

# A Philosophical Critique of New Partnership for Africa's Development

Ifechi J. Ndianefoo, Ph.D

Senior Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

## Abstract

The state paradigm is imperiled in Africa so much that there are whispers in Western capitals and among disillusioned Africans whether surrender of these fragile sovereignties to their former imperial powers would not be a viable option. The continent's security challenges and the concomitant political fragility of most African States add to the development crisis plaguing the continent today. New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) was established in order to tackle African developmental crisis and make African States economically buoyant to the extent that their sovereignty will be represented more by sovereign will and might than by sovereign emblems. This paper argues that the theoretical assumptions of NEPAD are misconceived and subjects them to an unremitting philosophical critique. In doing so, the paper re-conceptualizes the fundamentals of NEPAD in the light of African Socio-political milieu and interests and points out the path not taken which, if taken, would put African States in economically viable and competitive status. The paper concludes that no development paradigm will lift African states from the extant economic dependency on the Western and Asian economies if it is not driven by the exigencies of African Socio-political milieu and interests.

**Keywords:** Africa, Crisis, Critique, Partnership, Development, Philosophy.

## 1. Perspectives on Philosophy and Development

Most people who have little or no acquaintance with philosophy hold the view that philosophy is about the most abstruse and abstract of all subjects, a kind of intellectual hobby or an intellectual game which philosophers play with highfalutin and quixotic theories. In this light, philosophy is impugned as irrelevant to practical life. This is a wrong view of philosophy. What is more, facts of our daily life and the long and chequered history of human existence do no support this view.

Starting with western society, we find that the philosophy of Socrates was certainly not an abstraction that had nothing to do with the practical lives of men. On the contrary, his philosophy had such practical effect on the lives of the Athenian youth that the authorities accused him of having corrupted their youth and had him put to death. The philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau was one of the forces that precipitated the French Revolution. His book, the *Social Contract*, with its forceful key assertion, 'man is born free and is everywhere in chains' was the 'bible' from which the leaders of the French Revolution drew inspiration; nor can the practical effects of John Locke's philosophy be denied. His theories 'are embedded in the American constitution, and can be seen at work whenever there is dispute between President and Congress' (Russell 1955).

The philosophy of Karl Marx operated as the official philosophy of about one-third of the world population in the second half of the twentieth century and permeated and carved a niche for itself in virtually all university disciplines and social movements. The philosophical doctrine of atomism (pioneered by the ancient philosophers, Democritus and Leucippus) continues to loom large in the scientist's effort to understand the nature and dynamics of the micro world of physics.

The above facts, to put it most directly and succinctly, illustrate that there is no human action, no governmental program or scientific practice without a background philosophy that inspires and sustains it. Therefore, philosophy, contrary to common (though uninformed) view, has a critical bearing on practical life by its unremitting interrogation of human experience using available modes of human knowledge. It is against this background that this essay draws immense inspiration from Prof. Olusegun Oladipo's espousal of the mandate of philosophy in African social and economic development. He holds that:

Philosophy should occupy itself with a critical examination of economic and political theories in an attempt to expose the contradictions and inconsistencies of contending political and economic theories with a view at both the desired means and end for change and development in Africa. (Oladipo, 1992)

The foregoing section has expounded both the concept and the mandate of philosophy in the social and economic development of Africa which is the *raison d'être* of this essay. It is now proposed to explicate the concept of 'development' as will be employed in this essay. As a social concept, the term 'development' has been a source of hot ideological dispute over its meaning. Everyone tends to define the term from his or her cultural and ideological matrix. Nevertheless, 'development' can be classified into physical, technological or scientific, moral, economic and social dimensions. But Bottomore (1962) takes a holistic view of development and construes it to mean such factors as growth in political freedom and participation, growth of knowledge, and growth of human

control over the natural environment marked by technological advancement and economic efficiency. Iroegbu also has a holistic view of development but with a progressive tinge. According to him:

*'Development is the progressive unfolding of the inner potentialities of a given reality. It is to de-envelop, that is, to bring out to light: existential, functional and epistemic, what was enveloped, folded or hidden. As it applies to a people, development is the integration of the various givens: natural, physical, acquired and human of a people towards the full working out, permanently and cumulatively of their being as persons, of their community, and of their real productivity' (1994).*

The above views of Bottomore and Iroegbu are refreshingly holistic in the sense that they did not pander to the common myth which construes development wholly in terms of economic growth. The multi-dimensional nature of development admits of no such economism; on the contrary, it demands that development is to be understood as the expanding and adaptive capacity of the society in satisfying the material and cultural needs of its members.

