African Growth and Opportunity Act: Myth and Reality

Ezeibe Christian Chukwuebuka[3]

Key Terms: Dependency, trade, development, growth, neo-liberalism, eligibility.

Abstract

In this paper, we examined the African Growth Opportunity Act (AGOA) aimed at facilitating socio-economic growth and development in Africa in line with the neo-liberal ideology. We largely relied on centre – periphery model for our analysis and argued that African countries especially the Sub Saharan African countries expected to benefit from this US development policy would be unable to do so because they lack independent technological base, capital and manpower to permeate and compete in the American market. Again these states in Africa are in the periphery and US is a centre nation. While the later state expropriates the resources of the former because of this relative weakness of the periphery, the former designed AGOA as one of the strategies of intensification of US exploitation of Africa through trade. This paper calls for a global support for technology and capital exchange to enable African (Industries) to effectively compete in US markets.

Introduction

The socio-economic and political crisis of sub-Saharan African countries has long been announced. In fact, poverty rate, diseases (HIV, AIDS, Malaria), illiteracy and internal strives have more than increased. Hence SSA countries are said to be in development crisis.

---

[3] ***Ezeibe Christian Chukwuebuka*** *teaches at the Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria Nsukka.*

However, the concept of development has been difficult to define. Issues of development and underdevelopment constitute one of the major areas in political economy in particular and political science in general. This is because every nation seeks development (Ezeibe, 2010: 1-2). Since Rodney (1972:1) defined development at the level of the individual, as increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material well-being, the question has remained what is development. However, some of these categories are virtually moral categories and are difficult to evaluate-depending on the age in which one lives, one's class origins, and one's personal code of what is right and what is wrong. Meanwhile, what is indisputable is that the achievement of any of those aspects of personal development is very much tied in with the state of the society as a whole. Historically, man found it convenient and necessary to come together in groups to hunt and for the sake of survival. The relations that develop within any given social group are crucial to an understanding of the society as a whole. Freedom, responsibility, skill etc. have real meaning only in terms of the relations of men in society.

On the other hand Rodney (1972) argued that, obviously, underdevelopment is not absence of development, because every people have developed in one way or another and to a greater or lesser extent. Underdevelopment makes sense only as a means of comparing levels of development. It is very much tied to the 'act that human social development has been uneven and from a strictly economic view-point some human groups have advanced further by producing more and becoming wealthier.

The moment that one group appears to be wealthier than others, some enquiry is bound to take place as to the reason for the difference. After Britain had begun to move ahead of the rest of Europe in the 18th century, the famous British economist Adam Smith felt it necessary to look into the causes behind the "Wealth of

Nations". At the same time, many Russians were very concerned about the fact that their country was 'backward' in comparison with England, France and Germany in the 18th century and subsequently in the 19th century. Today, our main pre-occupation is with the difference in wealth between on the one hand Europe and North America and on the other hand Africa, Asia and Latin America. In comparison with the first, the second group can be said to be backward or underdeveloped. At all times, therefore, one of the ideas behind underdevelopment is a comparative one. It is possible to compare the economic conditions at two different periods for the same country and determine whether or not it had developed; and (more importantly) it is possible to compare the economies of say two countries or sets of countries at any given period in time.

A second and even more indispensable component of modern underdevelopment is that it expresses a particular relationship of *exploitation:* namely, the exploitation of one country by another. All of the countries named as 'underdeveloped' in the world are exploited by others; and the underdevelopment with which the world is now pre-occupied is a product of capitalist, imperialist and colonialist exploitation. African and Asian societies were developing independently until they were taken over directly or indirectly by the capitalist powers. In this paper we shall explore the theories of development and underdevelopment under the prismatic prisms of classical, modernization and radical theorist bearing in mind other intervening theories like the neo liberal theory of development and dependency theory of underdevelopment.

The contentious question of development has led scholars and intellectuals to plunge into an in-depth study for an analytical explanation of the character and nature of development. This has helped in producing various theoretical explanations on development. As noted is was noted by Wambugu (2002:10) the bone of contention in the views and meanings of the concept is seen in the agencies, objectives, objects, and means of development". The difficulty associated with the definition of development has both theoretical' and practical implications for development policies in the developing areas. Most studies see development as being concerned with improving people's standards of living. Todaro (1977) defines development as a multidimensional process involving the reorganization and reorientation of entire economic and social systems. Similarly, Bryant and White, (1982:14) defined development as the "increasing the capacity of people to influence their future" (). Thus, development has socio-economic, cultural, political and psychological dimensions. Hence development is both immanent and intentional in nature though in this study we shall concentrate on the intentional development whereby the people embark on deliberate and planned project and programmes aimed at addressing problems facing the society. Truly, the period from 1960 to present has witnessed development failure in most SSA countries.

