

Economic Diplomacy, Global Waste Trade: The African Perspective since the 20th Century

Dominic A. Akpan, Ph.D

Department of History and International Studies
University of Uyo, Uyo
E-mail: dominicakpanhistory@gmail.com

Inyang, Basse

Centre for General Studies
Cross River University of Technology, Calabar
E-mail: basseyinyang62@yahoo.com

Abstract

The paper examines economic diplomacy in relation to global waste trade. It discovers that economic diplomacy is a pillar for the development of nations, but global waste trade is anti-development in all forms. But the question is why has developed countries be exporting hazardous toxic waste to Africa: and in some instances pay those countries of dump. What kind of economic exchange is that? The paper discovers that, the acceptance of this hazardous waste by these African countries was as a result of poverty. Or is the dumping of waste the only way these developed countries can assist poor African states? It has also been discovered that toxic waste dumped about 28 years ago in some countries such as Cote d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea and Nigeria have started showing its negative effect. For instance in Cote d'Ivoire some people who lived near the dump site, one of them was reported to have suffered and died of acute glycaemia. The disease – acute glycaemia in Cote d'Ivoire is a flash point of occurrence of diseases in those countries. It concludes that international treaty on the control of Trans-boundary movements of hazardous waste should be involved in dealing with toxic exporting nations. Materials for this work are from secondary sources, it adopted historical analysis as its methodology.

Introduction

Towards the close of the 20th century and the dawn of the 21st century the issue of economic diplomacy among nations was intensified in many fora as a result of „ushering“ in of the new wave of economic integration called globalization. Nations began to see international relations from the economic axis rather than political. But this is not to say that political relations/alliances or friendship was not anchored on economy. In fact international relations would not have gotten any flesh without economic relations. Hence, nations have been coming together through various economic arrangements coined bilateral, multilateral and other trade agreements for the benefit they would seek to derive. However, since the economic might of states are not the same; some states are favorably disposed to production that commands respect than others – they become economic super houses than some – while the weak are recipients from the strong. It is against this background that economically all weak nations receive all manners of merchandise from the strong economies ranging from new machines, ships, arms, computer, food, old or used cars and toxic waste. Toxic waste though a merchandise become goods tradable because nations which receive them are

incapacitated economically and therefore want to develop and belong not willfully but pushed by necessity – they are poor and need help by all cost. If not why would a country receive merchandise of death and this is common in the developing countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia. Africa as a perspective is used because she appears to be the highest recipient since the last quarter of the 20th century.

Understanding Economic Diplomacy

Ogwu and Olukoshi (2002) see economic diplomacy in three perspectives. First, it may be understood as the management of international relations in such a manner as to place accent on the economic dimension of a country's external relations. It is the conduct of foreign policy in such a manner as to give top most priority to the economic objectives of a nation. It has to do with the various diplomatic strategies, which a country employs in its bid to maximize the mobilization of external material and financial resources for economic development. This, they say, obviously, is a limited view of the notion of economic diplomacy. But, it is in this sense that the term, „new economic diplomacy“ is used in Nigeria by Nigerian political leaders and officials. In short for them, economic diplomacy means simply the diplomacy of economic development.

A second and equally limited notion of the concept is that which sees economic diplomacy as the application of economic instruments in negotiation and bargaining with other countries. The foreign policy goals in view may be economic, social or political. The diplomacy is economic when the means employed to achieve them, in terms of either “carrot” or “stick” or both, involve the mobilization and application of the economic resources of the nation. This may entail the extension or denial of financial benefits, petroleum products, food supplies, the granting, denial or withdrawal of trade concessions, the establishment or disinvestments of foreign investment, etc. It is in this sense that the word may be better used.

Third, economic diplomacy may be seen as a set of strategies and tactics formulated and applied for the achievement of a fundamental restructuring of the existing international economic order. It consists of policies aimed at establishing a new international division of labour, at bringing about a radical redistribution of the pattern of ownership and control of economic resources in the international system. Such policies would entail the application of both implicit and explicit bargaining process. This is a broad view of economic diplomacy. The first two concepts may be described as depicting the diplomacy of economic development; the third concept refers to the diplomacy of economic liberation (Ogwu, 2002).

