



Dependency and Underdevelopment Theory: Exploring the Implication for State Of Underdevelopment in Nigeria

Asadu Ikechukwu, Ph.D

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Department of Public Administration and Local Government

E-mail: ikejustin2@gmail.com

Corresponding author: ikejustin2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Development is one of the global challenges facing many nations. While some countries are regarded as developed others are described as underdeveloped or developing. Various theories have been advanced by scholars to explicate the causes of development and underdevelopment. Among these theories are Marxist theory, political development theory, modernization theory and dependency theory. The objective of this paper is to employ dependency theory in examining how incorporation of Nigeria into international capitalist system via colonialism, capitalism and imperialism has contributed to state of underdevelopment in Nigeria. The methodology of the study is qualitative and descriptive. Relevant data were generated through secondary sources and the data generated were subjected to contextual-descriptive analysis. The finding shows that the integration of Nigeria economy into international capitalist economy subjected the country to producer of cheap raw materials for advanced capitalist states and consumer of imported manufactured commodities. This exposed the economy to exploitation, dependency and underdevelopment. The paper, among other thing, recommends that Nigeria leaders and policy makers should re-direct its economic policies and look inward for indigenous enterprise and technology for industrial development. Experiences in the past indicated that Nigeria has the human capacity to develop but only that the political will to encourage such ingenuity is lacking

Key words: underdevelopment, dependency, theory, colonialism, imperialism

INTRODUCTION

Development is a worldwide phenomenon that has preoccupied the efforts of both developed and developing nations. Whereas development is a multi-dimensional process through which the various potentials of man are developed to actualize his aspirations which include improved standard of living, reduction of material deprivations and

sustainable socio-cultural, economic and political setting, underdevelopment is the deprivation of these prime aspirations of man (Ghai, 1988; Seer, 1969). Development is dynamic and oriented towards the fulfillment of humans needs within his definite environment. Goulet (1971) asserted that underdevelopment depicts a real fact of life reflecting a state of mind and a state of nation poverty. The import of development underscores the escalating efforts by developed nations to sustain their achievements while the underdeveloped as well as developing nations are preoccupied with diverse measures aimed at improving their socio-economic and political lives. The attendant consequence of variation in the state of development among different nations of the world has stimulated a wide range of debates on the root of underdevelopment and the best possible approach of moving forward. Diverse theories have been propounded by some famous scholars to grant explanations for the variations between development in the advanced nations and sorry state of underdevelopment in the Third World countries. Among these theories, which are ideologically, historically and situationally influenced are the modernization theory/capitalist economic theory, the Marxist/socialist theory, the political economy theory and the dependency theory (Rostow, 1960; Almond and Powell,1966; Dos Santos 1970).In view of the failure of some of these theories, particularly modernization cum capitalist theory to offer comprehensive explanations for the state of underdevelopment in Africa, Nigeria inclusive, this paper adopt the dependency theory to elucidate how colonialism, neo-colonialism, capitalism and imperialism enormously contributed to underdevelopment in Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the work is qualitative and descriptive. Primary source of data collection was adopted. Consequently, relevant data were elicited from government documents, conference papers, books, internet material, periodicals and journals written by renowned scholars on development theories. The generated data were subjected to contextual-descriptive analysis. The theoretical framework employed was dependency theory advanced by scholars such as Dos Santos (1970); Nkurumah (1965); Offiong (1980); Amin (1972) etc

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS AND ANALYSIS

In the field of Social Sciences, virtually every concept is a subject of controversy. Varieties of meanings and expressions are associated with a particular term or concept as influenced by the circumstances or ideological inclination of the scholar. Thus, there is hardly a consensus among scholars in the field on what precisely a particular variable expresses or represents. Consequently, an intellectual discourse of this nature presupposed the inevitable clarification of some key concepts employed.

Development

The term development has been variously defined and conceptualized by scholars, which at times are influenced by disciplinary orientation, wide generalizations and assumptions. The orthodox economists are of the view that development is a measure in terms of national economy. In terms of Gross National Product, it is the total monetary or market value of all final goods and services produced by the residents or nationals of an economy during an accounting period. In this sense, development is synonymous with economic growth. However, this notion of development is quantitative and may not reflect the rate of distribution and well being of the people. Seer (1969) contends that economic progress is merely a constituent of development and not development in itself. He demonstrated that development encompass more than material and financial side of life. Accordingly, he conceives development as ‘a multi-dimensional process involving the re-organization, and re-orientation of entire economic and social system. Impliedly, development embodies growth of human capabilities and potentials accompanied by progressive reduction of material deprivation and social inequalities, which flow from structural changes and modernization. Exponents of cultural modernization and western liberalists view development as “a process of change in which the goal is modernity”. According to Agbakoba (2003), this view perceives development as revolving around and locating those qualities of western societies, which are absent in traditional societies, and making the latter accept them. They argued that for development to occur the various socio-cultural norms and practices have to be substituted for modern scientific culture. One of the prominent scholars of cultural modernization theory, Rostow (1960) went

further to delineate the five stages of economic development which include: traditional society, precondition to take off, take off stage: drive to maturity and mass consumption. Nonetheless, modernization theory's idea of development has been criticized severely as being an instrument for the propagation of capitalism, imperialism and its consequent dependency. Frank (1969) described Rostow's stages of economic development as 'fictional and utopia' for being incapable of illustrating discernibly a linkage between the stages. Exponents of political development theory, which is akin to capitalist view of development, conceived development from the political and administrative point of view. Almond and Powell (1966), argue that political development occurs to the extent that political system undergoes cultural secularization and structural differentiation. As the political system develops, it acquires greater capabilities, equality, participation and distribution. Ake (1979) has long dismissed this view as being ideologically biased as well as an instrument of imperialism. Marxist scholars such as Rodney (1982); Duru (1998) and Nnadozie (1990), Ake (1979) have made some salient contributions to the definition of development. According to Walter-Rodney, development implies an overall social process, which is reliant upon the product of man's efforts to deal with his natural environment. This entails an increased skill and capability to do things, greater freedom, self-confidence, creativity, self-discipline, and material well being. In a related manner, Duru (1998) describes development as a process of socio-economic and political transformation of problem generating structures in such a way that it leads to enhancement in the level of living of the people including income, education, health and nutrition and other related social services, decreasing inequality in the distribution of income, urban-rural imbalances and political as well as economic opportunities. Nnadozie quoted in Duru (1998), on his part sees development as the competence of members of the society to actualize their needs and potentials by participating keenly in the social engineering of their lives and fate. At this juncture, it is imperative to state that development is dynamic and qualitative with direction towards individuals in particular and society at a large. It involves the capabilities of man in overcoming his socio-economic and political problems both as an individual and group. Thus, for the purpose

