis however, it would be up to African leaders to consider co-ordinating stabilisation policies from within with the aim of achieving convergence criteria they might require for future monetary union at the various sub-regional levels. And of course in that regard the Bretton Woods could contribute expertise and information in support of any such initiative.

In the interim however, one can surmise that the negative impact of structural adjustment outweighs any positive effects it may likely have on integration in Africa. The reason is not far fetched. Almost all member countries of the African Union are in one way or the other got wedged in a severe debt crisis due to Bank-Fund policies, the poverty reduction strategies are still not reflecting daily economic life and experience of ordinary Africans. Cash strapped as they are, Africa countries are rarely capable of honouring their national economic and social policies. The problem of implementation of protocols is also in one sense the results of high debt servicing ratio and chronic budgets deficits the countries experience annually. The problem of involvement in African integration efforts by the Sister institutions is one of credibility, trust and transparency. Their changing posture on African issues in the new millennium as
evidenced by the Fund-Bank confession of past mistakes will go along way in improving relations between African states and the twin institutions.

**The Role of the European Union (EU)**

For the purpose of analytical convenience the role of the EU should have been placed under the contributions made by the G8 in this perspective. However, given the long historical ties and presence in the continent, the role of the EU has to be sub-categorised in order to draw a clear boundary between what is *specific* and *general* about their respective roles in Africa's global political presence. Even of much crucial importance to any analysis of the sort is the fact that 48 out of the 78 member countries of the ACP are African. The imposition of colonial rule and the resulting distortions it created in Africa had been discussed at length in this work under the rubric of the colonial heritage in terms of linguistic influence, imposition of cultural imperialism, social disintegration and economic dependence. Given the deeper political dimensions of Africa's global marginalisation, those aspect of Europe-Africa relations since the European institutionalisation process in the late 1950s would be accorded detailed attention and space in here.

Even though European economic relations with Africa had existed ever since the European Economic Community (EEC) was established in 1957, it had lacked any concrete institutional impetus except in the framework of the loose European Development Fund (EDF) to provide aid in the form of a series of ad hoc privileged trading arrangements with former colonies in sub-Saharan Africa. Such relations were embodied in the 1963 Yaoundé Conventions that was signed with 18 sub-Saharan Francophone African countries. These relations moved through Yaoundé II in 1971 and later assumed the caption of a series of arrangements reached in Lomé I-IV, to embrace 46 countries including (Anglophone African states) former colonial dependencies in the Caribbean and Pacific Ocean soon after the accession of the United Kingdom into the EEC in 1973. By the conclusion of decolonisation of the former Spanish and Portuguese colonies the number rose to 70 countries. Notwithstanding those early initiatives, Africa's share of development aid from the EDF (though increasing to the level of over 3b Euros) stagnated and gradually dwindled to 29 percent as compared to other regions such as Latin America, Eastern Europe, Asia and the near East. Aid as perceived to be functioning, scarcely failed to put the colonial dependencies on the path of recovery, sustainability and incorporation into the world economy. In its stead, poverty, war disease, crisis of governance and marginalisation prevailed over policy. The results presented by the EU Council of Ministers evaluation team to investigate and evaluate the impact of aid on the recipient countries were far from encouraging. It admitted that aid policy and programmes in the past twenty-five years had been carried out without taking due cognisance of the „institutional and policy context in partner countries, thus undermining the viability of, and the effectiveness of co-operation”. Added to that was the low performance in the domain of the much focused non-reciprocal trade preferences. It had been recorded that „ACP countries share of the EU market had declined from 6.7 in 1976 to 3 percent in 1998, about 60 percent of total exports still being concentrated on only ten products.” But the most undermining of all was the failure to put in place an effective administrative machinery to ensure efficiency and timely transfer of resources and other immediate deliveries.

It was against this deplorable background during the run up to the new millennium that both donors and recipients recognised that relations had to be reconsidered in order to suit the realities of the rapidly changing global economy, and politics of the 21st
Century. This mutual recognition finally led to publication of a Green Paper with the objective to stimulate public debate and pave the way for injecting some new dynamism into the hitherto defective EU-ACP relations. The ensuing series of debates and negotiations finally resulted in the signing of a new EU-ACP Partnership Agreement in Cotonou (Benin) on June 23, 2000, embracing all sub-Saharan African countries, groups of countries from the Caribbean, and the Pacific. What is then new about Cotonou after twenty-five years of co-operation between both groups?

The key innovations of the new agreement include the introduction of new political conditionality grounded in appropriate governance; empowering the role of non-state actors and local authorities in aid delivery programmes, especially in support strategies and at the implementation phase; termination by 31 December 2007 of the current all ACP non-reciprocal tariff preferences and its replacement by a set of reciprocal Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs); and finally redefining the transfer of aid resources as a strategic management tool, and streamlining the aid delivery system in order to inject more effectiveness and co-ordination at all levels of engagement. It also advocates more resource transfers to compensate for the diminishing and negative impact of WTO regulations on trade privileges that had been accorded the ACP countries.

Hence the current agreement opens a new chapter in EU-ACP relations that sets forth a political dialogue on wide range of issues that are of mutual interests to both parties. It delineates responsibilities for both donor and recipient countries within the framework of a dynamic partnership. This is a logical step forward given the fact that by the time of signing the agreement the economic and political context of both parties was under going transformations that warrant a rethink of the EU-ACP relations. In the EU in particular there had been a gradual emergence of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) that is inherently linked to development co-operation in an international system guarded by the principles of peace, stability and security. This is based on the general conviction that the fundamental principles of development partnership in the 21st Century are geared towards eradication of poverty, and promotion of equality between competing social and identity groups. That poverty and inequality are the key causes of political instability in the new nations of the world cannot be overruled. These challenges chime exactly with the EU’s principles aimed at preserving and strengthening international peace and security. And within the African continent the past one-decade had seen transformations at all levels with the common goal of promoting peace and security and attaining prosperity.

Therefore, on the part of the EU, the intent and purpose of a new political dialogue is to establish a framework for engaging its ACP partners that places premium on issues of governance and instability that hitherto acted as constraints on implementation and co-ordination of past trade and aid policies as stipulated in the former Lomé arrangements. In furtherance of its objective an ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly was created to enhance interaction and co-operation among the member states that had by then signed the Cotonou Agreement. The ultimate rationale for its creation, however, is to enable the participating states implement successive ACP-EU conventions in diverse domains. The Assembly came into operation in March 2003, and had since then taken resolutions on some issues affecting development and peace in the partner states. In that direction the EU has set as its priority the promotion of good governance, conflict prevention and resolution and the establishment of a lasting peace within the framework of the CFSP (ACP-EU 3601/04/fin.) In the realm of good governance, the EU expects its ACP partners to ensure accountability, transparency in government, capacity-building for policy-making and implementation, support for civil society, and ensuring participation of the broad network of private sector and social movements in
the partner countries in aid programming and implementation. Integrated in the scheme of policy are conflict prevention measures such as arms control, illegal arms trafficking, and curbing the use of landmines. In the economic realm the Assembly in its meeting in February 2004 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia adopted resolution on Economic Partnership Agreement in the spirit and letter of the Cotonou Agreement running up to the end of 2007. From then on it has been envisaged in the Economic Partnership Agreements that policies and strategies must be focused on ensuring a “smooth and gradual integration of the ACP states into the world economy, with regard for their political choices and development priorities, thereby promoting their sustainable development and contributing to poverty eradication in the ACP countries” (ACP-EU3643/04/fin.) By the turn of the new millennium, and within the new framework of dialogue with Africa, a Plan of Action was adopted in Cairo in April 2000 that recognised Africa’s NePAD document, was accepted and boosted by the EU. Since then the issue areas for cooperation has been expanding to embrace regional co-operation and integration in Africa, the environment, combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic, external debt, private sector development and food security.

Africa’s part of the new political dialogue, in addition to its responsibility to the governance and conflict resolution component also embraces initiatives that are crucial to enhancing the continents capacity to respond swiftly to the challenges of globalisation, especially in areas of global finance and investment, and information and communication technology. The centrality of these factors in Africa's development is emphasised by the efforts most ACP Africa members are making towards integrating their national economies as embodied in the provisions of the Abuja Treaty establishing the African Union, including their long history of implementing economic reform programmes and structural adjustment under the auspices of the IMF and the World Bank.

Like the Bretton Woods twin institutions the EU has also cut deeper into domains of endeavour that were hitherto considered taboo in its ACP relations, namely, support of societal structures. While the promotion of civil society had been identified as one of the main ingredients of a democratic culture, its engineering from external political actors had always been repudiated by most African ruling elites who have always considered any such venture as intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign nations. However, the intent and purpose of the EU-ACP agreement on civil society are one of the several important steps that had been taken in confidence by African elites to build local capacity and training for democratic decision-making and responsible leadership.

The G8: A Partner or a Standard Setter?

The transformations that had been taking place in Africa since the aftermath of the Cold War in the realms of politics, economy and societal structures gradually opened up a new chapter in the relations between Africa and the seven major industrialised democracies, which is often referred to as the G8. By the turn of the new millennium, a combination of a deepening crisis in Africa, and a show of commitment and action by African leaders to alleviate the extreme suffering of the most vulnerable and poor in the continent gradually won the attention of the international community which was spurred into action in a joint partnership with their African counterparts to work on common goals for eradicating poverty and achieving sustainable development. By the second summit of the G8 in the new millennium in July 2002 in Kananaski, Canada, an African initiated policy blueprint, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NePAD), had for the first time been welcomed by the G8. Prior to this summit an invitation had first
been extended by the G8 to African leaders at Genoa, in Italy in July 2001. That summit culminated in a focus on Africa at Monterrey, in March 2002 where many of the world's wealthiest nations under the summit highlight, 'Financing for Development' pledged to boost the flow of foreign aid to developing countries pursuing sound socio-economic and political policies and reforms. At the global level this new relations had been enhanced by common determination to help Africa achieve adequate growth rates and broader access to markets as signified by the launching of the multilateral trade negotiations by the WTO members in Doha, Qatar, in November 2001 which placed the needs and the interests of the developing countries at the heart of the negotiations. The UN Millennium Declaration and World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg are all important milestones in that process. The G8's response and commitment in support of the African effort is enshrined in the G8 Africa Action Plan.

After decades of subordination, defiance, confrontation, and at times acquiescence in Africa's relations with metropolitan powers since the immediate aftermath of political independence in the early 1960s, the early years of the new millennium as indicated above, had even gone beyond the normal boundaries of co-operation to partnership based on mutual responsibility and respect. However, given the obvious discrepancies between both groups in terms of power and the ability to influence decisions and actions, we are of course bound to interrogate the implications of any such partnership on the African state system in particular, and the universal principles upholding the existence of states in general. In the immediate perspective we might also be justified to interrogate the underlying motivation for action after decades of inaction and rhetoric about Africa's economic woes?

The issues are indeed compelling. Past policy failure had been widely blamed as one of the many and varying causes of Africa's present predicament. However, analysis of the overall crisis also reveal that the obstacles and constraints thereto are both internal and external thus opening up a constructive dialogue between Africa and the industrialised countries aimed at halting the crisis and putting the continent on the path of recovery and sustainability. The events of 11/9/2001 combined with the global fight against terrorism, and hunt for terror cells and preventing potential sources of its growth also had broad implication for Africa. Poverty and squalor, prevalent as it is in Africa, might be fertile grounds for such terrorist’s related activities, according to cross the board expert’s opinion. And for the United States in particular, the most powerful and richest among the G8 members, the surge in terrorism in most of the oil producing countries in the Arab world, and the likelihood of using oil as a political weapon as demonstrated by Saddam Hussein some few years ago, compelled US decision makers to look elsewhere for alternative sources of oil supply of which the African continent appears to be the immediate supplier of any possible short fall in the foreseeable future. But above all, there had also been a growing conviction among the international donor community of their obligation to support and consolidate the efforts African countries had been making at democratisation and appropriate governance, liberalisation, and human rights since the end of the east-west hostilities. Even in the eyes of some British political elite, such as, Prime Minister Tony Blair, there is even a moral obligation on the part of the richest countries of the international community to rescue Africa from its present predicament since extreme poverty, war and conflict among other things constitute a „slur on the conscience of humanity‟.

That new relationship is anchored on the NePAD policy document which the G8 and African heads of states have pledged their commitment to ensure its implementation. The G8 expresses its part of that commitment as follows.
„We welcome this commitment. In support of the NePAD objectives, we each undertake to establish enhanced partnership with African countries whose performance reflects the NePAD commitments. Our partners will be selected on the basis of measured results. This will lead us to focus our efforts on countries that demonstrate a political and financial commitment to good governance and the rule of law, investing in their people, and pursuing policies that spur economic growth and alleviate poverty. We will match their commitment with a commitment on our own part to promote peace and security in Africa, to boost expertise and capacity, to encourage trade and direct growth-oriented investment, and to provide more effective official development assistance”. 29

By this declaration a clear link has been made between good governance, sound policies, restoration of efficiency in the aid delivery system, and development success. Also, in reiteration of their commitments at Monterrey, the G8 agreed to inject new dynamism into the allocation of resources including trade and investment, and official development assistance, and by so doing „this will help ensure that no country genuinely committed to poverty reduction, good governance and economic reform will be denied the chance to achieve the Millennium Development Goals through lack of finance”. 30 The G8’s engagement in support of NePAD also reflects almost the African blueprint itself, covering promotion of peace and security; strengthening institutions and governance; fostering trade, investment, economic growth and sustainable development; implementing debt relief; improving and promoting education and expanding digital opportunities; improving health and confronting HIV/AIDS; increasing agricultural productivity; and improving water resource management. This is indeed a very broad policy engagement that cuts through the micro-macro nexus as regards issues affecting the African continent. Given the relatedness of the G8 Africa Action Plan and NePAD, the former would not be discussed in detail in here in order to avoid repetitions. However, given the importance attached to some aspects of NePAD, such as issues relating to peace and security, promotion of democratic governance and institutions, and efficient corporate governance, some tour d’horizon of the G8 Africa Action Plan might be worthy of this discussion.

In the domain of peace and security, the G8 has pledged to support African efforts at conflict resolution through the provision of technical and financial assistance with the long-term goal of improving the capacity of individual African countries, regional and sub-regional organisations to prevent and resolve violent conflicts on the continent, and be able to undertake peace support operations within the framework of the UN Charter. Of particular reference in this regard is the support for efforts in search of peace in DRC and Sudan, and measures to consolidate peace in Angola and Sierra Leone, while assisting ongoing programmes of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of ex-combatants into society, including post-conflict development. It also expresses it commitment to help curb illicit trade in weapons, and trafficking across national and international borders. These commitments are based on the conviction that there would be no development without peace on the continent, and it is only in a peaceful environment where the institutions of governance can prevail and operate efficiently.

It was in this direction that the G8 unanimously agreed to support NePAD’s political governance objectives through expanding capacity-building programmes that are of crucial relevance to the creation of a sound democratic and civic culture in the partner countries. Selected priority areas include improving administrative and civil services, promoting participatory decision-making, judicial reform, election monitoring, combating corruption, bribery and embezzlement, protecting human and minority rights, improving the role of civil society in the NePAD process, and above all supporting efforts to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women. In the realm of economic and corporate governance such capacity-building measures would focus on the implementation of sound macro-economic strategies, strengthening public financial
management and accountability, protecting the integrity of monetary and financial systems, strengthening and ensuring transparency in the accounting and audit systems, including support for African and international organisations that are striving to realise the objectives of NePAD.

The overall analysis of the NePAD document convincingly points to acute financial constraints on the parts of many African countries, and it is one of the prime reasons that compelled the continent's leaders to turn to the industrialised countries for the financial component of the document. This particular development is however grounded in the deepening marginalisation of Africa in global trade and investment opportunities, which have also prevented the countries of the continent from achieving economic growth and sustainable development. The situation is even exacerbated by the rapid developments that had taken place in global multilateral trade negotiations coupled with Africa's inherent incapacity to participate fully in such negotiations due to lack of trade related technical know-how and expertise. The continent's infrastructure network also leaves much to be desired, trailing far behind the rest of the world. The consensus among both parties at the current stage of their partnership is to empower Africa to participate fully and efficiently in the global trading and financial system in order to stimulate economic activity in all productive sectors with particular focus on achieving sustainability, mitigating against any possible social costs, while endorsing the role of the private sector as key engine for economic growth. In this connection the G8's commitment in the Africa Action Plan, among others, is to help participating African countries in the NePAD process to attract the much needed foreign investment, both from within Africa and from abroad to enable them implement policies that are investment-driven and conducive for economic growth and sustainable development. Given the crucial role infrastructure plays in modern economies the G8's policy support measures for Africa in that regard also includes capacity-building and the transfer of expertise and know-how for the development of infrastructure projects, especially those relating to regional initiatives. The G8 also recognises the need to provide greater market access for African products, and provide support for trade-related technical assistance and capacity building, regional economic integration and intra-African trade, as well as improving the effectiveness of Official Development Assistance (ODA).

Another observable and striking element of Africa's relations to the rest of the world is without any doubt the widening digital divide. Hence the G8 has adopted a programme of action to promote and expand qualitative education at all levels, including promoting research and higher education in enhanced-partnership countries, create digital opportunities, and help Africa make more effective use of ICT with the goal of attaining sustainable economic, social and political development.

However, in retrospection one recognises how Africa had moved from confrontations of the early decades of independence with Northern powers to even go beyond co-operation to embrace close partnership. It is viewed as a calculated attempt to trying to please Northern donors. Such sudden turn of events is not without criticisms. Ashley for example had observed that:

"The document is in essence an attempt to negotiate with Northern powers the terms of Africa's integration into the world economy without challenging the systemic and structural dynamics by which globalisation has further marginalized and created polarisation within Africa, within individual countries and between them" and "As a development plan for Africa its central concern with economic growth and the potential for the „exploitation” of Africa's resources fails to locate the problem of „development” in a much broader context that is people-centred, participatory and based on peoples own efforts". 32

In the foregoing description of the crosscutting nature of the G8 Africa Action Plan, one becomes convinced of the increasing role and importance the industrialised nations
attaches to private transnational actors, such as, NGOs and other private economic actors in delivering their part of that commitment. Bent on bolstering a democratic civic culture in Africa, almost all the G8 members have focus greater part of their resource transfers to Africa with the ultimate goal of building a viable civil society that would counterbalance the role of the African state and state system that had of late lost credibility among the major industrialised countries.

The Role of Non-State Actors

In the early 1990s the donor community began to reconsider the role of aid in the economies of African countries, and concluded that aid delivery to poor countries had barely achieved the results it aimed at almost forty years ago. In countries such as the US and Canada where private organisations have relatively easy access to the national legislatures, lawmakers began to push forward legislation to overhaul the post-World War II practice of government-to-government aid to poor countries. With most African states characterised as being defunct, decay, failing, and overly interventionist, the donor community streamlined their aid delivery systems focusing on individual initiative through minimal state intervention. The US Congress for example, „cut direct foreign development aid appropriations for 1996 to sub-Saharan Africa by about $130 million, a 20 percent drop from 1992-1995, and there had been substantial pressure on Congress to cut it further“. From that period there had been an increasing shift toward private channels that provides incentives for reducing the size and influence of governments in economic policies, while placing special emphasis on the growth of civil society that was gradually emerging in the African political context after long decades of being sidelined in the continent's political entrepreneurship.

Bedevilled as it were by apathy, resignation and disillusionment, civil society from then onwards fell 'prey' to a mushroom of non-state actors also referred to as Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), especially of Northern origin competing to make social, humanitarian and moral gains from the fate of civil society in Africa. The names are many, and the roles are deeply varied. They include the Action Internationale Contre la Faim, Medicine sans Frontieres of France, Belgium and the Netherlands, Catholic Relieve Services, Christian Reformed World, Church World Services, Community of Caring, Plan International, World Vision, Oxfam, Save the Children Fund. They have become the sources of finance and engines of growth in some countries of the South whose national economies are either stagnating or retrogressing. In a bulk of poor African countries such as Djibouti, Malawi, Benin, Rwanda, Burundi, Mali, Niger, Eritrea, Chad, Burkina Faso, Guinea and a plethora of post-conflict regenerating countries, such as Liberia and Sierra Leone, the contributions made by NGOs have become indispensable in a new development paradigm wheeled by democracy, human rights, and good governance, and environmental awareness involving a broad network of actors.

