

African States and the Effect of Unequal Parties in Relations With Major Powers on Nation Building

Steve A. Iyayi

Wellspring University, Benin City, Nigeria

At independence, African states remained tied to their erstwhile colonial masters in their relations with the outside world. Apart from political autonomy, other aspects of relationship remained virtually parts of their former colonial masters. Although the United Nations Organizations (UNO) and other international institutions have provided a platform for multilateral relations for the new states, African states have remained in a position of unequal party with the more advanced nations of the world. Their export earnings are still low, from primary produce putting the balance of trade persistently at the advantage of the more developed nations. This, added to the poor technologies, weak infrastructure, and poor living standards of the people, has created for the African states a huge burden of nation building. The task is to successfully create a sense of nationalism and nationhood out of the various ethnic collectivities in the states. This is the focus of this paper with particular reference to Nigeria's relations with Britain and therest of Europe and America.

Keywords: burden, unequal, relations, nation, nationalism

Introduction

Part of the legacies of colonialism in Africa is the relationship that has existed between the states and their erstwhile European masters characterized by the European political system, cultures, exchange of goods and services, education, tourism, and many more. Each of the states has remained in this type of relationship with her former ruler, and collectively as groups in multilateral relations with bodies and groups of developed countries. The developed countries individually and collectively have more resilient and well established structures and institutions that provide platforms as well as determine the pattern and nature of the relationship. They are, in addition, more powerful by all considerations, wealthier, and better connected.

While the colonial rule lasted, they took as much as they could of what they needed from Africa, primarily economic resources. Little or no attempt was made to industrialize the colonial territories. By design therefore or by omission, the African economy was structured to complement or serve the economy of the former masters.

At the time, most African states gained independence, which was in the 1950s and 1960s, the Cold War was on. Though the states opted for non-alignment as their foreign relations policy, the reality was that they could hardly operate outside the influence of their ex-masters and hence the majority if not all of them leaned towards the capitalist group. Nigeria, for instance, did not allow full complement of the Russian Mission in

Nigeria, till a long time after independence in the country. Similarly, the relationship between Nigeria and China started on a low note and pace. China did not list Nigeria among the states for close relations in her early contacts with African states in the early 1960s, neither was Nigeria interested in any relationship with the Communist China. Formal diplomatic relations were established between the two countries in 1971 after the Civil war experience by Nigeria.

The volume of Nigeria's trade with Britain till 1970s was more than she had with all other European countries put together. To underscore this, Nigeria, long after her independence and till 1st January, 1973, used the British Pound Sterling as her currency. Individually and collectively, the West African Francophone countries have been somewhat "part" of France in view of their very close relationship arising from the colonial policy of Assimilation adopted by France. The Francophone countries currently use the CFA Franc, a common currency that is somehow tied to the French Franc for trade and other transactions. This has been one of the challenges to Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in her efforts at having a common currency.

African states have not fared better in their multilateral relationship with the European Union (EU). The relation has, over the years, not created the type of changes that could transform the African states and engender their development. There have been attempts by the states to assert their independent status in their relations with the more advanced countries, particularly after the Cold War. For Nigeria, the shift started after her civil war experience, which lasted from 1967 to 1970. She did not quite get the type of support she had expected from Britain and other members of the capitalist group. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), on the other hand, provided military and political support to Nigeria and thus laid the foundation for full diplomatic relations between the two countries. At the break-up of the USSR, Nigeria and the Russian Federation established diplomatic relations in 1991.

Africa, however, remains a potentially wealthy continent with huge deposits of untapped minerals, favourable climate, and large population. The developed nations know this and hence the occurrence of what can be referred to as the new scramble for Africa by the developed nations in their recent successive summits with Africa. The first was the China-Africa Summit, followed by the Japan-Africa Summit, Russia-Africa Summit, and Britain-Africa Summit. The United Arab Emirate (UAE) also held a summit with Africa between 2019 and 2020.

All the countries hosting the summit have one thing in common, which is to promise Africa of bringing investment and thus inject funds to stimulate economic growth and development. Africa, unarguably, is at the receiving end, all gathering at the summits to pick offers from their hosts. This, however, does not put them in control of their economies.

