

# **PATHWAYS TO AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT AND THE OPTION OF “DELINKING”: A THEORETICAL APPROACH**

By

**Aliyu Mohammed Shamsudeen**

[Shamsuddeen001@yahoo.com](mailto:Shamsuddeen001@yahoo.com)

08036916063, 08027036063

School of Preliminary Studies, New-Bussa

Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Niger State

## **ABSTRACT**

Most African countries even after attaining political independence many years ago remain (underdeveloped) as they were under colonial rule, and are in constant search for the pathways to development. They have been driven by the two hitherto ideological blocs vis capitalist and socialist all in search for an ideal path to development. Their dissatisfaction with these two contending and often conflicting politico-economic prescription for development, led scholars, intellectuals, and analysts in the third world and Africa in particular to come up with the idea of “delinking” from the international capitalist system. This paper relied on secondary sources in generating data for the study. The paper is structured into different but interrelated compartments, and tries to extrapolate from the various explanations of both modernization and underdevelopment theories and find a workable and lasting solution to Africa's economic backwardness. The paper supports the idea of Africa delinking from the international capitalist economy as all efforts by African leaders in various strategies, blueprints and development plans failed due in part to external forces perpetuated by globalization and neo-liberal ideas. Africa should therefore look inward and re-organize its political as well as economic structures in a way that suits its internal composition.

**Keywords:** Development, Underdevelopment, Modernization, Delinking.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The post second world war era saw the emergence of new states from colonial rule mostly from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Most of these countries at independence were poor economically and less developed, while their counterparts in Western Europe and North America were rich and developed. In order to explain this situation of development in one end, and underdevelopment in the other, two broad competing and contending theoretical perspectives emerged: the modernization theory, and underdevelopment and dependency theory.

Modernization theory originated from the ideas of German Sociologist Max Webber regarding the role of rationality and irrationality in the transition from tradition to modern society. The theory became prominent in the 1960s and was largely influenced by the writings of Talcott Parsons, WW. Rostow, Edward Shills, Lucian Pye, Gabriel Almond, Harold Lasswell, Samuel Huntington, David Easton, David Apter, Dean Tipps, Fred Riggs and a host of other prominent social scientists mostly of American origin. The theory however was a veritable tool of explaining the backwardness of the third world countries and as well as making modernization and/or westernization a solution or basis of development for third world countries.

However, a counter perspective arose and challenges the modernization school for

essentially attributing the woes of the new states to their internal configurations and ignoring external factors that contributed gravely to the underdevelopment of the underdeveloped countries. These factors as argued by some scholars from Africa and Latin America include, slavery, capitalism, imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism (Rodney 1972), as well as unequal exchange and the lopsidedness of the international capitalists system which was, according to these scholars by default designed to favor the developed world at the expense of the new states. Consequently, the underdevelopment and dependency theories gain relevance especially within and among the less developed countries (LDCs). Prominent among scholars in these schools include, Walter Rodney, Andre Gunder Frank, Claude Ake, Paul Baran, Paul Sweezy, Samir Amin, Immanuel Wallerstein, Fernando H. Cardoso, Peter Evans among others. Some of these scholars prescribed the delinking option for the newly independent states. Essentially, delinking here means breaking away or removing this group of countries from the imbalanced international capitalist system in order to develop. While others opined that the new states should remain within the international capitalist system and seize the opportunities therein for their growth and development.

This paper therefore seeks to extrapolate these divergent views to see which of either delinking or not delinking will be an option

for Africa's economy to thrive and compete favorably with the highly industrialized world within the current international capitalist system, and place it (Africa) on the track of sustainable economic growth and development.

**2.0 THE MODERNIZATION THEORY**

The theory as said earlier was inspired by the ideas of Webber (1947) where he examines the relationship between bureaucracy and modernization. He attributed the rise of organizations to the expansion of markets, development in law, and especially to changes in the nature of authority. Identifying the institutional

structure of a new “rational-legal” authority, he observes that rights of control increasingly derived from expertise rather than lineage. He identified ways in which the new development he referred to as “rationalization” underlay the rise of a modern state.

