POLICY BRIEF

JUNE 2025

AFRICA'S POWER PIVOT: STRATEGIC ASCENT IN A FRACTURED WORLD

FERID BELHAJ

POLICY CENTER FOR THE NEW SOUTH

PB -34/25

In 2000, The Economist dismissed Africa as the "Hopeless Continent"—a label reflecting a broader system of marginalization rooted in colonial legacy and post-Cold War neglect. This essay offers a realist reappraisal, arguing that Africa's growing strategic relevance is not the result of benevolence, but of structural necessity.

Amid a fracturing global order and the rise of transactional geopolitics under Trump 2.0's Bessent Doctrine, Africa has become indispensable: rich in critical minerals, home to strategic digital infrastructure, and central to climate and demographic futures.

Yet presence is not power. Africa's visibility must be converted into bargaining leverage. This requires institutional depth, coordinated diplomacy, and a rejection of donor-driven dependency.

From climate finance to digital governance, African states must act not as petitioners but as negotiators. Sovereignty must become operational—anchored in legal capacity, regional platforms, and control over resources, data, and standards.

The African Century will not be granted. It must be forged through strategy, discipline, and the will to shape global outcomes rather than be shaped by them.

FERID BELHAJ

INTRODUCTION

In 2000, The Economist stamped Africa with a single word: "Hopeless." This was not merely a provocation—it was a verdict. It crystallized a broader assumption within Western financial institutions, policy circles, and media empires: that Africa was a periphery of dysfunction, a space to be managed rather than engaged; a geography of weakness, rather than agency. This judgment was neither neutral nor accidental—it was rooted in a worldview shaped by colonial legacy, Cold War utility, and post-Cold War indifference. For much of the modern era, Africa was not seen as a player in global power politics but as a pawn—alternately exploited, ignored, or securitized to serve external interests.

Two decades later, that framework is being dismantled—not by moral awakening, but by strategic necessity. The international system itself is fraying, and Africa's centrality to the emerging multipolar order is no longer optional. The continent is no longer a question mark—it is a battlefield of interests, a reservoir of leverage, and increasingly, a site of autonomous decision-making. But in realism, nothing is given. Power must be seized, and influence must be built. The so-called "African Century" will not be granted. It must be constructed—amid rivalry, risk, and *realpolitik*.

This transformation is not a fairytale arc of progress. It is a hard-fought, uneven reassertion of sovereignty in a world where rules are conditional, partnerships are transactional, and global governance often serves the strong. Africa's rise is not about feel-good narratives—it is about control over resources, standards, alliances, and outcomes. It is about converting presence into power, demography into leverage, and narrative into negotiation. The shift underway is not just African—it is global. And Africa's leaders must now play a new game: one where sovereignty is asserted through strategy, not slogans.

I. A CONTINENT REPOSITIONED: FROM OBJECT TO ACTOR

For much of the 20th century, Africa existed on the margins of global power calculations—not because it lacked value, but because it lacked leverage. Its strategic assets—raw materials, maritime routes, and demographic scale—were instrumentalized by others, filtered through colonial extraction, Cold War proxy alignments, and post-Cold War developmentalism. Africa was spoken about, rarely spoken with. Its role was assigned, not asserted. From Bretton Woods to the G7, the continent was treated less as a sovereign actor than as a problem to be solved.

But in realist terms, Africa's repositioning in the 21st century is not the product of benevolence, nor of a sudden recognition of injustice. It is the consequence of structural shifts in the global system—and of African states and elites learning to exploit those shifts. This is not emergence by grace; it is recalibration by necessity.

Between 2000 and 2015, more than a dozen African countries experienced sustained economic growth. GDP rose, foreign direct investment surged, and debt levels—previously paralyzing—were alleviated through initiatives like the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) program. But the strategic victory lay not in the numbers—it lay in the fiscal space that allowed states to reassert control over infrastructure, education, and the national budget. The HIPC initiative, framed by the IMF and World Bank as a developmental success, was in fact driven by Western fears of systemic risk: an overexposed financial system, a rising China eager to fill the vacuum, and the specter of state collapse in fragile regions.

African leaders used this window strategically. Structural reforms were not uniformly successful, but they were deployed with a clear objective: to strengthen state capacity, regain control over macroeconomic policy, and build leverage in a world where multilateral rules were increasingly malleable. In countries like Rwanda, Ghana, and Ethiopia, this maneuvering allowed governments to impose discipline and project competence, not just domestically, but also to investors and international partners.

China's accession to the World Trade Organization in 2001, followed by its diplomatic and financial expansion into Africa, marked a turning point. The West was no longer the only source of capital or legitimacy. The Belt and Road Initiative, launched in 2013, injected billions of dollars into African infrastructure—from railways and highways to ports and power plants. But this was not charity; it was geopolitics by other means.

