Third World Dependency: The Nigerian Perspective

Uchechukwu Igwe and Austine Ifeanyi Okere
Department of History and International Studies
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
E-mail: drsky2002@gmail.com

Abstract

Nigeria marks the centenary anniversary of its creation by the British colonial government in January, 2014. The amalgamation of Northern and Southern Protectorates on 1st January 1914 officially signaled the political creation of Nigeria. This British creation continued its existence as one nation-state throughout the years of colonial administration, which ended on 1st October, 1960. With attainment of political independence, Nigeria was seen as a promising nation due to its abundant natural and human resources. However, post-independence management of its economy by successive political leaders left much to be desired, and gave credence to the contention among many observers that Nigeria will celebrate its centenary as an under-developed country. Against this background, this paper examines the issue of "economic dependency" as a major challenge to sustained growth and enduring economic development in Nigeria. By the adoption of the eclectic Research method, the essay argues that despite the transition from an agrarian to a mono-economy based on petroleum resources, Nigeria failed to make effective use of abundant revenue derived from petroleum resources as a result of its dependence and lack of political will by its leaders during the last century. The paper concludes that for Nigeria to attain sustained growth and enduring economic development, it must put its abundant natural and human resources into proactive use through internal mechanism, which will lead to diversification of the sectors that could ultimately ensure economic development of Nigeria.

Keywords: Dependency, Post-Colonial, Challenge, Sustained Growth, Enduring Development.

Introduction

Questions have been asked as to why countries like Nigeria are underdeveloped. This question has excited all not only in Nigeria, but other countries that have failed to achieve economic development despite numerous economic potentials. In an attempt to proffer answers to this question, neo-Marist thinkers put forward the dependency theory as a plausible paradigm to explain the unfortunate situation of underdevelopment in the world. The contention of dependency theorist who are mostly from Third world or developing economies is that dependency relates to a situation in which the economy of certain countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of others to which the former is subjected (Dos Santos, 2002). This thinking centers on inter-relations between and among nations of the world where to some, this relationship is advantageous while to others it is the reason for their continuous stunted growth and underdevelopment. The relation of inter-dependence between two or more economies in world trade terms, assumes the form of dependence when some countries (the dominant ones like the USA, Britain, Germany and France) can expand and be self-sustaining; while other countries (the dependent ones like Nigeria, Rwanda, Bolivia, Thailand and India) can do this only as a reflection of expansion which can have either a negative or positive effect on their immediate development.

This situation therefore presents asymmetrical relationship which exists in the world system under world capitalist foundations; thereby creating wealth within the metropolis (Frank, 1968), or the Center (Galtung, 1972; Amin, 1974) and poverty or under -development at the other pole, the satellite or periphery (Wallterstien, 1973). Succinctly put, this is an unequal relationship between the countries perceived to be already at an advantage (North) and disadvantaged countries (South) as a result of past economic exploitation. Under the maxim of "development of underdevelopment," which was necessitated by the twin concepts of imperialism and colonialism, dependency theory identifies different external factors based on relationships which transcend decades between developed countries and their underdeveloped counterparts as plausible reasons for underdevelopment. Examples of such external factors identified so far are: Slave Trade, Imperialism, Colonialism and current asymmetrical global economic conditions which ultimately led to the pre-mature integration of Third world economies into the global capitalist economy (Ake, 1981). Third world countries thus argue that since the emergence of a world capitalist system, relationships which currently exist have been to their detriment. In this context, the dominant theme on underdevelopment is the global asymmetrical economic relationship between the underdeveloped and developed economies which results to dependency of Africa, Latin America and Asian countries to Europe and North America.

At the end of World War II, the modernization school of thought that emerged tried to tailor the "periphery" economies in line with the developed Western model, basing development as an evolutionary process which Third world countries would soon attain by following certain economic principles. However scholars from countries targeted by this modernization thinking started to develop their own theories, partly as a result of 'sub-optimal' results of such policies based on the modernization theories, as well as concluding that imperialism in general has actively underdeveloped the peripheral societies they live in (Martinussen, 1997).

