Under Development Question and the Game of Blame: The Case of Nigeria.

By

Jonathan Yeriworikongha Ayibatari
Department Of History and Diplomacy
Niger Delta University Wilberforce Island,
Bayelsa State.
Email: ayibatariyjonthan@gmail.com
Telephone: 08137687570,
&
Abiobio, Philip Humphrey
Department of Educational Foundations, School Of Education.
Federal College of Education (Technical), Omoku Rivers State.
Email: abiophiloni@yahoo.com
Phone: 08038977901

Abstract

The issues of development and underdevelopment and the causes once conceived as definable have in recent times become the subject of fluidity and contestations. In the face of blames and trading in accusation on why some countries have attained some level of economic prosperity while others are suffering in sheer penury. This work seek to attempt a critique on the causative phenomena of Nigeria's continued captivity by under-development, a scenario that has attracted discordant voices, blames, shifting of blames, accusations and counter accusation. This blame game of a sort traded among economic historians and political elite and the absence of consensus among scholars of different background have similarly compounded the identification of causes of Nigeria's marginal rating in development rating. This calls for concern, especially against the backdrop of a seemingly hopeless future. The study's primary objective is to resolve, using the lens of history and inter disciplinary approach, the realistic causation of Nigeria's underdevelopment. In the final analysis, it admits the role played by external forces, but insists on internal contradictions as the nagging tumor annihilating all efforts on development. Not until these endogenous contradictions of which the ruling class institutionalized are removed, Nigeria must continue to remain in the circle of poverty, economic dislocation and under

development. The study also recommends, among other things, a formidable war against institutionalized corruption as panacea for nation building and sustainable development.

Key Words: Development, Under-development, NEO-Marxist and Modernization Theorists.

Theoretical analysis of key words

Development

North-South: A programme for survival, otherwise called the report of the independent commission on International Development issues under the chairmanship of Willy Bramdt (Herein after referred to as the Brandt Report 1979) was quite frank when it began its examination of the dimensions of development by stating that: Development never will be, and never can be defined to universal satisfaction (1979:49). This view is in many ways, akin to that of W. Rodney (1917) when he argued that "development in any human society is a many sided process". And many people who had attempted to define this concept, had for the most part, and emphasized one element at the expense of other aspects of development. Some have for instance, look at development as a synonym for growth. Others who have tried to be more comprehensive, sometimes also failed to be holistic, as they ended up proffering definitions that tended to equate development with either economic or industrial progress. It is for this reason an attempt is made to look at an holistic approach of defining what "Development" is all about. This will be done by first of all turning to the views of some experts on development studies. First, going by the Brandt Repot (1979:48). If (development) refers, broadly speaking to desirable social and economic progress …… (Even though) … people will always have different views about what is desirable. In spite of the divergence in opinion as to what is desirable. The report was sure that; certainly, development must mean improvement in living conditions, for which economic growth and industrialization are essential. But if there is no attention to quality of growth and to social change, one cannot speak of development (1979:48). One strong and significant qualification which the Brandt Report has made on its definition is worthy of special attention. And this is that; development is more than the passage from poor to rich, from a traditional rural economy to a sophisticated urban one. It carries with it, not only the idea of

economic betterment, but also a greater human dignity, security, justice and equity.

This views on the concept of development expressed in the Brandt Report are in some ways akin to those expressed by W. Rodney (1972). According to him, while at the individual level, development may denote an increase in one's skill and capacity greater freedom, capacity, self-discipline, responsibility and wellbeing, the same may mean "an increasing capacity to regulate both internal and external relationship". Rodney (1972), also emphasized that when applied to an entire human society, the concept of development proves to be a multi-faceted process. For instance, if the concept is considered from the angle of the past, according to Rodney (1972:10), it has meant increase in the ability to guard the independence of the social group, and indeed, to infringe upon the freedom of others. There is no gain saying the fact, that Walter Rodney's seminal work on Africa's developmental history, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa (London) 1972 is one of the most popular attempt made by a black to explain the development of Africa's underdevelopment form historical perspective.

The word development and its concept has remained elusive in meaning, arising from its multi-dimensional faces. However, in the context of this work, we shall limit its definition to denote a process and activities under-taken by a state, clearly defined with efficient planning focused on qualitative and quantitative changes in the society with multiplier effect on the people's standard of living, economy, polity, culture and general social well-being. It's a process and not static, progressing from one stage to another until the desired goal is appreciably achieved.

Development is a process and not a chance event. There are recognizable physical, social, political and economic factors whose interaction brings about development. To bring about development in a given region, these factors must be identified, mobilized and harnessed. This underlies the importance of proper planning in the process of economic development.