Conceptualizing Waste

Wastes are disposing products that are harmful to environment and or capable of causing death or injury to life. Hazardous waste are flammable, corrosive, explosive, toxic (also called toxic waste), or that are dangerous and usually damage the environment when poorly disposed (Freedman, 2007). Switzer (1994) defined hazardous waste as substances consisting of (liquid, solid, or sludges) considered flammable, corrosive, reactive, explosive, or toxic (defined as containing one or more of thirty-nine specific compounds at levels that exceed established limits). Hazardous waste may be a by-product of manufacturing process or commercial and consumer products – like cleaning fluid or battery acid – that have been discarded, and may include heavy metals from electroplating operations, solvents, and degreasing agents. According to Udoidem (1992) waste traditionally is defined as something which has no current or perceived value, of which the owner no longer wants at a given place and time. Toxic or hazardous waste is a type of waste that has physical, chemical or biological characteristics that are harmful

to man his environment. Such waste includes radioactive waste, medical waste, all forms of industrial, chemical waste, expired drugs and contaminated food items.

History of Waste Trade between Developed and Developing Nations

Indeed, toxic waste trade is not a recent phenomenon. History of dumping of toxic waste in a form of exchange relations through trade had been in practice since the closing days of the 20th century and now between developing countries of Africa and the industrialized West. By 1989, according to the reports of the United Nations Environmental Protection Programme (UNEP) and the Green Peace Movement about ten African states had been identified as dumping sites for various toxic chemical and other waste products (Udoidem, 1992).

In January 2013, *Premium Times*, a United Kingdom, based newspaper, alleged that Messrs Moronuk David and Bonik Investment were shipping electronic waste (e-waste) from UK to Nigeria through Tin Can Island Port in Lagos. E-waste is a term for electronic products that have become useless or unwanted, non-working or obsolete, and have essentially reached the end of its useful life. Such waste includes discarded office electronic equipment, computers, entertainment devices such as electronics, mobile phones, television sets and refrigerators, some of which may be destined for reuse, resale, salvage, recycling or disposal (Adeyemo, 2013).

However, Nigeria reacted promptly and ordered for the return of that ship to the UK in line with the Harmful Waste (Special Criminal Provisions) Act of 1988. That was not the first time such consignment would seek to unload its waste in Nigeria. In 1988, Italy was able to unload its 3,500 tonnes of toxic waste at Koko Seaport in the present Delta State (Adeyomo, 2013).

The point of argument is that anything that is negative or counter-productive from the perspective of the Western nations is usually channeled towards Africa. For instance when the United States and West Indies was discovered, African slaves were recruited to work in the mines and plantations of these lands (Stride and Ifeka, 1973). History has shown that the recruitment of able Africans to the Americas stunted the development of African states. This was so because apart from the inhuman treatment, it also denied Africa “physical and mental energies of young and strong people who could have contributed to the overall development of the continent” (Udoidem, 1992).

With the advent of industrial Revolution in the 19th century, African manpower was disregarded and what they needed was raw materials and market for the disposal of their products. Here again to avoid ugly competition, Africa was divided among the contending powers in 1884 – 1885 Berlin conference. In this connection, Africa was Balkanized and African unity eroded through the introduction of „dubious“ culture into the continent. Since then violence and hatred have dominated the African life (Fajana & Anjorin, 1979).

Indeed, with the changing scenario in the international system since the 15th century till date, African predicament becomes enormous. Europe no longer need human labour in mines and agricultural plantations, African market is less profitable, rather Africans have been pushed into debt traps; and in all Africans are used by Europe to solve their problems. With the industrial revolution, increase in knowledge of science and technology – in production of goods and services – for the waste products Africa can at least serve as the dumping territory.

Cases of Toxic Trade Exchange Relations with African States and the Industrialized West

It should be noted that by December 1989, the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and Green Peace Movement identified more than 10 African countries that become dumping grounds for dangerous toxic waste from Western countries. These countries are (were) Benin, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Zimbabwe (Udoidem, 1992). These countries were those who received the toxic waste from the west of the time.

Benin

A contract between Benin and North America and Europe commenced on January 1988. Under it Benin was to receive 5 million tons of toxic waste from North America and Europe. The contracting firm and exporter, Sesco Limited of Gibraltar was to pay \$2.50 to Benin government per ton of waste delivered in Benin. Disposal method was a recycling plant to be built after two to three years. In some other arrangement, according to *Africa Analysis*, in April 1988, two shiploads of radioactive waste were exported from France to Benin. President Mathew Kerekou had wanted the toxic waste dumped at Abomey (close to Nigeria's border) but the Nigerian government pressurized on him made Kerekou to change his mind. The waste was later dumped at Aheme region close to Togo. The method of disposal was to be landfill (Udoidem, 1992).