of this paper development encompasses self reliance of individual and society; quality medical care, improved standard of living, equal access to social service: improved skills and potentials, employment opportunities, qualitative education, equitable economic opportunities and independent control of the economy. The end product of development is improved well being for man in his environment.

Underdevelopment

Similar to the concept development, underdevelopment is a subject of controversy with scholars taking divergent views that are ideologically influenced. Conventional economists in line with their views on development see underdevelopment as a decline in the Gross National Product of a country. In this perspective, underdevelopment means a dwindle in economic growth and per capita income (Obiajulu and Anthony, 2004). It is a demonstration of total plunge in the nation's output in terms of monetary value of total goods and services produced in a given state. Nevertheless, underdevelopment depicts more than low level of output or per capita income. As Goulet (1971), asserted underdevelopment depicts a real fact of life reflecting a state of mind and a state of poverty. According to him, underdevelopment is an expression of three components: incapability to achieve the core value of life sustenance, self-esteem and freedom. Modernization theorists such as Rostow, Smelster, Warren, Mecllelland, Hagan and Hoselitz, viewed underdevelopment as the deficiency of modern cultural value such as universalism, specificity, self orientation, achievement orientation, individualism free competition and structural transformation of the environment (Rostow, 1960). Modernization theory argues that the Third World countries are underdeveloped because their societies are characterized by particularism, ascription, collectivity, affectivity, non-achievement oriented and diffuseness. Almond and Powell (1966) included absence of political system capability, differentiation and secularization. However, this position on underdevelopment has been dismissed as a historical fallacy. As Rodney (1982) observed, every society have to develop at its own pace. Development is relative and differs from place to place. The Marxist view of underdevelopment has a qualitative measure. Underdevelopment exists when the people of other nations stopped the process of

development in other nations through exploitation and this has given rise to dependency, inequality, abject poverty and backwardness in those countries which had suffered centuries of exploitation and human degradation (Obiajulu and Anthony 2004). Thus, we conceive underdevelopment to mean the deprivation of the fundamental elements of development such as self reliance of individual and society, qualitative education, improved standard of living, equal access to social service and potentials and independent control of the economy. These are concomitant with a situation in which the institutions of a country in the periphery of international capital maintain a dependent relationship with other countries at the centre of the national economy. It means the subordination of internal economic and political institution to the influence of external forces from the centre, which entails the lack of real autonomy and is a function of poverty.

Colonialism

The word 'colonialism' is derived from the word "colony", a name that is used to identify a nation's dependency abroad. According to Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary colonialism is 'a trait of colonial life or speech', 'the colonial system', 'the policy of obtaining or maintaining hold over colonies, especially with the purpose of exploiting them'. Accordingly, colonialism is based on the theory that overseas settlements should be treated as 'proprietary domains exploited for the benefits of the mother colony' (Olisa, Okoli and Nwabufo, 1990). Colonialism is the maintenance of political supremacy over a conquered or scrambled overseas territory by advanced nations for the reason of economic exploitation or an amalgamation with others. It the practice or process of exercising direct right and control over the socio-economic and political affairs of a given state or nation-state by alien power (Asadu, 2014). It is also viewed as practice whereby a state is under direct political control of foreign state with superior powers. Simply, colonialism is alien rule and dominion over the socio-economic and political affairs of a state considered to be inferior in terms of authority relation with the colonizing state (Asadu, 2014). Colonialism is not the same with imperialism and neo-colonialism.

Neo-colonialism

According to Nkurumah (1965), neo-colonialism is the last stage of imperialism. It is a situation of political independent but economical dependent. According to Nkurumah, today's neo-colonialism represents the final and perhaps the most dangerous state of imperialism. Its nature is continued reliance on the global capitalist system, which has acutely impeded development in the Third World. Neo-colonialism depicts a situation of political sovereignty, but economic reliance. Neo-colonialism exists when the economy of a sovereign nation is indirectly controlled and exploited by authoritative foreign nations, which it depends on economically (Asadu, 2014). Neo-colonialism is a form of imperialism through which industrialized states become in charge of foreign nations by economic dominance while respecting the formal political autonomy of those nations. Obiajulu and Anthony (2004) describe neo-colonialism as a system by which the former colonial powers and other developed nations of the world is indirectly in command of states previously under colonial rule after gaining self-government. Precisely, neo-colonialism entails incessant control of the economic affair of an independent nation by their previous colonial master or their collaborators such as Multinational Corporation, IMF' or World Bank.

Imperialism

The phenomena associated with imperialism include monopolistic privilege and preferences, pillage of raw materials, capture of territory, enslavement of the indigenous population, nationalism, racism and militarism (Offiong, 1980). There is a general accord in associating imperialism with economic, political, cultural and territorial expansion; however, there is much controversy about the meaning of economic imperialism. Imperialism and neo-colonialism are products of colonialism and capital accumulation. Imperialism refers to economic and political exploitation of a nation's or state's economy by advanced capitalist states. It is political and economic exploitation of poor nations by powerful nation (Asadu, 2014). Imperial growth reflected domestic capitalist pursuit to maintain proceeds level via export of surplus capital and this in turn brought capitalist powers into clash with another, the resulting conflict being fundamentally an imperialist war in the sense that it was fought for the control of colonies. Economic imperialism is