From the 1950s Latin American theorist focused on the Leninist insight that imperialism had perpetuated the uneven development of metropolitan and peripheral countries, as surplus earned from the peripheral countries accrued to metropolitan nations. They argue that despite their political sovereignty Latin American nations became tied economically to metropolitan nations either through foreign ownership of companies or the capital and technological resources required for industrial development (Amadi, 2012). Countries and scholars alike started rejecting modernization theories and exploring the tenets of the Dependency theory as a response to bankruptcy of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA). The ECLA promoted protectionist policies together with industrialization through import subsidies, which in practice resulted in a brief economic expansion in the 1950s followed by economic stagnation: unemployment, inflation, declining terms of trade, etc (So, 1990; Keet, 2002). On the African side, by the 1960s, most sub-Saharan African countries became independent nation states. Despite Africa being a victim of slave trade; and being traumatized by, and deprived as a result of colonialism that secured the exploitation of its raw materials, agricultural products and mineral resources for the industrialization of Europe; Colonial African governments sent their soldiers to fight on the Allied side (USA, Britain, defunct USSR, France and China) during WW II. Colonial Africa also shipped foodstuffs for the feeding of Allied forces; it also sent materials for the war efforts. In short, Africa contributed in no small measure to the defeat of the Axis powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) (Uche, 1994; Ake, 1981) described this precarious situation on Africa as being "appendages of colonial economy." With such conditions, by the 1960s, Africa joined the comity of nations handicapped, short-changed and cheated; thus making her quest for industrialization problematic despite her enormous contributions to the global capitalist economy. Demonstratively, African governments at independence were heavily dependent on their colonial masters to survive as some tied their currency, trade and other economic relations to them.

Nigeria, – a political amalgamation of the British had in no little way benefited from this dependent relationship which existed before and after independence in 1960. By the late 1800s and early 1900s, almost every part of Nigeria had been subdued militarily by British forces and the British government had asserted her political dominance in Nigeria. Ideally, this was an attempt to protect trading activities which had been going on for decades between Nigeria and Britain (represented by the different trading companies e.g. the Royal Niger Trading Company). This trade fueled the industrial process in Britain with raw materials like palm oil, rubber, and cocoa alongside providing a veritable market for finished products churned out from British industries. Prior, Nigeria like many other African counties, had also supplied slaves to fuel the massive agrarian transformation in the Americas and Europe as labour for their enormous plantations. At independence, Nigeria still maintained strong economic ties with Britain despite denouncing political ties. Nigeria continued to produce primary commodities for Britain and other Western economies for more than two decades, such only declined slowly as a result of the oil boom of the 1970s. Primary commodities comprised of 92% of exports and 21% of imports in 1975 alone (Nigerian Index, 1991).

One research identified that Nigeria since independence had trade with about 100 countries worldwide; but the composition of trade by country analysis has been mainly to Western economies. By 1976, exports to and imports from Britain were 38 percent and 32 percent respectively, while to the United States was at 36 percent exports and 14 percent imports (Nigerian Index, 1991). Nwankwo (2002) like Offiong (1980) dwells extensively on the nefarious activities of Western multinational corporations (MNCs) in Nigeria and recommends outright nationalization of these companies. His view identifies MNCs activities/roles (like monopolization of the means of production and repatriation of profits) which undermine the economic independence of Third world countries. Today, Nigeria like the rest of other Third world countries is dependent on economies of Western countries. Although there are some exception to this (like China, Brazil), which have developed a unique economic system with an attempt to reverse the dependency model. What does this dependency portend to Third world countries like Nigeria? That is the question so many have asked and still attempt to answer.

Theoretical Framework

Since Karl Marx first made public his views on how economic ideas can dictate the patterns for political systems, scholars have made further attempts to explain this. In his various theses, Marx argued that political relationships in societies could be understood within the context of "those who control the economic sub-structure determine the political structures." This idea summed up as economic determinism views society as divided into different strata/class;

such that a society in which one class or strata controlled economic means (like land etc.) determines the general patterns and progress of society to the detriment of others. Using this idea put forward by Karl Marx, scholars (sometimes called neo-Marxist) have tried to explain relationships which exist in the world today under this class division. This has been the idea guiding some explanations of development and underdevelopment.

Formerly, sociological and other social scientific work on development and underdevelopment was largely conducted under the purview of evolutionary stages for societies. Here, scholars like Rostow (1960), Almond and Coleman (1960) and Parsons (1966) explained in economic, political social terms respectively how societies and countries evolved. Such explanations could also be subsumed under the modernization paradigm which contends that nations-states moved gradually into the general world capitalist system until they are finally integrated. To them social change in non-Western societies is deeply rooted in the perspective of developmentalism, which was already firmly established in the conventional wisdom of Western social science well before the nineteenth century (Dean, 1973). With ideals on social differentiation and social system, modernization emphasis was on the ability to adapt to gradual, continual change as the normal conditions of stability and a causal priority to imminent sources of change (Black, 1996).

Dependency theory thus seeks to debunk this modernization notion put forward by some euro-centric scholars and takes a step further by blaming Western-piloted capitalist system for underdevelopment in Third world countries. Defining Dependency theory, Dos Santos opines that it is a "historical condition which shapes a certain structure of the world economy such that it favours some countries to the detriment of others and limits the development possibilities of the subordinate economies (Dos Santos, 1971). This particular type of contention received focus mostly after WW II. Particularly, special issues of journals have examined this dependency theory and identified four major ways which it advances ideals which differ over other models for explaining development and underdevelopment. These are:

1. Unlike the evolutionary or modernization model, dependency theory does not assume the "society" or "nation" to be a self-contained unit. Rather it recognized the fact that there are political and economic relationships among social formations and these relationships have different consequences for those formations.

