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Introduction.

Globalization today is commonly understood to be a process of change, which comes in many forms. It has a number of direct effects on the economical, political, cultural, religious, social, demographic, environmental and military spheres. Understanding these aspects of globalization is very crucial and important, because the interaction among them can be constructive or destructive. In recent experiences of some developing countries, globalization can trigger security problems, especially in some of the developing countries (Murad, 2002).

From obscure origins in French and American writings in the 1960s, the concept of globalization finds expression today in all world's major languages. Yet, it lacks precise definition. Indeed, globalization is in danger of becoming the cliché of our times (David, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton, 1999:1). The phenomenon of globalization has indeed captured the centre stage of international relations in the post cold war world. In deed, globalization mirrors cooperative as well as conflicting trends across states and civil societies between multiple ranges of actors, at varying levels, which shape contours of international relations. Understanding the trajectories of interactions between these multiple actors including nation-states, international/regional organizations, transnational firms and banks, multinational terrorist organizations and international social movements etc; under globalization, is incontestably, a daunting task. For, perceptions and perspectives on the complex themes underlying globalization tend to vary according to diverse schools of thought in international relations as well as the spatial locations of scholars (Harshe, 2004:9).

Since the last decade, globalization in its accelerated form has been setting the pace as well as the logic of international relations. Nevertheless, being a constantly evolving and an ongoing process, the term “globalization”, continues to escape definition clarity. Broadly, however, it is deployed to describe an ongoing movement towards conceiving the world as a single unit and building the consciousness of the people towards the world as a whole (Robertson, 1992 as cited in Harshe, op. cit.,:15).

Push Factors.

Certain important developments in the last century since the late eighties, such as:
1. the disintegration of the former Soviet bloc,
2. the end of the cold war,
3. and the reunification of Germany have given an unprecedented impetus to the current phase of globalization (Harshe, ibid.)
What then is globalization? Although in its simplest sense globalization refers to the widening, deepening and speeding up of global interconnectedness, such a definition begs further elaboration. In seeking to remedy this conceptual difficulty, this paper commences from an understanding of globalization which acknowledges its distinctive spatial attributes and the way these unfold over time.

In general, therefore, the concept of globalization implies, first and foremost, a stretching of social political and economic activities across frontiers such that events, decisions and activities in one region of the world can come to have significance for individuals and communities in distant regions of the globe. In this sense, it embodies trans-regional interconnectedness, the widening reach of the networks of social activity at a distance. Beyond this, globalization implies that connections across or random, but rather are regularized such that there is a detectable intensification, or growing magnitude, of interconnectedness, patterns of interaction and flows which transcend the constituent societies and states of the world order (David, et al, op.cit,15)

Methodology of the Study of Globalization.

There is a great deal of confusion about the nature of theory concerning the working of international system, political and economic. This has resulted in a lot of ‘theoretical’ work which is not really theory at all, in the sense in which that word should be used and is defined in the dictionaries (i.e. ‘a supposition explaining something, especially one based on principles independent of the phenomenon to be explained’, Concise Oxford Dictionary).

The approach to international political economy can be made by making some negative assumptions about what is not theory and some positive assumption of what is theory.

Negative Assumptions:

A great deal of social theory is really no more than description, often using new terms and words to describe known phenomena, or to narrate old stories without attempting theoretical explanations. Putting on event after another without explaining the causal connection, if any, cannot count as theory. Some so-called theory in international studies merely rearranges and describes known facts categories or in new taxonomies. This is not to say a fresh taxonomy may not be necessary to the elaboration of new theory. The development of quantitative techniques applied to international studies has not advanced theory.
The choice of what to be counted is too arbitrary and the determination of what is causal and what is coincidental is too subjective to provide a basis for explanation. For the most part of such methods have been used only to substantiate platitudes and reinforce conventional wisdom concerning historical patterns of state behaviour in relation to other states.

