

## **International Regime Governance and the Crises of development In Africa**

Dr. Odo, Samuel Ituma<sup>1</sup>, Aro, Gilbert Chukwu<sup>2</sup>,

*Department of Political Science Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria.*

*Department of Political Science Federal University Ndufu Alike Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria.*

---

**Abstract:** *At the moment, the history of Africa continues to be bandied with various forms of epithets in respect to its development status. This is sequel to failing state syndrome, economic stagnation and inundated features of state conflicts. While the socio-economic and political fortunes plummet in Africa, efforts of domestic, international donor agencies, and international regime converge in attempt to addressing these myriads of problems confronting and bedevilling the continent. Sometime, there is clash of culture of the domestic pattern with the international regime posture in handling African situation. It will be recalled that that emergence of international regime as global liberal thought pursued by the dominant and hegemonic powers came in order to keep the world safe for western liberal democracy and capitalist value permeation. Africa is not spared of the heinous intention of the international regime cloaked in the idea that its emergence came with a relief to addressing third world's problems. Various international regime efforts are available in Africa, and crises of good governance and development continue to plague the continent. This is travesty and parody questioning the essence of the international regime in Africa. Data are sourced through secondary methods. The paper attempts at dissecting the effects and intentions of international regime effort in solving developmental challenges in Africa. It also calls for common synergy between the autochthonous domestic forces and the international regime in tackling developmental problems. The paper makes succinct strategic policy recommendations.*

---

### **I. Introduction**

Critical to the survival of nation states in the international system is the cobweb of relationship rooted in transnationalism and complex interdependence. So the need to address the problems of common concern metamorphoses the collective quest for the organisation of international regimes to give vent and attention to these problems. The development of human society appears at the epicentre of international regimes on the cooperation of the area of mutual needs and contending collectivities. On this note, infrastructure is crucial for overall economic development of any society. It also, incidentally, provides basic amenities that improve the quality of lives; The needs for basic infrastructure, especially in rural communities, is a powerful tool for instituting collective action and mobilising whole communities towards facilitating consensus building, developing skills and building human assets and social capital (Uno, 2012). The developmental challenges in Africa indicate that the basic infrastructure are lacking. Boggled down by the socio-economic and political instability occasioned by direct failure of good governance in Africa, the citizens continue to wallow in abject poverty and untold suffering. The needs for infrastructure cannot be overemphasised particularly in the case of Africa, where developmental challenges and crises loom large. Lipton and Ravallion (1995) opine that development alleviate poverty, referring to this contribution to poverty alleviation as an indirect effect. The response by the world society through international organisation and institutions to attend to the world developmental needs gave birth to the pretty idea of forming a regime cooperation otherwise referred as international regime.

The study of international regimes has been an important part of international relations for over two decades. In essence, the study of regime is an effort to understand the means and conditions under which states cooperate with one another (Uno,2012). International regime is a set of explicit or implicit principle, norms, rules, and decision making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations (Krasner, 1983). Examining the conceptualisation of international regime by Krasner, it will be explained that interactions of the states through the following institutions like , EU, OPEC, World Bank, IMF, MDG Programmes, AGOA, UNHCR, ADB, and EUMPP6 tend to have impact in Nigeria with a view to serving the developmental needs of the people. International regime in practice serve as more specialised agents that involve real defined and articulated arrangements that pertain activities, resources of geographical areas and involves a number of the constituent members of the international society. The convergence of expectations means that participants in the international regime in the international system have similar ideas about what rules will govern their mutual participation, everyone expects to play by the same rules. Regimes are important and wide spread phenomenon in international relations (Uno, 2012). In practice, international regimes

are supposed to assist make cooperation possible in an international that is constrained by anarchy in the complex world of interdependence. But a closer examination of the various activities of several international regimes is fraught with bad intentions aimed making ways to access and exploit the world particularly the developing countries. This is the crux of liberalism and neo-liberalism that brought international regime as a measure to tackling socio-economic and political ills in the international system, which remains invidious and insidious uppermost in the mind of the marauding hegemony who lurk in the cloak of regime to inflict exploitation and underdevelopment. States are actually in need of one another, but this must be realised in the structure with comparative capability of viable domestic agent powers of the respective states. The current structure of international system are favourably disposed to the very interest the big power while engaging in international regime to assist the weak states in needs of developments.