Under Development

Now that we have an idea of what the concept of "development" entails, we expect that it will be easier to understand what "under-development": means. Rodney (1972:2), is right when he observed that; one of the ideas behind under-development is a comparative one. This point of clarification is timely here, because, it is easy for people to presume that under-development is the opposite of development, or that it is the "absence of development". This is not true. The concept of underdevelopment is best understood when we see it as a means of comparing the level of development between two regions of the world, or of a country at a particular point in history, or between two epochs in the evolution of the same region or country. In essence, the concept is therefore, closely tied to the fact that human and social development has never been even. This, in short, is what the Brandt Report (1974:48) seems to be saying when it adds that; the actual patterns of structural transformation will tend to vary from one country to another to depending on a number of factors including resources, geography and the skills of the population. It is for this reason also, that critics of the Bretton Woods Institution, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the Word Bank have ceaselessly hold t that there are: no golden rules capable of universal application for economic development. Each country has to exploit the opportunities open to it for strengthening its economy (Brandt Report 1974: 48). Thus, the moment one part of a country or the world, or a period of a people's history begins to appear to have attracted more wealth or miseries than others, some probing and inquisitive minds would begin to ask, why.

This apparently, was the kind of condition that led a Scottish professor of moral philosophy, Adam Smith, to publish his seminal book, An inquiry into the Nature And Causes of Wealth of Nations, in 1776 with the major aim of explaining the underdevelopment of the rest of Europe Vis-à-vis Britain, which in the eighteenth century, had become more advanced economically, than her neighbours. The same can be said of Gunnar Myrdali's Asian Drama: Inquiry into the poverty of Nations (New York, Panther Random House) 1968.

Indeed, one of the Fundamental goals of the present study is to provide an historically valid answer to this question as it relates to the Nigerian state. It is this paper's aim to establish why, in spite of the great strides the peoples of this region

are said to have made in the past, particularly before the birth of Nigeria, the nation is still considered "poor" backward compared to other parts of the world. It is pertinent here to distinguish "no-development" from under-development. Whereas "no development" conjures a sense of stagnation, under-development refers to the inability of a state to effectively put into optimal use of her human and material resources for economic, political, cultural and social transformation in order to increase in its capacity to meet the citizen's basic human needs and rise in their standard of living. It is not same as economic growth it is a pre-requisite for laying the foundation for overall national development, if used as a catalyst for holistic development, which is cantered.

Dependency Theory: The theory of dependency is a revised version of Marxist theory on the topic of development and under development. It explains under-development with externalities which it posits has marginalized the countries tagged as "Third World" in the international system by the capitalist, imperialist and economically advanced superpowers. Their main argument is that the external relations with the super powers structured on capitalist global economy have produced an exploitative division of labour between a dominant core and subordinate periphery. In their summary, therefore, development and underdevelopment are synchronous and did not occur at different historical eras. Development they maintain, reinforces under-development as both are simultaneous phenomena.

Modernization Theory: Modernization theory in the light of contemporary scholarship is not just westernization as some had earlier opined. The theory insists that industrialization is the key to production for optimal profit from the global market. Investment in human capital and stable polity it argues, generate economic growth for total transformation of the society. This in turn improves the level of living in quantitative and qualitative terms. It suggests and encourages developing nations to use Western Europe as a model, where the industrial revolution changed their economic viability, with electrifying effects on their overall development as a people. The emphasis here is that third world nations such as Nigeria should toe the line of industrial revolution if she wants to get of the shackles of under development and the visual circle of poverty associated with underdevelopment.

Over the years, Nigeria's economy has remained largely a mono-economy and has substantially failed to sustain meaningful development in a comprehensive meaning of the concept. Though evidence showed that it has witnessed some structural changes and several development plans, adopted by successive regimes since the country's independence in 1960, none of these strategies has translated into reducing the country poverty level or taken her to any direction towards sustainable development. This is pathetic considering her vast natural and human resources has angered questions on why Nigeria still remain at the slum of development indices.

This situation is further complicated by her seeming reluctance to rise up to the challenge, by knowing what to do, when, how and ensuring it is alone in the best of ways to achieve positive outcome that is time bound. Instead, what has been obtained is the game of blame passed from one regime to another, one political administration pointing fingers at their predecessors being responsible for misappropriation of state funds. It paints a picture as if what makes for development is rhetoric and blame game diplomacy.

This paper critically assesses both the extrinsic and intrinsic sources of Nigeria's under development in time perspective. It dismisses the blame game as more of excuses than reason. To the country, while admitting the role of some externalities as among the constraints to her development, the work asserts that, the casual factors are internal, with self-annihilating consequences on economic growth and national development as a whole.

