



Imperialism in Africa: A Case of Multinational Corporations

Author(s): O. E. Udofia

Source: *Journal of Black Studies*, Mar., 1984, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Mar., 1984), pp. 353-368

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2784064>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Black Studies*

IMPERIALISM IN AFRICA

A Case of Multinational Corporations

O. E. UDOFIA

University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

The central issue this article attempts to discuss is how we should understand the imperialistic attitudes of multinational corporations in Africa; what implications they have for development; how African countries can curb or minimize the imperialistic role of the multinational corporations. The question in its simplest form, is how far multinational corporations promote imperialism in Africa.

Many theorists associate imperialism with colonialism, neo-colonialism, capitalism, and nationalism. J. A. Hobson (1972), the protagonist economic-political theorist of the heyday of colonialism (1885-1914), made colonialism the focal point of his book. He equated imperialism to colonialism. He saw in Britain the existence of "surplus capital as unprofitable means for investment." The capitalists subsequently sought outlets abroad in the economically under-exploited continents. Britain, therefore, acquired colonies in Africa as a dumping ground for surplus capital. Lenin agreed with Hobson by causally linking foreign investments with the acquisition of colonies. He understood that "imperialism is a stage of capitalist development." One of the basic features of imperialism is "the formation of the international capitalist monopolies which share out the world among themselves" (V. I. Lenin

JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, Vol. 14 No. 3, March 1984 353-368

© 1984 Sage Publications, Inc.

1926: 71-76). This feature bears resemblance to the present day multinational corporations.

Lichtheim sees "imperialism as a movement—or, if one prefers, as an ideology—latched on to nationalism . . . this statement can also be turned around: nationalism transformed itself into imperialism wherever the opportunity offered" (Lichtheim, 1971:81-82). This argument may be interpreted to mean that popular patriotism (nationalism) was gradually corrupted when it passed into the service of the imperialist movement. Paradoxically, this patriotism manifested in the ideological instrument of expansionist policies of colonialism.

This process developed later into what is known in French literature as the *pacte colonial*. This is what we know today as "neo-colonialism". It represents a different relationship that involves contractual arrangement between capitalist and developing countries whereby the former undertake to assist the industrialization and development of the latter, on the understanding that loans will be reimbursed and investment capital will not be nationalized. This is imperialism in the post-colonial African states.

Still other discussion of imperialism in terms of economics as "plunder of raw materials, seizures of territory, enslavement of local peoples, nationalism, . . . all of these phenomena have been closely identified with imperialism" (O'Connor, 1971:23-68). This connection of imperialism with economics clearly associates imperialism with multinational corporations as we will see later in the article. There is general agreement in the association of imperialism with expansion—economic, political, cultural, and territorial expansion. The dominant view of economic imperialism is based on the Marxists' view of the export of industrial capitals to less-developed countries of Africa by industrialists and bankers (Baran and Sweezy, 1971:69-84) who played the leading role in the pillage of Africa (Jalee, 1968).

However, today, industrialists and bankers cannot constitute the leading capitalist groups in industrial capitalism. The

“giant monopolistic corporations” are at the head of capitalism in Africa. The actions and existence of these corporations constitute today’s imperialism in Africa. Their size, complex structure, and multiplicity of interests are what make up the corporate existence of the twentieth century imperialism. The corporate giants (multinational corporations) dominate means of production in Africa, they sustain transfers of income for their own benefits and at their own discretion. Among the best known examples are: General Motors, the Standard Oil of New Jersey, Unilever, IBM, International Telegraph and Telephone (ITT), Exxon, Shell-BP (Royal Dutch Shell) and Ford Motors (Vernon, 1971: 132-133) and many others, These are both American and European giant corporations with network of subsidiaries in Africa. This action of domination of means of production by the giant corporations represents a substantial characteristic of capitalism as a system of private enterprise (Dunning, 1971:265–288).

Having discussed the origin of imperialism in Africa and its connections with multinational corporations, we will attempt to define “multinational corporation” and its impact on Africa.