**Regime and Impediments to Good Governance**

The countries of Africa are embroiled and enmeshed in corrupt practice, thereby reducing the development and undermining good governance. Corruptions have been noted as the major reasons for the underdevelopment of Africa (see, Aluko, 2002, Remi, 2008, Doig and Theobad, 1999). The intensity of corruption continue to soar high in Africa, while Africa remains the most blessed in terms of natural and human resources, but it is rated the poorest continent in the world. It is on this circumstance that Odinaku (2010) argued that African countries collectively lose an estimated 25% of GDP or about \$148 billion annually. Recent studies have shown that it cut through the length and breadth of Africa.

Twelve African countries are ranked among the 75 most corrupt nations in the world, according to the 2012 index published by Transparency International. The annual publication on the Corruption Perceptions Index draws upon a range of data sources to determine how corrupt countries’ public sectors are perceived to be. On a scale from 100 (highly clean) to 0 (highly corrupt), two-thirds of all countries scored below 50. This year’s survey includes 176 countries, down from 182 in 2011.

The top eight in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) in 2012 also led the list in 2011, with approximately the same global rankings, ranging from 65 to 43. Liberia– at number 11 in sub-Sahara with a score of 41 – saw its global ranking rise 16 points – from number 91 last year to 75 in 2012.

Botswana, Cape Verde, Mauritius, Rwanda, Namibia, Ghana and Lesotho led the SSA rankings, along with South Africa, which dropped two places this year – to nine from seven. Gambia, which was ninth, last year, dropped this year to 21 in SSA and 105 globally. Tunisia, which is grouped with Middle East and North Africa (MENA) countries, is tied with Liberia at 75 on the global rankings.

Nigeria and Kenya both received the low ranking of 139, compared with 143 for Nigeria and 154 for Kenya in 2011. Cameroon, the Congo Republic (Brazzaville) and the Central African Republic are ranked 144. Angola is 157, DR Congo 160 and Equatorial Guinea 163. Crowding the bottom among the most corrupt in the world are Chad (163), Sudan (173 and Somalia (174 – last) (see, African Economist, 2013 <http://answersafrica.com/corrupt-countries-africa.html>).

The table of corruption perception showed and indicated Africa is a home and nest of corruption. See the table below

	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012	
	Index	Country Rank / 163	Index	Country Rank / 179	Index	Country Rank / 180	Index	Country Rank / 180	Index	Country Rank / 178	Index	Country Rank / 182	Index	Country Rank / 174
Algeria	3.1	84	3	99	3.2	92	2.8	111	2.9	105	2.9	112	3.4	105
Angola	2.2	142	2.2	147	1.9	158	1.9	162	1.9	168	2.0	168	2.2	157
Benin	2.5	121	2.7	118	3.1	96	2.9	106	2.8	110	3.0	100	3.6	94
Botswana	5.6	37	5.4	38	5.8	36	5.6	37	5.8	33	6.1	32	6.5	30
Burkina Faso	3.2	79	2.9	105	3.5	80	3.6	79	3.1	98	3.0	100	3.8	83
Burundi	2.4	130	2.5	131	1.9	158	1.8	168	1.8	170	1.9	172	1.9	165
Cameroon	2.3	138	2.4	138	2.3	141	2.2	146	2.2	146	2.5	134	2.6	144
Cape Verde	...	...	4.9	49	5.1	47	5.1	46	5.1	45	5.5	41	6.0	39
Central Afr. Rep.	2.4	130	2	162	2	151	2	158	2.1	154	2.2	154	2.6	144
Chad	2	156	1.8	172	1.6	173	1.6	175	1.7	171	2.0	168	1.9	165
Comoros	...	...	2.6	123	2.5	134	2.3	143	2.1	154	2.4	143	2.8	133
Congo	2.2	142	2.1	150	1.9	158	1.9	162	2.1	154	2.2	154	2.6	144
Congo, Dem. Rep.	2	156	1.9	168	1.7	171	1.9	162	2.2	146	2.0	168	2.1	160
Côte d'Ivoire	2.1	151	2.1	150	...	...	2.1	154	2	164	2.2	154	2.9	130

