International Journal of Advanced Studies in Business Strategies and Management
ISSN Hard Print: 2354-4236 Online: 2354-4244
ASBSM: 014:2:3

THE STATE, INFRASTRUCTURE, DEMOCRACY AND PEASANT PRODUCTION IN NIGERIA

Matthew D. Ogali PhD
Department of Political & Administrative Studies
University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt

Abstract
A major component of colonial development policy was an infrastructure distribution pattern badly skewed against the peasantry and the rural setting in Africa. Colonialism pursued a dual policy of channeling the evacuation of agricultural and mineral resources from Africa to Europe and concentrating infrastructure in the urban areas, a lopsided development policy that was bequeathed to the post-colonial state. This paper argues that though several development strategies have been adopted to develop infrastructure in the rural areas, but all have so far fallen short of satisfactorily developing infrastructure in the rural areas, to enhance peasant production and integration into the mainstream of the nation's economy. The argument is hinged on what is conceptualized here as infrastructure democracy defined as the right of availability and access of the citizens of a state, particularly the rural dwellers, to social and physical infrastructure in their areas of domicile and milieu of economically productive activities. The neo-Marxist theory of unequal or uneven development is the theoretical framework for this paper. The major objective of the paper is to evaluate the implications of the lopsided provision of infrastructure by the state in developing societies like Nigeria. This paper is significant for advocating the view that the concept of democracy needs to be expanded to include uniformity in the provision and access to modern infrastructure in the rural areas where the peasantry is predominant. The methodological approach for data collection is mainly from secondary sources, while the scope of the paper covers every part of Nigeria with special emphasis on the rural areas. The findings show a consistent pattern of deprivation of the rural areas in infrastructure distribution and a persistent failure of rural development policies despite the huge contribution of the rural agricultural sector to the GDP. In conclusion the paper insists that the emphasis on democracy and democratization would be meaningless without infrastructure democracy designed to effectively integrate the peasantry into the modern national economy.

Keywords: *Peasantry, Rural Development, Democracy and Infrastructure*

Background to the Study

Human societies are sustained by infrastructure. No human society or collectivity, no matter how primitive or rustic, is without some basic infrastructure. The concept of Infrastructure might primarily refer to physical structures such as roads, bridges, water supply, sewage system, telecommunications, schools, hospitals, etc but there is a non-physical dimension to it. The development of infrastructure is a natural process that grows with society, a process that reflects the level of development of the intellectual and creative capacity of the members of a society. Infrastructure is therefore embedded in the culture of a society. The paving of roads for access, digging of wells for water, maintenance of the village square, the large wooden drum or gong for communication, the floating bridges across streams, the drainage network, hauling with dug-out wooden or fastened floating logs, etc are all steeped in cultural and infrastructural ingenuity.

In pre-colonial Nigeria peasants depended on farming implements such as digging sticks, hoes, cutlasses, spades, diggers and sickles as well as the construction of barns for storage and preservation. Since they had to walk long distances to market their products pathways had to be constructed for easy access and security. The fishermen / women utilized various types of traps, locally woven nets facilitated by wooden boats, canoes, floats, paddles, buoys and gear, with which they also accessed their local and inter-communal markets. Smoking and drying were the major methods of fish preservation. These may form the basic primitive network of infrastructure in a typical African village setting. The challenge however is the process of improvement, innovation, transformation and modernization of these facilities as the foundation of economic or social evolution. Africa had lagged behind in this process of socio-economic transformation, a difficulty compounded by the external forces from contact with Europe and its attendant consequences. Rodney (1972: 2) insists that there has been a constant and persistent process of development in human societies since the origins of man, though the pace may not be uniform in all societies, depending on certain factors. A society develops economically as its members increase jointly their capacity for dealing with the environment. This capacity for dealing with the environment is dependent on the extent to which they understand the laws of nature (science), on the extent to which they put that understanding into practice by devising tools (technology), and on the manner in which work is organized.

Africa is no exception to this general rule guiding societal transformation and development. There was always enough room and capacity, both materially and humanly for the transformation of the primitive or peasant African economies into some form of a higher or more progressive society, which may or may not tow the capitalist path to modernity. The combination of science and technology as twin processes in the transformation of African traditional societies had been set in motion, as in all other continents of the world, long before contact with Europe. However, with the emergence and constant progressive innovation and revolutionizing of the capitalist mode of production in Europe and its compulsive expansion to integrate all other continents into its production orbit the result was a concomitant retardation of economic development in those pre-capitalist societies. Infrastructure is the facilitator of this production process.