2. Dependency theory attempts to be holistic. Whereas in earlier, evolutionary model there was a division of labour among economists, political scientists and sociologists each looking at different characteristics of the unit.

3. While evolutionary theory was idealist in its attempt to explain social change, dependency theory has looked closely at the material bases of organized social life, in particular at the growth and extension of the world capitalist system.

4. At its best, dependency theory has been historically specific, replacing the earlier evolutionary stages with concrete analyses of historical material (Wayne, 2006).

Andre Gunder Frank, the most influential of the dependency theorists argued that there has been "development of underdevelopment" which was occasioned by the expansion of the capitalist system over the past centuries and as such have effectively and entirely penetrated even the apparently most isolated sectors of the underdeveloped world (Frank, 1969). Dependency theorist believes such expansion outside of Western Europe, North America and Japan is a consequence of emerging relationships among political-economic formations. This model thus creates an understanding that modern history of any given nation or states only makes sense only as part of the history of the organized world system that capitalism historically created. If they appear backward now, Frank asserts, their relationship are the cause, just as these same relationships are the cause of what has been labeled "development" in other societies. Dependency theory blames contemporary poverty, inequality and other socio-economic disadvantages of Third world countries on this relationship which dates back to the years of slave trade.

Another important scholar who examined this relationship identified by Dependency theorist was Walter Rodney. In his book, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, he catalogued the disadvantages associated with this unequal relationship between economically advanced countries and Africa. To him poverty, economic stagnation, greed and the presence of pseudo-middle class to preserve such system which benefits only Europe are some of these disadvantages. Furthermore, he traced the antecedence of Africa's past and contemporary economic problems to contacts made in the 15th century, arguing that Africa was developing at her own pace, but has been degenerating since this contact with the capitalist world while Europe on the other hand continues to develop before and after this contact (Rodney, 1972).

Dependency theory also holds the view that what exists today in Europe and America is "literally the creation of the Third world" (Fanon, 1961); built from centuries of theft of wealth from the underdeveloped people. His idea of dependency in Africa came from a direct 'criminal activities' of colonialist in their robbery adventure in Africa. These included slavery, forced labour, deportation and massacre; methods Europe employed to increase its bullions and as well to establish its hegemony over the world under the capitalist system. These criminal activities thus scared Africa, economically, culturally, psychologically and socially making her dependent on Europe. For dependency theorist like Fanon, Africa and other Third world countries should demand from Europe and other Western economies (aids, grants, debt relief etc) to escape underdevelopment; seeing this as reparation due for the years of punitive economic relationships between them.

In summary, dependency theorists believe:

(a) Third world countries do not exist in isolation. They can only be understood in the context of the world economic and political system (i.e. political and economic events in First world have a huge impact on the politics and economies of Third World countries).

(b) With such interactions (between First and Third World Countries), it results to an isolated and weak peripheral (Third world) country cumulatively leads to an unequal relationship which is formed.

(c) Politics and economics are related. They cannot be understood apart from each other. Economic ties and relationships between core (First World) and periphery (Third World) countries are important and leads to continuous growth on one hand to the detriment of the other (Wallerstein, 1973).

Contentious Views on Dependency

Despite the strong arguments put forward by proponents of Dependency theory, they have failed to provide clarifications on some grey areas for which concerns have been raised. One of such is the view of classification and division of the world in strict economic terms into the North, Core, First world, Metropolis, Center, Developed on one hand and South, Peripheral, Satellite, Third World, Underdeveloped on the other hand. Opponents of dependency identify how cumbersome it is just to classify countries into these two broad groups. For Example, within the Third World countries, there are some which have and are still doing better than others; thus the classification of all underdeveloped countries into one group might be inadequate.

Despite a body of published works categorized as dependency theory and the consistency of language addressing unequal development and economic growth, dependency theory essentially lacks theoretical coherence to explain uneven development patterns among third world countries thus it has resulted notably into political inefficacy (Snyder, 1980). The dependency theory therefore falls short of explaining the relationship which exists within these two broad classifications. Using the dependency theoretical classification, Nigeria and Brazil are viewed as underdeveloped countries without difference which might not be so. Thus proper classification is called for within an attempted explanation of dependency. For instance, some countries could be classified as developing or emerging economies and not only underdeveloped or third world. Despite booming success for some developing countries, a group of disadvantage countries –in Africa and some parts of Asia –have seen little or negative economic growth: the rich got richer and the poor got poorer in the same system that advertised this idea -the dependency theory (Ferraro, 1996).