Djibouti	...	...	2.9	105	3	102	2.8	111	3.2	91	3.0	100	3.6	94
Egypt	3.3	70	2.9	105	2.6	115	2.8	111	3.1	98	2.9	112	3.2	118
Equatorial Guinea	2.1	151	1.9	168	1.7	171	1.8	168	1.9	168	1.9	172	2.0	163
Eritrea	2.9	93	2.8	111	2.6	126	2.6	126	2.6	123	2.5	134	2.5	150
Ethiopia	2.4	130	2.4	138	2.6	126	2.7	120	2.7	116	2.7	120	3.3	113
Gabon	3	90	3.3	84	3.1	96	2.9	106	2.8	110	3.0	100	3.5	102
Gambia	2.5	121	2.3	143	1.9	158	2.9	106	3.2	91	3.5	75	3.4	105
Ghana	3.3	70	3.7	69	3.9	67	3.9	69	4.1	62	3.9	69	4.5	64
Guinea	1.9	160	1.9	168	1.6	173	1.8	168	2	164	2.1	164	2.4	154
Guinea-Bissau	...	...	2.2	147	1.9	158	1.9	162	2.1	154	2.2	154	2.5	150
Kenya	2.2	142	2.1	150	2.1	147	2.2	146	2.1	154	2.2	154	2.7	139
Lesotho	3.2	79	3.3	84	3.2	92	3.3	89	3.5	78	3.5	75	4.5	64
Liberia	...	...	2.1	150	2.4	138	3.1	97	3.3	87	3.2	91	4.1	75
Libya	2.7	105	2.5	131	2.6	126	2.5	130	2.2	146	2.0	168	2.1	160
Madagascar	3.1	84	3.2	94	3.4	85	3	99	2.6	123	3.0	100	3.2	118
Malawi	2.7	105	2.7	118	2.8	115	3.3	89	3.4	85	3.0	100	3.7	88
Mali	2.8	99	2.7	118	3.1	96	2.8	111	2.7	116	2.8	118	3.4	105
Mauritania	3.1	84	2.6	123	2.8	115	2.5	130	2.3	143	2.4	143	3.1	123
Mauritius	5.1	42	4.7	53	5.5	41	5.4	42	5.4	39	5.1	46	5.7	43
Morocco	3.2	79	3.5	72	3.5	80	3.3	89	3.4	85	3.4	80	3.7	88
Mozambique	2.8	99	2.8	111	2.6	126	2.5	130	2.7	116	2.7	120	3.1	123
Namibia	4.1	55	4.5	57	4.5	61	4.5	56	4.4	56	4.4	57	4.8	58
Niger	2.3	138	2.6	123	2.8	115	2.9	106	2.6	123	2.5	134	3.3	113
Nigeria	2.2	142	2.2	147	2.7	121	2.5	130	2.4	134	2.4	143	2.7	139
Rwanda	2.5	121	2.8	111	3	102	3.3	89	4	66	5.0	49	5.3	50
São Tomé & Príncipe	...	...	2.7	118	2.7	121	2.8	111	3	101	3.0	100	4.2	72
Senegal	3.3	70	3.6	71	3.4	85	3	99	2.9	105	2.9	112	3.6	94
Seychelles	3.6	63	4.5	57	4.8	55	4.8	54	4.8	49	4.8	50	5.2	51
Sierra Leone	2.2	142	2.1	150	1.9	158	2.2	146	2.4	134	2.5	134	3.1	123
Somalia	...	...	1.4	179	1	180	1.1	180	1.1	178	1.0	182	0.8	174
South Africa	4.6	51	5.1	43	4.9	54	4.7	55	4.5	54	4.1	64	4.3	69
Sudan	2	156	1.8	172	1.6	173	1.5	176	1.6	172	1.6	177	1.3	173
South Sudan	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Swaziland	2.5	121	3.3	84	3.6	72	3.6	79	3.2	91	3.1	95	3.7	88
Tanzania	2.9	93	3.2	94	3	102	2.6	126	2.7	116	3.0	100	3.5	102
Togo	2.4	130	2.3	143	2.7	121	2.8	111	2.4	134	2.4	143	3.0	128
Tunisia	4.6	51	4.2	61	4.4	62	4.2	65	4.3	59	3.8	73	4.1	75
Uganda	2.7	105	2.8	111	2.6	126	2.5	130	2.5	127	2.4	143	2.9	130
Zambia	2.6	111	2.6	123	2.8	115	3	99	3	101	3.2	91	3.7	88
Zimbabwe	2.4	130	2.1	150	1.8	166	2.2	146	2.4	134	2.2	154	2.0	163

