



International Journal of Development and Sustainability

ISSN: 2168-8662 – www.isdsnet.com/ijds

Volume 3 Number 8 (2014): Pages 1794-1805

ISDS Article ID: IJDS14050902



New wine in old wine skin: An appraisal of the African Union in the light of the current underdevelopment of Africa

Kelechi Chika Ubaku*, Alex Amaechi Ugwuja, Nkechi Caroline Rotimi

Department of History and International Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria

Abstract

Underdevelopment has been a serious problem for African States. The problem is undoubtedly exacerbated by the nature of the colonization of the continent by European powers. Thus, in the last years of colonialism, some African leaders were far-sighted enough to realize that hopes for the continent's development lies on cooperative integration and pooling of resources together. However, the difference in political interests and philosophies amongst African leaders led to the creation of a Union that was not radical enough to obliterate the obstacles to African development. The Organization of African Unity finally formed in 1963 was severally handicapped. Prominent among these handicaps were: inadequate funds, different ideological postures, imperialism and dependency etc. Thus Africa continued to remain poor and underdeveloped. At the Durban Summit in July 2001, in anticipation of a better fight against underdevelopment, the O.A.U was re-branded the A.U. It is now a decade after and Africa still gropes in darkness and underdevelopment. This study, therefore, appraises the African Union in the light of the current underdevelopment of the continent. The contention is that the change in name did not reflect in the workings of the organization. It has been indeed, some "new wine in old wine skin".

Keywords: New wine; Old wine; African Union; Africa; Development

Published by ISDS LLC, Japan | Copyright © 2014 by the Author(s) | This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Cite this article as: Ubaku, K.C., Ugwuja, A.A. and Rotimi, N.C. (2014), "New wine in old wine skin: An appraisal of the African Union in the light of the current underdevelopment of Africa", *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, Vol. 3 No. 8, pp. 1794-1805.

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: donwealths@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The Organization of African Unity (OAU) was created to serve as institutional manifestation for the desire of development in Africa. The O.A.U developed out of the Pan African Congress which met in Accra, Ghana in 1958. The conference was formerly known as the first conference of independent African States. It was sequel to the Bandung Conference of 1950 (Nwanolue, 2001). In the conference, African leaders affirmed the unity of the continent and pledged to develop an institutional mechanism that would ensure the speedy development of the African Continent. The O.A.U was finally created on 25th May 1963. However, the O.A.U subsequently created was a compromise between the two major ideological groups in Africa: that is, the socialist and capitalist- Casablanca and Monrovia Blocs (Ofoegbu, 2006).

The Organs of the O.A.U included: the Assembly of Heads of States, the Council of Ministers, the Secretariat and the Commission of Arbitration and Conciliation. For a variety of reasons, the O.A.U achieved a tangential success in its desire to achieve unity and development for Africa. A major identifiable reason for this relative degree of success, according to Okohmina (2009:2), is traceable to the “tripartite ideological divide that pervaded Africa in the formative years of the O.A.U”. Nevertheless, the O.A.U achieved a modest success. In the first instance, it was able to bring to an end the pronounced antagonism among African States; precisely between the radicals and the moderates. It served as a forum for African leaders to discuss their common problems. The O.A.U most importantly contributed to the achievement of political independence of some African states, especially those colonized by Portugal viz. Angola, Mozambique, (and also the former Southern Rhodesia now Zimbabwe and the former South West Africa now Namibia). However, as far as the question of African development is concerned, the O.A.U was a total flop (Ogom, 2009). Indeed, its efforts to turn around the economic misfortunes of the African continent for example, the Lagos plan of Action of 1980, all appear to be inconsequential to the development of the African Continent. Thus in order to equip the organization and make it stronger in the fight against underdevelopment and poverty, the O.A.U at the Durban Summit in July 2001, was made to transit from the organization of African Unity to the African Union.

The objectives of the African Union though somewhat similar to the O.A.U amongst other things include: achievement of greater unity and solidarity between the African countries and peoples of Africa; acceleration of political and socio-economic integration of the continent: establishment of the necessary conditions which enables the continent to play its rightful role in the global economy and the international negotiations; promotion of sustainable development at the economic, social and political development as well as the integration of African economies etc. A remarkable change in the objectives of the African Union unlike the O.A.U is the dropping of the eradication of all forms of colonialism since the last colony (Namibia) gained independence in 1990 (Ogom, 2009). The objectives of the African Union lay emphasis on consolidation of continental development, integration, security, stability, democracy etc (Ogom, 2009).

There are many more ancillary organizations in African Union than there were in the “defunct” O.A.U. Again, there also appears to have been some nomenclatural changes in the organs. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government became simply the Assembly. The council of Ministers became the Executive Council and the General Secretariat became the Commission. What is more, there are also new organs like the

Permanent Representative Committee, the Specialized Technical Committee, and the Economic Social and Cultural Council etc.

These adjustments and modifications as crucial as they seem have continued to weigh little in the calculation of African development scholars. What is crucial is that, it is now more than a decade since the O.A.U transited to the African Union and yet Africa continues to grope in darkness, poverty and underdevelopment. Even though the Charter of the African Union pledges commitment to socio-cultural and economic development, very little is yet to be seen in real terms. Africa continues to be the poorest and most underdeveloped continent on the face of the earth. For example, life expectancy in the records of the United Nations Development Programme continues to be at all times low (40%) (<http://www.undp.org>), whereas, infant and maternal mortality is still regrettably very high, unemployment and socio-cultural conflicts still ravage the continent. More deleterious is the fact that more than 80% of Africans still live below the poverty line (2 dollars per day) (<http://www.undp.org>).

With the above statistics remaining irrefutably correct, optimists are getting worried about the viability of the African Union in transforming the underdevelopment status of Africa while pessimists have already concluded that the change in name from the O.A.U to the African Union is just a window dressing. Pessimists thus aver that it has been the same old wine in new wine skin. This study, therefore, attempts to appraise the African Union in the light of the current and lingering underdevelopment of the African continent. It is divided into five sections. Section one underscores the extant literature on the contentious issues of development and underdevelopment. Section two makes a historical overview of the O.A.U/A.U whilst section three appraises the African Union in light of the underdevelopment status of the African continent. Section four analyses the prospects of the African Union in the fight for development and finally section five contain the recommendations and the conclusion.

2. Development and underdevelopment: A conceptual explanation

Development as important as it is continues to defy definition. People view the term differently. For example, development to Rodney (1972) is the ability of a society to tap its natural resources in order to cater for the material and social needs for the generality of the people. Rodney's conceptualization of development is important because it stresses the fact that African underdevelopment is unnatural, it is a result of the exploitative activities of Europeans in Africa. Thus, he contends that Europe underdeveloped Africa (Rodney, 1972). Development according to Udaba (1994) is a process of actualizing people's capacity to live a better and a more worthy life. On the other hand, Awashti (quoted in Eneka, 2008) conceptualizes development as the transformation of economies from underdevelopment to developed status. To him development must have direct impact on the citizens and must seek to address the problem of poverty inequality and unemployment (Awashti quoted in Eneka, 2008). In line with the foregoing, Seers (quoted in Odu, 2006:52) asserts that:

The questions to ask about a country's development are therefore: what has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? If all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt, there has been a period of development for the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all three have, it would be strange to call the result "development even if per capital income doubled.

Furthermore, Odu (2006) maintains that development occurs when there is evidence of social and economic progress. In his words, thus, "what actually indicate the state of development in a country is the general conditions of the living of people ascertained from the levels of poverty, unemployment and inequality" (Odu, 2006:52-53). Even though W.W Rostow and his modernization thesis has received a plethora of condemnations by African scholars, his observation that development basically involves modernizing a traditional society with the aim of attaining self-sustained growth is indeed relevant for the African situation.

Not minding how one undertakes to see development; it should be human centered and "should aim at eliminating, such evils of mankind as poverty disease, ignorance, illiteracy malnutrition, hunger, unemployment, inequality and deprivation of human rights" (Euka, 2008:3). Finally on this, Euka (2008) noted that the features of development among other things include: strong industrially based economy, advanced and scientific agricultural sector, high income per capita, improved welfare, high level of integration and high life expectancy. These clear characteristics of development according to Euka (2008) contrast developed economies from underdeveloped ones. Since these features of development are conspicuously absent in most African countries, one can safely argue that most of the countries in Africa are underdeveloped.

Underdevelopment on the other hand, is the opposite of development. It refers to a condition of dependence in which a state lacks vital indices of socio-political and economic progress and relies on other states for survival. Offiong (1982:200) has observed that:

Underdevelopment refers to the state of ... a satellite economy characterized by underdevelopment of human and material resources; such an economy is characterized by low real income per capita in comparison with those of Western North America and Western European. It is characterized by illiteracy, poverty overpopulation and diseases.

Reinforcing the ongoing submission, Anderson (quoted in Offiong, 1982:200) contends that:

The condition of underdevelopment simply deepens the longer a country remains as a backward cog in the world capitalist system. The elite-mass cleavage widens. Rural-urban inequalities increase. City slums grow. Unemployment increases, illiteracy abounds, Agricultural production stagnates. Malnutrition speeds. Diseases debilitate millions. Birth rates remain high. Death rates begin to rise in some areas. Imported luxuries drain foreign exchange. Foreign debt and balance

of payment deficits mounts. Inflation runs rampant military spending for army and police repression increases.

He also has noted that foreign corporations drain huge amounts of raw materials, and profit from underdeveloped countries (Anderson, in Offiong, 1982). Todaro (1980), on the other hand, identified the following as the characteristics of underdevelopment: low levels of living, low level of productivity, high rate of population growth, rising levels of unemployment and underemployment, high dependency burden, low rate of industrialization, significant dependence on agricultural production and primary product export, high mortality rate etc. With these characteristics thus adumbrated, the underdeveloped status of Africa cannot be argued. Hence, the task of eradicating the underdevelopment of Africa is now the primary concern of the African Union and how the A.U. has failed in this assignment (as stated earlier) is the basic thrust of this study.

3. A historical overview of the organization of African Unity/African Union

All human activities and contrivances start from an idea. The idea or philosophy that gave occasion for the coming together of Africans to have a common voice in the outside world is the Pan African philosophy. Thus, a history of the O.A.U/A.U. must as of necessity start with the philosophical concepts of Pan-Africanism. For without this African unity would not have been possible. Pan- Africanism, in the words of Quison-Sackey (1975:201), "is both a concept and a force. It is a revolutionary philosophical concept which came in response to the vast economic, social, political movements that have been convulsing Africa..." The concept of Pan-Africanism represents a historical development in the formulation of the African identity and culture. It is an affirmation of an overwhelming pride in the black heritage and culture, and that is to say that, it is not a curse to be a black or an African. The historical origins of Pan-Africanism, we must note is traceable to many cultural expressions outside the African continent especially, in the French Caribbean.

Pan-Africanism was very important in the struggles for political independence in Africa (Okeke, 2006). It did not only serve the purpose of a philosophical cum intellectual vehicle for African independence, it also provided a radical revolutionary basis for the struggle (Okeke, 2006). However, the granting of political independence by the European colonial powers did not solve the economic problems of Africa. Before independence, African leaders had thought that political independence was the 'almighty formula' to their problems but when independence was achieved, it became very obvious that economic emancipation was indispensably crucial for African states to be viable. Thus, efforts became intensified amongst African leaders (their differing ideological postures notwithstanding) to create an institutional frame work for achievement of African unity and development.

The organization of African Unity was thus established on May 25 1963 by 37 independent African states at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The Charter *inter alia* specifically in article II states the objectives of the O.A.U as follows: to promote the Unity and solidarity of the African and Malagasy states; to coordinate and intensify their collaborations and efforts to achieve a better life for the people of Africa; to defend their sovereignty,

their territorial integrity and independence; to totally decolonize Africa by eradicating all forms of colonialism from the continent of Africa; and to promote international cooperation having due regard to the charter of the United Nations and the universal declaration of the human right. The principles of the organization were contained in article III. They among other things included: sovereign equality of all African and Malagasy states; non-interference in the internal affairs of states; peaceful settlements of disputes by negotiation, mediation or arbitration etc.

Membership of the O.A.U was open to every independent sovereign African state. All members enjoyed equal right and equal duties and the member states pledged themselves to observe the principles enumerated in article III of the Charter. The organs or institutions of the organization were embodied in articles vii, the organs included, The Assembly of heads of State and Government, Council of Ministers, The General Secretariat, Commission of Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration, Specialized Commissions. The Assembly of Heads of State and Government was the supreme organ of the organization; it discussed matters of common concern to all member states with a view to coordinating and harmonizing the general policy of the organization. The Assembly was composed of the Heads of state and government or their duly accredited representatives. It was mandated to meet at least once a year with provisions for extra ordinary sessions. Each member state had one vote and all resolutions were determined by a two third of majority of those present and voting.

The Council of Ministers consisted of foreign ministers of member states. Their meetings were scheduled to hold at least twice in a year. It was entrusted with the implementation of the decisions of Assembly of Heads of State and Government. The General Secretariat was the administrative machine of the organization. It has a secretary general who was in charge of it and provision was made for one or more assistant secretaries general who were appointed by the council of ministers. The Commission of Meditation and Conciliation was not originally included in the Charter. It was formed in 1965 and it was charged to settle all disputes or conflicts by peaceful means. The specialized commissions like the economic commission, education and cultural commission etc was an avenue through which the council of ministers carryout their functions.

The O.A.U was a modest success but in the area of economic development for the people of Africa, it has been considered a failure (Nwanolue, 2001). The organization, however, mediated several border and internal disputes. It was also instrumental in bringing about majority rule and an end to apartheid in South Africa. Again, the O.A.U was helpful in the decolonization struggle of the former colonies of Guinea Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, as well as in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). It also sought to turn the economic woes of Africa around by creating the African Economic Community in 1977. However, with its achievements the O.A.U according to Okeke (2006) was bedeviled with harsh criticisms, including the fact that it did little to protect the rights and liberties of the African citizens from their own political leaders- African Dictators. As a result of these criticisms and in order to reposition the organization for greater efficiency, the O.A.U at the Durbar summit in 2001 transited to the A.U. Generally, the framework of the A.U seems to be akin to the defunct O.A.U. However, the new charter of the organization now known as the 'Constitutive Act of the African Union' envisages the establishment of a number of technical committees including those on monetary and financial affairs education, culture and human resources (Kumba, 2012). There were also protocols for

the establishment of the African Central Bank, the Monetary Fund and Investment Bank. Provisions were also made for the establishment of African Court of Justice, a Pan African Parliament and Economic, social and Cultural Council that would have advisory capacity (Kumba, 2012). Some of these committees are yet to actively assert themselves on the African terrain while others like the African Parliament have not only asserted themselves but have continued to make legislation for the betterment of the African people especially on human rights. Let us, therefore, proceed to underscore the African Union and the question of African development.

4. The African union and the question of African development

We have noted that the African struggle for development is an age old one. It is a struggle that the African continent has continued to wage with a determination that marches the degree of its inherent challenges from the very inception. The mother organization of the African Union that is the Organization of African Unity made committed efforts to arrest the problem of underdevelopment of the continent. African states bound themselves under the O.A.U charter to pursue economic development not just at national levels but also through the mechanism of functional organizations and regional associations (Cervenka, 1977).

The first conference of the Heads of state of independent Africa on May 22-25, 1963 adopted a resolution called Areas of Cooperation in Economic Problems. A committee was subsequently set up to study the ideas of a common tariff system to protect African infant industries. A commodity stabilization fund was also established which worked to free African currencies from external attachments and also for the restructuring of international trade to Africa's favour. The O.A.U continued in concert with the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, and these resulted in the Lagos plan of Action of 1980.

The Lagos Plan of Action was a design for the restructuring of African economy on two principles which are self reliance and self sustaining development (Ake, 1996). It was a measure by the O.A.U towards participative development. It took a holistic approach in several ways: "in treating agriculture and industrial development together and being methodically attentive to the effects of one on the other, in recognizing the integral relations of the internal and external causes of development and in seeing development as a task that must involve every one and every sector private and public, agriculture and industry, labour, capital and peasantry" (Ake, 1996:125).

