

A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT AS A STRATEGY FOR THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF NIGERIA

By

**ENOBONG D. UMOH¹,
LAWRENCE I. EDET^{2*} & VICTOR E. ITA³**

*Department of Political Science & Public Administration,
University of Uyo-Nigeria*

E-mail: lawrence4justice@yahoo.com

Phone: +2348027039444.

SUMMARY

Consolidating on the existing theoretical formulation of political economy, various scholars have stated that every seemingly economic activity is interwoven with political considerations and other variables. The thesis of this paper is that the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) is not a better and/or alternative development strategy for Africa and Nigeria in particular. This statement is predicated upon the lack of political will on the part of Nigerian leaders to carry out drastic or radical economic and political policies that will direct economic development, lack of state autonomy, lack of good governance, lack of good leadership with vision under conditions of democratic, just and peaceful development and lack of political capacity, amongst others. Perhaps, the most serious of these deficiencies is Nigeria's lack of the kind of leadership that could marshal a profound vision of the country's economic transformation. An analysis of a wide spectrum of literature and the situation on ground indicate that NEPAD is intrinsically and extrinsically bound to fail. The main recommendations/conclusion inter-alia is that Nigerian State should take certain mandatory and mediatory steps/measures with a view to making the objectives of NEPAD attainable, achievable and realizable.

INTRODUCTION

African continent, and Nigeria in particular, is in a dire need for economic and political development, as a result of a myriad of problems. The economic and political problems of African countries have defied a number of policies which were geared towards their amelioration. Consequently, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) appeared in the socio-economic and political lexicon of Africa as a potential panacea for its economic and political problems.

In an effort to lift itself from its economic and political quagmire, the then 53-member nations of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), now African Union (AU) initiated the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). Its objectives include the eradication of poverty, promotion of growth and development in Africa; diversification of production and exports; the creation of awareness and opportunities to invest in the continent's human resources. The other objectives are the improvement of the role of

women in the development process; and above all, promotion of peace, security, human rights, democracy and good governance (Eminue, 2007). Of the eight chapters into which the 60-page New Partnership for Africa's Development document is broken, three clearly spell out the goals and objectives of NEPAD. The first states that:

The New Partnership for Africa's Development is a pledge by African Leaders, based on a common vision and a firm and shared conviction, that they have a pressing duty to eradicate poverty and to place their countries, both individually and collectively, on a path of sustained growth and development and at the same time participate actively in the world economy and body politics.

The programme is anchored on the determination of Africans to extricate themselves and the continent from the malaise of underdevelopment and exclusion in a globalizing world. The fourth of the eight points of the NEPAD document states that:

In Africa, 340 million people, or half of the population (estimated at 700 million), 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% of the population has access to safe water. The rate of illiteracy for people over 15 is 41%. 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.

Consequently, NEPAD is essentially Africa's response to exclusion from the globalization process, for, as the NEPAD document reveals:

The poverty and backwardness of Africa stands in stark contrast to the prosperity of the developed world. The continued marginalization of Africa from the globalization process and the social exclusion of vast majority of its people constitute a serious threat to global stability... While globalization has increased the cost of Africa's ability to compete, we hold that the advantages of an effectively managed integration present the best for future economic prosperity and poverty reduction (NEPAD document, 2001:8).

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Generally, some writers have painted a dark picture of the African condition which Nigeria is part of. For instance, Akinrinade (2003:2) has asserted that Africa is:

The poorest, the most technologically backward, the most debt distressed, and the most marginalized region of the world, with 12.5% of the world's population, the region produces only 4.7% of global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and account for only 1.5% of the global trade in goods and services, despite exporting no less than 20% of its GDP annually.

In part, the low volume of business transacted in Africa is a reflection of infrastructural deficit. In virtually all parts of the continent, there is "substantial infrastructural decay" and "quantitative deficiency". In a continent where transportation systems are dominated by roads, less than 30% of surface roads are in good conditions, even as

ports are either under-performing or non-functioning. The telecommunications and power supply systems are grossly inefficient, as they rely on outdated and inadequate equipments. The infrastructural deficit produces major bottlenecks to the production and export businesses and hinders Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flows to the continent.