Congo

In April 1988, the United States Embassy in Brazzaville disclosed that the government of Congo had accepted to be taking 1 million tons of industrial waste from USA for 12 months beginning from June 1988 – May 1989. But when Congo requested to for information on the toxicity of the waste, all of a sudden in May 1988, Congo reportedly retracted the agreement through her information Minister, Christiana Gilbert – Bembet saying: “The Congo would rather stay poor but dignified” (Udoidem, 1992).

Equatorial Guinea

For this tiny country, *Africa analysis* reported that a UK based firm had a 10 year license to dispose of 10 million drums of waste in Equatorial Guinea in exchange for payment of \$1.6 million. The method of disposal was to be by landfill on Annobon Island.

Gabon

The late President, Bongo of Gabon was reported by the *West African Hotline*, to have concluded an agreement with the Board of Denison Mining of Colorado, USA in 1987, to take unspecified quantities of Uranium tailing wastes. There was no agreement on the method of disposal.

Guinea

In Guinea, the method of bringing in the waste was tricky in nature. The shippers, Bulkhandling brought in gabage and incinerator ash and “labeled as road building materials”, to the volume of about 15,000 tons from Philadelphia, USA and Norway and dumped on Kassa Island, off the coast of Conakry in Guinea. When Green Peace reported the level of toxicity of the ash, the Guinea government requested the shippers to remove the ash.

Guinea Bissau

In February 1988, a report indicated that many Western countries had signed a \$120 million yearly contract with Guinea Bissau for the acceptance of 3 million tons of waste annually. The exporters of this merchandise of death include Hobday Limited of the Isle of Man, the London – based Empresa Bis (Import and Export) and the US firm, Lindeco. In another deal, about 500,000 tons of pharmaceutical and chemical waste from Swiss Impresa Intercontract at a rate of \$40 per tonne was to be dumped in Guinea Bissau in a land owned by Carlos Bernard Vieira, the brother of the then president.

Nigeria

By June 1988, Nigeria was taken unawares, a consignment of toxic waste shipped from Italy and Norway by Rafaile through Pisa Port to Nigeria, specifically to Koko Port in the Niger Delta. The toxic waste which was labeled as “orange juice” was deposited at Koko port in the then Bendel State (now in Delta State of Nigeria). It brought diplomatic friction between Nigeria and Italy; Italian government later removed the waste (Omatseye, 1988). In September 1989, an American Ship MV Pro – American loaded with toxic waste set sail for Nigeria. Nigeria got wind of it through the Nigerian Embassy in Teheran, Iran; the ship was refused entry into the Nigerian territorial water. The ship later sailed to the Gulf of Guinea into which it emptied its 2,000 tons of cargo of “death” (Oroh, 1989). In October 1989, a shipment of 546 tons of toxic Irish beef from Rotterdam, Netherlands found its way to Nigeria through Tin Can Island Port in Lagos. But the Nigerian navy was alerted and did not allow the ship to berth or offload (Oroh, 1989).

In November 1989, an Argentine firm, “Mariance” was said to have hatched a master plan to export 2,320 metric tons of poisonous chicken to Nigeria and other hunger stricken countries in Africa. The plan would have materialized but for a tip from the Nigerian Embassy in Brazil (Oroh, 1989).

In February 1990, the News Agency of Nigeria carried a story of how about ₦4.5 million fake and expired drugs had been imported into the country but was impounded in Kano and Rivers States by task forces engaged in fighting the distribution of fake and unwholesome, dangerous and poisonous drugs to unsuspecting consumers.

Senegal

In 1988, a Swiss company, Inter-contract S.A; is reported to have negotiated a contract with Solido of Senegal for the use of disposal site 40km, North of Dakar (Udoidem, 1992).

Sierra Leone

On April 19 1988, the Sierra Leonean newspaper, *The Chronicle*, carried an article titled “*Death Ship*” in which it reported the dumping of toxic ash and other chemical waste in the Shebro River (Udoidem 1992).

South Africa

In 1986, it was reported that two shipments of 60 drums of mercury-laced sludge waste from New Jersey, U.S.A were deposited in South Africa. However, it was reported too that South Africa has since refused anymore shipment.

Zimbabwe

Hazardous waste from armed forces agencies in the U.S.A totaling about 1,500 gallons was exported to Zimbabwe by Jack and Charles Calbert. The falsely labeled 275

drums of toxic waste as “cleansing fluids”. This was purchased by a company in Zimbabwe with federal funds from the US Agency for International Development. Jack and Charles Calbert were found guilty and were sentenced to 13 years imprisonment in February 1988 for fraudulent business practice.