The development of infrastructure is a major component of the process of social transformation and economic development. Kemp (1993) has drawn attention to the role of the transport revolution during the Industrial Revolution in Europe. Production would not be complete and would even be meaningless if products could not be delivered to consumers within the shortest possible time and at the lowest possible cost. Closely related to transport is communication. “Although transport is usually thought of as a means of moving people or goods, its development has always been associated with the movement of information . . . intimately related to the market and to the general structure of the economy” (Kemp, 1993: 55).

Furthermore, the state is also a facilitator of the process of infrastructure development and a determinant of the pattern of infrastructure distribution. The role of the state is embedded in its function of mobilizing the citizenry for great public works. Stateless primitive communal societies lacked such organizational ability. The state therefore occupies a central position in generating and facilitating infrastructure development in both pre-capitalist and modern social formations. This idea of the state in its pivotal role as the facilitator of the process of infrastructure development and distribution forms the background to this study.

Statement of Research Problem

There is a fundamental disconnect in the structure of the Nigerian economy. The peasantry, which dominates the rural economy, has not been properly integrated into the national economy. The root of this problem is the lopsided or uneven and largely disarticulated pattern of infrastructure distribution. Spatially, developing societies tend to have a dual character, a fast developing urban metropolis, where there is a high concentration of infrastructure and a countryside strewn with villages and semi-urban settlements surrounded by farmlands. Water supply is from boreholes or wells. In most cases there is no electricity, no telecommunications facilities, no airports and no seaports. Mabogunje (1980: 58-62) distinguishes between spatial competition, which obtains in Nigeria, and spatial integration through infrastructure democratization which this paper advocates.

Generally, in the rural areas farmlands are small and scattered, but still provide about 80% of the total food requirements of the Nigerian population. Agriculture, apart from oil and gas, is the mainstay of the Nigerian economy, contributing about 40 per cent of the GDP and employing about two-thirds of the country's total labour force. From the colonial period to the First Republic the then Regional governments set up marketing boards to control the production, marketing and export of agricultural produce such as cocoa, palm produce, cotton, groundnuts, rubber, etc. The regional economies as well as the Federal Government depended largely on these boards for financing their developmental activities as the “major function of these Boards was to stabilize local cash crop prices well below their world market equivalent in order to accumulate public capital” (Nnoli, 1978: 178). In other words the entire economy depended on agriculture for its sustenance. These agricultural resources were derived from the rural areas where there was scarcity of infrastructure. The urban centres were and still are developing at the expense of the rural areas which provide the resources.

This developmental trend was set in motion by the colonial administration which established new cities and expanded some others which were hitherto semi-rural towns. Urban areas existed in Nigeria prior to British colonial intrusion e.g. Ibadan, Abeokuta, Oshogbo, Kano, Zaria, Sokoto. However the pre-colonial importance of these towns began to diminish relative to the newly established colonial administrative centre such as Lagos, Kaduna, Enugu, Calabar, Port Harcourt, etc.

The famous northern centres of Sokoto, Katsina and Yerwa have deteriorated in importance because of their unfavorable location in the colonial scheme of things. Wage employment, small-scale business, hospitals, water supply electricity and education, although severely limited, were concentrated in the new towns. Township status guided the distribution of social services; they were provided to the first, second and third class towns in that order (Nnoli, 1978: 47).

The real problem lies in the fact that these new towns or cities are experiencing consistent provision and constant upgrade of infrastructure with resources derived mainly from the productive activities of peasants operating in the rural areas where these facilities are characteristically deficient. It is said that colonialism met the African peasant with the hoe and left him with the hoe (Rodney, 1972: 264). This situation has hardly changed in the post-colonial era. Several policies such as DFRRI, NEEDS, NEPAD, 7-Point Agenda, introduced to extend infrastructure to the rural areas have failed to impact strategically on the rural communities, the domain of the peasantry. Consequently, the rural areas remain largely isolated from the cities. The objective recipe to this problem is the democratization of the distribution of infrastructure, as a matter of right, for all citizens, if the democratic values of freedom and equality would be meaningful. The major producers of the national wealth are denied availability and access to the critical infrastructure produced by their sweat. That is the problem this study seeks to investigate.

Objectives of the Study

This paper is designed to achieve following objectives:

1. To critically assess the various rural development policies introduced by successive governments in Nigeria.
2. To examine the reasons for the failure of rural infrastructure development policies of successive governments in Nigeria.
3. To analyze the consequences of the neglect of the rural areas in the distribution of infrastructure by the Nigerian Government.
4. To proffer solutions to the problem of absence of infrastructure in the rural areas.