Source: Transparency International: <http://www.transparency.org/>

The pertinent questions that are agitating and worrying the minds of diverse intellectual persuasions remain: why are looted treasuries from Africa kept in the developed countries? Why are there no visible international regime like (ICC and ICJ that try war crime perpetrators) to fight and punish corrupt public officials in Africa? The academic answers to the above questions need not detain and belabour us in this discourse, but the obvious fact according to the opinion of this paper is that corruption makes Africa vulnerable and weak, so that countries in Africa will not become strong and challenge the status quo in the international liberal economic order, while at the same time the looted treasuries from the continent add value and boost the economy of the harbouring countries. Otherwise, the harbouring countries need not keep monies looted by African heads of states in their banks. This view agrees with the perspective of the critical theorists, who argued

for restructure of the current international system riddled with corruption and injustice. While structural violence persists in Africa without international regime governance effort to stop it, development crises take a centre stage.

### **External regime in Development Agenda in Africa**

As the African states emerged from imperialism and colonialism, among the numerous challenges confronting the entire continent was the question of development. Many decades of preoccupations with development in Africa have yielded merger returns. African economics have been stagnating or regressing. For most Africans, real incomes are lower than were some decades ago, health prospects are poorer, malnourishment is wide spread, and infrastructure is breaking down, as some social institutions. Many factors have been offered to explain the apparent failure of the development enterprise: the colonial legacy, social pluralism, the corruption of leaders, poor labour discipline, the lack of entrepreneur skills, and subsequently the prevailing absence of social capital in the continent (see Ake, 2001). These problems indeed exist, many perhaps are as results of colonial consequence.

While the effort for globalisation and integration of the international system, presents opportunity, hegemonic power with liberal tinge came up with the idea of international organisation as panacea to global challenges such as security, peace and health. The United Nations with affiliates international agencies and institutions were designed to address these preponderant challenges in the world. Given the peculiar challenges in Africa, some of these international regime agencies like WHO, IMF, World Bank, ADB, UNHCR, others include with manifest assignment to deal with African challenges as NEPAD, AGOA, EUMPP6, SAP, and non state actors purveyed in the activities of the Multinational Corporations.

The interventions of these external development regimes are in most cases impede, constrain, confuse, and contradict development agenda. Ake, (2001) sees this situation as confusion of agenda. The confusion in the development in Africa stemmed from the competing agenda, nowhere is the conflict more evident than the rift between the Bretton Woods institutions and the African government approaches (Ake, 2001). The development agendas of World Bank and IMF produced structural adjustment programme as international regime governance to address the peculiar African problems. The IMF and World Bank conditionalities rather crippled Africa economic and development. One will not hesitate to ask the sincerity of purpose behind the effort and strive of international regime governance in Africa, while underdevelopment continue to characterise the entire continent in spite so many claims of international regime programmes.

It is perforce and imperative at this juncture to examine critically few of the international regime governance in Africa. Let us look at the European Union Regime activities popularly called European Union Micro Project Programme implemented in Cross River State of Nigeria (EUMPP6). This programme was a five year activities funded up by the European Union covering a period of five years beginning from 2003 to 2008. Principally, MPP6 is aimed among others, at instituting sustainable community based poverty reduction projects, through the provision of improved rural infrastructure (Uno, 2012). MPP6 provided infrastructure and services in Cross River in the following areas: education, income generation, transport infrastructure, water and sanitation (Basse, 2006). The net evaluation of these programmes in Cross River State indicated that the objectives have not been realised truly because there is avalanche of poor infrastructure, low level of education and poverty in the area. Also the ulterior motive remains to provide these amenities so as to douse the tension and agitations from the militants in Niger Delta, so as to enable the Multinational Corporation to continue to operate in the region. While the programme was on going, the frequency of militant activities was on the increase, until when the domestic measure of amnesty was applied by Umaru Musa Yardu in 2009. This paper has argued earlier that international regime governance under the auspices of subtle imperialism disregarding the actual development of domestic agential powers of the respective African state. This is crucial and fundamental prior to full autochthonous African development.