Reasons for the Acceptance of Toxic Waste by some African Governments

The reasons for acceptance of toxic waste by some African governments are varied. Some have agreed that European businessmen and their African partners have connived to make cheap money at the expense of human lives in Africa. It would appear that the 1980s were notable years of toxic dumping in Africa. The question that may be asked is why some African states reacted negatively to toxic dumping in their countries while some merely kept mute. For instance countries such as Congo, Guinea, Nigeria, South Africa raised alarm and employed a diplomatic severance with countries of export, for instance for Nigeria, Italy. Others never showed any disenchantment, meaning that they accepted the toxic dumping. It may be added that poverty is responsible in some quarters as the underlying factors for the African engagement in the transaction. African nations are poor, but must human lives and environment be exchanged for money. A news journal, *African Guardian* once put the value of waste disposal market at \$126 billion a year. In the 1980s that sum was a huge amount of money (Oroh, 1988).

However, it is contented that, this fat sum of money could act as an inducement for a poverty stricken economies and people. Again, it is agreed that it could be a factor combination- poverty and greed. In some cases, it may apply to both; poverty is a hydra that can dislocate national policies and or economic policies.

According to Udoidem (1992):

One thing that is certain is that the selling of toxic products by Europeans and accepting by Africans do show the insensitivity of both the Europeans and their African partners to the dignity of human life in Africa. If the African partners were a little bit more critical, they would have known that in normal business exchange, one pays for the commodity or service he gets. But in the case of toxic business, Africans are paid for receiving the commodity. What the African partners do not seem to be aware of, is the fact that in the transaction, Europe is being freed from toxic elements while Africa is being infected with toxic substances. Europeans in the transaction are creating a future for themselves while Africans are creating self-destruction and doom for themselves.

Impact of Waste Trade on African Economies

Waste trade between developing economies and developed ones is business, and every business has its positive side or otherwise depending on who is worst off or who gains. It is often said that in business there is no morality. So, since it is business and it involves exchange relations, it must create impact positively or negatively. Toxic waste was not just been brought to outright agreement or contract or both – for either agents or private citizens to undertake the merchandise to countries of dump. The exchange relations did not only involve toxic material but money was also exchanged. The borders were opened for the dumping and money used within the economy. Whether the money is used by few persons or all the people, the implication is that it is used in the development of states that receive the toxic waste.

Indeed, it is contented that, the rapid rate of technological development globally makes electronic devices now have very short time to serve the needs of man. In this connection, the spate of growth of technological waste products have now made e-waste the fastest growing of the municipal waste stream because people are upgrading their computers, television sets, mobile phones, audio equipment and printers more frequently than ever before. Poverty makes the recipient of this e-waste a factor for positivism. Again, what can poverty offer in running an economy? For instance, in Nigeria, an ipad retails for about ₦120, 000, and the purchasing power among Nigerians is low as it is at present, it is believed that there is some economic sense in investing in e-waste from the West. Thus, cash – strapped business concerns and students, for instance would be willing to pay ₦20, 000 for a desktop computer, which is non-existing anymore in the West. In this sense, there is some monetary gain in embracing e-waste from the Western countries. For many years – even up till now – Nigerians and indeed other Africans enjoyed „second hand“ cars, computers, refrigerators etc for the same benefits (Adeyemo, 2013).

Waste Trade (Positive)

Supporters of global waste trade argue that importing waste is an economic transaction which can benefit countries with little to offer the global economy. Countries which do not have the production capacity to manufacture high quality products can import waste to stimulate their economy (Britannica, 2010). This may be true of the e-waste such as computers, etc. Indeed, Lawrence Summers, former President of Harvard University and Chief Economist of the World Bank, issued a confidential memo arguing for global waste trade in 1991. The memo stated:

I think the economic logic behind dumping a load of toxic waste in the lowest wage country is impeccable and we should face up to that... I have always thought that countries in Africa are vastly under polluted; their air quality is probably vastly inefficiently low compared to Los Angeles... Just between you and me should not the World Bank be encouraging more migration of the dirty industries to the least developed countries (Johnson, 1991, p. 20).

There is no point building fire in preparation cooking when there is no food. Africa has not developed to the stage of having industries that produce toxic waste, where would the toxic come to accommodate. It is a simple logic but that would not mean the develop states use that disadvantage position of Africa in the industrial ladder to dump waste from the developed West. Morally it is wrong, economically wasteful and politically it is cheating.