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATION

Multinational corporation has become one of the forces in international economic relations of the twentieth century. What are the nature and limits of the international connections of the multinational corporation, especially in Africa? It may be that its multinationality is in the sense that it operates in a number of African countries with the purpose of maximizing the profits not on individual units (subsidiaries) but of the group (MNC) as a whole.

Spero (1977:89) attempted to define multinational corporation as:

a firm with foreign subsidiaries which extend the production and marketing of the firm beyond the boundaries of any one country.

The definition of multinational corporation by Spero does not reveal some underlying qualities of the firm. This will require further elucidation of the motive of creating MNCs. Gilpin (1975:9) gives a more embracing definition of multinational corporation as:

a corporation that invests in other countries for a variety of reasons, to have access to a foreign market, to secure foreign sources of supply, or to have the benefit of lower-cost production or lower taxes.

Still, the definitions of multinational corporation tend to omit important elements of ownership and control. Ownership and control are located in one nation, and are not dispersed throughout the corporate system. But there may be few exceptions in this generalization. The Royal Dutch Shell and Unilever are both jointly British- and Dutch-owned. In other words, the ownership and control are shared through parallel headquarters structures. Another case of shared ownership and control is LAMCO, a joint venture that involves Swedish and American interests as well as minor participation by the Liberian Government.

However, the general characteristic of the multinational corporation is that of ownership and control. The headquarters of the corporation is located in the capitalist metropolitan center manned by managers and directors who are the indigenes of the multinational corporation's parent country. The indigenes of the host country are not given the opportunity of occupying managerial positions in the giant corporations.

Multinational corporations that operate in Africa are various, and no African is given any position of responsibility. American firms are most interested in Africa's enormous

mineral resources. In Liberia, the rich iron ore is exploited by the Swedish-American-Liberian Mining Company (LAMCO) (Smith, 1974:68-72) and Republic Steel. These giant corporations exhibit the capitalist characteristics of exporting the raw materials to their parent centers and Africans in the host countries are denied managership of these corporations.

In Libya, Standard Oil of New Jersey holds rights over 18.8 million acres where large deposits of crude oil have been found. Similarly, Standard Oil and Gulf Oil explore crude oil in Algeria. The same process takes place in Nigeria where Shell-BP (the British- and Dutch-owned corporation), the Italian-owned Agip-Phillips, the French SAFRAP, and the American Mobil, Gulf, and Texaco corporations all explore crude oil and natural gas. These products were formerly exported to the metropolitan centers of the parent corporations. But now, the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation, an indigenous Nigerian company, has built three refineries to process crude oil for African and overseas markets. This corporation is managed and controlled by Nigerians.

However, the characteristic of multinational corporations of control and ownership is capitalistic. The apparent discriminatory appointment of indigenes of the host countries to managerial positions in the corporations is imperialistic. The imperialistic behavior of the multinational corporation is also clearly shown in the production and marketing processes. Production may take place in different stages in several African countries and the final product may be marketed in still other countries. Example of this system of production and marketing may be shown in the method carried out by the oil companies in crude oil from Nigeria. The corporations produce and market Nigerian crude oil as well as refined products in different countries of Africa and the Western world. This integrated production and marketing reinforce imperialistic central control of multinational corporations. This is, in Lenin's terminology, "monopolistic capitalism". On the other hand, it is imperialistic because multinational corporations

control the economy and dictate to the host government how to deal with the host country's products. These characteristics of multinational corporations have placed them in potential conflicts with host countries.

CONFLICTS AND INTERFERENCE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS WITH THE HOST COUNTRIES' ECONOMY AND GOVERNMENT

African countries have increasingly sought to manage their economies in order to improve efficiency, to bring about welfare of their people, and to speed the liberation of black people in the world. Despite this aspiration and struggle, external constraints are put on African countries by the multinational corporations. These actions engender conflicts between multinational corporations and their host governments.

Multinational corporations are not enthusiastic to help in economic development of Africa. They have devised imperialistic means to solicit low-tax payments to host governments. By paying less tax, the profits accrued to multinational corporations are increased. Or sometimes they manipulate means to evade host governments' national taxation. These behaviors of multinational corporations are not in tune with their host African governments' national economic objectives.