Parsons (1951) examined the underlining character that defines and differentiate one society from another. He identified certain variables in both traditional and modern societies which according to him define social action. He therefore put forward the following pattern variables as found in both traditional and modern societies.

Table 1: Parsons Five Pattern Variables

	A: (Traditional society)	B: (Modern society)
1	Affectivity	Neutrality
2	Collective orientation	Self-orientation
3	Particularity	Universality
4	Ascription	Achievement
5	Diffussioness	Specific

Source: Parsons (1951).

In line with the above variables, traditional societies are characterized by “A” while modern societies are characterized by “B”. The development of the traditional societies is measured by the extent to which they have abandoned “A” in favor of “B” because there is no simultaneous occurrence of “A” and “B”.

Rostow (1960) on his own part coined and popularized the idea of *take off* into a self-sustainable economic growth as a key stage of development. He proposed five stages which all developing societies must pass through in order to attain economic development. The stages are the traditional stage, the transitional stage, the take off

stage, drive to maturity, and high mass consumption. Rostow's *Traditional society* which was the first stage in economic growth was pre-Newtonian and largely agrarian with limited productivity due in part to inaccessibility to modern science and its applications. Another character associated with this society was its value system where family and clan connections played large role in social organization. The second stage was *the pre-condition for take-off*; at this stage people begin to mobilize their savings and took risks in pursuit of profit, appearance of banks and other institutions for mobilizing capital, increase in investment notably in transport, communications and in raw materials in which other nations may have interest. The new highs attained in this stage were in part consequent to the Atlantic slave trade. At that period, African slaves were the best economic solution for plantation owners seeking cheap labor. The slave trade made significant impact on the economic development of Britain as Davis (1973) put succinctly "high differential tariffs on sugar preserved the large British markets". More so, slave trade as argued Williams (1944) played central role in the developments leading up to the industrial revolution which made European countries set out in search of markets for their product and also source of raw materials that led to balkanization and partitioning of Africa and other sections of the world making them colonies. Raw materials extracted from across Africa were feeding the ever growing industries in

Europe; these developments served as catalyst and provided rudiments for transition of European economies to the next stage. The third stage is *the take-off* where new industries expand rapidly, yielding profits in large proportion some of which are reinvested in new plants, new techniques spread in Agriculture and farmers accept new methods and revolutionary changes in agricultural productivity. Basic economic, social and political structures are transformed in a way that encourages sustainable growth. In Africa there was a new wave of economic policy where privatization became a key component of the structural reform and strategy for economic development. It was observed by White and Bhatia (1998) that by the end of 1996, all but five countries in Africa had divested some public enterprises within the framework of macroeconomic reform and liberalization. In this transition period, many African economies including Nigeria embarked on extensive privatization programs as a means of fostering economic growth, attaining macroeconomic stability, and reducing public sector borrowing requirements arising from corruption, subsidies and interventions to unprofitable state-owned enterprises (Jerome, 2008). The privatization policy adopted by most African states was in a bid to lessen government burden and encourage efficiency for economic growth. The *Drive to maturity* is the fourth stage, the make-up of the economy changes unceasingly as

technology improves, new industries emerged, and older ones phased out. The economy finds its place in international economy; goods that are formally imported are produced at home. Industry and technology has transformed into more refined and technologically complex processes. For instance, the shift in focus from coal, iron, and heavy engineering industries of railway phase to machine-tools, chemicals, and electrical equipment. At the final stage which was characterized by *high mass consumption*, two things happen; (i) real income per head rose to a point where a large number of persons gained a command over consumption which transcended basic food, shelter, and clothing, and (ii) the structure of the working force changed in ways which increased not only the proportion of urban to total population, but also the proportion of the population working in offices or in skilled factory jobs- aware of and anxious to acquire the consumption fruits of a mature economy.

