

## Neo-colonial Imperialism: the Trend and the Plight of African States

Festus C. Onuegbu

### Abstract

No doubt, as Africa moved out of the shackles of colonialism, it discovers itself in the murky waters of neo-colonial imperialism. This new imperialism, pervasive as it seems, has confronted and still confronts Africa in all fronts of her development questions. Thus, Africa has been entrapped in a complex web of predicament as she fell into the cold grip of 'underdevelopment'. Therefore, adopting the 'centre-periphery' model as the relevant explicatory framework,, attempt is hereby made to examine the trend of neo-colonial imperialism and the plight of African States there-in. In doing this, methodically, thematic-analytical approach is employed, and published literature is mainly used as the source of information gathering. As a matter of conclusion, the paper maintains that the inherent 'structural inequality and unfairness' characteristic of the asymmetric global economic and political architecture is the bane of Africa's development. However, Africa's predicament is not insolvable, hence some plausible policy options as an antidote are critically imperative.

**Keywords:** Imperialism, Development, Underdevelopment, Colonialism, and Inequality.

### Introduction

Neo-colonialism, as a form of imperialism, largely dominates and shapes global opinion and discussions bordering on development/under-development issues in the third world, particularly, in Africa, though controversial it seems. According to (Nkrumah, 30):

Neo-colonialism is a greater danger to independent countries than colonialism. It is more insidious and complex... a state in the grip of neo-colonialism is not master of its own destiny... neo-colonialism is the worst form of imperialism; for those who practice it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress.

It is arguably a fact that neo-colonialism, a trajectory epoch in the West-led imperialism, is the bane of African states. Observably, it manifests covertly and overtly in different forms ranging from economic, political, diplomatic, religious, to socio-cultural relations of Africa with the West-led outside world.

Looking back to history to fathom the foundations of pervasive European colonialism, and better understand the dynamics of neo-colonialism in Africa, (Rodney, 186) observes:

Africa and Asian societies were developing independently until they were taken over directly or indirectly by the capitalist powers. When that happened, exploitation increased and the export of surplus ensued, depriving the societies of the benefit of their natural resources and labour... in order to understand present economic conditions in Africa one needs to know why it is that Africa has realized little of its natural potentials... the fact of the matter is that the most profound reasons for the economic backwardness of a given Africa nation are not to be found inside that nation. All that we can find inside are symptoms of underdevelopment.

Ake (116), in his own contribution, posits, “neo-colonialism owes its origins from the culture of dependence and underdevelopment orchestrated by the manipulations of capitalist colonial enterprise in Africa”. To this end, (Nnoli, 32-33) argues:

The capitalist colonialism in Africa was parasitic, exploitative, and pervasively voracious... Africa resources were drained indiscriminately to satisfy the bourgeois capitalist needs of the West instead of development needs of African societies. Hence, Africa became ill-integrated into the mainstream Western capitalism on a peripheral status to suffer marginalization and underdevelopment, as the few indigenous comprador bourgeois elite class became the conduit through which neo-colonial imperialism is perpetrated, and continue to ravage independent African states.

Thus, the colonial experiment in Africa peripheralised Africa states, and laid the debilitating foundation under which neo-colonial imperialism finds its thriving but predatory tentacles.

In other words, the ‘capitalist colonial status quo’ still remains dominant in Africa, but in a disguised and indirect fashion that is insidious and tactical. Hence, the ‘independent sovereign status’ of African states had become a lost cause; the much taunted question of political independence around leadership circles in Africa notwithstanding. Obviously, the understanding and manifestations of neo-imperialism in today’s independent African states are multifaceted and complex. Within the purview of African development/underdevelopment praxis, the contentious impact of neo-colonial imperialism is phenomenal and multi-dimensional. But for insightful and painstaking examination, it is the intention of the present writer to subsume, technically, the discourse in the politico-economic dimension.