the subordination or domination of one country or a group of countries by another for the main purpose of formal or informal control of domestic economic resources for the benefit of the subordinating or dominating power, and at the expense of the local people and their economy. The imperialist power controls foreign exchange, public and private savings, agriculture and mineral, transportation, communication, manufacturing and commercial facilities. Lenin (1965) conceived imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism. It emerged as the expansion and direct continuation of the essential distinctiveness of capitalism. But capitalism only became capitalist imperialism at a specific and very high point of the development when certain of its basic characteristics began to transform into their opposites, when the features of the era of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves all along the line. The term imperialism is used in two senses, one broad, the other narrow (Ake, 1979). In its the broader usage, imperialism is the subordination of one country to another or an attempt to subordinate one country to another in order to maintain a relation of asymmetrical exchange. The stricter usage of imperialism makes it an economic phenomenon. In this sense, imperialism is a stage in the progress of the capitalist mode of production. In the context of this paper, imperialism should be understood to mean the socio-cultural, economic, political and military subordination of one country to another with the main purpose of controlling the socio-cultural, economic, political and military resources of the subordinated countries; thereby making them dependent on the subordinating country for the sole purpose of exploitation.

Dependency

Dependency is an upshot of imperialism. It is the state of affairs that the history of colonial imperialism has left and that which contemporary imperialism creates in underdeveloped countries. Dependency is imperialism viewed from the point of view of underdevelopment. It is a conditioning situation in which the precise histories of development and underdevelopment transpire in various societies. Dependency is a situation in which a certain group of countries have their economy conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy, to which the former is subject. The



relation of interdependence between two or more economies, and between these and world trade assumes the form of dependence when some countries (the dominant) can expand and give impulse to their own development, while other countries (the dependant) can only develop as a reflection of this expansion (Dos Santos 1970). The dominant countries have a technological, commercial, capital resources and social political prevalence over the dependent countries. This permits them to impose condition of exploitation, and eliminate part of the domestically produced surplus. This basic situation leads to universal situation in dependent countries that situate them in backwardness and under the exploitation of the dominant countries. Therefore, dependency is processes of incorporating a country into an association of uneven exchange in which the integrating (dominated) country maintains absolute authority over the aspirations and needs of the integrated and as such take advantage of the general resource of the dependent for the progress of the independent. The resultant outcome is underdevelopment in the incorporated country.

DEPENDENCY AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT THEORY: A CRITICAL REVIEW

One of the foremost critics of modernization theory was Frank (1969) who came up with the dependency theory of development or underdevelopment theory. This theory argues that the underdevelopment of Third World countries is the upshot of their absorption into the world capitalist system. According to Frank, underdevelopment in the Third World country is the end result of neo-imperialistic structure, which creates centre-periphery association between the vastly developed capitalist society and the Third World countries. This relationship in which the Third World countries are converted into sheer producers of raw materials makes the Third World countries to be always reliant on the metropolitan capitalists. The effect of this is the expropriation and appropriation of surplus from Third World countries to the advanced industrial society. He further contends that within the dependent countries, the metropolis have indigenous collaborators. These aboriginal comprador bourgeoisies further exploit the resources of their own people and further underdevelopment of their people .Amin (1972) has argued



that black Africa countries are all characterized by intense form of underdevelopment. This condition, according to him, is produced by dependency of African states on more developed countries as a consequence of the continent's common historical experience of economic exploitation by European organized mercantilism, the slave trade, imperialism, and colonialism. Moreover, via the apparatus of neo-colonialism, African underdevelopment has been perpetuated, perhaps even increased, during the accomplishment of political independence. Amin (1972) as well maintains that the expansion of capitalism in Western Europe led to the structure of an international political economy characterized by a universal division of labour in which metropolitan capitalist countries attain supremacy over underdeveloped areas. Dependent countries, in this circumstance, are incapable to make autonomous decisions relating to the rate and course of growth of their domestic economies. Rather, the central economic issues and decisions are decided by international structure and process outside the control of their countries. The general consequence of this development is the distortion of the nature of development and underdevelopment in the Third World countries. Offiong (1980) argues that imperialism and its subsequent dependency is the root of underdevelopment in Africa. According to him, underdevelopment is not an original state as modernization theorists want us to believe. The foundation of African underdevelopment can be traced to Trans-Atlantic slave trade, and the abandoning of that trade in favour of 'legitimate' trade in Africa. In other words, the basis of African underdevelopment can be found in slave trade and colonial imperialism. In the first trade relation, the Africa supplied the white man with human cargos who were taken to toil the lands stolen from other owners, the Indians. In return, the Africans received guns, gunpowder and silky items that began their process of dependency. In the second stage, African became oriented to the export of primary products under the control of metropolitan capital and constituted as markets for imported manufactures from the same metropolitan countries. Since the imperialist power could not continue their occupation of their former dependencies, they decided to quit but made sure that they left the reins of power in good hands. They handed power to their internal collaborators for perpetual exploitation. Rodney (1982) provided the

historical evidence of how Europe's wealth and development have been the direct result of the systematic impoverishment of the African continent. He argued that capitalism has introduced underdevelopment and dependency in new nation states in the course of neo-colonialism, exploitation and imperialism. Nwankwo (1981) decisively exposed how imperialist authority through Multinational Corporation perpetuates underdevelopment in the Third World. These transnational corporations with colossal capital accumulation dominate the investment and commercial activities of their host countries and meddle in policy making and decision of the countries. The transnational corporations, which enjoy the sturdy backing of their home countries, enjoy the surplus of the underdeveloped countries. This surplus, they send back to their home country leaving the host countries depleted economically. Maybe, this exploitation made Nkurumah (1965) that the underdeveloped countries would not make any forward march towards economic independence until neocolonialism or neo-colonialism was vanquished.