**Positive Assumptions:**

The first is that assumption theory must seek to explain some aspects of international system that is not easily explained by common sense. It must serve to explain a puzzle or a paradox where there is an aspect of the behaviour of individuals, groups or social institutions for which a simple explanation is not apparent. It is not necessary to look for a theory to explain why people try to leave a burning house, but is necessary to find a theory to explain why they patronize shops on the other side of the street corner more than the other. Theory need not necessarily aspire to predict or prescribe. This is where social science differs from natural science. National science can aspire to predict-though it does not necessarily do so. Much science, from anatomy to microbiology, enlarges understanding of what happens without being able to offer conclusive explanation of why it happens. Social science can never confidently predict because the irrational factors involved in human relations are too numerous, and the permutations and combinations of them are even more numerous. Lastly, theory should be scientific only in the sense that the theorist respects the scientific virtues of rationality and impartiality and aspire to the systematic formulation of explanatory propositions (See Strange, 1994:9-12).

**Political Economy Approach to Globalization.**

First of all, it should be understood that, there is no theory in itself, and that there is no theory independent of a concrete historical context. Theory is the way the mind works to understand reality it confronts. It is the self-consciousness of that mind, the awareness of how facts experienced are perceived and organized so as to be understood. Theory thus follows reality in the sense that it is shaped by the world of experience. But it also precedes the making of reality in that it orients the minds of those who by their actions reproduce or change that reality (Cox, 1995:31).

Political economy is one of the more complex and contested concepts on social science. This is consequently also true for the more recent concept of International Political Economy (IPE). According to most introductory textbooks, IPE deals with the way the world economy is organized politically, or how political anarchy can be compatible with international economic cooperation-the non-coincidence of political organization and economic function. More concisely, IPE is the connection between
politics and economics in international relations. One important underlying assumption of IPE, which makes it distinct from mainstream international economics, is that no economic system can exist for long without a stabilizing political framework of some sort. Thus the world economy and the international political system cannot be usefully analysed in separation from each other, but must be dealt with within one single theoretical framework, although necessarily informed by several disciplines.

Although political economy was always an ideological battlefield, there is a consensus about the what conventionally constitutes, or at least what has in the past constituted, the fundamental concern of political economy, namely the interaction of state and market, or. In different terms, politics and economics. It can be said therefore that without both state and market there would be no political economy (Hettne, 1995:1-2).

Lastly, it is impossible to study political economy and especially international political economy without giving close attention to the role of power in economic life. It is power that determines the relationship between authority and market. Markets cannot play a dominant in the way which a political economy functions unless allowed to do so by whoever wields power and authority(Strange, op.cit.;23). Political economy therefore is concerned with the historically constituted frameworks or structures within which political and economic activity takes place. It stands back from the apparent fixity of the present to ask how the existing structures came into being and how they may be changing, or how they may be induced to change. In this sense, political theory is critical theory (Cox, op.cit.:33).

Critics of Globalization.

Critics of globalization thesis who study the longer-term aspects of capitalist development see much déjà vu in the alleged novelties of the recent changes in the global economic system. The current changes, while significant and distractive, are not unprecedented and do not necessarily involve a move towards a new type of economic system. The basic criticism arises from common sense but often forgotten observation: Some critics argue that the international economy is not global yet. Markets, even for strategic industries and major firms, are still far from being fully integrated. Capital flows are still restricted by currency and banking regulations, the mobility of labour is undermined by immigration controls and xenophobia, and multinational enterprises still keep most of their assets and strategic command centers in their historically defined home nations. Moreover, critics of the globalization thesis
also argue that capital mobility is not producing massive shifts of investment and employment from advanced to developing countries. Rather, foreign direct investment, technological capacity, industrial production and markets are highly concentrated among the advanced industrial economies of the European Union, Japan and North America (Rugumamu, 2001:16)

Thus it can be observed so far that globalization is a complex process that that is confronted with much resistance and suspicion, although its objective can be said to be unify principles, rules and values across the world. It should be remembered that, for some, profit remains the driving force of this process.

Formation of Powerful Economic Blocks.

The most developed countries are trying above all since the beginning of 1980 to form large groups of considerable weight in order to develop an economy that was to an extent autonomous. Since 1989, the United States and Canada concluded a North American free trade treaty, NFTA. Negotiations also later included Mexico in Western Europe. In Western Europe, the Economic European Community tried to create an autonomous economic policy. A third pole under the influence of Japan in the Pacific was also emerging. Nonetheless, a certain degree of autonomy did not signify independence. It was inter independence resulting from liberalization of, movement of goods and capital. Devaluation, taxation and protectionism in general were not acceptable policies anymore among developed countries. In most countries control of exchange was eliminated and capital circulated according to interest rates, fiscal policies, possibilities of economic growth, etc. international trade of goods and services increased to a dynamic that concerned trade with a regional pole rather than international trade in general (Fouad, 2003:8-9)

Self Sustainable Development in Africa?