As noted by UNDP, human development is a process of enlarging the range of people's choice by increasing their opportunities for education, healthcare, income and employment and covering the full range of human choices from a sound physical environment to economic and political systems" (UNDP, 1992:2). Hence, the human development perspective, development should ensure that individuals in society have access to health services, education facilities, opportunities to earn income and access to other social welfare services (UNDP, 2003). Africa had lost over 30 years or three decades of development (World Bank, 1989). Hence, in the 1980s and the 1990s, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) prescribed Structural Adjustments Programs (SAPs) as one of the solution to African economic problem. This impromptu policy led to 'devaluation of currency, reduced government spending in social service ministries such as the education and health sectors across the SSA countries (Mkandawire and Soludo, 1990). SAPs also led to liberalization and privatization of government enterprises. Notably the implementation of SAPs in Africa did not result in economic recovery.

Often, AGOA is presented to African as the new path for Africa's economic recovery. Thus AGOA is the United States' trade Act that came into force in October 1, 2000. No doubt AGOA has both strengths and limitations in theory and produce. At conceptual level AGOA failed to involve her beneficiaries in the policy formulation process in contradistinction to UNDP human development approach. A decade after the launching of AGOA, it becomes pertinent to appraise the achievements and failures of the American designed policy for African economic development through trade. Thus this paper seeks to explore how the policy has been implemented with a view of determining the way forward for the SSA countries.

Theoretical Framework of Analysis

We adopted centre-periphery model to appraise the achievements and failures of the American designed AGOA for African economic development through trade. The main proponent of this model of explanation is Johan Galtung in his work titled 'A structural Theory of Imperialism' published in 1971. Among other related writers who have contributed to the development of this model are Bodenneimer (1978), Frank (1960) Offiong (1980) and Santos (1972).

This model purports to explain the division of the world into centre nations and periphery nations. The centre nations include Western European Countries, United States of America hence the members of the G8. They are the owners of the MNCs, the designers of AGOA, formulators of UN, IMF, World Bank and WTO with capitalism as its fulcrum. They are the colonialists and neo-colonialist. On the contrary periphery nations are those nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, who were drawn to the global economy forcefully through colonialism to play a fiddle role and hence sentenced these periphery notions to perpetual dependency on the centre or metropolitan nations.

International economic relations favour the centre more than the periphery. Again these centre nations have open influence on the decisions of the existing international order. African states are structurally dependent on the centre state hence Africa remains underdeveloped due to structural linkages with the west. According to the theory, the relationship between the developing countries and developed countries has been that of exploitation. The developed countries exploited the raw materials of the developing countries making supernormal profits on the manufactured goods produced from the raw materials, while the developing countries made very low profits on materials exported. This trend still continues today. According to the proponents of the dependency theory, for countries from the developing countries to develop, they have to delink themselves from the international capitalist system. Samir (1972), for instance identifies dependency in neo-colonialism in West Africa in terms of colonial trade as a step backwards, export-oriented economic development, the creation of colonial enclave, and the presence of a bourgeois class. Given the shortcomings of both theories, the current thinking has moved away from global explanations, with the exception of neo-liberalist trade paradigms. Theories such as postmodernism and post structuralism, which focus on the relationship between actors and structures, free agency and systemic coercions, have been advanced. Postmodernism has been explained in terms of keeping with the idea of 'post' which means after modernity. It refers to the incipient or actual dissolution of those social forms associated with modernity (Sarup, 1993).

AGOA was therefore designed to maintain the international economic structure which promotes internationalization of capitalism hence favours the west and continual impoverishment of the weaker states which Africa and the rest of the Third World countries represent

AGOA as neo-liberal Agenda

Various neo-liberal theories seek to bring about economic development in Sub-Saharan Africa and other developing countries through trade, deregulation of capital markets, and less state involvement in socio-economic affairs, rather than through aid (Cambua, 1994). Trade liberalization is a process of systematically reducing and eventually eliminating tariff and non-tariff barriers between countries as trading partners. The liberalization policies aim at creating a level playing field on which economies at different levels of development can fairly compete. Its main foundation is the economic theory of the invisible hand of the free market enterprise and the notion that unrestrained markets will led to efficiency in the production and distribution of goods and services between African countries and the rest of the world.