Also Ake (1979) effectively brought out the imperialistic character of most of the Social Science teaching. In particular he x-rayed the theory of political development and maintained that it is ideologically biased. In an insightful analysis, he brought out very evidently the nexus between political development theory and western notion of capitalism and argued that social sciences are propagated by the West to inculcate their ideology on the Third World and accordingly maintain their subordination to the western capitalist. According to Ake (1981) in the process of integrating the pre-capitalist economies into the world capitalist system, there was no question of evolving and institutionalizing standards for the non-arbitrary employment of power. What emerged was disarticulation of the economy and politics; market imperfections; arbitrary use of state power; rent-seeking behaviour and prebendal politics on the part of leadership; compradorial external relations and an interventionist and commandist state with limited autonomization. This situation made the states in Africa feeble in the face of struggle with imperialist state in the international capitalist order. The weakness of states in the Third World countries which is attributed to capitalism and imperialism, made Knor (2000) caution the leaders of the developing countries against the risk of embracing

globalization and liberalization hook, line and sinker. He maintains that globalization and liberalization are instruments of imperialism; a premeditated designation of few developed nations of the North to exploit and appropriate the economic and financial resources of the South and accordingly imposes untold adversity and underdevelopment. He criticized in a strong term the demands mounted on developing countries by the developed countries to liberalize, privatize and deregulate their economy arguing that the present structure of states in developing countries placed them on disadvantage in the world of competition with the advanced capitalist states. Knor states: “globalization has led to the erosion of national sovereignty and narrowed the ability of government to make choice from options in economic, social and cultural policies”.

In a well-thought-out argument, Aluko (2005) decisively criticized the prevailing economic reform in some Third World countries that is premised on the tenets of capitalism, liberalism and globalization. Although trained in the London School of Economics where capitalism, liberalism and globalization are embraced like religion, the renowned economic scholar attributed the increasing inclination of underdevelopment in the Third World to appropriation of human, material and financial resources by imperialist states. He posits that the International Monetary Fund and World Bank are agents of the advanced capitalist states of the West that serve the purpose of integrating the Third World countries unto the international capitalist structure through their economic prescriptions for growth and development. These prescriptions, which are imposed conditionality for granting of loans or debt relief, make the Third World countries to be perpetual dependent on the economy of the advanced West. For Aluko economic salvation of the Third World countries cannot come from the East or from the West but from the local environment. Dos Santos (1970) identifies and distinguishes three forms of dependence historically as follows: (1) Colonial dependence-trade export in which commercial and financial capital in alliance with colonialist states, dominated the economic relations of the Europeans and the colonies, by means of trade monopoly of land, mines and manpower in the colonial countries. (2) Financial-industrial dependence which consolidated at the end of the nineteenth century, characterized by domination of

big capital in the hegemonic centres and its expansion abroad through investment in the production of raw material and agricultural products for the consumption in the hegemonic centre. A production structure grew up in the dependent countries devoted to export of these products, producing foreign-oriented development. (3) Technological-industrial dependence which was consolidated in the post, World War II period based on multinational corporations, which began to invest in industries, geared to the home market of the underdeveloped countries. Santos maintains that under these conditions both internal development and internal market condition in the Third World countries are restricted by a number of factors. Deducting from 1 and 2 of dependence stage delineated above, production is geared to those products destined for exports, i.e. production is determined by demand from hegemonic centre. The internal productive formation is characterized by firm specialization and monoculture in entire region. Alongside these, export sector there grew up certain complementary economic activities, which were directly reliant on the export sector to which they sell their product. The technological-industrial dependence is conditioned by the exigencies of the global product and capital markets. The likelihood of generating novel investment depends on the existence of monetary resources in foreign currency for the procurement of machinery and processed raw materials not produced domestically. The industrial development is then sturdily conditioned by fluctuations in the balance of payments. This leads towards shortfall due to relations of dependence themselves, such as trade relation which take place in a highly monopolized worldwide market which also tend to lower the price of raw materials and to raise the prices of industrial products particularly inputs. Consequently, foreign capital retains control over the most dynamic and modern sectors of the economy and repatriates a high volume of profit.

Among writers on dependence and dependency only Caporaso (1978) made any formal attempt to develop a clearer focus on dependence and dependency. He identifies two diverse sets of theoretical concerns which were sometimes labeled identically and often treated indiscriminately. He differentiated dependence from dependency and defines dependence as “external reliance on other actor” and dependency as “the process

of absorption of less developed countries into the global capitalist system and the ‘structural distortions resulting there from’. He argues that there are some similarities between the two approaches to the extent that both focus on “relational inequalities among actors and both are equally interested in the vulnerabilities of members of the global system resulting from these unequal relations. Apart from the similarities Caporaso (1978) also identifies basic gaps in the supportive methodologies of the two approaches. He maintains that the dependence approach seeks to investigate and explore the symmetric and asymmetric among nations-states. This which approach proceeds from liberal paradigmatic viewpoint focuses on individual actors and their goals and sees power in decisional term. The individual actors are of course the unified nation-states, which are pit against the external environment comprising other homogeneous units with the nation-states as the basic unit of analysis of dependent relations. As opposed to the dependence approach which focuses on the nation-states, the dependency orientation ‘seeks to explore the process of integration of the periphery into the international capitalist system and to assess the developmental implication of this peripheral capitalism’. This approach, consequently, has basically dissimilar direction from the liberal paradigm whose main interest and focus is on the class structure in the periphery country. The dependency framework, in other words, explicitly rejects the unified state as actor, as a useful conceptual building block of theory. The dependency system does not consider the global system as composed of independent, autonomous and isolated nation-states but rather it conceptualizes the system in terms of complex interaction roles, specialized positions and status (Caporaso 1978).

OVERVIEW OF STATE OF UNDERDEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

The state of underdevelopment in Nigeria is multi-facial as every sector of its economy is deeply affected. Whereas Nigeria, South Korea, Indonesia and India were almost rated at par in the 1980s, the rest of the countries, except Nigeria, are now being tagged developed countries with indigenous technology growing geometrically while Nigeria remained at status quo.