Although development in the holistic sense in which it is employed in this paper avoids the well-known disputes amongst disparate ideological schools over its meaning and purpose and rightly conceives it beyond the economic aspect, it is still amenable to empirical content analysis and appraisal. Such empirical content analysis and appraisal of development contemplates such indices as income of the population, population growth rate, the level of life expectancy, the level of school enrolment, the level of industrial production vis-à-vis primary production, the volume of commodities produced by a people both for internal consumption and for export, etc. Nations which do not record high levels in each of the above indices (with the exception of population growth rate presumed to be low in developed nations) are regarded as under-developed nations or, more charitably, developing nations, while those who do are generally known as developed nations. ( Etuk 1998).

It is against the foregoing considerations that when we talk about the development of a society we are invariably talking about the level of enlightenment, quantity and quality of life which, in turn, are invariably a function of the level of exploitation of the society's natural resources. All this is determined by man and the amount of knowledge he is able to acquire and wield. This is where philosophy comes in. Philosophy, in its axiological concerns, has potent contributions to make for the development and transformation of man and his environment. Philosophy, as such, is a great intellectual force that develops and sustains societies. This might have inspired the late African patriot, Kwame Nkrumah, who reminded Africans during the maiden conference of independent African states in 1958 that just as Europeans discovered Africa it is expected that African philosophers will be of immense help to the rediscovery and development of Africa.

The hope of Kwame Nkrumah in the liberating powers of philosophy is not misplaced. Philosophy, by its nature, is the very engine that produces and sustains knowledge through its reflective, critical, analytical, logical and integrative methods. All disciplines, as we know them today, developed directly or indirectly from the bosom of philosophy and remains connected with philosophy in very obvious ways. Every discipline has its philosophical foundations (assumptions, methods and logic) and philosophical goals (aims or projected contributions to man's life conditions). Thus every discipline has a philosophy. This is why professional philosophers and scientists, artists, technocrats, and bureaucrats have continued to be in critical engagement over fundamental issues of methods, goals, policies etc. This paper is an instance of such critical engagements, namely, a philosophical critique of NEPAD. In pursuit of such critical engagement, one will first examine the African condition which is essentially a crisis condition.

## **2. Anatomy of the African Condition**

It is proposed here to put into proper perspective the current state of the African condition which NEPAD is established to tackle. This involves at least three critical tasks.

First, it involves a characterization of the African crisis in terms of its nature, pattern and dynamics. Second, it raises the issue of understanding the causes of this crisis and why it has persisted over the decades. Thirdly, there is the question of articulating and comprehending its specific consequences on the continent and its peoples and the implications of this on their peculiar status in the global political economy. Examination of these issues will put us on a sure footing to engage in a philosophical critique of NEPAD as proposed in this paper.

Beginning with the issue of characterization of the African condition, a good guide comes from the words of Julius Nyerere who drew the attention of his audience at the occasion of the convocation ceremony of the University of Ibadan on November 17, 1976 to the incompleteness of the process of liberation of Africa in his address entitled 'The Process of Liberation'. According to him, although most of Africa was at that time free from colonial rule, African states were still 'desperately poor and under- developed.... Political independence had brought no change in economic conditions and very little-if any-social change' (Quoted in Otite 1978).

However, by the time Dr. Robert Mugabe, President of Zimbabwe, gave Daily Times Annual Lecture on January 9, 1991, the consequences of the failure to match political independence with social development in Africa

had become more devastating than they were in 1976. Mugabe gave an idea of the extent of this devastation when he declared in his lecture that:

‘Africa is now home to world’s largest number of least developed countries. The continent further boasts of the largest refugee population in the world. Furthermore, it is a theatre of endless conflicts, civil strife and gross human rights abuses whereas standards of living are not better than they were two decades ago. High employment, inflation, civil strife, poverty, refugee crisis, desertification, disease, and malnutrition- the list is endless- appear to be the only legacy the continent is capable of passing from one generation to the other’ (1991).