Other contentious views of the dependency theorem criticize its emphasis on external factors (slave trade, imperialism and colonialism) as a result of underdevelopment in Third world countries and not looking inward. This contention examines some fundamental quagmires which have become peculiar characteristics of underdeveloped countries and have little or nothing to do with the relationships which existed with developed countries before and after the intrusion of colonialism. Citing problems like corruption, internal conflicts, insensitive leadership, prolonged political tenure to the detriment of democratic institutions and inertia; opponents put forward notions such as 'How Africans underdeveloped Africans' thus faulting the dependency theory for been inadequate to examine inward trends that have contributed significantly to underdevelopment. It is accounted that contemporary problems bedeviling underdeveloped countries cannot be blamed entirely on those early years of colonialism and imperialism; mostly such problems are resultant effects of how these countries have administered themselves over time.

However, while appraising such position, economic historian, Alexander Gerschenkron examined underdeveloped countries and the involvement of government in industrial process, thus not allowing the free flow of economic institutions which would affect economic growth and development. To him, underdeveloped countries have witnessed state intervention (although less than the Soviet Union) well beyond what most scholars imagined, as such they find themselves further and further from the world technological frontier (Gerschenkron, 1962). Also, such views contend that within the underdeveloped sub-group of countries, there are some countries which did not witness any form of colonialism, rather fought to preserve their sovereignty during the years of imperialism and colonialism. Ironically, these countries are still classified as underdeveloped. Countries like Ethiopia, Liberia, and Thailand were not colonialized yet these countries remain poor and classified as Third world countries.

Snyder (1980) argues also that most of the underdevelopment and dependency theorist did not subscribe to any empirical approach to social science. Consequently, they conceive dependency theory by nature as normative: to which the key terms of development and underdevelopment are largely subjective. Quite naturally, a moral rhetoric has become a part of dependency theory because it seeks to discern circumstances leading to underdevelopment in order to improve the status quo (Bosch, 1997; Snyder, 1980). This particular normative and subjective nature of dependency theory has led to multiple permutations of dependency concepts. Furthermore, dependency theory is faulted for its focus solely on economic terms, as against political dependency and other forms of dependency.

Nigeria's Post-Colonial and Contemporary Dependency: A Challenge to Sustained Economic Growth and Enduring Economic Development

Many scholars share the view that the pair of economic growth and economic development share one of the most striking semantic similarities. Specifically, growth is seen as a fore-runner to development, and it deals strictly with economic variables in a society at a given point in time. Furthermore, growth denotes the quantitative increase in the volume of output in an economy over a given period of time. Although at times growth may be rapid within an economy, but it does not occur at all times. A principal characteristic of growth is that it is un-dimensionally economic and does not incorporate the welfare of citizens within a given country.

On its part, economic development is quite different; it is permanent and endures, unlike economic growth. Thus, it denotes “growth, in addition to structural, physical technological changes in all segments of the society”. It has also been described as a multi-dimensional process which involves the re-organization,, re-orientation and restructuring of the entire economic and social system within a society (Todaro, 1977:90). Furthermore, economic development embraces features such as equal opportunities for all citizens, full employment, availability of social services and equitable distribution of resources among the populace; as well as basic political rights. It is also concerned with the effects of the expansion of output (growth) on the quality of lives of individuals within a nation. Thus, economic development impacts positively on all the sectors within an economy as a result of interdependence among the sectors, which results to the availability of jobs due to the fact that all sectors are fully activated.

From the above brief explanation of economic development and few of its characteristics, there is no doubt that Nigeria still remains under-developed because none of the above indices of development characterizes the nation's economy. Scholars and commentators have continued to ponder over the reasons for this state of affairs despite the enormous natural and human resources that abound in the country. While many have blamed the colonial heritage and diverse socio-political and economic problems that hamper post-colonial nation-building process, many others lay the blame on poor political leadership that has stunted efforts at economic growth and development. However, it is the contention of this paper that post-colonial economic dependence that has been sustained till date remains the major challenge to the actualization of sustained growth and enduring economic development in Nigeria.