The laws of the home government of multinational corporations affect their subsidiaries in Africa; these cause conflict with African countries. This happened in Angola in 1974-1975 when this country was in civil war. The American government accused Angola of being backed by the communists. As a result, the Gulf Oil Company, with its Angolan investments of close to \$200 million (Miah, 1973:5) was ordered by the American government to stop payment of royalties to Angola.

The action of the American government was imperialistic and inimical to economic progress and political stability of Angola.

The common consensus of African countries is to liberate the entire continent and black people in the world from imperialistic and racial domination of the West and their descendants who settle in Africa. On the basis of this consensus, resolutions are sponsored and supported by Africans and their friends in the United Nations to place bans on all goods to the apartheid South Africa, the racist regime that hates the black race. This ban on all forms of economic transactions with South Africa has been constantly violated by the multinational corporations. The violators of the ban are principally the Western countries. The United States government is one of the violators and because of its action, the American multinational corporation subsidiaries in Africa toe the line of the parent government. Similarly, Shell-BP, which explores crude oil in Nigeria, defied the Nigerian government's directive and exported Nigerian oil to apartheid South Africa. The outcome of this blatant defiance was the nationalization of the British Petroleum company in Nigeria. The Western-based multinational corporations have no regard for African governments and their people.

Parent governments of multinational corporations often run into conflict with economic policy of the host countries. For example, the intervention through the U.S. balance-of-payments policy was practiced by the multinational corporation subsidiaries in Africa (Spero, 1977:101-103). Under the Voluntary Capital Restraint Program of 1965, the U.S. government asked American corporations and their subsidiaries to limit new investments in Africa. The moratorium in the level of investment flows from the United States created a serious impact on investment in Africa, and this threatened to dampen economic growth and hurt the balance-of-payments of African countries. This element of control of MNCs and influence of parent government together constitute imperialistic and capitalistic character of multinational corporations.

The multinational corporation is powerful in the parent country as well as in host countries. Sometimes (or in a number of cases) it seeks to shape law and public policy of African host countries or third-world countries. In most cases they attempt to and actually overthrow an unfriendly host government. The case of Allende of Chile is an example: the International Telephone and Telegraph Company, a giant multinational corporation of world renown, engaged in illegal activities with the U.S. government to overthrow Allende (Spero, 1977:200). Multinational corporations are guilty of intervention in elections in host countries through illegal campaign contributions to support unpopular candidates and regimes or to oppose particular public policies. The classic example was the support of the illegal regimes of Ian Smith and Abel Muzorewa in Zimbabwe. This attitude of the MNC retarded the progress of majority government of the people of Zimbabwe.

The multinational corporation as a corporate body is able to provide export markets for the host country's product. It could withhold such markets by cutting jobs that depend on such exports. For example, the Peugeot Assembly Plant in Nigeria, the subsidiary of Peugeot Motors of France, constantly laid off workers and withheld markets for vehicles. On the other hand, the multinational corporation may shift products from a high-cost producing country to a low-cost one. This shows the monopolistic control and capitalistic behavior of multinational corporations in Africa. In this, African economies are dampened and economic developments are thwarted.

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA

As we mentioned earlier in this article, what may be the implications multinational corporations have for Africa? In

other words, can multinational corporations help in economic development of host countries in Africa? Multinational corporations can effect economic development through investment (Leys, 1974:135). In Africa, government participation in investment is a common phenomenon. But this may not help to solve the problems involved. The problems may be considered under the following: "the level of profits; the transfer of surplus; the effect on wages and employment, and so the pattern of demand; and, finally, the general political and social influence of foreign-owned sector" (Leys, 1974:135).

The rationale of multinational corporations is to make as high a profit as possible. For this reason, investments of multinational corporations in African countries yield returns much higher than what they have in their parent countries. In Kenya, according to William J. House (1971: 137):

evidence that foreign firms had above-average profits was provided by ILO (International Labour Organisation) mission report in 1972, which found that foreign-owned manufacturing firms received 73 per cent of total pre-tax profits in 1967, but produced only 51 per cent of gross output.