Accordingly, Akinrinade (2003:3) said that:

The economic growth rates for the decade averaged only 2.1% per annum, a figure less than the population growth rate of 2.8% producing an actual per capita income decline of 0.2% and, more importantly, considerably less than the 7% growth required to reduce by half of the proportion of the African population in poverty by 2015, the internationally agreed target.

More than 50% of the people of Sub-Saharan Africa live on less than US \$1 per day (Yaqub, 2012). According to Ihonvbere (1997), the World Bank's assessment of Africa revealed that; sub-Saharan Africa will be falling further behind the rest of the world, based on the realistic projections of the policies and Africa's depressed per capita income level, while developed countries and high-income countries will see their average income levels triple by the year 2030. Sub-Saharan Africa's per capita income will probably be only US \$400 by the year 2030 that of the developed countries as a whole will probably reach US \$2,500. Professor Mazrui (1995), predicted that in this age of globalization, Africa stands the risk of being "ghettoized" under "the new global apartheid"-a situation whereby a globalizing world generates new inequalities through corporate exclusion, financial manipulation and commercial barriers by dominant interests in the industrialized countries, thus leading to the incipient "hierachization" of nations, in which the rich few are able to preserve their power and privileges, while the poor are permanently condemned to a life of misery, destitution and frustration. The proliferation of "failed states" in Africa in the past few decades is already accentuating that hierachization.

However, Africa is marred by serious economic and political problems. The reasons for these sad and devastating situation cannot be over-emphasized. The continent has passed through slave trade, colonial subjugation and dominations and these have suppressed the entire spectrum of human endeavours. Nigeria was incorporated into the world capitalist system as a result of slave trade and colonialism. Besides, colonialism and imperialism are serious problems in addition to lack of technology and skilled manpower and the control of the trading and financial systems of the world by the big powers (developed countries), which often result in unequal exchange, transfer pricing and capital flight. All these have the potency for retarding and constituting obstacles to economic and political development of Africa and Nigeria in particular (Edet, 2012). However, considering the serial economic and political problems facing Africa and Nigeria, the focus of this work is on how the Nigerian state can extricate itself from the shackles of poverty, unemployment and underdevelopment. How realistic is the NEPAD vision, considering these myriad of economic, social and political problems confronting the country?

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

Some of the concepts- development and political economy which are relevant to the understanding of this paper are discussed below.

To Bello-Imam (1997:4), development is “a process by which a continuous increase in a system’s efficiency produces the condition which results in general upliftment. Such upliftment could be material and quantitative while it could be psychological and hence qualitative. The physical and psychological elements of the development mutually reinforce each other to bring about the desire general upliftment which is measured by general improvement in man’s living conditions”. To Okereke and Ekpe (2002:2), development refers to “the maximization of the growth of the Gross National Products (GNP) through capital accumulation and industrialization”. Defined in this way, development implies what Morris refers to as “emerging from poverty” or what Todaro in (Ekpe, 2002) calls “the reduction or elimination of poverty, inequality and unemployment within the context of a growing economy”.

Political economy simply explains the relationship between economics concern and its impact on political outcomes. According to Ikpe (2009), political economy has to do with the tools and methods developed to mediate between economics and political activities and apply them to the political or governmental sectors, to politics and to the public economy. For Mclean (1999:381), political economy is concerned with “that branch of government concerned with the systematic inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations”. Political economy is the interplay between economic and politics and how institutions develop in different social and economic systems influence public policy. It is most commonly refer to interdisciplinary studies drawing upon economics and politics in explaining how political institutions, the political environment and the economic system influence each other. Contemporarily, the concept is loosely used to describe political aspect of economic policy-making. Accordingly, political economy is the science of the laws governing the production and exchange of the various material means of subsistence in human society at the various stages of its development. Politics and economics are intertwined, one cannot be divulged from the other.

According to Anifowose and Enemuoh (1999), political economy is that mode of production in material life that determines the general character of the social, political and economic processes of life. The political economy framework, thus requires the analysts to take cognizance of the mode of production which refers not only to the state of technique but to the way in which means of production were owned and the social relations between men which resulted from their connections with the process of production.

In the view of Shively (1999), political economy focuses on how the state and the economy interact. Here, emphasis is on how state’s government influences the economy through its policies. To Eboh (1991), “political perspective of economic development deals with the interplay of political variables and societal structure with economic policy and outcomes.” It is concerned with the determinants of economic policy that are outside of economic realm. Political economy analysis of development

studies the impact of the politics of competitive bidding by various interest groups and mediating roles of government.