With a land area three times the size of the United States, Africa’s vast rich continent possesses all the resources required for modern development. Its many-faceted history and culture reach back through the empires of early antiquity to the first known site of human life. Long before Europeans discovered the Americans people of Africa had built towns and carried on trade with Europe and Asia. Prior to World War II, Africa was a net exporter of food. Today, with a population of over 500 million, Africa ships an infinitive variety of mineral and agricultural riches – the saw sinews of modern industry and luxurious consumption to all corners of the earth. Yet, at the same time four decades after the peoples of Africa began to throw off the bitter yoke of colonial rule, the majority of African countries, mainly in Sub-Saharan
Africa, still rank among the world’s poorest. Deteriorating economic and social conditions have left the average African 20 to 25 percent worse off than in 1979. As the conditions for limited financial aid, bilateral and multilateral agencies require African governments to adopt policies that many critics claim push tens of thousands more Africans still deeper into the mire of poverty and dependency (Seidman and Anang (eds).1992:1).

While developed countries are seeking ways and means to adopt to the new world and means to ensure for themselves a good share in economic growth, African countries are more than trapped in a mesh of social, economic, political and cultural problems. Consequences of the multiplication of transnational flux and the end of the Cold War weakened the modern model of the nation-state. In Africa, in particular, populations were occupied in dismantling the model established in 1960 with the colonization movement.

The Modern State in Africa.

The modern State is a political system where judicial, legislative and executive functions are centralized in government. In theory, the system permits equal participation of all citizens. A sentiment of belonging to a national community constitutes the link between society and its government. Nationalism expresses the will to defend interests of the community. This presupposes that the nation is clearly defined, that its interests and values are predominant, and that its independence must be preserved. The modern nation in Africa was weakened by the impact of transnational flux and the incapacity of modern development projects to concretize promises for a better life for the majority of people. Modernity as a homogenizing process it seems to have failed. The legitimacy of the elite who control judicial, legislative and executive power is in question in many African countries. The connection between the government and society was disrupted. Differences that were concealed for long suddenly appeared. There are no more shared values. Ethnic, cultural, religious, linguistic and even historical differences have been magnified (Fouad, op.cit:9).

State Building and Globalization in Africa.

Globalization, which among other things represents openness and state disengagement from economic activity, has, thus, also become a factor that obstructs state-building and undermines states. Income inequalities - between social classes, ethnic groups, and regions are on the rise, and the state – especially in poor African countries – has become powerless to deal with these problems. The state
and institutions such as democracy and labour unions are national in nature and they are not equipped to deal with the economic system, which is increasingly global. Uneven development and deprivation are clearly not the only causes of ethnic conflict, nor do the absence of uneven development or poverty guarantee successful state – building or harmonious interethnic relations. Uneven development is, however likely to spark or aggravate ethnic cleavages. Thus, a state that perpetuates uneven development or fails to correct it is unlikely to succeed in state – building by mobilizing the different ethnic identified for a shared future. Excessive centralization and coercion, which only aggravate ethnic conflicts, have increasingly become the most common means to preserving the territorial integrity if an increasing number of African states (Mengisteab, 1996:13)

Because of the above arguments, critics of globalization characterize it as a great threat to potential human development. The primary emphasis of globalization has been economic liberalization, with very little attention paid to the importance of international equality and solidarity. As the remote forces of globalization hobble governments and weaken the bounds of social solidarity anger is growing among those whose existence is being threatened. Moreover, the rise of globalization has also seen a greater degree of economic differentiation among developing countries, a factor which has further undermined the ideals of South – South Cooperation (Cheru, 2003:1).

Sovereignty Debate and International Organizations’ Agreements.