Nigeria's Foreign Policy: The Thrust

Alhaji Tafawa Balewa, Prime Minister and Nigeria's first head of government at independence, in his maiden address at the United Nations General Assembly on 4th November 1960, outlined Nigeria's foreign policy thrust as follows:

1. The sovereign equality of all African states;
2. Respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of all African states;
3. Non-interference in internal affairs of other African states;
4. Commitment to functional cooperation as a means of promoting African Unity.

Section 19 (a-e) of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria also states some of the broad objectives of Nigeria's foreign policy as follows:

(i) Promotion and protection of national interests; (ii) promotion of African integration and support for African Unity; (iii) promotion of international cooperation for the consolidation of universal peace and mutual respect among all nations and elimination of discrimination in all its manifestations; (iv) respect for international law and treaty obligations as well as the seeking of settlement of international disputes by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and adjudication; and (v) promotion of a just world order (Agbu, 2011, p. 29).

Nigeria, however, in the immediate years of her independence, could not make good her stated commitment to African states in her foreign policy objectives. She was either not forthcoming or slow in responding to matters concerning the African states, a situation that "could be traced to the immediate post-colonial character of the state, and especially the national elite who viewed the West, Britain in particular, as a dependable ally" (Agbu, 2011, p. 29). Cases readily recalled are the Congolese Crisis in 1960s and the decision by the Organization of African Unity (OAU, now AU) Ministerial Council in 1965 to break diplomatic relations with Britain over Rhodesia. Nigeria was then rightly or wrongly termed a stooge of Britain.

Nigeria's special relations with Britain and the West and America remained visible even when she was a member of the non-aligned movement and when the Cold War intensified. Omole (2011) noted, "Nigeria maintained a systematic/tactical approach to the principle of non-alignment. This is manifested in the cordial relations/contacts it maintained with the dominant Western Powers-Britain and the United States-at the detriment of states of Eastern bloc" (pp. 271-286), Nigeria had declared earlier her commitment to the non-aligned group when the then Prime Minister, Aihaji Tafawa Balewa

explained persistently what the principle meant to Nigeria thus; that shall not blindly follow the lead of any in so far as it is possible—asserting the right of independence of thought and action, the right to judge issues on their individual merits subject only to Nigeria's own national interest, the right to try out political and economic relations with both the Eastern and the Western bloc and elsewhere, thereby reducing dependence on a specific power. (Ijewere, 1981, as cited in Omole, 2011, p. 272)

Nigeria's weak position in her relations with Britain politically was the same in the economic relations between the two countries. The historical antecedence underlying the relations between them has been given its space in the earlier part of this work that it requires no repetition. But it suffices to state that the colonial administration took effective measures to integrate the economies of its colonies, including Nigeria into that of Britain through institutions and professional bodies before granting independence to the colonies.

To recall, for instance, is that "the initiative for improving transport and communication was said to have been taken by European merchants. Governors and High Commissioners from Nigeria visiting Liverpool were often hosted by the Chambers of Commerce to dinner during which lobbying took place" (Olawale, 1987, p. 67). Furthermore, the structure of the trade relations between the two nations, its content and manipulation by the British government and its agents favoured Britain against Nigeria.

State power was used to grade the products, determine the price and ensure their compulsory sale to monopolistic agencies-marketing boards. This meant that peasant producers were paid ridiculously low prices for their products. The British manufactured goods, in contrast, attracted exorbitant prices to Nigerians to the extent that "with the same quantity of raw materials, Nigerians could only buy 60% of manufactured goods that could be bought in the pre-colonial period. (Rodney, 1982, p. 175)

In order to protect Britain's dominance in the relationship, Nigeria received no encouragement to industrialize her economy and go into manufacturing. The pre-colonial state of Nigeria's economy which was based on production and export of agricultural products, while it imported the British and other developed nations' manufactured goods at high costs persisted in the post-independence era. This, of course, satisfied the desire and plan of Britain and her European and American allies to support and continually grow their economies at the expense of their colonies, including Nigeria. The latter were to supply raw materials to the industries and or factories in the former's countries, for instance, among the indigenous items that featured in the trade between early European traders and the indigenes in the West African coast and also in the Trans-Saharan trade were native woven clothing, metal and wooden arts, salt and gold. In fact, the indigenes had mastered skills in the making of these items but received no encouragement or assistance to modernize their production during and after the colonial administration in line with the administration's policy.