In contemporary global politics, NGOs have also become the main conduits of voicing the plight of the developing world in global forums such as the World Trade Organisation, and International Institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank (calls for debt cancellation, issues affecting environmental degradation and human rights are glaring examples), and addressing issues that affect the poor in global political economy. Whereas the presence of local and foreign NGOs is a welcomed development in Africa's re-democratisation and development process, there are also worrying signals that their growing influence had made them competing actors of development in Africa not without the displeasure of the state which captures their pre-eminence as a threat to
their sources of aid hitherto secured from the West without the middleman role that now seems to be played by the NGOs. Today NGOs such as Oxfam and the European Network on Debt and Development (a network of NGOs from fifteen European countries) have even stronger relationships with international financial institutions, international organisations, and national legislatures and parliaments of Western countries than majority of African states. By bypassing the African state, the West is also sending the indirect message that the state in Africa has failed to live up to its responsibility. It is no wonder that in the Treaty Establishing the AEC/AU there is no reference to external NGOs except their local African counterparts regarding the establishment of relations between the Community and non-state actors. In light of those competing interests between the state and NGOs, Egypt took the unprecedented initiative to regulate their activities under the ‘cloak’ of the simple reason that they duplicate national development programmes. In Liberia during the heights of the brutal dictatorship of Charles Taylor NGOs became the main victims of state and civilian assaults in an environment of dictatorship and all forms of human rights abuses. This kind of political wrestling blurs the transition process in several ways. The state’s resort to unconstitutional methods to counteract the growing influence of NGOs questions its credibility, consistency and commitment to the basic ingredients for democratic growth and consolidation. But some of the problems relates to the posture that had been taken by the NGOs. They are scarcely transparent, and are rarely prepared to share information and co-ordinate their activities. They are even at times accused of inciting local agitation for political change where democratisation is perceived to be stalked by incumbent dictators. In addition, some of the areas of endeavours of some NGOs at the community level such as basic development initiatives negatively impact the creativity of local populations in solving their own problems. Instead of direct involvement, foreign NGOs could easily empower local communities by providing hardly needed fiscal components of local projects, which is needless to say one of the many bottlenecks of the development chasm in most African communities. Ghana has also taken the initiative to regulate the finances and activities of NGOs as some of these organisations have become the channels for corruption, and fast moneymaking ventures by some individuals.

In order to minimise the widening gab of mistrust between actors in the new development paradigm of networks and alliances of groups and individuals, foreign NGOs in particular should reorient their policies to foster local identities and create some form of local ownership of policies to enable them achieve sustainability at the local level. By ensuring transparency, accountability, and local participation, a bridge could be built between state and non-state actors to further the goals of achieving basic human needs and security in an embedded multilateral scheme involving state and non-state actors, trans-national co-operations, international organisations, regional economic groupings, private investors and civil society. A peaceful and co-operative relationship between state and non-state actors will in turn certainly provide a healthy environment for growth of a vibrant civil society crucially needed for democratic consolidation in Africa.

Evaluation and Conclusion

The delineation and analysis of the various state and non-state actors, and international organisations, such as, the UN-system, and the Bretton Woods twin institutions involve in shaping Africa's political and economic path reveals a 'common' commitment, namely, ensuring peace, stability and general security of the international system. In
addition, the obsession by Africa’s international partners to focus excessively on the role of non-governmental organisations and other transnational actors has implications for minimising the role of the African state, which is now perceived as incapable and non-performing in the eyes of powerful states and non-state actors. A stable and less statist African state with minimal elite role in the economic and private spheres also enhances the role of external powers and actors to penetrate and safeguard their hegemonic interests in Africa. Large portions of aid delivery, and efforts relating to the promotion of human rights have all by-passed the state in one-way or the other in Africa. However, investigations have revealed that actual cuts in direct development aid directed at Africa have been offset by new aid for businesses undertaking investment ventures in Africa. As Reno had observed, “the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 1998 increased funding by $650 million for loan guarantees through the official Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and enhanced duty-free access to US markets via the Generalised System of Preferences (GSP). Organisation for Economic Corporation and Development (OECD) member-states have followed a similar course, with modest cuts in Africa aid programs since the mid-1990s, while bolstering support for commercial transactions with Africa”. He further observes “the shift toward economic aid to Africa through increasingly private channels creates incentives for some rulers to adopt non-interventionist economic policies, as intended. Others, however, incorporate this aid via private channels into their political strategies to weather the collapse of their state institutions”.

What then are the implications of this policy shift for the African state and state system characterised by proliferating actors involved in shaping events on the continent? One of the many and varied outcomes is that there is a deepening in Africa’s fragmentation, balkanisation and marginalisation. The G8 does not have a homogenous and clear-cut commitment to Africa. They are only obliged to act in accordance with national preferences and choices and the prevailing capacities of their national economies, including stability of the international system. They do not deal with African states collectively, but selects and choose on the basis of the enhanced partnership as embodied in the G8 Africa Action Plan. And above all, they delegate greater part of their commitment to non-state actors backed at times by legislation and state subsidies. Irrespective of how individual African states confront and manage any such delegated interstate transactions by transnational actors, they are compelled to share sovereignty outward, and even compromise on their territorial integrity, especially on core issues regarding security, and crucial decision-making affecting national interests. This issue becomes even more compelling if one considers the core tenets of the NePAD policy document that directly ties African domestic polices with foreign policies and diplomacy of the industrialised countries, notably the G8. The penetration of powerful transnationals backed by their home governments into African economies creates another echelon of unequal relations between the two, in addition to the already deep and lopsided inter-state relations. Given the fact that most of the host countries are weak in providing adequate and standard security for those firms, the transnationals backed by their home country governments pressurises the former to secure the services of private security establishments of stronger states by occupying and defending an enclave territory where the firms are located. According to Reno, such provision of security by proxy protects the weak states, and enables it to establish alliances with global economic actors including the attendant diplomatic opportunities it may channel to the host state.

Is the compromise on national security and sovereignty a legitimate channel for states in Africa to engage the international community?

But the gist of ongoing discussion is less about the opportunities that weak, fragmented and balkanised African states may reap from their relations with global
political and economic actors. *It is more about the African state and the state system that is failing to exist on universal principles and contending norms of statehood.* If we subject the analysis to the traditional Weberian conception of the state founded on the states' capacity to maintain its territorial integrity, ability to exercise monopoly over legitimate use of force within its boundaries, as well as governing its citizens and subjects through an impersonal system of rules and decision-making, then current developments in the African continent leaves much to be desired. Even in terms of expanded contemporary notions and properties about statehood, such as, capacity to extract resources for its own support and development and rational rule making, all are not within the confines of a greater number of African states. African domestic politics and policies have become an extended arm of foreign policies of the leading industrialised countries. They are Washingtonian, Parisian, Londoner, and Berliner, or Brussels oriented. In the final analysis, fragmentation, balkanisation and marginalisation create conditions for policy and politics to be subcontracted. The *African polity*, on the other hand, has increasingly become alienated, disillusioned, its loyalty parabolic and therefore looks outside for economic redemption. The inherent unequal power relations enable stronger states in any form of co-operation or partnership to impose their will, standards and norms of behaviour on the weaker states.

What then are the consequences of the inherent power imbalances between Africa and her partners? The answer may be broad. The long term effect may be systematic weakening of domestic state authority and control, which development might not be in the interest of Africa's powerful and privileged external partners, and the international system as a whole. But in connection with Africa's prevailing and emerging challenges covering developmental as well as security and environmental among an array of issues, the need for a stronger African state and state system is crucial in the contemporary setting than ever before in the history of the continent. The nature of contemporary development paradigm characterised by subtle alliances of multifarious actors in an international system and global economy wheeled by increasing interdependence and globalisation in which technology, trade and investment flows freely conditions a robust African state. The fragility and vulnerability of some states to open conflict and political violence, the controversial and fluid nature of some state boundaries all points to rethinking the role of the state in Africa. Hence, it is this particular condition which in its self demands a stronger African state capable of directing, regulating, co-ordinating, harmonising and implementing the many and various globally interconnected policies and strategies that have been designed for the continent's development for the 21st Century. The peace, stability and security required for putting the continent on the path of development in the 21st Century cannot bypass the state.

Under those circumstances Africa would require a new leadership that posses not only the political vision, but the economic insight as well in handling the numerous and complex development and security challenges facing the continent. An efficient bureaucracy staffed by qualified and diligent personnel and civil servants could enhance the leadership role, restore confidence, trust and security in all forms of transactions that takes place in a particular country. It is a strong leadership supported by an efficient bureaucracy that would be capable of building the requisite international and global alliances within the current development paradigm to represent the national interest of the hitherto weakened African state in its interaction and co-operation with international partners. In light of such perspectives, the industrialised countries and major international institutions preference for bypassing the African state as an important political and economic actor, and opting for non-governmental actors would not yield any long-term dividends. It is time to support measures for *state capacity* building to enable the state in Africa to compete and bargain effectively in an interdependent and
globalised world. And above all, it is only a strong African state that can strive to reap the opportunities of globalisation in ensuring global equity and justice. The innovative steps taken in the WTO combined with the ACP relations with the former in increasing the negotiating capacity of that group of countries chimes with this thinking. A far reaching step was taken on 10 September 2003 in Cancun, Mexico during the Fifth Ministerial Conference of the WTO whereby a Memorandum of Understanding for closer co-operation was signed between the WTO and the ACP group of countries on providing training, technical assistance and support to negotiators of the ACP member countries. This step expresses not only the growing desire by many African states in their efforts to become more active members of the WTO by developing their capacity to negotiate effectively and to monitor and implement WTO agreements, but more because the African members of the ACP have recognised the dire need for increasing state capacity for effective participation in the global economy.

The logic of that argument is that our focus is on a continent where some states have gained the attribute and category ‘failed states’, some branded economically defunct, others conflict prone, a large number of them have experienced long periods of stagnation, and many now gradually regenerating from decades of civil wars, and occasional genocide. A strong, robust and competitive African state would serve not only the interests of the African state system, but it would equally benefit the continent’s external partners since the state is the ultimate guardian and co-ordinator of external investment, upholder of the principles of democracy and the rule of law, and the only actor that can collaborate with external actors to ensure predictability, transparency and stability in an ‘anarchic’ international system. And in this connection, a viable, stable, peaceful African state and state system would be part of the democratic peace. The tenets of good governance, the responsibility to protect citizens, ensuring equity and social justice are all core duties of the modern state and cannot be delegated to any other body or entity. The deepening fragmentation, balkanisation and marginalisation of the African continent constituted by fifty-three states, coupled with growing tendency and pressures by the forces of globalisation to subcontract the legitimate obligations of the state in Africa would be a counterproductive venture with disastrous consequences for international peace and stability. This has been partly proven by the instance where the already fragile African state had been dragged into the global war on terror after 9/11 without the corresponding capacity to do so.

By and large the development chasm that has griped the continent since independence cannot be simply overcome by the current condition of some African states whereby transnational and private actors subcontract its traditional duties. Neither could private actors shoulder the task of development alone without active role of the state. Hence there is an urgent need for a sustained dialogue between state and non-state actors to create an environment which is conducive and favourable for their respective roles. Judicial transparency and fairness, accountability and responsibility in politics and corporate transactions are all crucial for restoring confidence among the multiplicity of actors involve in prevailing development paradigm. And finally, as the role of the state in the Asian economic miracle has thought us, the role of the state in African development cannot be subcontracted for the sake of convenience on the part of Africa’s privileged partners.
Part V Regional Policy Making and Implementation in Africa
African Policy Infrastructure vs. Political Realities and Risks: the past, the present and future.

As the euphoria accompanying the gain of independence began to wane, and the promise by the new African elite to deliver the public good gradually failed to materialise, African leaders realised the inherent weakness of the post-colonial state to fulfil its responsibilities single handed. Overwhelmed by the oil-price shocks of the mid and late 1970s, coupled with sustained deteriorating terms of trade, deepening dependence and growing instability characterised by civil and ethnic wars, chronic military coup d'état, declining capacity utility at all sectors, poor performance of major infrastructural facilities, large budget deficit, rising levels of unemployment and inflation, external debt overhang, weak industrial base, a weak private sector, inefficient public utilities, low quality social services etc., there emerged an increasing urgency among African leaders to form a collective platform to battle the inherent domestic and external constraints of the continent's development and security. Another aspect of the post-independence disillusionment was Africa's poor progress towards streamlining its external relations, especially with the major industrialised countries manifested by the global quest for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) in the late 1970s, and the subsequent failure of the Paris Conference on International Economic Co-operation, which failed to reach agreement on a Common Fund. However, at the same time the 'successes' chalked at the inception of the Lomé Conventions also paved the way for a common African front in promoting continental wide integration and development projects. The main conduits for realising the goals for common action was of course the OAU, given her global outreach to the UN-system in particular and other key international and regional organisations.

The general picture across the length and breadth of the continent was Africa that had sunk into oblivion, fragmented by superpower ideological rivalry, economically defunct and cash strapped, living in despair, squalor and pestilence. This informs us of the collapse of the general policy infrastructure at the regional, sub-regional and national levels. The various sectors, Agriculture, Health, Science and Technology, Economy, Education and Human Capital Development, Information and Communications Technology, Transport, and Industrial Manufacturing all fared below capacity.

Far back in the 1960s African leaders realised the potential of economic integration as basic prerequisite for achieving the objectives of the OAU’s efforts at resuscitation and development of the continents security and economies. However, a more concrete initiative for economic integration of the continent did not take place until the mid 1970s. That initiative to establish an African Common Market took shape during the 11th Extraordinary Session of the OAU Council of Ministers in December 1976 where the Kinshasa Declaration was adopted. It was an irony of fate that the main steam behind the initiative to establish an African Common Market was President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire, who suggested the creation of an African energy commission, an African planning institute, an African data bank, and by institutionalising the conference of ministers responsible for economics, finance and trade. While the adoption of the proposed initiative was downplayed by many observers as part of a calculated political courtesy to the leader of the host state, African inter-state interaction had by the following couple of years produced two important policy initiatives that became the bedrock of any future talk of collective platform for economic action in the continent. These were the Monrovia Declaration of Commitment on Guidelines and Measures for National and Collective Self-Reliance in Social and Economic Development for the
Establishment of a New International Economic Order”, embodied in a resolution passed at the 16th session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the OAU held in Liberia in July 1979, and the Lagos Plan of Action for the Economic Development of Africa adopted by a special summit in 1980. And as pointed out elsewhere in the discussion, in the aftermath of the Cold War, given the changing international political and economic context, African leaders also adopted the Abuja Treaty establishing the African Economic Community/African Union. Constitutional changes have also been effected to facilitating the transition of the OAU to the African Union. For any observer of African political affairs these are just core documents supported by a plethora of summitry protocols and declarations all designed to resuscitate Africa's deteriorating economic condition since the late 1970s.

Among the many questions worth investigating in this chapter are the possible reasons for failure situated not just within the African continent, but also how the harsh international political and economic environment factored the continent's policy incapacity and inaction. But above all, one would also inquire how African leaders perceived or failed to perceive the political realities and political risks that had the potential to negatively impact their initiatives, declarations, and protocols at their sub-regional and continental annual summits, including their kind of imagination and consciousness of the prevailing domestic and external politico-economic context. It is in the light of this investigation that it is deemed necessary to systematically delineate, analyse and evaluate key past and present policy documents, and protocols relating to Africa's transformation and integration under the auspices of the former OAU and the newly formed African Union.

Within that framework of analysis we do bear in mind that the OAU's Assembly of Heads of States and Government (AHSG) was the sole decision-making organ on matters affecting the continent. That had also not changed much under the African Union. The office of the Secretary-General, now the office of the Chairman of the Commission, was, and is still subordinated to the AHSG. Its structure, functions and regulations are still determined by the Assembly of the Union. In the past, the Secretary-General was, and today the Chairman of the Commission is, always mandated, authorised, requested, obliged, or recommended to act in collaboration with others, without any modicum of autonomy. Even though a court of justice to regulate the actions and excesses of the members of AHSG had been part and parcel of the Act, it still remains an African dream. An independent, functionally efficient, parliament that would guarantee the full participation of African peoples in the development and economic integration was an anathema in African inter-state relations under the OAU, and has also still not materialised under the AU despite its urgent presence in the CAAU. Even though these institutions have been put in place, and there is a growing commitment for doing more, their establishment is one thing, and their efficient, transparent and fair operations is also another matter all together. The general implication of this is that the regional body had lacked a robust, efficient, and institutionally capable policy infrastructure that could have come to grips with the acute economic, social and political crisis that had beset the continent right from the dawn of independence. That inherent weakness revealed itself in the various policy documents and declarations for economic development since the establishment of the regional body in the immediate post independence era. The difficulty inherent in current analysis is that neither the OAU nor its successor, the AU has operated as full fledged political systems. The deliberations of the continental body and its decision-making mechanisms have always been under the direction and control of the AHSG and the Council of Ministers. This reduces the analysis to investigating policy documents employing the
tools of discourse analysis. The following key documents might worth discussion and analysis in that light.

The Monrovia Declaration

Africa's part of the South's quest for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) in the late 1970s took reflection in the OAU's Monrovia Declaration (1979) on guidelines and measures not just for national and collective self-reliance in social and economic development of the continent, but also unambiguously called for establishment of a just and equitable world economic order. An order that takes into accounts the socio-economic structures, productive capacities and even constraints of the periphery countries of the South. Under the prevailing harsh international economic system, African leaders individually and collectively were for the first time in the history of regional integration in Africa determined to restructure their economic and social strategies and streamline their development programmes to achieve rapid socio-economic transformation and create the enabling environment for a solid domestic and intra-African indigenous base for a self-sustaining, self-reliant development and economic growth. Even at the height of the Cold War, and also in the context of low accountability by states in their internal affairs, African leaders realised that the creative initiatives of the peoples of Africa could only be harnessed for rapid economic development, scientific and technological innovation only under a political regime that protects human rights and democratic freedom. Hence, aware of the basic prerequisites for realising their goals the collective African leadership declared as follows:

1. “That we commit ourselves individually and collectively on behalf of our Governments and peoples to promote the social and economic development and integration of our economies with a view to achieving an increasing measure of self-reliance and self-sustaining;”
2. That we commit ourselves individually and collectively on behalf of our Government and peoples to promote economic integration of the African region in order to facilitate and reinforce social and economic intercourse;
3. That we commit ourselves individually and collectively on behalf of our Governments and peoples to establish national, sub-regional and regional institutions which will facilitate the attainment of objectives of self-reliance and self-sustaining;
4. That more specifically, we commit ourselves individually and collectively on behalf of our Governments and peoples to:
   a) Give an important place to the field of human resources development by states to eliminate illiteracy;
   b) Put science and technology in the service of development by reinforcing autonomous capacity of our countries in this field;
   c) Self-sufficiency in production and supply;
   d) Complete implementation of the programmes for the United Nations Transport and Communication Decade for Africa;
   e) Sub-regional and regional internally located industrial development;
   f) Co-operation in the field of natural resource control, exploration, extraction and use for the development of our economies and for the benefit of our peoples and the setting up of appropriate institutions to achieve these purposes;
   g) The development of indigenous entrepreneurial, technical manpower and technological capabilities to enable our peoples to assume great responsibility for the achievement of our individual and collective development goals;
h) Co-operation in the preservation, protection and improvement of the natural environment;
  i) Ensure that our development policies reflect adequately our socio-cultural values in order to reinforce our cultural identity;
  j) Take into account the dimension of the future in the elaboration of our development plans including studies and measures aimed at achieving the rapid socio-economic transformation of our states.**

These commitments were not made in a vacuum. There was at least a common consensus against the background of their different cultures, distinctive values, and special attributes that each member state of the OAU may possess. That common line of understanding shared among the collective African leadership was that the smallness and fragmentation of the newly independent states markets and productive capacities constituted a major constraint to achieving sustainable economic growth and development. Hence, at the economic level the obvious policy consequence was intensification of inter-state interaction, promoting dynamic interdependence among the member states at the national, sub-regional and regional levels that would eventually pave the way for the establishment of an African Common Market that would also lead to the formation of an African Economic Community.

But the question to be asked by any true observer of African affairs is that, were there any correspondences between those declarations and the show of commitments thereto with the prevailing political reality at the regional and international levels? The time and context of Africa's short post-colonial political history and events of the late 1970s combines to raise doubts about the true intentions and actions of member states of the OAU. By that period Africa's balkanisation and fragmentation had gone beyond the traditional boundaries of the Francophone-Anglophone-Lusophone constellation to assume trappings of East-West superpower rivalry, military rule and dictatorship became the norm of governance, and almost two-thirds of heads of state in Africa were either full-fledged military regimes, or a deceptive military cum civilian alliance regime. One of the most brutal dictators, Idi Amin was in 1975 Chairman of the OAU, and addressed the UN General Assembly on behalf of Africa. While the member states of the OAU declared in Monrovia in 1979 to uphold the principles of human rights and democratic freedom, a large number of the leaders back home were either exclusively serving ethnic or sectional interests, or ruling according to their personal whims and caprices, eliminating their political opponents and peoples and groups with alternative views by killing, lynching and torture. Corruption even became an accepted norm of politics and governance. It would be platitudinal to go through the list here. But the constraints for ensuring effective policy formulation and implementation were not only internal. The point had been clarified in various contexts in this work, but suffice it to emphasise that the inequities of the international economic system in the areas of production and exchange still hampers growth and development in many poor countries of the South. A year after the Monrovia Declaration this particular concern was to push farther African heads of states to adopt common decisions on issues affecting economic development and growth in the African continent. It therefore provided the basis for the policy direction of the 1980s.
By the turn of the 1980s Africa’s economic plight had neither shown signs of improvement, nor did the existing global strategies that had been designed for restructuring African economies produced any tangible results. During that period the key global response to Africa’s crisis took shape in the form of the *Brandt Report*, which in content and substance shared the expectations of the countries of the South, particularly in Africa. It recognised, and thereby articulated the growing interdependence between national economies, and mutuality of interests between the rich countries of the Northern hemisphere and economically disadvantaged countries of the South. The report reiterates the concerns of the South as embodied in the NIEO, and emphasised the importance of Multinational Corporations in global production and trade, underlined the significance of private direct investment and capital flows to developing economies, injection of fairness and justness both in accessibility to global resources and in distribution of global income and resources, and above all the transfer of appropriate technology to the South. However, despite the good intentions of architects of the report, the views, voices and perspectives of its critics who were bent on preserving the economic hegemonic interests of the industrialised countries smothered the implementation of the report.