The work is set in three inter-connected parts. Part one examines in time perspectives Nigeria's troubled journey to development. This prepare the ground for part two which attempts a critique on Nigeria's development plans and strategies, and opines that none of these yielded celebrative results. The final segment of the work addresses the blame game among the political class who it identifies as the real cankerworm and the destroyer of the Nigeria's economic growth and development. It argues that other factors such as corruption, poor governance, policy disarticulation that are obstructive to development are the cancerous cells they inflict on Nigeria. It ends with recommendations on ways to

tame the spread of this devastating cancer that has affected the continent of Africa and Nigeria in particular.

Trouble Journey to Development in Time Perspective

The economy of Nigeria, the foundation of national growth and development, has over the years experienced several fundamental and structural transformations in response to change, intrinsic and intrusive. At independence, the economy was at "tutelage phase" depending largely on primary products for foreign exchange earnings. Agriculture dominated economic activities, with mining and manufacture at the periphery. Agricultural commodities were at the core of Nigeria's export earnings, while manufactured goods dominated imports. (Central Bank of Nigeria, CBN Report, 1993). The revenues earned form the oil boom of the early 1970s instead of turning the economy of Nigeria around to the positive path of sustainable development ironically beclouded the country with what one can describe as oil "doom". Instead of using the oil wind-fall for holistic national development, the excess accruals were spent on exotic goods, food importation, unguided huge public spending and profligacy, rise in wages and investments on non-revenue generating projects, unguided mass importation of all kind of food items that dwarfed local food production, forcing Agriculture to fall into destitute. According to the (CBN) report of 2014, Nigeria, by this turn of event, became a major food importer which stood at N116.40bn in 1998, at N119.87bn in 1999, N11134.81bn in 2000, N174.76bn in 2001 and eventually rose to an unimaginable level of N500bn in 2014. In the face of sharp fall in crude oil prices of the early 1980s, 1985, 1986 and 2015/2016, Nigeria's economy at morass with its consequent miasma. The impact has caused enormous build-up of fiscal and external deficits, and other macro-economic disequilibrium and imbalances. Today, it has come to an ugly extreme, were the constituent thirty-six states have to ask for bail-out loans to off-set back log of arrears of salary of civil servants and execution of statutory responsibilities of government.

Government failure on non-diversification of the economy, the decline in export crops and dependency on crude oil often shrinking in price from the volatile international market has over the years made Nigeria very vulnerable to economic shocks and down-turns. Successive government regimes had come up with economic blue print on which to situate development strategies to raise the

standard of living for the citizens of Nigeria. According to (Olukoshi 1993), the bedrock for Nigeria's economic development can be precisely located to begin in 1945, articulated lopsidedly by the colonial masters on import substitution and industrialization. The post-colonial state in the early years of independence ((1960s) built the nation's economic growth and expected a miracle to happen on industrial development. The core "objective of such a policy is to facilitate local manufacture of goods previously imported and though this require skills, either technological, managerial or organizational skill". Ayo (2012).

In the late 1960s and 1980s, the Nigerian state witnessed development plans rolled out to increase exchange earnings, generate employments, reduce income gap and poverty and achieve faster economic growth and development, through industrialization, expansion in Agriculture and critical infrastructures. According to (Okoh, 2014), during this period, Nigeria adopted and implemented four development plans.

The early 1980s witnessed recession in crude oil prices. However, to absorb the economic distress, the Nigerian state opted for what came to be popularized as austerity measure, a phenomenon that caused more hardship than comforts to the generality of the citizens of the country. The same period (1980s), came the strong hold of the International Monetary Fund, IMF on the economy and the unsolicited influences on the running of the economy than over-stretched by debt burden and debt servicing. By the fiat and prescription of the International Monetary Fund, the Nigerian state eventually succumbed to the unfavourable Structural Adjustment Programme, (SAP) in 1986.

The theoretical base of the structural adjustment programme (SAP) was couched on the deregulation of the economy. Its rationale was derived largely form the equilibrium theory, which amongst others stresses on the electrifying effects of efficient pricing for optimal management of scarce resources for efficient productivity and distribution of goods and services. It tied its thesis on competition, trade, liberalization under a free and competitive market economy. The end result, it argues equalizes supply and demand, and in the long run translates into profitability for the competing producers of goods and services, price stability and sustainable economic growth and development. The number

one objective of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), was deregulation. According to (Kupolokun 2005), this has to do with market export driven economy, increase in production, privatization, withdrawal of subsidies and liberalization. The derivative gains of SAP as in the case of Brazil and that of Mexico was to stabilize the economy through the instrument of diversification, relax government monopoly through private participation to finally position Nigeria on a path of economic growth and sustainable development.