Such is the gloomy picture of the African condition. Although it is well over a decade since such accounts were given, the socio-economic and political conditions in Africa today have remained the same and in some cases worse. Indeed, contemporary Africa harbors the world worst human tragedies: from malaria scourge to cholera epidemics; from Ebola virus attacks to HIV/AIDS pandemic; from boundary crises to inter-ethnic conflicts; and from political instability to refugee crises. The list is endless.

Analysts have attempted to diagnose the root causes of the African crisis. Thus there is a plethora of views on the causes of the African crises and this can be distilled into three broad perspectives. The first stand point on this issue anchors its explanations on Africa’s contact with Europe. This began in the fifteenth century as the transatlantic slave trade but later snowballed into colonialism. The consequences of these patterns of interactions on the continent and her peoples have been sufficiently documented by scholars like Walter Rodney, S. Amin, Kwame Nkrumah, Claude Ake and Daniel Offiong in their works. Going by the evidence distilled from the works of these scholars, Africa’s relation with Europe and North America during these two epochs left the continent in dire economic and socio-cultural ruins from which she has never completely recovered.

The second interpretation of the African crisis relates it to the phenomenon of neo-colonialism which, according to (Onimode 1987),

‘replicates into the failure of Africa’s policy makers to properly assimilate the notion of development, the bankruptcy of her ruling elites (both civilian and military); the predatory, oppressive and fascistic character of the state and the vulnerability of the continent to the world’s Breton Wood institutions namely, the WB, IMF and their conspiratorial strategies of development’.

The unrelenting pauperization and marginalization of the continent in the global system is partly associated with neo-colonialism. For this perspective, therefore, the African crisis is best explained by the preponderance of the structures of dependence which came about as a result of the wreckage of African economies by colonialism, the perpetuation of new colonial domination after independence and the systematic control of economic activities by the advanced countries (Okpe, 2005)

The third and, of course, the last of the three categories of causes of the African crisis associates it with the absence of an enabling environment for meaningful development. The thesis of this perspective is that the continent’s inability to extricate herself from the web of social, economic and political contradictions has compounded her developmental problems and hindered all attempts to arrest this trend. In this connection, the prevalence of dependency and underdevelopment, social decay, political instability, rural poverty, among many other problems, have denied the continent the opportunity of development. In the views of development pundits under this perspective, Africa appears to be trapped in a cycle of crisis whose internal manifestations and implications have continued to encumber the development potential of the continent and her peoples.

The preceding account of the root causes of the African crisis shows that, essentially, the crisis arose out of a combination of factors that are both exogenous and endogenous. A combination of these factors, however, has continued to determine the peripheral status of the continent in the global economy. Today, the truth is that Africa is a continent that appears to be losing grip of her destiny. This situation explains the anxiety of her ruling elites regarding the prospects for the continent in the changing world of the twenty-first century. It also explains why they inaugurated NEPAD and view it as the magic wand to African development. Before going into the philosophical examination of the authenticity and feasibility of NEPAD as the objective of this essay, it is proposed to see what NEPAD presents as an economic development program.

### **3. Emergence of NEPAD**

The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) is an economic development program for Africa authored by the African Union and adopted at its 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Assembly of Heads of states and governments in July 2001. It came about as a response to the New World Order. A good understanding of the emergence and object of NEPAD presupposes a good acquaintance with what is meant by the New World Order and some of the interpretations that have been put on it.

Briefly, the immediate issues that have led to the emergence of the New World Order have been associated

with the historical demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. Although the events that led to this development have since been aptly traced to the crisis in the practice of socialism in the Soviet Union which reached a crescendo in the 1980s, the remote causes lay in the emergence of liberal-minded leadership since 1953. From this period, the Soviet Union began to grapple with ideological, constitutional and political problems that affected its Super Power status and eventually led to its demise.

The demise of Sovietism and the consequential disappearance of Soviet Union from the economic and political configuration of the international system triggered tremendous changes which have affected every aspect of human existence. Significantly and in specific terms, this gave rise to changes in the way and manner nations relate with one another and the way various social groups perceive the change process itself. It is the combination of all these that brought about the notion of a New World Order. A critical feature of this prevailing order is what scholars have described as “unipolarity”. Krauthammer (1991), for example, examines an important dimension of this process which he associates with the emergence of the United States of America (USA) as the strongest nation on earth in the following words:

‘There is but one first-rate power and no prospects in the immediate future of any power to rival it... American pre-eminence is based on the fact that it is the only country with military, diplomatic, political and economic assets to be a decisive player in any conflict in whatever part of the world it chooses to involve itself’

This ‘global pre-eminence’ of the US has been emphatically dramatized in her intervention in the domestic affairs of former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq and, much more recently, in Pakistan and Libya- all in flagrant disregard of the principles of the United Nations Organization.