It was this disillusion that propelled the OAU member states to take urgent action within the framework of the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA) and the Final Act of Lagos to provide the requisite political support to put the continent on the path of rapid self-reliance and self-sustaining development and economic growth. As a policy document, the LPA was a crosscutting initiative that embraced regional development strategies in key areas, such as, regional integration, industrialisation and systematic transformation of the socio-economic, institutional and physical infrastructure of the continent planked on the notion of *interdependence* and *mutual interests* of the member states of the OAU. Hence on the basis of that recognition the OAU member states reiterated their commitments in the Monrovia Declaration, and declared as follows:

(i) "We commit ourselves, individually and collectively, on behalf of our governments and peoples, to promote the economic and social development and integration of our economies with a view to achieving an increasing measure of self-sufficiency and self-sustaining”

(ii) "We commit ourselves, individually and collectively, on behalf of our governments and peoples, to promote the economic integration of the African region in order to facilitate and reinforce social and economic intercourse”

(iii) "We commit ourselves, individually and collectively, on behalf of our governments and peoples, to establish national, sub-regional and regional institutions which will facilitate the attainment of objectives of self-reliance and self-sustaining”.

(iv) More specifically, we commit ourselves, individually and collectively, on behalf of our governments and peoples, to:
(a) give an important role to the field of human resource development by starting to eliminate illiteracy;
(b) put science and technology in the service of development by reinforcing the autonomous capacity of our countries in this field;
(c) achieve self-sufficiency in food production and supply;
(d) implement completely the programmes for the UN Transport and Communications Decade for Africa;
(e) realise the sub-regional and regionally internally located industrial development;

(f) co-operate in the field of natural resource control, exploration, extraction and use for the development of our economies for the benefit of our peoples and to set up the appropriate institutions to achieve these purposes;

(g) develop, indigenous entrepreneurship, technical manpower and technological abilities to enable our peoples to assume greater responsibility for the achievement of our individual and collective development goals;

(h) co-operate in the preservation, protection and improvement of the natural environment;

(i) ensure that our development policies reflect adequately our socio-cultural values in order to reinforce our cultural identity; and

(j) take into account the dimension of the future in the elaboration of our development plans including studies and measures aimed at achieving a rapid socio-economic transformation of our states.

(v) "We hold firmly to the view that these commitments will lead to the creation, at the national, sub-regional and regional levels of a dynamic and interdependent African economy and will thereby pave the way for the eventual establishment of an African Common Market leading to an African Economic Community".

(vi) "Resolving to give special attention to the discussion of economic issues at each annual Session of our Assembly, we hereby call on the Secretary-General, in collaboration with the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, to draw up annually specific programmes and measures for economic co-operation on sub-regional, regional and continental basis in Africa".

The background to this declaration was that the collective African leadership had realised by the turn of the 1980s that their efforts for restructuring their economies in the post independence era were not producing the expected outcomes. The continent had still remained the least developed compared to other regions of the world. By that time the continent was home to 20 of the 31 least developed countries of the world. Disease, exploitation underpinned by racism, neo-colonialism, and apartheid prevailed against the goodwill of the leaders and peoples of the continent. Agricultural production was and is still incommensurate with population growth thus giving room for acute food shortages and malnutrition and exposure to diseases. The continent's total GDP was only 2.7 per cent of the world’s per capita income and averaging US $ 166. A large number of the countries in the continent depend on single commodities for exports which fact makes them highly susceptible to the vagaries of the international pricing system. Interstate conflicts and acts of political destabilisation and violence covered almost the length and breadth of the continent.

Hence, in order to achieve their goals against that horrific socio-economic background, the LPA set basic guidelines that should be borne in mind by all state actors in their decisions and actions:

(i) “Africa's huge resources must be applied principally to meet the needs and purposes of its peoples;

(ii) Africa's almost total reliance on the export of raw materials must change. Rather, Africa's development and growth must be based on a combination of Africa's considerable natural resources, her entrepreneurial, managerial and
technical resources and her markets (restructured and expanded), to serve her people. Africa, therefore, must map out its own strategy for development and must vigorously pursue its implementation;

(iii) Africa must cultivate the virtues of self-reliance. This is not to say that the continent should totally cut itself off from outside contributions. However, these outside contributions should only supplement our own efforts; they should not be the mainstay of our development;

(iv) As consequence of the need for increased self-reliance, Africa must mobilise her entire human and material resources for her development;

(v) Each of our states must pursue all-embracing economic, social and cultural activities, which will mobilise the strength of the country as a whole and ensure that both the efforts put into, and the benefits derived from development are equitably shared;

(vi) Efforts towards African economic integration must be pursued with renewed determination in order to create a continent-wide framework for the much-needed economic co-operation for development based on collective self-reliance."

On the basis of those guidelines, the LPA set ambitious targets in key sectors. A 7% growth rate predicated on the set outcomes to be derived from a genuine agricultural revolution, 4% annual industrial growth, and a 2% share of world industrial output for Africa by 2000 in reflection of the UNIDO industrialisation plan (also dubbed the Lima targets) and a wide range of integration to be achieved on several fronts, economic, social (gender issues, especially role of women in development), cultural and political. In furtherance of these objectives the LPA proclaimed the years 1980-1990 the Industrial development Decade in Africa. In light of the fact that self-reliance did not connote absolute autarky from the international system the LPA reiterated the duty owed the developed countries in helping Africa in her industrialisation efforts, especially on matters relating to capital flows and transfer of technology. On that particular point the AHSG urged the General Secretariat to enlist the active support of the international community and relevant international organisations.

To every observer that is indeed an in-depth recognition of the key aspects of the African crisis by the OAU member states. Were the intentions, beliefs and adopted solutions of the leaders to resuscitate the continent from her economic woes commensurate the strategies for achieving their goals? And more so to critical observers did the respective economic capacities and the political will of the individual African states go beyond their intentions to practical implementation in the praxis? Was the OAU as a regional organisation and the sole agent for transformation and integration of the continent robust, persuasive and compulsive against the actions of the member states? Did it possess the requisite supervisory and juridical powers to effect implementation, sanctions and even the coercive powers to bend the member states to the collective will of the organisation?

In his delineation and analysis of the OAU’s capacity to promote economic development, particularly on viability of the LPA achieving its goals, Ravenhill, had noted that:

"The Lagos Plan of action is replete with recommendations and exhortations, is almost totally lacking in commitments. Although the Final Act of Lagos reaffirms the decision taken in Monrovia to establish an African Economic Community by the year 2000, it is extremely vague on the means by which this will be implemented".

He further argues that the apparent lack of support for the OAU’s efforts to promote economic co-operation among the member states is not necessarily the outcome of a
perverse lack of political will but from a deep-rooted, “lack of faith in the prospect of the proposals actually producing the benefits envisaged by their proponents”. **13** Neither did the OAU possess the capacity to go beyond the symbolic actions taken by the AHSG at annual summities to adopt *rule making* and *enforcement measures* as regards the actions of the member states, nor could it shape a common ideology for the path of self-reliant development it proclaimed to have adopted.

Beyond that there is still another pertinent factor as regards the dismal performance on the goals set by the LPA, namely lack of *institutionalisation* and capacity-building to empower the state and private actors, and individuals engaged in the integration and development effort. That same factor, as noted, had been a painful oversight for the Bretton Wood’s institutions and the EU in their quest for solutions to Africa’s stagnant economies. The logic and potential of this factor if examined on the basis of current transformations would reveal unambiguously to the observer that the commitments made by the OAU member states less of institutions and capacity-building was a clear indication or proof of how noble intentions are unmatched by corresponding means and resources for realising them.

But if one considers the absolute rejection of the NIEO proposals by the West, which also bears trappings of the LPA, would the same developed countries on the grounds of any economic reasoning, not alone a moral one, have embraced Africa’s initiatives for self-reliant strategies of development? If NIEO suffered direct rejection by the developed world, the LPA suffered a similar fate as soon as the Bretton Woods institutions began to lay their economic onslaught on the continent in the form of neo-liberal market-driven strategies that are needless to say in overt contradiction to the guidelines and principles enshrined in the LPA. No wonder in the same year that the LPA was adopted, the World Bank’s 1980 plan for sub-Saharan Africa took expression in the *Elliot Berg Report* that juxtaposed solutions to Africa’s economic woes on maximum demands of global capital and mechanisms of the market in open contradiction of the guidelines set out by the LPA. The LPA did not run its full policy duration of the projected year 2000 had the Bretton Woods institutions captured to their fold almost two-thirds of African countries, including non-Sub-Saharan countries.

Another dimension of the problematic surfaced in the form of the deepening partnership of Europe of the EEC with its special relations with ACP countries. The ensuing economic dependence and unequal power relations, no doubt, ran parallel to tenets of the self-reliance guidelines called for in the LPA, thus creating divided loyalty on the part of the many countries in Africa that are part of the EEC-ACP convention. Their massive presence dictates that they are to be subjected to the iniquities of the international pricing system for their primary commodity exports that had been the major cause of unequal distribution of income and global resources.

In another critical perspective, subjecting the document to critical *text analysis* can also easily identify the difficulty associated with the LPA as a genuine blueprint for the transformation of Africa’s socio-economic structures. Here, the role of *language* in the *construction of reality*, *revelation of symbolism*, and *articulation and implementation of action* would be of valuable importance in understanding some of the core issues of the document. While the document emphasises specifics on its declarations and commitments, statements regarding implementation are either semantically flawed, vague, or loaded with rhetorical strategies, thus creating dissonance between *language* and *action*. As stated in the preamble of the document, (see paragraph 3) reference is made of „the need to take urgent action...” and in section (iv) of the same paragraph commitments in crucial areas of the African crisis were made by using statements whose linguistic items include „More specifically...”. Even more serious were statements made in sections (v) „We hold firmly to the view that...” and (VI)
"Resolving to give special attention to...": For all these statements the leaders had their people in mind and as such the commitments made by them "individually and collectively" were made "on behalf of our governments and peoples". As far as language use is concerned one does not need to be tutored to capture the power of the above statements. Wherein lay the correspondences between the beliefs, expectations, shared knowledge about the world, and the politico-economic context of their decisions and actions? Was the option for a self-reliant path of development the appropriate decision at a time when total control of the economies of Africa was rather externally oriented?

To accuse the architects of the document and their leaders of being deprived of imagination and consciousness would imply affirming their innocence about the prevailing international order and its effects on the continent. As pointed out above, the forms of governance practised, promotion of ethnic and sectional interests, corruption, lack of participation, absolute state controls in all facets of life, myriad external loyalties, are all inimical to a self-reliant strategy of development. Most of the economies were defunct, griped by debt, or dependent on single commodities for export and thus have any significant share of global trade, and investments are only externally driven, with little or no mobilisation of internal investments resources. And corrupt, parasitic and non-patriotic as the leadership was, the little state resources were siphoned out of the respective countries into the financial centres of the industrialised world. And the bottom line was that indigenous factors, such as human resource and the requisite technological edge, civic culture, bureaucratic efficiency and legal order, were all in one form or the other non-existent in many member states of the OAU. In other words the strategy they adopted had no modicum of foundation or a springboard towards self-reliant development. What then were the leaders up to?

Indeed, the leader's response to African crisis from the eighties was just the beginning of ritualising African summities to create the impression that at least disempowered and desperate as they may be in the context of the harsh international economic order, they are still at grips with African problems. Statements and pronouncements made there from became a shield against responsibility and accountability. The leaders intentions are perhaps well captured by Ravenhill when he opined that:

"For political elite's, the great virtue of the plan is that it does not force them to make difficult choices: Even when the deadlines for taking specific actions pass - for example, for the establishment of regional preferential trading areas - Leaders can plead force majeur and continue to make rhetorical commitment to the plans objectives".14

The evidence became clear in the praxis only a decade after making those declarations. The LPA envisaged regional integration with the ultimate goal of achieving an African Common Market by the year 2000 in six phases. As had been noted, the 1980s failed to deliver the expected policy outcomes. However, by the beginning of another new decade African leaders had made new commitments under the Abuja Treaty of 1991 to establish an African Common Market in six stages of variable duration over a transitional period not exceeding thirty-four years.

Without drawing any hasty conclusions at this stage of the analysis, suffice it to surmise that after almost two decades of independence the leadership structure in Africa was far from being able to institutionalise policy, built the requisite policy infrastructure and bureaucracy to facilitate implementation and action of their decisions. And no wonder, the LPA blueprint bears semblance with today's efforts for transformation and reconstruction taking place in the continent. That point of semblance with the NePAD document was the optimism of the authors of the LPA that the industrialised countries
would allow a massive transfer of financial resources, technology and know-how, including allowing free access of African exports into the developed markets of the industrialised countries. As Nwokedi and Mutambuka had noted:

The expression of such optimism by the African blueprint is, therefore, an exercise in self-deception and grossly exaggerates the factor of „benevolence“ within the dominant international mode of production and exchange" \(^{15}\)

How far had the situation then changed in the aftermath of the Cold War, and the changing effects it came to bear on the international system and African interstate relations? Is the Abuja Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community and the AU going to make the difference in a new era?

**The Abuja Treaty**

Even though the African leadership ushered in the 1980s confident that the decisions that they had at the dawn of the decade taken would produce the outcomes they expected, the end of the decade rather produced statistics and images about Africa that were unprecedented in the continent's political and economic history. Contrary to declarations of the 1980s as Africa's industrial decade, the continent witnessed the worst industrial output and global share in trade due to declining commodity earnings and tightening of international markets. Population growth dramatically galloped over food production, and the increasing debt of African countries in the 1970s had then assumed heights of a burden causing economic stagnation. The basis for sovereign rights of some states was challenged, as they could no longer honour their responsibility to protect their citizen’s lives and properties. The failure of governments to master the storms of the 1980s in general created fertile grounds for acts of destabilisation and instability, civil strife and failed development strategies. In all, the 1980s was declared as Africa's 'lost decade' as had been pointed out already. At the same time however, the turbulent global changes that took expression at the end of the Cold War brought new hopes for a new international order.

As indicated in the introductory section of this discussion, Africa's share of the changes taking place in the world at that time took the form of a long range of structural transformations and reconstruction crucially needed to revamp most of the continents economies and political structures. In the realm of regional policy action, in 1991 the OAU adopted the Abuja Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community and the process leading to the formation of the African Union. In its content the document reflects the core goals and interests expressed by the collective African leadership for the attainment of a common market and continental wide integration, and thus reiterated the goals of the LPA and the Final Act of Lagos in 1980. However, this time around the changing international order starkly influenced the philosophical foundation, the conceptual framework, and strategy for realising the objectives of the Abuja Treaty. Hence, the contracting parties of the Abuja Treaty collectively affirmed and declared their adherence to some basic principles to enable them create the enabling environment for pursuing the objectives of the Treaty.

Key among these principles were strict adherence to equality, interdependence and co-operation in African inter-state interaction, show of solidarity on common matters affecting the continent, and collective self-reliance, harmonising and co-ordinating economic activities at the national, sub-regional and regional levels, observance of the legal system of the Community, peaceful resolution of conflicts among member states, enthroning and protecting the rights of citizens within the broad framework of the
African Charter on Human Rights and People's Rights, and above all ensuring accountability, economic justice, and popular and active participation of Africans in development. The context, the background and participating actors shaping Africa's political economy had already been discussed at length in the course of this work. The objectives of the Abuja Treaty and for that matter the envisioned Economic Community shall be:

(a) “To promote economic, social and cultural development and the integration of African economies in order to increase economic self-reliance and promote an endogenous and self-sustained development;
(b) To establish, on a continental scale, a framework for the development, mobilisation and utilisation of the human and material resources of Africa in order to achieve a self-reliant development;
(c) To promote co-operation in all fields of human endeavour in order to raise the standard of living of African peoples, and maintain and enhance economic stability, foster close and peaceful relations among Member States and contribute to the progress, development and the economic integration of the continent; and
(d) To co-ordinate and harmonise policies among existing and future economic communities in order to foster the gradual establishment of the Community.”

In order to create an enabling environment to promote the attainment of the envisioned community, African leaders collectively recognised the role played by the existing Sub-regional Economic Communities (SRECs) and therefore made commitments to strengthen them, and encourage the establishment of new communities where they do not exist. Given the objectives set for themselves and the goals of a continental wide integration, the various SRECs should facilitate agreements aimed at harmonising and co-ordinating policies that would pave the way for the promotion and strengthening of joint investment programmes in production and trade and other key products and economic inputs within the framework of collective self-reliant strategies embodied in the Treaty.

Recognising the potentials of inter-African trade, the contracting parties are to ensure the liberalisation of trade by lifting major barriers to trade such as customs duties and Non-Tariff Barriers in order to create conducive conditions for establishing a free trade area at the various sub-regional levels. National policies affecting key sectors such as agriculture, industry, transport and communications, energy, natural resources, money and finance, human resources, education, culture, science and technology should all be harmonised and co-ordinated to reflect the goals of achieving a common trade policy, a common external tariff, and a common market. Also conscious of the fact that lack of appropriate and functional institutions had been one of the major causes of policy failure in Africa, the Abuja Treaty enjoins all existing African multinational institutions to harmonise and rationalise their activities so that these institutions would be transformed into organs of the community.

Also aware of the role of information technology in all facets of development, the contracting parties declared to ensure the establishment of close contacts and promotion of information flow among trading organisations to enable them adopt innovative marketing strategies. And for the first time in African inter-state interaction, the leaders individually and collectively took it upon their shoulders to adopt measures to harmonise and co-ordinate their national environmental protection policies. In its general undertakings, one novelty in the treaty is that, the heads of states of the then OAU also for the first time agreed to subject member states to sanctions upon their persistence failure to honour the general undertakings of the Treaty or fails to abide by
the decisions or regulations of the Community. The decisions thereto are however, the exclusive prerogative of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government (AHSG) upon recommendations of the Council of Ministers. The kind of sanctions may include the suspension of rights and privileges of membership. Likewise, lifting of sanctions remains the legal prerogative of the said institutions. For modalities for the establishment of the Community see introduction.

But one thing worth mentioning at this stage in connection with the said modalities for the establishment of the Community is that the projected transitions from one stage to another would be based on the accomplished objectives of the Treaty as declared by the Assembly in reference to a particular stage of the transition process whereby the said objectives are implemented and all commitments fulfilled. The organs of the community shall be the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, the Council of Ministers, the Pan-African Parliament, the Economic and Social Council, the Court of justice, the Commission, and the Specialised Technical Committees. The organs and functions of the Community are quite similar to the organs and functions of the Union, except that the Executive Council of the Union has the Council of Ministers of the Community as its counterpart, and likewise the Commission (Secretariat of the Union) and the General Secretariat of the Community.

While space, time and the need for brevity may not permit full discussion of the Articles of the Treaty, the provisions of Article 35 on „Exceptions and safeguard Clauses“ cannot be overlooked. Aware of the negative impact the provisions of Articles 30 and 31 regarding elimination of customs duties among member states of the regional economic communities and elimination of non-tariff barriers to intra-community trade respectively may have on the fragile economies of African countries, the said Article 35 allows member states that makes its intentions and purposes known to the Secretariat of the community in consultation with member states thereof, may have exclusive and special rights to continue impose restrictions or prohibitions affecting key strategic interests. These were in the domains of security, military, export of strategic minerals, protection of cultural, industrial, commercial and intellectual property, environmental protection, protection of infant industries, control of strategic products, and economic transactions with third countries regarding application of total prohibitions on country of origin. The most interesting of the list of exceptions and safeguard clauses, without any doubt, relates to the one on protection of infant industries. While the Treaty cautions against arbitrary discrimination in application of the clause, prevailing economic realities in Africa vis-a-vis customs revenues and protection of infant industries may pose greater challenges for regional economic integration. The reasons are not far fetched. A large number of industries in the African continent excluding South Africa are still at their infant stages, many states depend on customs revenues and proceeds from other trade prohibitions. Above all, a large number of member states of the various sub-regional economic communities suffer from chronic balance-of-payment difficulties that may make the imposition of trade restriction still attractive for many states. The test for the often too much attribute of lack of political will as the major cause of policy inaction in African inter-states relations may once again re-emerge, but this time provided by the challenges embodied in Article 30, 31 and 35 of the Abuja Treaty Establishing the AEC.