The inseparable nature of economic and politics was analyzed by Nnoli (2003), when he asserted thus:

The involvement of the state in economic development underlines the fundamental link between economic and political life. No economic problem of any magnitude is purely an economic problem. Almost every important economic act undertaken in a society has, in greater or lesser measure, an inevitable impact on social and political processes (p.117).

On the other hand, the very solution of many economic problems, including those connected with prospect and goals of the country's development, acquires and acutely political character depends on the correlation of class forces, on the interaction or conflict of political grouping and so on.

ORIGIN/BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF NEPAD

NEPAD is an OAU/AU mandated process which was intended to offer Africa a historic opportunity to showcase its new development strategy. The initiation of NEPAD is an acknowledgement of the demise of previous developmental paradigms and modules. Two former African Heads of State-former President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa and former President Abdoulaye Wade of Senegal-based on their share belief that African developmental strategies in the 1980s and 1990s had been initiated by African experts and not by African Heads of State. This time around the development agenda was formulated and initiated by the decision-makers themselves-African Leaders. While President Wade proposed his Plan Omega for Africa, President Mbeki joined by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika of Algeria and former President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria launched the Millennium Partnership for African Recovery (MAP).

The MAP centers on economic and social revival of African through the instrumentality of constructive partnership between Africa and the developed world. President Abdelaziz Bouteflika of Algeria who was the then Chairman of the OAU, President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria who doubled as the Chairman of G77 and President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa who was the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement were asked by African Leaders to harmonize their proposal at the July, 2000 OAU summit which took place in Lome, Togo. The Plan Omega of President Wade of Senegal also took the centre stage in 2001. The Plan Omega for Africa centers on the development of human and physical capital under a single international authority as the prerequisite for sustained and balanced growth. The draft of MAP in March 2001, received OAU's endorsement at OAU's Extra-ordinary Summit at Sirte, Libya. It was at the July, 2001 at Lusaka, Zambia OAU meeting that these proposals were fused to become the New African Initiative (NAI) which was approved as an official document. (www.nepad.org).

A committee of Heads of State was set up to carry out its implementation with President Olusegun Obasanjo as its Chairman and Presidents Wade and Mbeki as members. The committee met at Abuja, Nigeria in October, 2001 and adopted NEPAD as the new name of the initiative. The primary and long term objectives of NEPAD accordingly to Adeniji (2004), are to eradicate poverty in Africa, to place African countries both individually and collectively on a path to sustainable growth and development, to halt marginalization of Africa in the globalization process, to enhance its full and beneficial integration into the global economy and to accelerate the empowerment of women. While the principle of partnership with rest of the world is equally vital to this process, such partnership must be based on mutual respect, dignity, shared responsibility and mutual accountability.

Conceptualizing NEPAD as an integral part of African Renaissance, President Mbeki embarked on the process of galvanizing external support and cooperation for it before beginning to rally support among African Leaders for the new idea even before the NEPAD document was drafted. President Mbeki explained this *modus operandi* after briefing the World Economic Forum in Davos in January, 2001 when he said:

During the year 2000, we spent some time meeting the political leadership of the developed world-the North. Accordingly, in May, we met British Prime Minister, Tony Blair and President Bill Clinton in London and Washington D.C. respectively. We also met the then Governor George W. Bush in Austin, Texas. In June, we were part of the Berlin meeting on Progressive Governance... In the same month, we visited to participate in and addressed the meeting of Nordic Prime Ministers. Again, in June, we addressed the meeting of the European Council held in Portugal, which was attended by all Heads of State and Government of EU. In July, together with President Obasanjo and Bouteflika, we met Heads of State and Government of G7 in Tokyo and had the opportunity to hold bilateral discussions with the Japanese Prime Minister, Yoshiro Mori. While in Tokoy, we also met the President of the World Bank, Jim Woflensohn. Later, in Pretoria, we also held discussion with the Managing Director of the IMF, Horst Kohler. In September, we addressed the UN Millennium summit and had an opportunity to meet Presidents Putin of Russia, among others. Before this, we had also interacted with the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, who committed the UN to cooperate with us as we worked on the MAP (www.nepad.org).