Troubled by Nigeria's economic quagmire and arrested development, the then Military Head of State General Sani Abacha introduced a paradigm shift in economic and national development when he launched Vision 2010 Economic Plan in September, 1996. According to Obasi (2001), Vision 2010 Economic Plan is a Social Advancement Programme which is aimed at improving life quality and the eradication of poverty through a policy of sustained human centered development, local capacity building and industrialization by the year 2010. The vision was therefore tied to the idea of poverty eradication, provision of basic needs, productivity and prioritization of human capital development. In summary, the vision was designed to be a remediation for poverty and under-development through the stimulation of the nation's humongous development potentials, believed to be lying waste.

In the Fourth Republic, when Chief Olusegun Obasanjo came to power as a democratically elected President (1999-2007) his administration articulated the programme of Vision 2020, a holistic economic and development plan to make the country one of the twenty largest economies in the world by the year 2020. This vision was tied to the Nigerian Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) by addressing the constraints to Nigeria's development and competitiveness in the globalized economy. It was aimed at transforming all critical infrastructures, social, political, economic and cultural dimensions necessary for sustainable growth and development. Put categorically, Vision 20:20-20 was comprehensive in its capture of hindrances to development, the remedial measures and the strategic intents to translate policies into results on its mandate.

Late President Umaru Yar' Adua, on assumption of office in 2009, initiated and constituted the National Council on 20:20-20, with members cutting across all Stake-holders from bottom to top. In synchrony with the goals of the vision, he rolled out his administration's seven point agenda on the seven critical sectors, namely; the Polity, Macro economy, Infrastructure development, Education, Health, Agriculture, and Manufacturing. The administration led by Goodluck Jonathan continued with the seven-point agenda of Yar' Adua, under the branded name known as "Transformation Agenda", without much change in content and intents. The sectors he achieved moderate success were in Agriculture and Education.

Evaluation of Nigeria's Development Goals

The implementation success or otherwise of Nigeria's development efforts from pre-colonial and post-colonial periods are the bedrock on which we base our evaluation. During the pre-colonial era, what was obtained in the contention of O.C.C Ama-Ogbari (2005), was traditional economic activities, basically primitive means of farming, indigenous methods of manufacture and trade on locally made goods as was in the Western world (Europe) before the industrial revolution occurred in the18th century. This event of things he argued changed with the advent of Christianity, colonialism and the abolition of the obnoxious slave trade and its subsequent replacement with the legitimate trade.

In the eras of Euro-Nigeria's trade relations, following the abolition of the slave trade and its supplanting with the legitimate trade, she was encouraged to produce raw materials to service the European industries, which were exchanged at ludicrous cheap prices for expensive finished products manufactured in Europe. The high exchange rate and the lop-sidedness in such economic relations sustained by fetish imperialism and its close associate colonialism, produces dependency and core-periphery exploitative relationships. The manifestation of these economic exploitations suffocated Nigeria's growth and development and sent parking local industries which would have favorably competed with industries in Europe.

The road to development is long and difficult. It does not occur all of a sudden, but over time, after several years of efforts, trials and errors. The West is aware of

this, but of more importance is their silence for well over a century of exploitation and plunder of the valuable resources of the continent of Africa. Great Britain, as other European colonialist in Africa, did very little to develop Nigeria, or ran the economy to the best of the colonized people. C. Ake (1981) accused the colonial masters of refusal to operate a people oriented economy (development) as profits were expatriated, instead of investing part of it into industrialization. Rather, the economy was patterned to serve wholly the interest of Britain and to ensure its subjugation to the economy of the metropolitan state. The colonial masters did not take steps to create any concrete institution or policies for the acceleration of economic growth and sustainable development. Instead, she was an economic tumor on Nigeria's economy, which she looted. This limitless looting and political and bureaucratic corruption one can submit is the beginning of the disturbing high level of official corruption in the Nigerian state.

During the colonial era, the colonial government did not take steps to map out directions to follow on development for the future of the young nation. This offers clarity to Nigeria's confusion on development strategies, been that its erstwhile colonizer, Great Britain, never prepared her along that line. Nigeria was pulled into the orbit of the global international capitalist system at the periphery, without consultation within the people on its desirability or otherwise. What seems to appear as a development blueprint was scratchy in the 1946 Arthur Richard's constitution and indirectly expressed with the phrase a political system which in itself advance and contain the living possibility of further orderly social and political unity. (Dispatch from the Governor of Nigeria to the Secretary of State for the colonies, December 6, 1944).