(i) Post-Colonial Trends in Nigeria's Dependency

The arrival of Europeans shattered and disorganized the age long pre-colonial economy which existed in Nigeria and marked the beginning of her underdevelopment and dependence on Western economy. Although this process existed with the years of slavery which deprived Nigeria (and her African neighbours) of her productive population, the arrival of the Europeans and subsequent colonialism provided a way to re-affirm European political and economic hegemony on Nigeria. The colonial powers ensured the continuous supply of primary products (cocoa, groundnut, oil palm etc.) to Euro-America while in turn importing expensive goods from here and ensuring that the Nigeria economy did not take-off. Under such economic subservience, she gained political independence just like other Third world countries. Since independence, Nigeria has thus been faced with the challenge of discharging the last relics of colonialism which seems to be her economic disadvantaged position in the world capitalist economy orchestrated by the likes of Britain, the United States and France among others. Post-independence Nigeria was controlled by the bourgeoisie class which the colonial powers handed over the apparatus of government to in order to ensure the status quo of economic subservience is preserved.

From Kwame Nkrumah's analysis of post-independence class structure in Africa (Nkrumah, 1973) from 1960, the bourgeoisie controlled the major industrial and commercial establishment in all key sectors of the Nigerian economy assisted by their 'compradors' –representing and serving international capitalist interests counterparts. Up to the early 1970s, major sectors of the economy were dominated by foreign investments and domestic resources were exploited by the foreign investors mainly for their own appropriation (Obasi, 2005).

Since 1960s to date, Nigeria has been a country dependent on a single source of capital generation. This monoculture economy presented such situation which in the 1960s, agriculture was the mainstay of the Nigerian economy and accounted for over 63.4% of her GDP (Abudu, 1983) while from the 1970s crude oil started to play the same role and contributed for about 80% of her GDP. Post-independent bourgeoisie class in Nigeria patterned and maintained this monoculture economy which she inherited to favour the interest of international capitalist system its class. More so, foreign direct investment in these sectors was dominated western companies.

In the agricultural sector, British colonial policy maintained an economic imperialism by first encouraging farmers to specialize in the production of cash crops to meet her desire for raw materials for her teeming industries. To further maintain this condition, Marketing Boards were established with the right to buy these cash crops at very low prices for export, but these prices never reflected the interest of Nigerian farmers or the development of the agricultural sector. Developed capitalist nations purchased these primary products at very low prices and then processed them into finished goods for re-sale in Nigeria. The bourgeoisie class maintained these boards and other agricultural policy which ultimately led to the massive importation of food items like rice, wheat, sugar, poultry feeds, and fertilizer. Post-independence Nigeria dependence on the agricultural sector saw foreign investment in this sector to preserve this modus operandi. Nigerian government concluded major joint-venture agreements with foreign multinational companies like African Timber and Plywood Company, Mushin Estates, Tate and Lyle, Savannah Sugar and Swiss-Nigerian Wood Industries (Onimode, 1981). Such agreements saw continuous dependence of the agricultural sector on investments from the Euro-American companies.

From the 1970s when the oil boom started, the same mono-cultural economy remained, but this time the focus was on oil exploration and exploitation.

Similarly, foreign owned multi-national companies dominated this sector, thus making Nigeria's dependence to western capitalist countries highly pronounced. Consequently, due to Nigeria's technical inability and Western countries supposed superiority and technical knowledge in exploration of crude oil, exploration in Nigeria depended on western countries for the development of this sector. Post-independent governments allowed a number of companies like Shell BP, Agip, Gulf, Mobil, Texaco, Elf, Ashland and Safrap to control the patterns of exploiting Nigeria's natural wealth to the benefit of their home countries. Consequently, these multinational corporations have been appropriating most of the surpluses from this sector and correspondingly de-capitalizing the economy. According to official accounts, from 1966 to 1970, foreign control of major concessions in the oil sector was put at 100% and only declined slowly from 1976 to 39.2% with Nigerian ownership at 60.8% (Financial Times, 1980). Critics have traced this antecedent and highlighted this peculiar situation in Nigeria as the reason behind her underdevelopment (Obasi, 2005).

The same pattern was replicated in other segments of the Nigerian economy. Particularly, the domination of foreign companies in sensitive sectors of post-independence economy likes manufacturing, building and construction, transportation, banking and finance etc. have been documented. It is believed that such situation further guaranteed Nigeria's dependence to Western-capitalist system and has made it difficult for Nigeria to attain economic development.

(ii) Contemporary Trends in Nigeria's Dependency

Today, in analyzing Nigeria's contemporary economic dependence position, it could be observed that with the current global economic crisis and economic advancement of some countries previously perceived to be underdeveloped, there is a shift in Nigeria's dependency pattern or loyalty. Countries like China, Brazil, Singapore and even South Africa, have become integral components economies which Nigeria seems to depend on for some form of survival. Although, Nigeria's oil wealth still plays a decisive role in the modus operandi of such economic relationship, but concerns have been raised on if Nigeria is slowly drifting into the same oblivion of dependency which existed during the immediate post-independence period. Particularly, China, because of her growing global economic and political influence has made it possible or "mandatory" for almost all nations to engage her (Kalu, 2011). China has currently emerged as the second largest economy in the world, only few places behind the United States of America. Perhaps another reason why it seems important for countries like

Nigeria to turn to China for economic dependence is because of Chinese perspective and quite currently her position as major driver in development. Some scholarly positions believe the Chinese economic background makes it easier to understand Nigeria's problems and her markets; thus China seeks to collaborate at multilateral levels with Nigeria.