According to NEPAD document, NEPAD is envisaged as “a long-term vision of an African-owned and African-lead development Programme”. The programme is based on a twin strategy of: (i) development predicated on the paradigm of structural transformation. (ii) Utilization of the regions of Africa as the basic operational space, even as emphasis is place on the resort to substantial private investment. The programme as encapsulated in the NEPAD document (2001:3), is anchored on the

“determination of Africans to extricate themselves and the continent from the malaise of underdevelopment and exclusion in a globalizing world”.

According to Eminiue (2007), structural transformation refers to an export oriented strategy of development that ensures growth with poverty reduction and sustainability through balanced inter-industry linkages and export diversification based on a mobilization of domestic saving as well as external resources flows that generate neither dependence nor international indebtedness. Also, emphasis on regionalism implies that NEPAD has opted for development of the continent based not on individual states but on the existing regions and functional regional communities.

- The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
- The Economic Community of Central Africa States (ECCAS)
- The Southern African Development Community (SADC)
- The Arab Maghreb Union (AMU)
- The East African Community (EAC)
- The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)
- The Inter-governmental Agreement on Desertification and Development (IGADD).

The NEPAD Programme is a comprehensive, coordinated and integrated sustainable economic, political and development initiative for the revival of Africa as encapsulated in its objectives and principles.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF NEPAD PROGRAMME

The conception, formulation and implementation of NEPAD is a laudable approach towards emancipating African continent from its serial economic and political problems. NEPAD is faced with some challenges that pose a potential hindrance to its practicability, as analyze below. This analysis is with a view to buttressing the thesis of this paper that NEPAD is not a better and/or alternative development strategy or initiative for Africa as a whole and Nigeria in particular.

(a) Lack of State Autonomy

According to Mcfaul (1995) in (Omoweh, 2003: 10), state autonomy is the “state’s ability to define independent preferences”. Polidano (2001) in (Omoweh, 2003:12) sees it as “the ability of states to act independently of the wishes of non-state actors”. Non- State actors are societal interest groups which are partisan, sectional and particularistic. They may be ethnic, religious or ideological in nature. Such actors may include Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) in Sudan, Janjawid in Sudan, Alshabab in Somalia, Lord Resistance Army (LRA) in Uganda, Boko Haram in Nigeria, Selake Rebels in Central African Republic, etc. For instance in Nigeria, before the advent of Boko Haram in 2002, there were still conflicts in the country, ranging from inter/intra-communal conflicts, religious conflicts and militancy in the Nigeria Delta region. The proliferation of these conflicts and inability of the Nigerians state to harmonize dissenting interests without seeking foreign help erodes the autonomy of

the state. Nigeria as a weak state cannot engage in the kind of partnership which NEPAD purports (Edet, 2012).

Ake, (1986), Ony-eoziri, (2002), Ukiwo, (2003) and Omeji, (2004), have all argued that Nigeria lacks institutionalized economic and political autonomy due to a combination of domestic and external forces at work. The factors are corruption among political office holders, weak political institutions and foreign influence on the economic policies of the country, among others. African countries including Nigeria are perpetually indebted to developed nations and the financial institutions controlled by them. Thus, they are nominally independent and therefore free but ironically, they are basically working for the developed nations, as they continue to accumulate massive debts. Corruption among political office holders is another serious problem. Ability of the Nigerian state to prosecute corrupt officials is also questionable. For instance, the subsidy probe in the petroleum sector indicted many companies and individuals mostly members of the ruling People Democratic Party (PDP). They are yet to be punished accordingly and the judiciary is not also helping matters by dismissing criminal cases on a mere technical grounds. A typical example was a case of corruption and diversion of Ogun State Government funds by the former Governor of State, Gbenga Daniel to the tune of about ₦1.6 billion. A Federal High Court in Ogun State had to dismiss the case on grounds that Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (EFCC) did not seek the leave of the Court before filing charges against the former Governor. This is ridiculous and laughable. The political institutions like judiciary, legislature and executive are relatively weak.