Beyond Lack of Political Will

Explanations on past policy failure in Africa have most of the time been attributed to lack of political will as a major contributing factor, among others, for the member countries constituting the OAU, a particular sub-regional body or even a couple of
nations working together to facilitate their co-operation and ensure good neighbourliness. However, beyond this superficial reasoning there are indeed other equally compelling reasons that may influence the decisions of state actors to fulfil or fail to fulfil their part of commitments for implementing common strategies for their common good. Our reasoning and analysis beyond the horizon, may for example, provide highly plausible answers as to why Mauritania for example, decided to withdraw its membership from ECOWAS on the question of monetary union and formation of military Brigade Units, or why the Francophone West African countries have consistently maintained an additional track of integration outside the ECOWAS sub-regional integration framework by holding on to the letter and spirit of UEMOA. Indeed, reasons for such actions may be purely rational as some actors may choose to evaluate the strength and momentum of integration on the basis of the benefits that accrues to them or evaluate the risks involve in fulfilling their commitments in an agreement to justify the consequences accompanied by sharing sovereignty to a supranational authority. In a similar vein, causes of failure are most of the time beyond the capacity of African countries themselves since their domestic economies are starkly influenced by prevailing condition of international political economy, and even decisions taken elsewhere by relatively powerful states of the core capitalist world. In the aftermath of the Cold War and intensification of globalisation, complex emerging issues and proliferation of global actors in influencing global political and economic outcomes have also come to bear on policymakers in their decisions, choices and predictions for success or otherwise.

Also in another perspective, given the prevailing context of globalisation and supremacy of the market and the presence of multifarious states and non-state actors, daily political and economic business also means risk taking of various forms and dimensions. Past policy failure under the auspices of the OAU for example, were conditioned by lack of knowledge about the risks of the international political economy, and thereby the collective African leadership shared a shallow optimism founded on the goodwill and benevolence of its external partners. The optimism of the early 1980s symbolised by the launching of the LPA for example, had by the end of the same decade smouldered in the dark economic history of Africa. In the hardest sense African leaders failed to capture the realities and risks of international political economy before making projections about their collective economic development effort. As far back as the mid 1980s, convinced by the fact that we live „in a world wrapped in a shroud of mystery and risks‟, Onwuka had attempted to subject the LPA to political risk analysis in containing political changes outside Africa that may have direct effect on the implementation of the blueprint for Africa's development. Hence he wrote that:

„The interlocking variables and innumerable actors involved in the areas of trade, foreign policy, national and multilateral development plans have raised the anxiety of decision-makers in reducing, and where inevitable, containing the effects of political risks in decision-making process”\(^{17}\)

In the past, given the hostile nature of the international economic system polarised by the North-South dialogue in search for NIEO by the developing economies of the so-called third world, such a consideration was a right step in the right direction. There was scarcely any incentive for the rich North to make any genuine commitments to development efforts in any region of the South that was not prepared to comply with 'laid down rules of the game' that would enable them to entrench their hegemonic interests at that time. And even today, Africa's search for economic development, growth and prosperity in close partnership with its external allies gives us a compelling reason to give consideration to the application of political risk analysis in policymaking and evaluation. The financing for NePAD with huge external component for example
provides enough evidence for this. Thus, external financial assistance would only be forthcoming and sustaining depending on economic growth in the industrialised countries of the west. And as Onwuka further notes:

"If the western investors are curious about the effects of political changes on their profit, Africa should equally be concerned about the behaviour of the investor to the development effort in the continent"13.

Indeed, there might be a wide range of situations in the developed economies that may negatively impact development financing in Africa. Possible scenarios may include the developed countries response to civil and international conflicts elsewhere that would also imply resource diversification; the global fight on terrorism and organised crime may impact budgetary allocations with unintended consequences for aid recipients; elections and government reshuffle, regulatory and fiscal changes, labour unrest and union activity, downturns in global financial markets, may all have the combine effect of impacting development financing in Africa. The international community’s neglect of the Liberian crisis in the early 1990s and their sharp focus on events in the former Yugoslavia in 1994 is a clear pointer for caution. And even from within Africa itself the prevalence of conflict, instability and lack of predictive tools in daily economic and political business gives further credence to political risk analysis. However, in the broader context of current transformations and integration in Africa political risk analysis might constitute a pivotal tool in overall crisis management by providing early warning system to contain the spill over effects of political disasters arising from political changes and acts of destabilisation. And at the current level, Africa’s search for economic redemption as structured around the NePAD concept and the future formation of an African Economic Community are all quite vulnerable to risks ranging from lack of incentive by member states to sign and implement key protocols, shared fear among many member states about possible bureaucratic and institutional risks that may weaken their already strained capacities. But above all, the anxieties of integration pundits, optimists and sceptics alike boil down to two main concerns.

The first is the financial component of NePAD, which depends on external resource flows, and the second is African states vulnerabilities to political instability. Of course the first raises concerns among African governments working hard to create an enabling environment to attract foreign investors. Towards that direction the NePAD document’s first priority is to „address investors‘ perception of Africa as a „high risk“ continent especially with regard to security of property rights, lack of regulatory framework and operational markets“. The second concern provides enough reasons for foreign investors to be worrisome of where their capital must go. It is against this backdrop that the NePAD policy document has emphasised the need for ensuring the right process, putting in place the requisite structures and mechanisms to reduce risk-taking by the private sector. Steps taken so far reflect NePAD’s component initiatives for Democratic and Political Governance and Economic and Corporate Governance. In between the two levels there are instances of risks situations that produces rolled back effects in the form of economic opportunism as exemplified by the benefits enjoyed by companies doing business in war economies with security guarantees from rebel groups. The case of the DRC, Liberia and Sierra Leone, and Angola are glaring examples. But more significantly, political risk analysis may go beyond country specific conditions to embrace inter-state relations, especially where a particular investor happen to transact business across national borders in a particular region. For example, the states perception, and level of hostilities to one another may constitute legitimate benchmarks for political risk analysis and assessment and possible impact on doing business in the region.
These revelations explain why many regional policies and initiatives for African integration and development have faltered and failed to deliver the public good and fulfil the expectations of ordinary Africans. The various policy blueprints since the 1980s failed to grasp political realities and risks about the domestic and international political economy, while African leaders relied on common solidarity and unity at their annual summities and made commitments individually and collectively as if ‘solidarity’ and ‘unity’ are ends in themselves. Herein lays the rhetoric of a club of leaders most of whom did not even have a modicum of control on their domestic economic policies, let alone making commitments on continental basis to better the lives of their citizens back home whose support and legitimacy they did not have. It is this omission in the total African policy infrastructure of the past that justifies a consideration for integrating political risks analysis in current and future policies and decision-making on the continent.

Political Risk Analysis and Policymaking in Africa.

„In nearly every economic crisis, the root cause is political not economic“¹⁹ This increasing trend, especially in the context of globalisation that is characterised by multifarious actors is causing many to rethink the predictive power of economics alone in assessing and predicting early warnings about economic disasters. As a new sub-discipline of political science, Political Risk Analysis (PRA) gained academic credence in the nineteen sixties and seventies as Western Multinational Companies operating in the developing world began to face the wave of virulent nationalism and various forms of antagonism against western capital due to the exploitative relations it tend to create in those new nations.²⁰ In that particular context and era, the main focus of the debate was to identify and analyse how governmental interference with business operations in a particular political environment creates conditions of risks and uncertainties that would negatively impact the prospects for the profitability of a given investment venture. Hence in that perspective not only the economic climate of a particular country becomes the yardstick for analysis, but also the domestic social and political conditions measured by ethnic and communal tensions, widespread and entrenched socio-economic iniquities and tendencies towards acts of subversion, rebellion, political turmoil, among others. At the same time given the fact that the politics of the period was ideologically laden between East and West, foreign relations between nations factored deeply in the conduct of PRA research work. Another noteworthy development of the nature of research work in that domain of PRA was that most of the literature focused on the risks posed to multinational companies from unstable political systems of the developing world paying less or no attention to the effects of economic and political developments in the industrialised countries on policy in the developing world.

With the intensification of economic and political interaction in the aftermath of the Cold War, coupled with the increasing density of a global network of actors in the fight against the development chasm that had gripped most developing economies, academic concerns had been raised as to the need to consider PRA from host country’s point of view. Thus, in the past while we have observed how Western investors relocate their capital from areas of high political risk to areas of low political risks because of host country’s government non-conformity with contracts or nationalisation of foreign investment without due compensation, little attention had been devoted to the impact of political changes on the development programmes of the host countries. As Onwuka had noted:
Perhaps it is necessary to dualise the theory of political development, one to serve the economic interests of the West, and the other the development objectives of Africa. Thus a political risk analysis of the Lagos Plan of Action will relate to the assessment of those micro and macro political changes that enhance or retard the process of implementing the plan.21

Writing in the context of African political systems of the mid 1980s dominated by military, semi-military, one party, multi-party, and Apartheid regimes, Onwuka identified and assessed the impact of violent political changes on the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action. In here, he equally focused on the international political context, and how regime changes from that source influences and affect economic policy in Africa. He cautioned against methodologies of investigation that rely on political instability as a benchmark for analysis. He opinionated that:

“Political instability that does not lead to a regime change and economic policy changes will have no decisive impact on the Lagos Plan of Action”.

For Onwuka therefore, the most investigative tool of PRA must be:

“Thus what is important is the ideological orientation of the regime - whether or not it revolves around African development and identity” And most important of all he points out that “Political changes are crucial when they lead to a change of regimes and not merely a change of government. Thus political instability per se is not useful as an organising concept in this regard. We are not terribly concerned with a roster of instances of riots, strikes, demonstrations, street killings likely to remove the government of an African country, but only if these indicators are likely to foretell regime and policy”22

Under those circumstances he recommended that it would be necessary to bear the following in mind when doing political risk analysis. First, identification of the objectives of the Lagos Plan of Action (and in this connection including subsequent blueprints for African integration and development, my italics). Second, a close study of the responses of the African regimes with a view of knowing those regimes that have created conducive environment for the implementation of the Plan to enhance the simultaneous analysis of the various risks that would surge in the process. As indicated in the discussion of the LPA for example, we had been informed of the strong commitments made by African leaders to take urgent action to create the requisite political support needed for the successful implementation of the plan towards achieving the goals of rapid self-reliance and self sustaining development and economic growth. We are also well informed of the element of time series and achievement of a common market by the year 2000. In order to capture the intentions and purposes of the various stakeholders of key African blueprints since the early nineteen eighties, especially at the level of the individual states, the sub-regional economic blocs, regional organisations and private groups and institutions, we may need a method of analysis that would enhance the level of prediction about political events and trends, and their impact on policymaking and policy implementation in Africa.

Some Methodological Explorations

PRA as pertains to Africa and undertaken by the host state, multilateral organisation, or a transnational corporation keen on doing business in Africa may likely face some fundamental investigative challenges, especially on issues relating to methodology. And even with regard to doing assessment for the host state the researcher's task becomes too cumbersome as most of the literature on risk assessment has traditionally focused on risks likely to be faced by companies wanting to operate in the host state, and not the risks that are to be faced by the host state in engaging foreign state and non-state actors
in the era of globalisation. In his pioneering work on African policy and risks analysis and assessment, Onwuka identified two major problems, namely, the selection of approach whose tools of analysis will increase the level of prediction, and the problem of data collection or information required to facilitate scientific interpretation of political events, trends, and issues affecting a particular country, a sub-region or a region. Like in every scientific undertaking the insistence here too is on the right methodological technique to reduce the error gab in the analysis. Onwuka succinctly makes this case clear when he wrote again that:

"Thus it will be appropriate for reason of a political risk analysis of the Lagos Plan of Action to devise political theories which would explain what social or economic environment in the developed economies lead to anti-African policy. And given the context of politics in the period he even went on to state that "What theory for example, can explain President Reagan's pro-South African policy in spite of the dangers of an ugly revolution taking place there. The dangerous risk of adopting social theory in analysing political risk of change lies in the level of reliability. If, for example, one cannot be very sure that it is the fear of communism that has forced Reagan to adopt anti-Lagos Plan or pro-South African policy, one needs a perfect theory that could explain the behaviour of the OECD countries, and transnational corporations towards South Africa. That is not easy to come by."

Given the difficulty associated with devising a plausible theory for the task, PRA had also been conducted by analysts applying the stock of knowledge accumulated by political consultants who had lived with and observed regimes for a long period of time and thereby had managed to produce credible forecasts about political changes in a specific area. Others too have most of the time relied on an organisational approach whereby key political resources of a country such as leadership structure, institutions, government ministries and opposition are systematically observed and assessed. Such considerations provide room for tangible prescriptions, and even under stable investigative conditions help make projections and predictions about the many and varying components of a regime.

On the same plane, given the active role of international organisations and institutions on the question of African development issues it would be appropriate to situate the analysis of Lagos Plan of Action and subsequent blueprints within the framework of organisational thinking to enhance the search and identification of coherence and stability of the behaviour of international institutions and groups of donors such as the IMF, the OECD countries, the EU and the G8, among others. The aim here is to enable African stakeholders and policymakers to put in place a mechanism for adopting, reviewing or rethinking their strategy of development in the face of systemic crisis that had direct impact on commitments of their external partners.

In its current state, political risk analysis has gone beyond the traditional boundaries of analysis. Experts now adopts measures that promotes the formation of partnerships that allows risks to be shared with local entities by involving local political entrepreneurs and factions in the discussion of tensions and conditions and potential political dangers. In that regard some companies have become parts of the broad effort in conflict resolution in conflict prone areas where their economic interests are at stake. Others have taken the strategic step of involving local populations in share holdings of the companies so that on the face of any future threats of governmental action against the company, the host country's political elites are compelled to reconsider their actions since not only the company becomes the loser but local shareholders as well. Thus the elements of ownership and mutuality of interests that has characterise prevailing partnerships in Africa chimes exactly with this thinking.

However, a caution of note is that not all situations of instability necessarily create political risks for companies. In Africa in particular there are companies that have managed to establish their economic presence in war torn countries. The flourishing war
economy of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has to be elaborated here. In that country, a Belgian by name, George Forrest, affectionately called Papa Forrest by locals, had successfully established a business imperium by soliciting active support of rival political entrepreneurs and factional leaders involve in the Congo conflict. He promotes political corruption in order to survive. Formulate his own policies, has his own civilian police. But part of his survival has also come to depend on the wide support he enjoys from the Congolese communities in his areas of operations which is made possible not just by the provision of jobs for thousands of impoverished Congolese citizens, but more because of his provision of badly needed community projects where the Congolese state had failed in its responsibility. In September 2002 he was prosecuted by a Belgian Commission of inquiry for plundering the natural resources of the Congo in mineral extraction. In that same period he was arraigned before a Belgian Parliamentary Commission, but was exonerated because of the political and social support of the state elites and communities in the host country. The relevance of this particular example is that, it offers an empirical confirmation of lost of authority of an African post-colonial state, and thereby pave the way for not just transnationals to secure economic enclaves for appropriations, but offers opportunities for local economic predators and their political proxies who seek to ruin the state for their interests in an environment of disorder. Thus, the pattern fits Chabal's identification of political economy of disorder, in explanation of how the post-colonial state has lost its formal structures and survives on informal, personal ties and controls.24

But like any field of scientific endeavour the key challenge for researchers on Africa in the field of political risk analysis would be their ability to collect data, and in this regard data about, and from the industrialised countries and institutions. While Western countries and institutions had always managed to penetrate African countries for their informational needs, on the other side of the coin it still remains difficult for African countries to make any significant counter penetration in terms of data collection.25

However in order to give a birds eye view of the broad category of risks, Onwuka conceptualises the Lagos Plan of Action „as a business firm eager to reduce the consequences of regime changes in and outside Africa in order to implement its continental objectives”26 He therefore classifies risks that are critical to the survival of the Lagos Plan of Action as micro-macro risks. He identifies and characterises the microenvironment as the African continent and the states constituting it, including their activities at the sub-regional and regional level. Micro risks, however relate to possible dangers for the main architects of the Lagos Plan that might surface as a result of regime change that may lead to a significant change of existing economic policy, or actions and decisions that may constitute constraints on operational objectives of that policy. The major stakeholders in this regard are the African states, the sub-regional and regional organisations. Such organisations and bodies with regard to the Lagos Plan of Action in the past had included:

(a) All sub-regional aspiring Customs Union/Common Markets of UDEAC, ECOWAS, Economic Community of the Great Lakes, Southern African Customs Union.
(b) All intergovernmental joint business ventures - West African Cement Industry (CIMAO), Ghana-Guinea Iron and Steel Industry; West African Monetary Union, West African Rice Development Association;
(c) All regional financial and economic institutions, e.g., African Development Bank - ECA and OAU, the Association of African Central Banks and African Centre for Monetary Studies, African Peanut Council and
(d) All non-governmental economic organisations which directly or indirectly relate to African development.  

Under such constellation of stakeholders micro-risks would refer to the effects of regime or institutional changes on the „operational objectives of the Lagos Plan of Action“. Onwuka’s classic example in that regard was how, for example, do institutional and political changes in West African Rice Development Association or a change of regime in Nigeria or Kenya threaten or improve the Food and Agriculture, or science and technology programme of the Lagos Plan. In the more fundamental sense micro-risks may also result from change in policies in areas such as taxation and import duties, controls on repatriation of dividends, convertibility of currency and other governmental actions that may have direct impact on companies profit margin. In the current picture, the AU, the SRECs, the national economies and multinational African institutions, NGOs, and key stakeholders involve in the transformation and integration process captures the micro-risk dimension of the analysis. The risks from within the continent could however be contained by intensive and sustained co-operation among the member states on matters of trade and industrialisation while co-ordinating their efforts at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. But a successful risk management effort would also require periodic analysis, assessment and communication of the feedback information to the relevant policy-making bodies on economic development. Those co-ordinating and monitoring functions also demands that Africa produces the requisite experienced political crisis management experts. Past regional policy failure can be explained by the fact that African regimes in the past failed to engage the services of such experts, or failed all together in recognising the relevance of risk analysis of regional policies.

A Macro dimension of risks spans across external political situations and events that is likely to negatively or positively impact the realisation of the objectives of a particular policy whose survival is closely linked to external political conditions. Such external threats emanate from actions and decisions of major international economic actors involve in shaping the international and global economy. They include a wide range of transnational corporations, the IMF, World Bank, the EU, the OECD countries, the WTO and powerful sovereign state entities such as the US, France, UK Germany and Japan. Their influential role on African development strategies can be explained by the fact that they are the key bearers of modern technology and sources of FDIs that are also the life-wire of any development project, or strategy. In the Cold War era, the dichotomization and polarisation of the international system into East and West, communist and capitalist, friends and foes, as well as the antagonisms it bred, had serious consequences on global investments. In the 1980s for example, one could hardly expect the Reagan Administration to either directly support the investments requirements for the Lagos Plan of Action, or lobby for African investment interests in the Bretton Woods Institutions at a time when his government was vehemently fighting communism in the African continent, while keeping a blind eye on the brutalities of apartheid.

The end of the Cold War however, did not mean the end of the hegemonic interests of Western countries. Needless to say, what has disappeared is their ideological rivalry and hostile postures. The West’s intransigence on entrenching and safeguarding those interests are now manifest in rigid protectionism that continues to compromise the industrialisation and development policies of the developing world in general, and Africa in particular. However, the wave of liberalisation in world financial and technology markets, widespread speculation in financial transactions, coupled with virulent religious fundamentalism and global terrorism, combines to convince
policymakers to rethink the efficacy of current political risk analysis, especially in the African continent where a complex dual process of transformation and integration was put in place in the aftermath of the Cold War. The need for an integrated political risk analysis with multidimensional issue analysis and assessment has become important than ever in the context of globalisation that offers not just opportunities, but risks that spans across disparate distribution of benefits, devastating financial crisis in emerging markets, and the pressures it exerts on the natural environment.

The Way Forward: Integrated Political Risk Analysis (IPRA)

As already noted, during the past one decade or so, the international political landscape has assumed a proliferation of several key words such as liberalisation, deregulation, privatisation, social networking, human rights, democratisation, the rule of law etc. One attendant consequence is that there has also emerge a proliferation of actors involve in shaping the international political and economic system. It is this fact, and the accompanying reality that has also resulted in a dispersal of roles and activities within the international system by those multiple actors whose decisions and actions yield not only opportunities but also produces risks and uncertainties in the global economy. This is where an Integrated Political Risk Analysis (IPRA) of policy in the African continent fits in.

In this framework of analysis several political factors that are likely to result in policy change in multiple areas or sectors are discussed and linked together to facilitate the construction of an analytically rigorous and tractable analysis and assessment of risks both from within and outside the African continent. Even more convincing is the fact that a large number of African countries have move from the politics of confrontation of the past, going beyond co-operation to partnership with Western industrialised countries. Such partnership as embodied in the NePAD document breeds uncertainties, and thus calls for a kind of risk transparency on both sides of the partnership. In that sense sharing information about each other would facilitate policy prediction, and containing possible dangerous risks that may come their way in their mutual partnership. Hence, an IPRA aims to discuss the manner and degree the developed approaches of risk analysis can be efficiently applied in solving some of the political risks in the domain of policymaking and policy implementation. Such an integrated approach provides useful means by which we are able to structure and evaluate complex policy decisions concerning economic viability of development strategies in the African continent at present and in the future. The novelty here is that we attempt to integrate the knowledge of risk experts with that of other specialists, and more importantly, the integration of such analysis into the governmental policy decision making apparatus in a proactive manner, spanning across multiple issues and spaces. It is of course only then that risk assessment would have direct impact on government decision making.