Research Questions

1. Have the various rural development policies introduced by successive governments in Nigeria been properly articulated?
2. What are the reasons for the failure of rural infrastructure development policies of successive governments in Nigeria?
3. What are the consequences of the neglect of the rural areas in the distribution of infrastructure by the Nigerian Government?
4. What is the solution to the problem of failure of government policies on the development of infrastructure in the rural areas?

Significance of Study

This paper is particularly significant for emphasizing the need to revolutionize the process of rural infrastructure transformation through the democratization of the distribution of infrastructure in Nigeria. It is also significant for projecting and defending the rights of the peasantry to the availability and easy access to infrastructure both as a right and a mechanism for effective and improved production and integration into the society. Characteristically state officials in Nigeria provide development blue-prints for rural transformation. This study is significant for suggesting a reversal of this policy of exclusion and non-consultation. Dependence by the Federal Government, states and local governments in Nigeria on monthly revenue allocation from oil has rendered them vulnerable to oil price shocks like what is presently being experienced in the oil producing countries, including Nigeria. This paper is significant for pointing to the need for policy change in favour of agriculture through progressively transformed peasant production supported by rural infrastructure.

Conceptual Clarifications/Literature Review

Infrastructure is the basic physical and organizational structure needed for the operation of a society or enterprise, or the services and facilities necessary for an economy to function. It can be generally defined as the set of interconnected structural elements that provide a framework supporting an entire structure of development. It is used to judge or measure or determines a country or region's level of development (www.thefreedictionary.com/infrastructure). It includes airports, bridges, canals, dams, electricity, seaports, parks, railways, roads, water supply, telecommunications, utilities, sewage, public spaces, mass transit, public housing, universities, schools, stadia, hospitals, etc.

Infrastructure democracy is defined here as the availability, fair distribution and access of the citizens of a state to physical and social infrastructure in both urban and rural settings as a fundamental right enhancing freedom and equality. Democracy has been defined as a system in which elites acquire power to rule through a competitive struggle for the people's vote (Schumpeter, 1947: 269). Others have extended the concept to include participation, accountability, responsiveness (Diamond, 1996).

Atieno-Odhiambo (in Gutkind & Waterman eds. 1977: 233) defines peasants as “those whose ultimate security and subsistence lies in their having certain rights in land and in the labour of family members on the land, but who are involved, through rights and obligations in a wider economic system which includes the participation of non-peasants”. From this concise but prescriptive definition certain essential features serve to define the peasantries which include rights in land, production basically for subsistence rather than profit, dependence on family rather than wage labour, presence of higher powers or the state. Wolf (1966: 11) argues that “the state is the decisive criterion of civilization and it is the appearance of the state which marks the threshold of transition between food cultivators in general and peasants”.

The state is broadly conceptualized as possessing the four attributes of a definite territory, a definite population, a government and sovereignty (Appadorai, 2003: 11). However, from a narrower perspective Marx defined the modern state as “a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie” (Marx & Engels, 1977: 110-111). Ake (1981: 126) defines the state as the set of social institutions which apart from being the ultimate coercive power makes exclusive claim to the legitimate use of coercive force, a conceptualization that appears to flow from Weber's definition of the modern nation state as “a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory”, adding that “the state is a relation of men dominating men, a relation supported by means of legitimate (i.e. considered to be legitimate) violence”. However, this paper also explores the concept of developmental state which centralizes a nation's resources in order to generate and facilitate development. It establishes as its principle of legitimacy its ability to promote and sustain development, understood as the combination of steady and high rates of economic growth and structural change in the productive system (Castells, 1992:56). It is also associated with the period of national development planning to achieve conscious and self-reliant development in Third-World countries (Chibber, 2005:237).

The World Bank defined rural development as the process through which rural poverty is alleviated by sustained increases in the productivity and incomes of low-income rural dwellers and households (Ekpo & Olaniyi, 1995). But rural development is not just about achieving positive economic growth rates and implementation of poverty reduction strategies. It is a process of improving the quality of life of rural dwellers with their own active participation. Rural development should therefore be democratic, participatory, inclusive, comprehensive, interdependent, creative, active and sustainable.

Theoretical Framework

To serve as its theoretical framework this study has chosen the theory of unequal or uneven development, an offspring of dependency theory, which has been defined as a situation in which the economy of certain countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is subjected (Dos Santos, 1973). Uneven development has always ensured that when different societies at different levels of development come in contact the weaker of the two societies is bound to be adversely affected and "the bigger the gap between the two societies concerned the more detrimental are the consequences" (Rodney, 1972: 12). It results in what Dennis Cohen described as: the operation of the law of uneven and combined development. Through the expansion of the relations of exchange between areas of different levels of development, which extends and expands the differences as surplus value is transferred from less to more advanced areas while the less developed modes of production are pressured as sources of cheap raw materials and labour as protected markets for the more advanced areas rather than being transformed themselves into the more advanced mode of production (Cohen, cited in Ntete-Nna, 2004, 194).