It is argued forcefully that, in signing WTO agreements, governments abdicate a lot of their power to control their domestic economies and their own development priorities. It is acknowledged that WTO is an important instrument of global deregulation, for example, by:

- Requiring countries not to discriminate between domestic products, companies, services and intellectual property rights, and those from other WTO member countries (national treatment and most favoured nation, MFN-principles);
- Determining how the state can subsidise farmers and environmental protection, setting compulsory minimum levels for agricultural imports and eliminating non-tariff protection;
- Prohibiting government-imposed conditions on investors, such as domestic input quotas and limits on profit repatriation.

WTO obligations are guaranteed and enforced by the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism, which acts like a small court. The dispute panel’s preoccupation with
strict implementation of the WTO rules precludes the wider concerns governments may consider and, indeed, ignore the objectives laid down in the preamble to the WTO. Even when there is broad popular consensus about a particular rule, such as the banning of meat hormones in the EU, the panel rules against it on the basis of the assessment methods prescribed in the WTO.

Such strong enforcement of WTO obligations guarantees companies—especially those with global capital-freedom to operate where they can benefit most (Stichelle, 19997:6). The ratification of the WTO in 19995 marked a landmark in the development of the global economic system. The WTO’s mandate consists of regulation trade to the benefit of the international banks and transnational corporations as well as supervise the enforcement of national trade policies (see Ninsin, 2000:5). In fact, the new order encompasses a wide range of phenomena from the internationalization of economic activities to globalization of national cultures and politics, environment, and security issues, whereby the major actors are transnational corporations, multilateral financial institutions, multilateral agencies and indeed powerful states in the global system (Rugumamu, 1999:3-4).

IMF and The World Bank Weight over Africa.

Because economic globalization brings about marginalization on a massive scale and economic and political domination of a magnitude never witnessed since the days of colonialism, it is turning into a process of globalized poverty and wholesale plunder of neocolonies. The effects of globalization are thus terribly uneven and they produce big winners and losers (Schufa, 2001:2). It is easy, therefore to see that economic power affects the rules and conduct of those rules by the international institutions. The International Monetary Fund is the world’s institution meant to help countries to manage macroeconomic imbalances and minimize the risks of financial shocks. But in the 1990s, the IMF was enthusiastic about developing countries’ opening their capital accounts. This is one example where the IMF and the World Bank have been insufficiently humble in their recipes and probably all too heavily influenced by their richer members (Birdsall, 222:9).

The inventory of IMF/World Bank prescriptions is by now well known. It includes:

1. currency devaluation,
2. deregulation of prices and wages, reduction of public spending on social programmes and state bureaucracies,
3. removal of food subsidies and other basic necessities,
4. trade liberalization, privatization of parastatal enterprises,
5. and the expansion of the export sector; the latter—in the case of agriculture—often at the expense of food production.
The officially-stated aims of these policies was to stabilize domestic economies, to stimulate economic growth, and to ensure the country’s ability to earn the foreign exchange needed to service its foreign debts (Hoogvelt, 2002:5). Despite frequent uprisings and riots by some segments of their populations, most African governments have largely complied or attempted to comply with the liberalization drive. There are hardly any African states without some kind of adjustment programmes (Mengisteab, 1996: 29).

Globalization not undermining views:

Some authors dispute the claim that globalization is undermining sovereignty as exaggerated and historically myopic. They argue that, regardless of how sovereignty is understood, it is difficult to make a case that globalization is a radical dispersion of the power structure in a state. There has never been a mythical past which states were secure in the exercise of either their control or authority. Weaker states in particular have always had to struggle not only to maintain effective control within their borders, but also to exclude external authority. These challenges have been an inherent element of an international system (Sarangi, 2004: 199) quotes Stephen Kramer who suggests that the term sovereignty is commonly used in four different ways:

1. *Independent sovereignty* refers to the ability of a government to actually control activities within and across its borders, including the movements of goods, capital, ideas, disease vectors, etc.
2. *Domestic sovereignty* refers to the organization of authority within a given polity.
3. *Westphalian sovereignty* refers to the right of a government to be independent of external structures.
4. *International legal sovereignty* refers to the recognition of one state by another, especially when it is associated with diplomatic immunity and the right to sign treaties and join international organizations.