In another perspective, T. V. Reed, Professor of English and American studies at Washington State University, argues that the correlation between historical colonialism and toxic colonialism is based on perceptions of indigenous land as “waste”. He observed that Western cultures have deemed indigenous land as “underdeveloped” and “empty”, and that the people inhabiting it as therefore less “civilized”. Using historical premise of colonialism, toxic colonialism reproduces these same arguments by defining global south land in which Africa is as expendable for Western wastes.

Toxic colonialism, defined as the process by which “underdeveloped states are used as inexpensive alternative for the export or disposal of hazardous waste pollution by developed states”, is the core critique against the global waste trade. Toxic colonialism represents the neocolonial policy which continues to maintain global inequality today through unfair trade systems. Toxic colonialism uses the term colonialism as a justification because “the characteristics of colonialism, involving economic dependence,

exploitation of labour, and cultural inequality are intimately associated within the new realm of toxic waste colonialism (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/200532677>)
Accessed 2/6/2016

Waste Trade (Negative)

The negative impacts of toxic waste on economies are enormous and varied according to countries of production and countries of dump. Toxics are found where human beings live or do business – in household, office, and commercial areas. Common products that routinely become parts of the toxic waste streams of industrialized economies are toxic chemical of radioactive waste, which is mostly uranium waste derived from spent nuclear fuel. The impact are always enormous – for instance the radioactive effect of the bomb dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan in 1945 is still having negative impact on the land, on children that are born into most families. In those Japanese cities many children are deformed from birth and these are attributed to the radioactive effect of the 1945 bomb. In all toxic waste has been responsible in deaths and health problems such as cancers, birth defects, miscarriages, low birth weight, neurological disorders, liver disease, developmental disorders, hypertension, and heart defects (Britannica encyclopedia @ <http://www.britannica.com/science/toxi-waste,2016>).
Accessed 2/6/2016

Global waste trade has reproduced inequality on a global scale, for activists, environmentalists from Africa and other parts of global South are disappointed with global trade policies. Evo Morales, the first indigenous Amerindian President of Bolivia, argues against an economic system that forces the exploitation of his country and people. He claims:

If we want to save the planet earth, to save life and humanity, we have a duty to put an end to the capitalist system. Unless we put an end to the capitalists system, it is impossible to imagine that there will be equality and justice on this planet earth. This is why I believe that it is important to put an end to the exploitation of human beings and to the pillage of natural resources, to put an end to destructive wars for markets and raw materials, to the plundering of energy, particularly fossil fuels, to the excessive consumption of goods and to the accumulation of waste. The capitalist system only allows us to heap up waste.

To him the capitalist system is destructive to emerging economies. The growths of emerging economic are slow and may not move at the same rate with the west. In this connection, the West uses her productive advantage to exploit the developing nations in all perspectives. This makes the developing economies subservient to the West. So, whatever they do it exploits others including African nations that would not matter to them provided they have an edge over the Africans.

Dumping has an effect on the people. Just as the radioactive waste has on Hiroshima and Nagasaki so also toxic dump has on most states in Africa. Though the toxic waste are land filled, the impact is still being felt especially in the regions where human beings occupy permanently. For instance Jean Francois Kouadio, an indigenous African living near a toxic dump site in the Cote d'Ivoire, explains his experience with the effects of toxic substances lingering throughout his community. Jean added that with major Western corporations dumping their toxic waste in the Cote d'Ivoire he has lost two children to the effects of toxic waste. He described the loss of his second daughter Ama Grace, and the medical doctors “said she suffered from acute glycemia caused by the toxic waste”. Indeed, the Cote d'Ivoire experience with Jean Francois Kouadio as a

flash point, because other countries are suffering and equally experiencing terrible feelings caused by toxic waste dump.

In all, hazardous waste trade has disastrous effects upon the environment and ecosystem. Studies have indicated the concentrations of persistent organic pollutants on areas surrounding the concentration of the toxic waste by and large affect the underground water become inimical to humans who depend on this water for their livelihoods.

Again, the methods of disposal of this toxic waste in areas of dump have implications for the future populations. The toxic wastes are often disposed of in open landfills, burnt in incinerators, or in other dangerous processes. In some areas workers wear little to no protective gear when processing these toxic chemicals, in the long run are exposed to these toxics through direct contact, inhalation, contact with soil and dust, as well as oral intake of contaminated locally produced food and drinking water. Health challenges resulting from these toxic waste affect humans by causing cancers, diabetes, hormone disruption from endocrine disruptors, skill alternations, kidney damage, liver manage, bone disease etc. Health is wealth thus speaks volumes of the productivity of the sufferers.