Hence, liberalization of trade is based on the neo-liberal idea that successful development can only be achieved by adopting the policy of openness to global capital and competitive forces and closer integration with the global economy (World Bank, 1994). While this sounds quite plausible in theory, in practice it has also proved elusive. For example, McGrew (2000) noted that Structural Adjustment Policy (SAP) prescribed for developing countries by the IMF and the World Bank form part of the neo-liberal development agenda. As noted by the UNDP (2002:1) in 1960, the richest 20% of the world's population had incomes 30 times greater than the poorest 20%. By 1990, the richest 20% were getting 60 times greater more. And this comparison is based on the distribution between rich and poor countries. Adding the misdistribution within countries, the richest 20% of the world's people get at least 150 times more than the poorest 20%" (UNDP, 2002:1). Developing countries enter the market as unequal partners and leave with unequal rewards" (UNDP, 2002:1). The reason provided for world income disparities is that in areas where developing countries like those from SSA have a competitive advantage, such as in labour intensive manufacturing or trade, and the market rules are harsh on the SSA countries.

The US and Africa's Woes and Pride

Notably, Africa is the second largest of the Earth's seven continents, covering about 23 percent of the worlds total land area and containing 13 percent of the world population. Africa straddles the equator and most of its area lies within the tropics.

Africa has diverse people with a wide range of culture, backgrounds and varieties of languages. The new nations that emerged after one form of reform or violent confrontation of their elsewhere colonial masters began to experience integration into the global political economy long before 1950's and 1960s when most nations in the region attained independence.

The natural endowment of Africa is over whelming that sometimes the argument of African underdevelopments becomes self-defeating. The large deposit of natural resources ranging from crude oil, platinum, Iron, Diamonds, gold, silver and agricultural outputs (palm oil, cocoa, rubber etc) attracts the rest of the world to Africa and Africa to the rest of the world.

Meanwhile this African endowment appears to favour the advanced countries more than Africans themselves. This is because Africans lack the know how to exploit and appropriate these natural, resources. Hence African Action (2003:1) noted that:

> The unprecedented challenges facing Africa and the U.S. at this moment are emblematic of the state of the world… while Africa is the poorest region containing the majority of the world's poorest countries, the US is the richest. The relationship of U.S. to Africa graphically illustrates some of the most central questions of the present era-How much inequality is the world prepared to accept, and at what cost? How should be U.S. address the historic injustices that were the cornerstones of contemporary western wealth and power, and that now continue to define the pattern of global inequality? What should the U.S. relationship to Africa be?

Africa's mineral resource such as oil, gold, diamond, and copper, is of great significance to the United States. In 2000 about 16.3 billion or 69% of U.S crude oil imports was from Africa. Sub-Saharan Africa supplied 18% of U.S crude oil imports in 2000. Compared to Persian Gulf suppliers who provided 25% of U.S imports. Nigeria was the fifth largest oil supplier. It provided $10 billion of crude oil to the United States, 11% of total imports from Africa. Angola was the eighth leading suppliers, at $3.4 billion. Gabon $2.1 million, Congo-Brazzaville $348 million, Congo-Kinshasa $168 million and Equatorial Ghana $107 million. These countries ranked among the United States' top 25 suppliers of crude oil (U.S. Department of Trade, 2001:15-16) (See table 1 below).

Again, the main U.S. exports to Africa in 2000 included aircrafts and parts $780.2 millions, oil and gas field equipment $343 million, wheat $309.8 million and motor vehicle and parts $257.5 million. U.S. exports to Africa in total accounted for $2.6 billion (See table 2). The U.S. imports from Africa have remained highly concentrated among a small number of African countries. (Nigeria, South Africa, Angola and Gabon accounted for more than 87% of U.S Purchases from Africa in 2000). When compared to the European Union during the same time period, a significant difference was observed. For example South Africa, Nigeria, Cote D'Ivoire, Cameroon, Angola, and Ghana accounted for 70% of EU imports from

Africa (Office of the U.S. Trade, 2001). In fact Francophone West Africa perceives AGOA as a U.S. facility that would benefit more Anglophone countries than Francophone countries due to the traditional focus of U.S. policy and private sector operations (West Africa Trade Hub, 2003). Arguably, more than $500 million new investments and about 210,000 new jobs have come to Africa as a result of AGOA. The Lesotho apparel sector now employs more people than the government (Eme, 2009). Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Guinea, Rwanda and Tanzania have benefited from AGOA by their increased exportation since 2005(Eme, 2009:197).