Deleuze and Guattari (2013: 465-436) have argued that capitalism needs the periphery constituted by the Third World, where it locates a large part of its most modern industries. It does not just invest capital in these industries, but is also furnished with capital by them. They argued further that the so-called First World States necessarily require the so-called Third World States in order to subsist as they do. In brief, the marginal Third World is partially organized and completely inseparable from the states of the centre. They provide a modern substitute for colonization. "The policy of constructing physical infrastructural facilities for the primary purpose of advancing imperialist trade and the transfer of economic surplus from the colonies, was pursued relentlessly by British colonialists in Nigeria . . . Moreover, relative to the size and financial resources of Nigeria, the colonial infrastructure was a minimalist venture" (Onimode, 1983: 57).

Within the colony capitalism created enclaves and concentrated development in the newly created urban centre with resources garnered from the peasant-dominated rural sector of the economy through unequal exchange between the primary agricultural products of the peasants and the manufactured goods of the modern industries. "The consequence is that local capital increasingly comes under the control of the MNCs in the modern, dynamic sectors of the economy, while the more backward sectors of the economy are left to local capital" (Roxborough: 1981: 59). Unequal exchange engendered unequal development both within the global capitalist economy and the national colonial and neo-colonial economic settings. Unequal development was the product of the colonial administration's pattern of investment in infrastructure such as roads, water resources, railways, electrical power and administrative structures to facilitate the extraction of the colony's resources. "Not surprisingly the places in which colonialism fostered some development were in places which were convenient collecting centres for commodities, such as Kano; places from where the commodities could be shipped abroad" (Ake, 1981: 43-44). The post-colonial state has not deviated much from this pattern of development of infrastructure which neglects the rural areas, the domain of the peasants. Here lies the relevance and applicability of the theory of unequal development as the theoretical framework for this study.

Methodology

Data gathering method emphasized secondary sources such as newspapers, news magazines, books, internet sources, academic journals, etc. and the method of analysis is mainly qualitative and historical. Primary sources include personal observation and the display of pictures as a method of data presentation and analysis.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Infrastructure facilitates the production and distribution of goods and services within and between communities. The movement of raw materials to production sites, the distribution network of finished goods, the ability to provide services speedily are all facilitated by the network of infrastructure in a society. In recognition of these developmental challenges various programmer and strategies of rural development have been introduced but poorly executed.

Some Baseline Data on Infrastructure

The Nigerian transport system comprises all modes: roads, railways, water, air and pipeline transport. The rail network consists of 3,505km, narrow gauge (1.067m) single track rail line running from Lagos to Kano and Port Harcourt to Maiduguri and the uncompleted 349km of standard gauge from Itakpe to Warri via Ajaokuta. In 2005, rail carried only 753, 000 passengers and 93,000 metric tonnes of goods. The railway at present does not evacuate goods from the Nigerian seaports, unlike in the 1970s and 1980s. This shift has significantly increased the use of road transport and heightened demand for an expanded and efficient road network. The Nigerian water transport system is made up of the inland waterways and the seaports. Nigeria has 12 major inland navigable rivers of about 3,800 km, with extensive coastline of about 852km. The waterways traverse 20 out of the 36 States of the Federation. The seaports handle most of the nation's imports and exports under the Nigerian Ports Authority (NPA). The nation has 13 major ports, 11 oil terminals and 128 jetties with a total annual handling capacity of 35 million tons. In 2006, most of the ports were concessioner based on the landlord model. The air transport mode in Nigeria consists of 21 airports and 62 airstrips which are managed and supervised by the Federal Airports Authority of Nigeria (FAAN) (Federal Ministry of Works, 2013).

The above modes of transport have played significant roles at key stages in the development of the Nigerian economy before and after independence. Due to its economic importance, successive governments have invested substantially in the transport sector. The transport sector received 19%, 23%, 22% and 15% of total public capital outlays respectively for the periods 1962-1968, 1970-1974 (75), 1975–1980 and 1981 – 1985. In Nigeria, the roads sector (including road bridges) is the dominant mode for intra-state and interstate passenger and goods movement. The importance of the roads sector to the Nigerian economy is apparent from the amount of government capital outlay, the volume of passenger traffic carried and the tons of goods evacuated to and from the Nigerian ports. The intra-modal split of the transport sector's share favours road transport as it received over half of the total public sector capital outlay. Road infrastructure received 58, 67, 71 and 60 % of the transport sector's share while the remaining modes shared a combined 42%, 33%, 29% and 40 % during the first, second, third and fourth development plans respectively (Federal Ministry of Works, 2013).