Another characteristic of the New World Order that is important to the context of our discussion is the consequences of what has been termed ‘globalization’ on the international economy. As a phenomenon, globalization is the process through which the world’s economies are increasingly being integrated as a function of tremendous cross-border economic activities and the remarkable expansion in human activities in the spheres of transport, communication, financial exchange and mercantile networking. It is characterized by a sustained increase in the ratio of international trade to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the rapid expansion of the financial market which, as a result, has outpaced growth in international trade itself, the boom in direct investment amongst the biggest capitalist nations of the world, namely, the US, Europe and Japan and the phenomenal preponderance of the activities of multinational corporations in the world economy.

The New World Order is also characterized by the deepening hiatus between the developed countries and the developing countries of the world located predominantly in the Northern and the Southern Hemispheres respectively. This North/South divide has engaged the attentions of scholars for quite some time now because of its serious implications on the nature and character of global politics involving countries from both sides of the divide. For example, the perpetuation of this dichotomy has made it possible for the marginalization of the countries of the South by those in the North.

The last of the characteristics of the New World Order that will be considered here is that marked by humanity’s unprecedented reliance on scientific and technological innovations, a development that has accelerated the tempo of global interdependence. The revolution in information technology has produced a world that has become organic. More than ever before, the world’s societies, economies and polities are so intricately linked via the instrumentality and dynamics of advanced technology. The consequent construction of the information super highway has, for instance, transformed the world into a ‘global village’, a world in which national boundaries are crumbling and the state is gradually being stripped of its most valued characteristic, sovereignty (Cheneau-Loguay, 2000).

It was the above circumstances that foreshadowed the emergence of NEPAD and against which NEPAD was conceived as a reaction. Thus NEPAD was conceived as a sort of compass for engaging and navigating the challenging twists and turns of the twenty-first century, a blue-print for resolving Africa’s development problems. In the minds of its founders, therefore, NEPAD is supposedly the ‘bridge’ contemporary Africa needs to cross over and be re-integrated into the main stream of the global capitalist economy (from which she has been by and large isolated), just as it is also the ‘beacon’ for achieving the much desired socio-economic and political transformation of the continent and, consequently, achieving the liberation of its teeming population from the shackles of poverty and penury, ignorance and disease as well as general underdevelopment (Coetzee, 2001).

In order to consolidate our grasp of NEPAD as an economic development program and be in good stead to appraise it philosophically, it is proposed to take cognizance of the specific provisions of NEPAD Document. The Document describes it as:

‘...a pledge by African leaders, based on a common vision and 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 sustainable

growth and development and, at the same time, to participate actively in the world economy and body politic. The program is anchored on the determination of Africans to extricate themselves and the continent from the malaise of underdevelopment and exclusion in a globalizing world'. (NEPAD Document, 2001)

More specifically, the principles and objectives of NEPAD are as follows:

- Ensuring African ownership, responsibility and leadership
- Making Africa attractive to both domestic and foreign investors.
- Unleashing the continent's vast economic potential
- Achieving and sustaining an average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rate of 7% per annum for the next 15 years.
- Increasing investment in human resources development.
- Promoting the role of women in all activities
- Promoting sub-regional and continental economic integration.
- Developing a new partnership with industrialized countries and multilateral organizations on the basis of mutual commitments, obligations, interests, contributions and benefits.
- Ensuring that there is a capacity to accelerate the agreement and projects already approved or in the pipeline.
- Strengthening Africa's capacity to mobilize additional external resources for its development.

NEPAD also hopes to promote accelerated growth and sustainable development, eradicate widespread and severe poverty and halt the marginalization of Africa in the globalization process. On the basis of the above set targets, NEPAD is expected to achieve:

- Economic growth and development and increased employment
- Reduction in poverty and inequity
- Diversification of productive activities and enhanced international trade.
- Competitiveness and increased exports.
- Increased African integration. (NEPAD Document, 2001).

Whether the above principles and objectives of NEPAD reflect the historical, cultural, political and economic specifications of the African continent and proffer a feasible development option for the continent have been a hotly debated issue among development scholars and public policy analysts. It is proposed here to join the *fray*, however, from strictly *philosophical* perspective.