The Lagos Plan of Action which would have been the best platform for turning the economic misfortunes of the African continent around was incidentally manhandled by external forces in which the African leaders were helpless. Ake (1996:25-26) writes that:

The Bretton Woods Institutions and the West would not accept the approach of the Lagos plan, although they refrained from opposing it openly. Instead, they expressed their rejection of the plan by ignoring it and refusing to reorient their economic relations with Africa... There was enough to render the plan inoperable. In the end, African leaders found that they were too dependent and too weak to have their way, and they started to retreat.

The inability of the O.A.U to foster Africa Development cannot be blamed on Western Imperialist forces alone. Indeed, internal problems like corruption, greed nepotism and flagrant mismanagement of public fund were contributory factors. As noted at the beginning of this study, the change to A.U had been seen by some as old wine in new wine skin. This is because of the fact that more than a decade after the inception of the African Union, Africa's underdevelopment continues to persist. This is manifested in the low level of trade amongst African countries and global trade in general. Africa continues to be in debt which has being estimated to be above 300 billion U.S dollars. Africa is also plagued by a depression in Foreign Direct Investments (2.8% of world's FDI flows in Africa in 2009) (Ake, 1996). As if that is not enough, the African Union has done nothing to stimulate industrial productivity and output in Africa which is very weak. Adejo (2001) has written that the African Union is an ambitious undertaking but despite the change in name, little seems to be done on African development. In his observation, new institutions and frameworks will do little to ratify the situation in Africa except Africa's political leaders are ready and willing to stop the exploitation of the continent with outsiders. Adejo (2001:136) subsequently argues that:

Africa's development will continue to remain a mirage; the change in the name of the organization notwithstanding. This is because it is still the old crop of leaders that piloted the O.A.U that are now still piloting the A.U. These leaders are notoriously known for stealing public funds of their various governments and the shameful penchant for luxury items like expensive official vehicles, presidential jets and the expending of inordinate amounts on running public offices, foreign travel and diplomatic representation which cannot be sustained, instead of engaging in pooling or coordinating representation.

Critics have also dismissed the Constitutive Act of the African Union as utopian. Some have argued that the Act does not present a new agenda for development of Africa. The whole thing appears to be only on declaration of intention which does not respond to the realities and intentions of Africans (Adejo, 2001).

Ten years since the inception of the African Union, African's crisis of growth in the social sector has being complicated by high income inequality, high unemployment and underemployment, increasing level of poverty etc. Diseases like Malaria and HIV/AIDS which can easily be prevented have continued to ravage Africa. These have had untold implication for economic development of the continent and the African Union is yet to find a solution to these problems. Again, the African Union has adopted the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) as the blue print for the continent's socio-economic development. The organization voiced the belief that NEPAD is a programme through which the African leaders are setting an agenda for the renewal of the continent and as such 'NEPAD is a new framework for interaction with the rest of the world. The African Union posits that through NEPAD African states seek "to achieve and sustain an average GDP (Gross Domestic Product) growth rate of above seven percent per annum for the next fifteen years, to ensure that the continent achieves the internal development goals (IDGs)" (Bukarambe, 2004:15).

Ironically ten years have passed and yet no country on the African continent has registered a GDP growth rate of more than five % per annum (Nwanolue, 2001). This explains why Nwanolue (2005:232) argued that "NEPAD did not settle down well with some African scholars, its concomitant operations have, as well,

brought little or no improvement on the protracted developmental backwardness of Africa". What is more the African civil society in May 2002 at the Durban summit totally rejected NEPAD as a framework for African Development. We quote their submissions at length herein. Their argument centers on the fact that:

NEPAD has been imposed on the continent by the few governments and elites supported by the countries of the North and the Bretton woods institutions (World Bank, IMF and WTO). Africa and her people have not been involved in devising this path of development...

That NEPAD and the strategies it adopt pose a grave danger to the preservation and rehabilitation of the environment. Africa and the world's environment have suffered profoundly from unhindered profit maximization and from the process that have impoverished Africa...

That policies of the so called free trade promoted by the World Trade Organization, and its associated constitution, have led to the destruction of African industries and the livelihood of its people...

Increasing direct foreign investment has only benefited the multinational corporations that extract Africa's wealth and exploit its people. Over many years, foreign investments have failed to live up to the promise of more jobs and prosperity for the continent.

Debt reduction strategies or the HIPC (highly indebted poor countries) initiative which NEPAD embraces, and champions are meant to perpetuate the enslavement of Africa and her people to the creditor nations and bank. NEPAD fails to even call for the cancellation of Africa's debts.

That NEPAD shall not exist, simply because it will serve the African people no good (as quoted in Nwanolue, 2005:232).

Having seen all these about the African Union's NEPAD blue print for development, one can safely contend that the African Union is not yet ready for advancing the course of African development. Little wonder why Nwanolue (2005:232) argued that:

The problem of Africa today is not formation and reformation of continental institutions; rather corruption, insincerity, flagrant greed, extravagance and general mismanagement of public funds are the problems hindering Africa's development... African leaders are confused as regards which way to follow. They are unable to realize that whether O.A.U, A.U, or NEPAD, the fundamental issues remain that Africa can never develop with the imperialistic, inhumanistic and obliterate assistance rendered by the G.8 countries.

5. Problems and prospects of the African Union for African development

In spite of the euphoria and exaggerated optimism that marked the launching of the A.U. as a new phase in the struggle for African development, there are still several challenges to the process of unity and

development in the continent, some have openly questioned whether A.U is working towards becoming a political Union or economic community. Adogamhe (2008) notes that the A.U lies somewhere between national sovereignty and supranational sovereignty. He observed that such an arrangement could become a source of friction by impairing the freedom of action of national governments without substituting a reliable new source of authority and responsibility (Adogamhe, 2008). The reality of contemporary Africa is that it is still marked by political, economic, social and linguistic diversity, which are formidable obstacles to establishing a true African Union. Where there is no unity, one can scarcely hope to see development.

Again, the African continent is made up of several countries which differ significantly in size, demographic trends, levels of economic development and natural resources endowment. These situations kick strongly against the prospects of a true integrated Africa. For example, Nigeria has the highest population density of about 162 million people, hundreds of times more than some small African states. South Africa has the most developed economy with a capacity that is almost equal to that of forty other sub-Saharan countries combined (Larporte and Machie, 2010). South Africa, Nigeria, Egypt and Algeria account for half of the continent's GDP and nearly a third of its total population. Therefore, any prospects for integration must not only take into account the magnitude of all these societal, economic and ecological disparities but also the African leaders perceptions of these difficulties and their willingness to overcome them.

Most importantly, the inability of the African Union to foster African development derives from its historical antecedents. The rivalry of Kwame Nkrumah and his African compatriots also manifested somewhat, in the present African Union. Before his brutal death, Col. M. Gadhafi who first expressed the idea of a stronger African government with its headquarters in Libya with himself elected as the executive chairman/president of the United States of Africa was considered a power monger. The African Union was initially perceived by other African states as Gadhafi's pet project and a reflection of his personal ambition to rule and dominate the continent. The Constitutive Act of the African Union like the O.A.U Charter was a compromise between those led by Libya who favoured an immediate and total unification of Africa and the gradualist approach based on the E.U Model favoured by Nigeria and other member states (Adejo, 2001). This ideological difference (as was with the O.A.U) also continued to haunt the A.U.

The prospects of the Africans in bringing about development for the continent are also dampened by border and security crises of the continent. To what extent is Africa prepared for a borderless continent in which the African people can move freely without hindrance, including the right to permanent residence in countries outside their own? How can the African Union guarantee the right to free movement of persons in an atmosphere of xenophobia, given the ethnic and racially motivated violence in many parts of the continent?

Apart from the on-going, the African Union is assailed by some serious political challenges which is exacerbated by the fact that integration in the continent is elite led rather than mass based. The imperatives of democratic governance have meant little or nothing to Africa's ruling elites. The implications of these have been more profound on African economies. What is therefore the way forward?

The prospects of the African Union in its quest for turning around the economic woes of the continent rely on understanding that Africa's development cannot be externally stimulated. Internal factors like corruption

and greed by African public office holders must be addressed. Again, the African Union must seek to include the Africans in Diaspora in the developmental calculus of the continent. In this connection, Ogom (2009) has noted that as a development resource, the potential implications of the African Diaspora are indubitable. Africa cannot develop if it continues to stake its economy in the hands of foreigners whose interest is profit making and abdication of social responsibilities to the host communities (Ikeriohanma and Oguoma, 2010).