Generally across the globe, particularly in developing countries, the contribution of the transport sector to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) ranges from 3 - 5 per cent. Between 1960 and 2009, the Nigerian transport sector contributed between 1.9 and 5.5 % of GDP. Of this percentage, road transport alone accounted for over 60 per cent in the 1960s; over 80 % in the 1980s and over 90 % in the 1990s and 2000s. The relative share of road transport to the total transport GDP continues to increase. The road sector not only accounts for an overwhelming percent of passenger and freight movements across the nation, but also for over 95 percent of non-oil goods conveyed to and from the Nigerian seaports. Nigeria has a total road network of 193,200km of which the Federal government owns 17 percent of the network while the States and Local Government Councils own 16 and 68 percent respectively. 19 percent of the main road areas are paved. As at 2007, only 35 per cent of the Federal roads were rated as being in a good or very good condition (Federal Ministry of Works, 2013).

Between 2000 and 2011, the average capital budget of the Federal Ministry of Works (FMW) has been N100 billion per annum (US$735million). It stood at N30.7 billion in 2000, rose to N58.0 billion in 2001 but declined to N41.6 billion and N20.3billion in 2002 and 2003 respectively. It however rose again to N166.1 billion and N263.0 billion in 2007 and 2010 respectively. The financing has ranged from as low as N20billion (US$168m) in 2003 to a high of N263billion (US$1,768m) in 2010. The fluctuation in budgetary allocation is indicative of the instability in financing through this source and the abandonment of road projects across the country due to financing challenges. In 2009, the utilization rate of the budget for the Ministry was only 3%. The average annual expenditure on road maintenance at FERMA, between 2008 and 2010 was (US$329m) represents just 50% of amount required. The effects of the above funding anomaly are road degeneration, an increasing backlog of road rehabilitation and slow network expansion. The Medium-Term Implementation Plan (2010-2013) puts Federal expenditure in physical infrastructure at N3.318trillion, which includes transport infrastructure. This amount represents 33 % of Federal expenditure of N10 trillion for the Plan period. However most of this transport infrastructure is urban-based.

Past Rural Development Efforts

The National Accelerated Food Production Project (NAFPP) was introduced by the Gowon Regime in 1973 and continued till 1976 when it was replaced by the Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) under General Obasanjo. The Agricultural Development Project (ADP) commenced in 1975 jointly owned by the World Bank, Federal and State Governments with the objective of raising productivity, income and standard of living of the rural dwellers. The River-Basin Development Authorities (RBDA) initially meant to address the developmental challenges of the Niger Delta were later expanded in 1962, 1976 and 1983 to include virtually all the major river basins in Nigeria. The objective was to make Nigeria self-sufficient in food production and uplift the socio-economic standard of people living in the rural areas, including flood and erosion control as well as rural infrastructure. The Green Revolution was launched in 1980 by the Shehu Shagari Administration to make the country self-sufficient in food and crop production within 5 years. The programmer was a failure as the same Government engaged in the massive importation of rice and other essential food items from India and America (Otoghagua, 1999).

The Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) was established in 1985 by the Babangida Administration to mobilize the rural population to engage in rural development activities, identify areas of high production potential for priority food and fibred requirements, formulate and implement a national rural feeder-road network programmer involving construction, rehabilitation, improvement and maintenance; a national rural water-supply programmer food production, preservation and processing. It also included agronomy, extension services, update of data on rural infrastructure, rural agro-industrialization, handicraft and small-scale industries, etc.

Table 1: DFRRI's Completed Projects on Economic and Social Infrastructure

Year	Amount Allocated (₦ Million)	Feeder Roads (km)	Rural Electricity (No. of communities)	Boreholes/wells
1986	500	—	—	—
1987	400	60, 000	—	—
1988	500	30, 000	—	—
1989	300	30, 000	142	4, 000
1990	300	30, 728.34	114	1, 291
1991	152.3	55, 576.24	325	11, 310
1992	250	85, 592.82	506	18, 680

Source: DFRRI Press Briefing (1992).