Historically, the economic base of Nigeria was agriculture with more than half of the workforce engaged in subsistent farming. With the discovery and exploration of oil in the late 1950s, the economic base of the country began to change towards petroleum production. Today exportation of crude oil is the pillar of Nigeria economy. This account for 40% of our GDR; 70% of government revenue and 95% of foreign exchange earning (<http://www.org/CGI-BIN/publication/presentationlstrengthening%20nigeria's%20refmes%20sector.ppt>). The contribution of manufacturing sector to the GDP has over time dropped from a peak of 13% in the early 1980s to an average of 4% from 2008 to 2011. The manufacturing sector has been characterized by weak infrastructure predominantly in the area of power supply; unpredictability in fiscal, monetary and trade policies; array of taxes/levies; scarcity of long-term fund/high cost of fund ;smuggling and faking of Nigerian products; insecurity of lives and property; unrelenting overcrowding at the sea ports; low support of locally made products(Agu, Anichebe and Maduagwu,2016).Despite the abundant natural resources in Nigeria, the level of poverty and economic hardship is unprecedented. Agriculture which initial generated huge foreign reserve and abundant employment opportunities has long been neglected leaving the citizen in the hands of petroleum exploration and production which is under the monopoly of Multinational Corporation (Ani, 2005). In fact, notwithstanding the country's raw materials Nigerians have not seen their improvement in lives.

Paradoxically between 1965 to 2015, the country cannot boast of more than four refineries that operate sub-optimally as a result of neglect, poor maintenance, corruption, lack of focused leadership, vandalization to mention but a few. A Special Committee set up by the Federal in 2000 to review the supply and distribution of petroleum product in Nigeria, frowned at the sorry state of refineries and petroleum sector. In its report, the committee observed that the four refineries “had been affected by accidents, maintenance and operational problems that have negatively affected the output and capability to meet domestic demand” (Federal Government of Nigeria, Report of the Special Committee on the Review of Petroleum Products Supply and Distribution, 2000). The resultant consequence of the condition is reliance on re-importation of refined crude oil and other

raw material exported by Nigeria comprador bourgeois in collaboration with the metropolitan bourgeois. This re-imported refined petroleum products imposes economic hardship on Nigerians since the prices are hiked and which in turn influence the prices of other commodity. This has resulted in a fallen standard of living consequent upon increase in the cost of living. It is definitely not astounding to those who have strongly analyzed the unconscionable pillage of the national economy by the political leaders that in spite of being the sixth largest producer of crude oil, Nigeria has been classified among the least developed state on the globe. In 2004, African Development Bank in one of its reports disclosed that 70 per cent of people in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria lived in abject poverty. Also UNICEF in its own report in the same year stated that 18 percent of Nigeria children die before they reach the age of five. The report added that about 70 percent of Nigerians live on less than one dollar per day (Okosieme, 2005). In a document launched by the World Bank entitled “Where is the Wealth of Nations? Measuring Capital for the 21st Century”, Nigeria was classified as the second poorest nation in the world. The report put Nigeria’s per capita at \$2,748, natural capital at 147 percent, produced capital at 24 percent and intangible capital at negative 71percent (The Daily Times, September,2005). The UNDP Report (2005) entitled “World Population” lamented the turn down in human development, economic wellbeing, and life expectancy in Nigeria. According to the report, the well being of Nigeria had further declined as much as 8% between 2004 and 2005. It states that a significant lower estimate of life expectancy at birth had declined from 51.6 percent to 43.2 percent. This by implication means that average life expectancy in Nigeria is 43 years (Ewuzie, 2005). Similarly, the United Nation Development Programme (2006) Human Development Index Report based on three factors: life expectancy at birth, adult literacy and per capita GDP shows that Nigeria ranks 159 out of 177 countries in HDI and ranks 157 on per capita GDP.

The level of unemployment in Nigeria is increasing on daily basis. Over 70% of Nigeria university graduates are unemployed as a result of non-indigenous enterprise to absorb them as well as poor capital for self-reliant business. The downsizing or right sizing programme of the government has added more to the number of unemployed. The

massive unemployment has led to social vices such as fraud, armed robbery and other corrupt practices. Nigeria, according to the report of Transparency International, ranks the third most corrupt nation as against the second in the 2003 report (Atolagbe, 2005). According to 2016 Corruption Perceptions Index Report by Transparency International, Nigeria is the 136 least corrupt nations out of 175. Nigeria scored 28 points out of 100 on the 2016 Corruption Perception Index. Corruption index in Nigeria averaged 20.17 points from 1996 until 2016, reaching an all time high of 28 points in 2016 and a record low of 6.90 points in 1996 (Transparency International, 2016). The Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (2017) rates Nigeria 27 points out of 100 (Transparency International, 2018). The level of corruption in Nigeria particularly in the oil sector which is the sole of our economy is very devastating. The President, Mohamadu Buhari, in a maiden media chart disclosed that corrupt practices in Nigerian public sector predominantly in the petroleum sector are monumental. He has insisted that if corruption is not killed in Nigeria polity, corruption will kill Nigeria. For instances, Mr. Andrew Yakubu, former NNPC Group Managing Director, has been charged to court by EFCC on six count charges following the recovery of 9.8 million US dollar found hidden in his house in Kaduna (AFP, 2017). The EFCC on January 6, 2017, brought an application to Federal High Court seeking order for interim forfeiture of 133.3 million US dollar, allegedly belonging to former Minister of Petroleum Mrs. Deziani Alison-Madueke, to Nigeria government. Out of the funds 23.4 billion naira was lodged in Sterling Bank plc, 9.08 billion naira in First Bank plc and 5 million dollar in Access Bank plc. In granting the order for permanent forfeiture of the money after the expiration of 14 days given by the court for the owner to come with a proof, the court ruled that the EFCC has satisfactorily proved that the money was a proceed of crime. Also in August, 2017, Justice Chuka Obiozor of Federal High Court in Ikoyi Lagos ordered the permanent forfeiture of 37.5m US dollar mansion on Banana Island Lagos allegedly owned by Diezani Alison-Madueke. The court also ordered that the rent payment of 2,740,197.96 dollar and 84,537,840.70 naira collected from the property be forfeited to the government (Nwachukwu, 2017). Many governors and political office holders in Nigeria are under

going prosecution and investigations on alleged corrupt practices. Corruption has no doubt left the state treasure empty and hampered development projects. The educational sector has not been spared. The quality of education in Nigeria has drastically fall and thereby producing half-baked graduates who contribute less meaningfully in the development of the nation. Prevalent of examination malpractice in Nigeria education system manifest in various forms: procurement of answer script; impersonation; collusion; examination leakages; enrolling syndicate and self; smuggling of answer booklet; sorting; insult and assault of examination official; stealing; copying; dubbing; converting and substituting of answer booklet; bringing foreign material into examination hall etc(Gbagolo,2011).The decision to adopt a Post JAMB examination underscores the level of education decay in Nigeria. In a similar manner, the political sector is characterized by prebendalism, ethnicity, bureaucratic decay, electoral fraud, poor leadership, and bereft of cardinal element of democracy and good governance.