### **Conceptual Clarifications:**

#### **Neo-colonialism**

The term neo-colonialism, judging from the context of experience, means different things to different people. Heywood (136), sees neo-colonialism as a more subtle form of imperialism which industrialized powers use to control foreign territory by economic domination, based on the export of capital to less developed countries, while respecting the territory’s formal political independence. In other words, neo-colonialism is seen as an economic phenomenon. To (Pincus, 73), “neo-colonialism is a manipulative ideology through which metropolitan states control, and create tensions in, less politically and economically viable states in a disguised manner”. Thus, neo-colonialism is manipulated and mainly covert in operations. Hence, (Abia, 195) argues, “it is the desire to hold sway in the newly independent African countries by ex-colonial power and continue to exploit them”. That is to say that neo-colonialism seeks to enthrone

alternative enterprise to the liquidated colonialism. However, none of these definitions seems adequate and encompassing. Nkrumah (21), in his *Neo-colonialism: the Last Stage of Imperialism*, posits:

Neo-colonialism is externally manipulated system that not only prevents its victim independent states from developing their economic potential for their own use, but controls the political and socio-economic life of the country, and supports indigenous bourgeoisie in perpetuating the oppression and exploitation of the masses...

To this end, any oblique attempt by foreign power to thwart, corrupt, or pervert the true independence of a sovereign people is neo-colonialism. From the attempts made by scholars above, it is understandable that neo-colonialism takes place in an independent state. It is not only exclusively the crime of ex-colonial masters; every other powerful nation is involved. It encompasses economic phenomenon; it is multifaceted. It is a universal reality and not peculiar to Africa; Latin American and Asian states also share the experience. In other words, neo-colonialism can be seen as a form of imperialism through which advanced nations indirectly seek to control and pauperize the less developed independent nations.

### **Imperialism**

Imperialism means different things to different people. It can be discussed, denounced, defended and died for, but it cannot be defined in any generally acceptable way. Morgenthau (142) sees imperialism as “the expansion of a state’s power beyond its borders”. Thus, imperialism means expansionism. In the Marxist tradition, imperialism is seen as an economic phenomenon that typically results from the pressure to export capital. Hence, (Lenin, 18) defines it as “a stage in the development of capitalism which is exploitative, parasitic, and moribund”. From the Marxist-Leninist conceptualization, imperialism is evil and is sustained by finance capital.

To (Offiong, 74) imperialism can simply mean underdevelopment and exploitation of people by manipulative and coercive means of domination. However, (Schumpeter, 68) differed sharply with the condemning voices of imperialism. He sees imperialism as ‘an atavistic force, ancient in inception, decadent and self-conscious in an age of rationalism, yet powerful enough to lord it over rival; the up-start capitalism’. In other words, imperialism is nationalism and has no capitalist motive. Nevertheless, considering imperialism as it relates to Africa’s experience, Schumpeter’s understanding of it must be kept in abeyance. Imperialism is much more complex. It encompasses more than exploitation. It encapsulates both colonialism and neo-colonialism. In a simplest form, it involves both direct and indirect control and domination of all spheres of a country by another powerful country.

### **Theoretical Foundation**

To properly understand the basic parameters and philosophical ethos under which neo-colonialism entrapped, and got sustained in Africa, it is pertinent to adopt a relevant theoretical framework, as an effective tool to explicate its reality. Taking cognizance of the peripheral status of Africa in the asymmetric web of global political economy, the choice of ‘centre-periphery’ model as the relevant explicatory framework is adopted. As an offshoot of mainstream ‘Marxism’, centre-periphery model has the same focal thrust on the explanation and description of the structure and mode of global relations similar to that of dependency theory. The proponents of this theoretical

construct were drawn from the same school of dependency. Henrique Fernando Cardoso, Theotonio Dos Santos, Andre Gunder Frank, Samir Armin, Immanuel Wallerstein, Claude Ake Arghiri Emmanuel, Walter Rodney, and so on belong to this school.

The centre-periphery sees the world as a global capitalist economy where its fundamental structure is anchored on inequality; hence, the relation between the 'unequal' must be fraught with contradictions. Nwoke (4-7) notes that 'capital' and 'technology' create the difference between the 'centre' and the 'periphery' in their unequal partnership. Armin (38) adds, "the 'core' areas set the rules that guide the system which the 'peripheral' areas have little or no choice but to remain subservient against their natural wish." It is the assumption of the centre-periphery apologists that the global capitalist system is structured into two classes of states — those that relate to it as owners of means of production (bourgeois states), and those that relate to it as non owners of means of production (proletariat states) and whose resources are exploited by those who own 'capital' and 'technology' as means of production. Thus, (Rodney, 94) locates the 'African underdevelopment and exploitation' within this context. The proponents admit that there is 'complex interdependence' that characterized the global capitalist order but, however, contend that the 'peripheries' are manipulatively conditioned to be more dependent; and as a result, suffer 'dependency' in the midst of interdependence. Hence, much taunted but dependent and placating mantra of 'development assistance', 'partnership in development', aids, and debt rescheduling and cancellation paraded by the core further pauperize the periphery.

The theoretical construct holds that the bulk of third world countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia are located at the periphery of the global capitalist system, and that the bulk of developed nations, located at the centre metropolis, use disguised means of 'unfair trade', 'manipulation of the decision making in international economic institutions', 'oversea development assistance' (ODA), and host of other means to hold the auto-centric development of the victim states in the periphery at ransom. Ake (13) posits:

The 'core' metropolises are comfortable with the capitalist formations. The international division of labour they forcibly impose continues to pauperize African societies in their seemingly inevitable bid to supply raw materials for the development interest of the West. The economic resources, through the local bourgeoisie as a conduit, are oriented towards satisfying external demands at the face of gross underdevelopment and poverty of the masses who cannot afford the expansive luxury and capital goods from the West.

Thus, (Wallerstein, 42; Szentes 215; and Dos Santos, 70) maintain that the local bourgeois elements in the periphery are made by the bourgeois elements in the core metropolises; and thus, act as agents of imperialism and captains of internal exploitation. In other words, within the context of this model, the ruling elite and local petty comprador bourgeoisie are co-opted into the mainstream international capitalist orbit by the controlling core metropolitan powers. To this end, it seems that the entering of the ruling elite in the periphery into parasitic collaboration with the international bourgeoisie elements makes the notion of 'de-linking' and 'disengagement' from the hounds of dependency in Africa a pipe dream. Hence, the third world suffers from economic balkanization and political instability, as a result. However, center-periphery model has its limitations and inadequacies in explicating the reality of global economic relations, yet it proves more potent in describing that reality in Africa.

### **Characteristics of Neo-colonial Imperialism in Africa**

Neo-colonial imperialism in Africa today manifests in many ways but, largely, in the economic spheres. However, the political and socio-cultural sectors of independent African states are not spared by this trajectory. Girvan (106) observed that the patterns through which modern imperialism is perpetrated in today's weak independent states could be defined within the behavioral parameters of their agents. In other words, the forms which neo-colonialism take is a direct function of how their 'agents' are influenced in pushing their 'bourgeois parasitic contours'. The 'nature' of neo-colonialism in Africa is complex and pervasive. It is wisely and tactically crafted to consolidate the hold on Africa's development process by the West to contain the fall-out of predatory capitalism. The nature of neo-colonialism does not portend good to Africa, contrary to the erroneous claim of 'capitalist hoax masters' of the West. The Spark Editors (138-139) described the mechanisms of neo-colonialism as follows:

- i. Economic control in the form of aid, loans, trade, and banking.
- ii. The strangle hold of indigenous economies through vast interlocking multinational corporations with their subsidiaries and affiliates.
- iii. Political direction through puppet governments.
- iv. Cultivation of an indigenous bourgeoisie closely linked with the international bourgeoisie.
- v. The imposition of defense agreements and the setting up of military, naval, and air bases.
- vi. Ideological propaganda through the mass communication media of press, radio, and television...

In other words, neo-colonialism in Africa penetrates through many channels; it is multifaceted. Nwoke (5) posits that neo-colonialism in Africa is maintained through unequal trade contacts, investments contacts, aid contacts; and subversive political contacts. That is to say that unequal trade relation which Africa suffers, foreign investments which transnational corporations represent in Africa, aid in form of loans and oversea development assistance to Africa, and the clandestine political meddling into governance process in Africa by 'the outside powers' are all characteristic forms of neo-colonialism. Thus, the West is actively involved in independent African states with their agents through these channels. Abia (201), also, pointed the operations of multinational corporations, co-optation of indigenous bourgeois elite into international bourgeoisie, political intervention and subversion of government, and foreign aid complex as sustaining factors of neo-colonialism in Africa. According to him the blending of all these factors is the heart of Africa's underdevelopment and retardation.