Infrastructure diplomacy became a tool for Beijing to project long-term influence, secure commodity flows, and embed its companies in key nodes of Africa's future. For African states, Chinese capital offered a compelling alternative to Western conditionalities—but it also introduced new dependencies. The emergence of a multipolar financing environment gave African governments the ability to triangulate between partners, but it also exposed them to strategic entanglement. Debt, once owed to Paris Club members under familiar parameters, diversified into opaque bilateral arrangements with Beijing and private bondholders. The game changed. So did the risks.

What was once a donor-recipient relationship has evolved into a competitive marketplace of geopolitical attention. Through a realist lens, Africa is no longer invisible—it is indispensable. Ports in Djibouti, mineral contracts in the DRC, rare earths in Tanzania, and voting alignments at the UN General Assembly have become tradable assets in a global game of influence. African states, long treated as objects of aid, have become subjects of negotiation.

The digital transformation that swept the continent in the early 21st century added another layer to Africa's repositioning. The mobile revolution—epitomized by platforms like Kenya's M-Pesa—was celebrated globally as a case of technological leapfrogging. But beneath the development narrative lay a deeper strategic shift: Africa's digital infrastructure had become a new frontier in global competition.

Today, fiber-optic routes, mobile banking systems, e-governance platforms, and 5G rollout strategies are no longer merely commercial ventures—they are embedded in geopolitical rivalries. The choice between Huawei and Ericsson, or between Chinese and Western cybersecurity protocols, is not just technical—it is a sovereign decision with long-term implications for surveillance, standards, and strategic vulnerability. Africa's data is no longer just valuable—it is geopolitical currency. Its bandwidth is now contested space.

At the level of diplomacy and security, the creation of the African Union (AU) in 2002 represented a deliberate effort to reclaim continental agency. The replacement of the Organisation of African Unity was more than cosmetic—it marked an ambition to shift toward proactive engagement. Through the Peace and Security Council, and instruments like the African Standby Force and the African Peer Review Mechanism, the AU began slowly asserting a normative framework for sovereignty, intervention, and governance.

Crucially, Africa's responses to internal crises—Sudan, Mali, Libya—have evolved from reactive appeals to more assertive—though still vastly insufficient—positioning. The AU may lack the enforcement tools of major powers, but its role in shaping the narrative around intervention, ownership, and legitimacy has expanded. It no longer accepts the automatic imposition of external "solutions" in its conflict zones without contesting for involvement.

This is narrative sovereignty: the assertion that African security problems must first be addressed through African lenses.

The COVID-19 pandemic served as a revealing stress test. While the West descended into vaccine hoarding and nationalist procurement, African institutions—particularly the Africa Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (Africa CDC) and the African Vaccine Acquisition Task Team (AVATT)—demonstrated the capacity to coordinate procurement, negotiate pricing, and challenge global inequities. This was not development. This was diplomacy.

But power is fragile without consolidation. The post-2015 commodity downturn exposed the structural vulnerabilities of Africa's resource dependence. Fiscal balances deteriorated, debt levels spiked—particularly with non-Paris Club lenders—and inflation returned across many economies. At the same time, democratic backsliding, military coups, and a resurgence of authoritarian populism revealed a harsh truth: formal sovereignty does not guarantee internal coherence. Strategic autonomy without institutional stability is a hollow promise.

Moreover, visibility brings vulnerability. As Africa became more central to global resource chains, digital connectivity, and political alignments, it also grew more susceptible to external manipulation, proxy contests, and economic coercion. What appears as attention may, in fact, be encroachment. What seems like empowerment may conceal new dependencies.

In sum, Africa's repositioning from object to actor is real—but incomplete. It has moved from being overlooked to being targeted, from being passive to being strategic. The task now is to convert this visibility into sustained influence. Realism reminds us that in a world of power asymmetries, sovereignty is not simply declared—it is accumulated, defended, and exercised with vigilance. Africa must now defend its gains, deepen its institutions, and sharpen its strategic instincts—not for symbolic recognition, but for real power in an unforgiving global system.

II. DEMOGRAPHICS, POWER, AND INSTITUTIONAL MARGINALIZATION

Demographics are often framed as destiny. But in international relations, they are not an automatic ticket to influence. In realist terms, population alone does not confer power; it becomes a strategic asset only when backed by the institutions, coalitions, and capabilities to convert sheer numbers into influence. Africa's demographic expansion—while unprecedented in scale—therefore presents a double-edged sword: the potential to be the most dynamic region of the 21st century, or the risk of becoming a demographic pressure cooker amid institutional weakness and systemic exclusion.