In the same vein, the AGOA and NEPAD emergence in Africa as international regime governance were prepared and foisted on the continent with a view to keeping it as the apron string of the global hegemon, whose interest is covered under the regime operation. The African Growth and Opportunity Act was US initiative to partner with the African countries. The legislation of AGOA was passed by US Congress in May 2000, and in July 2004, the President Bush signed into law AGOA accelerated ACT. AGOA is designed to do for Africa and Sub-saharan in particular, what Caribbean Basin Initiative did for the economic development in the Caribbean Basin over the last twenty years (Okolie, 2006). In furtherance, to maintain her grip on African countries by AGOA hegemon- the US marshalled out the following conditionalities for participating states: (a) established a market based economy,(b) respect the rule of law, political pluralism and right to due process,(c) eliminate barrier to US trade and investment. (d) pursue economic policies to reduce poverty, (e) enforce policies to combat corruption, (f) not engaged in activities that undermine US national security or foreign policy initiative and (g) not engage in gross violation of internationally recognised human rights or provide support for acts of terrorism (Okolie,2006). Countries of Africa complied with terms and conditions of AGOA, why has the

continent remained with intractable problems of poverty, poor infrastructure, conflicts and more dreading is the current wave and onslaught of terrorism? The answer lies in the fact that international regime governance in Africa serves the interest of the dominant powers that tend to play the driving role in the regime management. It will be recalled also that laudable objectives of NEPAD as framed by Britain and other power brokers in the international regime governance have failed equally to tackle the problems of development as being espoused. The real intention pursued by many of the international regimes remains rooted in imperialism be it cultural or economic.

### **International Regime and Conflict Management in Africa**

International governance regime has been seemingly tends to involve in certain measures to address numerous problems in Africa. Africa as a continent is beset with numerous problems in politics and economics; this found expression in the political conflicts arising from the nature and character of the African states, which started from injustices and inequities of colonialism. As independence came political conflicts ensued in the continent creating the problems of refugees and internally displaced persons. So the management of conflict, internally displaced persons and refugees became a big burden on emerging African states, with economic and political base. It will be recalled that political situations coupled with ethnic bias in Africa created numerous conflicts. According to Olusola (2010), the main aim of the African Refugee Foundation (AREF) is to attack the root causes of refugeeism and the same time manage the problems of refugees and internally displaced persons in Africa. Since 1989, Africa has been experiencing more armed conflicts than any other continents across the globe. Conflicts, and especially violent conflict, are factors creating political and economic instability and poverty in Africa. The violent conflicts, whether high or low in their intensity, have continued in all region regions of the continent (Nwanolue, 2012).

While the African Refugee Foundation and the African states wriggle to come out with the problems of conflicts, internally displaced persons and refugees. Conflict management and refugees needed the support of the world community. After extensive discussions in its Third Committee, the General Assembly moved to replace the International Refugee Organisation (IRO) with a subsidiary organ (under Article 22 of the Charter of the United Nations), and by resolution of 428 (v) of December 1950, it decided to set up the office United Nations High Commission for Refugees with effect from January 1951. Initially set up for three years, the High Commissioner's mandate was regularly renewed thereafter for five years periods until 2003, when the General Assembly decided to continue the office until the refugee problem is solved (resolution 58/53 of 22 December 2003, paragraph 9). With this, it became imperative that UNHCR launched its operation since its establishment in Africa to help solve the refugee problem bedeviling the continent. The operations of United Nations High Commission on Refugee as International Governance Regime took over the management of refugees raising from the conflict situations. But so far the activities of UNHCR have not automatically translated to addressing causes of refugees and management of refugee in the continent. What then is the essence of international regime in respect to tackling any African problems, if it cannot wholly tackle an issue that is besetting the continent? Africans are advised to rely not on the solution provided by the international regime governance, but to depend on their ability to attend to their problems. International regime as has been discussed in this paper remains an imperialist outfit with little or no serious intentions to addressing the problems of the continent. Despite, the activities of international regime, crises of development continue to loom large in Africa attesting to fact that external regime cannot solve the African problems.

### **The Roles of External Forces in Democratic consolidation in Africa**

In considering international regime governance in democratic consolidation in Africa, Democracy and democratic consolidation is not a new phenomenon in Africa. Prior to the advent of colonialism and imperialism in Africa, the hitherto autochthonous political institutions which has fostered a sense of an all inclusive political and economic participation, which bestowed on the indigenous people, respect for their rights and dignity was torpedoed. Colonialism created new political institution whereupon the rights and dignity of man were atrophied and social justice denied with impunity ( Aro and Otu, 2014). It was in the political ambience of liberal democracy of chaos that the hegemonic powers seemed to have resurrected the idea of international governance regime, which in their practice created post-neo-dependency status in a ploy to remedy the ills of weak democracy in Africa.