Nonetheless, in more recent times, the tentacles of neo-colonialism in Africa have extended to include the spread of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) ostensibly meant to do charity work in Africa but actually serve as neo-colonial agents for intelligence gathering and propaganda spread. Since 1980s, the pervasive role of international financial institutions including the Breton-woods and international trade regulatory agencies have expanded, and had taken a new but more predatory dimension toward Africa. The IMF, World Bank, and WTO take the major role in this form of neo-colonialism. Hence, their politics towards Africa is nothing but strategic game plan of the West to further underdevelop and pauperize Africa and her masses.

From the manifestations of neo-colonialism described above, one can understand that they are sustained by (a) the Western capitalists ethos of 'free market enterprise' and

‘competition’, paraded as the only economic system for promoting development, (b) the Western political philosophy of parliamentary democracy, so claimed to be the ideal form of government for nations with quite different historical experiences. Therefore, neo-colonialism as a phenomenal reality in Africa can be seen from the following operational contexts.

- It is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. It affects every sphere of African existence, ranging from the economic, political, diplomatic, and socio-cultural spheres. Neo-colonialism, therefore, has many faces.
- Neo-colonialism in Africa is indirect and disguised in its operations. It penetrates African state insidiously and may not be consciously noticed in the short-run; hence, it is parasitic and exploitative. Whether, planned or unplanned, it harps on local sentiments to thrive.
- It is carried out in Africa by ‘agents’ and is collaborative with petty comprador bourgeois elements and the ruling elite in Africa. The transnational and multinational corporations (TNCs/MNCs) as foreign investment in Africa and their bourgeois policies, the co-operation of indigenous bourgeoisie, Western ‘democracy-support’ campaigners, and the proliferation of NGOs unambiguously represent ‘agents’ of neo-colonialism in Africa.
- It underdevelops Africa and stifles her indigenous development initiatives.

Thus, neo-colonial imperialism peripheralizes African states within the fulcrum of asymmetric international political economy.

#### **Impact of Neo-colonial Imperialism on Africa**

The force of neo-colonial imperialism affects the development process of African states in different ways. It is a truism that colonialism peripherally and exploitatively integrated African economies into the unequal global capitalist architecture, yet one would have expected that after the liquidation of colonialism, there would have been a holistic transformation and re-direction of ideology. However, contrary to this expectation, the imperialism engendered by colonialism continue to subsist and reinforced by the subterranean and indirect tactics employed by ex-colonial overlords to consolidate their stronghold in Africa.

One of the implications of neo-colonialism in Africa is the sustenance of dependency syndrome. Stiglitz (68) observed that the neo-colonial trade relations between African states and the industrialized countries of the North did not change from what was dominant during colonial period. Rather, the ‘dependence’ which Africa suffered in such relations complex has become modified, expanded, and tactically refined. The advanced capitalist states, harping on the mantra of ‘free trade’ and ‘mutual development’ for global prosperity, are surreptitiously manipulating the decision making processes of international trade and financial regimes to maintain, and even, expand the horizons of unequal ‘capitalist status quo’, that will further accentuate Africa’s ‘dependence’ on them in the aftermath of independence. Thus, (Offiong, 63) notes;

The external developments and the internal economic distortions inherited by independent African states could not made for radical progressive change. They were externally resisted; hence, the regrettable recapitulation into status quo of inequality which made the much taunted decolonization false.

African states have continued to remain in a servitude position in the architecture of global political economy, the 'toga of political independence' notwithstanding. Any progressive efforts to reverse their position have always been blocked by the West through neo-colonial tactics. Africa remains primary produce exporter without technologically induced capital production base that could spur authentic development; they wholly depend on the industrialised states to satisfy their primary and capital consumption. The economies of African states, as a result, became export-oriented, not for their internal development but for the progress, and satisfaction of industrial needs of the West. Ake (28) and Eboh (81), paradoxically, observed that Africa produces what it does not consume, and consumes what it does not produce. This is a clear case of Africa's underdevelopment. For instance, Ghana and Ivory Coast were giants in the world rankings of cocoa exports but they still, today, import large tons of tea from Euro-American and Asian markets. Nigeria, in a like manner, ranks sixth in the global crude oil production, yet imports fuel from abroad for her local consumption.