Multinational corporations invest heavily in African countries, mainly in mining industries—oil, iron, and tin in particular; and in motor and bicycle assembly plants, as we have in Nigeria and some other African countries. The high profits realized are transferred to parent corporations. This action of the multinational corporations undermines economic development in African countries where their subsidiaries exist. Multinational corporations undertake direct foreign investment because it enables them to enlarge or defend their ability to extract oligopolistic rents.

The question may arise of how much of the oligopolistic rent should the foreign investor in Africa be entitled to keep in payment for his services? Edith Penrose (1959) tried to discuss this through setting an empirical standard for making this

normative judgment by arguing that the host country ought to allow the foreign company to receive only the amount necessary to induce him and others to invest and/or to prevent them from withdrawing. Charles P. Kindleberger (1965:334) challenged the Penrose formulation. For him, the problem was a bilateral monopoly (the company has control over the services; the host country has control over access, before the investment is made, and over taxation or expropriation) in which the solution would depend upon the relative bargaining power of the two sides. The "just" price in the Penrose analysis may be the lower limit of the price that would have to be paid to the foreign investor. The upper limit, would be the scarcity value of the foreign investor's services to the country, that is, the price at which the country would rather do without those services. A price anywhere between those two extremes—which might be quite far apart—could not be criticized by any objective standard, according to Kindleberger. What that price would be, empirically would be a function of the relative bargaining strengths of the two sides. (Penrose ultimately was convinced by Kindleberger's argument.) But Kindleberger's formulation also provides a way of addressing a separate conceptual issue, namely, whether foreign multinational corporations "drain off" an economic surplus that could otherwise be devoted to the host country's development. The outcome of a calculation of this sort depends upon the alternative against which one measures the services of foreign corporations. For some dependency writers, for example Andre Gunder Frank (1967), the cost of foreign investment appears to be measured against hypothetical state industries of a socialist government that could perform all the functions of the foreign investors at the same or lower cost in terms of local resources, and with less leakage (via imports or profit remittances) abroad. If that is a realistic alternative, then within the Penrose-Kindleberger framework, the value of foreign investment should clearly be placed at zero (or less). But if that is not a realistic alternative, then the public policy analyst must

compare the minimum price to which foreign investors can be pushed with the scarcity value of their services to the host country. The works of Kindleberger and others suggest that multinational corporations will concentrate their activities in industries, or at stages within industries, where the greatest barriers to the entry of competition are located—that is, where there are the greatest scale factors, the largest advertising efforts, and so forth. By common definition, therefore, they are likely to be found in those sectors considered by the host country as most dynamic or most glamorous. At the moment when the multinational corporation first comes into the host African country, however, domestic firms may possess the special skills, special contacts, and special methods of exploiting local market imperfections that foreign investors need to become successfully established. Lawrence G. Franco (1971) has hypothesized that the foreigners will have a strong inducement to penetrate the host country by means of some kind of merger with a domestic enterprise. However, this may be a transitory stage for many multinational corporations. Once the parent corporation expands the horizon for the subsidiary's operations beyond sales in the domestic market, its primary concern focuses on how to integrate the subsidiary most effectively into its worldwide operations. At this point, local partners become a hindrance (because their loyalty is to the profits and dividends of the domestic subsidiary, not to the profits and dividends of the multinational corporate system as a whole), and the parent company will tend to buy or force out independent stockholders. The forcing out of independent stockholders and the host country's stockholders shows the capitalistic and imperialistic tendencies of multinationals. This behavior of the MNCs is inimical to economic progress of the host country.

Multinational corporations claim aid to developing nations of Africa is to help development. If this is correct, then the purpose of aid-giving is genuine; but the developing nations often are suspicious of the donor's (the MNC's) intentions.