A further demonstration of the subordination of the Nigerian wishes to the whims and caprices of Britain was the inability of Nigeria to independently decide on crucial matters bordering on the growth and development of the country. It was to such an extent that Nigeria deliberately settled for losses in order to please Britain in many instances. In some other instances, Britain had, before granting political independence to Nigeria, put in place arrangements that could not be repudiated by Nigerians after independence. For example,

West African Conference Lines was given exclusive monopoly for the shipment of all Nigeria's export crops sold by Nigeria Produce Marketing Company. This monopoly continued even after Nigeria launched her own shipping line. The Nigeria Company merely became a junior partner to West African Conference Lines and up to 1963, it could carry only four percent of Nigeria's exports and imports. (Osoba, 1980, p. 217, as cited in Majuk 2011, p. 75)

Also, the initial exploitation and marketing of Nigeria' crude by the Royal Dutch Shell Company, an Anglo-Dutch enterprise, was carried out on the conditions dictated by Britain.

The agreement with these companies was based on the fifty-fifty formula that had long been rejected by the Arab states. Under this formula, Nigerian government took 50% of the companies' profit. It also included mining royalties and income tax on overall profits. This meant that if their profits did not exceed the total of import tax and royalties they were not subject to company tax in Nigeria. (Osoba, 1987, p. 228, as cited in Majuk, 2011, p. 74)

This agreement regrettably was allowed to stay even against a much better offer that was made by the Italian AGIP Miner.

Apart from the fifty-fifty share profits contained in the AGIP offer, Nigeria was given an option to buy 30% of the company's shares which would yield for Nigeria another 15% of the profits. Moreover this 30% share- holding could be paid for install mentally, within a mutually agreed period of time. (Osoba, 1987, p. 229, as cited in Majuk, 2011, p. 75)

Aid Receiver's Mentality

One major factor that has perpetuated the inequality in the relationship is the aid receiver mentality cultivated by African countries. They created and operated on the belief that the developed countries should aid them to develop. This belief stems from the moral obligation on the part of the ex-colonizers to give back to their former subjects what they forcibly took from them. In other words, they were to give reparations to Africans. But beyond this argument is the assumption by the African states that they are a weaker party that needs to be supported by the stronger party in their relationship with the developed nations.

There is nothing bad or new about aid giving and receiving. After all, the United States of America (USA) exemplified the idea in its Marshall Plan to war torn European countries after the WWII and as part of its build-up of allies for the Cold War. She aided the countries with \$12 billion. It was after this that attention was turned to developing countries which later gained independence. The concern about aid to the African countries is that these European and some Asian countries that at one time or the other had the cause to be aided, are today, in turn, aid donors while African countries have remained aid receivers.

This position has rendered them non-sufficiently creative in addition to misuse of the aid, especially the donations made in cash. Hardly any conviction, that aids have a positive impact on the lives of the people and general development of the African countries. For example, Easterly pointed out that over the past 50 years, the amount of foreign aid dispersed totaled over \$12.3 trillion and roughly equaled the amount that Derher et al indicated.

William Easterly (2005, p. 1) further noted that

the year 2005 was the year the West tried harder than ever to save Africa. British Prime Minister Tony Blair called at the World Economic Forum in Davos in January 2005 for 'a big, big push forward' in Africa to end poverty, financed by an increase in foreign aid. Tony Blair commissioned a report on Africa, which released its findings in March 2005, likewise calling for a 'big push'. Gordon Brown and Tony Blair put the cause of ending poverty in Africa at the top of the agenda of the G-8 Summit in Scotland in July 2005. Rock celebrity Bob Geldof assembled well-known bands for "Live8" concerts on July 2, 2005 in nine cities around the world to lobby the G-8 leaders to 'Make Poverty History' in Africa. In July 2005 the G8 agreed to double foreign aid to Africa from \$25 billion a year to \$50 billion to finance the big push as well as to forgive the Africa aid loans contracted during the previous attempts at a big push.

Easterly (pp. 21-22) concluded that his review of literature on the subject of West aid to Africa

does not give a lot of grounds for hope that the West can save Africa. Either the various views of the roots of poverty in Africa were too simplistic, or the attempts to change these root causes underestimated the difficulty of doing so from the outside, or both. In short, the West cannot "save Africa", but rich country aid can still do good things in a piecemeal way to alleviate the suffering of some desperately poor people.

Kofi Annan, former United Nations' Secretary General and Chairman Africa Progress Panel, expressed similar view on the subject. He described Africa as "a new economic frontier". He noted the continued new discoveries and that Africa's stock (was) rising as the Africa Progress Report being launched on Africa Day (highlighted).

But the report also asked some difficult questions: Given our continent's wealth, why are so many people still trapped in poverty? Why is progress on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals so slow and uneven? Why are so many women marginalized and disenfranchised? Why is inequality increasing? And why is so much insecurity? In trying to provide answers to these difficult questions, one must be wary of generalizations. Africa is not homogeneous; it is raucously diverse. But its nations are linked by common challenges hampering human development and equitable growth-weak governance and insufficient investment in public goods and services, whether citizens productive capacity, infrastructure, affordable energy, health, education and agricultural productivity. (Hindustan Times, 2010, p. 1)

Multilateral Relations

Nigeria, under the auspices of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries in the quest for aid and assistance for development, entered into close relationship with the European Union (EU) in an agreement otherwise referred to as the Lome convention in Lome, Togolese Capital in February, 1975. The agreement was to provide a platform for economic cooperation between the two parties

whereby agricultural and mineral exports from the ACP countries entered the EU 'duty free' under a preferential scheme. The EU was also to provide substantial development aid to ACP countries to boost development. The Lome Convention was reviewed three times as Lome (ii), Lome (iii), and Lome (iv) in deliberate attempts to adjust what was then a lopsided relationship in favour of Europe. Above all, the Lome regime did not address most of Africa's developmental challenges. Africa remained overwhelmingly an agrarian continent while millions of Africans remained below the poverty level. (Eze, 2010, Forward, 1x)

The Lome Convention was followed by the Cotonou Agreement of 2000 and the Strategic Partnership Agreement of 2007. These later Agreements, just like the Lome Convention, proved to be grossly against African states. The Cotonou Agreement, for instance, provided for the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPA), which allowed for interim and full membership; new Rules of Origins (Ro Os) and a Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) have directly and indirectly created tension in intra-African relations on the one hand, and in Africa's relations with Europe on the other hand. Arguably dismantling African solidarity was completed in December 2007—Osita Eze noted in his comment on the Institutional Framework for the Africa-EU Strategic Partnership, "it has been mostly a history of unequal exchange, ravages, exploitation and the development of underdevelopment" (Eze, 2010, p. 3). This scenario is aptly illustrated by the dependency and the modernization theories.

Dependency, Modernization Theories

Dependency Theory

This is a development theory that provides for development of underdeveloped states having external links with developed parts of the world. However, this kind of development is considered to be "dependent development", i.e., it does not have internal domestic dynamic in the developing country and thus remains highly vulnerable to the economic vagaries of the world market.

Dependency thinking starts from the notion that resources flow from the "periphery" of poor and underdeveloped states to a "core" of wealthy countries, which leads to accumulation of wealth in the rich states at the expense of the poor states. Dependency theory states that not all societies would progress through similar stages of development. Periphery states have unique features, structures and institutions of their own and are considered weaker with regards to the world market economy, while the developed nations have never been in this colonized position in the past. Dependency theorists argue that underdeveloped countries remain economically vulnerable unless they reduce their connections to the world market.

Dependency theory states that poor nations provide natural resources and cheap labour for developed nations, without which the developed nations could not have the standard of living, which they enjoy. When underdeveloped countries try to remove the core's influence, the developed countries hinder their attempts to keep control. This means that poverty of developing nations is not the result of the disintegration of these countries in the world system, but because of the way in which they are integrated into this system.