It could be considered also, that Nigeria's new form of dependency to countries other than the West draws from sentimental positions. Among such, sentiments like the failure of western styled development policies and programmes; geophysical similarities between Nigeria and these emerging economies; and finally the stringent conditions of western developmental assistance have been raised continuously. Nigeria's growing economic dependency to these emerging economies has been promoted by various institutions (like the Nigeria-China Joint Commission for Cooperation) set to encourage such dependency in numerous forms.

Particularly, Sino-Nigeria trade is expanding, as well as assuring economic and political ties. The volume of trade between Nigeria and China in 2010 reached 7.5 billion U.S dollars while Nigeria maintains the position of the fourth trade partner of China in Africa and second exporter market in the continent (Okoh, 2011). By November 2010, the total contract investment by China in Nigeria reached 13. 3 billion US dollars of which most investment was concentrated in the oil and gas sector (Williams, 2011). Since the early 2000s, the number of Chinese multi-national corporations investing/working in Nigeria has increased with this geometric leap in bi-lateral trade volume. To guarantee these economic benefits, Nigeria acceded to China's "One China Policy" which has always been the pre-requisite of Chinese engagement with other countries. This requirement was clearly stated in China's Africa policy document (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, 2006) in which China recognizes Nigeria's sovereignty and even though it demands recognition of the People's Republic of China. In recognition of the "One China Policy", the Nigeria government has no official political dealings with Taiwan; instead Nigeria – Taiwan engagement is limited to economic and business arrangements that are at the prerogative of a sovereign Nigerian state and does not technically renege on commitment to the "One China Policy" (Kalu, 2011).

Apart from trade, Nigeria depends on China on other areas like technical training, military weapons, construction and infrastructural development. Although "the One China Policy" does not allow for military intervention and control of political structures, China has increased its military presence in

Africa and Nigeria to protect its numerous economic investments. Alden (2007) notes that military cooperation and growth of arms sales are parts and aspects of relations with African governments, especially those under threat owing to civil war, insurgency or even domestic opposition. Under this background, Nigerian military benefits immensely from partnership with the Chinese government mostly during this period of increased security concern all for the sole aim of protecting Chinese economic investments.

Adverse Effects of Dependency on the Nigerian Economy
Despite Nigeria's economic dependent relationship both with Western or the emerging economies it has not availed her opportunities to develop at the same pace like some other countries. No doubt, while Nigeria enjoys foreign direct investments, her economic ability has been undermined. Her dependence on these economies in the 21st century has thus been seen as neo-colonialism, where by the economic relics of colonialism is maintained thus encouraging the re-colonization of Nigeria by Western or emerging economies. But what are the implications of these dependency trends on Nigeria (both past and contemporary). Over time scholars have identified numerous effects of Nigeria's continued dependency on foreign countries which are discussed below.

Economic dependency undermines political independence and creates a weak government susceptible to control. Nigeria just after political independence had so much economic attachments to Britain demonstrative in the volume of trade and the number of multi-national companies functioning in Nigeria. This made it increasing difficult for Nigerian government to assert herself independently on domestic or international matters. This affected not only Nigeria's foreign policy pattern but her relationship with other African countries. For instance, voting on matters in the United Nations would always be considered first in economic terms before the general benefit of Nigeria as a nation-state. Again, western governments, in a bid to maintain such dependent status-quo could covertly or overtly involve in the general political process of Third world countries. An example is the alleged British support for the Lt. Colonel Dimka-led coup of February, 13th 1976. Similarly, such dependency position takes away from Nigeria decision makers' natural right to make choices on production and industrialization patterns, thus ensuring they do not set the parameters of economic choices (Alkasum *et al.,* 1985).

On the economic side, the presence of numerous foreign controlled companies led to huge financial repatriation of capital, thereby developing their economies and continuing this process of dependency and underdevelopment. Dependency allows for these foreign companies to bring in little resources into a Third world country and take away more for their own use back home. For example in Nigeria, between 1970 and 1980 the total amount of outflow of investment was 6.5 trillion US dollars against an inflow of 3.8 trillion US dollars (UN, 1983). Such figure excludes the total amount of money stolen from Nigeria's coffers by the corrupt bourgeoisie class in charge of government during the same period.