(b) The Debt Crises

Most African countries including Nigeria are highly indebted to the Bretton wood institutions-IMF and World Bank and other developed nations. As at April, 2012, the Nigeria's Coordinating Minister of Economy and Finance, Dr. (Mrs) Ngozi Iweala, declared that Nigeria's domestic and external debts stood at 44 billion dollars (₦5.96 Trillion) (Thisday, Tuesday, April 17, 2012).

As at June, 2013, Debt Management Office (DMO), through its Director General, Dr. Abraham Nwankwo, declared that Nigeria's debt stocks hits ₦7.93 trillions. According to DMO, Nigeria owes both local and international creditors a total of \$50.91 billion (about ₦7.93 trillion). DMO also revealed that the external debts stood at \$6.92 billion (about ₦1.08 trillion), while domestic debts component stood at ₦6.85 trillion (\$43.99 billion). The external debts component comprises debts owed by both federal government and 36 states of the federation and the FCT, while domestic debt is owed by federal government alone. According to the Director General DMO, the federal government had over-borrowed especially from domestic sources (Punch, July 22, 2013).

As at May 5, 2014, the DMO said that Nigeria's debt profile hits ₦10.04 trillion. According to DMO, Nigeria total debt stock hit a total of ₦10.04 trillion as December 31, 2013, indicating an increase of 33.03 percent compared with the ₦7.55 trillion as

at December 31, 2012, following massive borrowing both from the domestic market and international agencies. (Leadership, May 5, 2014).

According to DMO, the federal government borrowed an estimated ₦2.49 trillion to finance its operation in 2013, representing 54.13 percent of the budget estimate of ₦4.6 trillion. This happens evening when the oil benchmark in the budget was exceeded, that is, \$79 to \$110. What happens to the Excess? Data on the public debt stock as at December 31, 2013, released by the DMO on May 4, 2014, indicated that the external debt comprising federal government and states' debts to international multilateral agencies stood at ₦1.37 trillion (\$8.82 billion) at the exchange rate of ₦155.75/\$1, accounted for 13.68 percent of the total debt stock, while domestic debt stock totaling ₦8.67 trillion accounted for 86.32 percent of the total debt stock.

The DMO report on actual debt service charges showed that the ₦794.56 billion used in servicing both domestic and external debt stocks in 2013 increased by 10.20% compared to the ₦721.00 billion used in 2012. The actual debt services charges also overshoot the ₦591.76 billion provide in the 2013 Appropriation Act for debt servicing by 34.27 percent (Leadership, May 5, 2014). The above shows that government spent much on administration and operated appropriation act with impunity. It also shows that about 17.27 percent of the Nigeria's budget goes to debt service while the country at the same time, continues to increase its borrowing profile. The debt is so burdensome that it is capable of turning any economic programmes such as NEPAD meaningless, impracticable and uncoordinated. These debts crisis is causing an "economic dislocation" to Nigeria and it constitutes a definitive cog in the wheel of progress of NEPAD agenda. By "economic dislocation", we mean a situation where government reckless economic activities leads to erosion of economic sovereignty of state. For instances, Nigeria depended solely on the manufactured goods from developed nations which are usually over-priced while their raw materials like oil are usually under-priced. These brings about lopsidedness in trade relations; thus leading to unequal exchange and trade deficit. Consequently, it leads to debt burden as Nigeria will be unable to raise enough money to finance its capital and recurrent projects.

Some observers have described it as debt peonage or debt trap making the highest stage of imperialism. They see the indebted nations such as Nigeria as trapped in a viscous circle of perpetual debt. As these nations struggle to survive under the weight of accumulated debts, the leaders are unable to provide the people with the very facilities to ease their struggle for survival. The major problem of Nigeria is that they do not earn enough to pay off their debt, for as long as there is unequal exchange. Consequently, they are unable to accumulate enough surplus to direct their development towards self-reliance.

(c) Lack of control over the rules governing global economy

The rules governing global economy are determined by the capitalist, industrialized and imperialist powers; the U.S.A, Britain, China, etc. These rules operate regardless of the desires of the Less Developed Countries (LDCs) to which Nigeria belongs. The

International Economic Order was deliberately structured to the advantages of developed nations. This paper therefore submits that NEPAD is subject to the whims and caprices of the industrialized nations which determine the rules governing International Economic Relations. NEPAD has as one of its objectives, to halt the marginalization of Africa in the globalization process and enhance its formal integration into the global economy. Ironically, NEPAD is dependent on external support and cooperation (Edet, 2012).