In conclusion, Nigeria wallows in a state of underdevelopment characterized by non self-reliance, foreign control of national economy, poverty, poor standard of living, diseases, insufficient human development, dependency on foreign economy and importation of manufactured products, poor educational system, inequality of income distribution, corruption, poor leadership and general absence of democracy and good governance.

DEPENDENCY: IMPLICATION FOR UNDER DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Chronological situations of dependency, have conditioned present-day under development in Nigeria and other developing societies. The groundwork of Nigeria underdevelopment can be traced to the Trans-Atlantic slave trade, the abandoning of that trade in favour of “legitimate trade” and the ultimate partition of Africa, which placed Nigeria under the British colonial imperialism. In other words, the starting point of Nigeria underdevelopment can be found in slave trade and colonial imperialism. In the first phase, the contact with the European in the 13th century sparked off slave trade in

which Nigeria and other African countries supplied the white man with human cargos who were taken to the American plantations to toil the lands. The slaves taken away from Nigeria and other African societies provided them with low-cost labour in their plantations under cruel state of inhuman handling. These slaves enabled them to augment their production and make colossal profit thereby causing the depletion of the best brains that would have initiated development in Nigeria. The slave trade merchants in coalition with their home collaborators incited conflicts and fanned the embers of intra and inter communal wars all in a bid to overpower and cart away slaves. Inferiority complex was imbibed in the minds of Nigerians and as such a 'wrong notion of European superiority of race became prevalent (Rodney, 1982). The industrial revolution of the 18th century drastically changed the economic orientations and attitudes of the white men to Nigeria and other slave providing societies. The industrial revolution created a situation of surplus manufactured products in Europe, which gave rise to search for diverse market where the surplus could be sold and the required raw material procured at a very cheap rate. African and indeed, Nigeria became the existing opportunities for European economic exploitation. In this stage, Nigeria became oriented to the export of primary products, predominantly agricultural, under the control of metropolitan capital and constituted as market for imported manufactures from the same metropolitan countries with huge foreign capital and military power. Thus, the European successfully kept Nigeria as a de facto colony. The government of Nigeria and its economy were then brought under the stringent management of the overseas power, thereby depriving the nation its control over international market for primary products, the prices of which rise and fall and quite often are manipulated by the wealthy and powerful nations. Such oscillation in prices almost always results in adverse term of trade in relation to import.

Colonialism integrated Nigeria economy into the western capitalism structure, which hindered effectively the domestic growth of Nigeria economy. This assimilation into the exploitation of capitalism intensified the underdevelopments of Nigeria by making the country a major importer of western goods. The issues of self-reliance are no longer there and dependency becomes the order of the day. Apart from perpetuating



underdevelopment through economic exploitation and dependency, colonialism did not see any good in most aspects of Nigeria culture. It tactfully devastated Nigeria mode of life such as farming, settlement, native technology, traditional mechanism of administration, spirit of brotherhood, creativity, and generally menial dispositions. This designed act of cultural and social disorganization in the name of colonial policy intensified the spirit of inferiority and dispossession of confidence among Nigerians. In a bid to uphold supreme authority of the foisted ethnic groups, the colonial masters adopted a divide and rule system thereby keeping the varied ethnic groups on conflict course so as to subside their internal cohesion and probable fight against the colonial masters. The divide and rule system engendered ethnicity which has continued to hound the spirit of Nigeria many years after its political sovereignty. This repulsive situation was fittingly captured by Okoli (1980). He argued that the institutional structure maintained by the colonial masters could not effectively arbitrate in conflict resolution rather; it generated conflicts considering its multi-ethnic nature. He further stated that the institutionalization of devolution and regionalism in Nigeria from 1967 intensified the existing ethnic cleavages, and stunted the growth of federal political institutions. The under developing effects of colonial policy were multi-facet and unrestricted. The administrative institutions created by the colonial master were oriented towards the interest of the colonial masters. The civil service was prearranged and conceived as an instrument for incessant dominance of the white men over the black men. The worst being that in the era of colonialism, Nigeria civil service were prematurely integrated into the system. They played the second fiddle with every bit of administrative problem and lack of basic knowledge. The attendant consequence becomes that even after independence; the fundamental requirement of efficient civil service remains a far cry.

Indeed, colonialism left a heritage of ethnicity, pitiable leadership, prejudice, frail administrative and institutional structure, economic dependency, social and cultural disorganization, political imbalance as well as other social vices that have kept Nigeria underdeveloped and in constant manipulation of the Europeans. It is significant to note, that when the imperialist powers could not continue the occupation of their previous



dependencies, owing to campaigning for political autonomy through a growing nationalism, they decided to give up but made sure that they left the reigns of power in good hands. They did not hesitate to build and finance political parties in opposition to real nationalists and even rigged election and employed other means to ensure that power was handed over to their loyalists who would continue with the colonial policy. Thus, a decisive problem of underdevelopment is the fact that dependency has arisen a concurrence of interest between the capitalist oligarchy and the internal comprador bourgeois that to a great extent benefit from this dependency circumstances and could not hesitate to confront any endeavor to dismantle the status quo (Offiong 1980). Hence, at post independence, these comprador bourgeois have strengthened the asymmetrical association with their global partners to the extent that their transactions are export oriented. They represent the interest of their overseas allies and rob their countries of their much-needed exchange and as well engage in all sorts of unpatriotic activities that fail to aid economic development. They invested their capital abroad and launder their stolen wealth from their national treasurer in foreign banks. Most Nigeria leaders both the past and present are products of colonial imperialism and have been directly or indirectly guilty of unpatriotic capital flight and illegal money laundering. The late General Sani Abacha drained the national treasure, which he lodged in his numerous foreign accounts. In a similar manner, many governors and political office holders are currently facing charges over corruption and illegal transfer of money to foreign banks.