By 2050, Africa will be home to over 2.5 billion people—roughly one in every four humans on the planet. It will contain the world's youngest population, with a median age under 25. While Europe, East Asia, and even Latin America age and shrink, Africa is expanding, urbanizing, and connecting. This youth bulge represents the largest latent labor force in the global economy. But it also constitutes its largest pool of unmet expectations. Demographics can fuel growth, or they can feed unrest. The determining factor is not population size, but the architecture of power.

As it stands, Africa's demographic weight is not reflected in its influence over global governance. The continent accounts for less than 3% of global trade—still dominated by raw commodity exports rather than high-value manufactured or digital goods. Its financial footprint is even smaller. At the International Monetary Fund, African countries collectively hold just under 7% of voting power, despite comprising nearly a quarter of the membership and 17% of the global population.

If this is not an oversight, then it is surely by design.

The Bretton Woods institutions were never structured to reflect demographic reality—they were designed to enshrine post-World War II power distributions. Quota formulas and voting shares mirror mid-20th-century GDP rankings, not 21st-century needs or responsibilities. The fact that reform remains stalled, despite decades of advocacy, reflects a deeper strategic logic: incumbent powers do not yield influence without compulsion. Reform is resisted not because it is difficult, but because it is politically dangerous to entrenched hierarchies.

The imbalance is even more pronounced at the United Nations Security Council. Africa—the most frequent subject of peacekeeping operations and crisis deliberations—still lacks permanent representation. The Ezulwini Consensus, adopted by the African Union in 2005, calls for at least two permanent seats with veto power and five non-permanent seats for the continent. Yet the proposal remains ignored—not due to a lack of legitimacy, but because it would dilute the monopoly of influence held by the P5. Realism reminds us of what liberal institutionalism often overlooks: power, once accumulated, is rarely shared without pressure.

Symbolic inclusion has replaced substantive reform. The 2023 admission of the African Union as a permanent member of the G20 was hailed as progress—but it changed nothing in the distribution of agenda-setting power or financing authority within the group. The move cost the G7 nothing, yet gave Africa a seat without a budget. In the absence of voting mechanisms, veto power, or influence over macroeconomic coordination, presence risks becoming pageantry.

Nowhere is this structural marginalization more visible—or more consequential—than in climate negotiations. Africa contributes less than 4% of global carbon emissions, yet it bears a disproportionate share of the climate burden: droughts in the Horn, floods in Mozambique, heat waves across the Sahel, and rising seas threatening West African and Mediterranean coastal cities. And yet, when decisions are made on climate finance, technology transfers, and carbon markets, African priorities are filtered through donor frameworks.

This is not just a moral failure. It is a structural asymmetry.

Adaptation finance and loss-and-damage mechanisms are not designed around Africa's realities—they are structured to preserve the discretion of donor states. Climate finance is often tethered to World Bank safeguards, GEF project cycles, or bilateral arrangements that prioritize donor visibility over recipient agency. The climate regime—like the trade, financial, and security regimes—is a power system masquerading as a global good.

But Africa is no longer waiting to be rescued or recognized. It is recalibrating.

Across the continent, regional economic communities (RECs) such as ECOWAS, EAC, and SADC are becoming instruments of functional sovereignty. In security mediation, trade facilitation, and health coordination, they are building the operational infrastructure that substitutes for global neglect. The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) when seriously put into motion, is not merely a development project—it is a geostrategic platform, capable of insulating the continent from external shocks and reducing its dependence on externally imposed conditionalities.

Other pan-African initiatives—like the African Medicines Agency, the African Space Policy, and digital cooperation through the Smart Africa Alliance—are quietly laying the groundwork for what could become an endogenous governance ecosystem. These are not expressions of optimism—they are responses to marginalization. Africa is not petitioning for inclusion. It is building the scaffolding for parallel relevance.

Realism requires accepting a core truth: the global order will not accommodate Africa out of fairness. It will only do so when the cost of exclusion outweighs the benefit of control. That tipping point has not yet been reached but it is approaching—as Africa builds its own bargaining chips in minerals, markets, manpower, and multilateral alignment.

The strategic question for Africa is no longer, "Will the global system include us?" The question is: "How much of the system do we still need?"

In some areas—such as access to concessional finance or the global payments system—Africa remains structurally dependent. But in others—like vaccine procurement, fiber-optic infrastructure, or critical mineral supply chains—the continent is in a position to rewrite the terms of engagement.

To do so, African states must act not only as moral claimants but as power-based negotiators. They must align internally to act externally. This requires a new realism within Africa itself: to overcome fragmentation, reduce diplomatic duplication, and mobilize collective voice not as a gesture—but as leverage.

Ultimately, Africa's demographic expansion may be the defining trend of the 21st century. But its impact will depend on strategy. Without institutional strength, numbers risk becoming a burden. Without bargaining power, presence risks being reduced to spectacle.