Krasner argues that while the first domain of sovereignty implies the extent of ‘control’ by the state, the rest of the meanings relate to the actual ‘authority’ of the state. He argues strongly that globalization has raised some new and unique problems for sovereignty understood as ‘control’ only. However, if higher levels of international transactions seem to be a threat to the control exercised by a state, this is not new phenomenon, which has emerged during the period globalization.

Africa’s Uneasiness over Globalization:
Despite Krasner’s arguments, African uneasiness about globalization is not without justification. The continent is no stranger to globalization and its deleterious effects. More than any region in the world, Africa has paid a high price for the globalizing policies of rival capitalist powers as they have striven to expand the geographic bounds of capital. Starting with the slave trade in the 1650s, and continuing under colonial rule after the Berlin Conference of 1884, the continent was heavily drawn into the centres of capitalist accumulation, but always a subordinate partner whose primary role was to contribute to the development of the metropolitan powers. For better or for worse, the globalization of labour in world history began with the slave trade, especially the trans-Atlantic variety. African people were scattered in four continents—Europe, North America, South America, and parts of Asia and of the African continent itself. Never in history was one race scattered so widely as physical workers (Mazrui, 2002:14).

Warning for Africa:

The present globalization process, much like nineteenth-century globalization under colonialism, could again end up leaving the continent permanently marginalized unless African governments redirect their efforts to manage it successfully to their own advantage. For Africa, this is an absolute necessity if the continent wants to avoid a repeat of the degrading and inhuman treatment its peoples received from the colonial and capitalist forces. The globalization of the twenty-first century should not be allowed to leave behind the same terrible economic, political, and social legacies (Cheru, op. cit.: 2). It should be appreciated that globalization is part of the reality of the contemporary world. If we ignore it, we do so at our peril. It is necessary that we understand and deal with it, rather than lament or complain about it (Zimbabwe Human Development Report(1999):9).

Africa’s Recovery Prospects:

Africa’s response to the on-going transition must involve its accelerated recovery and structural transformation. Besides the urgency of the need to eliminate mass poverty and accelerate human-centred development this transformation is essential to Africa’s security on several grounds. It offers the best hope achieving regional food self-sufficiency and thus eliminating the dangerous problem of food insecurity in Africa. Sustainable development is also the indispensable material basis for any security arrangements that must be funded and implemented with resources that can only be assured from sustainable economic expansion. The termination of the paralytic weakness of African states, which is the major source of their abusive foreign manipulation and domination, is possible also through the irreversible
recovery and structural transformation of African economies. This is equally central to the termination of financial imperialism that has become the most comprehensive form of foreign intervention in Africa since the 1980s (Adedeji, 1993 in Obasanjo and Mosha (eds) 1993:5).

Recent/Current Economic Recovery Initiatives from Within and Outside Africa:

AFRICA’S NEPAD

- NEPAD’s goals are to promote accelerated development, eradicate poverty and halt the marginalization of Africa in the global process. It claims to be:
  - A holistic integrated strategic framework for the socio-economic development of Africa;
  - A plan conceived and developed by African leaders;
  - A commitment that African leaders are making to accelerate the integration of the African continent into global economy;
  - A call to the rest of the world to partner Africa in its own development.

It must be noted here that before NEPAD, the African landscape had been littered with failed initiatives, development plans and programmes of action. Of note were the regional initiatives of the Lagos Plan of Action (early 80s) and the Abuja Treaty establishing the African Economic Community (early 90s). For a variety of reasons, including lack of capacity, lack of political will, outside interference and lack of resources, these past initiatives were unsuccessful (See Bujra, 2004:18).

Through NEPAD, Africa is appealing for a new partnership with the developed world. The key to the new partnership is Africa’s assertion of responsibility for its development, and its determination to set the development agenda. Thus ownership and partnership are closely linked. But what exactly do “ownership and partnership mean, and does Africa and the G-8 agree on the meanings?

The NEPAD envisages a bargain whereby Africa delivers peace and good governance and adopts appropriate policies of its own choosing and the developed world delivers more relief, and aid reform. This would replace the existing aid relationship which is heavily controlled by developed countries for reasons of self-interest, differences in world view, and perceptions of pervasive corruption or incapacity of African partners. A number of key questions arise concerning the proposed bargain: is a real partnership possible when the balance of power
necessarily weighs on the side of developed countries? Is real ownership by African partners possible?, and how likely is it that ownership by African countries will lead donors to increase resource flows and reform aid policies programmes, and practices?(Chimanikire, 2003 in Jalloh, (ed): 55-56).