DFRRI developed rural access roads. Government surveys indicated that 60, 000km of rural feeder roads were either constructed or rehabilitated under the first phase which was completed in 1987. In 1990, a total of 30,724.34km of rural feeder roads were completed and accepted as having met the required specifications under the second phase of the project. Another 55,576.24km of rural roads was constructed in 1991. By 1992, a total of 85,592.82km of rural feeder roads were completed, inspected and accepted. Another important infrastructure on which DFRRl's resources were concentrated was rural electrification. The first phase took off in 1987. Two model villages in each local government area of the country were selected for the project to serve as reference points in rural development in the country. By 1989, 142 electricity projects were completed in phase 1. In 1990, 114 communities in 11 states were provided with electricity. In 1991, 325 communities were supplied with electricity, and another 506 communities benefited in 1992. Also, on water supply to rural communities, 4, 000 wells/boreholes were reported to have been sunk by 1989. Another I, 291; 11, 310 and 18, 680 wells and boreholes were sunk in 1990, 1991 and 1992, respectively (Ekpo & Olaniyi, 1995).

DFRRI's production activities involved two special programmer for cultivating 50 million fruit trees and improved seeds or mass distribution launched in 1986. In 1987 various research institutes were engaged in the Directorate's seeds multiplication and distribution, livestock, horticulture and aquaculture development programmer. By the end of 1987 a total of 3,624 tonnes of assorted breeder/foundation seeds for livestock had been produced. In 1990, 1, 633 tonnes of seeds of arable crops, 4, 598 million oil palm seedlings and 294,072 tonnes of groundnut seeds were distributed to farmers. Aqua culture also increased through the production of 2, 666 million fish fingerlings. In 1991, the achievements improved to some 4, 033.13 tonnes of improved seeds. 17, 112 million seedlings, 2, 666 million fingerlings and 14, 529 tonnes of fodder seeds were produced and distributed to farmers. In 1992, 846, 224 fruit seedlings for horticulture, 5, 726.13 tonnes of arable crop seeds and 3, 466 million fingerlings were produced and distributed to farmers (Ekpo & Olaniyi, 1995).

These could be considered landmark achievements but were still not commensurate with the huge funds allocated to DFRRI much of which was misappropriated. The programmer was not sustained but largely abandoned after the Babangida Administration. Eventual decay was the experience of the infrastructure provided under DFRRI as no follow-up maintenance programmer was put in place. Maintenance culture still remains a major challenge in Nigeria. The Obasanjo Administration also introduced NEEDS and SEEDS, at the national and state levels respectively. The Yar' Adua Administration in 2007 came up with the 7-Point Agenda, which included energy, education, agriculture, infrastructure, wealth creation and poverty alleviation, land reforms and security, which were expected to catapult Nigeria to the position of the 20th strongest economy by the year 2020. The Transformation Agenda of President Goodluck Jonathan focuses on three key areas which include strong, inclusive and non-inflationary growth; employment generation and poverty alleviation. Infrastructure, particularly rural infrastructure is also effectively captured but implementation has been rather shoddy.

Rural Infrastructure Policy Framework

In 2005 the Rural Travel and Transport Programmed (RTTP) with an implementation programmed called Rural Access and Mobility Project (RAMP), was introduced in Kaduna and Cross River States, to develop and manage the rural transport network in a sustainable manner. However, "the enormous resources locked up in the rural communities cannot be harnessed due to lack of access to these areas" (Emejor, Daily Independent, 7 July 2014). RAMP is funded with a credit facility of $230 million provided by the World Bank and the African Development Bank (ADB), in partnership with the Federal and State governments, to support the construction and rehabilitation of rural roads covering about 1,450km of rural roads and 65 river crossings. RAMP 2 covered Adamawa, Enugu, Niger and Osun States.

An Infrastructure Action Plan was introduced by the Federal Government in 2013 that would require US$350 billion funding over a ten-year period. Project design would cost US$11.0 billion, capacity building and technical support US$2.3 billion and the balance for capital expenses. Of this electric power and rural energy would cost US$61 billion; sanitation and waste management US$64 billion; rehabilitation and expansion of national road network US$35 billion; infrastructure for urban roads and mass transit US$19 billion and US$14 billion respectively. Others are sea ports, passenger, freight facilities and inland waterways US$19 billion; urban and rural water supply US$18 billion and national communication grid US$15 billion. The balance of US$50.1 billion was committed to transportation fleet (Abubakar, Daily Trust, www.dailytrust.com.ng/daily/columns/tuesday-? columns/2500 retrieved 06/12/2014).