Africa's challenge is not just to be counted—but to count. And in a world where attention does not equal influence, it must now play by the only rule that matters in realist politics: convert visibility into control, and control into agency.

Only then will demographics become destiny—not dilemma.

III. TRUMP 2.0: THE STRATEGIC REORDERING OF AFRICA'S PLACE

The return of Donald Trump to the U.S. presidency in 2025 did not merely signal a shift in American foreign policy—it crystallized a global transformation already underway: the collapse of liberal multilateralism and the unapologetic resurgence of power politics. Where previous administrations paid lip service to global rules and institutional fairness, Trump 2.0 dispensed with euphemism.

Under the emerging Bessent Doctrine—articulated by U.S. Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent in a defining speech in April 2025—the international financial institutions are no longer framed as impartial arbiters of macroeconomic stability. They are redefined as instruments of geopolitical alignment.

In this vision, institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank are not neutral technocratic entities—they are coercive levers. Debt relief, concessional financing, and emergency liquidity are now conditioned not on need or reform benchmarks, but on strategic loyalty. "Shared values" becomes the new euphemism for alignment with U.S. positions—on the war in Ukraine, Taiwan's international status, digital infrastructure regulation, and the emerging architecture of global artificial intelligence regulation.

This shift is not a reversion to Cold War bipolarity. It is more ruthless, less ideological, and deeply transactional. Whereas the Cold War was framed in the moral language of democracy versus communism, Trump's second term strips diplomacy to its essential realist core: "What will you give me in return for support?" The question for African leaders is no longer whether to choose sides—but how to price their alignment.

Countries across the continent now find themselves under quiet pressure to:

• Vote with the U.S. on UN resolutions involving China or Russia;

• Dismantle or avoid Chinese-built 5G and surveillance infrastructure;

• Reject digital currency cooperation with Beijing or Moscow;

• Embrace U.S.-led data protection, cybersecurity, and AI standards;

• Recalibrate their foreign aid portfolios to privilege American programs.

In return, they are offered access to IMF standby agreements, World Bank budgetary support, and American FDI guarantees. This is not multilateralism—it is managed dependency.

But the U.S. is not alone in pursuing this model. China has refined its own version of conditionality, dressed in the rhetoric of "non-interference" but coupled with strategic expectations:

• Chinese loans often come bundled with contracts awarded to Chinese contractors;

• Support at the UN—or silence on Taiwan—is quietly expected in exchange for infrastructure investments;

• Debt renegotiations, when granted, are opaque and politically calibrated.

Russia, for its part, offers arms, mercenaries, and diplomatic cover in forums like the UNSC—but demands rhetorical alignment and veto protection. The Gulf monarchies increasingly act as geopolitical venture capitalists: investing in ports, telecommunications, and food systems, while subtly projecting their ideological and strategic preferences, particularly around energy policy and Islamism.

The competition for Africa's allegiance is real—and intensifying.

What distinguishes the Trump 2.0 moment is the bluntness of its coercion. The U.S. has moved beyond soft power and development aid diplomacy. It demands transactional clarity: deliver loyalty, receive liquidity. Refuse, and face financial isolation, diplomatic pressure, and regulatory obstruction through Bretton Woods institutions.

For African states, this presents a stark dilemma—not of morality, but of strategy.

Do they trade partial sovereignty for short-term fiscal space? Do they align with one bloc at the risk of alienating others? Or can they maintain enough strategic ambiguity to extract concessions from all sides without succumbing to any single patron?

The realist answer lies not in principled neutrality—but in calibrated leverage. Africa must price its cooperation, not give it away. This means understanding its true strategic value:

• Its rare earth minerals and cobalt are indispensable to the green transition;

• Its digital markets are the last frontier for global tech expansion;

• Its voting bloc is pivotal across global institutions—from the UN to the WTO;

• Its geography—chokepoints, airspace, and ports—is increasingly militarized by global powers.

In a world of great power competition, Africa is no longer invisible—it is indispensable. But indispensability without leverage is vulnerability.

To transform presence into power, African states must embrace a new foreign policy doctrine based on:

1. Strategic Ambiguity: Refusing binary alignments, keeping all options on the table, and making flexibility a form of deterrence.

2. Issue-Based Bargaining: Fragmenting alignment across sectors—cooperating with the U.S. on counterterrorism, with China on infrastructure, with the EU on climate, and with Gulf states on food security—without conceding overall control.

3. Regional Consolidation: Strengthening collective bargaining through the African Union, AfCFTA, and RECs to prevent states being isolated and picked off individually.

4. Narrative Control: Framing African interests in terms of global stability—making it costly for powers to ignore or coerce the continent without reputational or operational blowback.