Since attaining political independence, African states have articulated various plans, strategies and blueprints as pathways to Africa's development. These range from Kwameh Nkrumah's pan-African idea of a continental unity in the immediate post-independence era, to the Lagos Plan of Action for the Economic Development of Africa in early 1980s, to other strategies like Africa's Priority Program for Economic Recovery (APPER) in the mid-1980s and

more recently New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) in 2001. All these efforts were stunted due to international economic politics. The developed nations and their agencies especially the World Bank viewed many of these plans as radical choices that repudiate the logic of liberal economic theories, by focusing more on state control of natural resources as against the role of market and private entrepreneurs. Another factor as observed by Adejumobi (2003) was the festering economic crises in Africa where most countries were faced with debt burden, trade deficits, rising unemployment, industrial collapse, and social upheavals which coerced the states into seeking for support from the international financial institutions (IFIs). The conditionalities of the IFIs were at all times antithetical to the goals of Africa's plans, strategies and blueprints for development. These factors made it difficult for African countries to attain the third and fourth stages of economic development.

On his part, Shills (1960) stated that new states feel a pressing necessity of searching for policies which will make them join the circle of modernity. To him, to be modern is to be dynamic, and to be dynamic, the elites must show concern for people and must be equalitarian. The society on the other hand must be democratic, scientific, economically advanced, sovereign, and influential. He posited that Western Europe, North America and the English speaking dominions of the British Commonwealth

need not to aspire for modernity for they fulfill all or most of the criteria outlined. But their counterparts the new states are “*unmodern*” and have in them old societies and live in traditions which maintain the past in the present. Their machinery of government are new, weak and frail; their social structure and culture are highly traditional; there is in them preponderance of parochial loyalties which hinders the workings of the rule of law; the urban middle class is uneducated; there is disconnect between the cities and the countryside; there is incompetence in civil service and corruption in politics. These are the characteristics of the new states.

Similarly, Riggs (1964; 1973) in his analogy of agraria-industria societies within the context of administration and politics offers his fused-prismatic-defracted-model and contends that societies in the process of development move from a fused mode in which little or no differentiation exists, to a diffracted condition in which there is a high degree of functional specialization. In administrative terms, this means a change from a situation in which a few structures perform a variety of functions, as in very underdeveloped conditions, to one in which many specific structures perform specific functions, as in highly developed societies like the industrial societies of the west.

When the system begins to assign specific functions to specific structures, then it is evolving into a higher mode of differentiation. This phase is referred to as transitional to the ultimate position of a complete differentiation. Riggs began with a bipolar analytical framework known as the so-called agraria-industria model, which highlighted the contextual distinction of public administration between the traditional agrarian societies and modern industrial ones. While the agrarian is characterized by self-contained and agriculture-based economy, family or clan-based organization, divine authority source, and communalistic value; the industria possesses interdependent market economy, achievement-oriented organization, secular authority, individualistic value, and so on. Given such contextual variations, the administrative system in the agraria is characterized by politics-administrative fusion, lack of specialization, and ritualistic action; but in the industria, it is based on politics administration division, specialization, impersonal human relation, and functional action.

In his theory, Huntington (1971) compared the primitive societies with the modern societies. Drawing upon Sutton's characterization of the two societies, he outlined the following;

Table 2: Characterization of primitive and modern societies by Samuel P. Huntington

Primitive Society	Modern Society
1. Predominance of ascriptive, particularistic, diffuse patterns.	Predominance of universalistic, specific and achievement norms.
2. Stable local groups and limited spatial mobility.	High degree of social mobility (in general -not necessary “vertical”-sense)
3. Relatively simple and stable “occupational” differentiation.	Well-developed occupation system, insulated from other social structures.
4. A “deferential” stratification system of diffuse impact.	“Egalitarian” class system based on generalized patterns of occupational achievement.

Source: Huntington (1971).