In the modern parlance of experts regarding risk, the notion of risks conjoins two basic ideas, namely that of adverse consequences and that of uncertainty, recognised and unrecognised, manifest and latent, specific and general. Typically, risk analysts distinguish between risk assessment, on the one hand, and risk management, on the other. According to this distinction, risk assessment attempts to evaluate undesirable outcomes and to assign probabilities to their chance of occurrence, whereas risk management involves political decisions as to what should be done to control or otherwise mitigate societal risks. In other words managing the social cost of
governmental decisions, that negatively impact economic entrepreneurship. The adjectival conjoint integrated collocating assessment may go a long way to injected new dynamism in PRA. In brief integrated assessment describes a method of analysis that enables all relevant aspects of a problem to be considered simultaneously. But given the diversity and complexity of African politics it is difficult to consider every detail in that regard. Even under normal circumstances no method of social science analysis, and organisational research techniques could accomplish that task. The attempt to be all inclusive in integrated analysis also entails showing linkages between different parts of a particular problem, and finding how they may be decoupled into discrete, separable issues that can receive individual attention. A glaring example in this regard would be the problematic concerning FDIs flows into Africa, perspective from the various national and sub-regional levels.

One also has to bear in mind the fact that integration is no one dimensional concept. It is at times convenient to distinguish between a horizontal integration and a vertical integration. In a horizontal integration, all outcomes are considered simultaneously, while in a vertical integration the sequence from cause to outcome is considered. Ideally, a full integration considers all facets of an issue at once. Once again the continent's diversity and complexity of issues hover on us to consider both strands of the concept as mutually reinforcing in discussing political risk in the African continent.

It has been argued that the main sources of risks on African policy and strategy for economic development are externally oriented. In that sense integrated risk analysis of the Abuja Treaty Establishing the African Union, the Economic Community of Africa, and the NePAD policy Document would seek to provide answers to some basic questions: What are the likely impacts of global changes in institutional and governmental decisions, economic downturns, and other policy twists and turns in the Western industrialised countries upon the existing strategies for economic development in Africa? And even more so, how could the possible adverse consequences of the changes there from be eliminated, contained or reduced? How do global trade and liberalisation decisions taken by the WTO, for example, affect African economies, their capacity for wealth creation and human security? What terrorism risks exists in Kenya, and to what extent is the constant terror alert on the east African sub-region by the US and Britain affect investment and the tourism industry in Kenya, and economic development in the wider East African integration efforts? How likely is post-war Liberia and Sierra Leone going to plunge into conflict after that shaky peace deal between Charles Taylor and West African leaders? What are the effects of the Ivorian crisis on West African integration, foreign investment and the drive for a monetary union? In the end, how do these events affect the general policy infrastructure and regional integration?

In order to enhance the analysis of whatever possible risks on policy in Africa due to political and economic changes in the Western industrialised countries, one should be able to identify the individual and independent factors or events causing that risk, describe those events, analyse the conditions influencing those events, and making projections of future developments and their impacts on strategies for development in Africa. The relevance of these factors is that they chime exactly with the basic foundations of political science research. But above all, the viability and valuability of PRA would also equally depend on how the results of the independent assessors work is communicated into the policy infrastructure for requisite action or judgement that may be deemed necessary under prevailing circumstances. Hence IPRA only makes sense when it is communicated into existing policy infrastructure.
Interpretation of risks as indicated in the diagrammatic representation in figure 3 begins of course at the global level moving in a descending order through the regional, sub-regional, national and societal levels. At all levels however, the most crucial situation/s
would involve not just the events that are happening, but the decisions and actions that are being taken by the various institutional and state actors elites and their policymakers that are involved in global political and economic bargaining and transaction, and the likely effects they have on African development strategies. In a chronological order the analysis proceeds from global policy change assessment, impact assessment, and risk management. The global economic and political setting serves as inputs to African policy infrastructure. Impact assessment is concerned with the effects of global policy change, institutional change, or regime change in a particular powerful country, or even change of philosophy or ideology of a given global institution or influential actor. The operational objectives of African policy documents, effects of global decisions and policies on growth, integration and standard of living, and the response strategies it receives from the continent constitute endpoints in risk assessment and management of the adverse consequences of global policy changes. Information about risks is further communicated into the continents policy infrastructure via a mechanism of inputs and feedbacks.

For example, at the institutional level the IMF and the World Bank acting within the context of the Cold War notoriously prescribed economic policies to Africa that were far from the principles of self-reliance and self-sustainment embodied in the LPA. Even though not all African countries embraced the Bretton Woods Institutions economic orthodoxy of SAPs, their ability to bring some countries under their fold broke the common African front for achieving the goals of the LPA. The dangers and risks of the sister institutions for the LPA was also reflected in competing policy blueprints that were brought to the fore in the 1980s by the twin institutions (Part IV, section on the role of the Bretton Woods institutions). In the final analysis what was even more crucial was the systematic accumulation of debts by African countries, which fact, as already pointed out severely compromised African countries capability for implementing national policies in order to honour their commitments to the LPA. We should also bear in mind that in the 1980s the social cost of structural adjustment emerged as a shock for many countries implementing SAPs. It took Ghana some time before winning the support of the donor community to adopt a coherent remedy for mitigating the social cost of structural adjustment after five years of stringent implementation of the IMF reform programme. The role of the EEC in the 1980s as indicated did not go beyond the achievement of stability of the international system, as the series of agreements with African countries in the Lomé Conventions failed to address internal efforts for economic emancipation and development in the African continent (Part IV, the EU), especially under the banner of the LPA. The LPA also suffered the ideological onslaught of the capitalist West as the US and its allies in the era of the Cold War balkanised and fragmented African states in her fight against the so-called evils of communism in order to protect apartheid South Africa and Western and Japanese interests in that country. Even more debilitating was the widespread covert and overt acts of destabilisation by the rival superpowers on the African continent for ideological supremacy that produced general insecurity and instability thus denying the LPA the needed peaceful and stable ecology for a take-off. The failure of the OAU's classic intervention in Chad that was wedged in an international environment of superpower power jockeying substantiates how the influence of some external actors could compromise a collective African initiative, so long as the interests of the competing actors diverges with that of Africa's. On the whole, under such hostile international political environment, the bearers of capital and technology had scarcely any economic incentive to invest in Africa during that period, excluding South Africa.

Internally, the situation was neither better for a policy take-off. At the organisational and institutional level, the OAU was hardly prepared for the task of
implementing the objectives of the LPA. It did not only lack the appropriate institutions and capacities, but also the trained and competent personnel. Lacking the expertise, therefore, it no wonder failed to perspectivise the viability of development strategies amidst the surrounding international realities, uncertainties and risks of the time. Nor was existing African leadership at the national levels braced to the task. For them the OAU annual meetings of Heads of States and Government had become a norm, while many others like the Francophone countries looked to France for their economic survival because of the uncertainties that had long loomed over Africa's economic salvation. Corruption, nepotism, exclusion politics, human rights abuses resulted in social disintegration and insecurity of all forms which were inimical to the operational objectives of the LPA. That poverty, war, political instability and technological backwardness had by a decade after adoption of the LPA become the hallmarks of African political economy was no surprise. The reasons for that failure obviously goes beyond the usual claim that lack of commitment, and lack of political will was the key factor in explaining policy inaction in Africa. All that this boils down to is, had African policymakers instituted a coherent risk analysis and assessment scheme, some of the ill effects of risks on policy might have been mitigated without disastrous consequences.

The 1990s ushered in a new era. As noted already, the international political context had been transformed. Apartheid had been disbanded and dismantled. There is a relative sense of transparency and accountability in governance. And for the first time Africa's voice and concerns are being heard and addressed by the G8. There is a sustained dialogue between African governments and the G8 and the European Union on NePAD. African governments have genuinely recognised conflict and insecurity as the major cause of underdevelopment.

The drive for sustaining partnership had gain legitimacy within the OECD countries. In this direction the Development Co-operation Directorate working party on Aid Effectiveness and Donor Practices was set up in May 2003 within the framework of the international consensus reached at Monterrey on the action needed to promote global partnership for development and accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals in the following key areas - harmonisation and alignment, public finance management, managing for development results and untying and procurement of aid. Members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) also agreed to the objective of untying their bilateral development assistance to the least developed countries as a means of "fostering efficient and effective partnership with developing countries, strengthen ownership and responsibility of partner countries in the development process, demonstrate responsiveness to the requests from partner countries and to increase the use of untied aid in order to promote aid effectiveness, and finally to contribute to broader efforts in partner countries to promote their integration in the global economy". Prior to this development, as far back as 1996 the DAC members designed and adopted a "strategic orientation for development partnerships", which finally culminated in the publication of a popular report "Shaping the 21st Century. The contribution of Development Co-operation". In addition to these is the response that had been made by the EU and the G8 noted in the previous chapter.

What then are the implications of these global responses for realising the operational objectives of the Abuja Treaty and NePAD? Are the risks of global co-operation and partnerships diminishing or increasing? If the answer is the former, what are the opportunities to be reaped by Africa in any such global engagements with her privileged partners? If the answer is the latter, how do we identify and manage the risks associated with being part of the globalisation process that had been intensified in the last one decade or so? But among the observed changes that have taken place at the global political and economic levels there are some salient points that need to be emphasised
before one can proceed on any genuine and meaningful analysis of risks at those levels of analysis. It is now quite obvious that lessons had been learnt from past failures. The IMF, the EU, the OECD and a large number of non-state actors have realised how they misplaced priorities either in the form of doing business in Africa with illegitimate political leaders, or operating in an environment lacking appropriate institutional structures (Part IV). There is also a growing sense of concern among a significant number of African political and military elites for failing the citizens of the continent after the glorious days of the immediate period after political independence period.

The crucial point regarding current analysis of risks is that, in addition to the commitments and pledges made by the international community in bailing Africa out of its economic woes, there is hardly any element of „code of conduct“ binding the donor community that assures African countries of sustained flow of assistance in that effort. The implications here are quite clear: risks and uncertainties in global economic transactions between Africa and her partners in the era of globalisation, and the changes in today’s development that affects the sentiments and aspirations of a large number of peoples do come from the global level.

The latter point in particular does send signs of uneasiness in some finance Ministries in Africa. In his address to participants at a colloquium on „Accountability of International Financial Institutions“ organised by the Ghana Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the World Bank Independent Inspection Panel in Accra, Ghana, Mr. Yaw Osafo-Maafo, Minister of Finance and Economic Planning announced that the government of Ghana has drafted a code of conduct that would make the activities of multi-donor budgetary supports more predictable and mutually beneficial. He substantiated the government’s stand by arguing that the rationale was based on the premise that the government is in partnership with such donor countries and that both parties once satisfied with the nuances of the agreements between them must be in the position to play their respective roles. This being a dimension of the general picture showing the degree of reliability and trustworthiness of the donor community, how then does other global contingencies depicted on the diagram affect African policy infrastructure?

The effects of the decisions and actions of the Bretton Woods sister institutions on the LPA in the 1980s are still reminiscent to us. Today, guided by the fundamental values of globalisation and liberalisation, the twin institutions are again preaching verses of the neo-liberal orthodox credo urging impoverished African countries to make recourse to the private sector for solutions to their economic predicament as if that sector in Africa is a given entity equip with ready-tailored solutions. After long decades of decay and mismanagement it is unlikely that a decade of transition and integration could revitalise the long neglected private sector in most African economies to fulfill the demands made by the two institutions. A classic example is offered by Ethiopia. Given the colossal amount of money spend on food aid, and the meagre amount of money for investment in the Agricultural sector (Part III), the IMF’s response to calls for revitalising the agricultural sector in Ethiopia is that the task should be given to the private sector. Calls for investment in storage facilities to halt Ethiopia's perennial hunger were likewise met with the same response. Of course they are not calling on private local entrepreneurs, but expect investment in agriculture and storage to be placed under the control of private foreign competitors, so that in the name of globalisation the task of feeding millions of malnourished Ethiopians would be in the hands of foreign investors guided by the quest for profit maximisation. This new orthodoxy supported and enhanced by WTO rules and arrangements on trade and services, also relates to water supply, electricity, health, communication and transportation.
The role of individual state actors also does influence policy in diverse way in the continent. This is even more so the case if allies turn foes overnight or existing friendship turns out to be marred by events and situations the outcomes of which could not be predicted or calculated. For example, in the West African sub-region, in August 2003, Nigeria led a peace deal in good faith to get rid of Charles Taylor who had then become the main obstacle to peace in Liberia for fourteen consecutive years, but only to incur American displeasure, not only from the White House, but Congress as well because of American insistence on justice first for the ex-dictator and Warlord of Liberia. Since then key Congressional figures have taken a strong stand against the West African giant on issues of human rights abuses with occasional threats of sanctions and cuts in American aid. Assuming that Nigeria depends heavily on American aid for realising key components of her national development goals, her overall role and contribution to sub-regional integration would likely be affected in one way or the other by subsequent American decisions and actions.

Another dimension of powerful states influence on policy emanates from the likely use of linkages in both bilateral and multilateral negotiations. For example in negotiating for participation for AGOA, the US applied a selective mechanism based on criteria satisfying the American fundamental ideals on democracy, human rights, liberalisation, privatisation which many African countries are not likely to fulfil thus denying them a place in the American market (introduction and Part III). This particular posture is also adopted by the European Union, individual powerful economies such as France and Germany. Their actions go a long way in reducing the opportunities that might accrue to the affected states in the global economic and political setting.

Having identified the main sources of risks that are likely to have adverse consequences on the continent's policy infrastructure, how do we then cope with such unavoidable risks, especially in our rapidly changing world wheeled by globalisation and competition? In Onwuka's analysis of risks regarding the LPA he had noted that the key source of a micro or macro risk could be a regime change. He then devised measures or scenarios for coping with these risks, and thereby identified three measures for investigation.

(a) Acceptance Measures
(b) Reduction Measures
(c) Avoidance Measures

Bearing in mind the ultimate goal in political risk analysis is to design ways of preventing crisis (Avoidance Measure), he made recommendations for closely monitoring the various levels of policy making. Various levels of the policy echelon must be able to identify the major sources of risks, including deeper insights about the regimes whose decisions and action are likely to influence policy outcomes from within and without the continent. The task of the policy team would include selling the policy in and outside the continent in order to secure the needed support for the policy to take-off. In this direction African policy makers would have to engage willing partners through lobbying, concessions in mineral explorations and trade, and consultancy services. That approach would involve, for example, establishing strong relations with the Labour Party in Britain, or the Democratic Party in the US or the Socialist in France, and all other friendly governments whose domestic and foreign policies are likely to generate an enabling environment for the operation of the LPA. Of particular relevance in the African development context would be a solemn appeal to willing partners of Africa in the West to adopt fiscal and monetary policies that would not jeopardise the efforts that had been imputed in any sector of the Lagos Plan of Action. But Onwuka also did recognise the fact that in most cases Africa hardly posses the power and the
resources to informally or formally influence regime change anywhere, let alone influencing policy outcomes.  

The second level measure for coping with the effects of risks on the LPA involves instituting measures that would go a long way to reduce any possible effects of the crisis on the LPA that might emanate from regime change. Apart from monitoring and co-ordinating existing facilities and policies at the various level of the LPA, mechanisms must be put in place to make the goals of risk reduction achievable. This includes timely rescheduling and spatial relocation of projects where it is deemed rational and necessary. In a glaring example, Onwuka recommends that investment and loan conditions usually called for by transnational corporations and such international financial institutions as IMF should not be necessarily executed, especially if portions of the said conditionalities are found to be perilous to the fundamental goals of the LPA. Thus, in all, during the implementation of external conditionalities decision and policymakers should bear in mind the adverse consequences it may have on the operationalisation of the objectives of the LPA. It must be added here that efforts towards reducing war, famine and pestilence must have to be equally intensified through both governmental and societal action.

On another plane there are scenarios at the micro-macro levels which can neither be avoided nor contained due to reasons of intensity and unpredictability of risks. Under such circumstances it would be advisable for decision and policymakers to share risks via joint ventures and the adoption of insurance facilities. In his concluding remarks the Author opines that the relevance of the above measures could have enable the architects of the LPA to avert not only risks where they are likely to emerge, but the ultimate goal could have been the ability to have created the enabling environment for making strategic adjustments on the face of such risks at any particular time of the implementation process of the LPA.  

However, since the adoption of the LPA in 1980 the global political and economic context had been rapidly transformed with an unprecedented momentum in the aftermath of the Cold War thus shedding some of its polemic ideological traits. Under current circumstances of transformations and integration in Africa, and considering deepening partnerships with the West, measures for coping with micro-macro risks must be expanded in scope and content. As a reflection of existing partnerships for example, a congenial atmosphere is required for sustaining such partnerships, not only by fulfilling the conditionalities called for by the West as preconditions for investments and aid, but also involves a show of commitment on the part of the donor community at large by streamlining not only policies, but change of attitude and perception in the way African politics is handled at the macro level. The conditionalities that are usually imposed on Africa are well known and the continents leadership had been struggling in the past one decade to achieve most of them. It is now high time that the donor community honour its pledges and commitments. External assistance will continue to constitute a significant component of source of finance for most African countries so long as efforts for mobilising internal financial resources are not developed to maximised tax collections and other forms of public revenue. In the final analysis, however, aid dependence will be diminished, with increasing returns in the terms of trade of most African countries if the industrialised countries open their markets for African agricultural products, textiles, and semi-manufactured goods.

But Africa’s privileged partners rarely carry out their part of global agreements designed for overcoming the development chasm that has gripped the continent for several decades.

The failure of the Cancun Ministerial Conference in Mexico in September 2003 where members of the world’s multilateral trading system did not reach consensus on
agriculture regarding the call for subsidy reduction and tariffs on imports by a large number of developing countries sends an unhelpful signals for making any improvements in injecting a new sense of morality and solidarity in the global political and economic setting. The EU now spends over $100 billion on farm support schemes, and the US $180 billion Farm Bill in 2002 are all fresh memories of the industrialised countries failure to honour their pledges in that regard.

One compelling case for IPRA is evidenced by the stalemate in WTO talks regarding agriculture and market access into the developed economies of the industrialised countries. We are all witnesses to a situation whereby promises made to developing countries at the Doha rounds of negotiation in 2001 had not been implemented. African countries have big interests here. On the average, the agriculture sector in most African countries accounts for about 40-50 percent of GDP and 70 percent of employment. Thus, IPRA would enable African countries to make policy predictions based on prevailing decisions of the WTO on agriculture, identify the risks and adverse consequences they have on the general African policy infrastructure, and take common positions to further Africa’s cause on trade negotiations within the broad context of the continent’s regional integration project.

These recent observations apart, there is enough reason to opine that even some of the promises made by the G8 several decades ago in dealing with development challenges in the developing world have been broken without remorse. In the early 1970s the world’s major aid donors agreed to direct 0.7 percent of their GNP to international development. Contrary to that pledge, key donors in the OECD countries have since then given only one-third of the said promise. Top contributors in the G8, such as, France and the UK contribute 0.33 and 0.32 per cent respectively, with the US being the least generous. Given the deteriorating socio-economic and political conditions of the 1970s, had the urgency expressed in the Brandt Commission’s Report for addressing the issues of the developing world been taken seriously by the G8, some of the crisis in most poor countries would have been minimised. In the African continent, even countries that supported the West during the Cold War did not receive positive engagements from their allies to ensure socio-economic and political transitions in the immediate aftermath of their independence struggle. In Zaire, Liberia, Kenya, and the Ivory Coast, for example, which were staunch allies of the West, dictatorship and authoritarianism were allowed to flourish under the auspices of the West. Lack of space might not permit a catalogue of broken promises to be made here, but suffice it to say that key promises made by the world’s wealthiest countries on trade, aid, debt relief, global financing for development, conflict resolution have all lacked the commitment thereto. It is true that in the past Africa also failed to fulfil her part of the deal, but given the tremendous strides made in current transformation and integration in the continent, Africa may deserve better. The continent was left in a turbulent transition process without a committed big power engagement. The guided policies of the US in Asian transition process, and active engagement of the EU in Eastern European transitions were all important milestones in post-Cold War international relations. That, twelve years of transition in some countries in Eastern Europe, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Baltic have resulted in their joining of the EU vindicates the case that committed big power engagement facilitates transitions in the period of political turbulence. In the context of promises and broken promises, there is the dire need for IPRA in Africa’s policy infrastructure, while instituting mechanisms for mobilising internal resources for supporting the efforts being made.
Evaluation and Conclusion

It must be pointed out at this stage that if there is going to be any novelty, and in that case a special impetus in existing partnership by the donor community with Africa, then the former must adhere to calls for code of conduct and establish a new moral ecology in the international and global political setting that would of course accommodate the interests and concerns of the poorest poor in the comity of nations, especially in Africa. This is also where the call made by the Ghanaian Finance Minister for code of conduct for donors is a right step in the right direction. The initiative should be extended to the regional level and integrated within the NePAD development framework. Hence, such considerations in that direction would involve a show of commitment by the industrialised countries in giving a hard look at their foreign policy decisions that are likely to jeopardise the sacrifice African countries are making in the promotion of democracy peace, economic recovery, growth and development. Both Africa and her willing partners must see risks management as a dual responsibility.