The Bessent Doctrine makes clear that Bretton Woods institutions will be weaponized—used to reward allies and pressure swing states.

Africa must therefore:

• Invest in alternatives: Scaling Afreximbank, reforming the African Developing Bank, operationalizing the African Monetary Fund, and building regional credit-rating agencies;• Diversify its financing sources: Including local currency bond markets, diaspora bonds, and sovereign wealth coordination;

• Push back on conditionality: Not with rhetoric, but with options. When one source of funding is denied, another must be ready.

Dependency—on Washington, Beijing, Brussels, or Riyadh—is not an accident; it is a policy failure. The antidote is agency, built not on nostalgia for non-alignment, but on a deliberate architecture of multipolar leverage.

Trump 2.0 may represent a new peak in transactional diplomacy, but it is also an opportunity. It lays bare the mechanics of global influence—stripped of moral pretense. That clarity is a gift.

Now Africa must respond—not with outrage, but with calculation.

IV. RESOURCES, CHOKEPOINTS, AND THE PRICE OF INDISPENSABILITY

In the 21st century, Africa's resource endowment has shifted from being a developmental curiosity to a central axis of great power strategy. This is no longer about raw materials feeding global markets—it is about who controls the foundations of emerging industrial systems. Lithium, cobalt, manganese, graphite, and rare earths are no longer just commodities—they are the sinews of sovereignty in the age of green transition, digitalization, and strategic decoupling. Whoever controls these resources controls the terms of technological advancement.

Africa holds approximately 30–50% of the world's reserves of key transition minerals. The Democratic Republic of Congo alone supplies over 70% of the world's cobalt. Zimbabwe, Namibia, and South Africa are emerging as critical suppliers of lithium and rare earth elements. This mineral abundance has transformed Africa from a source of developmental concern into a site of geoeconomic contestation. The new scramble is not for colonies—it is for contracts, concessions, and corridor control.

China moved first. Over the past two decades, it has secured long-term stakes in dozens of African mining operations—offering capital and infrastructure in exchange for preferential access to critical minerals. But as the West belatedly scrambles to "de-risk" from Chinese dependencies, it now turns to Africa with urgency—seeking to redirect supply chains, finance refining capacity, and impose new ESG-linked regulatory standards. What was once a bilateral negotiation has become a multilateral bidding war.

But unlike the 19th-century partitioning of the continent, this is a war waged in spreadsheets, data centers, and legal frameworks. Power now flows not only from access to the resource, but from control over its transformation—who builds the processing facilities, owns the ports, controls the blockchain verification systems, and dictates the ESG compliance metrics that determine market access.

The price of indispensability is visibility—and with it comes the threat of entrapment. As external actors compete for mineral deals, influence over standard-setting, and technological alliances, African states face the risk of being played off against one another. Divide-and-rule has moved from colonial empires to foreign capital consortia.

The same dynamic applies to geography. Africa's location—once dismissed as peripheral—is now central to global supply and security routes. Maritime chokepoints such as the Bab el-Mandeb, the Gulf of Guinea, the Mozambique Channel, the Strait of Gibraltar and the strait of Sicily have become strategic real estate. From the Red Sea to the Atlantic, naval deployments have multiplied: the U.S. and China maintain permanent military presences in Djibouti; Turkey, France, the UAE, and others are expanding their footprints in Somalia, Senegal, and Equatorial Guinea. Maritime security operations are no longer just anti-piracy missions—they are about projecting power, protecting trade lanes, and controlling the future of transoceanic logistics.

The digital layer compounds this competition. Africa is now a contested zone for fiber-optic routes, cloud infrastructure, data storage, and satellite coverage. The digital race is not only about connectivity—it is about who owns the cables, who writes the code, and who controls the surveillance. African states are increasingly under pressure to choose between competing digital ecosystems: a U.S.-led regime emphasizing "trusted networks" and surveillance restraint, and a Chinese model focused on hardware deployment and data sovereignty through state control.

In realist terms, data is the new resource—and Africa's growing digital population, mobile transaction data, and AI training potential are geopolitical assets. But these assets must be governed, not given away.

Africa must now treat its mineral wealth, digital infrastructure, and geographical chokepoints not as commodities to be auctioned—but as strategic assets that confer bargaining power. This requires three foundational shifts:

1. Leveraging critical minerals for tech transfer and industrial upgrading.

African states must move beyond concessionary extraction. Every mining deal must be tied to local processing, skills development, and technology sharing. Countries like Namibia and

Zimbabwe are already introducing export bans on unprocessed lithium to force upstream investment. This must become the norm, not the exception.