Other modernization views expressed by Apter (1968) as well as World Bank (1981) and Sandbrook (1985) also argued that African societies have in them values that are against modernization and, therefore, in order to develop, they must drop their social values and embrace that of the West. So also, African political institutions, culture, and socialization are weak, and that the only way to strengthen these institutions is by embracing liberal democracy. The modernization theorists concluded that the best way to get their primitive societies to develop is by emulating and following the development pattern of the developed European economy. What the modernization theorists obviously failed to note is the fact that their comparison between the so-called traditional and modern societies only explains the inherent differences between the two distinct societies and this by no means depicts

superiority of one society over the other. Africans had varied ways of life under different kinds of governments, Kings ruled great empires like Mali and Songhai, some states had democratic rule while some groups had no central government. Some Africans lived in great cities like Timbuktu, while others lived in small villages deep in the forests. Some were nomadic hunters, and some were skilled artists who sculpted masks and statues of wood, gold, or bronze. More so, Rostow's theory only highlighted certain historical landmarks in Europe, but does not represent a model for any society to adopt and attain economic growth and development, even so ignored the role of slavery to the industrial revolution.

These and more lapses provoked another line of thought which represent a radical view that counter the modernization theory.



### **3.0 THE UNDERDEVELOPMENT AND DEPENDENCY THEORY**

The underdevelopment and dependency theory rejects the central assumptions of modernization theory. In the 1960s, the advocates of dependency theory argued that former colonial nations were underdeveloped because of their dependence on western industrialized nations in the areas of foreign trade and investment. These relationships, rather than benefiting developing nations, stunted their development. Drawing upon various Marxist ideas, dependency theorists observed that economic development and underdevelopment were not simply different stages in the same linear march toward progress (Baran 1976) as posited by the modernization theorists. They argue that colonial domination had produced relationships between the developed and underdeveloped worlds that were inherently unequal (Amin 1974).

Dependency theorists believed that without a major restructuring of the international economy, the former colonial countries would find it virtually impossible to escape from their subordinate position and experience genuine growth and development.

However, within the underdevelopment and dependency theory two groups emerged; the radical or delinking group of theorists like Andre Gunder Frank

(1967), Walter Rodney (1972), Samir Amin (1974) etc and the reformist group of theorists like Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1979), Peter Evans (1979), Enzo Faletto (1979) etc

### **3.1 ASSUMPTIONS OF THE UDT**

The following are some of the assumptions upon which the underdevelopment and dependency theories are built:

- i. The wealth or poverty of nations is as a result of global process of exploitation arising from the incorporation of the third world nations into the international capitalist system;
- ii. Surplus extraction had been a feature of the economic relationships between core and peripheral regions since the beginning of colonial era;
- iii. The underdeveloped nature of the third world nations was consequent to different historical circumstances which include slavery, colonialism, imperialism neo-colonialism and globalization;
- iv. Dependence upon foreign capital, technology and expertise impedes economic development of the third world nations; and
- v. Underdevelopment can be eliminated through a move towards socialist system of economy (Frank, 1967; Amin, 1974; Rodney, 1972 and Cardoso, 1979).

### **4.2 THE RADICAL OR DELINKING DEPENDENCY THEORISTS**



#### **4.2.1 ANDRE GUNDER FRANK**

Frank coined the “metropole-satellite” model in his analysis of dependency and underdevelopment between the developed and underdeveloped societies. He presented an argument that is based on a global relation of economic domination and exploitation, or what he called the “metropole-satellite relations”. His primary points of reference are Latin American countries, which occupy a satellite position in relation to their colonial metropolises. He argued that underdevelopment arises out of the metropole-satellite relation because it is essentially a hierarchical relation of extraction and expropriation which then becomes generalized on a global scale. He examined this relation through the metaphor of vampirism where the metropole suck capital or economic surplus out of its own satellite and channel part of this surplus to the world metropole (Frank 1966).

