

BETWEEN PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE: NEPAD AS AN INDICATOR OF AFRO-CENTRISM IN NIGERIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Solomon Tai Okajare, PhD

Lecturer in the Department of History and International Studies, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

Abstract

Following the attainment of her independence in 1960, Nigeria was ushered in to an international system that was thoroughly split into two different ideological divisions. There were the Western bloc, led by the United States of America, with democracy and capitalism as its core politico-economic ideological persuasion, and the Eastern bloc, led by the defunct Soviet Union, which embraced communism and socialist drive. This ideological division made the emergent African states of the 1960s enmeshed in the vortex of power manipulations and vulnerabilities from these ideological Powers. This made it expedient for the African states to exert and assert their independence both in spirit and letters. It was against this backdrop that Nigeria opted for an Afro-centric foreign policy, which would enable her promote and protect pan-African interests within the international system. This paper situates the involvement of Nigeria in the NEPAD initiative as a critical effort in the process of maintaining and strengthening an Africa-centred foreign policy, by way of providing effective leadership for the Continent. We argue that the initiative was in the best strategic interests of Nigeria in view of her pivotal position in terms of core elements of power in the comity of African states.

Keywords: Principles, Practice, Foreign Policy, Afro-centrism, Interests, Leadership

I. Introduction

In the contemporary age of globalization with its attendant features of technological advancement and compactness of the international system, a number of fundamental changes

are evident. At least, this development has provoked the awareness among countries particularly the developing ones that there is a compelling need for rapid and progressive development. Thus, there is a mutual race towards development as nations are now exploring their economic, human and natural resources, and other potentials for the purpose of attaining high level economic, industrial, socio – cultural and of course, political development. While such efforts geared towards development are not new¹, the intensity of recent efforts is quite profound and comparatively higher. It follows, therefore, that various dispositions and behavioural patterns of states in the international system are directed at attainment of developmental goals.

The attainment of such goals is contingent upon the objectives of a nation's foreign policy², since that policy is the blueprint a nation articulates to guide her conduct of international relations³. No nation can easily attain the goals in isolation. Therefore, in course of its intercourse with other member-states of the international system, and to a lesser degree, non state actors, a nation expectedly designs a foreign policy as its main substance of external relations to project and protect its interests within the system.

In the light of the foregoing, this paper attempts an x-ray of Nigeria's involvement in the NEPAD⁴ initiative. Situating this involvement within the context of Nigerian foreign policy, the paper argues that it was primarily in furtherance of Nigeria's avowed Afro -centric principle and not just a pursuit of an enlightened self (national) interest. Apart from this introduction, the paper is split into three other sections. The first section is the discussion section, which covers a brief note on Nigerian foreign policy principles with particular discourse of Afro –centrism. It also covers the origin, principles and objectives of NEPAD. The second section is the findings, which highlight the place of NEPAD in Nigerian foreign policy. Section three is the conclusion.

II. Brief Note on Nigerian Foreign Policy Principles

As Nigeria was driving close to attainment of independence in 1960 and basking in the euphoria of that imminent new status, the first Nigerian leader/Prime Minister, Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa made the first official foreign policy statement on 20th August, 1960 in the Federal House of Representatives. In that speech described as “a brief but strongly worded policy statement”, Balewa tried to state the major elements of the general principles that would guide the conduct of Nigeria's foreign relations. One of such principles was “an independent policy which would be founded on Nigeria's interest and consistent with the moral and democratic principles on which our constitution is based”⁵.

On October 7, 1960, when Nigeria was admitted into the fold of the United Nations as the ninety-ninth member⁶, Tafawa Balewa further expounded on the aims and principles of Nigerian foreign policy as including the following;

- a. the defense and promotion of Nigeria's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and national independence.
- b. the creation of the necessary economic and political conditions to secure the government, territorial integrity and national independence of other African countries and their total liberation from imperialism and all forms of foreign domination.
- c. the creation of the necessary conditions for the economic, political, social and cultural development of Africa.
- d. promotion of the rights of all black and oppressed peoples throughout the world.
- e. promotion of African Unity.
- f. promotion of world peace built on freedom, mutual respect and equality of all peoples of the world.
- g. respect for the territorial integrity of all nations, and
- h. non-partisanship in East – West ideological disputes and freedom of association and action in the international system⁷.