2. Controlling the data generated within African borders.

As mobile penetration and digital services expand, African states must define clear rules around data storage, localization, and ownership. Sovereignty in the 21st century includes control over algorithmic training, biometric systems, and digital identity frameworks. Africa cannot afford a digital-era replay of the resource curse.

3. Coordinating regional access terms through common negotiation frameworks.

External actors must no longer be allowed to cherry-pick bilateral deals. Whether in port development, AI governance, or battery supply chains, Africa needs continental standards and collective bargaining platforms—anchored in institutions like the AU, AfCFTA, and African Legal Support Facility.

These shifts are beginning to take root. Morocco's ascendancy as a green energy hub—through its Ouarzazate solar complex and emerging hydrogen corridors—signals an ambition to shape European energy futures. Nigeria's fintech ecosystem, home to billion-dollar startups like Flutterwave and Paystack, is setting digital standards across West Africa and attracting strategic investments from Silicon Valley and Beijing. Rwanda's leadership in digital ID systems and smart governance is giving it a disproportionate voice in shaping regulatory frameworks. Kenya's AI and data infrastructure expansion—backed by global tech firms—positions it as a regional digital fulcrum.

But intent is not capacity. These success stories reveal a strategic will—but sustaining them requires institutional depth.

African power will be measured not by declarations, but by:

• The ability to negotiate favorable terms and enforce conditionalities.

• The strength of domestic regulatory bodies to audit contracts and prevent exploitative clauses.

• The consolidation of continental institutions that prevent external actors from exploiting intra-African fragmentation.

• The creation of state-owned or public-private strategic operators that can act as African champions in global negotiations—on the model of Brazil's Embraer or India's ONGC.

This is the new frontier of sovereignty: the ability to extract strategic rent from one's position in the system, not merely to participate in it. For too long, Africa has been defined by others—its resources exploited, its location ignored, its people measured only in humanitarian terms. That era is ending.

In a fractured world, Africa's indispensability is rising. But the cost of being indispensable is constant exposure. Strategic relevance attracts attention—but also interference. The burden now lies with African leaders, technocrats, and institutions to convert resource wealth and geographic centrality into leverage—not vulnerability.

And that means embracing a new maxim of realist geopolitics:

Power does not reside in what you have—but in what others need from you—and what you are willing to demand in return.

V. REALISM, DISCIPLINE, AND THE NEXT QUARTER-CENTURY

The next 25 years will not be decided by moral appeals or international benevolence. They will be shaped by hard constraints, conflicting interests, and strategic asymmetries. For Africa, this coming quarter-century will be defined not by promises from others, but by the choices it makes under pressure—amid climate volatility, financial exposure, and geopolitical fragmentation.

Climate shocks are no longer distant projections. They are structural realities. Droughts, floods, rising temperatures, and food system disruptions are altering the physical and economic geography of the continent. Yet the institutional response to these shocks remains fragmented and externally dependent. Africa's voice in climate diplomacy—despite being the most affected region—is often relegated to moralistic appeals. But realism dictates that vulnerability does not translate into influence. Leverage does.

Debt distress is returning with a vengeance. More than 20 African countries are either in or at high risk of default. The post-COVID global monetary tightening has exposed the fragility of debt portfolios bloated with Eurobonds, opaque Chinese loans, and rising interest payments to private creditors. Unlike previous debt cycles, today's creditors are dispersed, non-transparent, and less willing to coordinate. And the IMF, under the politicized logic of the Bessent Doctrine, increasingly ties relief to geopolitical alignment.

Supply insecurity—from fertilizers to semiconductors—is no longer episodic; it is structural. Global value chains are shifting, and Africa risks being locked out of next-generation supply networks unless it builds resilience—not only through domestic production but through strategic stockpiling, regional industrial policy, and infrastructure alignment.

In this world, agency is not a slogan. It must be treated as a system of choices—disciplined, deliberate, and institutionally grounded.

Africa must now build its own scaffolding of power—not to mimic the West, but to insulate itself from the volatility of the global system and project its interests with coherence. This scaffolding includes:

1. Legal and contract renegotiation frameworks.

Africa's extractive industries and infrastructure agreements are too often governed by poorly negotiated contracts with weak dispute resolution provisions. States must invest in sovereign legal capacity—through national arbitration teams, regional legal support mechanisms like the African Legal Support Facility, and pan-African contract audit protocols. Sovereignty begins with the fine print.

2. Robust statistical and regulatory institutions

Power in global trade talks is data-driven. Africa must control its own narrative through independent statistical agencies capable of producing credible data on trade balances, emissions, labor, and investment flows. Without control over its own facts, Africa becomes vulnerable to external modeling that justifies restrictive trade or climate conditions.