The multinationals are interested in profit maximization and their paramount interest is to remain as economic giants in developing countries so as to enjoy business profits. Thus aid is a mere camouflage, and it also stabilizes dependency of the recipients and the dictatorship of the donors (MNCs). The politics and economics of aid may present a problem to African countries. The acceptance of foreign aid would jeopardize the African countries' freedom of action in the formulation of their economic and foreign policies. Development plans, the ultimate aim of developing countries, may not be smoothly executed. Thus, aid is a weapon whereby multinational corporations entice developing countries (hosts) into accepting their (MNCs) business existence. This manipulative attitude of the multinationals is a true characteristic of capitalistic imperialism. In the words of the current Chairman of the Organization for African Unity (OAU), Dr. Siaka Stevens (1981:2):

The economic aids given by these developed nations are more of a dehydrating agent than an economic advancement catalyst. The strings attached to most of the aids given to African nations and the interest charged in an imperialist [are a] noose on the neck of Africa and a double gain for these nations.

The Chairman of OAU's categorizations and observations are accurate in that corporations exploiting in Africa are selfish and egoistic. Their economic policies aim at maximization of profits as opposed to promotion of economic development.

MEANS OF CHECKING OR MINIMIZING MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS' INFLUENCE IN AFRICA

African countries in which multinational corporations engage in business operations should try to compete with them.

For example, the Industrial Development Corporation of Zambia Limited (NDECO), and the Mining Development Corporation Limited (MINDECO) were formed “to administer diverse investments and to hold [the] government’s share of mining equity” (Sklar, 1975: 41–42). Similarly, in order to unify control of the public sector interest and to limit the monopolistic capitalism of the MNCs in Nigeria, the government decided in 1976 to merge the Ministry of Petroleum Resources and the Nigerian National Oil Company (NNOC) into a new national agency to be called the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) (*Africa Research Bulletin, Economic, Financial and Technical Series*, (December-January) 1976-1977:4127). The new indigenously owned Nigerian statutory corporation holds mineral rights in petroleum industry. It explores, extracts, refines, and markets finished products domestically and in other African countries. It also exports to overseas non-African countries. The NNPC built three refineries in Nigeria—at Port Harcourt, Warri, and Kaduna. The proposal is on the way to locate the fourth one, probably in the Cross River State. The aim is to limit, and if possible, to oust the foreign-owned multinational corporations in Nigeria. In Algeria, similar arrangements had been made by establishing the new Algerian-owned corporation, the Sonatrach.

The European Economic Community (EEC) countries formed corporations in the third-world countries to continue the imperialistic action of the dying colonialism. The Lome Convention and the Lagos Agreement of the 1970s that African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) countries negotiated (as a block) for terms of economic transactions favorable to them. This arrangement may be described as “global harmonisation and bargaining” (Curry and Rothchild, 1974:183–188). The ACP through this swift action was able to check and limit the spread and hegemonic attitudes of MNCs in countries where a majority of black people live. This may also hasten the total

liberation of the black race in Africa, the United States, the Carribeans, and the Pacific countries.

African countries should take appropriate and necessary precautions in their negotiations with multinationals, either collectively or individually, to ensure that they have not been subjected to any foreign economic power. The collective act in multilateral trade negotiations will provide safeguards in the adoption of effective concerted measures to put a definite end to constant deterioration in terms of trade of African countries. Also, they should adopt effective measures for stabilizing relative prices of African commodities. Export earnings should be stabilized in the light of the increasing needs of African countries for development financing. The formation of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) provides a classic case of dynamic economic organization that aims at stabilization of oil prices (Africa Research Bulletin, October 15-November 14, 1976:3123).

African countries should work towards achieving economic independence and ensuring effective development. This can be done by mobilizing Africa's domestic resources rapidly and effectively, so as to serve as the main basis of African development. The formation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in 1975 is, according to one of the five protocols, based on "the creation of a fund for co-operation, development and compensation" (Africa Research Bulletin, 1976:4054). Furthermore, ECOWAS's "faith is based on three 'imperious necessities' for the original [sic] 15 states to take their economic destiny into their hands, to work for new World economic order, and to work for realisation of all Africa's joint ideal, unity" (Africa Research Bulletin, 1976:4055). Another example similar to that of ECOWAS was the defunct East African Cooperation, which aimed at establishing economic self-sufficiency in the member countries. To relieve Africa from economic dominations of imperialistic corporations, regional economic cooperations should be formed all over the continent.

Laws followed by a strict system of enforcement to control the subversive functions of foreign corporations in Africa should be promulgated. The Nigerian Enterprises Promotion Decree and Indigenisation Decree of 1977 were enacted by the military government to forestall the capitalistic attitude of multinational corporations. Although these decrees did not achieve the objectives aimed at, the implication was an attempt in the right direction.

One of the problems of African development is shortage of manpower. African governments should take appropriate measures to put an end to the "brain drain" from Africa in order to encourage qualified Africans living abroad to return, with a view to help in development; and to rapidly phasing out technical assistance from outside Africa. By stopping brain drain from Africa, MNCs may run into difficulties, because some Africans who live abroad even help MNCs to operate luxuriously in Africa. The return of Western-educated Africans to their countries will help indigenous corporations to compete well with foreign corporations. For example, some indigenous corporations that employ expatriate experts would engage indigenes whose incomes will circulate within Africa and will help the economy to stabilize.

An extreme case may be adopted to curb the existence of MNCs in Africa—the nationalization of MNCs. The entire enterprise may not be nationalized, however. In other words, only a certain percentage of the business may be nationalized. For instance, Sklar (1975:5) said that "in 1969 the Zambian government chose 51 per cent nationalization as its major means to control the conditions and effects of mine production." These measures may minimize to some extent the imperialistic capitalism practiced by the multinational corporations in Africa.

REFERENCES

- PENROSE, E. T. (1959) "Profit Sharing between Producing Countries and Oil Companies in the Middle East." *Economic Journal* (June).
- BARAN, P. A. and P. M. SWEEZY (1971) "Notes on the theory of imperialism," in K. T. Fann and D. C. Hodges (eds.) *Readings in U.S. Imperialism*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.
- CURRY, R. L., Jr. and D. ROTHCHILD (1974) "On economic bargaining between African government and multi-national companies." *J. of Modern African Studies*, 12, 2 (June): 183-188.
- DUNNING, J. H. (1971) *The Multi-National Enterprise*. New York: Praeger.
- FRANCO, L. G. (1971) *Joint Venture Survival in Multinational Corporations*. New York: Praeger.
- FRANK, A. G. (1967) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- GILPIN, R. (1975) *U.S. Power and Multinational Corporation: The Political Economy of Foreign Direct Investment*. New York: Basic Books.
- HOBSON, J. A. (1972) *Imperialism*. Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- HOUSE, W. J. (1971) "Market structure and industry performance: the case of Kenya." Discussion Paper No. 116. Department of Economics, University of Nairobi.
- JALEE, P. (1968) *The Pillage of the Third World*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- KINDLEBERGER, C. P. (1965) *Economic Development* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- LENIN, V. I. (1926) *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- LEYS, C. (1974) *Underdevelopment in Kenya*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.
- LICHTHEIM, G. (1971) *Imperialism*. New York: Praeger.
- MAIAH, M. (1973) *The U.S. Role in Southern Africa*. New York: Pathfinder Press.
- O'CONNOR, J. (1971) "The Meaning of Economic Imperialism" in Fann and Hodges (eds.) *Readings in U.S. Imperialism*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.
- PENROSE, E. T. (1959) "Profit sharing between producing countries and oil companies in the Middle East." *Economic J.* (June).
- SKLAR, R. L. (1975) *Corporate Power in an African State: The Political Impact of Multinational Mining Companies in Zambia*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.
- SMITH, S. (1974) *U.S. Neo-colonialism in Africa*. New York: International Publishers.
- SPERO, J. E. (1977) *The Politics of International Economic Relations*. New York: St. Martin Press.
- VERNON, R. (1971) *Sovereignty at Bay*. New York: Basic Books.
- Africa Research Bulletin (October 15 - Nov. 14, 1976).

O. E. Udofo is Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science & Administration, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria. He has taught at Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio and University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria. His research interests include political modernization, politics of trade unionism, African politics, civil military relations and development, law and politics, political parties, politics of international economic relations, oil and politics, politics of cooperative movements, environmental politics, and politics of multinational corporations.