TABLE 1: US IMPORTS FROM AFRICA

Commodity	**Leading U.S. Imports from Africa ($Millions)**
Crude oil	16,289.8
Platinum group metals	1,528.8
Partially refined petroleum products	869.4
Woven or Knit apparel	748.1
Iron and Steel products	494.9
Diamonds	433.4
Ferro-and nonferrous ores	399.1
Cocoa beans and products	311.0
Total	21,174.5

Source: *Office of the U.S. Trade (2001).*

TABLE 2: U.S. EXPORT TO AFRICA

Commodity	Leading U.S. Exports to Africa ($Millions)
Aircraft and parts	780.5
Oil gas field equipment	343.0
Wheat	309.8
Motor vehicles and parts	257.5
Industrial chemicals	231.9
Computers, peripherals and software	219.3
Construction machinery and parts	189.3
Telecommunications equipment	139.5
Agricultural machinery	68.5
Used clothes and textiles	60.7
Total	2,618.0

Source: *Office of the U.S. Trade (2001).*

While other regions are emphasizing on regional integration as a strategy for effective global competition, sub-Saharan Africa countries are further disintegrating into smaller units (ethnic states) as a strategy of solving the evil seed of hatred sown by the colonizers in the 19^{th} and 20^{th} centuries.

The Content of AGOA

The Trade and Development Act of 2000 containing the AGOA was passed by the U.S Congress and signed into law in May 2000. On the main objectives of AGOA, Fletcher (2003:1) noted that AGOA provides(s) preferential access to U.S. market to countries that liberalize trade, promote rule of law, and adopt free market policies. "The U.S. official policy observed that AGOA was passed as an important law to "broaden and deepen U.S. relations with the country of sub-Saharan Africa" (Office of the United States Trade, 2001:1). The President of the United States in his submission report to the United States Congress noted that:

1. Achieving AGOA objectives would benefit the U.S. and sub-Saharan African countries by helping to create healthier more stable economies, stronger more democratic governments in Africa and expand markets for U.S. exports;

2. AGOA was aimed at promoting economic development and political freedom and stability in the poorest regions of the world;

3. AGOA would lead to interdependence of economies and make all parties involved to appreciate that global prosperity in the long-run will be more secure if broadly shared; and

4. The need for U.S. policy towards Africa to be pursued in collaboration with African countries in a supportive and complementary manner.

AGOA is an indication that African leaders have lost every sense of ownership of the future and how to achieve that vision. A number of leaders have taken news responsibility for moving their countries forward, acknowledging problems and challenges but realizing that they, Africans, could not.

Each time AGOA comes to mind of scientists and leaders the question of involvement and eligibility is raised. AGOA seeks to promote trade and economic cooperation between the U.S. and eligible sub-Saharan African countries. It involves trade in apparel and textile and in 1,835 products that have been added to the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) programme. Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (2003:5-6) identifies the following keys elements of AGOA:

- Institutionalizes a process for strengthening U.S. relations with African countries and provides incentives for African countries to achieve political and economic reform and growth.

- Offers eligible sub-Saharan African countries duty-free market and quota free U.S. market access for substantially all products.

- Provides additional security for investors and traders in African countries by guaranteeing GSP benefits through 2008.

- Eliminates the GSP competitive need limitation for beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

- Establishes a U.S. sub-Saharan African Trade and Economic Cooperation Forum to facilitate regular and investment policy discussions.

- Promotes the use of technical assistance to strengthen economic reforms and development, including assistance to strengthen relationships between U.S. firms and firms in sub-Saharan Africa.

AGOA Textile Benefits

- Lifts existing quotas on eligible textiles and apparel articles from eligible sub-Saharan Africa countries.

- Extends duty free and quota-free U.S. market access for sub-Saharan African apparel made in eligible sub-Saharan countries from yarns and fabrics not produced in commercial quantities in the United States.

- Extends duty free and quota free treatment for apparel made in eligible sub-Saharan countries from U.S. yarn and fabric and for knit-to-shape sweaters made in the region from cashmere and some merino wools.

- Extends duty-free and quota-free U.S. market access for apparel made in eligible sub-Saharan African countries with regional fabric and yarn. Such imports, however, are subject to an annual cap (limit). The original cap increased incrementally from 1.5 to 3.5 percent of the multibillion-dollar U.S. apparel import market over an 8-year period. (The ceiling cap was increased to 7 percent under the provisions of AGOA II).