Frank's metropole-satellite model debunks Rostow's view of underdevelopment which sees it as the result of both a country's relative isolation from capitalist relations and the residual existence of “traditional” socio-cultural practices that act as fetters to forces of modernization. Underdevelopment is not an effect of isolation and inertia, rather, as he argued, “was and still is generated by the very same historical process which also generated economic development: the development of capitalism itself” (Frank 1966). To him, the

same process that causes underdevelopment on the one end, promote development on the other as he posited that “development in metropole, leads to underdevelopment in satellites” (Frank 1966). This lopsided relationship is further intensified by globalization as aptly observed by Adejumbi (2003) that “the levels of spatial inequality income and wealth concentration and social injustice have continued to deepen under the spell of globalization”. This current world phenomenon called globalization is predicated on the ideology of neo-liberal free trade of capitalist expansionism, thereby intensifying the exploitative relationship which Africa remain at disadvantage. This position is buttressed by the World Bank (2000) that “Africa is the worst hit by the deepening crisis of survival under the orgy of globalization, with a per capita income averaging \$315 in 1997, more than its 600 million people live below the poverty line of \$1 per day. In many African countries, 200 out of every 1000 children die before the age of 5, and more than 250 million people lack access to safe water, while more than 200 million others have no access to health services. The metropole-satellite relations Frank tries to explain is aptly captured as thus “while Africa continues to record dismal performance on trade and economic development, the triad of United States, European Union and Japan are consolidating their grip on the global economy. This triad controls 80% of world trade, and a large chunk of foreign direct

investment (FDI). During 1998-2000, the triad accounted for three-quarter (3/4) of global FDI inflows and 85% of outflows, and was home to over 50,000 multinational corporations (MNCs) and over 100,000 foreign affiliates (UNCTAD, 2001). This relationship that greeted Africa at the dawn of the new millennium remain as it were more than a decade and half ago.

Frank therefore concludes that satellites can only develop when their links or ties to the metropole are relatively weakened. He suggested a radical breakaway and prescribed the mobilization of internal resources for the overall development of the society.

#### **4.2.2 SAMIRAMIN**

Amin is an Egyptian political economist, who argued that, Europe had underdeveloped large parts of Africa during the colonial era. This he argued, created a dependent peripheral economies characterized by weak capitalist sectors focused on a small elite luxury market, with little attention to manufacturing for mass consumption or to promoting links between agriculture and industry (Amin 1974).

He advanced the concept of unequal exchange where he posited that “economic surplus transferred from low wage (low profit producers in the periphery), to high wage (high wage producers in the core), is an international by-product of the capitalist world economy” (Amin 1974). He believed that global capitalism allows strong states to

enforce unequal exchange on weaker states thus causing underdevelopment in the third world while generating wealth in the industrialized nations.

Like Frank, he advocated for the severance of links or a radical break of the third world nations from the international capitalist system.

#### **4.2.3 WALTER RODNEY**

He observed that underdevelopment expresses a particular relationship of exploitation i.e. the exploitation of one country by another. That all third world nations were exploited by the advanced capitalist states, and underdevelopment is a product of capitalist, imperialist, and colonialist exploitation. He argued that Africa and Asian societies were developing independently until they were taken over directly or indirectly by the capitalist powers. Consequently, exploitation increased and the export of surplus ensued, depriving the societies of their natural resources and labor (Rodney 1972).

He denounces the global capitalist system by reinforcing the conclusion that:

*African development is possible only on the basis of a radical break with the international capitalist system, which has been the principal agency of underdevelopment of Africa over the last five centuries (Rodney 1972).*

Frank and his colleagues challenged the assumption that decolonization had truly liberated the newly independent nations in the Third World. They argued that, in fact, exploitation had intensified, both between nations and within Third World countries, and concluded that, Third World elites and their Western capitalist allies could bring nothing but underdevelopment and despair to the periphery. They called for revolutionary action to remove local political elites from power and to establish governments based on socialist ideals and structures. Only then would Third World nations be able to break their bonds of dependency, challenge global capitalist patterns of exploitation, and develop as autonomous, self-reliant nations. Some dependency scholars however do not agree with the conclusions of Frank, Rodney and Amin. They formed a moderate opinion; hence they are called moderate dependency theorists.