Another economic effect of dependency on the Third world economy like Nigeria is the increase of debt burden. Specifically, since Third world economies cannot sustain the patterns of economic competition with their developed counterparts, they have to resort to borrowing. In order to finance major budget deficit, these countries run to neo-capitalist institutions to acquire loans. Financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, Paris Club, G8 and even financial alliances formed by emerging economies (BRICS –Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) would become lenders of resort to Third world countries. Although some of these financial institutions might introduce stringent conditions (like austerity in Nigeria under SAP programme) the general debt profile of these countries would increase as a result of initial economic dependence. Accordingly, Okigbo (1981) asserts that such situation presented Nigeria with a total debt burden of over 19.8 billion US dollars in 1982. Contemporary evidence proved that with such economic dependence during the years of military administration, Nigeria owed 30.8 billion US dollars in 2004 (Ogunlana, 2005).

Dependency creates a huge reliance on foreign economies both for goods and economic sustenance. On the part of goods reliance, such dependency would not avail the opportunity for industries to grow beyond certain stages. Furthermore, such Third world economy might remain in primary production stage with inherent capacity to move into industrialization but hindered by foreign importation of manufactured goods. More so, it becomes difficult for dependent countries to fully utilize her natural resources for its common benefit. Also, this could create an adverse balance of payments between countries (mostly in dependent countries). Furthermore, with the current global economic crisis, it becomes apparent that such dependent Third world countries are susceptible to economic shocks and recession which might affect Western economies.

Conclusion: New Political Economic Thinking and Need to Escape Dependency

Understanding some of the effects of dependency on Third world countries like Nigeria has made it necessary for these countries to reconsider most of its economic relationships with some countries. Such consideration for both pervious colonial powers (Western countries) and emerging economies (China and Brazil), have put into better perspective the postulations of the dependency theorists. Accordingly, neo-Marxist theories (such as dependency) question such relationships and advocate for internal dependence or a regional dependency among countries. From historical accounts, lessons could be drawn from the new ways to confront cotemporary problems. Africa is in need of a progressive change and if such change could be achieved by economic relationships, she must not assume the dependent position if such relationships should exist.

Nigeria, just like other Third world countries, is blessed with numerous natural resources which make her the envy of both Western countries and emerging nations. Besides, it was these natural resources which attracted colonial powers to her in the first place. Consequently, under international boundaries of bi-lateral and multi-lateral economic relationships, Nigeria could take the leading role and not revise the case; breaking away from neo-colonial controls which hold captive her economic development. Although some scholars advocate adoption of a socialist mode of production; where the Nigerian proletariat and peasantry would have the opportunity to control, exploit and utilize Nigeria's domestic resources for genuine national development (Obasi, 2005) ,the answer would be to perform whatever solution without Nigeria playing second fiddle.

Dependence on foreign inputs by Nigeria seems more pronounced as from the beginning of the 21st century. For instance, despite the existence of many universities and diverse experts in the fields of science and technology, industrialization in Nigeria is at its lowest ebb. The major reason for this is the non-existence of an enabling environment for industries to operate fruitfully. Lack of basic infrastructures especially good road net-work, rail-roads and erratic energy supplies exacerbates the fate of industries in Nigeria. Consequently, Nigeria imports virtually all its needs, both industrial products and even basic food for sustenance of its enormous population. The level of dependence is so disturbing to the effect that although Nigeria is the sixth largest world producer of petroleum resources; ironically, till date (July 2013) it imports refined petroleum for domestic consumption.

It is against this pitying/embarrassing scenario that this paper recommends that Nigerian political leaders must proactively re-direct the affairs of the country, particularly the vexed issue of economic mismanagement witnessed in enormous corruption at different levels of governance. The first step to take in curtailing excessive corruption is by ensuring the non- politicization of sensitive issues of economic management by putting 'square pegs in square holes'. After more than fifty years of political independence, the issue of "quota system" should be de-emphasized if Nigeria is to witness sustained growth in all sectors of its economy. Sustained growth will no doubt lead to envisaged economic development through the utilization of its abundant human resource that will put the nation's abundant natural resources into effective use, thereby achieving enduring development before the end of the 21st century. This is achievable through the emergence of visionary/selfless political leaders, who will champion this course and free Nigeria from its dependency status as soon as possible.

References

Ake, C. (1981) *A Political Economy of Africa*. Enugu: Longman.

Alden, C. (2007) *China Into Africa*. London: Zed Books.

Alkasum, A. (1985) *The Nigerian Economic Crisis: Causes and Solutions*. Lagos: ASUU Publication.

Almond, G. & Coleman, S. eds, (1960) *The Politics of the Developing Areas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Amadi, L. (2012) "Africa: Beyond the 'New' Dependency: A Political Economy" *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* Vol. 6 No.8.

Amin, S. (1971) "Underdevelopment and Dependence in Black Africa: Historical Origin." *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 2.