#### 4. A Philosophical Critique of NEPAD

As a program for charting a development path for the African continent, NEPAD represents a noble idea. Therefore, the point should be made that NEPAD, as an idea, does have some positive aspects. In the first place, it acknowledges the fact that the African continent has been plundered for centuries and must now take its rightful place in the world. Secondly, NEPAD is a landmark in the field of prevailing perspectives on the African development crisis. It has thus opened a new debate which is moving away from blaming all African problems on colonialism and the 'the whites' to the consideration of Africa's internal contradictions as well as her elites' collective responsibility in re-building the continent and pointing the way of sustainability to her largely impoverished peoples.

Furthermore, NEPAD acknowledges the invaluable role Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) can play as partners in sustainable development. As non-state actors, NGOs have demonstrated their relevance in the fast-changing and globalizing New World Order of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Through the proposed adherence to 'good governance' NEPAD tries to lay the basis on which human rights abuses committed by African leaders can at least be brought to limelight. Finally, the NEPAD project symbolized a wake-up call to all Africans to resolutely confront the challenges posed by the African crisis in the new millennium (Okpe, 2005).

Notwithstanding the loftiness of the goals of NEPAD, the logical and philosophical contradictions which beset the program have tragically predisposed it to become a still birth. These contradictions arose from the misbegotten conceptual, methodological and ideological assumptions upon which the NEPAD project was founded. It is proposed here to do a philosophical critique of NEPAD by way of re-conceptualizing the fundamental theoretical assumptions of NEPAD in the light of African socio-political milieu and interests and thereby point out the paths not taken which, if taken, would put African states in economically viable and competitive status. This is done with the hope that African development policy formulators and implementers would be persuaded to re-think, re-focus and re-engineer African development agenda to upgrade the quantity and quality of life of the African peoples.

The first point of this philosophical critique concerns NEPAD's conception of the root causes of African development crisis. For NEPAD, the basic cause of, and reason for, the perpetuation of the continent's

underdevelopment is her protracted 'exclusion' from the core of the international capitalist trading system and the 'benefits' this privilege bestows. According to the NEPAD document, this phenomenon has continued to impoverish the continent and her peoples as well as frustrate all attempts to salvage them from its incapacitating consequences. NEPAD'S conception and interpretation of the root causes of African underdevelopment in these terms is not only naïve from the point of view of international political economy but is also conceptually flawed. There is no doubt that NEPAD is actuated and driven by a philosophy of economic emancipation of African peoples. It is however tragic that such philosophy was pursued upon wrong methodological assumptions. On the contrary, such philosophy dictates a methodology of radical de-linking from the international capitalist system and not 'inclusion' or 'mainstreaming' as architects of NEPAD propounded. NEPAD's lamentation against exclusion from the world capitalist system and its effort at inclusion or mainstreaming is akin to remaining in a sinking boat and hoping to be saved from drowning. In plain words, architects of NEPAD were unable to conceive and appreciate that African developmental crisis is *structural* and that for Africans to overcome such developmental crisis they have to question the philosophical and ideological assumptions supporting the *structure*. In doing so, they will eventually see through the theoretical charade and abandon it.

There is unanimity among eminent African scholars like Walter Rodney, S. Amin, Kwame Nkrumah, Claude Ake, and Daniel Offiong that African developmental crisis is *structural* and dates back to the fifteenth century when Africa's asymmetrical economic, political and cultural relations with the West began. Such asymmetrical relations have been institutionalized, formalized and objectified as the *given* which the African should accept and adjust to as a matter of course. Such obvious asymmetrical relations were so duplicitously constructed and foisted on the African imagination through the prejudiced and racist philosophical and socio-economic postulations of Western writers like W.F. Hegel (*Philosophy of History*, 1944), Lucian Levy-Bruhl (*The Soul of the Primitive*, 1965), Herbert Spencer (*Principles of Sociology*) and A. Allier (*The Mind of the Savage*, 1929). From these writers a paternalistic philosophy crystallized which projected to the popular African imagination the idea that colonialism was a historical task, a mercy work, 'a civilizing mission' and 'white man's burden' carried out for the benefit of the colonized. Unfortunately, this philosophy, though a ruse, is still rife and looms large in the guise of globalization as I have argued in a recent paper (Ndianefoo, 2012).

NEPAD's failure to come to terms with this obnoxious philosophy and ideology which underpin the international capitalist system accounts for its misbegotten program of getting looped into the core of the international capitalist system as a pathway to African development. Such a program betrays the architects of NEPAD as hapless hostages to the Western imperialist philosophy and ideology who still think and work within the constraints of these imposed structures of economic, political and cultural subjugations.

In fairness to the architects of NEPAD, it is understandable that as African leaders whose hearts are more with their western patrons than with their countrymen and as leaders who have grown fat on the unjust expropriations of internal capitalist system, they are too involved and immersed in the system to look at it critically and step out of it and liberate their people from its stranglehold. The architects of NEPAD need a conscious re-thinking of the philosophical and ideological categories which underpin the international capitalist system to attain the required conceptual conversion (or what Prof. Wiredu has also termed *conceptual decolonization*) to liberate Africa from the deadly grooves of the international capitalist system. It is the attainment of such a conceptual conversion (that is, perceiving and interpreting contemporary realities in the light of African cultural and historical experiences and aspirations for abundant life) that will put African development planners and implementers in the stead to engage the venal and rapacious international capitalist system on our own terms and extract our due.

Another philosophical wrong-footing of NEPAD is its conception of globalization as a voluntary or coincidental phenomenon consistent with the logic of the New World Order to which all countries of the world that are desirous of meaningful development must subscribe (NEPAD Document). In this sense, NEPAD sees globalization as a phenomenon over which nations of the world have no control. In conceiving globalization in this way, the architects of NEPAD demonstrate they have been doped by the stupefying ideological brew of the likes of Giddens (1999) who wrote that globalization is a ubiquitous phenomenon that just happened: 'It has come from nowhere to be everywhere'.

Beyond such ideological wrappings and subterfuge, the reality is that globalization is the old western imperialism and neo-colonialism in a new guise. Globalization is neo-colonialism as D. Keet (2002) has aptly described it in the following words:

'The integration of the world into one global village is not some natural and voluntarily convergence process pursued and promoted by all countries but arises from the dynamics within the most highly developed economies and powerful countries.... Globalization is the latest manifestation and outcome of the global imposition of the economic and broader strategic interests of the most highly industrialized countries, using their financial, economic, political and/or military power to do so, and the service of the outward expansion of their transnational corporations throughout the world'

The architects of NEPAD failed woefully to see through the deceptive ideological wrappings of globalization made bare in the foregoing and thus raised the false alarm that African peoples and governments should join the bandwagon of globalization or be left behind in developmental oblivion. This NEPAD's false alarm is redolent of the age-long third world hysteria of 'catching up with the west'. Above all, NEPAD's misconception of globalization is a tragic failure to decipher in the latter the old racist philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism.

The history of the racist philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism is very ancient and ramified. It is a philosophical and ideological cesspool of about 3,000 thousand years ago to which ancient and modern European thinkers and writers like Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, Marx, Locke, Hume, Spencer and Durkheim have contributed their ablest thoughts. The racist philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism posits that western societies beginning with the Greek city states are the ends, the best examples of civilization. Plato and Aristotle saw the Greek city states as the best at the time despite the contradictions and oddities of these states which their philosophers sought to cure. Hegel saw European societies as the latest modes of historical expression of Reason or Spirit. For Marx, the contemporary capitalist society of his time represented, for all its faults, the most advanced society in history. Although it fell far short of the *telos*, the socialist society, Marx was convinced that Western society would become socialist and that it was more likely to do so than other societies. In the writing of Durkheim, Weber, Maine, Parsons, Prichard and Levy Bruhl, the Eurocentric teleologism was much less subtle. They tended to ascribe to European societies the attributes of the advanced or even the ideal society. From this, they give the impression that the ultimate purpose of all other societies is to be like the west.

The philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism assumes a dominant motif in what is commonly known today as development studies. The latter is a direct product of Western social science reaction against Third World struggle against colonialism, imperialism and under-development. The contemporary Western-biased development studies which emerged from the Western Social science concern with the Third World tend to use the typologies of Western social science (in adherence to the overarching philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism) to characterize the evolution and development of societies. Thus under such Western-biased development studies, as Claude Ake rightly observed (198), the societies of the Third World are represented as being approximations of the typologies of the lower ends of the development continuum while western societies are represented as approximations of the typologies of the higher and advanced stages of the development continuum.

This racist philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism constitutes the very engine of globalization because globalization which is made possible by hyper invention in the information and communication technology (ICT) is the contemporary arrow-head of imperialism and neo-colonialism and these latter ideologies developed from the ancient and ramified philosophy of Eurocentric teleologism. The failure or negligence of the architects of NEPAD to give due attention to this racist philosophical-cum-ideological matrix in their diagnosis and prognosis of African development question constitutes great historical and cultural drag on African development from which African leadership elites must wrench themselves.

Another of NEPAD's wrong-headed theoretical assumption is its conception of the New World Order symbolized by globalization as the putative triumph of capitalism over socialism/communism. NEPAD's justification for conceiving the New World Order as synonymous with the putative triumph of capitalism is the epic collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1992 which, in turn, sparked off a political turmoil that had dire consequences for the whole of the former Eastern bloc countries. It is sheer historical and philosophical naivety for the NEPAD architects to conceive and interpret the collapse of USSR as emblematic of the triumph of capitalism. Because of such misconception and misinterpretation, NEPAD adopts the socio-economic philosophy of neo-liberalism which is the latest name and form of international capitalism.

Neo-liberalism posits that wealth can be created through the establishment of an enabling environment for the private sector to make profits and through the operations of market forces wealth so created would ultimately trickle down to all citizens and social groups. Furthermore, Neo-liberalism advocates reliance on foreign investments and development aids as well as loans from institutions like the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the London and Paris Clubs of Creditors etc. However, experiences in African and other Third World countries over the last thirty years or so have shown that NEPAD's unreflective adoption of Neo-liberalism is illogical and methodologically-flawed because it is antithetical to African development. Hence, it has led to an unprecedented concentration of wealth in the hands of a few while the majority became poorer.

Furthermore, NEPAD's call for Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and the entrenchment of the structures of an open economy through liberalization and deregulation under the inspiration of neo-liberalism will deepen Africa's development crisis. The reasons for this are legion.

In the first place, all FDI programs are intended to generate super profits for the investors along lines dictated by imperialism. In other words, no foreign investors invest in any part of the continent on purely humanitarian basis. Secondly, in the pursuit of their clearly defined economic objectives, foreign investors care little or nothing about the economic and social transformation of their host countries. For example, in Nigeria, the exploitation of Nigeria's oil reserves has had very little benefits for the mass of the people. This accounts for the restiveness amongst the youth of Niger Delta and the resultant violence in the region in the last decade. Arising

from the above is third reason that the specific role of FDI in economic growth and development has been questioned. Accordingly, it has been argued that there is no necessary causal nexus between capital flows and growth nor is there such causal link between growth and development. For example, economic statistics by agents of Western capitalism like Dr. Okonjo Iweala showed positive indices of growth of the Nigerian economy but the notorious facts of dilapidated infrastructure, epileptic energy supply, shambolic educational system and mass unemployment mock such claims of growth. Nigeria's famous economist, Professor Sam Aluko decried such western agents as "voodoo economists" because of phony statistics.

It is against this backdrop that one sees NEPAD'S unjustified and unjustifiable adoption of Neo-liberalism as akin to (and no doubt done under) such ideological mongering as Fukuyama's apocalyptic postulation that liberalism is the end of History. At a more philosophical level, nobody can justifiably gloat over the so-called 'triumph' of capitalism or lament the putative fall of socialism when the logic of capitalism and socialism as socio-economic philosophies are undercut. The ideologues, buffs and sympathizers of capitalism should preserve the logic and laws of capitalism and let us see how capitalism will triumph. The fundamental thesis of Marxist philosophy is that the contradictions of capitalist production, namely avarice, oppression, economic and social alienation would shovel the grave of capitalism. But in practice, capitalists weaken or undercut the laws of capitalist development through some sleight-of-the-hand infusion of extraneous and alien elements (like welfare perks and other labour incentives) into capitalist production to save capitalism and yet vociferate about its triumph. Why will Nigerian Banks be bailed out with whooping N400 Billion public resources in 2010? Why will such corporate giants like ENRON, Layman Brothers, American International Group, Inc. (AIG), General Motors, Chrysler and American Banks come to financial grief and be bailed out with state resources and yet capitalists gloat they have triumphed? Whatever happened to the so-called efficiency of private enterprise? It is a sheer myth. Therefore, when NEPAD celebrates the so-called triumph of capitalism and adopts the neo-liberal path to African development, it becomes very much less of the socio-political and economic think tank it holds itself out to be.

In choosing the neo-liberal path, the architects of NEPAD alluded to the collapse of socialism in the former Soviet Union. This section of this paper will not be concluded without some words on that unfortunate collapse of institutionalized socialism. History of socialism in the Soviet Union revealed that the soul and body of socialism died from the ravenous worms of capitalist psychology and procedures: avarice, oppression, domination and alienation well dramatized in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. At the end we see that capitalism is the Nemesis of the world and not the benefactor of the world.

NEPAD's unreflective adoption of the neo-liberal ideology brings in its train a further philosophical flaw, namely, it's disconnect with *mass consciousness* in Africa. It has no mass ontology. This partly explains why NEPAD has not permeated the popular consciousness. Most educated Africans do not know what NEPAD is all about. The social reality which determines and drives the philosophy and praxis of NEPAD is a tiny and obtuse elite segment of the African society whose real motives were to articulate, aggregate and indeed renew old relations of subordination and superordination within the context of the New World Order and globalization and against the collective aspirations of the largely impoverished peoples of Africa.

These tiny African elites constitute the African variant of the Euro-Asian transnational capitalist class. The latter is an agglomeration of transnational executives and their affiliates, globalizing state bureaucrats, so-called statesmen and professionals and other consumerist elites who have formed conspiratorial alliance with avaricious and obtuse African elites. It is this alliance sustained by rapacious and obdurate capitalist mind-set which formulates drives and owns NEPAD and is therefore dictating the character and pace of development in the continent. It is this class that would also ensure that the so-called peer review mechanism of NEPAD for gauging good governance in the continent is congenial to its strategic selfish interest. This orientation of NEPAD however alienates the generality of the African populace and is therefore a major flaw in its philosophy.

## 5. Conclusion

NEPAD as a development program is a still birth. It is infected by the general ineptitude of leadership and governance in Africa which has characteristically failed to invent endogenous initiatives for African development. Unless such endogenous initiatives are invoked, Africa may yet wait for a long time for her emancipation from the deleterious effects colonialism and neo-colonialism and eventual participation in the ravenous world political economy on her own terms.

## REFERENCES

- Ake, Claude. (1982). *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Bottomore, T.B. (1962). *Sociology: A Guide to Problems and Literature*. London: Allen and Unwin,
- Cheneau-Loguay, A. (2000). "Africa in Global Communication Networks: From Networks to Concrete Users" *Information Development*, vol. 16 (No.4) (pp.10-25)
- Coetzee, D. (2001). "The New African Initiative". Paper presented at the Africa and G8 Civil Society Planning



- Conference, Ottawa, October 21-22.
- Giddens, Anthony (1999). *Runaway World*, London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Iroegbu, Pantaleon (1994). *Enwisdomisation and African Philosophy*. Owerri: International University Press Ltd.
- Keet, D. (2002) "Perceptions and Perspectives on the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) on Regional/Continental and /or Global Integration of Africa". Paper presented at the Conference on Africa and the Development Challenges of the New Millennium, Ghana, April (23-26).
- Krauthammer, C. ( 1991). "The Uni-Polar Movement". *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.70. (No.1) pp.12-20
- Mugabe, Robert (1991). "Africa in the New World Order". Paper presented at the Daily Times annual lecture Series, Lagos, January.
- New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) Document, 2001.
- Ndianefoo, Ifechukwu, 2010. "Globalisation as an Imperialist Philosophy and Ideology". Eyisi Joy, Obienusi Ernest and Omazu Eric, eds. *Celebration of Academic Excellence: Festschrift in Honour of Prof. L.N. Muoghalu*, Enugu: Eldmark (pp.453-463).
- Okpoh, Ochayi. 20005. *NEPAD and the African Crisis*. Makurdi: Aboki Publishers.
- Oladipo, Olusegun. 1992. *The Idea of African Philosophy*, Ibadan: Molecular Publishers,
- Onimode, B. *Africa's Crisis*, London: Institute for African alternatives, 1987.
- Russell, Bertrand. *History of western philosophy*, London: Unwin Books, 1955.
- Udo, Etuk, 1998. "Ethical conditions of development in twenty-first century". Olusegun Oladipo, ed. *Remaking Africa: Challenges of the Twenty-first Century*, Ibadan: Hope Publishers.(pp.276-291)