#### **4.3 THE REFORMIST OR MODERATE DEPENDENCY THEORISTS**

The reformist dependency thinking emerged to challenge the radical theorists' argument for the inevitability of underdevelopment within the capitalist system. In particular, the Brazilian sociologist Fernando Cardoso and his colleague; Enzo Faletto, while sympathetic to much of radical dependency thinking, rejected the assertion that peripheral underdevelopment was completely determined by the logic of capital

accumulation and exploitation and argued that Latin America economies can better understood by looking at “forms of local societies, reactions against imperialism, the political dynamics of local societies, and attempts at alternatives” (Cardoso and Faletto 1979). Dependency, to them, depended more on local dynamics and the maneuvers of politicians, particularly their willingness to be co-opted by foreign capital, than on the inevitable workings of the world capitalist system. Indeed, they rejected the notion of a world economy, positing instead a world of multiple capitalist systems, with each nation having its own specific social formation and style of capitalism.

Cardoso and Faletto also rejected the radical *theorists'* blanket hostility to the national bourgeoisie. Their focus on internal factors highlighted the importance of discovering which groups and classes were willing and able to push for national development. This could include the national bourgeoisie as well as labor, peasants, ethnic groups, and civil society. No class or group was inevitably seen as inclined to help or hinder national development.

Cardoso, in his earlier work posited three ways that nations in the Global South could attain development:

- I. Gaining political autonomy and using that power to industrialize;
- ii. Developing an export-oriented economy capable of accumulating enough capital to industrialize; and

- iii. Being assisted by multinational capital investments that would foster technology transfer and eventual industrialization (a dependent form of development, however) (Cardoso 1972).

Other scholars, such as American sociologist Peter Evans (1979), have gone even further than Cardoso in recognizing the importance of negotiations between governments in developing countries and governments and firms from industrialized nations. This analyst believes the way nations respond to dependence on foreign capital can be as important as the dependence itself. This position to dependency theory suggest the promise of new approaches to the problem of development, approaches that seriously take into account the role of politics and government-level negotiations in determining economic outcomes (Wendy, 2009).

However, while accepting the tendency toward dependent development rather than the independent development in the Global South, the reformist dependency theorists stake out a different position than their radical colleagues. For Cardoso and Faletto, genuine autonomous development can occur in the South if the correct alignment of internal forces, both structural and cultural/ideological, can be put in place.

## **5.0 AN EVALUATION OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT AND DEPENDENCY THEORY**

This part of the paper seeks to test the relevance of the UDT in the international politics. The radical/delinking theorist concluded by recommending a socialist system as against the global capitalist system for the third world countries as a prerequisite for their development. Socialism however, has failed in many countries that practiced it. Here, the paper will look at Vietnam, China and Tanzania as case studies.

In Vietnam, as in other states ruled by communist parties, the government plays a guiding role in all matters, including the national economy. In 1976, after the reunion of northern and southern Vietnam, the economy performed poorly throughout the first decade. This was as a result of “excessive government controls, lack of managerial experience, limited capital resources, and absence of capital incentive economic activities” (Duiker 2009).

In 1986, the government launched a reform program called “*doi moi*” (economic renovation) to reduce government interference in the economy and develop a market- base approach to increase national productivity. In the second decade of *doi moi* reforms, Vietnam achieved one of the fastest growing economies, with annual growth rate exceeding 7 percent (Duiker 2009).

Similarly, China originally established a socialist state, and before a change in power, was self-reliant and separate from the global market economy dominated by capitalist industrialized states (Lin & Ho 2005). Whilst throughout history China had been less engaged with the outside world and this initially resulted in them falling behind (O'Brien & Williams 2010). In post-Mao era, China has experienced rapid economic growth and a shift of power to neoliberal leadership under Deng Xiaoping (Lin & Ho 2005). Xiaoping introduced a program of economic reform, abandoning the autarkic, Maoist economic system and implemented an internationalization approach in order to participate in the capitalist world economy and improve China's global position (Lin & Ho 2005). This led to restructuring of the internal policies including alterations in the organization of production, resource use and regional development to accommodate new external requirements.