3. Financial architecture designed for strategic autonomy

Relying on donor-funded budgets and ratings from Fitch or Moody's is not financial sovereignty. Africa must fast-track institutions like the African Monetary Fund, create African-based credit rating agencies that reflect developmental risk properly, and deepen cross-border bond markets denominated in local or regional currencies.

These are not technocratic projects. They are mechanisms of sovereignty—designed to reduce exposure to coercion and increase room to maneuver.

This realist infrastructure must be matched by a strategic shift in Africa's external diplomacy. Climate negotiations, digital governance, trade talks, and taxation must cease being arenas of petitioning—and become arenas of coordinated, issue-specific power projection.

For example:

• In climate finance, African states should negotiate as a bloc, demanding clear timelines, automatic triggers for adaptation funds, and the operationalization of loss and damage facilities linked to measurable climate vulnerability metrics—not donor discretion.

• In AI governance, Africa must not wait to adopt others' norms. It should lead with its own frameworks on data sovereignty, algorithmic bias, and ethical standards grounded in its developmental needs.

• In digital taxation, Africa must fight back against loopholes that allow tech giants to extract value without contributing to domestic revenues. Joint negotiation through the African Tax Administration Forum (ATAF) and AfCFTA protocols is a first step—but must be backed by enforcement capacity.

• In global trade rule-setting, Africa must prioritize industrial policy flexibility and strategic tariff space—especially in sectors like green manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, and digital services.

Pan-African economic institutions—Afreximbank, the African Development Bank, the African Risk Capacity, and others—must now operate not just as lenders, but as strategic policy tools. Their mandate must be redefined: not to follow OECD models, but to underwrite African self-interest.

However, institutional architecture is not enough without discipline and cohesion. Africa's greatest internal threat is fragmentation—along linguistic, ideological, or sub-regional lines. External actors exploit this constantly—offering differentiated terms to divide negotiators, fund rival think tanks, and playing one capital against another in bilateral forums.

Pan-Africanism must evolve from symbolic solidarity to operational leverage. That means:

• Harmonizing legal codes and investment protocols—such as through the OHADA initiative in West and Central Africa—so external actors cannot forum-shop for the weakest regulator.

• Building joint procurement mechanisms for energy, health, and defense to extract scale-based concessions.

• Developing common negotiating positions across RECs and the AU—particularly at the WTO, IMF, and COP summits.

• Defining continental red lines—on AI norms, digital infrastructure, data control, and military basing—so Africa speaks with one voice where its interests are indivisible.

Unity does not mean uniformity. Diversity is an asset. But without coordination, diversity becomes vulnerability.

The next quarter-century will offer no easy wins. The international order is fracturing; the climate is destabilizing; digital governance is being weaponized; and Bretton Woods institutions are becoming platforms for conditional loyalty.

Africa must choose not whether to play in this world—but how. The real choice is between participation and authorship. Between being at the table—and being on the menu.

Realism, at its core, is not cynicism. It is clarity—a discipline to see the world not as we wish it would be, but as it is—and to act accordingly.

The next 25 years will reward those who build institutions, coordinate strategy, enforce red lines, and price their power accurately. Africa must be among them—not as a moral cause, but as a strategic actor with the capacity, vision, and will to shape its destiny.

VI. CONCLUSION: SOVEREIGNTY IS THE STRATEGY

In the realist world of 2025, power is not granted—it is taken, institutionalized, and defended. Africa's trajectory is not a tale of redemption but a contest for leverage. Success is not defined by narratives or summit invitations, but by who sets the terms—over resources, rules, and rewards.

In 2000, Africa was sidelined—a region to stabilize or assist, not to reckon with. Today, that has changed. With 1.5 billion people, 30% of the world's critical minerals, and growing geopolitical weight, Africa is impossible to ignore. But visibility is not influence. The real measure is operational sovereignty.

Africa must now:

• Set its own terms of engagement;

• Channel its youth into institutions and innovation, not instability;

• Act collectively where fragmentation weakens power—on debt, climate, and technology.

This demands more than token inclusion. In a world of transactional alliances and narrative battles, Africa must act not as a moral cause but as a strategic bloc—with red lines, priorities, and leverage.

Today's financial architecture still imposes a sovereignty premium: costly debt, insufficient climate finance, and marginalization in AI and global governance. These are not development gaps—they are structural power imbalances.

But Africa is no longer silent:

• The AfCFTA promises a $3.4 trillion market.

• Institutions like Afreximbank and the African Legal Support Facility offer tools to renegotiate terms.

• African-led efforts in vaccine production, satellite regulation, and digital governance are shifting the rules.

Sovereignty is not a slogan—it is a system. Legal frameworks, financial tools, tech capabilities, and diplomatic cohesion must be built layer by layer. Pan-Africanism must evolve from nostalgia to execution—measured by enforcement, not declarations.