At another level of analysis IPRA could be applied in the crucial domain of conflict resolution, management and prevention within the African continent. In this way peace facilitators and post-conflict reconstruction experts could exchange ideas, share experiences, information and knowledge across the length and breadth of the continent where war and conflict are still raging. In that regard a centre for integrated political risk analysis has to be embedded in the Peace and Security Council with accredited offices at the secretariats of the various sub-regional economic communities. This step will help bring the work of the Council’s experts closer to society by creating an information and knowledge belt to enhance policy making at that level. The relations could be extended to willing external partners committed to conflict resolution in Africa.

In its external dimension, such an approach to conflict research will in turn provide transparency by making available information relating to political risk analysis on key questions such as a potentially troubled country that is likely to get involve in a political thug of war with a major power that would jeopardise the ties that had been established between Africa and her partners. Country indexes such as nature of regime (authoritarian, democratic, semi-democratic, constitutional dictatorship, traits of exclusions it exhibits, sources of illegitimacy and state irresponsibility, the general propensity towards war with neighbours, and the potential for internal insurrection), its longevity, its economic performance and its relations with society may be key points for analysis. In the long term a trust for a reciprocal risk transparency would be established between Africa and her willing partners. The efforts consolidated in political risk analysis and conflict management would in turn create a stable political and economic environment (and in this connection restore transparency) to ensure that there is long-term perspective and transparent regulatory framework to inspire investor confidence that had been denied the continent in the past because of war, insecurity and the attendant negative image that had been labelled on Africa in the international community of nations.

In a longer term perspective, the overall policy infrastructures at the regional, sub-regional and national levels could be enhanced by a full reorientation in the context of globalisation and competition in order to accelerate growth and development of the respective national economies, improve public services and thus create the enabling environment for attracting hardly needed annual inflows of foreign direct investment into the continent. The ultimate goal of any policy reorientation in that regard would be
geared towards restoring investor confidence in Africa, and reduce the harmful perception of Africa as a high risk continent. The following steps, though not unknown in policy circles, if taken seriously, might go a long way in reducing the gap between policy and action in Africa. The catalogue may include:

(i) A transparent and predictable political systems and corporate governance;
(ii) A penchant for continuity, stability and policy consistency;
(iii) The ability to get rid of all bureaucratic hindrances that acts as constraints in the transaction of daily businesses;
(iv) Reforming market infrastructure (clearance, settlement depository system etc.) and adopting measures to strengthen regulatory and legal frameworks.
(v) Judicial reform to ensure transparency and fairness, including improvement in laws on protection of persons and properties.
(vi) Conforming to international jurisprudence and norms on protection of investments and intellectual properties;
(vii) Developing a culture of sanctity of contracts;
(viii) Ensuring the availability of experts, and knowledgeable personnel in the national bureaucracies in order to facilitate speedy, efficient and cost effective investment and business transaction; and finally
(ix) Developing an integrated approach to attract FDIs given the low competitive edge of single individual African countries.
(x) These are however no panacea, as long as political and corporate corruption continues to constitute a canker that eats into the fabric of society. Hence, the recommendation made in the introduction of this discussion for self-re-examination, self-renewal and change of attitude would have to occupy all and sundry for some time.
Epilogue: Broad Based Transformations for Realising Africa's Visions

Be it platitudinal to say, active participation of the people of a country in political life to decide the destinies of their country is an essential condition for growth of a democratic culture and economic development. This important democratic ingredient is not new to the African leadership. On his reflection for a path to development and progress in Africa, Dr. Nkrumah once stressed that in all its actions governments should rely on the productive social forces and hearken to their wishes and aspirations. The great African leader’s reflections and conclusions on Africa's socio-economic and political development as indicated on page 103 of one of his famous books, „Africa Must Unite“ (first published 1963, Heinemann, London) once arrived at the postulate that „The building of a new state requires more than the preparation of programmes, the design of plans and the issue of instructions for their implementation. It requires the wholehearted support and self-identification of the people and the widest possible response to the call for voluntary service“.

Within a broader framework, and still with an organised and conscientised social forces in mind, the ultimate goal, in this regard, was to lay a solid foundation from the national level for the political and economic unification of Africa that would enhance the urgent need to co-ordinate efforts in the spheres of defence and security, foreign policy and diplomacy, the national economy, science and technology, guided by a proposed African Unity Charter. Even more importantly, Nkrumah's visions were founded on realism of the African „condition“ that expresses itself in the differences between the social systems and foreign and domestic policies of the various African states, as well as the disparity of their levels of social and economic development. Indeed, it is a condition that cannot be ignored. It is these same conditions of hybridity of the continent's socio-economic forces that will determine the ultimate forms and methods of ongoing transformations and integration in the African continent. In the visionary parlance of Nkrumah during the 1960s, the path, and success of Africa's socio-economic transition could be realised by effective mobilisation of political and social forces supported by the progressive national democratic forces at the various national levels. Proping up those national structures in the transition process was the emphasis on ideological education that would arm the people of the continent with the basic tools of self-insurgence, capabilities and a high sense of ethics. Hence a new consciousness emerged to characterise Africa's social and organisational capital that combines some of the rich and enduring socio-cultural traits of the past, communalism and solidarity with the traits that had emerged after independence, national consciousness and patriotism, voluntarism, and the drive for industrialisation for ending drudgery. In this regard, the hallmark, and philosophical foundation of his vision had also included reconstitution or transformation of the post-colonial state that had been invented by outsiders without consideration to Africa's socio-cultural and political diversity.

It is an unfortunate irony of fate that the death of a man was synonymous with the death of his ideas, not because his ideas were bad, but because people had lacked courage, self-confidence, and self-assertiveness for expressing their identity and idiosyncratic path of development in an environment characterised by neo-colonialist tutelage, benevolent dependency and self-interests that thrives on exclusions and greed. The opportunities created by global transformations and changes in the aftermath of the Cold War have also open up new ideas for reconfiguring the continent's development strategies in the context of globalisation and competition for access to new sources of knowledge and capital, organisational skills and qualitative entrepreneurship.
Development as captured by the contents of the NePAD document exhibits a holistic approach with a vision of the future including a framework for realising the goals of that vision. Despite the enormous changes that have occurred, Nkrumah's articulate reference to the importance of Africa's new social and organisational capital in the continent's democratic and economic development is still with us. Today that problematic has been couched in a semantic jargon that reverberate all policy circles in the developing world in general, and Africa in particular. Thabo Mbeki, the President of the Republic of South Africa, and a major architect of NePAD, has assigned capacity building as one of the major constraints on African integration. As Stiglitz has observed, the acquisition of physical capital, such as, roads, schools, energy, and telecommunications in the early stages of development is not a sufficient foundation for achieving overall development. The overriding issue in current circumstances is capacity building. He makes a clear distinction between easy and hard capacity building. The former embraces upgrading the quality of human capacity, the education, the skills and the knowledge required for development. The latter is the „development of the organisational and social capital, and the identification and promulgation of new codes of conduct that will enable a society to function well“, whereby development is captured as a broad societal transformation situated in a holistic environment. He identifies three dimensions of capacity building:

(a) The enabling environment for the private sector, which includes market and the legal infrastructure that is necessary for markets to function well;
(b) The knowledge environment, which enables new knowledge to be absorbed, adapted to the circumstances of the country, and put to use in an efficient and socially acceptable way;
(c) The policy environment, which includes the capacity to make key decisions concerning development strategies.

Even though the transitions and integration that are occurring in Africa have bitten deeper into some areas of society, politics and economy as characterised by democratisation and the establishment of rule of law, deregulation and privatisation, including attempts at improving the human rights situation and the rights of minorities, there had been no enduring impact on the above mentioned three dimensions of capacity building all of which affect the ingenuity and creativity of a country's social and organisational capital. This dismal performance is exhibited at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. For example, as main building blocks of integration all the sub-regions have embrace a policy of free movement of peoples, goods and services, but in the praxis crossing a national border is a nightmare in the African continent. Administrative hindrances and corrupt customs officials who openly extorts monies from travellers is just a tip of the iceberg, thus contradicting the spirit of NePAD and regional integration as a whole.

While NePAD can be seen as an exposition of a visionary strategy, it also hardly reflects daily experience and our knowledge about the real world of African politics. War, conflict and insecurity still abounds. The new democracies are still fragile: they are ethnically driven and ethnically lobbied. Diversity has not been effectively managed to harness and harmonise the hybrid socio-economic and political conditions at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. Thus, Nkrumah's problematisation and reflections on the African 'condition' has still not been answered. But Africa cannot afford to wait till her unity and cohesion are fully shaped in order to foster development. Under current circumstances, the magnitude and scope of the wider African crisis should be the rallying point for purposive, collective action via a regional consensus to
redeem the continent from war, insecurity and poverty. The framework for that action had been established by the CAAU and NePAD. However, the wheels of NePAD in particular are immobile without oiling, and that oil is its social forces.

It is in this direction that the Author believes that judgement of the overall transformation of the OAU in the aftermath of the Cold War must be executed with reference to the prescient visions of one of the founding fathers of that organisation. Thus the success of that transformation would not be determined by the meticulous presentation of facts and noble intentions as embodied in the CAAU and NePAD. Neither could it be realised by the mere exhortations for showing political will and commitment, and humble appeals for ratification and implementation of protocols. In the final analysis it would require, in the words of Nkrumah once again „the wholehearted support and self-identification of the people“ and their widest possible empowerment and participation. For example, the founding of the ECOWAS Citizens Union, the active involvement of local non-governmental organisations and the private sector at the national, sub-regional and regional levels, including the strive for ensuring transparency and accountability in governance are all positive developments in that direction, but not enduring. At the same time however, intensification and deepening of informal integration in that regard would put more pressure on governments to do more on issues of formal integration. The two are mutually reinforcing. That is why the formation of the ECOWAS Citizens Union, the active role of non-governmental organisations, the private sector and the many constituencies and stakeholders engage in Africa’s development efforts must be applauded. In furtherance of socialisation of Africa’s integration efforts, governments would have to initiate and support activities that promote cultural exchanges among diverse African states to help winnow down the reciprocal misperceptions about cultural and identity groups.

Africa’s development efforts in all its ramifications must therefore be captured as a social praxis whereby the impact of decisions and actions by the leadership and policymakers on the wider society can be measured, evaluated and capable of providing deeper insights about domestic and foreign policy contingencies (see figure 3). In the long term such endeavour would help improve the policy infrastructures at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. A policy infrastructure that would go beyond a mere reconfiguration of nomenclature from OAU to AU, but show the courage and steadfastness to back present initiatives with the accredited supranational institutions and the requisite legal framework that also reflects international law and jurisprudence. Any such act of injecting dynamism into the AU would of course give it the political impetus toward attaining the prescient goals of Nkrumah for a truly political union. With the sub-regions now firmly recognised as the building blocks for regional integration, and the new political realism provided by the CAAU, NePAD, and the current drive for achieving an African Economic Community, African leaders can no longer compromise on the drive for a supranational political order. Its establishment constitutes the life wire of prevailing integrating impulses now proliferating in the continent at the various sub-regions. The transformations and changes that have taken place in Africa in the last one decade have restored optimism in many Africans, and the collective African leadership have no reason to fail the peoples of the continent this time around.

Indeed, the transformation of the OAU and the achievements made in human rights, democratisation of a large number of the member states political institutions, improvements on issues affecting participation and political representation of the African citizenry in the Pan-African setting, and the frantic attempt at injecting some sense of legitimacy in the AU (however limited) have brought to the fore the urgent need for reconciling normative questions with an institution that had once reached the brink of moral bankruptcy and inaction. In that direction a good foundation had been
laid, and on that Africa must make her „great leap forward“, grounded in her own socio-economic and historical past.

The goals elaborated in various policy documents of the OAU/AU are attainable. What are required are the requisite conditions to be created for its realisation. Indeed, the vision and the underlying realism had been there since the early 1950s symbolised by the series of Pan-African conferences initiated and headed by Nkrumah. We would be collaborating in distorting or misplacing facts about African integration if we continue to adhere to the popular and prevailing view that the wave of current integration is a borrowed or an imitation of the European model. From the formation of the EC in 1951 till the early 1960s when Nkrumah's prescient ideas had gained political credence and popularity on the African political landscape, the main dynamics of EC integration among the founding members, the three Benelux states, Germany, France and Italy had been nothing more or less of sectoral co-operation manifested by the member states efforts to integrate the European Coal and Steel Community (April 1951, the Treaty of Paris), the establishment of the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM, March 1957,) established by the Treaty of Rome. At the same period, Nkrumah's political and philosophical deliberations captured a wider unification of post-independence African states interacting for common purposes within common institutions governed by a common Charter.

Under those circumstances, the founding architect of Africa’s vision was even more so inspired by the dynamics of the American model, after a long period of his academic sojourn in that country. In spite of his ‘emotive and pent up anger’ about America's racial divide, especially, the dehumanising treatment of African Americans and people of black descent during that period, the young Ghanaian academician took solace in the main underpinnings of US multicultural society, namely, the concept of the „melting pot“ of hybrid cultures. It was in his recognition and appreciation of the peculiar African „condition“ for realising similar goals that Nkrumah consistently revealed and articulated the idiosyncratic „African condition“, and how that condition could be socially and politically engineered towards achieving a United States of Africa. A vision that could not survive the countervailing forces of neo-colonialism and metropolitan power tutelage, external loyalties of African states, in an environment of Cold War superpower rivalry characterised by fragmentation and balkanisation, overt and covert insurgencies and destabilisation in Africa.

It must however be noted that individuals, groups, entities and collectivities of all kinds that are engaged in any form of human endeavour are capable of learning. Africa does not similarly have to meander through the dark history of Europe's political past to enable her chart a similar course of European phenomenal strides in democratic consolidation, peace, progress and prosperity within a record time of fifty years. Of course, there are some key events in the European process that are likely to have acted as boosters for the African process and integration efforts in other regions of the world: the Single European Act (July 1986), the Maastricht Treaty (February 1992), the unique achievement in monetary union, and the recent historical expansion, are all important European events with significant international implications for regional integration in other regions of the world. African leaders must show the capability in absorbing knew knowledge and learning from experiences from afar that can be adapted to their circumstances in an efficient and socially acceptable manner at the respective national, sub-regional and regional levels. At the end of the day however, the success or failure of the AU must be evaluated on its own terms. Europe on the other hand, could seek knowledge from African inter-state co-operation, especially at this stage of her integration process where the number of member states is going to gallop from fifteen to
twenty-five. The OAU/AU’s experience in accommodating fifty-three member states, some too big, some too small; some powerful, some weak and vulnerable; some rich, some too poor; some defiant, and some co-operative and tolerant. The litmus test for sustained drive for European integration after its biggest enlargement in the history of the regional body would be shaped by humility, tolerance, mutual and reciprocal respect and dignified interaction and communication among the member states. In brief, there is much beyond the rule of law that has guided European interaction till now.

In the African continent prevailing academic discourses and journalistic writings on the twin processes of transformation and integration do confirm that the AU’s performance would be judged by its adherence to the commitments made in the CAAU on those international values, norms and jurisprudence enshrined in it. The policy content of the NePAD document, the capacity for realising its stated goals, the negotiation and bargaining among African states and between African states and their willing partners, all demands a strong, transparent, accountable and responsible networking of inter-state interaction and diplomacy. That partnership is quite essential, at least under prevailing circumstances, given the fact that a large number of countries in the continent are cash strapped and have still not succeeded to erect viable mechanisms for internal mobilisation of revenue, especially income tax collection. However, a show of resolve by African leaders, and change of attitude across the broad spectrum are some of the possible parameters along which Africa's privileged partners would honour their share of the commitment to boost her efforts. In the final analysis the ultimate responsibility for rescuing the continent out of the woods, however arduous the task may be, lies in the hands of the collective African leadership and citizenry.

In the interim, however, if there are any finger pointing at rhetorical designs among the collective African leadership, then that could be enunciated by the lukewarm attitude national parliaments have adopted towards implementing the various protocols establishing the supranational institutions constituting the new African Union. Over here too Nkrumah’s thoughts and reflections must guide us: “Effective economic links, however, are impossible to establish without sound political direction to give them force and purpose. Therefore, we must come to grips first with the major and basic issue of African unity, which alone can clear the way for the united effort in erecting the powerful industrial and economic structure which will give substance and reality to our dream of a strong African continent” – Africa Must Unite p. 172). In the general sense, this means that the key challenge for the collective African leadership would be their ability to implement the plethora of crosscutting policies that have been enunciated in the transformation process to improve the political development and economic well being of ordinary Africans. And since the continent's leadership have no good track record of policy implementation due to multiple constraints, ongoing developments in the continent should be judged and evaluated with a guarded optimism.

Even though there are encouraging signs in the institutionalisation process, their establishment must be backed by mechanisms for ensuring their effective operation and legitimacy in order to restore the lost of confidence that occurred during the period of existence of the OAU. In this regard, in the spirit of calls for self-renewal and change of attitude, the African citizenry should deliver their part of the new social contract that seems to span across the continent. From the introduction of the discussion till this stage the reader might have been exposed to a catalogue of problems, constraints, obstacles and hindrances that are negatively impacting the realisation of the continents visions for development, peace and prosperity.

However, at this juncture, suffice it to opine that there are two key aspects of the broader African crisis that may need immediate attention. Obviously the solution they
provide would pervade or ramped up other aspects of the broader crisis in the long term and yield positive results. These are issues relating to:

(i) **Judicial transparency, accountability, fairness and civil obedience.**

(ii) Addressing the perennial issue of **brain drain** that has afflicted Africa for centuries ever since the first batch of the continent’s dynamic and vibrant sons and daughters were forcefully made to toil on agricultural plantations in the Americas.

Both problems demand a committed and sustained response from politics, policy and polity. Anatomy of African political systems and the crisis they produce reveals that there is a link between the operations of the judicial systems and the effectiveness or otherwise of governance in all its ramifications. By capturing governance as the authoritative framework for the institutions of political systems to function for the common good of the citizens of a country, the judiciary then becomes a key institution in facilitating the effective functioning of all state institutions and society. In this regard, the judiciary as an organ of government must posses the requisite legal framework that reflects societal norms and behaviour, and leaders trusted in political offices must demonstrate the political will to engage the legal framework that has been entrusted on them in good faith.

This is where the issue of accountability comes in. The notion of accountability impinges on national leaders, organisations and individuals the obligation to render account for responsibility that has been conferred on them via the legal framework. In this direction, men and women in authority are expected to exercise their legal and civic duties within the framework of clearly articulated codes of conduct. Hence, the state must be responsible, transparent and accountable. The element of transparency should be embraced as the unfettered **access** to the justice system by all citizens, leaders and public officials, while adhering to the principles of tolerance for public debate, public scrutiny and public questioning of the leadership and the decisions and policy choices they make on behalf of their citizens. Law enforcement agencies must execute their duties with dignity and respect for **rights** of the citizens who they serve. Citizens must reciprocate this gesture with dedication and show a sense of civil obedience, response to call for voluntarism, while executing their overall civic duties within the confines of the rule of law. In all, law and order is a basic prerequisite for all facets of development. Hence an effective and transparent judiciary system would empower state, society and the bureaucracy in the developmental efforts of many African countries that are woefully lagging in the institution of the rule of law. This is not new to traditional African cultures. As Aneesa Kassam had pointed out in his delineation of the **Oromo** concept of advancement and development (Part I on Regional Integration), their notion of development was grounded in their spiritual and moral beliefs with special emphasis on **social equality and justice**.

As far as the problem of brain drain is concerned, that problematic has metamorphosed from its historicity in the form of forceful removal of the energetic and dynamic youth of Africa during the era of slavery, to recent voluntary exodus of youngest, talented and brightest of educated Africans to the developed industrialised world. The overly dependence of most African countries on the UN Economic Commission for Africa as a Think Tank vindicates the magnitude of the brain drain crisis in the African continent. It must be noted that the factors that motivated the flow of African experts, technicians and middle level manpower in the 1970s and 1980s to foreign territories are far different from what is driving it today. In the past, political instability, dictatorship and systematic elimination of political opponents provided a rationale for people to look elsewhere for a peaceful environment in which they could live and organise their life in decency and dignity. In the 1990s and beyond as African
economies continued to be marginalized in a globalised world, the search for economic redemption by seeking greener pastures elsewhere has become the prime factor for the brain drain in most African countries due to low wages at home, underemployment or unemployment and the deplorable working condition of most African countries. Being cash strapped, governments spending in research and development have been diminishing as a percentage to GDP.