The reformist/moderate theorists on the other hand, presented a less severe critique of capitalist world market and explain that limited development in the Third World is possible while depending on the West (Jackson & Søensen 2010). The economic development of China demonstrates a change from economic self-sufficiency and national economic independence to involvement in the global capitalist economy (Caporaso 1972). China has become a vast and growing market, the second largest economy in the world and a large overseas investor.

In Africa, Julius Nyerere the former Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) party leader and president of Tanzania introduced the idea of *Ujamaa* (family hood) in Tanzania based on African tradition. This ideology was in search for path to Africa's development away from both capitalist West and communist East using expressions such as "Exploitation of Man by Man" to characterize the former and "Inevitable Conflict between Man and Man" to mean the later. Nyerere was very critical of colonialism in all manners; to him *Ujamaa* was a consensus where he asserts that "the Tanzanian situation is one where the common struggle against a foreign enemy has created a party which represent the interests and aspirations of the whole nation" (Nyerere, 1973). The *Ujamaa* implies that state is an expanded family community where the political leader is a Pater Familias who can naturally speak on behalf of his family; the leader also guides his people as their "Mwalimo" (teacher) rather than a political office holder. The exemplar of the family in *Ujamaa* discourse suggests how the political process should be organized. Beyond that, it also states a substantial ideal of the good life and the good society. This socialist idea remains on paper as it was not fully institutionalized in Tanzania. Detailed analyses of social and political institutions in African societies were not highlighted; Burke (1964) observes that Nyerere's papers on democracy and one-party rule are considerably lengthier in analyzing the British system than the African one.

The rapid economic development experienced in China, Vietnam and other countries does not appear to be explained by the reformist theorists, and on the other hand the failure of *Ujamaa* in Tanzania only show that Nyerere was not able to form political, social and economic institutions to support his idea. Indeed African states can create ideas like the *Ujamaa* with strong institutions.

### **5.0 CRITIQUE**

The following are criticism against UDT and Dependency theory put forward by some scholars.

- I. The Theory is criticized for concentrating more on external factors without much credence to internal factors such as poor leadership, bad governance, corruption, which in part contributed to the underdevelopment of the third world;
- ii. Ernesto Laclau (1971) condemned Frank for focusing on the market rather than class relations, despite his call for a class-based socialist revolution;
- iii. Bill Warren (1980) questioned the assumption that third world are inevitably caught in the circle of underdevelopment. He advocated for a more specific, historical and class-based analysis of global capitalist relations;
- iv. Colin Leys (1980) retracted the position of the dependency theorists that condemned national bourgeoisie and posited that national bourgeoisie

are potential instruments for escape from underdevelopment; and

- v. Gender and development analysts have been particularly disturbed by dependency theorists' failure to pay attention to cultural dimension of development. This is particularly problematic for those concerned with gender equality issues because cultural attitudes and practices clearly play a crucial role both in reinforcing and strengthening patriarchal power structures. The focus on structure rather than agency and culture are, thus, serious problems for feminists interested in utilizing the insights of dependency theory, whether radical or reformist.

### **6.0 CONCLUSION**

There is no denying the fact that the long relationship between the new states of Africa and the industrialized states has been one of exploitation, subjugation, and domination. This is consequent to the historical realities of slavery, imperialism, colonialism, globalization, as well as the adoption of capitalist system of economy. However, the traditional societies of Africa as described by the modernization theorists (in defense of capitalism) were on the path to a sustainable economic growth and development. This is evident in the activities Africans engaged in, trade relationships that existed between and among the hitherto existing empires and kingdoms as well as the institutionalized



system of governance which clearly the modernization scholars chose to ignore in their theorization and rather only highlighted certain historical landmarks in Europe's march towards economic growth and development. The colonial experience which did not only took away Africa's independence, but also thwarted and disrupted the economic activities of the African communities and reduced the African states to mere appendages of their erstwhile colonial masters and also dependent on them (colonial masters) for prescription of economic and political systems. Therefore, the acceptance and adoption of liberal democracy and capitalism did not only stunted efforts of African leaders towards economic liberation, but also perpetuated the dependent relationship between the new states and the capitalist economies through foreign direct investment (FDI), grants, aids, and debt relief.