In early 1980s, African countries including Nigeria demanded for restructuring of the International Economic Order, as it was structured to their disadvantage. Instead for it to be restructured, African states were asked by the developed nations to restructure their domestic economy, with the imposition of SAP-Structural Adjustment Programme. SAP further exacerbated and deteriorated the continent's socio-economic and political fortunes (Owugah, 2009).

All these lopsided economic decisions of the developed nations became practicable and realizable because they direct and decide rules governing International Economic Relations. Apart from the unequal nature of the trade relations between the African countries and the developed nations, the vessels in which their exports and imports are carried as well as the insurance companies that insure the goods are all owned by the developed nations. Understandably, African states were dissatisfied and in fact, frustrated with the Bretton woods International Economic Order which was put in place by the developed nations in which less developed countries' interest was not in any way taken into consideration. It turned out to be economic order in which as President Julius Nyerere, in Owugah (2009:7) put, "no matter what they do, their condition will continue to get worst". It was this frustration that led to African States' demand for restructuring of the extant International Economic Order in order to usher in a New International Economic Order in which they will participate in designing and their interest would be taken into consideration.

(d) The Nature of the Initiative

There has not been adequate enlightenment about NEPAD. Civil Society Organizations and other society based groups which are more in touch with the grass-roots are being sidelined by NEPAD. It is being perceived by some scholars like Omoweh (2003) and Akinrinade (2003), as a neo-colonialist approach in disguise.

NEPAD is not Afrocentric (African-Oriented) in its conception and contents and that presents a problem for its practicability. NEPAD Programme still depended on the support of the developed nations, its technology and foreign aid. This was evident in January, 2001, when former President Thabo Mbeki of South Africa briefed the World Economic Forum in Davos. He narrated how he, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo and Algerian President Abdelaziz Bouteflika toured and met world leaders in different places, with a view to getting their support and cooperation.

(e) Lack of Administrative Capacity

Administrative capacity is the "ability of states to deliver goods and services such as public health, education, provide physical infrastructure and carryout normal administrative functions of governments. Effective service delivery is a key component

of administrative capacity which in turn will be the product of quality of state institutions...” (Onyeoziri, 2005:6). The central argument here is that a state which is deficient in administrative capacity is likely to be unable to enter a partnership of the magnitude of NEPAD. For instance, less than 30% of the roads in Nigeria are in good shape, more than 1 in 6 adult cannot read as well as a sizeable number of people having access to public health (Punch, July 22, 2013).

(f) Lack of Extractive Capacity

Nigeria is hugely entangled in both domestic and external debts. According to DMO, Nigeria’s current debts stock stood at ₦10.04 trillion (Leadership, May 5, 2014). It is deficient in key economic and political development indices. The ability of the Nigerian State to raise revenue is questionable. For Cummings & Norgard (2004:692) in Onyeoziri (2005:6), a country with high debt profile lacks the capacity to enter into a partnership such as NEPAD. To a greater extent, it is doubtful if Nigeria can achieve NEPAD objectives given its lack of extractive capability-that is capacity to raise revenue without much dependent on foreign aid or loans.

(g) Lack of Technological Capacity

Technical capacity could be described as “... the intellectual and organizational resources owned by a state such as internal or external expertise or experience that may be brought to bear on policy making process so as to design coherent, viable and politically feasible policies”. (Cummings and Norgard, 2004:688 cited in Onyeoziri, 2005:6). African Countries cannot replicate the positive role the state played in the Asian development experience... because they lack the necessary technical and analytical capacity” (Onyeoziri, 2005:6).

However, in July, 2002, members of some 40 African social movements, trade unions, youths and women’s organizations, NGOs, religions organizations and others endorsed the Africa Civil Society Declaration on NEPAD, rejecting NEPAD, as not carrying them along in the formation of the document. It is however, argued that NEPAD is elitist and top down its approach, having been drawn up by a few Heads of State, virtually excluding civil society organizations in its preparation.

More recently, NEPAD has also been criticized by some of its initial backers, including the former Senegalese President, Abdoulaye Wade, who accused NEPAD of wasting hundreds of millions of dollars and achieving nothing. NEPAD suffers from slow decision making and a relatively poorly resourced and often cumbersome implementing framework. There is a great lack of information about the day-to-day activities of NEPAD secretariat (www.nepad.org).

Also, NEPAD is only concerned with raising external financial resources, appealing to and relying on external Governments and institutions. This may ultimately lead to dependency and neo-colonialism. NEPAD will lead to further foreign exploitation and further plunder of Africa’s rich natural resources, rather than mobilizing such resources for the benefit of Africans and its involvement with western financial

institutions such as World Bank, IMF, etc. will further bring about “economic dislocation”, to the detriment of Nigeria in particular and Africa in general.

Above all, the challenges of getting all segments of the Nigerian society to understand the NEPAD Programme is also critical as well as slow domestication of the NEPAD process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper ends with the following recommendations:

- (i) The Nigerian State should be sincere in its fight against corruption and also build its capacities in the areas identified and discussed.
- (ii) The NEPAD document should be reviewed to make it more Afrocentric (African-based/oriented). Civil Society organizations should be incorporated into NEPAD programme. There should be more publicity for people to be acquainted with NEPAD thereby ensuring popular participation.
- (iii) The Nigerian government should muster the necessary political will and courage to implement the programme. By political will, we mean the zeal and patriotism to carry out drastic implementation of the programme. The Nigerian leaders need to summon such courage to be able to implement the programme.
- (iv) The Nigerian government should reduce their domestic and external borrowing to avoid problems associated with debt burden.
- (v) African and Nigerian leaders should be sincere in implementing programmes as contained in the NEPAD document.
- (vi) Relevant organs of government like the National Assembly should support the NEPAD programme through enabling laws.
- (vii) Nigerian government should increase funding of NEPAD priority programmes to achieve the aims and objectives.
- (viii) Well meaning Nigerians should support the NEPAD programme to achieve its objectives.

CONCLUSION

Analysis of previous works on political economy which showed the linkage between economics and politics, indicates that NEPAD may be unworkable due to a multitude or myriad of economic and political problems in Nigeria. Specifically, it was shown that debt burden, lack of technological capacity, amongst other factors are capable of jeopardizing the good intentions of NEPAD. The polarized political system of the Nigerian society may render NEPAD processes and implementation unworkable and untenable, such as insecurity, corruption, weak political institutions, debt burden, fiscal indiscipline, over-dependence of Nigeria’s revenue on oil, etc. These variables has the potency of retarding any development efforts. However, the history of NEPAD, its aims and objectives as well as the potential problems were presented with a view to grounding the critical analysis properly.

REFERENCES

- Akinrinade, S. (2003) NEPAD: Dispensing with the begging bowl. In: Obadare, O. (ed.), *NEPAD: Challenges and developments*, London: Centre for Democracy and Development.
- Momoh, A. M. & Hundey, A. (1999) "Perspective on Political Economy". In: Anifowose, R. & Enemu, F. (eds). *Elements of Politics*, Lagos: Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Eboh, E. (1991) "Political economy of national development", *African Development Studies*, 1(2) 15-27.
- Edet, L. I. (2012) "Globalization and trade relations in the post-war economic order: The Third World countries experience", *International Journal of African Culture, Politics and Development*, 7(2) 38-48.
- Eminue, O. (2007) *Politics of African States*. Mimeograph: Department of Political Science & Public Administration, University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.
- Ihonvbere, J. O. (1997) "Nigerian in the new world order: Implementations and option". In: Bello-Iman, I. B. (ed.). *Governance in Nigeria*, Lagos: Stirling-Horden Publishers.
- Ikpe, U.B. (2009) *Introduction to Political Economy*, Lagos: Concept Publications Limited.
- Iweala, N. (2012) "Nigeria's debt profile", *Thisday Newspaper*, April 17, p.6.
- Mclean, I. (1999) *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nnoli, O. (2003) *Introduction to Politics*, Enugu: Pan African Centre for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution (PACREP).
- Nwankwo, A. (2013) "Nigeria's debt profile", *The Punch*, July 22, p.7.
- Nwankwo, A. (2014) "Nigeria" debt profile", *Leadership Newspaper*, May 5, p. 5.
- OAU (2001) "NEPAD document", Abuja, OAU.
- Okereke, O. and Ekpe, A. (2002) *Development and Underdevelopment: Politics of the North- South*