Neo-colonialism encourages the exploitation and domination of African economies. The ambiguous and bogus idea of 'foreign direct investment' (FDI), which transnational conglomerates represent, is a prime suspect here. As (Chinweizu, 5) contends, "the multinational conglomerates with capital and technology potent and large enough, than the capacity of their host countries are unofficial agents of neo-colonial imperialism in the business of Africa's underdevelopment and backwardness in recent times. Thus, the TNCs and MNCs are not only in for profit making and the so called 'technology transfer', they are also neo-colonial tentacles through which their parents countries meddle into internal politics in Africa. Ejiofor (36) observes:

Multinational corporations (MNCs) with their large capital and state of the art technology prevents the indigenous firms from coming into limelight; thus, stifling indigenous technological initiative. They generate unemployment and cause environmental and social degradation against international safety standards; hence, social tensions ferment in their host nations. The most, being the cycle of de-capitalization they reinforce- the insignificant amount of capital inflow they brought-with takes a disproportionate large amount of capital outflow from their hosts which pauperizes them further. This is Africa's predicament.

Thus, the stagnation of industrial development initiatives, unemployment generation, importing social tensions and environmental degradation coupled with the problem of de-capitalization they create in Africa, are all bastions of neo-colonial imperialism. This impact on Africa is devastating.

Neo-imperialism creates 'debt syndrome' as part of Africa's present day predicament. Negotiated and un-negotiated (unofficial) loans granted to African states for their development challenge have turned out to be the bane of Africa. The amount of resources (money) spent in servicing the loans has become enormous that African states are almost drained. The taunting 'debt rescheduling' and outright cancellation by grantor agencies like IMF, World Bank, Parish Club, London Club, European union, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for most of African states is far more less significant to the enormity of the Africa's debt burden. Obiegbu (125) and Nyerere (5) opined that Africa does not need loans and aid assistance but rather a restructured and humane international system that would guarantee fair trade and freedom for development. Onimode (51) maintains that debt and aid pauperize Africa and put logs in its waters of development. Neo-imperialism holds Africa in the shackles of

foreign aids and loans that translate themselves into weapons of dependency and underdevelopment. The staggering estimate of Africa's debts ranging between 1.6 trillion dollars to 2.3 trillion dollars as at 2002 informed Ghadaffi to declare before the African leaders summit in Durban, South Africa that "Africa is in a serious internal and international stress, and does not need 'aid' but 'freedom to chart its course'", (NewAfrican, 9).

Neo-colonialism, as a contemporary form of imperialism, has created political corruption and puppet regimes in Africa. Most of governments in Africa have been toppled and supplanted with ones compliant to external forces. The ruling elite in Africa no longer hold political power in trust of their citizens but rather for their superior overlords outside their borders. This has bred the culture of political indiscipline, corruption, and exploitation of African peoples. In other words, neo-colonialism plays on the sentiment of the people to thrive. "One internationally manipulated jingle against non-Western complaint leader is enough to set the smoke that eventually brings him down", noted (NewAfrican, 12).

The West use tools like aids, loan assistance, manipulated electoral processes, and international media to create tensions against leaders they do not want and favour leaders they institute. "Most of the coup d'état and counter coup d'état in Africa could be explained from the prism of neo-colonial Western sponsorship", contented (Eze, 76). In other words, neo-colonialism partly orchestrates political instability, and consolidates puppet regimes in Africa. The list is uncountable considering the experiences of most African countries in their political transitions and crisis periods. From Nigeria, Guinea, Togo, Burkina Faso, Algeria, Somalia, Burundi, Ivory Coast, Congo, Mozambique, Angola, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Sudan, Liberia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, and to a host of others, the record status is very regrettable.