The Commission for Africa:

The Commission for Africa was an initiative of the U.K Prime Minister Tony Blair, to provide a coherent set of policies to accelerate progress towards a strong and prosperous Africa. It was launched in February 2004. Blair and other members of the commission formally began their work at the first meeting of the Commission on May 4th 2004. The Commission met on several occasions before publishing its report and recommendations in March 2005. Outside the full Commission meetings, Commissioners were active in a range of international forums and events presenting their work and engaged a wide range of Africans and others who were able to help the Commission to take an independent look at the challenges facing Africa, and achieve its goal to generate action for a strong and prosperous Africa. There were 17 members of the Commission. All were working in an independent capacity. Most of the Commissioners were from Africa.

The Objectives of the Commission were:

1. To generate new ideas and action for a strong and prosperous Africa, using the 2005 British presidencies of the G8 and the European Union as a platform;
2. To support the best of existing work on Africa, in particular the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and the African Union, and help ensure this work achieves its goals;
3. To help deliver implementation of existing international commitments towards Africa;
4. To offer a fresh and positive perspective for Africa and its diverse culture in the 21st Century, which challenges unfair perception and helps deliver changes; and
5. To understand and help fulfill African aspirations for the future by listening to Africans (http://www.commissionforafrica.org/).

The timing of the Commission’s work was intended to seize 2005 as an opportunity to make a difference for Africa, with 2005 seeing the coincidence of the United Kingdom’s chairmanship of both the G8 and, in the second half of the year, the European Union (EU), with Africa high on both agenda.

The Commission early 2005 finished its work and on March 11th, 2005, it published its report and recommendations. In a Declaration the Commission had this to say:
The Commission for Africa finds the condition of the lives of the majority of Africans to be intolerable and an affront to the dignity of all mankind. We insist upon an alteration of these conditions through a change of policy in favour of the weak.

Having analysed and costed how this may be achieved, we call for our conclusions to be implemented forthwith in the cause of right and justice and in the name of our shared humanity.

On the edge of this new century, in an age of unprecedented wealth and economic progress by all continents, it is unacceptable that Africa drifts further from the rest of the world, unseen in its misery and ignored in its pain.

The Commission, in its members acting in their capacity as individuals, has assimilated the analysis of years and all extant reports into our findings. These clearly show how things may have been otherwise.

However, we exist in contemporary realities. The world is vastly different to that of 20 years ago when we forcefully acknowledged the pity of the Great African Famine of 1984-85. The world. Then locked into its Cold War political stasis, remained rigid in its competitive ideologies. The breaking of this deadlock, and the increase in global trade that followed, allied to new technologies and cultural shifts, have created a more fluid, less predictive yet more interdependent world.

This world in flux has brought great opportunities along with confusion, change and anxiety. But such changes poses great possibilities for us all and especially for Africa, that great giant finally beginning to stir itself from its enforced slumber. We need, then to seek to understand these newer forces in play about us, attempt to define them and in so doing set the framework for policies that favour the poor.

The great nations of the world, in alliance with their African neighbours, must now move together, in our common interest. How they may proceed will be determined by each nation’s needs and desires. But all must immediately begin the journey that leads us to the ultimate common destination of a more equitable world.

Our task was the first step. It is done.

Reflections on the CFA:

A Southern Africa Consultative Meeting which met in Lusaka from 13 to 14 December 2004, which comprised of NGOs and Other Continental bodies like AU, COMESA, NEPAD met to discuss the following themes of CFA:

- Issues relating to Africa's development,
- Cultural and inclusion in human development,
- Natural Resources and environment
- Growth and opportunity
- Peace and security
- Governance and effective states. Both positive and negative responses to CFA featured in the discussions. Positive views included;
  - The CFA and NEPAD complemented each other.
  - NEPAD focuses on what Africa can do for itself while CFA focuses on the international community.