Shortly, after political independence, African states fell under the deluge of military authoritarianism, and democratisation became an issue, but now that military are not found in the corridors of powers, the question of democratising the inclement political democratic setting became paramount. So America and other powers began to sponsor NGOs for the promotion of democracy in Nigeria such include: National Democratic Institute, International Republican Institute (IRI), International Human Rights Groups (IHRIG), Center for International Private Enterprise (CIPE), and International Foundations for Electoral System (IFES) attempted executing and establishing local presence and carrying programs that will entrench democratic consolidation

(Jega, 2007). All these organisations stand to make way for liberal democratic environment for Foreign Direct Investment of the Bourgeois countries aimed at dominating the third world states. It would seem that once a regime change is effected and incoming civilian regime is deemed friendly and cooperative, its undemocratic practices and lack of concern for democratic consolidation are condoned and NGOs seeking to institutionalise popular democracy are not encouraged by the Western countries (Jega, 2007). This is to show that international governance regime does not encourage democracy for the well being of the people, but for the serving interest of political hegemony in the international system.

## **II. Conclusions**

International regime governance is on the spree in the international system with a view to tackling the numerous problems in the continent of Africa. United Nations and its affiliate associates embarked on establishing international regime to foster sense of world community. Given the poverty rate, economic and political crises bedevilling the African continent, it requires the mercy of international regimes to articulate on how to address these problems. The World Bank, IMF, NEPAD, ADB and the EU regime currently in Nigeria. All these bodies are dissected and their impacts discussed in the paper.

The paper discovered the negative roles of these international regimes border on the super interests of the sponsors usually the dominant powers in the world politics. Notably, AGOA has basically worked for the interest of the United States of America without considering the basic interest of the African in the regime partnership. The paper recommends that Africans should not rely on the support garnered from international regime, but depend on developing their domestic agential powers, which in turn is capable of addressing the present challenges.

## **References**

- [1]. African Economic Outlook, 2015.
- [2]. African Economics, 2013.
- [3]. Ake, C (2001). Democracy and Development in Africa. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- [4]. Aluko, M.A (2002). The Institutionalisation of Corruption and its Impact on Political Culture and Behaviour in Nigeria. Nordic Journal of Africa.
- [5]. Aro, G.C and Otu, S. E (2014). Autochthonous Democracy, Social Justice and
- [6]. Human Rights: A Road to Political Development in Africa. African International Journal of Contemporary Studies in Humanities and Social Science. HPC Books vol 2.
- [7]. Bassy, C (2006). Project Management Committee Training. Micro Project Manual, Calabar Cross River State.
- [8]. Doig, A and Theobald, (1999). Introduction: Why Corruption? Comparative Politics Vol 37, No 3.
- [9]. Jega, M.A (2007). Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Nigeria. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- [10]. Krasner, S.D (1983). International Regime. New York: Council University Press.
- [11]. Lipton, M and Ravallion, M (1995). Poverty and Policy
- [12]. Nwanolue, B.O (2012). Global Economic Crises and the Dilemma of Refugeeism in Africa: Issues and Prospect. African Journal of American Studies. Vol 2 Num 1.
- [13]. Odinaku, (2010). Corruption and Governance in Africa. How do We Break the Circle in Nigeria. Abuja: Cleen Foundation.
- [14]. Okolie, A-M (2006). Nigeria US Trade Relations under Africa Growth and Opportunity Act: An Evaluation. Journal of International Politics and Development Studies Vol 2, No 2.
- [15]. Olusola, (2010). Refugeeism. Calabar: Advanced Publishers Ltd.
- [16]. Remi, A.E (2008). The Role of INEC, ICPC, and EFCC in Combating Political Corruption. Abuja: International for Electoral System
- [17]. Uno, A (2012). European Union Regimes and Development Intervention in Nigeria: An Assessment of EUMPP6 in Cross River State. In: C.O Bassey and G.O Ozumba Political Science: An Introductory Reader. Lagos: Concept Publications Ltd pp213214.

### **Internte Sources**

- [1]. 10 Most Corrupt Countries in Africa. <http://answersafrica.com/corrupt-countries-africa.html>
- [2]. Corruption Perception Index Transparency International: <http://www.transparency.org/>