6. Recommendations and conclusion

To achieve the mandate of African Union with regard to the economic development of Africa, the organization must promote a citizen-based political integration. It can do this by enhancing the roles of national parliaments. The citizens of the continent must be brought into the entire programme through sensitization campaign unlike, the present scenario where it has remained an elite base movement.

More so, the A.U Commission needs to be empowered. In line with this, Larporte and Machie (2010:215) observe that, "any successful integration project needs autonomous and credible central institutions that can act as motors". The African Union Commission must be enabled to be autonomous and competent. Again, the African developmental aspirations under the umbrella of the African Union can only be possible if and when the close involvement of member states is secured. This is because the member states are the backbone of any integration process. The tendency whereby many African states show apathy and disinterest in integration must be discouraged through incentives to states that actively participate.

In conclusion, the African Union needs to dismantle the entire NEPAD framework and institute a more acceptable and feasible framework for the continent's development. NEPAD is "faulty in formulation and impracticable in reality" (Olukoshi, 2004:13).

References

- Adejo, A.M. (2001), "From O.A.U to A.U: New Wine in Old bottles?", *African Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 4, No. 1 and 2.
- Adogamhe, P.G. (2008), "Pan-Africanism: Revisited Vision and Reality of the African Unity and Development", *African Review of Integration*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 7-11.
- Ake, C. (1996), *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Spectrum Books Ltd, Ibadan.
- Bukarambe, B. (2004), "Historical Overview of Africa's Development Efforts", *NEPAD in the Nigerian Dock*, NIIA, Lagos.
- Cervenka, Z. (1977), *The Unfinished Quest for Unity, Africa and the O.A.U*, Freidman Publication, London.
- Enuka, C.S. (2008), "Globalization and Nigerian Development" working paper, Department of History and International Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, September 10.

- Ikeriohanma, E.B.J. and Oguoma, O. (2010), "Governance, Leadership Crisis and Underdevelopment in Africa: Explorative Discourse", *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 12, No. 3.
- Kumba, J. (2012), "The African Union: Is it too Early to Appraise?". Available at <http://www.google.com> (Accessed 17 July, 2012).
- Larporte, G. and Machie, J. (2010), *Policy and Management Report 18: Building the African Union, An Assessment of Past Progress and Future Prospects for African Union's Institutional Architecture*, ECDP and Nordic African Institute, Uppsala.
- Nwanolue, B.O.G. (2001), *From OAU to African Union*, K & F Publishers, Onitsha.
- Nwanolue, B.O.G. (2005), "NEPAD and the Future of African Development", in Obi, A.E. et al, (eds) *State and Economy*, Book Point Publication Limited, Onitsha.
- Odu, E.N. (2006), *Readings in African Political Economy*, Ojies Ojies Production, Calabar.
- Offiong, D.A. (1982), *Imperialism and Dependency: Obstacles to African Development*, Howard University Press, Washington.
- Ofoegbu, G.A.I. (2006), *Comprehensive Government*, Mass Founders Publishers, Onitsha.
- Ogom, R.O. (2009), "The African Union/African Diasporas and Quest for Development: In Search of the Missing Link", *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 165-173.
- Okeke, E. (2006), *The Political Thought of Africa*, Golden Value Books, Onitsha.
- Okohmina, S. (2009), "The African Union: Pan Africanist Aspiration and the Challenges of African Unity", *Journal of Pan African Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 4.
- Olukoshi, A. (2004), "Africa and the Process of Underdevelopment", *African Voices on Development and Social Justice*, Pambazuka News, July.
- Quison-Sackey, A. (1975), "The African Personality", in Mutiso, G.C.M., Rohio, S.W. (Eds), *Readings in African Political Thought*, Heineman educational Books, London, p. 201.
- Rodney, W. (1972), *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Bogle -L' Ouverture Publication, London.
- The United Nations Development Programme, Available at <http://www.undp.org> (Accessed 10 March, 2014).
- Todaro, M. (1980), *Economics for a Developing World*, Longman Group, London.
- Udaba, S.I. (1994), "Individual and National Development", in Okafor, R.C., Emeka, L.N. (Eds) *Nigerian Peoples and Culture*, New Generation Ventures Limited, Enugu.