It is pertinent to point out her that the import substitution industrialization of the 1960s was a development camouflage hatched during the colonial era and swallowed hook line and sinker by the post-colonial state of Nigeria. It raised hopes that never equalled with the realities on industrial take-off and transfer of Western technology. It ended up in strengthen the forces of Western imperialism, to the development advantage of capitalist predators, still in the business of aggressive exploitation.

By the undeniable reality that development is a continuous process, the position here is that every country is still progressing in the process. No country has come to the end of it, contrary to the flared conception of modernization theorist. This gives explanation to the unending exploitation and "economic gang rape" of Africa by the capitalist West countries. As a result of the failure of the import substitution industrialization to facilitate local manufacture of goods through acceleration of industrial development, Nigeria opted for and adopted export promotion policy to attain favorable level of economic and industrial growth by looking inwards for generation of exchange earnings, food security, employment and poverty reduction. It found expression in transformations in Agriculture, small and medium size entrepreneurs and other low intensive industries. In all, its contributions to industrialization and economic development are not satisfactory. Prior to vision 20:20-20, Nigeria has attempted five development plans. Sadly, none of these robust ambitions was impressively realized to have faith in government. She has over the years continued to live at the slum of the globalized market economy, with majority of her citizens wallowing in abject poverty, disease and severe hunger.

In spite of billions of Naira spent on the program of Vision 20:20-20, the state of the economy and decay of critical infrastructure obviously portrays Nigeria as lacking in intentions, strategy and executive capacity to turn the nation into one of the biggest global economies. No wonder the then Director General of Bureau for public enterprise Dr. Benjamin Dike, in his interview at Abuja during the programme, the reformer, on Monday, March 25th, 2014 categorically pointed out that Nigeria since Fifty years of independence has not been investing in anything. He lamented on the mass exodus of manufacturing companies from Nigeria to Ghana, due to the cost of self-powered sources of energy supply.

The annals of Nigeria's poverty reduction policies/programmes are as follows;
The River Basin Development Authority
Operation Feed the Nation
People's Bank
The National Agricultural Land Development Authority
The Green Revolution
National Directorate of Employment

The National Accelerated Food Production Programme
Better Life for Rural Women
Forum Settlement
National Poverty Alleviation Programme
Agricultural Credit Guarantee scheme fund and Rural Banking
Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure.

Satirically, on the surface, these programmes may tempt an individual to consider them as government's sincere commitment to curb the rise in poverty and underdevelopment, but in reality they served as legalized institutions for draining of public funds into the private bank accounts of politicians, political contractors and government officials in charge of their implementations. As a result of this corruption, the beneficiaries had always been the very rich and not the targeted masses for which the programme was intended for. Above all, absence of continuity and sustainability, monitoring and periodic evaluations made many of these programmes to fail in their mandate. The very fact that Nigeria is still ranked among the poorest of the poor in the ranking index of poverty driven countries leaves no one in doubt any longer on this paper's position that the nation's leadership class have failed completely in the execution of national development plans over the years. At best, all of these programmes are cosmetic appearances created by her ruling elite to hoodwink and deceive the citizens into believing that they have concern for the pitiable condition of the masses for which the state is striving to find a solution.

For example, in the World Bank (2008) ranking of progress by developing countries toward development, Nigeria comes a distant of 94th from the 87th position she occupied a year earlier. On basic requirements for growth and competitiveness, she was placed on 105th position on the global scale (World Bank Development Report 2012). Till the present, this uninspiring condition has not changed in spite of her widely publicized economic growth that has not translated into reduction of unemployment, poverty and improvement in the delivery of social goods to the citizens.

Consequently, Ahumihe and Anaelechi (2011) cited the statistician General of the Federation that 32.5m Nigerians are unemployed representing 21.7% of the

population. Similarly, in Ogbonna's (2009) analysis, Nigeria's disappointing position on global economic matrix means that out of her over 140m population, over 90 million are still living below poverty line. Relatively, the National Bureau of Statistics (2012) report shows that unemployment increased from 12.3% in 2006 to 23.9 percent in 2011. Ogbu and Emejo (2012) in their evaluation of poverty in Nigeria opine that poverty and unemployment have continued to be on the high increase compare to previous years.