The solution in here also demands commitments and action from politics, policy and polity. The state must create incentives in the form of better remunerations for its citizens to stay at home and contribute their quota to national reconstruction and development. But given the precarious nature of the financial situation of most African countries, it is hardly the case that most governments could remedy the anomaly in the short term. On that plane it is up to citizens to be modest in their demands and supplement state policies with patriotism and dedication to the national cause for a better Africa for the sake of posterity. The continent’s ‘great leap forward’ if any, needs an enormous sacrifice by educated Africans. You cannot develop a country under the situation where the best and brightest brains are lured to emigrate, leaving the task of development in the hands of the ‘less talented and less imaginative’ section of society.

Indeed, one of the explanations for Africa’s lag in terms of global economic performance compared to other regions such as Asia can be recouped from increasing disparity in human capital development between the two regions. Africa’s brain drain syndrome had been facilitated by the deepened historical bond between her and the former colonial powers. French colonial policy of assimilation grounded in La Francophonie and the right to French citizenship in particular provided fertile grounds for educated Africans to see France as an extended territory of their motherland. The United States and Great Britain also promotes a flexible and special issuing of travel visas accompanied by job opportunities with fatty remunerations designed for attracting talented professionals from Africa and elsewhere. However, the explanation must go beyond that perspective and accept the logic that the development of a nation needs the time and energies of its sons and daughters, its intellectuals and experts, its technicians and middle level manpower. The external assistance pouring into the African continent are just complements designed to be supported by home grown initiatives, expertise and knowledge of it citizens. The painful fact is that the persistence of the brain drain syndrome and the lag in judicial transparency and fairness may also imply the persistence of the African crisis. This is a challenge to which all well-meaning Africans must rise up to.

Some Salient Thoughts and ‘Postulates’

The classification of work into parts demands at this stage that the various key ideas and thoughts that have been developed in the course of this discussion and analysis are assembled for a coherent reading. The following excerpts of the numerous conclusions are selected for reflection and regurgitation.

(i) The general African crisis constitutes an impetus for a co-ordinated elite’s interaction for action towards achieving common goals in transforming, modernising and integrating the states and various national economies in Africa.

(ii) Beyond transformation and integration taking place in the continent, the most nagging issue is not the twin processes taking place, but the rapidly changing contents and boundaries of African politics situated in a context of a rapidly changing world designated by the pressures of globalisation and
competition. The rapid turn of events in the realm of African politics is without doubt the results of those pressures (see Part III, Africa’s integration in the context of globalisation).

(iii) The novelty of the African process is that it assumes a character of embeddedness incorporating the region, the sub-region, the nation-state, local government, society, constituencies and the individual citizen.

(iv) The Cold War period (1947-1989) will without least doubt, enter Africa’s history as the most fecund period for grooming dictators and for that matter destroying Good Governance and democratic development and promoting human rights abuses under the auspices of the West, as dictators and personalities were preferred against functioning institutions.

(v) The AU’s embrace of broad stakeholders, particularly the creation of channels for participation of African citizens implies that our judgements and evaluations of the regional body goes beyond traditional institutional analysis to include normative issues in the realm of political legitimacy, democratic performance, political accountability, and a show of general responsiveness by its member states to their citizens.

(vi) In most new nations such as in Africa, the principle of sovereignty has not pass the test of our time. We have seen sovereign collapse, state failure and state irresponsibility. Hence, in the African context, economic and political integration is welcomed as life-saving device or safety valve for defunct and incapacitated states, some too small to go it alone, and some too big and vulnerable for us to be indifferent to the possible effects of their being astray.

(vii) Given the multifarious dimensions of the African crisis, it is only an integration that captures social dialogue in contemporary Africa that can create cohesiveness in the long term to ensure sustainable development, growth and prosperity, as well as human security for the inhabitants of the continent.

(viii) The OAU’s dismal success record in crisis intervention as evidenced by the intervention in Chad and the Rwanda genocide were the results of the fact that diplomacy was not backed by military use of force. In other words peacekeeping was not backed by peace enforcement.

(ix) The sheer number of fifty-three sovereign states participating in an integration process creates a bastion for myriad state actors involving the willing and the unwilling, the co-operative and the defiant, the rogue, the pariah, the backlash and the formal, vibrant and the dynamic. Hence, the drive for building state capacity would continue to occupy the AU for a significant period of time in the history of its evolution and development.

(x) The sheer number of fifty-three sovereign states participating in an integration process creates a bastion for myriad state actors involving the willing and the unwilling, the co-operative and the defiant, the rogue, the pariah, the backlash and the formal, vibrant and the dynamic. Hence, the drive for building state capacity would continue to occupy the AU for a significant period of time in the history of its evolution and development.

(xi) In its core programme, NePAD constitutes the vision of current transformations and integration in Africa in the 21st Century aimed at promoting sustainable development towards achieving the goals of self-reliant economy in the long term. It is an all encompassing regional project
that lays down the socio-economic and political framework for constructing a new Africa out of her myriad and complex problems with the aim of giving the continent its due of the global presence in a comity of nations, and capable of upholding its own responsibilities, and shaping its own destiny. It is a vision that recognises the transformation of society and economy, while assigning greater importance to the participation of those socio-economic forces constituting that vision.

(xii) The strategy for realising the visions of NePAD is grounded in a globalisation strategy that is designed to reap the benefits of international trade, finance and technology by way of adopting measures such as structural transformation, rationalisation of institutions, promoting good, transparent and accountable governments that would create an enabling environment for securing those benefits to be channelled into a wide range of key projects aimed at stimulating regional integration and development, building economies of scale and harmonisation of industries on a sub-regional basis.

(xiii) The deepening fragmentation, balkanisation and marginalisation of the African continent constituted by fifty-three sovereign states, coupled with growing tendency and pressures by the forces of globalisation to subcontract the legitimate obligations of the state in Africa would be counter productive venture with disastrous consequences for international peace and stability. The tenets of good governance, the responsibility to protect citizens, ensuring equity and social justice are all core duties of the modern state and cannot be delegated to any other body or entity. Africa needs a strong state and state system than ever before. The complex nature of prevailing and emerging challenges substantiates this point.

(xiv) Given the deepening partnership between Africa and her privileged partners, and as long as African countries have not reduce dependence they would continue to rely on the rich members of the international community for financial assistance due to their weak capacity in mobilising internal revenue. Also, constrained by sustained deteriorating terms of trade, weak negotiating positions on global issues, saddled by domestic crisis of various dimensions, there is the urgent need by African states to adopt an integrated political risks analysis of not only domestic issues, but also global conditions (in all its manifestations) and their effects on policy in general and the operational objectives of key policy documents such as the Abuja Treaty and NePAD. (See Figure 3)

(xv) The various policy blueprints and programmes of action for transforming and integrating African states and economies since the early 1980s failed to grasp political realities and risks about the domestic economy and the harsh international political economy, while African leaders relied on common solidarity and unity at their annual summitries and made commitments individually and collectively as if ‘solidarity’ and ‘unity’ are ends in themselves. Herein lays the rhetoric of a club of leaders most of whom did not even have any modicum of control over their domestic policies, let alone making commitments on continental basis to better the lives of their citizens back home whose support and legitimacy they did not have.

(xvi) Policy recommendations for rescuing Africa are many and varying. But in the final analysis, African governments must refocus their time and efforts in positively engaging the diaspora at the level of the various embassies abroad. That step must be constituted in a policy framework designed with the purpose and intent of making Africa attractive for its sons and daughters.
abroad. Thus, as a counter measure in fighting the *brain drain* syndrome, conditions back home must be attractive for a process of *brain gain* to set in. Those conditions are not necessarily questions of fatty remunerations and other benefits as it may first sound in the ears of the reader. Of late the perils of poverty had produced a general lack of security of various dimensions in some countries. After all, under normal circumstances every individual wish to go about his or her daily life full of assurance about his life and property. In this connection law and order becomes a crucial prerequisite for engaging the full creative energies of the citizens to enable development to take off.

(xvii) Africa’s crisis areas are broad and deep, but in all its ramifications the way out would be determined by the premium that the continent’s leadership places on *performance* in crucial areas of the wider policy infrastructure, and above all their ability to show political responsibility of leadership.
Method of Work


Part I Background to Analysis

According to Architects of the new African Union, the Africa one is referring to is indeed the whole of Africa, from North to South, from East to West without distinction as to race, colour and religion. We should therefore discard the nomenclatures Black Africa and White Africa and some of the terminologies used in some North and East African countries which apply the term Africa to countries south of the Sahara. It is needful to avoid the classification of North Africa under the Middle East, and do away with co-operation agreements that embody the division of the continent. Furthermore, the acknowledgement of the Francophone Africa, the Anglophone Africa, the Hispanophone Africa, and the Lusophone Africa spaces should not be to the detriment of the Pan-African dimension and the integration efforts on the continent. Proposals to create a league of Black States put forward in the recent past would be inadmissible. Africa’s future resides in its total unity. *Culled from an OAU Document (2004): Vision of the African Union and Missions of the African Union Commission (Final Draft)*, Prepared by the Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union, March 2004. For analytical purposes however, this ban will be temporary lifted as regards those classifications prior to the establishment of the African Union in July 2002.

The Treaty establishing the ECA defines community to mean the organic structure for economic integration established under Article 2 of the Treaty and constituting an integral part of the OAU.

In the European context nationalism and inter-state rivalry took the centre stage, thus creating one of the most active and bloodiest war theatres in modern European history. Africa's version of crisis, however multiple and complex, has taken expression in its post-colonial state system that had failed in some cases to hold the diverse social structure and ethnic-religious-identities together in a generally acceptable system of governance, thus causing conflict and all forms of political violence. In economic terms, the early incorporation and subordination of Africa into the world capitalist system as producers of industrial raw material pushed the continent to the periphery. Problems of deteriorating terms of trade, low foreign direct investment, and paucity of technological impulses have combined to hinder growth and development. Any forward movement therefore towards the equilibrium would do include the extent to which the collective African leadership views the total African crisis. In this study the crisis itself is viewed as a catalyst propelling decision makers and policy makers alike for collective and co-ordinated action.

After lying dormant for several decades since the idea was first mooted by the first President of the Republic of Ghana, Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, the call for continental unity was revisited and revived by the Libyan leader Muammar Ghaddafi in the late Nineteen Nineties.

www.oau-oua.org An OAU Document. Report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Sirte Decision on the African Union (EAHG/DEC.1 (V)). Part of the Lome 2000 Document on the Constitutive Act of the African Union adopted by the 36th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, 4-12 July 2000 - Lome, Togo. The transitional one-year period is also stipulated in Article 33 of the Act regarding transitional and final provisions, with the purpose of enabling the OAU/AEC to undertake the necessary measures regarding the devolution of its assets and liabilities to the Union and all matters relating thereto.

The African crisis in this discussion would refer to the total social, economic, political, and the creeping environmental disaster looming over Africa. The OAU’s share of the total crisis is manifested by its...
inability to solve the widespread African refugees crisis, the failure to address the prevalence of insecurity of all forms in the continent, including cross border arms and drug trafficking, the problem of child soldiers and compulsory child labour, as well as the failure to confront the continent’s development chasm. These are also the results of institutional failure.

*MDGs are targets set by the UN for developing economies where poverty rages. It aims at achieving a wide range of economic goals that would culminate in reduction of poverty by half between 1990 and 2015.*

*Patrimonial rule in the Werberian sense denotes a variant of personal rule either by a monarch or a dictator through absolute control of the political and administrative wings of government that thrives on non-constitutional methods of rule, such as, personal relationships and concentration of power in the hands of arbitrarily favoured and selected groups and persons. Neo-patrimonial however, is a hybrid form of rule that combines elements of patrimonial and rational-bureaucratic traits of governance within the framework of a legally recognised and sovereign state apparatus. In here the classic dichotomization of the private and the public is not quite obvious. A dual system of rule that recognises the patrimonial relationships and power of the ruler coexists with a legal rational bureaucratic authority under the modern state system, but under which arrangements the former overshadows the latter in its legal and bureaucratic functions. In the African context the system survives on ethnicity, favouritism and nepotism in the distribution of resources to those loyal to the leader. The leader however, is capable of playing the political trump card to his advantage through manipulation of the political system and cunning deception of the ruled. Given the economic underpinnings of its operation, a deterioration of the economic situation can rapidly result in the demise of such system of rule. Most African states had exhibited this in the past, and the collapse of Tolbert of Liberia, Mobutu of Zaire, Tombalbaye of Niger, Acheampong of Ghana are all glaring examples.*

*Given the nature of politics in Africa clouded by ethnicity as a resource for aggregating power, fear of power shifting to previously disadvantaged ethnic and identity groups overshadows the raison d’être of prevailing political transformations, thereby making those transformations a foot-dragging undertaking.*


*The Assembly of Heads of State and Government is the supreme organ of the OAU task with decision-making on common issues affecting the African continent with intent to ensure co-ordination and harmonization of the organization’s general policy. The Council of Ministers, the General Secretariat, and the Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration follow it in rank.*


*OAU: The Monrovia Declaration 1979.*

*In principle the Abuja Treaty constitutes the pathfinder of the whole integration process and lays down the main instruments, principles and objectives establishing the African Economic Community?African Union. The OAU members of Heads of State and Government on June 3rd 1991 in Abuja, Nigeria signed the Treaty Establishing the African Economic Community (AEC) during the 27th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State.*

*The „region is defined by the OAU in Resolution CM/Res.464QCXVI of the Council of Ministers concerning the division of Africa.*

*The crisis over the Western Sahara is the results of decolonization after Spanish colonial rule when Morocco and Mauritania claimed territorial sovereignty over the land. See section on Arab Maghreb Union for details.*

*For further insights about developments that finally culminated in the NEPAD document see www.NEPAD.org*

*The principle of subsidiarity describes a bureaucratic action towards bringing the process of integration closer to the citizens of member countries participating in the integration process. The main ingredients of such action may encompass shared principles of governance in the region. Among a club of democratic nations, for example, participation, representativeness, local autonomy, gender issues, ecological management and safety, and private sector empowerment may be crucial factors for consideration. The key word here is the rule of law, guarding against supranational-cum-state excesses regarding individual rights and liberties.*

*The differences among African elites in the immediate post-colonial period and thereafter compared to a few years earlier can be attributed to their slow but increasing awareness if not obsession with questions of sovereignty and independence, as well as mounting misapprehensions about political strategies and designs of fellow heads of state and government, especially, on the issue of what political direction the newly independent states should take toward achieving unity and solidarity among African peoples.*


The Constitutive Act of the African Union, Article 29, 1. Reads, „Any African State may, at any time after the entry into force of this Act, notify the Chairman of the Commission of its intention to accede to this Act and to be admitted as a member of the Union. Column 2 of the same Article posits among other things „Admission shall be decided by a simple majority of the member States. Clearly there are no laid down criteria for admission except being a member state of the former OAU.

The Constitutive Act of the African Union is silent on criteria to accede, while NEPAD requires stringent standards of good governance and economic management and stabilization.


The British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, in a passionate, but rhetorical speech during the annual conference of the New Labour Party in 2001 called for a new moral world order. He hammered this point to the wealthy nations and urged them not to turn a blind eye on Africa since they are all going to be affected by it in one way or the other in the long run. He believed that peace and prosperity can be restored in Africa if Western powers engage Africa with the fullest commitment via the provision of aid, debt cancellation, help promote good governance and build the continent’s infrastructure, encourage investment and African enhance access to Western markets. For further reading see Per Olsson (2001): Blair’s Morals - not ours, in: Socialism Today, Socialist Party Magazine (2001), Issue 61. November 2001. Cited online: www.socialismtoday.org/61/newOrder.html.


Jean Monnet, Les États-Unis d’Europe on commencé, Paris, 1955. This was one of the various symposiums compiled from his early European speeches.

www.un.org/ECOSOC

UN Policy Document: www.un.org. The Millennium Partnership for African Recovery-Economic Commission of Africa for the UN-system (UNECA), held in Algeria from 8-10 May 2001. The policy was the collective initiative of South Africa, Nigeria and Algeria on behalf of the OAU.


Elenga M’Buyinga (1982): Pan-Africanism or Neo-colonialism, the Bankruptcy of the OAU, questions the credibility and reputation of the OAU and captures it as club of betrayals who had stolen the African revolutionary struggle for freedom, economic self-sufficiency and global competitiveness and dignity: Pan-Africanism or Neo-colonialism, the Bankruptcy of the OAU


See the final declaration of the World Conference on Human Rights held in June 1993.

Brief on the OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, Africa & OAU Bureau, 19 May 1995 p.1


The Functionalist debate was generated by the conviction that transnational society and supranational institutions are the products of the common objective for achieving technocratic management of economic and social policy, which would gradually lead to the establishment of legitimate international agencies that promote economic welfare and thus overcoming ideological opposition to strong international institutions in the form of an envisioned international government. It gained momentum in the 1950s and its major adherents were, Mitrany, David. (1966): A Working Peace System. Chicago: Free Press. A new breed of Authors such as Groom, A.J.R., and Paul Taylor, (Eds.) followed this path with their work (1975): Functionalism: Theory and Practice in International Relations. New York: Crane, Russak.

Karl Deutsch, the main proponent of the Security Community perspective draws his foundations from the fusion of federalism and functionalism situated within the analytic framework of nation-state building. Deutsch argues that modernisation facilitates high levels of social interaction, which also causes congruence of individual and group values directing towards more cosmopolitan norms that can further the establishment of a security community in which peace reigns instead of mistrust, threats, and conditions for war. The short falls of these views emanated from the fact that there is no one-dimensional direction for integration and the emphasis on social interaction relegates the institutional and political prediction to the background. In addition, later research work had revealed that there is little correlation between value change and political outcomes. Deutsch, Karl W. (1954): Political Community at the International Level. New York: Doubleday, and also Deutsch et al (1957): Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organisation in the Light of Historical Experience. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Another product of the federal-functionalist synthesis is neofunctionalism, which is based on the assumption that the main dynamics of integration are endogenous and self-reinforcing (Pentland, Charles (1973): International theory and European Community. New York: The Free Press). It is also rested on the critical premise termed spill over. In its political dimension for example, political spill over will include emergence of new transnational and supra-national actors who are more oriented toward deeper integration, and have the capacity to move the integration process forward under the auspices of centralized, technocratic relatively apolitical administration. The limits of this perspective were the reflection of empirical disconfirmation in the process of European integration, as speed and momentum for integration were not uniform. There were instances of stagnation and external intrusion in the form of global economic crisis, and geopolitical values. It assumptions were found out to be defective as the integration process was seen to be more successful in areas where governments were liberalising within the framework of the Common Market, as against areas of big government and intervention such as the common project on the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) ratified in 1958. It failed to capture the role of leadership, while it also underestimated the strength of nationalism and ideology in general, and overemphasising the role of interest groups as the sources of pressure on governments to redirect their policies toward deeper integration. Spill over therefore did not produce automatic results (Moravcsik, Andrew. (1991): Negotiating the Single European Act: National Interests and Conventional Statecraft in the European Community, in: International Organisation 45, no. 1 Winter, pp. 19-56) as evidenced by the fact that economic integration performed far better than political integration which even fell victim to Charles de Gaulle’s French nationalistic grand design. Haas, Ernst, spearheaded Neofunctionalism in the late 1950s and published his work (1958): The Uniting Europe: Political, Social, and Economic Forces, 1950-1957. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Lindberg, Leon N., and Stuart A.
Constructivist approaches depart with mainstream material thoughts on integration to emphasise the role of ideas, norms and identities that captures core human consciousness, which constitute constraints on agents and actors in their choice-making ventures. It draws on psychology and sociology. A classical contribution to this school is by, Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas (1966): *The Social Construction of Reality*. However, the most outstanding and updated work on the subject is attributed to Checkel, Jeffrey T. (2001) ‘*The Europeanization of Citizenship?’* in Maria Green Cowles, James A. Caparoso and Thomas Risse (Eds.), *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. pp. 180-97

Multi-level governance approach is rooted in the idea based on the progress and inroads that EU had made to date. Hence, drawing on those insights, adherents of this approach argue that the decision-making process in the EU is the outcome of a blend of interaction of centralised authority at the supranational level, growth in the power of member states, and expanded influence for sub national actors. The bottom line of the argument is that that interaction takes into account levels below and above the state as a unit of analysis. For further reading see Marks, Gray, Hooghe, Liesbiet and Blank, Kermit (1996); ‘*European Integration from the 1980s: State Centric vs. Multi-Level Governance’*, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (3): 341-378.


For further reading on the said concepts see Ghita Ionescu (Ed.) (1974): *Between Sovereignty and Integration*. Croom Helm: London.


Ibid. p. 13.

The fore-runners of this school of thought include André Gunder Frank whose views on the North-South relations were captured in his popular publication *development of underdevelopment* in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Frank assumes that the prevalent underdevelopment of the third world countries is the results of the close economic relationship between the metropolitan industrial countries
and those on their periphery. This means that the incorporation of the periphery into the world capitalist system reproduces and sustains underdevelopment in the periphery.