International Treaty on the Control of Trans-boundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and their Disposal

The control of trans-boundary movements of hazardous waste and their disposal was adopted at the Basel Convention. Basel Convention is an international treaty that plays important role in regulating the Trans natural movement of hazardous waste. The Basel Convention was adopted in 1989, and attempts to regulate the hazardous waste trade, specifically to prevent the dumping of hazardous waste from more developed countries into less developed countries. This was as a result of the high-profile cases in which large amounts of toxic waste were dumped in less developed countries, poisoning the people and environment. The convention seeks to reduce the creation of hazardous waste, and to control and reduce its trade across borders.

The convention was opened for signatories on March 22 1989, and officially came into force on the 5th May, 1992. As of May 2014, 180 states and the European Union were parties to the convention. Haiti and United States have signed the convention but not ratified it (<http://www.basel.int/countries/statusofRatifications/parties> Signatories/tabid/12/Default.aspx. Accessed 2/6 /2016 has not been working according to expectations that set it up.

This is so because how would one explain the condition in which a state rejects the waste, but only to be turned around and dumped in the high seas. For instance, in September 1989, An American Ship MV Pro. Loaded with toxic waste was not allowed to berth on the Nigeria coast. The ship later sailed an emptied its 2,000 tons of cargo of “death” into the Gulf of Guinea. The Americans were not punished, for their criminality. Sea of Commons is now opened to the developed countries to dump their toxic waste. This is inimical to the high seas “natural state” for the growth of fauna and other sea creatures and by extension man depends on water for sustainability.

Conclusion

Economic diplomacy may be a veritable way in which nations can prosper. Thus one of such ways in which economic diplomacy may prosper nations is through the exchange of commodities, aid and other sundry matters. Since the 1980s, it would appear as if some developed economies were in agreement to export or dump toxic waste in Africa. In fact 1980s emerged as decades of toxic dump in African countries. In

economic diplomacy or in exchange within international relations, it is usually give and take Africans have taken negatively. But it is observed that in dumping of toxic waste, these developed states have to pay some of these countries in hard currency. This is not an assistance nor effective exchange relations in trade exchange rather it would be seen as “slow poisons” to kill individuals and degrade the environment.

It may be styled slow poison because the toxic wastes are gradually placing some communities close to dump sites on the disadvantage. For instance, in Cote d’Ivoire the disease of acute glycemia has affected many people and has killed them in large numbers.

Indeed, it is agreed that poverty, greed are responsible for some countries accepting toxic waste. But would the African’s exchange toxic waste for lives. Or is there no other better way Africans could be assisted in their poverty state? These are questions the developed economies who are exploiting Africans in many ways should answer. Africans are poor, but African poverty has its root from the exploitative methods of the developed nations in their relations. To save Africa, International Treaty on the Control of Trans boundary Movements of Hazardous waste and their Disposal be invoked on countries still dumping toxic waste either in Africa or International waters. There is need to save lives and Environment. Without conducive environment life is worthless, this, the advanced economies know. Let Africa Environment be free from hazardous toxic wastes.

REFERENCES

- Adeyemo, T. (2013). Nigeria and the Challenge of E-waste in Tell Magazine, January 28, p. 14.
- Britannica Encyclopedia @<http://www.britannica.com/science/toxic-waste>). Retrieved 7 June, 2016.
- Fajana, A. & Anjorin, A. O. (1979). *From Colony to Sovereign State: An Introduction to the History of West Africa since 1800 Lagos*: Nelson.
- Freedman, B. (2007). *Environmental Science: A Canadian Perspective*, 4th Ed. Toronto: Pearson and Prentice Hall.
- <http://www.basel.int/countries/statusofRatifications/Partiessignatories/tabid/1290/Default.aspx>). Retrieved 7 June, 2016.
- <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20532677> Retrieved 7 June, 2016.
- Johnson, J. (1991). “Potential Gains from Trade in Dirty Industries: *Revisiting Laurence Summers’ Memo*”. Cato Institute.
- Omatseye, S. (1988). “Death Can go from Pisa” in African Concord. June 21, p. 28.
- Oroh, A. (1989). “The Toxic Bug” in the African Guardian, December 4, p. 20.
- Switzer, J. V. (1994). *Environmental Politics: Domestic and Global Dimensions*, New York: St. Martins Press.
- Udoidem, S. I. (1992). *Values and National Development*, Lagos: African Heritage Research and Publications.