- Provides an average 17.5% duty advantage on apparel imports in the U.S. market and promotes economic development and diversification in Africa's poorest countries. Through a special provision in the cap which allows beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries with an annual GNP of under $1,500 ("lesser developed beneficiary countries") to use third country fabric inputs for four years. This special investment incentive for the poorest African countries is aimed at providing a market stimulus to economic development for areas with existing industry.

Although AGOA is perceived as a panacea to sub-Saharan Africa's development dilemma, its examination becomes necessary in the face of continuing underdevelopment in the region. For instance, how many countries in Africa are benefiting from the policy? By January 2001, thirty-five countries were designated as AGOA beneficiary countries. By October 2003, only 19 states were eligible and also qualified to participate in the project. Some of the states that met the requirement to benefit from the AGOA textile project include:

Botswana, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia (Office of the United States Trade Representative, 2003).

Whereas these nations benefit peripherally from the AGOA policy hence their level of dependency on US have increased. These countries now depend on US for both economic and political decisions and this detracts from sovereignty of SSA countries. Though, in the first two years of AGOA's existence, the volume of foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows to sub-Saharan African doubled (Office of the United States Trade Representative, 2003), these FDI are in extractive sectors (see table 1) for example. The U.S. Department of Commerce reported that FDI inflows to Africa rose from US$6.2 billion in 2000 to US$12.4 billion in 2002; in the same year, AGOA imports increased by 10 percent to US$9 billion. This figure includes duty-free imports under both the pre-existing U.S. Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) and the expanded trade agreements under AGOA. On the importance of AGOA, it accounted for half of the U.S. total imports from Africa.

Meanwhile, the trade between the U.S. and Africa only benefited a few countries. South Africa accounted for a large share of US-Africa trade. South Africa received US$1.3 billion of flows under AGOA. The other African countries that recorded increased trade with the U.S. in 2002 included Gabon US$1.1 billion, Lesotho US$318 million and Kenya with US$129.2 million. Thus, AGOA imports accounted for half of total merchandise imported to the U.S. from sub-Saharan Africa in 2002. The period also witnessed a 13.2 percent decline in U.S. exports to Africa which now stands at US$6 billion (Mogusu, 2003).

Again, the mono-cultural economy of SSA countries do not allow for full implementation of AGOA. For instance AGOA need large quantity of cotton to produce garment and Nigeria for instance do not produce cotton. Industries for production of garment find it difficult to cope with such condition as their products are expected to be of US standard and must carry made in-Nigeria tag (Omoh 2007:2) Nigerians first shipment to US after the lunching of AGOA was in 2008. This illustrates the level of infrastructural decay and dysfunctionality of the Standard Organization of Nigeria.

Faced with competition from China, Asian Tigers, Brazil and other Latin American developing economies, goods from SSA countries - Nigeria included- are rather expensive and unattractive and this has led to the closure of many more industries and also increased the level of dependency of these SSA nations on US. The implementation of the Act has not benefited the entrepreneurs in SSA countries. This is because of lack of emphasis on African ownership of manufacturing, environmental control, and allocation of standard wage (United States International Trade commission, 2002). Fletcher (2003:1) noted that All forms of AGOA ignore the crucial fact that it prevents trade from being mutually beneficial. Given the $49 billion worth of agricultural subsidies that the United States gives to its farmers, attempts to aid African exports to the U.S. are undermined. In Mali, for example, structural adjustment policies implemented by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have dictated that growing cotton is their comparative advantage. However, AGOA requires that most African countries buy U.S. cotton; a surplus generated and engineered by the U.S. This situation has therefore affected negatively the domestic market which is mainly dependent on US for their political and economic survival.

Conclusion

The myth of AGOA as an instrument to benefits Africans through trade has met the reality of continual dependency of these countries on the global North especially the US through AGOA. While US expropriate the resources of Africa because of this relative weakness of the later, the former designed AGOA as one of the strategies of intensification of US exploitation of Africa through trade. Significantly any development endeavour that fails to involve the people whose lives it aims to touch, is bound to crash. AGOA was developed and advance by the US to promote trade and investments in sub-Saharan Africa. Although, AGOA was not the first US Act or policy for African trade and investment development, it was peculiar for its apparent magnanimity to the African countries. Like the rest of the western propelled Acts, polices or Agenda, AGOA has its own strings which pools it as eligibility principle. This principle was similar to those of IMF/World Bank imposed conditionality for aid, grants and FDI in the 1980s and 1990s. Eligibility talked would be beneficiaries in Africa. This does not consider the surplus benefit it accrues to the US economy to suggest any form of reform for US. While AGOA has some benefits to the African countries, this evaluation is timely to determine ways for improved US-African trade relation. We recommend in this paper that African countries should declared state of emergency on re-construction of infrastructure, allow for free flow of knowledge, human beings, technology and capital. Again, without conducive environment in the SSA no knowledge, human being, capital or technology capable of transforming the manufacturing capacity of the African countries can be sustained.