As a sum up, neocolonial imperialism, as it affects Africa, retards development and does not work in the good interest of Africans. To (Nkrumah, 29) neo-colonialism is evil and needs to be liquidated like colonialism; and the only good thing in it would be its demise. However, no matter how tall neo-colonialism stands in Africa, not every contact with outside world in the present time is fraught with imperialism. Africa still needs international strategic support, encouragement, and partnership to develop and grow. Therefore, despite how neo-colonial imperialism holds its grip on Africa, possibilities exist for Africa to survive out of it. Thus, Africa has a chance to develop. There is alternative, if we stand to face the reality.

### **Conclusion: Policy Implication for Africa and the Way Forward**

It is arguably a regrettable fact that after about four decade that saw the demise of colonialism, Africa still grapples with problems of underdevelopment and backwardness. Neo-colonialism is the suspect. The ex-imperial powers, though have conceded political independence to African states, they indirectly still hold sway on the economic fabrics of these states. Thus, Africa's position within the centre-periphery explanation of the global political economy is grossly disadvantaged. Africa is in a distress and has to work out her survival out of the predicament that has engulfed her. However, in Africa's transformation march, 'caution' and 'reality' are imperatively necessary. Therefore, every policy advocacy or solutions to Africa's present predicament should be realistic, and take cognizance of the ideological base and dynamics that informed the present socio-economic and political formations in Africa.

It is unfortunate that Africa is at the receiving end in the trajectory movement of global capitalist economy. But the question does not depend on ‘how to break with capitalism’, contrary to what many pundits advocate as a radical approach, because the emergence and existence of all independent African nations was a direct function of colonial capital (imperialism). Thus, the integration of Africa into the mainstream global capitalism, though peripherally, has been complete. Rather, the engaging question should be ‘how to position Africa to gain from the trajectories of the interdependent, but asymmetric, global capitalist economy instead of being a victim to it’. How?

To start with, the capacity of state as authoritative allocator of national resources in Africa has to be strengthened. The economy is still parasitic and less viable; hence, there is wide and continuous expanding gap between the few bourgeois elements and the masses, reflecting gross income inequality. Poverty still resonates among larger proportion of the populace. So, if the economy is left to operate without viable state guidance, it will work in favour of the wealthy class as they direct it to do so; thus, spelling gross impoverishment for the majority of citizens. The increasing government withdrawal from the economic life in Africa in the face of wide development and income gap, is not a step in the right direction. Hence, the aggressive grip with privatization and commercialization of state public utilities and parastatals in the face of parasitic economy by most African states will only hand over the national economies to foreign control, in collaboration of few compatible indigenous comprador bourgeois elements, at the detriment of the African masses. To this end, I advocate what may be called ‘state-assisted capitalism’ as an alternative to unregulated free competition for African economies.

“Africa is spectacular”, is the answer when you ask donor agencies where they may be taking their charity to; Africa remains the highest recipient of global aids ranging from official development assistance (ODA), technical assistance, and different loan packages to expert assistance, (NewAfrican, 15). This trend has proved inimical to development rather than supportive to it. Between 1980 and 1988, the debt burden ratios in majority of African countries were mind boggling with estimated 1.2 trillion dollars; and aids that were advanced to Africa through the ODA was worth of 726 billion dollars, (NewAfrican, 16). But, regrettable enough, Africa recorded the worst economic failures during this period. Thus, it holds that foreign loans from international guarantor agencies and aids from foreign donors deepen dependency and retard development in Africa. It is pertinent to adumbrate that, if Africa is serious with its development mission, it needs ‘investment’, ‘strategic partnership with willing partners’, and ‘capacity building’, and not foreign aids and loans (both negotiated and unofficial) that cause underdevelopment.

Regional co-operation and integration has to be strengthened in Africa. However, it is appalling that after more than three decades ECOWAS is still fledging and has not transited to a viable integration bloc; the Maghreb Union has become a ghost; the Eastern African Community has collapsed; and UMOA suffered internal contradictions and died off. The SADC still has one or two problems to grapple with in its march to actualize its dream. Despite this rocky road, there is still a big chance for revival and strengthening to respond to the enormity of the present challenges in Africa. In this context, strategic alliances with large groupings outside Africa should be encouraged, and must be ‘craftily’ associated with. Therefore, Africa should renew and re-strengthen its commitment to South-South Co-operation, ACP-EU Partnership, and Afro-Asia Summit. This will open up alternative markets and technology adaptation avenues for Africa’s exploration and utilization for her development.