This paper believes that African don't stand a chance to fully experience economic growth and development within the current international capitalist system. Africa should therefore delink from the system that is obviously designed to favor only the western industrialized states. Africa should form their own type of political system that suits their traditions, values and ideologies, just like what Nyerere attempted in Tanzania. Institutions of government be strengthened to check corruption and any form of arbitrariness. Economically, Africa

should look inward and concentrate fully on those items they have comparative advantage over others. Industrialization should form the central theme of Africa's new economic policy.

#### REFERENCES

- Adejumobi, S. (2003). *Globalization and Africa's Development Agenda: From WTO to NEPAD*. Addis Ababa: Development Policy Management Forum (DPMF).
- Ake, C. (1982). *Social Science as Imperialism*. Ibadan: University Press Ibadan.
- Amir, S. (1974). *Accumulation on a World Scale*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Apter, D. (1968). *Ghana in Transition*. New York: Atheneum.
- Baran, P. (1976). *The Political Economy of Growth*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Bergeron, S. (2004). *Fragments of Development: Nation, Gender and Space of Modernity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Burke, F.G (1964). *Tangayika: The Search for Ujamaa*. In W.H Friedland and G.G Rosberg (1964), *African Socialism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Caporaso, J. (1972). *Dependence, Dependency and Power in Global System: A Structure and Behavior Analysis; International Organization*. Vol. 32, no.1



- Cardoso, H. and Falleto, E. (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. London: University of California Press Ltd.
- Duiker, W. (2009). *Vietnam-government role in economy*. Encarta.
- Davis, R. (1973). *The Rise of the Atlantic Economies*. Ithica: Cornell University Press.
- Evans, Peter. (1979). *Dependent Development: the Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Frank, A. G. (1966). *Development of Underdevelopment*. New York: Month Review Press.
- Frank, A. G. (1967). *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Huntington, S. (1971). *The Change to Change: Modernization, Development, and Politics*. New York: City University Press.
- Jackson, R. and Soensen, G. (2010). *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jerome, A. (2008). *Privatization and Enterprise Performance in Nigeria: Case Study of Some Privatized Enterprise*. Nairobi: African Economic Research Consortium (AERC).
- Laclau, E. (1971). *Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America*. New L.eft Review.
- Leys, C. (1980). *Kenya: What Does Dependency Explain?* Review of African Political Economy.
- Lin, S. and Ho, S. (2005). *The State, Land system and Land Development process in Contemporary China's integration into Asian Corporation: Review of International Political Economy*". Vol. 3 No.1
- Nyerere J. (1961). *One-party Rule*. In P. Sigmund (ed) (1963), *The Ideologies of Developing Nations*. New-york: Praegar.
- Nyerere J. (1973). *Freedom and Development: A Selection from Writings and Speeches 1968-1973*, Dar es Salam: Oxford University Press.
- O'Brien, R. and Williams, M. (2010). *Global Political Economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Riggs, F. W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries: The theory of Prismatic Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Riggs, F. W. (1973). *Prismatic Society Revisited*. Morrison, New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture.

- Rostow, W. (1960). *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandbrook, R. (1985). *The Politics of Africa's Economic Stagnation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shills, E. (1960). *Political Development in the New States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2001). *World Investment Report*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.
- Warren, B. (1980). *Imperialism, Pioneer of Capitalism*. London: New Left Books.
- Wendy, H. (2009). *Dependency Theory, Early Perspective*. Encarta.
- White, O. and Bhatia, A. (1998). *Privatization in Africa*. Washington D.C: The World Bank.
- Williams, E. (1944). *Capitalism and Slavery*. North Carolina: North Carolina Press.
- World Bank (1981). *Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Agenda for Action*. Being a Report. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank.