



Neo-colonial Dependence and Dualistic Development Models: An Exploration of the Development Communication Trajectory in Nigeria

Osakue Stevenson Omoera^{1*}, Enuwa Evelyn Obekpa²

¹Departement of English and Communication Studies, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Federal University
Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria
Email: osakueso@fuotuoche.edu.ng

²Centre of Excellence on Development Communication, Department of Theatre and Performing Arts, Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria, Nigeria
Email: evelynobekpa@gmail.com

Abstract

Communication has been identified as the underlying factor for human development whether at the socio-scientific, socio-economic or socio-political levels. Globally, development communication has increasingly become a critical component in the pursuit of scientific, economic, agricultural, social and political advancement of human societies. It is within this context that this study uses the historical-analytic, sociological and direct observation methods to appraise the neo-colonial and dualistic development models. In doing this, it highlights critical inferences on how development communication could be more beneficial to developing countries in Africa, specifically Nigeria, by way of communicating science and producing higher end products in the vital sectors of the economy. The conclusion reached is that through the dynamics of development communication the Nigerian populace can be mobilised and empowered to be productively creative in their contributions to Nigeria's gross domestic product (GDP) and improve their living standard.

Keywords: *neo-colonial dependence, dualistic development, nigeria, development communication, socio-economic development.*

Abstrak

Komunikasi telah diidentifikasi sebagai faktor yang mendasari perkembangan manusia baik pada tingkat sosial-ilmiah, sosial-ekonomi atau sosial-politik. Secara global, komunikasi pembangunan semakin menjadi komponen penting dalam mengejar kemajuan ilmu pengetahuan, ekonomi, pertanian, sosial dan politik masyarakat manusia. Dalam konteks inilah studi ini menggunakan metode pengamatan historis-analitik, sosiologis dan langsung untuk menilai model pembangunan neo-kolonial dan dualistik. Dalam melakukan ini, ia menyoroti kesimpulan kritis tentang bagaimana komunikasi pembangunan dapat lebih bermanfaat bagi negara-negara berkembang di Afrika, khususnya Nigeria. Dengan cara mengkomunikasikan ilmu pengetahuan dan menghasilkan produk-produk akhir yang lebih tinggi di sektor-sektor vital ekonomi. Kesimpulan yang dicapai adalah bahwa melalui dinamika komunikasi pembangunan, penduduk Nigeria dapat dimobilisasi dan diberdayakan untuk menjadi kreatif secara produktif dalam kontribusi mereka terhadap produk domestik bruto (PDB) Nigeria dan meningkatkan standar hidup mereka.

Kata kunci: ketergantungan neo-kolonial, pengembangan dualistik, nigeria, komunikasi pembangunan, pembangunan sosial ekonomi.

INTRODUCTION

This study is a theoretical exploration of neo-colonial and dualistic development models and how development communication could help to galvanise socio-economic and socio-political growth in Africa, with particular reference to the Nigerian situation. Communication has been identified as the underlying factor for human development whether at the socio-scientific, socio-economic, or socio-political levels (Omoera 2010). This is inherent in the ability to, among other things (Anejionu, Ahiaramunnah, and Nri-ezedi 2016); connect individuals to the social and scientific spaces, thereby realizing the development agendas to meet the needs of society. Regrettably, achieving this has been perennially threatened by the inertia of contemporary African society to harness local potentialities for its development needs, and perpetual reliance on the global north. Although Nigeria has since attained independence, the minds of the people appear to be wilfully subjugated to the control of the hitherto colonial power (Licata et al. 2018). This is probably responsible for the ever-widening gap between the developed north and the developing south. Underpinned by the neo-colonial dependence and dualistic development models, this conceptual paper, historicises the critical role of development communication in harnessing local resources for the overall growth of the Nigerian society.

Neo-colonialism has been conceptualised as the continuation of the economic model of colonialism after a colonized territory has achieved formal political independence (G P Atkins & Wilson 2008). This concept was applied most commonly to Africa in the latter half of the twentieth century (Daxecker 2014). European countries had colonized much of the continent in the late nineteenth century, instituting a system of economic exploitation in which African raw materials, particularly cash crops and minerals, were explored and exported for the sole benefits of the colonizing powers. The idea of neo-colonialism, however, suggests that when European powers granted nominal political independence to colonies in the decades after World War II, they continued to control the economies of the new African countries (Calder 2013).

The neo-colonial dependence model is a way of explaining underdevelopment with regard to historical factors and the influence that developed, capitalist countries from the centre have on the less developed countries in the periphery. The basis of this model stem from the Marxist tradition

and plays off the North versus South idea where the Northern, rich countries have the power and capital to influence the Southern, poor countries (Todaro & Smith 2015). Neo-colonial dependence theory is a view of economic development that began to take shape in the 1970s as previous economic theories, Keynesian and others, did not lead to marked increases in international development in less developed or developing countries (Ofason 2018). It's base argument comes from the Marxist thought that obstacles to economic development come from external factors which prohibit economic growth from occurring. These external factors are primarily because more developed capitalist countries gain wealth from less developed countries through exploitation or neglect (Trouillot, 2010).

Karl Marx proposed the idea "rich countries gain their riches off the neck of the poor" (Chirot, 1977). Developed countries through exploiting low-cost labour, acquiring raw materials and supplies from economically poorer countries, gain wealth through this exploitation, while simultaneously not reinvesting this wealth in the form of infrastructure, wage increase, working conditions, and other means that improve the countries quality of life. Whereas in developing countries there are still many trade barriers and restrictions on foreign investment (Yıldırım and Gökalp 2016). These rich-poor power dynamics is illustrated with two circles, one representing the rich countries in the middle, with the poor, exploited countries on the outside. As the inner circle enlarges, because of the accumulated riches from the poorer countries representing the outer circle, the wage difference between rich and poor continually increases and cannot equalize (Coker 2008). The characteristic of developing countries is the dualism between the traditional economy and industry. As this wealth disparity increases, the poorer countries become more financially and politically dependent on the rich countries and economic development in the poor countries is never fully realized because of these differences in power.

The neo-colonial dependence model attributes underdevelopment to the exploitation of the poor countries either intentionally or through unintentional neglect (Di Maria and Strykowski 2009). This result in an unequal power relationship with developed nations in the centre and poorer ones on the periphery. This situation is reinforced by elite groups within poor countries who

are in privileged positions as landowners, government hierarchies (the military for example) and benefit from, or are 'rewarded' by the existing relationships so have no desire for change. This situation has been perennially observed in many African countries such as Nigeria, South Africa, Ghana, Sudan, Zimbabwe, Mali, Congo, Kenya, among others.

METHODS

The neo-colonial dependence model is an indirect outgrowth of Marxist thinking. It attributes the existence and continuance of development primarily to the historical evolution of a highly unequal international capitalist system of rich country-poor country relationship. Whether because rich nations are intentionally exploitative or unintentionally neglectful, the coexistence of rich and poor nations in an international system dominated by such unequal power relationships between the centre (the developed countries such as Britain, China, US, etc) and the periphery (the less developed countries such as Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan, etc) renders attempt by poor nations to be self-reliant and independent difficult and sometimes impossible (Diamond 2005). Indeed, Omoera and Ibagere (2010) eloquently captured the point being made with respect to the unbalanced relationship between African media and its first world counterparts using the Nigerian television experience.

The neo-colonial dependence model is fairly structural which means that individual actions are largely ignored and collective actions such as actions of the state are examined. While this may be a better approach when looking at the influence a democratized (Lemon 2007), developed country has over a less developed country since the people, generally speaking, govern democracy and, therefore, looking at the institution's influence may be more productive. However, one also needs to consider the actions of a dictator and dependency theory does not always make room for that sort of analysis. Another critique of dependency theory is that it has Marxist tendencies, which may be valid as it has distant roots in Marxist teachings (Osunbor 2011).

Certain groups in the developing countries (including landlords, entrepreneurs, military rulers, merchants, salaried public officials and trade union leaders) who enjoy high incomes social status, and political power constitute a small elite ruling class whose principal interest, is in the perpetuation of the

international capitalist system of inequality by which they are rewarded. Directly and indirectly, they serve and are rewarded by international special interest power groups, including multinational corporations, national bilateral aids and multilateral assistance organizations such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which are tied by allegiance or funding by the wealthy capitalist countries. The elites' activities and viewpoints often serve to inhibit any genuine reform efforts that might benefit the wider population and in some cases actually lead to even lower levels of living and to the perpetuation of underdevelopment (Oshodi 2009). The neo-Marxist, neo-colonial view of underdevelopment attributes a large part of the developing world's continuing and worsening poverty to the existence and policies of the international capitalist countries of the Northern hemisphere and their extensions in the form of small but powerful elite or comprador groups in the less developed countries (Yıldırım and Gökalp 2016).

According to the tenets of the neo-colonial dependency theory, underdevelopment is thus seen as an extremely induced phenomenon, aided by the few international oligarchies. Revolutionary struggles or at least major restructuring of the world capitalist system are therefore required to free dependent developing nations from the direct and indirect economic control of their developed world and domestic oppressors. In Nigeria, the implications of this model has led to the impoverishment of the people, such that it has promoted corruption, lack of transparency, poverty and hunger, high illiteracy level and restiveness among the various social groups (Shin and Webber 2014). The politicians have taken advantage of these social problems to cause extreme hatred among the citizen's such that the right of the people are trampled upon, while the hegemonic few, mount their will on the populace.

Neo-colonial dependence model has two major weaknesses. First, although it offers an appealing explanation of why many poor countries remain underdeveloped, it offers little formal or informal explanations of how countries initiate and sustain development (Oshodi 2009). By this limitation, it only brings out the problems faced by these countries without proffering solutions to these existing problems (Jaramillo, L. & Sancak 2007). For instance, development

agenda in Nigeria cannot be achieved by mere raising the issues at stake, but by suggesting concrete ways to scale up the socio-economic and socio-scientific lives of the populace.

Second, the actual economic experience of less developed countries that have pursued revolutionary campaigns of industrial nationalization and state-run production has been mostly negative. If neo-colonial dependency model is taken at its face value, one would conclude that the best course for developing countries is to become entangled as little as possible, with the developed countries and instead, pursue a policy of self-dependence, or inwardly directed development, or at most, trade only with other developing countries. But large countries that embark on autocratic policies, such as China and to a significant extent, India, experienced stagnant growth and ultimately decided to substantially open their economies, China, beginning this process after 1978 and India after 1990. At the opposite extreme, economies such as Taiwan and South Korea that have most emphasized exporting, at least, to developed countries have grown very strongly (Kapoor 2002).

Critics of neo-colonial dependency theory claim that it takes into account too much of the Western world and, therefore, the idea and needs of the third world are pushed away. Some even say that dependency incorporates certain orientations that it does not recognize (Kapoor 2002). This, in turn, overshadows the already disenfranchised Third World even more. Also, the fact that the theory focuses on more socially oriented issues, being positive, it also can hinder economic development work. The lack of economically and strategically based research within this framework can be a hindrance when trying to determine why a certain country has not developed. Although close to the metropolitan countries during the colonial period apparently produced lastingly damaging outcomes, for example, Peru under Spain, Congo under Belgium, India under Great Britain, or West Africa under France at the very least, this relationship appears to have significantly altered during the post-colonial period. For perspective, the key to successful development performance is achieving a careful balance among what government can accomplish, what the private market system can do, and what both can best do together.

While the international-dependence revolution in development theory was capturing the imagination of many western and LDC scholars, a reaction was

emerging in the late 1970s in the form of a neo-colonial free-market counterrevolution. This very different approach would ultimately dominate Western (and, to a large extent, LDC) development writings during the 1980s and early 1990s (Metz 2009). One must denounce the existence of economic, financial and social mechanisms which although they are manipulated by people, often function almost automatically, thus, accentuating the situation of wealth for some and poverty for the rest. These mechanisms, which are manoeuvred directly or indirectly by the more developed countries, by their very functioning, favour the interests of the people manipulating them. But in the end, they suffocate or condition the economies of the less developed or developing countries (Robinson 2011).

Dualism is a concept that is widely discussed in development economics. It represents the existence and persistence of increasing divergences between rich and poor nations and rich and poor people on various levels. One of the elements of dualism is that there is a coexistence of wealthy, highly educated elite with masses of illiterate poor people within the same country or city. In developing countries, growth shows very low (Chaudhuri, Schneider, and Chattopadhyay 2006). Frantz Fanon, in a slightly different context, aptly refers to such a situation as “reciprocal exclusivity” (Fanon, 1963). Accordingly, there is a coexistence of powerful and wealthy industrialized nations with weak, impoverished peasant societies in the international economy.

This coexistence is chronic and not merely transitional. It is not due to a temporary phenomenon, in which with the capacity of time, the discrepancy between superior and inferior elements would be eliminated. The continuation of the disparity between the rich and the poor countries is perpetuated through a rich elite class that lives within the poor country. The fact that poor countries never properly economically develop, according to the theory, traces its root back to the historical development of the international capitalist economic system (Lall 2012). Dualistic development model takes the view that within all countries, there is inequality that is not temporary. The divergence between superior and inferior is increasing and that relationship does not necessarily pull up the inferior and in fact, may well push it down further.

Assumptions of the dualistic development model. Dualistic theories assume a split of economic and social structures of different sectors so that they differ in an organization, level of development and goal structures.

- i. Different sets of conditions – superior and inferior can coexist in a given space. An example is Lewis' notion of the coexistence of modern and traditional methods of production in urban and rural sectors.
- ii. The coexistence is chronic. In other words, the international coexistence of wealth and poverty is simply not a historical phenomenon that can be rectified in time.
- iii. The degree of superiority or inferiority not only fails to show any signs of diminishing but even has an inherent tendency to increase.
- iv. The interrelations between superior and inferior elements are such that the existence of the superior elements rather may actually serve to push it down, i.e., to develop its underdevelopment.

A number of scholars stress the dualism of specific factors. Studies explain regional dualism as a lack of communications and exchange between regions, the capital sometimes begins an island which in geographical terms, belong to the developing country, in economic terms, however, to the industrialized country. Economic, technological and regional dualism is often a consequence of a social dualism, the absence of a relationship between people of different race, religion and language, which in many cases, is a legacy of colonialism (Ruvalcaba, M. & Efren 2013).

Implications of dualistic development model on developing countries (Nell, Puck, and Heidenreich 2015). Dualistic development model argues that the world's present state can be most validly seen as the outcome of domination by the "have" nations over the "have not." And, within nations, by the domination of "have" over "haves not" classes and interests. This is surely not a new idea. What is, perhaps, new is acceptance by an increasing number of comparatives that this dichotomy between super-ordinates and subordinates amounts to a powerful, globally applicable, explanatory model. Growth is driven by productivity (Di Maria and Strykowski 2009). The term that expresses the key concepts of the theory is centre-periphery, hegemony, and reproduction. They are used to explain the world as it is supposed to exist today Wallerstein calls it a "world empire" in terms of the unilateral exercise of power by the centre on the periphery, by the

hegemonic on the dependent, bolstered through the systematic reproduction in the periphery of the values of the centre (Wallerstein 2011). Schooling is cast in an especially active role, as reproducing in the young those values, attitudes and skills best fitted to serve the interest of the dominant groups (2004). Colonial representations were made up of exploitation and development (Licata et al. 2018).

Both past and present are analyzed using the same framework of explanation. The historical record is read as beginning with a missionary zeal, which was soon transformed into explicit, unabashed colonization. The contemporary scene is characterized by the retreat of classical colonialism, and its replacement by more sophisticated and insidious colonization – that of the mind and the will. Universities and philanthropic foundations, multilateral and national development agencies, book publishers and mass media organizations, even the very artefacts of industrialized societies (from automobiles to ballpoint pens to infant feeding formulas) are all viewed as instruments of oppression. The oppressed people have merely exchanged physical for mental domination. In Nigeria, there is a clear disparity between the rich and the poor; giving better opportunities to the rich than the poor, in terms of fortune in life, life expectancy rate, infrastructure, and access to education, health services and other advantages.

Comparative implications of neo-colonial dependence and dualism models. Both are known as dependency models. The neo-colonial dependency model has four main points that try to help explain the relationship between the developed countries and the developed countries. These points also are applicable to the dependency models in a given country.

1. There is a centre-periphery relationship due to the political and economic power held by the developed countries over the underdeveloped countries.
2. Many thoughts held by the classical theorists cannot apply to the countries in the periphery.
3. The countries at the centre know they can gain from the countries in the periphery and do in fact gain regardless of the cruelty as a result.

4. The disbursement of income and wealth is extremely unequal and the wealthy keep it for themselves rather than investing in development (Tansey, R. & Hyman 1994).

Dependency theorists use these four points to help boost the rationality of the model. They claim that the exchanges between developed and underdeveloped countries always occur on unequal terms. The developed countries use their economic and political power to exactly what they want at little cost to them and usually at a pretty high cost to the population of the less developed country (Tansey, R. & Hyman 1994). Example of the misuse of power is the transnational corporations operating in the underdeveloped countries that take advantage of the supply of labour and less restrictive labour practices. The corporations locate themselves in an underdeveloped country and because they are not a national company the profit ultimately goes back to the centre and the periphery suffers. The second claim made by dependency theorists is that classical theories do not apply to development in the periphery and depends on the claim of classical theorists that the underdeveloped countries are having trouble developing due to the lack of advancement in technology and capital.

Furthermore, dependency theorists argue that lack of development is caused by the power held over the less developed countries by the developed countries whereas the classical theorists say that taking a laissez-faire approach and the use of free-market will help spur economic development. Classical theorists also believe that economic development and becoming a middle class society will eventually distribute wealth while dependency theorists argue that becoming more developed actually increases the gap between the rich and poor since the newly created jobs are mainly for skilled workers rather than the abundant unskilled labourers that usually lived in less developed countries (Tansey, R. & Hyman 1994). This may not be the strongest argument for neo-colonial dependency theory as the gap between the rich and poor is growing even in developed countries. The third claim made by dependency theory is linked to the first claim of the relationship between the centre and the periphery. The idea that the developed countries make exchanges that benefit themselves with no regard to the less developed countries' needs stem from the historical colonization of the periphery. In the past, colonized countries were only considered valuable because of the resources they held and the slave labour they could supply.

In today's world, multinational corporations use factories in less developed countries for their cheap labour and developed countries exploit resources as well as take advantage of exchange rate and the buying power associated with uneven exchange rates. The fourth point asserted by dependency theory is quite true, however, as the second point; it is true for developed countries as well (Tansey, R. & Hyman 1994). The disbursement of wealth is unequal; the rich seems to just get richer and the poor, poorer buying big, fancy houses, expensive cars, brand name clothing and purses and now even personal jets shows off the wealth accumulated by the rich in both developed and underdeveloped countries. While there are relevant points included in the theory's main ideas as well as some that do not hold, there are other positive aspects to examining neo-colonial dependency theory. Whatever their ideological differences, the advocates of neo-colonial dependence and dualism models reject the exclusive emphasis on traditional neo-colonial economic theories designed to accelerate the growth of gross national product as the principal index of development.

According to Marx and the believers of neo-colonial dependency theory, the only way for poor countries to overcome this oppressively parasitic rich-poor relationship is for the people to unite through revolution to resist the status quo and throw off their oppressors thus gaining their freedom and ability to dictate their own more effective economic policies (Chirot, 1977). In Nigeria, while many people live below the poverty line, the activities of the few rich tend to undermine the many poor so that their efforts at self-empowerment are trampled to the advantage of the few rich. The bourgeoisie tends to create opportunities for the poor through self-presumed modalities, for employment, provision of infrastructure, poverty alleviation, educational advancement and other development indices. Attempts by the poor to resist this is always met with regulations and division among the diverse people of the country, using ethnicity and religion as tools of sentiments.

The fundamental challenge and question for political leaders under the current dispensation is how to attain sustainable development given the proliferation of ethno-religious conflict and the dismaying economic condition in Nigeria. The extents to which foreign direct investments (FDIs) are attracted or

otherwise to any nation are largely determined by the administrative, socio-economic, socio-scientific and socio-political environments. Essentially, these environments are situated within a historical context. These contexts also influence the content of its public policies. Nigeria has a dependent neo-colonial political economy. This is aptly demonstrated, not only in its socio-administrative character but also in its policy context, content and impact. The Nigerian political economy is largely discontinuous, disarticulate, a structural, rentier one; dependent on the global capitalist for its persistence and reproduction. For instance, in Nigeria's bid to join the league of big players in the emerging cyber technology, it launched its NICOMSAT 1 and 11 outside the shores of the country, with the know-how coming from scientists from Japan, China and elsewhere whose national interests are without a doubt different from Nigeria's. This has put the country in a precariously awkward position. Hence, millions of naira went down the drain and the country's cyberspace dream remains a pipe dream.

However, if the view of Benedikter (2019), which holds that Sub-Saharan Africa is at a point where new technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI) could present both opportunities and threats to development and that civil society, governments and international organisations need to make sure that everyone benefits from these technologies – not just elites is anything to go by, we may be heading somewhere in which the teeming number of technopreneurs and African indigenous knowledge (AIK) scientists would be sufficiently motivated to achieve the deliverables for Nigeria's socio-scientific development. This is because, young people in Africa, particularly in Nigeria are among the most inventive and efficient “early adopters” of this nascent artificial intelligence (AI) revolution. Even under difficult circumstances, there are many examples of new technological tools related to AI being adapted or developed to suit local African realities and needs (R Benedikter 2019). AI is, in principle, a strategy aimed at developing human-fed machine learning towards self-sustained learning systems. As the idea goes, mechanical systems should more and more govern themselves in applying practical solutions to complex problems, learning by their experiences to improve capabilities and their features. This is the way to go to creatively counter the vagaries and volatilities of the international markets and technological systems,

which we as a country (Nigeria) and continent (Africa) are unproductively exposed to currently.

In fact, as things stand, what takes place at the international market has a preponderant impact on the Nigerian state. The domestic policies are exogenously oriented and largely converge with the interests of both the foreign and indigenous ruling classes. Policy outputs reflect nothing other than the desires and aspirations of the indigenous policy elites and their foreign counterparts (Logan 2008). The above assumptions become clearer as we realize the nature of the Nigerian state and its implications for policy inputs and outputs. Nigeria is a creation of the British. Precisely, its neo-colonial foundation explains its situation, even independence as “business” outfits: an international investment by the British, whose main purpose was to invest as little as possible, but reap as much as possible “profits”. John Beecroft, who was appointed her majesty consul for the Bight of Benin and Biafra in 1849, began the colonial enterprise in earnest (Oshodi 2009). However, it was Lord Lugard, first Governor-General that completed the routinization and institutionalization of the colonial enterprise in Nigeria, through the establishment of the Oil Rivers, the Niger Coast protectorate and the crown colony, to the amalgamation of the southern and northern protectorates in 1914. It is necessary to add that, all these political activities incorporated the imperialist religious, social, legal, and economic superstructures to the territory, which was eventually, christened “Nigeria”. In fact, the political aspect predominantly determined the leeway for economic domination of the enclave (Industrial Policy of Nigeria 2011).

Fundamentally, the economic activities initiated and maintained in the country were purely commercially oriented. The prominence given to commerce (dominated by foreigners), is illustrated by its having official representations in the various colonial constitutions. A primary objective of the colonial administration was the creation of Nigeria as a source of cheap raw materials and a profitable market for her finished products. Consequently, Britain encouraged its transnational corporations that were commercially oriented to take advantage of the opportunity. Little emphasis was placed on manufacturing or scientific research, which is the bedrock of industrialization. Thus, foreign interests

stringently directed and controlled the Nigerian economy, as local participation was indeed minimal (A A Akinsyanya & Gordon I 2002). Since there is a dearth of requisite indigenous industrial finances and technological prowess; Nigeria has always sought foreign finances and technical assistances for its development plans. Consequently, the western capitalist countries such as Britain, US, Japan and lately China vet and direct the country's development plans and other public policies as a condition for the needed financial assistance. This implies that rather than being self-reliant scientifically, economically and otherwise, Nigeria has become a beggar nation, in spite of its vast and enormous physical and natural resources. Nigeria has become more dependent on foreign inputs in order to sustain its socio-economic and socio-scientific development programmes. This, in a sense, is what has been called "arrested development" (Omoera 2008). This modus operandi must first change theoretically and then practice through a concerted effort at recalibrating and communicating African indigenous knowledge systems (AIKSs) and science, which can be accessed across Nigeria.

CONCLUSION

The endowment of countries with natural resources is unequal. While some countries benefit from fertile agricultural soils, others put a lot of effort into artificial soil amelioration. Some countries such as Nigeria, Brazil, Iraq, Indonesia, United Arab Emirates, and Iran have rich oil and gas deposits within their territories, while others have to import fossil fuels. However, a wealth of natural resources is not the most important determinant of development. Rather, the efficiency with which countries use their productive resources: physical capital, human capital, and natural capital is widely recognized as the main indicator of their level of socio-economic and socio-scientific development. This study, suggests a revolutionary struggle or, at least, a major restructuring of the world's capitalist system so as to free the dependent developing nations from the direct and indirect economic control of their developed world and domestic oppressors. Hence, for a country such as Nigeria to move forward in an increasingly competitive world, those at the helm of affairs must set up developmental platforms and strategically pursue the country's socio-economic growth through human capital development, communication of science and research, self-reliance, good governance and employment generation. This

panoply of efforts is aimed at empowering the populace to live above poverty and develop the required competencies to navigate productively the developmental vortexes of the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES

- A A Akinsyanya & Gordon I. 2002. *Nigerian Government and Politics 1973-1983*. Calabar: Wusen Publisher.
- Anejionu, Obinna C. D., Precious-Ann N. Ahiaramunnah, and Chinenyendo J. Nri-ezedi. 2016. *The 2015 Presidential Election in Nigeria: Gaining Insights with Spatial Analysis*.
- Calder, B. J. 2013. *The Impact of Intervention: The Dominican Republic during the U.S. Occupation of 19916-1924*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Chaudhuri, Kausik, Friedrich Schneider, and Sumana Chattopadhyay. 2006. "The Size and Development of the Shadow Economy: An Empirical Investigation from States of India." *Journal of Development Economics* 80(2):428–43.
- Coker, M. .. 2008. "The State, Industrialization and Direct Foreign Investment in Nigeria, 1960-2005." University of jos.
- Daxecker, Ursula E. 2014. "All Quiet on Election Day? International Election Observation and Incentives for Pre-Election Violence in African Elections." *Electoral Studies* 34:232–43.
- Diamond, J. .. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Viking.
- G P Atkins & Wilson. 2008. *The Dominican Republic and the United States: From Imperialism to Transnationalism*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Industrial Policy of Nigeria. 2011. "Targets, Policies, Incentives, Guidelines and Industrial Framework. Abuja." *Federal Ministry of Industry*.
- Jaramillo, L. & Sancak, C. 2007. *Growth in the Dominican Republic and Haiti: Why Has the Grass Been Greener on One Side of Hispaniola*.
- Kapoor, I. 2002. "Capitalism, Culture, Agency: Dependency versus Post Colonial Theory. *Third World Quarterly*, 23(4),." 647–64.
- Lall, S. 2012. "Is Dependence a Useful Concept in Analyzing Underdevelopment? World Development." *Sciencedirect*.
- Lemon, Anthony. 2007. "Perspectives on Democratic Consolidation in Southern Africa: The Five General Elections of 2004." *Political Geography* 26(7):824–50.
- Licata, Laurent et al. 2018. "Social Representations of Colonialism in Africa and

- in Europe: Structure and Relevance for Contemporary Intergroup Relations.” *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 62(May):68–79.
- Logan, R. .. 2008. *Haiti and the Dominican Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Di Maria, Corrado and Piotr Stryszowski. 2009. “Migration, Human Capital Accumulation and Economic Development.” *Journal of Development Economics* 90(2):306–13.
- Metz, H. .. 2009. *Dominican Republic and Haiti: Country Studies*. Wasingthon DC: Library Of Congress.
- Michael P. Todaro & Stephen C Smith. 2015. *Economic Development*. Wasingthon DC: Wasingthon University Press.
- Nell, Phillip C., Jonas Puck, and Stefan Heidenreich. 2015. “Strictly Limited Choice or Agency? Institutional Duality, Legitimacy, and Subsidiaries’ Political Strategies.” *Journal of World Business* 50(2):302–11. Retrieved (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2014.10.007>).
- Ofason, E. J.et al. 2018. *Public Sector Finance: Theory and Practice, Revised Edition*. Benin City: Wilprint Press.
- Omoera, O. .. 2008. “Revisiting Media Imperialism: A Review of the Nigerian Television Experience.” *The International Journal of Research and Review* 1–18.
- Omoera, O. .. 2010. “Public Relations in a Growing Democracy: A Study of the Nigerian Situation. Enwisdomization.” *An International Journal for Learning and Teaching Wisdom* 62–76.
- Oshodi, B. .. 2009. “Developing Integral Governance and Economic Framework for Sub Saharan Africa.” *Social Science Research Network* 1–18.
- Osunbor, S. 2011. “Opportunities for Foreign Direct Investment in the Industrial and Manufacturing Sectors in Nigeria in Creating a Favourable Environment for Foreign Investment.” in *Proceedings of a workshop by the Centre for Transnational Corporation (UNCTC)*.
- R Benedikter. 2019. “New Tchnologies Can Be a Force for Good in Africa If They’re Developed from the Ground.”
- Robinson, W. 2011. “Globalization and the Sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A Critical Appraisal.” *International Sociology* 26(6):723–45.
- Ruvalcaba, M. & Efren, D. 2013. “Inside the BRIC: Analysis of the Semi Peripheral Nature of Brazil, Russia, India and China. Austral.” *Brazilian Journal of Strategy & International Relations*.
- Shin, Geiguen and David J. Webber. 2014. “Red States, Blue States: How Well Do the Recent National Election Labels Capture State Political and Policy Differences?” *The Social Science Journal* 51(3):386–97.

- Tansey, R. & Hyman, M. .. 1994. "Dependency Theory and the Effect of Advertising by Foreign Based Multinational Corporations in Latin America." *Journal of Advertising* 27–42.
- Yıldırım, Aynur and Mehmet Faysal Gökalp. 2016. "Institutions and Economic Performance: A Review on the Developing Countries." *Procedia Economics and Finance* 38(October 2015):347–59.