Finally, but not the least, Africa should improve their diplomatic leverage through bloc voice in international forums to pressure for better and fairer trade relations in global economic decision making bodies like World Trade Organization (WTO), IMF, World Bank, and in other international institutions. The growth of Africa's negotiating power can ensure some changes in the same manner a collectivity of third world countries did in 1964 and 1974, for the establishment of UNCTAD and new international economic order (NIEO) respectively. Hence, 'the solution to a failed diplomacy is more diplomacy, (Okeke, 102). In other words, Africa's diplomatic negotiating position and clouts in international forum and summit need to be strengthened.

With these plausible policy options, the harshness and peripheral implications of unequal global relations that cause dependency and imperialism in neo-colonial Africa can be mitigated.

### Works Cited

- Heywood, A. *Politics*, New York: Pelgrave Publishers, 2002.
- Onimode, B. *A Political Economy of the African Crisis*, London: Zed Books, 1988.
- Nwoke, C.N. "Conceptual Perspective on the Peripheral Position of Third World Countries in the International Economic System", in R.A. Akindele and Bassey E. Afe (eds) *Nigeria's Economic Relations with the Major Market-Economy Countries 1960-1985*, Lagos: NIIA Publication, 1988.
- Chinweizu, *The West and the Rest of Us*, Lagos: Nok Publishers Nig. Limited, 1975.
- Ake, C. *A Political Economy of Africa*, Ibadan: Longman Publishers, 2005.
- Ake, C. *Revolutionary Pressures in Africa*, London: Zed Press, 1978.
- Offiong, D. *Imperialism and Dependency...*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers, 1980.
- Morgenthau, H. (1980) *Politics Among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York: Alfred. A Knopf Co. Ltd.
- Okeke, H. *Modern International Politics and Diplomacy*, Enugu: Evans Publishers, 1980.
- Wallenstein, I. "Dependence in an Interdependent World" *African Studies Review*, Vol.17, 1974.
- Obiegbu, J.N. "Africa and the World in 21<sup>st</sup> Century", *Nigerian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.31, No.3, 2005.
- Pincus, J. *Trade, Aid and Development: The Rich and Poor Nations*, New York: McGraw Hill, 1968.
- Schumpeter, J. (1986), *Beyond Imperialism*, Harmondsworth: Penguins Book Ltd, 1986.
- Stiglitz, J. *Globalization and its Discontents*, London: Allan Lane, the Penguin Press, 2002.
- Nyerere, (1987) *Reflection on Africa and its Future*, Lagos: NIIA Publications, 1987.
- Nkrumah, K. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, New York: International Publishers, 1966.
- Ejiofor, L. *Africa and the World Politics*, Onitsha: Africana Educational Publishers, 1981.
- New African*, (April, 2009).
- New African*, (March, 2006).
- New African*, (September, 2008)

- Girvan, N. *Corporate Imperialism: Conflict and Expropriation*, New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc, 1989.
- Eboh, O. *Politics of Decolonization and Neocolonialism in Africa*, Enugu: Evans Publishers, 1996.
- Nnoli, O. "Development-Underdevelopment: Is Nigeria Developing" in O. Nnoli (ed.) *Path to Nigerian Development*, Dakar: CODESRIA, 1981.
- Eze, R.C. *The Determinants of Nigeria's Relations Towards the Western Countries*, Enugu: Lauramby Publications, 2002.
- Armin, S. *Accumulation on a World Scale*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.
- Szentes, T. *The Political Economy of Underdevelopment*, Budapest: Akademia Kiado, 1984.
- Dos Santos, T. "The Structure of Dependence", in K.T. Fann and D.C Hodges (eds.) *Readings in U.S Imperialism*, Boston: Porter Sargent Publishers, 1971.
- The Spark Editors, *Some Essential Features of Nkrumaism*, London: Panaf Books, 1975.
- Abia, V.E.B. *Government and Politics in Africa: A Comprehensive Approach*, Lagos: BMD Publishers, 2006.
- Lenin, V.I. *Capitalism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, New York: International Publishers Co, 1973.
- Rodney, W. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Dar es Salam: Tanzania Publishing House, 1972.