An objective perusal and appraisal of the above principles will show that the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and latter part of the eighth principles are in tandem with the principles and objectives of NEPAD as will be shown in the next section of this paper. Thus, Nigeria's role and activities in the formation of NEPAD and implementation of its programme can be comfortably taken as the fulfillment of the cardinal principles of her foreign policy. It should be noted further that, these principles have, over the years remained the enduring, underlying framework of Nigerian foreign policy and external relations. As it has been rightly observed, they have retained their vitality and remained virtually unedited through the changes of regimes and the vagaries of domestic policies.⁸

This was quite true of Nigeria's foreign policy even under the Muritala / Obasanjo regime. The panel⁹ set up by that regime to review Nigeria's foreign policy produced a report, which included not only an overall review of Nigeria's foreign policy since independence, but also projected for at least the following decade objectives, priorities, and strategies¹⁰ which are not profoundly different from those outlined at independence (emphasis mine). In 1979, General Olusegun Obasanjo as then Nigerian head of state emphasized the Afro-centric character of Nigerian foreign policy in clear terms when he stated that Nigeria's objective was and is the independence of Africa and its freedom from external control or

intervention from whatever source¹¹. Evidence abounds to suggest that the Muritala / Obasanjo regime was comparatively more Afro-centric both in words and in deed¹². It is, therefore, not an accident of history that chief Obasanjo as Nigerian elected leader fast-tracked the formation of NEPAD.

This trend continued under the Shagari regime. At least, Shagari stressed that position in his lengthy and thought-provoking address to the OAU summit in, Sierra Leone as he left no one in doubt that Africa really occupied the central point in Nigeria foreign policy priority. He spoke widely on the bloody and protracted crises in Chad, Western Sahara, Horn of Africa, South Africa, Namibia and then newly independent Zimbabwe. He also addressed issues bordering on economic cooperation among member-states and the Middle East situation, and sternly warned OAU member-states of the grave consequences of these crises and their implications for Africa if forces outside the continent were allowed to exploit the unfortunate situation¹³. The Shagari regime did not merely make verbal commitment to African issues and challenges; it matched such speech with practical action particularly in the area of liberating Africa from all forms of external domination. For instance, the regime substantially and diversely assisted the newly free Zimbabwe in establishing post – independence governmental structure.

Severe economic crunch borne out of gross mismanagement of national resources marked the final lap of the Shagari regime. This led to another military intervention in December, 1983, which ushered in the famous Buhari-Idiagbon regime. While the economic crunch forced it to go on low profile diplomacy, the regime still demonstrated in unequivocal term that it was strongly committed to an Afro-centric foreign policy particularly in eradicating racism and apartheid from Africa and in fast-tracking the process of decolonization as witnessed in Nigeria's role in Namibia. It is a truism to state that the regime was at the front rank in the anti – Reagan linkage policy on Namibian independence¹⁴. It also recorded marked achievement in its bid to re- position Nigeria as the leading state in African affairs.

The Babangida regime succeeded the Buhari-Idiagbon regime. General Babangida portrayed himself as a leader with a vision and mission armed with reform philosophy to salvage the nation. As Amata has observed, “the foreign policy angle of Babangida's philosophy of reform derives logically from his views on the domestic scene”¹⁵. It was the desire of Babangida to establish and sustain Nigeria as an important player in the game of diplomacy both in Africa and in the emergent world order. Towards this end, he embarked on what has come to be known as economic diplomacy. The simple logic of this new-found

philosophy was that “no more was Nigerian foreign policy going to be conducted without a keen eye on our national interests defined mostly in economic terms”¹⁶.

Beginning from the West-African sub-region, Babangida tried to re-assert Nigerian leadership position through the ECOWAS¹⁷ structure. He laid this bare in 1985 to a cheering circle of ECOWAS member-states that “ECOWAS was ripe for rebirth”¹⁸. Dangling the carrots of donation and foreign aid and resorting to inter-personal diplomacy with heads of states in the sub-region, Babangida effectively rallied support for the formation of ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), -a peace-keeping force - in 1990. The piloting role of Nigeria in the ECOMOG enterprise¹⁹ earned her a pride of place in West African affairs, and the twin issues of economic cooperation and regional security became recurrent items on the agenda of regional summits and meetings. In all, the role of Nigeria in the Liberian conflict through ECOMOG was indicative of the desire of Nigerian leadership to re-assert the country’s position in the sub – region.

The Abacha years were marked by some unwholesome events²⁰. In spite of these however, Abacha continued to promote the leadership position of Nigeria in the West African sub-region through ECOMOG. According to Ajayi, with Nigerian prop, the ECOMOG attained the sub-regional goal of enforcing peace, keeping peace and returning normalcy to Liberia after brokering many peace accords between the warring factions until the Abuja Accord of August 1995, which was later reviewed in August, 1996²¹. Also, with ECOMOG’s efforts in Sierra Leone which culminated in the liberation of Freetown from the Paul Koromah-led junta and the ultimate restoration of the Tejan Kabbah-led civilian regime, Nigeria’s diplomacy attracted applause from OAU, UN, USA and the Liberian and Sierra Leonean peoples.

This trend continued after the death of Abacha in 1998 with General Abdulsalam Abubakar as the new helmsman. In pursuit of the Afro-centric principle, Abubakar visited South Africa for a bi - lateral purpose. He also visited Togo, Republic of Benin and Niger among other countries in the West African sub-region. Abubakar’s efforts at repositioning Nigeria in the global system and particularly in Africa could be appreciated against the backdrop of the unhealthy diplomatic record of the preceding Abacha regime. In Abubakar’s own words, his administration “will consolidate old friendships, will win new ones and repair damaged relations”. The peak of Abubakar’s achievement was the short and successful transition to civil rule programme he floated, which culminated in the return of democracy to Nigeria on May 29, 1999, with Chief Olusegun Obasanjo as the new democratically elected president. It was in this regard that a scholar observed that, the premonition that Nigeria

might once again come back prominently into global reckoning was obvious from the volume of goodwill the General Abubakar’s transition programme generated for the country²².

On the whole, Abubakar’s regime witnessed a re-organizing of Nigeria’s foreign policy mechanism, rapid spate of repair of damaged relations particularly with continuity of the extant principle of Afro – centrism. The 1999 - 2007 regime of Chief Olusegun Obasanjo marked a great leap to the practical implementation of Afro - centric foreign policy. This has been succinctly captioned by Abdulmumin that, “...Obasanjo’s foreign policy has demonstrated a renewed commitment to African affairs. The recent transition from OAU to AU does not only enjoy a tremendous Nigerian patronage, the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) has received significant boost from Nigeria Also, there is an increasing effort being geared towards conflict management and promotion of African integration”²³.

This Afro-centric drive manifested in many diplomatic shuttles by Chief Obasanjo or his accredited representative(s) to many African countries like South Africa, Cameroon, Ethiopia,²⁴ Morocco, Republic of Niger, Algeria , Democratic Republic of Congo, Botswana, Sao Tome and Principe, Namibia, Senegal, Zimbabwe, Uganda, Zambia, Libya, Equatorial Guinea and so on. In return some African leaders visited Nigeria during the period. Former South African President Nelson Mandela, and the then incumbent Thabo Mbeki, Blaise Compaore of Burkina Faso, Ghadaffi of Libya, Frederique de Menezes of Sao Tome and Principe, Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, Abdullahi Wade of Senegal and Abdulaziz Bouteflika of Algeria among others. Nigeria and South Africa deepened their bi-lateral relations in terms of closer economic cooperation and more investment inflow. The Nigerian-South African Bi-National Commission worked towards achieving this end throughout the Obasanjo Years²⁵.

It is, therefore, apt to state that Chief Obasanjo in his second shot at the Nigerian Presidency, continued with Afro-centric principles, which had blossomed in the Muritala-Obasanjo regime and that tradition manifested in the establishment of NEPAD with substantial prop from the Obasanjo regime.

III. Origin, Principles and Objectives of NEPAD

As noted earlier, NEPAD is the acronym for New Partnership for African Development (see note 4 below). It is a holistic, integrated and sustainable development initiative undertaken by African countries in constructive partnership with the developed countries²⁶ for the economic and social rejuvenation of Africa. The Africa countries anchored

the NEPAD effort on their avowed determination to liberate their continent and its peoples from the crushing challenges of underdevelopment and exclusion in the current age of globalization. Generally hailed as the beginning of a new era for Africa, and the continent's last chance to address its ugly status as the least developed continent both in terms of its governance and level of socio-economic development, NEPAD is a pledge platform built by African leaders who shared a common vision and conviction that they have a pressing duty to place their countries on a pedestal of sustainable development, to enable them participate in world economy and body politic²⁷.

It would seem from the above that the NEPAD initiative was a new wake-up call among African leaders for a partnership founded on the realization of common interest, obligation commitment, benefit and equity. The whole process of its founding began with the transition of Organization of African Unity to African Union in 2000. In preparing for this transition, the member-states had given a mandate to five selected heads of states of Algeria, Egypt, Nigeria, Senegal and South Africa²⁸, to design an integrated socio-economic development framework for the continent. As a result of their resolve to rebuild the African social and economic structures, they looked forward to NEPAD as a merger arrangement of the millennium development partnership for Africa. This merger was finalized on July 3, 2001, out of which grew a New African Initiative (NAI), and was approved by the O.A.U. Summit of Heads of States on July 11, 2001. On their own part, leaders of the G-8²⁹ endorsed the plan on July 20, 2001 in Genoa, Italy. An implementation committee³⁰ formalized the policy framework on October 23, 2001 at Abuja, Nigeria. Thus, NEPAD was formed, while the African leaders officially adopted NEPAD in July 2002 as the officially mandated programme of the new African Union, which had been inaugurated in Durban, South Africa as the successor to the defunct Organization of African Unity (OAU).

It is clear from the above that the NEPAD initiative was largely an home-grown African effort. The endorsement by the G-8 leaders was consequent upon the indisputable fact that African leaders cannot operate in an isolation and particularly so without the cooperation and assistance of the leading nations of the globalised world. This underscores why NEPAD has now become the main platform for United Nations programmes in Africa³¹. It has, as yet, remained one of the main channels of advancing foreign aids to Africa since 2002.

In course of establishing its structure, the African leaders noted a number of principles upon which to anchor the initiative. Such principles are noted as follows;

- a. Good governance as a basic requirement for peace, security and sustainable political and socio-economic development;
- b. African ownership and leadership, as well as broad and deep participation by all sectors of the society;
- c. Anchoring the development of Africa on its resources and resourcefulness of its people;
- d. Acceleration of regional and continental integration;
- e. Building the competitiveness of African countries and the continent;
- f. Forging a new international partnership that changes the unequal relationship between Africa and the developed world; and
- g. Ensuring that all partnership with NEPAD are linked to the Millennium Development Goals and other agreed developmental goals and targets³².

While these principles are meant to strengthen the initiative as guides, there are some set objectives meant to be achieved. They include:

- a. To place African countries both individually and collectively on the path of sustainable growth and development;
- b. To eradicate poverty;
- c. To halt the marginalization of Africa in the global process and enhance its full and beneficial integration into global economy;
- d. To accelerate the empowerment of women;
- e. To ensure improvement on water resources and health management as well as confront the problems of the deadly HIV/AIDS pandemic and other diseases eating up the continent of Africa; and
- f. To ensure continual peace as well as corporate governance in Africa³³.

The above outline on NEPAD'S principles and objectives is hinged on the compelling needs to assess the level of compatibility between Nigeria's foreign policy principles and NEPAD's purposes. It is not in doubt as seen above that Nigeria has largely operated an Africa-centered foreign policy from independence. The question, which is the crux in this paper, therefore arises as to whether Nigeria led other African states to develop NEPAD for her own enlightened self (national) interest, or for the broader purpose of furthering her Afro-centric principle. In other words, is there a contest between national interest and continental interest? Or, was Nigerian effort selfless, selfish or altruistic? This engages our attention next as we discuss NEPAD in Nigerian foreign Policy.

IV. NEPAD in Nigerian Foreign Policy

One of the cardinal principles of Nigeria's foreign policy since 1999 is that of Afrocentrism, which implies that Nigeria under the new attempt at democratic rule has not deviated from the main principles as outlined in 1960 and noted above. This was brought to the fore by the leading role Nigeria played by deploying her foreign policy structures in both the formation of NEPAD and implementation of its programmes. We have noted earlier that Chief Olusegun Obasanjo was one of the five heads of state mandated to work out the NEPAD framework. Also as noted above, it was at the Nigerian federal capital city; Abuja, that the policy framework was finalized on October 23, 2001, obviously at the structural and functional expense of Nigeria. Therefore, it can be safely opined that Nigeria has been in the fore-front for the development and promotion of NEPAD from conception to full growth as witnessed today.