About 112.5 million Nigerians (out of her population of over 140 million) are considered poor, judging by the living standard in the country (Ayo, 2012) p. 34. These disclosures are disheartening and at least to the reality of the offending level Nigeria's development has been degraded steadily over the years. They contrast sharply with the boastings of the Central Bank of Nigeria, CBN (2014) on the impressive growth of the economy, still hanging in the mid-air, while the citizens are yet anxiously waiting for its arrival to end their grinding poverty and wide income disparity between them and the few extremely rich class of the society.

Nigerian President (Muhammadu Buhari's) administration during his state visit to India and in different international conferences on the poor state of Nigeria's economy (in spite of many past years of stupendous oil revenues) confirms the extent the country has nose-dived into intractable poverty. The present administration is still overcrowded in a deep sea of confusion on what direction to take, in order not to replicate the mistakes of the past. For now, all hopes seem to have lost, as the economy of Nigeria has moved from bad to worse, due to the new policy of change in the colour of the Nation's currency of one thousand, five hundred and two hundred naira notes. This has brought about so much economic hardship to the citizens of Nigeria in a magnitude that has never been experienced in the history of Nigeria. The scarcity of the naira in circulation has brought untold hardship to the people to the extent that the average Nigerian has to buy his own money at 30%, 40% and other times 50% as the few bank notes in circulation are being traded upon by bank operators and their POS agents. Meanwhile, the leadership of Nigeria instead of tackling the real problem they are too busy complaining of looted economy and corruption of past administration, for his inability to deliver on his election promises. This has thus raise the issue of the game of blame which this study attempts to x-ray.

The Game of Blame

The root causes of Nigeria's very low performance in development index ranking instead of being frankly admitted have become a game of blame of a kind. The game of blame by the stand point of this study is more of excuses than sound reasons to accept the obvious by the leadership class in the polity. The political gladiators shift the blame to the ghost of the past namely, colonization, imperialism and capitalism, which they argue are still haunting Nigeria. When the steam of this cools off as it sometimes does, they trade the blame among themselves and between them and the military that ruled the nation for a period of about three and half a decade. At another time as realities of poor governance emerge, they pass the blame game to matters of corruption, social conflict, inconsistent macro-economic policy and policy reversals, huge debt over hangs, financial recklessness (Fiscal indiscipline), government monopoly of production (rigid regulation), absence of proficient coordination among levels of government, poor implementation of development plans, low industrial absorptive capacity, faulty educational system, lack of political will, institutional ineffectiveness and disunity among the major ethnic groups, mismanagement of human and material resource and so on. However, in the scholarship of discordant tunes on the causes of Nigeria's dismal rating on development, it is nothing but the game of blame and excuses. Mainly, two antagonistic views have emerged on the theoretical dramatization. The two are (i) the modernization which is best represented by Rowstow (1961) and (ii) the Neo-Marxists/Dependency theorists, pioneered by Latin American scholars, notably Gunder (1979) Amir (1976) Rodney, (1960). Their opinions on development and under-development had earlier been briefly discussed in this paper, thus there is no need dwelling on them here again. The two points of views the study have adopted for the explanation of development and underdevelopment are seriously flawed by their neglect on peculiarities and different circumstances among nations groups or classified as developing nations/emergent states. Each has its own peculiar challenges. This makes generalization in applicable to all of them because amongst them are national cohesion, policy inclination, internal and pathological contradictions.

Even in the much over stressed colonialism, imperialism, neo-colonialism and now globalization, different nations received different strokes. The neglect of the modernization and Neo-Marxist/dependency theorist to recognize these realities

is a big minus to the credibility of their thesis. Historical evidence has shown that every human society is transitory and not static, transiting from one stage to another, until it gets to the desired goal. After all, the very essence of political economy in the definition of Collier (2009) is all about the sources of political power and its use for economic ends.

Overall, the image in the literatures of the dependency school of thought has been one which makes the unwary to admit their postulation that development and underdevelopment are a direct consequences of capitalism, imperialism and colonialism. These they submitted have sustained and institutionalized income gaps among countries. They create the impression that international institutions are designed and scripted to ensure irreversible permanent exploitation and marginal involvement of emergent states, with the developed nations at the commanding heights.

Maybe unintentionally or deliberately, they have left the impression that Europe and United States of America (USA) are the sole proprietors of the global economy. Admittedly, granted that Europe and America colonized foreign lands and are referenced bench mark for capitalism and democracy. Their limelight in the globalized world market economy is not an ambition either to arrest or annihilate economic development/overall development of emergent states. Agreed that in international politics, the super powers have remained at the apex of dominance through the international organizations they created at a period when the emergent states were still under colonialism, the latter have at their dispositions the various inter-governmental organizations, IGOs, through which they can exercise great influence on international matters. Even at that, there are evidence on variations in economic performance and standard of living among the supposedly developed nations. The conclusion here reveals that development and under-development have in it both external and internal links to it.