Black, C. (1996) *The Dynamics of Modernization: A Study in Comparative History*. New York Harper Torchbooks.

Bosch, G. (1997) "Eric Williams and the Moral Rhetoric of Dependency Theory" *Callaloo* Vol.20 No. 4

Dean,T (1973) *Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective. Society for Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Cambridge: New York.

Dos Santos, T. (2002) *El Nuevo character de la dependencia (The New Character of Dependence),* Reversed Edition Cuadernos del CESO (CESO's Notebooks), 10. Santiago: CESP.

Fanon, F. (1961) *The Wretched of the Earth*, London: Penguin Books.

Ferro, V. (1996). "Dependency Theory: An Introduction." Paper Presented at Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts July 1996 http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/depend.htm

Financial Times July, 1980 "Nigeria: Twenty Years after Independence".

Frank, A.G. (1968) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York: Monthly Press.

Galtung, J. (1972) "Structural Theory of Imperialism." *The African Review*, Vol. 1. No. 4.

Gerschenkron, A. (1962). *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.

Ihimodu, I. (1994) "Nigeria's Experience with Medium Term Planning", *Planning and Budgeting in Nigeria: Institutional and Policy Reforms.* Ibadan: NCEMA.

Kalu, E. (2012) "Understanding Africa's China Policy: A Test of Dependency Theory and a Study of African Motivations in Increasing Engagement with China." *University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Political Science Department: Thesis, Dissertation and Student Scholarships*. Paper 21 http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/poliscithesis/21 [Accessed 20/04/2013].

Keet, M. (2002) "Neo-Marxist Dependency Theories: Dependency and Underdevelopment in Third World Countries", Department of Government & Society, University of Limerick, Ireland. http://www.meteck.org/dependency.html [Accessed 07/03/2013].

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (2006) *China's African Policy* Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC). http://www.focac.org/eng/zfgx/dfzc/ [Accessed April 21, 2013].

Nigerian Index Report see http://www.mongabay.com/history/nigeria/nigeria-foreign_trade_foreign_trade_and_balance_of_payments.html Accessed 20/04/2013

Nkrumah, K. (1973) *Class Struggle in Africa*. Accra: Panaf Books.

Nwankwo, G. (2001) *Africa and International Monetary Corporation* Lagos: Evergreen Associates.

Obasi, I. (2005) "The Domestic Dimensions of the Nigeria Economy: 1960 – 1985" *Nigeria's International Economic Relations: Dimensions of Dependence and Change.* Lagos: N I I A.

Offiong, D. (1980) *Imperialism and Dependence*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Ogunlana, A. (2005) *Nigeria and the Burden of External Debt: The Need for Debt Relief* see www.g24.org/TGM/ongu0905.pdf Accessed 15/03/2013

Ogunyemi, A. (2012) "Capital Budget of Nigeria, 1954 – 1996: An Assessment of its Contributions to Infrastructure Development" *UZU: Journal of History and International Studies*, Vol. 3 No.1.

Okigbo, P. (1981) *Nigeria's Financial System: Structure and Growth*, Ibadan: Longman.

Okoh, C. (2011). "Nigeria, China Trade Relations Hits U.S. $7.5 Billion." *Daily Champion Newspaper* February 11.

Onimode, B. (1981) "Imperialism and Nigerian Development", *Path to Nigerian Development*, Dakar: Codesria Book Series.

Parson, T. (1966) *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Rodney, W. (1972) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Dar Es Salam: Bogle L'Ouleture Publications and Tanzania Publishing Company.

Rostow, W (1960) *Stages of Economic Growth*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snyder, F. (1980) "Law and Development in the Light of Dependency Theory", *Law and Society Review.* Vol. 14 No. 3: Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

So, A. (1990). *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency and World Systems Theories.* London: Sage Publications.

Todaro, M.P. (1977) *Economics for a Developing World*, London: Longman.

Wallerstein, I. (1973) "Dependence in an Independent World: The Limited Possibilities of Transformation within the Capitalist Economy" Paper presented at *the Conference on Dependence and Development in Africa* Ottawa, 16 to 18 Feb.

Wayne, J (2006) "Dependency Theory: A Critique." *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 2, No. 4. http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0318-6431%28197723%292%3A4%3C399%3ADTAC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-c[accessed 13/03/2013].

Williams, S. (2011). "Chinese Execute 117 Projects Worth $2.1 Billion in the Nation." *Daily Trust Newspaper*, Feb 24.

References to this paper should be made as follows: Uchechukwu Igwe and Austine Ifeanyi Okere (2013), Third World Dependency: The Nigerian Perspective. *J. of Arts and Contemporary Society,* Vol. 5, No. 2, Pp. 67 – 86.