As Nigerian President, Chief Olusegun Obasanjo, working in accord with Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, continued to provide ample leadership to NEPAD throughout his tenure. He functioned as chairman of the Heads of State Implementation Committee, while Nigeria continued to lead two strategic committees namely; economic and corporate governance as well as capital flows. The country still provides vice chairman for committee on infrastructure in addition to being chairman for African Business Round Table, which is responsible for promoting NEPAD business programme in the private sector³⁴. Nigeria's involvement in NEPAD has helped strengthen Africa's relationship with the G-8 nations and other developed countries. Thus, it is incontestable that NEPAD is a comprehensive development plan designed with the aid of the AU platform and welcomed by powerful states of the global system. AU and NEPAD are, therefore, not separate institutions and both are Africa's platform in modern international relations.

Nigeria has demonstrated her deep commitment to continental and regional economic integration and cooperation in Africa, particularly in the contemporary age of globalization. As Obasanjo observed:

Fortunately and as paradoxical as it may sound, globalization has given a new fillip to regionalism. In other words, we must take measures of national, regional and continental levels to arrest and reverse the marginalisation of Africa and thus give a human face to globalization³⁵.

One of the "measures" is the formation of NEPAD and implementation of its programmes. At the country level, Nigeria instituted NEPAD with the primary aim of

ensuring civil society participation in NEPAD programmes, and to integrate such programmes within sectoral policy making and implementation bodies in Nigeria³⁶. With this, Nigeria has facilitated the gradual implementation of NEPAD programmes through the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programmes (CAADP), Short Term Action Plan for Infrastructure (STAP), NEPAD Environment Initiative, NEPAD Health Strategy, Peace and Security, and the African Peer Review Mechanism³⁷.

V. Conclusion

This paper has examined the NEPAD initiative in the context of Nigerian foreign policy. The main thesis of the paper is that, the driving motive behind Nigeria's central role in the formation of NEPAD and the prodigious support offered to it so far are two-fold. One, it was in conformity with and continuity of the country's avowed principle of Afro-centrism. Two, the formation of NEPAD was in the best interest of Nigeria, as the leading country of the continent at least in terms of human/material resources, population, land space. Any effort that would provoke development and wealth creation in the continent should be encouraged by Nigeria. This is because Nigeria will always bear the brunt in case of outbreak of poverty-related crisis in any part of the continent.

To claim that Nigeria fast-tracked the formation of NEPAD as a result of her commitment to Afro-centric principle and enlightened self-interest is a truism, because the two are closely intertwined. Convincingly, it was not propelled by any desire by Nigeria to foist any form of control on other African states in a manner that could erode their sovereignty and autonomy. In other words, the 'enlightened self interest' should not be seen in the context of any hegemonic tendencies on the part of Nigeria.

References :

Man has always explored his environment to harness available resources for his own survival. Stages of development are recorded in various accounts of history of mankind. See for instance, J.W. Hall and J.G. Kirk (eds.), *History of the World: Earliest Times to the Present Day*, (North Dighton, M.A: World Publications group Inc.,2005), pp. 10 – 286. This section contains details on activities of man from his origin to the dawn of modern age.

Foreign policy has been variously defined. See some definitions in J. Rosenau, *Comparing Foreign Policies*, (New York: John Wiley, 1974), p. 6, P.A. Reynolds, *An Introduction to International Relations*, (London: Longman, 1971), p. 25., and S.T. Okajare, *Evolution of the*

Contemporary International System & Organizations,(Akure: Pearlsberyl Resources, 2008), pp. 14 – 16.

Apart from foreign policy, it can be conceded that such attainment can also be largely influenced by domestic considerations. This position has been largely canvassed by G. Idang in his *Nigeria: Internal Politics and Foreign Policy, 1960-1966*, (Ibadan: University Press, 1973).

The NEPAD acronym means New Partnership for African Development. For the present purpose, the acronym will be used throughout.

See Idang, *Nigeria: Internal Politics*, pp. 7 – 11.

This was during a meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

F. Otubanjo, “Introduction: Phases and Changes in Nigeria’s Foreign Policy”, in A. B. Akinyemi et. al. (eds.), *Nigeria since Independence: The First 25 years, Volume X, International Relations*, (Ibadan: Heinemann, 1989), p. 4.

Ibid. Joe Garba described them as a well thought-out and forward-looking prescription for Nigeria’s foreign policy. See his *Diplomatic Soldiering: The Conduct of Nigerian Foreign Policy, 1975 – 1979*, (Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd., 1991), p. XIV.

Headed by Professor Adebayo Adedeji, the panel was charged to review the whole basis of Nigeria’s foreign policy and to formulate new guidelines. See B.J. Dudley, *An Introduction to Nigerian Government and Politics*, (London: Macmillan Press, 1982), p. 297.

Garba, *Diplomatic Soldiering ...*, p. 12

Curled from Dudley, *An Introduction ...*, p. 29

See for example, S.T. Okajare, “A History of Nigeria’s Foreign Relations,1960-2000” in S.O. Arifalo and Gboyega Ajayi (eds.), *Essays in Contemporary Nigerian History*, (Lagos: First Academic, 2003), pp. 174 – 179.

Full details of this period can be gleaned from T. Aminu and W. David (eds.), *Shehu Shagari: My Vision of Nigeria*, (London: Frank Cass and Co., 1981), pp. 49-58.

See O. Amechi, “Nigeria and the Superpowers”, in A.,B. Akinyemi et. al, (eds.), *Nigeria since Independence. ...*, p. 70 for more details on the linkage policy.

C. Amata, *Prince of the Niger: The Babangida Years*, (Lagos: Tanus Communications, 1992), p. 91.

Ibid. p. 92.

ECOWAS is the acronym for Economic Community of West African States – a sub -regional body for facilitating economic integration among states in the West African sub region. The terms and instruments of establishing ECOWAS were ratified by all the states involved on

28 May, 1975. Nigeria played leading role in the formation of ECOWAS when General Yakubu Gowon was head of state.

M.I.M. Abutudu, “Nigeria and ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons”, in J. Owoeye (eds.), *Nigeria in International Institutions*, (Ibadan: College Press,1993), p. 115.

Nigeria led other states in the ECOWAS standing mediation committee, which eventually established ECOMOG in 1990.

Some of these unwholesome events are highlighted in Okajare, “A History...”pp.184– 185.

K. Ajayi, *Nigeria’s Peace Keeping Role in Liberia and Sierra Leone*” in O. Kolawole (ed.), *Issues in Nigerian Government and Politics*, (Ibadan: Dekaal Publishers, 1998), pp 186. Of course, the emergence of Charles Taylor as Liberian President through a multi- party electoral process was mid-wifed by ECOMOG was greatly facilitated by Nigeria, which ironically was under an aberrant military rule.

F.J. Abdulmumin, *OBASANJO and the New Face of Nigeria’s Foreign Policy*, (Kaduna: M.O.D. Press, and Publishers, 2004), p. 131.

Ibid, p. 140. This effort at African integration was structurally backed by the creation of Ministry of Cooperation and Integration in Africa by the Obasanjo regime.

Ibid, p. 147.

Ibid.

K. Oladejo, “NEPAD and the African Charter on Population Participation in Development: The Position of Labour”, vol. 3, No 9, May – August, 2002, p. 25

See C. Asika, “The Prospects and Challenges of the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)” : Paper presented at the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), Kuru – Jos, 22 April, 2004, p. 1.

The heads of states were Bouteflika, Hosni Mubarrak, Olusegun Obasanjo, Abdullahi Wade and Thabo Mbeki in that order.

G-8 is used to describe the eight most powerful, industrialized and economically strong nations of the world. They include United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, China, Russia and Canada.

This committee is otherwise known as Heads of States Implementation Committee.

UN General Assembly, 57th Session, Agenda Item 4 (a), 20th November, 2002. This declaration urges the international community and the United Nations to organize support for African countries in accordance with the principles and objectives of NEPAD.

Details of these principles can be gleaned from R.A. Akindele, “Obasanjo’s Foreign Policy in a Global Diplomatic Market Place”, Social Science Academy of Nigeria, 1999 – 2002, p. 23.

WWW. Nepad. Org, p. 1.

Asika, “The Prospects...”, p.3, See also Abdulmumin, Obasanjo and the New Face..., p. 140.

Akindele, “Obasanjo’s Foreign Policy ...”, p. 20.

Strategic Plan of Action. National Office of NEPAD, Abuja, Official Gazette of the Presidency, February 2003, p. 2.

Full discussion and critical analysis of the implementation of NEPAD programmes, which is not the main focus here engages our attention elsewhere. See S.T. Okajare, NEPAD: Programmes, Prospects and Achievements in the Context of Globalization “ – Forthcoming.