The response to Trump 2.0, the Bessent Doctrine, and rising conditionality must be realist: diversify partnerships, protect strategic assets, and convert indispensability into bargaining power.

The African Century will not be granted by demography or global goodwill. It will be secured through discipline, coordination, and hard power.

Africa has moved from object to actor. It must now become an author.

Power respects only power.

Africa must no longer be described—but describe.

No longer managed—but manage.

No longer invited—but invite.

The African Century is not a forecast.

It is a sovereign project.

Only those who understand that will shape it.

REFERENCES

1. The Economist. (2000). *Hopeless Africa. The Economist*, May 13.

2. African Development Bank (AfDB). (2023). *African Economic Outlook 2023: Mobilizing Private Sector Financing for Climate and Green Growth in Africa*.

3. Alden, C., Large, D., & Soares de Oliveira, R. (Eds.). (2020). *New Directions in Africa–China Studies*. Routledge.

4. Gallagher, K. P., & Kozul-Wright, R. (2022). *The Case for a New Bretton Woods*. UNCTAD Policy Brief.

5. UNCTAD. (2023). *Economic Development in Africa Report 2023: The Potential of Africa to Capture Green Value Chains*.

6. Reuters. (2025). *Trump's Return Redefines U.S. Use of IMF and World Bank: The Bessent Doctrine*, April 24.

7. IMF. (2024). *IMF Governance Reform: Quota Review and Voice Reform in a Multipolar World*.

8. South Centre. (2023). *Reclaiming Multilateralism: South-South Cooperation in a Fractured World*.

9. Mo Ibrahim Foundation. (2023). *African Governance Report: Empowering Africa's Institutions*.

10. Financial Times. (2024). *Africa's Critical Minerals and the Race for Supply Chain Control*, August.

Ferid Belhaj:SelectedReferences

1. The Economist. (2000). *Hopeless Africa. The Economist*, May 13.

2. African Development Bank (AfDB). (2023). *African Economic Outlook 2023: Mobilizing Private Sector Financing for Climate and Green Growth in Africa*.

3. Alden, C., Large, D., & Soares de Oliveira, R. (Eds.). (2020). *New Directions in Africa–China Studies*. Routledge.

4. Gallagher, K. P., & Kozul-Wright, R. (2022). *The Case for a New Bretton Woods*. UNCTAD Policy Brief.

5. UNCTAD. (2023). *Economic Development in Africa Report 2023: The Potential of Africa to Capture Green Value Chains*.

6. Reuters. (2025). *Trump's Return Redefines U.S. Use of IMF and World Bank: The Bessent Doctrine*, April 24.

7. IMF. (2024). *IMF Governance Reform: Quota Review and Voice Reform in a Multipolar World*.

8. South Centre. (2023). *Reclaiming Multilateralism: South-South Cooperation in a Fractured World*.

9. Mo Ibrahim Foundation. (2023). *African Governance Report: Empowering Africa's Institutions*.

10. Financial Times. (2024). *Africa's Critical Minerals and the Race for Supply Chain Control*, August.

1. Ferid Belhaj: Africa and the Middle East: The Shift from Geopolitics to Geoeconomics Policy Center for the New South: 2024.
2. Ferid Belhaj. A Bold Agenda for the African Development Bank: Seizing Africa's Moment in a Fractured Global Economy. The Policy Center for the New South . 2025.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

FERID BELHAJ

Ferid Belhaj is the former World Bank Vice President for the Middle East and North Africa. He also served as the Chief of Staff of the President of the World Bank Group and held various positions at the Bank including Director for the Mashreq countries, Director for the Pacific department and Special representative to the United Nations.

ABOUT THE POLICY CENTER FOR THE NEW SOUTH

The Policy Center for the New South (PCNS) is a Moroccan think tank aiming to contribute to the improvement of economic and social public policies that challenge Morocco and the rest of Africa as integral parts of the global South.

The PCNS pleads for an open, accountable and enterprising "new South" that defines its own narratives and mental maps around the Mediterranean and South Atlantic basins, as part of a forward-looking relationship with the rest of the world. Through its analytical endeavours, the think tank aims to support the development of public policies in Africa and to give the floor to experts from the South. This stance is focused on dialogue and partnership, and aims to cultivate African expertise and excellence needed for the accurate analysis of African and global challenges and the suggestion of appropriate solutions. Read more

Policy Center for the New South

Rabat Campus of Mohammed VI Polytechnic University,
Rocade Rabat Salé - 11103
Email : contact@policycenter.ma
Phone : +212 (0) 537 54 04 04
Fax : +212 (0) 537 71 31 54

www.policycenter.ma

POLICY CENTER FOR THE NEW SOUTH
10 YEARS

RePEc