In Nigeria's case, what accounts for the nation's poor rating in economic growth and development are more of domestic factors than foreign. At independence, she was a still birth, and its managers have done very little to breath healthy life into her. Those who step into the corridors of power at independent made no frantic efforts at improving the new state from its inherent obstacles to growth and

development. Change was not put in place or conceived for the transformation of the emergent state. The state was however reduced by its leaders into a private estate, which began another rise of internal colonialism, the ethnic majors dominating the minors, a situation which was worse than the colonial state before it.

The leaders did not aspire for morphogenic change to restructure and re-order the institutions of the state for a new order from the colonial state. There were complete absence of development and transformation changes to dismantle the old order of colonial exploitation and economic plunder, neither did the ruling class create a new mind-set, values, visions, nor principles and national character, or strong institutions for organizing the post-colonial state towards development and steady and progressive development. Rather, the leadership of the new state limited the concept of the state to prebendalism, and primitive accumulation of public funds. What was obtainable in Nigeria after independence as in other parts of the continent of Africa was what Turok (1987) described as emergence of bourgeoisie and nouvre rich, who manipulated state power for their own private interest. The post-colonial political leaders did not depart form the colonial state mode of production and economic activities because both were convenient to their greed and prosperity. The pipit and comprador bourgeoisie made no concrete attempt to reverse the negative vestiges of colonial exploitation, but saturated their brain with struggle to win and hold onto power for control of public funds for selfish gains. According to Babawale (2002), the inclination for power perpetuity fostered greed, corruption and we have to add also averse to transparency and public accountability. Overtime, accumulated moral bankruptcy exploded into overwhelming embarrassing political and institutional corruption, class antagonism, social unrest, political and economic distortions, culture and values pollution.

The cankerworm destroying the economy and impediment to its sustainable growth and development is corruption and lack of political will to implement policies. Though the nation's Gross Domestic Product is $510bn, put at 5 percent growth rate by 2015, thus making it the third recipient of foreign direct investment (FDI). These figures and statistics are misleading because they lack concrete evidence of proof on poverty reduction level, unemployment and infrastructural

development. The virus on Nigeria's sustainable growth and development is corruption. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) alleged $400bn of Nigeria's money were stolen or looted in the last forty years (Adawale, 2015). Others are lack of political will and visionary leadership, budgetary-fiscal indiscipline, non-diversification of the economy, policy disarticulation, poor implementation of national budget and development plans, disunity among the component ethnic groups, non-accountability to the electorate, low industrial capacity, weak institutions to mention but a few.

These challenges and road blocks to development are not external dynamics, but creations of the political leadership (past and present military and civilian regimes), who must claim responsibility for the blame. Corruption is a "Child" of Nigeria and our leadership groomed and nurtured it to old age and is doing everything possible to ensure it continue to survive so far it serves their interest. From these emerging facts, the blame game on Nigeria's poor development index is diversionary and must be considered as such.

In terms of comparison, the colonial masters of Nigeria are far better leaders than our post-colonial leadership. Perhaps Nigeria would have developed more than what is obtainable today if we had still been under the British rule up till today. It is therefore high time we stop pointing fingers and heaping all our blames of under-development on white conspiracy instead of black conspiracy (Anaele, 2003). Conscious of the fact that while corruption and poor governance cut across several developing nations, the case of Nigeria and the numerous social evils it has generated and reinforced seem to assume tragic and peculiar dimensions.

Summary and Conclusion

This paper has carefully examined the development question in the Nigerian state and is attendant game of blame. It assesses the different stages of Nigeria's development under three but inter-related periods; the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial eras. The study further opines that in spite of the various development plans and poverty reduction policies, the country has still remained trapped in under-development and its accompanying human sufferings. The work identifies both internal and external sources of information, poor development index, but focuses more on the internal contradictions as the fundamental causes

of her poverty amongst numerous resources endowments. It identifies finally the economic, social and political backwardness of Nigeria on corruption, poor governance and leaders without vision.

The study concludes by maintaining that the main cause of our continued under-development is leadership and the soaring rate of celebrated institutionalized corruption among the political class.