In fact, in Nigeria, foreign factors of production such as capital and technology have become the core determinant of economic advancement and socio-political life. The international system or world market upon which Nigeria is integrated into is a structure of institutions, classes, and power arrangement which is “imperialism”. Multinational Corporations in Nigeria are representatives of imperialism. The character of modern capitalism has given rise to collaboration among the multinational corporations with respects to their overseas operation. There has arisen the need to control productive process, from the sources of supply and processing of raw materials to market or outlets for commodity. Some activities of the various multinational corporations in Nigeria such

as Shell BP, Mobil, Texaco, Leventis, Ford, UAC, Arab Construction Company, Julius Berger etc. are inimical to the economic development of Nigeria. These multinational corporations do not only deplete the human and material resources but also create environmental predicament, which endangers human life. In the Niger Delta, the exploitative nature of the multinational oil companies has created youth restiveness, environmental pollution, and lost of lives and property of the innocent citizens in communal crisis sparked off by their actions. Bayelsa state Governor, D.S.P. Alamieyeseigha appropriately captured this situation when he stated. “The seeds of dissent so visibly displayed in the Niger Delta today are rooted in the distant past, especially from the colonial rule” (Alamieyeseigha, 2005). Since the nature of private corporate operations abroad is such that they need security by the imperialist state, the multinational corporations have employed their power and influence to .shape the foreign policies of their government and that of the Third World nations. In Nigeria, multinational corporations are so influential, with colossal capital investment and accommodation, and have taken control of practically all sector of the economy. They control indirectly the policies of Nigeria government and even perhaps have hands in determining who occupies sensitive positions. The liberal economic reform imposed on Nigeria, which are conditionality of IMF, World Bank and Paris Club, (all are agents of imperialism) owing to huge external debt to the European countries and Paris club, is aimed at liberalizing and privatizing the infant economy to full blown competition with the industrialist nations. This phenomenon is a continuation of the imbalanced relation and dependence. It simply means allowing foreign investors, with their enormous capital accumulations, to take over strategic economic sectors of Nigeria either directly or indirectly with their comprador bourgeois. It is ironical to expect an infant economy to compete favourably or develop in the face of fierce competition with advanced capitalist economy. What these conditions imply is that Nigeria should remain dependent on the Western capitalist and by extension remain underdeveloped in the international community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Development is a far cry to Nigeria not until its leadership and policy makers appreciate the implication of integrating a pre-capitalist Nigeria state into the world capitalist economy where the basis of survival is exploitation of the national economy of one country by the other. Thus, the following recommendations are provided:

Policy re-direction: Nigeria leaders and policy makers should re-direct its economic policies and look inward for indigenous enterprise and technology for industrial development. Experiences in the past pointed out that Nigeria has the human competence to develop but only that the political will to encourage such ingenuity is lacking. For instance, during the Nigeria Civil War, the defunct Biafran state through its Research and Production Unit (RAP), which consists of indigenous Engineers were able to manufacture home made rockets, self detonating anti-personnel and anti-vehicle mines, repair worn out engines, design petrol etc (Nwankwo, 1972). It is very unfortunate that as a result of ethnic sense of subjugation impacted on Nigeria by colonialism or rather lack of vision, the then crops of Nigeria leaders could not muster the political will to nurture and support these young brilliant brains who would have transformed Nigeria into a high industrialized and technological nation.

Participatory decision making: Sourcing for indigenous technology and production without increase participation of the masses in decision making and implementation process of the government is as good as nothing. The government should be sensitive to the aspirations of the masses and should go every hog in developing the enormous potentials of the citizens so as to engineer qualitative development. Development should be people and grass roots oriented to enable the people have active participation in programme/ project initiative and implementation. Thus, bottom-top approach of development should be adopted.

Economic diversification: The resuscitation of agricultural production should be done through the encouragement of farmers and other local agricultural product producers; the government should encourage local consumption. Nigeria economy should not be dependent on petroleum products which its exploration and refining is dominated by expatriates whose interests are how to exploit the economy of Nigeria for the benefit of

their countries. The government rather should subsidize agricultural production and encourage large scale production through mechanize equipment by providing farmers with training, equipment and material. The agricultural institutes and universities should intensify research on new farm production techniques while the youths should be motivated to embrace farming as a means of livelihood. Moreover, science and technological institutions should engage in serious research on scientific and technological production using indigenous materials

Import substitution: The government should devise appropriate measures to reduce the level of importation of those products that can be locally produced or manufactured so as to encourage local producers through increase in consumption of locally produced products. Since Nigeria is rich in agricultural production, the government should discourage the importation of those consumer commodities that the country can sufficiently produced at comparative advantage level.

Accountability: Accountability demands that those who are entrusted with resources of state or organization should be able to render account on how they utilized the resources. Accountability enhances development because it reduces corrupt practices which under develop states and nation. Therefore, mechanism for ensuring accountability of public and private officials should be instituted to avoid the diversion of resources meant for development to private purposes. Finally, corruption should be fought seriously by government for its negative effect on national economy cannot be under estimated.