However, negative views and scepticism about CFAs legitimacy and delivery potential were expressed in a number of ways. There were concerned about:

- The real motive / agenda behind the establishment of CFA.
- In what way the CFA differed from previous initiatives which had had limited success.
- There were too many initiatives being started on the issue of Africa’s development and that no more commitments should be made until the already existing ones were met.
- CFA was perceived as having failed to give proper recognition to the AU as the institution that spearheads the development agenda. Rather than pursuing a parallel course, CFA should have aligned itself to the programmes of the AU. Closely related to this point CFA was that CFA had tended to recognize and place emphasis on NEPAD rather than the AU (see ChimaniKire, 2005:7-8), see also SARPN:www.sarpn.org.za

Africa and the Way forward:

Poor people and poor African countries risk being severely marginalized in the new order. To the poor and poor African countries, the main trait of globalization has been the dismantling of institutions of social protection, corporate restructuring and layoffs and pressure on funding of the social sectors. The benefits emanating global
markets, technology, ideas and interdependence have not been realized. Instead there are marked reversals in human development and increasing poverty. The challenge for Africa is to find ways to manage the integration of its economy in such a way that risks are minimized and opportunities realized (see *Zimbabwe Human Development Report*, UNDP, 1999: iii).

Africa’s future depends not only on the radical transformation of its internal national and regional policies and institutions; it will also significantly depend fundamental changes in relations with the industrialized economies of the North. African countries and other countries in the South should actively work with the North in order to change some of the policies that undermine development efforts of the South (Rugumamu, 2001: 28).

**External Dynamics:**

There is little doubt that external dynamics can be an important source of development. In some cases they may even be primary driving force for the economy. Botswana, Mauritius and South Africa are relatively good examples in Africa. To be successful, externally driven development requires a number of preconditions, including:

- The ability to attract a considerable amount of foreign investment, the ability to produce competitive export products with reliable external demand,
- The ability to obtain access to foreign markets,
- The ability to maintain favourable export prices and terms of trade,
- A reasonable degree of control the national process of capital accumulation, and the
- The involvement of significant portions of the general population in the production of tradeables either directly or through linkages.

The conditions essential for externally-driven development are largely absent in most African States. Africa’s access to foreign capital, with the exception of a few countries is negligible. Most of African states are too small, have insignificant purchasing power, and are too often politically unstable to attract foreign investments. Moreover, African countries are disadvantaged by lack of diversification of their exports and by their inability to exert influence over the prices of these products. As a result, terms of trade are generally tilted against them (see Mengisteab, *op.cit.*: 180-181).

In order to make the present international economic system (globalization) more just, Africa must campaign and demand vigorously together with other Third World Countries for a fair deal in some of the following key issues:
➢ Full sovereignty over natural resources;
➢ Increased possibilities of refining raw materials in the developing countries;
➢ Diversification of economies of African countries, so that among other things, their share in the world’s industrial production is increased;
➢ Greater support in order to increase the agricultural production of the African countries;
➢ Free access to the markets of industrial countries;
➢ Stable income from the export of raw materials;
➢ Greater influence for the African countries on the transfer of technology;
➢ Greater influence on the international monetary system;
➢ Increased cooperation between African countries and other Third World Countries;
➢ Increase aid.

If these demands are accepted by the rich countries, this may improve the terms of trade of the African countries. However, it is doubtful if, in the short run, the current reforms in the fields of trade and industrialization would especially favour African countries and other developing countries (see Regnell, 1995:67-8).

The last crucial issue is that of leadership and governance in Africa. The failure of Africa in more than four decades of independence is due largely to the failure of African leadership. The new generation of leadership that is required for this twenty-first century is one that is democratic, people-oriented, visionary in the sense of being conscious of what direction to follow and what goals to seek as well as capable of inspiring and mobilizing citizens for development (Rugumamu, 1999:17). Africa cannot afford to continue to be taken by surprise in world affairs, or to be persistently reacting to major international events. It must therefore elaborate a holistic and medium-to-long-term strategy for anticipating major international events, mobilizing the regional capacity for dealing with them, and thus linking and reconciling the demands for current crisis management with the imperatives for future survival in the context of transformation and global relevance. These demand mapping out a systematic and consistent programme of policy analysis and policy action for both the present and the future on the basis of the benefit of Africa’s painful hindsight from the past (Adedeji, op.cit.:1).
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