Recommendations

To find a lasting solution to Nigeria's developmental challenges, which this study has x-rayed, the primary sources, her leaders must fight the cancer of corruption head on with the capital punishment of death or life imprisonment without sparing any individual or group of persons found guilty. The Nigerian state should as a matter of urgency undergo proper restructuring to reflect true federalism, where the rule of law is regard for human rights are upheld. Social justice must prevail at all times, and sense of belonging given to all citizens irrespective of tribe or religion. The Nigerian state should mobilize her vast human population for hard work and to think more on what they can give to their country than what they can get form it. Furthermore, she should reform her education system to reflect global contemporary realities in the areas of science and technical and technology sector. There is also the urgent need for her to evolve indigenous technologies appropriate to her raw materials as dependence on trans-national/multinational Corporation for technological transfer has not helped over the years. Nigeria should embark on an export led industrialization in the manufacture of goods from her raw materials. The nation should as a matter of imperative, fund researches adequately in Agriculture and her numerous natural resources lying waste, for the diversification of the nation's economy.

Reference

Abraham M.F (1982). *Modern Sociological Theory*. New York: Oxford.

Abubakar, S. (2008). "The challenges of Nation building: Nigeria which way forward|"
in Ogbogbo C.B.N. and Okpeh, O.O. (eds) *Interrogating contemporary Africa: Dike memorial lectures* 1999-2007. Ibadan: BWright Publishers.

Achebe, C. (1983). *The trouble with Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension publishing co. Ltd.

Adesina, O.A. (2008). "European Penetration and is Influence on African culture and civilization" in Akinwimi, O.O. Okpeh and J.D Gwamma (eds) *Intergroup Relations in Nigeria during the 19th and 20th centuries*. Markurdi; Aboki publishers.

Adewale K. (2015). *Buhari challenges in Nigeria* News Gide.

Ake, C.A. (1981). *Political Economy of Africa*. Ibadan; Longman Nigeria.

Ama-Ogbari C.C.O. (2009). "Economic Resources, potential and development in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria" in Ifeanyi Anagbogu. *Essays on Nigeria Economic History* (Anambra Nigeria).

Amir, S (1976). *Unequal Development*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Amir, Samir, (1972). "Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa" origins and contemporary forms", *Journal of Modern African Studies*. Pp. 1-15.

Andah, B.E (1982). *African Development in cultural perspective*. Occasional publication of the department archaeology and Anthropology University of Ibadan.

Austen R. (1987) *African Economic History*. London; Heinemann Educational Books.

Ayo, M. (2012). *Issues of Development and poverty reduction in Nigeria*. Makurdi Destiny Ventures.

Babawale, T. "Nigeria in the crisis of Governance and development: retrospective and prospective analysis of selected issues and events" *in political economy of development, governance and globalization* Vol. 1. Pp. 15-21.

Balade, A.A and Adalemo,. I. A, "Internal colonialism in the National Development Process: some conceptual and theoretical issues" in *Nigerian economy; A Political economy approach. Nigeria economic society*/Longman, London. N.d, pp. 11-25.

Brandt, Willy: (1979) North-South: A programme for survival (The report of the Independent commission on international development issues) The Hague. C.B.N Report 1993

C.B.N Report 2001

C.B.N Report 2012

Cookey, S.J.S. "Colonalism and process of under-developmnt in Nigeria". *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, xiv, 1-2, pp. 19-31.

Crowder. M. (1976). *West Africa under colonial rule* (Hutchison and c., London).

Gunder. F. (1979). Dependent Accumulatn and under-development; New York. Monthly Review Press.

Isichei, E. (1983). *A history of Nigeria* (Longman, Essex).

Kupolokwu, F. "Liberalization: The Experience of the Nigerian Petorleum sector in Alexanders Gas and Oil Connectiosn. Vol. 110 No. 2 pp. 85-90.

Lenin V.I (1975). Imperialism: the highest stage of capitalism. Peking: foreign language press.

Ofonagoro, W.I (1979). *Trade and imperialism in southern Nigeria, 1881-1929* (Nok publisher's int. New York).

Okowa, W.T. (1991). *The political economy of development planning in Nigeria*. Pam Unique Publishing House Ltd Ozuoba.

Okowa, W.T. (1996). *How the tropics under-developed the Negro: A questioning of Theory of development.* Para graphics, Port-Harcourt.

Palmer, Robin, and Parson, Neil, (1977). *The roots of rural poverty in central and Southern Africa*. London.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe under-developed Africa.* Bogle-l' Overture Publications, London.

Rodney, W. (1982). *West Africa and eh Atlantic Slave Trade.* Afrographica Publishers, Lagos.

Rostow, W.W. (1967) *The stages of Economic Growth; A non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge University Press.

Rotberg, I. Robert. (1971). *Imperialism, Colonialism and Hunger in West and Central Africa*. Lexington Books, Toronto.

Tamuno, T.N. (1978). *The Evolution of the Nigerian state; the southern phase, 1898-1914*. Longman Essex.