In addition Nigeria would require some US$100 billion annually for maintenance. Funding would be sourced from the public sector (budget allocations and Sovereign Wealth Fund) US$154.34 billion; debts (domestic and offshore) US$50 billion and the private sector US$131,174 billion. The Action Plan is actually part of the National Integrated Infrastructure Master Plan developed by the National Planning Commission which indicated that Nigeria would require US$2.9 trillion in the next 30 years to bridge the huge infrastructure gap. This Master Plan was actually prompted by a background report on infrastructure issues in developing countries provided to the G20 in June 2011 by the African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (AsDB), European Investment Bank (EIB), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), Islamic Development Bank (IsDB) and the World Bank Group (Abubakar, Daily Trust, www.dailytrust.com.ng/daily/columns/tuesday-? columns/2500 retrieved 06/12/2014).

Increasing spending on infrastructure leads directly to commensurate increase in Gross Domestic Product (GDP). However, increase in GDP in the Nigerian context has had negligible impact on job creation and poverty reduction. An estimated 4.5 million people would be employed under the Plan but this promise has never come close to fulfillment. Furthermore, the Plan defines infrastructure so narrowly and urban-centered that agriculture and animal husbandry are largely ignored.

The Role of PPP in Rural Infrastructure Development

Public Private Partnership (PPP) is defined as a contract whereby the private sector is engaged by the public sector to mange public services and/or to design, build, finance and operate infrastructure to enhance efficiency, broaden access and improve the quality of public services (Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission, 2012). The public sector includes ministries, departments, agencies, municipalities or state-owned enterprises while the private sector is both local and international. PPP arrangements have been and are still being utilized in Australia, Canada, South Africa and the United Kingdom. PPPs allow access to the financial resources of the private sector, enable the public sector to benefit from the private sector technical expertise, experience and efficiency and also enable the public sector to transfer project-related risks to the private sector. There are various types of PPPs such as lease contracts under which the private partner is responsible for the service in its entirety and undertakes obligations relating to quality and service standards, the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) and the Build-Own-Operate (BOO).

Public private partnerships in many states are currently affecting some much-needed repairs to the road network, for example the development of roads such as the Lagos-Ibadan expressway. Nigeria also has 5,300 miles (8,600 km) of waterways, and there is a programmed underway to revitalize major ports including Bonny, Calabar, Koko, Port Harcourt and Sapele, in partnership with the private sector. The two biggest airports are Abuja International and Lagos Murtala Muhammed – also being expanded through a public private partnership – although there are almost 70 smaller ones. But these are urban-based infrastructure that is not designed to fill the urban-rural infrastructure gap to facilitate and integrate peasant production. Investment in infrastructure through PPP arrangements this currently is being targeted by international investors.

Pic.1 A Local bridge as infrastructure Pic.2 Locally constructed farm cart

Discussion of Findings

The findings would be discussed in line with the research questions and objectives. Have the various rural development policies introduced by successive governments in Nigeria been properly articulated? It has been shown that so many programmed and strategies have been introduced, all beautiful on paper, particularly Babangida's DFRRI. The Yar' Adua Administration in 2007 introduced the 7-Point Agenda and President Goodluck Jonathan, the Transformation Agenda. These policy areas did not deviate much from NEEDS and SEEDS of the Obasanjo Administration. The Rural Travel and Transport Programmed (RTTP) as well as Public Private Partnership (PPP) were also introduced. Virtually all the development programmed and strategies introduced by successive administrations in Nigeria recognize the importance of infrastructure and are beautiful on paper. A very crucial problem however is that no input has been made by the people who are the primary targets of their implementation. Rural transformation documents are always top-down, blue-print designed in Abuja and the state capitals.

What are the reasons for the failure of rural infrastructure development policies of successive governments in Nigeria? There has been insufficient public investment in rural infrastructure. Human capital investment in the rural areas is also presently lacking. The forces threatening rural infrastructure development include absence of good governance and accountability, ineffective public service and implementation agencies, exclusion of the rural populace in the planning process, problem of insecurity, corruption, faulty development agenda, lack of political will, mismanagement, political bickering, etc. Contractors and politicians often fail to execute contracts awarded but simply disappear with the money.

What are the consequences of the neglect of the rural areas in the distribution of infrastructure by the Nigerian Government? Peasants still depend on their primitive smoking and drying methods for fish preservation and because of the absence of storage, easy preservation and transportation facilities a lot of the products simply rot away, particularly fruits, the raw materials for various fruit juices that have become a huge industry. There is difficulty in locating silos for food storage or cold-rooms for preservation in the peasant communities.

What is the solution to the problem of failure of government policies on the development of infrastructure in the rural areas? This paper is of the view that the provision of other physical and social infrastructure should also be democratized. A correlation could be established between grassroots democracy and rural infrastructure. The only infrastructure that has been democratized is the GSM, which is now available in many rural communities, though with some difficulties in several communities. The use of modern communication facilitates production, distribution and exchange of goods and services within and between the rural and urban areas.

Pic. 3 Rural Water Supply, Dividend of Democracy

Pic. 4 Well Water Used, Despite Modern Tank Behind

Pic. 5 Peasant cassava processing

Pic.6 GSM, the only democratized infrastructure

Conclusion

This paper has firmly established the role of infrastructure in the development process. It is infrastructure that facilitates and sustains the process of economic development. Lopsided or uneven development in favour of the urban centre was introduced by the colonial administration and maintained by the post-colonial state. This paper has also examined the various development programmed of various administrations and come to the conclusion that they failed largely because they were poorly articulated and badly executed. Nigeria needs strong, transformative leadership that would spread the development of infrastructure to the rural areas to open them up for industrial development and link them as suppliers of food and raw materials to the industries Herbert (2012). Peasant production, distribution and exchange of their products are seriously hampered by the shortage of infrastructure in rural areas as they are disconnected from the urban sector. Without democratization of the process of infrastructure distribution economic development in Nigeria would be retarded.

Recommendations

From the foregoing this paper recommends as follows:

1 An integrated pattern of economic development through infrastructure democratization for easy and productive access to the peasantry who dominate the rural economy and whose surplus is used to develop the urban areas.

2 The drastic reduction of corruption, the use of inferior materials and administrative ineptitude, particularly in the area of infrastructure.

3 The unbiased prosecution of all those involved in contract failure through abandonment, absconding or collapse.

References

Abubakar, Sanusi (06 August, 2013) "Appraising Nigeria's Infrastructure Action Plan" Daily Trust, www.dailytrust.com.ng/ daily/columns/tuesday-HYPERLINK "http://www.dailytrust.com.ng/%20daily/columns/tuesday-?columns/2500"?hyperlink "http://www.dailytrust.com.ng/%20daily/columns/tuesday-?columns/2500"columns/2500 Retrieved 06/12/2014letters

Ake, C. (1981), "A Political Economy of Africa". London: Longman.

Appadorai, A. (2003), "The Substance of Politics" New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (1992), "Four Asian Tigers with a Dragon Head" A Comparative Analysis of State, Economy & Society in the Asian Pacific Rim". In Henderson (eds.), State & Development in the Asia Pacific. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Chibber, V. (2005). "Reviving the Developmental State? The Myth of the National Bourgeoisie", in the Socialist Register, pp. 226-246.

Diamond, L. (1996). "Is the Third Wave Over", in Journal of Democracy Vol. 7, no. 3, (July 1966): 20-37).

Ekpo, A. H. & Olaniyi, O. (1995) "Rural development in Nigeria: Analysis of the Impact of the Directorate for Food, Roads & Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI)" 1986 – 93, in E. C. Eboh, C. U. Okoye & D. Ayichi (eds.). Rural Development in Nigeria: Concepts, Processes and Prospects. Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Company.

Federal Ministry of Works (2013). "Draft Green Paper on Federal Roads & Bridges Tolling Policy".

Gerth, H. H. & Mills, Wright C. eds. (1964) "From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology / tr., ed. with an Introduction" London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1964, pp. 77-128.

Gutkind, P. & Waterman, P. (1977), "African Social Studies: A Radical Reader", London: Heinemann.

Herbert, W. E. (2012). "Chairman's Remarks on the Challenges of Governance need for Transformational Leadership". Presented at ANAN National Conference, held at Abuja, October 9.

Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (2012), "PPP Manual for Nigeria", Abuja: Nigeria Infrastructure Advisory Facility (NIAF).

Kemp, T. (1993) "Historical Patterns of Industrialization". London: Longman.

Mabogunje, A. (1980). "The Development Process" A Spatial Perspective, London: Hutchinson Publishing.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1977), Selected Works Vol. 1, Moscow Progress Publishers.

Ntete-Nna, N. (2004), "Contemporary Political Analysis: An Introduction". Owerri: Springfield Publishers.

Onomide, B. (1983), "Imperialism & Underdevelopment in Nigeria". London: Macmillan Press.

Otoghagua, E. (1999), "1960 – 2003: Profile of Nigerian Heads of State" Achievements & Failures. Benin City: Redemption International Company.

Rodney, W. (1972), "How Europe Underdeveloped Africa". Abuja: Panaf Publishing.

Roxborough, I. (1979), "Theories of Underdevelopment". London: Macmillan.

Schumpeter, J. (1947), "Capitalism, Socialism & Democracy, 2nd ed". New York: Harper.

Wolf, E. (1966). Peasants, NJ: Prentice-Hall.