CONCLUSION

The variation between development in the Western European nations and the Third World countries has generated a wide range of debate on the major cause of underdevelopment in the Third World countries. Although various theories such as modernization theory, Marxist theory, and political development theory have attempted an explanation of the cause of underdevelopment, none was able to offer a complete explanation of that. In Nigeria context, underdevelopment can be properly understood if the state is historically situated. With this, the historical passage of the country from slave trade, 'legitimate trade', colonialism, neo colonialism and imperialism will unveil how its

underdevelopment has been occasioned by dependency stemming from its integration into the international capitalist structure. Thus, the dependency and underdevelopment theory offers us a better explanation of the phenomenon of colonial imperialism and how it created perpetual dependency of Nigeria economy on the imperialist state. The attendant consequence of this asymmetrical relation is the prevalent of poverty, ethnic crisis, unemployment, huge foreign debt, poor medical care, low life expectancy, foreign economic control, bureaucratic crisis, brain drain, importation of foreign manufactured products, raw material exportation, poor education, capital out flow and money laundering etc. Thus, the paper concludes that the underdevelopment of Nigeria is partly a consequence of colonial imperialism and its components, which incorporated Nigeria into international capitalist system where Nigeria occupies a periphery status in an exchange of unequal relation. This incorporation has made Nigeria dependent on the economy of the imperialist state thereby neglecting its own indigenous power. The development of Nigeria in this 21st century depends on the ability of its leaders to develop the political will to look inwards for local ingenuities needed for production of goods and service, as well as increased participatory approach to development; economic diversification; import substitution and accountability in governance.

REFERENCES

Agu, A.O., Anichebe, N.A. and Maduagwu. N.E.(2016). Impact of globalization on Nigeria manufacturing sector: A study of selected manufacturing firm in Enugu. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management* 5(5), 44-55

Ake, C. (1979). *Social science as imperialism: A theory of political development*.

Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Ake, C. (1981). *A political economy of Africa*. London: Longman.

Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Washington D. C: The



Brookings Institution

Almond, G. A, and Powell, G.B (1966). *Comparative politics: A developmental approach*. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Amin, S. (1974). *Accumulation on a world scale: A critique of the theory of Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2.

Amin, S. (1972). Underdevelopment and development in black African origin and contemporary form. *In Journal of Modern African Studies*, 10(4), 503-524

Arrighi, E. (1972). *Unequal exchange: A study of the imperialism of trade*. London: Monthly Review Press.

Agbakoba, J. C. (2003). *Philosophical issues in development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.

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

Aluko, S. (2005, April 25.). Obasanjo is in a Chain. *The Tell Magazine*

Ani, P. O. (2005, May 29). Democracy at 6. *The Sunday Vanguard*

Alamieyeseigha, D. S. P. (2005, April 4.). Niger delta crises: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *The Tell Magazine*

Atolagbe, K. (2005, Oct. 2) Nigeria at 45. *The Tribune*



- AFP (2017, March 16). Court send former NNPC boss Yakubu to prison. *APF News*
- Asadu, I.(2014). *First class in government for schools and colleges*. Nsukka:AP Express Publisher Ltd
- Chukwuezi, B. (2000). *Issues in community development*. Nsukka: Mike Social Press.
- Caporaso, J.A. (1978). Dependence, dependency and power in global system: a structural and behavioral analysis. *International Organization*. 32(1), 13-43
- Caporaso, J.A. (1980). Dependency theory: Continuities and discontinuities in development studies. *International Organization*. 34(4), 605-620
- Duru, E. J. (1998). The role of bureaucracy in national development:A comparative analysis of United State and Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science and Public Policy*, 1(2) 145-152
- Dos Santos, T. (1970). The Structure of Dependency. *American Economic Review*, 60 (2) 231-236
- Ewuzie, A. (2005, Oct. 1). Nigeria and UNDP report. *The Daily Champion*
- Frank ,G. (1969). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in historical studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Frank, G. (1969B). *Latin America underdevelopment or revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Federal Government of Nigeria (2000). *Report of the special committee on the review*



- of petroleum products supply and distribution.* Abuja: Ministry of Information and Nation Orientation.
- Federal Government of Nigeria (2002). *Strengthening Nigeria's refinery sector.* Accessed at <http://www.bpeng.org/CGI-IN/publication/presentation/strengthening%20Refinery%20sector.ppt>.
- Gai, D. (1988), *Participatory development: Some perspectives from grassroots experiences.* UNRISD Discussion Paper June 5.
- Gbagolo, H.(2011). Examination malpractice in Nigeria: A review of literature. *Continental Journal of Education Research* 4(3), 34-43
- Goulet, D (1971). *The cruel Choice: A new concept in the development theory.* New York: Atheneum.
- Knor, M. (2000) *Gloaliation and the south: Some critical Issues.* Malaysia: Third World Network
- Lenin, V. (1965). *Imperialism the highest stage of capitalism: A popular outline.* Peking: Foreign Language Press
- Nkurumah, K. (1965). *Neo colonialism: The last stage of imperialism.* London:Thomas Nelson and sons.
- Nwankwo, A.N.(1981). *Can Nigeria survive?* Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishing co
- Nwankwo, A. (1972). *Nigeria: The Challenge of Biafran.* London: Rex Collings



Nwachukwu, J.O. (2017, August 15). \$90 billion loot Deziani finally break silence. *Daily Post*

Ogunnaike B. (2005, Oct. 1). At 45. Nigeria a failed State. *The National Interest*

Obiajulu, S.O. and Anthony, O.E. (2004). *Public administration in Nigeria:A developmental approach*. Onitsha: Book Point Ltd.

Okoli, E. F. (1980). *Institutional structure and conflict in Nigeria*. America University Press of America Inc.

Offiong, D. (1980). *Third World and Dependency*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension.

Okosieme. N. (2005, Oct., 2). Nigeria, the dream that fell to earth. *The Sunday Independent*.

Olisa, M., Okoli, E. and Nwabufo, E. (1990).. *Government for secondary schools*. Onitsha: Africana – Fep Publishers Ltd.

Rodney, W. (1982). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. (West African Edition). Enugu: Ikenga Publishers.

Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto* New York:. Cambridge University Press.

Seer, D. (1969). The meaning of development. *International Development Review* 11(4)3-4.

Transparency International (2016). Corruption perception index 2017. <http://www.transparency.org>



Transparency International (2018). Corruption perception index 2017.

<http://www.transparency.org>

The Daily Time (2005, September, 30.). The wealth of nations report in retrospect.

Theobald, R and Randall, V. (1985). *Political changes and underdevelopment: A critical introduction and third world politics*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press