This should also involve massive investment in development of domestic man power of Africa. Again, African countries should diversity their economies and revisit their interest in agriculture with a view of feeding her population from domestic products. This will help to save and re-direct capital often spent on importation of food.

Until these recommendations are considered, adopted and implemented the dependency of the African countries will worsen such that second colonization of Africa is looming.

References

Africa Action. (2003). *Africa policy for a news era: Ending segregation in U.S. Foreign Affairs.* Retrieved on October 20, 2003 from http://www.africaction.org.

Allen, T. & Thomas, A. (2000). *Poverty in the 21st Century.* London: Oxford University Press.

Bryant, C. & White G.L (1982). *Managing Development in the Third World.* Boulder, Colorado: Westeview Press.

Chambua, S.E. (1994). "The Development debates and crisis of development theories: The case of Tanzania with special emphasis on peasants, state and capital", in U. Himmelstrand, K. Kinyanjui, & E. Mburugu (eds.), *African Perspectives on Development*. London: James Currey Ltd.

Eme, O.L, et.al. (2009). "Global Partnership and Development: African Growth and Opportunity Act and Nigeria. The Missing-link" in A.M. Okolie (ed.). *Contemporary Readings on Nigerians External Relations: Issues, Perspectives and Challenges.* Abakaliki: Willyprose and Appleseed Publishing Coy.

Ezeibe, C .C. (2010) *Theories of Development and Underdevelopment,* A paper presented to the Department of Political Science in partial fulfillment of the requirement for award of PhD.

Fletcher, B. (2003). U.S. Africa trade relations: New beginnings or same old story? Retrieved on October 17, 2003 from http://www.transafricaforum.org/newsletter/US_Africa_Trade.

Frank, A. G. (1969) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

McGrew, A. (2000). "Sustainable globalization? The global politics of development and exclusion in the new world order" in T. Allen & A. Thomas, *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century.* London: Oxford University Press.

Mkandawire, T. & Soludo, C.C. (1990). *Our Continent, Our Future: Africa Perspectives on Structural Adjustment.* Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Mogusu, T. (2003). *U.S-Africa trade falters.* Retrieved on October 17, 2003 from http://www.eastandardnet/business/bsnews171003003.htm.

Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (2003). *2003 Comprehensive Report of the President of the United States on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa and Implementation of the African Growth Opportunity Act.* Retrieved on October 17, 2003 from http://www.ustr.gov/reports/2003agoa.pdf.

Offiong, D. (1980) *Imperialism and Dependency.* Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Rodney, W. (1972) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle L'ouverture Publication.

Samir, A. (1972). "Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa: Origins and Contemporary Forms," *Journal of Modern African Studies.* 503-524.

Santos, D (1970) "The structure of Dependency" *American Economic Review,* Vol 60 NO 2.

Todaro, M. (1977). *Economic Development in the Third World.* London: Longmans.

U.S. Department of Commerce (2002). U.S. trade with sub-Saharan Africa. Washington D.C.

UNDP (1992). *Human Development Report.* New York: Oxford University Press.

U.S. State Department (2002). USAID country allocation. Retrieved on October 17, 2003 from http://www.usaid.gov/policy/budget/cbj2004/summary tablestable4.pdf USAID Country Allocation Summary, Actual Appropriation, 2002.

U.S. Department of Commerce (2003). International trade administration: U.S. African trade profile. Washington D.C.

UNDP (2003). *Human Development Report.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wambugu, M.C. (2002). Trade liberalization and entrepreneurship: Responses to constraints and opportunities by micro and small garment producers in Nairobi. *Unpublished Masters Thesis.* Institute of Development Studies, University of Nairobi.

West Africa Trade Hub (1989). *Highlights for February through June 2003.* Retrieve on October 16, 2003 from http://www.watradehub.com/news/archive.htm.

Wikipedia (2008). African Growth and Opportunity Act.

World Bank (1989). *Sub-Saharan Africa: From crisis to sustainable growth.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

World Bank (1994). *Adjustment in Africa: Reforms, Results, and the Road Ahead.* Washington DC: The World Bank.