68 The misrepresentation of Africa was by no means a mere accident given the fact that Africa had been studied from the standpoint of imported intellectual categories. However, the results of those judgements are less to do with the categories themselves than the parameters to which those categories were subjected to influence those results. Those parameters of analysis had ranged from Anthropology, Functionalists and Structuralist perspectives, distorted Marxist conceptions about Africa, perpetuated at times by Western educated Africans who by one way or the other had become adherents or admirers of misconceptions and falsehood clouded in specific and myopic Schools of Thought. The changing views and conceptions about Africa, therefore, owe it success to expanded parameters of analysis which had traverse the boundaries of the study of mythologies to the study of ecology and gender research. Holism might not be a sufficient mode of analysing on contemporary issues in Africa but a necessary tool for consideration in any well-tested social science research.

73 Discussions on dominant religious influence on Africa have been lope-sided considering only positive achievements to gross negligence of its negative impact on African peoples. In the poorest communities lacking basic amenities ornamental Churches and Mosques prevail. They are most of the time quite capable of mobilising the free labour of their members for local Churches and Mosques initiated projects (especially constructing new churches or mosques). Found wanting in this regard, in Africa south of the Sahara. Christian non-orthodox churches spends extremely large amount of productive hours on worship than on other productive and basic ventures that members of the congregation may need for their socio-economic improvement.
75 Ibid.
77 Ibid pp. 1-26
78 Ibid
79 Ibid.
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81 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
Part II The Organisation of African Unity

8 The OAU had by then agreed through African Council of Ministers Resolution 15 (1), that sub-regional arrangements would be granted on the basis that such groupings conform to the Charter of the organisation by fulfilling at least two conditions: (a) Geographic relations and economic, social and cultural factors common to the states, (b) Co-ordination of economic, social and cultural activities peculiar to the states concerned.
12 Ibid. p. 15.
13 The idea for the establishment of an African High Command to be tasked with stability and security was tabled by Kwame Nkrumah, the first President of the Republic of Ghana at the founding conference of the OAU in 1963.

19 OAU: CM/1710 (VI) 1992: 1

20 OAU: CM/1710(VI)1992: 4

21 OAU: CM/1747 (LVII) 1993: 9

22 Ibid.

23 OAU: CM/1710 (XVI) Rev 1:12. The OAU Peace Fund set specially for operations of conflict management was extremely dependent on external sources of finance, which could lead to external stakes in possible conflicts situations and civil wars if not their being instrumentalised for certain parochial interests.


25 Ibid.

26 That role had been played more by the UN Economic Commission for Africa. For a comprehensive reading refer, John Ravenhil (1984): *The OAU and Economic Co-operation Irresolute Resolutions*, in Ayouty and Zartman (Eds.) pp. 173-192.


28 A brilliant reading on African socialism is provided by, Carl G. Rosberg & Thomas M. Callaghy (1979): *Socialism in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Institute of International Studies, University of California Berkeley (see introduction)


31 The Casablanca Group and the Monrovia Group, for and against supranationalism respectively, as well as the Francophone-Anglophone dichotomy, were all examples of interests and identity coalitions that emerged to shape the future of any continental scheme for unity.

32 Nkrumah, Kwame (1970): *Conciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonisation* (1964), revd. edn., New York, Monthly Review Press. pp. 78-79. In that work the Author describes the above terms as follows. „Conciencism is the map in intellectual terms of the disposition of forces which will enable African Society to digest the Western and the Islamic and the Euro-Christian elements in Africa, and develop them in such a way that they fit into the African personality. The African personality is itself defined by the cluster of humanist principles which underlie the traditional African society."

33 Senghor, Leopold Sédar (1964): *On African Socialism*, trans. Mercer Cook London, Pall Mall. p. 103. In that particular work Senghor writes, „First and foremost, however we may be influenced by Europe, our realities are not identical. To remain faithful to socialism means that facing these new realities, we must choose new methods, new techniques, and new means – the most modern and most perfected ones."

34 That the media conception of the Rwandan genocide as a human tragedy was a misconception, in that the root causes of Hutu-Tutsi dichotomy and antagonisms was part of a political reality set forth over centuries ago by German and Belgian colonial rule that had developed a political leaning to Tutsi domination of the Hutu majority. By the turn of independence the installation of democratic rule brought those inventions into disarray as politics shifted course and control in favour of the majority Hutus. Attempts by minority Tutsis to restore the equilibrium and the refusal of Hutus to positively accommodate them had remained a major source of conflict that finally resulted in the blitz-genocide that witnessed the slaughter of about a million Tutsis. It should however be noted that elite power struggle created room for some Tutsi politicians to conspire against fellow Tutsis, neither were moderate Hutus spared the spate of genocide. To keep the facts intact, acts of political violence and counter-violence germinates from the Rwanda revolution of 1962, as well as the covert and overt supports that was extended to the ruling elites by France under Mitterand whose socialist Party strongly advocated majority rule, but which failed to be inclusive in terms of the political aspirations of the minority Tutsi. Since then politics had been characterised by mistrust, fear and frustration juxtaposed on individual and group existence and survival.

35 Guinea opted from any post-colonial arrangements under French tutelage when she voted 'yes' for independence prior to France's decision to grant a wholesale kind of independence for French West and Central Africa.

37 Tensions had existed between French speaking and English speaking Cameroonian communities since independence, and Ghana-Togo-Ivorian territorial tensions are more often expressed along the lines of the colonial heritage other than any category of African identity.


40 A CNN report on 6/8/02 on the effects of the long civil war, compounded by years of severe drought and famine and current attempts at using television showing displaced families for reunion.


42 Ibid.


44 The conflict bearing the internal character as it had, constrained the OAU to take any swift interventional action which could run counter to the provisions of Article III which proscribes interference in the internal affairs of member states of the organisation.


46 Ibid. 7-20

47 Ibid.

48 Ibid p. 23.

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid. p. 24-36.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid

53 Ibid p. 66-70.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibid.

56 The core factions of the eleven groups with regional, religious, ethnic affiliations, (and even at times personal reasons for power acquisition) were the Forces Armée Tchadiennes (FAT), Force Armée Populaire (FAP), Forces Armée du Nord (FAN), The „Volcan Armies, The Third Liberation Army-Mouvement Populaire Pour La Liberation du Tchad (MPLT)-Force Armée Occidentale (FAO)


58 Ibid.

59 Thomson & Adlof (1981): p. 85-100. As a former French office assigned to the BET region, he was appointed to find a truce to the hostage crisis but was himself arrested by Habre’s forces on allegations of spying and sowing seeds of discord among the rank and file of the FAN. Hence his arrest and execution on 4. April 1975.

60 Ibid. Nigeria had during one of the negotiations in Kano placed Goukouni and Habre under house arrest which act enabled her to prop up the regime of Mahamat Choua Lol a member of the Third Liberation Army-Mouvement Populaire Pour La Liberation du Tchad (MPLT) in a provisional government of national union. In the course of Nigeria’s diplomatic involvement in the conflict Lol ignored Nigerian interests by excluding Abdelbakar Abdelrahmane the brain behind the MPLT, whose revolutionary rhetoric had won Nigerian financial and diplomatic support.

61 Sam C. Nolutshungu (1996) pp. 8-45

62 Ibid.

63 The said Article 53.1 of Chapter VIII declares, „The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority….NePAD The legalities of this article were used by the OAU again to empower ECOWAS intervention in the Liberian civil war in 1993.


66 The Status of Forces Agreement is a UN legal practise use to legitimising multinational military or para-military forces into member states, and was adopted by the OAU in Chad and later in Liberia.
68 Ibid. p. 13.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid. the Author outlines three main inter-related categories as the causes of the failure of the OAU’s intervention force in Chad: (I) Lack of theoretical and conceptual clarity, (2) Institutional immobility and inaction, and (3) technical and logistical problems. But our analysis would be lopsided if we focus exclusively on the internal weaknesses of the organisation without situating the issue in the broader context of the prevailing political environment of the Cold War.
72 Ibid. p. 14
73 Most of those countries are either ripped off by civil war or have had a long period dictatorship, bad governance and mismanagement of the national economies, including deep-rooted corruption of the ruling elite.
74 A report by the OAU Secretary-General, Die Oumarou on the financial situation of the organisation. Reported in *West Africa*, 16 March 1987, p. 541.
77 From the point of view of victims of the genocide if peacekeepers had not failed to act (or were obstructed to act by their home governments) while this act was going on, the genocide could have been prevented. It had been argued that during that particular short period that the genocide occurred, what was needed was indeed a limited display of military force to deter frenzied mob action. If any preventive measures were needed at all, it could not necessary had been the traditional interlocking force between two armed combatants, but erection of a shield to protect unarmed persons against lightly armed mobs. For detailed analysis of prevention see, Astri Suhrke (1998): *Three phases of prevention: a retrospective analysis of the Rwandan genocide*, in: Ulf Engel, Andreas Mehler (Hrsg)., Gewaltsame Konflikte und ihre Prävention in Afrika. Hintergründe, Analysen und Strategien für die entwicklungspolitische Praxis-Hamburg: Institute für Afrika Kunde, 1998. p.25-40.
79 Ibid. Authors note: The Twa are the third social group, but constitute an insignificant proportion of the total population.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
91 For details see Amare Tekle 1999.
93 Suhrke 1999 pp.139
94 Ibid. p. 140.
Part III African Transformation and Integration Analysis


7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.


10 The outbreak of anarchy and violence was predicted by Uganda, who had always justified the presence of its troops in the DRC for that particular reason. Whether Uganda incited the ethnic clashes or not is difficult to determine. But one obvious fact is that so long as the political centre in Kinshasa cannot hold, its peripheries would not be stable and peaceful.


19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.


23 Ibid. p. 339-341.
Ibid. p. 341.
24 Ibid.
25 A comprehensive reading on what is to be learnt from the past is offered by John Ravenhill (1979): "Regional Integration and Development in Africa: Lessons from the East African Community NEPAD in: Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics 17 (3), 227-246.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
31 A statement of the interim chairperson of the commission of the African Union on the occasion of the First Extra-ordinary Session of the Assembly of the Union 4th February 2003 highlighted a recommendation referred to it by an Ad Hoc Ministerial Committee to abolish the Permanent Representatives' Committee.
36 Yash Tandon, Director of KAIROS-Africa, a non-governmental organisation in his comments on NEPAD titled, Debt, Structural Adjustment and Jubilee, had articulated the point regarding false strategy, in: SEATINI Bulletin, 5,4, 28 Feb., 2002.
38 An AU Document, Abuja, Nigeria. October 2001. The paragraphs in the document are numerated (1-207), and the same method is being use here for the sake of convenience. It must however be noted that the numbering is defective. Paragraph 86 did not appear, which means that a later updated or corrected document may slightly affect references.
39 The IDG is component of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, adopted in September 2000, which outlines support for Africa's effort to halt the trend of underdevelopment and marginalisation through measures and initiatives covering conflict prevention, ensuring stability and democracy, as well as poverty reduction, aid, debt and trade management to help increase private capital flows to the developing world.
40 NEPAD sets its growth target at an estimated 7% per annum needed to meet the millennium goals, in particular, the goal of reducing by half the proportion of Africans living in poverty by the year 2015.
41 The Economist, February 24, 2001.
The contribution from the Diaspora has not escape the attention of the African leadership at all. The Interim Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union on the Occasion of the First Extra-Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the Union on 04 February 2003 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, had raised the issue during a Statement. The interim chairperson urged the Assembly to encourage the participation of the Diaspora in the building and strengthening of the new African Union.


Ibid. p.62.


Culled from selected portions of the NEPAD Policy Document. See indicated paragraphs for references.

The forum is under the auspices of UNECA with the objective to providing up to date information, assessment and discussion of multilateral economic co-operation, regional integration, and their global context, and how its affects Africa. In the ADF III between 3-6 March 2002, the forum aimed at building upon its established record of cutting-edge debate and the widest stakeholder participation to promote regional economic and political integration.


Ibid.


The view is also shared in the academic community: see for example Christopher Clapham whose series publication on African integration has repeatedly emphasised that path of integration in Africa


Ibid.


ECOWAS Profile: OAU Department of Foreign Affairs, last updated April 2000.


Ivorian Xenophobia and racist attacks are also directed at other West African migrant workers, from Nigeria and Burkina Faso, especially with the latter bearing the brunt of those acts in real terms.


For further reading on the contradictions of francophone integrative strategies in West Africa and its effects on development and a West Africa common goal in sub-regional integration see, Owuwa, Ralph I. (1982): *Development and Integration in West Africa: The case of the Economic Community of West African States*. Ile-Ife.


Ibid. p. 11.


While peace seems to be coming back to Sierra Leone, and is showing signs of consolidation with new elections and ensuring justice for the victims of injustices and atrocities, Liberia has been plunged into a new wave of political and civil violence mainly due to flawed re-democratisation process marked by intimidation and threats masterminded by Charles Taylor in the pre-election era, and perpetuated under his regime. Rebellion against the regime also reflects the exclusions and marginalisation that occurred in the peace process. The success of the current peace deal by West African leaders may need time to evolve.

ECOMOG is a non-standing military force first established in 1990 to handle security problems in Liberia following the break down of formal state structures and the outbreak of a protracted civil war.

ECOWAS Declaration A/DCL. 1/7/91 on political principles.

ECOWAS Protocol A/SP 1/12/01 on democracy and good governance.


Ibid. p. 10.


ARIA 2002 p. 10.

These states constituted a cordon of security architecture against apartheid South Africa during the peak of the Cold War in the early 1980s.


Ibid.

Ibid.

See *www.sadc.int*. Profile: SADC p. 7

Ibid. p. 8
Africa the Author failed to compare the past and the present as regard the state apparatus allocation of Bilateral with Regional Policies. Satisfying some of the immediate needs of the country's majority poor would likely put state resources and needs of just a tiny fraction of the country's white population. Under majority rule the dire need for national resources to the various sectors he had referred to. Apartheid operated by satisfying the interests, while there might be significant evidence for substantiating the rapid decline in state capacity in South Africa: Crime, Drugs, and Trade. Washington: Brookings Institution Press pp. 122-149. Population Flows into Southern Africa. Breytenbach, & Peter, Meyn (2002): Gamberg Macmillan, Windhoek. The San Francisco Chronicle (2002) South Africa becoming the continent's economic powerhouse Banks, railroads, technology among businesses taken over. Sunday February 17, 2002. p. 14. The article can be seen at the following website: http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-...ronicle/archive2002/02/17/MN108070.DTI

For further reading on South Africa's bilateral engagements and contradictory effects on sub-regional commitments see, Martin Holland (1995): South Africa, SADC and the European Union. Matching Bilateral with Regional Policies, in: The Journal of modern African Studies, 33, 2 1995 pp. 263-283. The new Treaty establishing COMESA envisages an ambitious programme of internal trade. COMESA was formed in December1994 to replace the former PTA, which had existed since the early 1960s. The new Treaty establishing COMESA envisages a free market-driven concept of integration in Eastern and Southern Africa. Burundi, Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. COMESA was formed in December1994 to replace the former PTA, which had existed since the early 1980s. The new Treaty establishing COMESA envisages an ambitious programme of internal trade

107 Ibid. p. 7.
112 Ibid.
118 Kenneth Good (1997): Accountable to Themselves: Predominance in Southern Africa, in: Journal of Modern African Studies, 35, 4 (1997), pp. 547-573. A point of departure here in Good's views is that while there might be significant evidence for substantiating the rapid decline in state capacity in South Africa the Author failed to compare the past and the present as regard the state apparatus allocation of national resources to the various sectors he had referred to. Apartheid operated by satisfying the interests, and needs of just a tiny fraction of the country's white population. Under majority rule the dire need for satisfying some of the immediate needs of the country's majority poor would likely put state resources and general capacity under strain. That is why there is also Affirmative Action for blacks., What is worrisome in the South African context is that declining state capacity is also accompanied by unscrupulous and widespread corruption among the ruling elites. The trend could number the days of any ruling body anywhere, anytime.
119 Ibid. p. 556.
120 Ibid. p. 573.
122 Ibid. p. 21
125 All three countries are also members of the wider Cross Border Initiative (CBI) and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA). The idea of CBI was borne at the Maastricht Conference on Africa in 1990 and is under the co-sponsorship of all multinational organizations, including the IMF, the World Bank and the EU. It is a framework of harmonized policies to facilitate a free market-driven concept of integration in Eastern and Southern Africa. Burundi, Comoros, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. COMESA was formed in December1994 to replace the former PTA, which had existed since the early 1980s. The new Treaty establishing COMESA envisages an ambitious programme of internal trade
liberalization; the development of industry, agriculture, human resources and communications within and between member countries; and ultimately the creation of an economic community in the sub-region.


West Africa, p. 6


Ibid. p. 1


The term Maghreb denotes the former French protectorates of Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria, and the later was considered to be part of France until its independence in 1962.

Profile: Arab Maghreb Union (AMU). See also www.maghrebarabe.org.


Ibid.

Profile: AMU p. 2.

Ibid.

Ibid. pp. 2-3.


Ibid.


See the Union's Website www.maghrebarabe.org.


The Libyan leadership was incriminated in the 1988 bombing of a Pan-American flight 103 over Lockerbie in Scotland for providing safe haven for two men suspected of the crime. Over a decade of UN sanctions was imposed on the country for her failure to accept responsibility. The sanctions hurt her oil industry. In 2003 the Libyan leader agreed in principle to settle claims of compensation by the victim's families, thus ushering in a new chapter in the country's relations with the Western world.


CNN Documentary on Ethiopian Famine and Drought, in: INSIGHT. Presenter, Jonathan Mann, 29.01.2003, 23 hours GMT.

Part IV Africa in Global Political Setting: Balkanised, Marginalised and Subcontracted?

The crisis was the culmination of conflicting interests among proliferating actors on the Congolese independence question. The former colonial power, Belgium keeping an eye on the country's rich mineral
resources and operating through a Belgian mining company, Union Minière, instigated secessionist's sentiments in the mineral rich region of Katanga and supported Moïse Tshombe to declare independence against the will of the central government in Kinshasa led by Patrice Lumumba. At the same time, Lumumba’s foreign policy inclinations towards non-alignment and communism in particular attracted American interests in the Congo, which also supported the anti-Lumumba movement. The general insecurity that followed compelled the Lumumba government to secure the assistance of the United Nations for intervention. Shortly afterwards, Belgium and the US supported Mobutu Sese Seko in a coup d’état that ousted the Lumumba government. In 1961 severe fighting erupted between the UN blue velvets and Katanga secessionist troops. The then Sec. Gen., Dag Hammarskjöld was killed in a plane crash while visiting the UN force in the Congo. The coalescence of these events, the external orientation of the actors, as well as the complex nature of their interests brought Africa for the first time in global political and diplomatic limelight.


1 See ECA Website [www.uneca.org/ About the ECA - Programmes](www.uneca.org/).  
3 Overview of the ECA: see the website - [www.uneca.org/overview](www.uneca.org/overview). pp. 1-5.  
4 Ibid.  
5 Ibid.  
6 Ibid.  
7 Ibid.  
11 Ibid.  
12 The sister institutions are both post-war institutions originally designed for reconstruction, development and stabilisation in war torn societies in Western Europe after the Second World War. The World Bank comprises three separate but closely affiliated institutions: The parent organisation, whose official name is the *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development* (IBRD), established in 1944 and provides loans in productive sectors such as agriculture and energy; the *International Development Association* (IDA) operative since 1960 and provides developing countries with long-term loans at low interest rates; and the *International Finance Corporation* (IFC) founded in 1956 to promote and assist development of the private sector through provision of both loan and equity finance for business ventures in developing countries. Traditionally the IMF role was to support the post war system of exchange rate. After the collapse of the system in 1971 however, it assumed new roles such as deficit financing in countries suffering from chronic balance of payment crisis and bailing some out of bankruptcy. From the 1980s onwards it redirected it programme towards economic recovery and structural adjustment in the weakened economies of the ‘developing world’.  
18 Percy S. Mistry (1996): *Regional Dimensions of Structural Adjustment in Southern Africa*. In: Jan Joost Teunissen (Ed.) Regionalism and the Global Economy, The Case of Africa. FONDAD The Hague. p. 166. It must be noted however that the thoughts of the Author on the subject are general and exploratory and needs further research.
Part V Regional Policy Making and Implementation

The main premise of the African Agenda within the broad framework of the countries of the South was that existing international economic order was not only asymmetric, but equally anachronistic, given the fact that the rich countries of the Northern hemisphere controls the larger proportion of global resources. Hence the main plank of the South’s agenda was to seek the transfer of resources in the form of technology and finance capital that would facilitate the development of the South, and also correct the growing imbalance between their trade relations and their respective positions on international institutions. For further reading on the debate see, Ralph I. Onwuka and Olajide Aluko (Eds.) (1986): The Future of Africa and the New International Economic Order. Macmillan Publishers Ltd.


By self-reliance the member states of the OAU did not mean absolute cut-off from the outside world and the contributions there from. The call for cultivation of self-reliance meant supplementing external assistance with local efforts, while curtailing the predominance of the later as the mainstay of Africa's development.

The Monrovia Declaration 1979. OAU DOCUMENT.


Onwuka and Olajide 1986, pp. 4, 17-18, 139.
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