Modernization Theories and Nationalism

The modernization theories help to understand the outcome of dependency of one party's economy on that of the other or more explicitly the inevitable result of the dependency of the underdeveloped nations on the developed countries for economic growth and general development. Modernization is traceable to the Italian Renaissance otherwise referred to as Enlightenment which coincided with the Scientific Revolution in 16th century. Commerce and trade had preceded this period and was later followed by Industrial Revolution, thus

giving it economic interpretation. But within political context, it implies “the appearance of the modern national state—a centralized, bureaucratic, territorial and sovereign polity”. When applied to developing nations, “some features of modernity such as commercialization, bureaucratization, secularization, urbanization, mass communication, literacy, etc may be present, while industrialization is often absent” (Smith, 1998, p. 10).

The nexus between dependency and modernization theory is the selective development, particularly in the area of industrialization. Both share similar features of development but without industrialization which is key requirement for economic growth and development.

Many authors have enunciated their theories within the frame work of modernity. Though the theories are based on the experiences of Europe as part of its history and socio-economic development, the theories are adaptable to the study of nationalism and growth and development of the new nation states not just because these states have become part of the cultural world of the European countries as their former colonies, but perhaps more importantly because of some of the unsavoury colonial legacies left with them by Europe and the continued relationship between them which is largely in favour of Europe.

Some of the authors of modernization theories see a synthesis between the old or traditional nations and the new nations whereby the older ones transit to the new. The ancient nations thus give rise to the new unlike the primordialists which see the nation as an existing entity that has lasted throughout history. Modernization theorists are many just as their submissions vary.

Karl Deutsch belongs to the group that believes that traditional nations have transited to modern nations on the instrumentality of mass communication which has helped to mobilize diverse people in communities to communicate more intensely and effectively with one another than with people outside the group (Smith, 1998, p. 10). He believed that by using a variety of data from economic history and demography, massive mobilization went along with processes of commercialization, industrialization and urbanization as well as with growth of general literacy and mass communication (Ibid). The theory assumes that a popularization of social mobilization would enhance the importance of language and culture and hence of nationalism. This, of course, has not been the situation because with all the mass communication activities individual collectivities have remained distinct from one another against their expected fusion. In the case of Nigeria, the print media, e.g., the West African pilot helped to awaken the national consciousness and pull together the views and efforts of the nationalists from different ethnic groups to wrest power from the colonialists. But after attainment of independence, mass communication has not succeeded in building the various ethnic nationalities into a nation state.

Perhaps the most relevant of the modernization theories to the subject being discussed is the economic theory. Theorists in this group believe that economies have been used to create false consciousness for nationalism under which are various acts of exploitation, build-up of political power and cultural supremacy. This, in the view of Marxists, establishes a link between capitalism and nationalism. For Marx and Engels, the nation was not a central category of social existence but rather a transitory institution created by the bourgeoisie, hence the passage in *The Communist Manifesto* to the effect that the ‘proletariat has no claim to any land’.

Features which are Western Capitalism that were imported into the colonies have formed the foundation of Nigerian and African states’ economic space today. They are manifested in exploitation, widening of gap between the rich and the poor in the same state, elites’ subordination of the masses to their whims and caprices and the consequent absence of a good standard of living.

However, later economic theorists, particularly from 1970s, modified the Marxists view of nationalism.

Among the modified views is that of internal nationalism which holds that internal inequalities have segmented the states along ethnic lines. One of the proponents of this is Michael Hechter (1975, p. 12) who in his classical study of the United Kingdom—Internal Colonialism, maintained that industrialization aggravates an already existing situation of economic dependency and inequality of the Celtic fringe (Scotland, Wales, and Ireland) vis-à-vis England and this manifested itself first in differential political behavior and later in ethnic national movement,

The key feature of Hechter's theory is the idea of cultural division of labour existing between the core and the periphery, that is, there developed a system of stratification by means of which the dominant group at the core was in a position to monopolize social positions, which had high prestige in the society, while the members of the peripheral cultures were assigned social roles which were considered inferior. (Hechter, 1975, p. 12)

Hechter has been criticized for taking economies as solely responsible for nationalism. The critics have good ground for their view but Hechter's submission remains relevant for the situation in the developing nations where wealth accumulation is through the instrumentality of politics and elitism whose foundation and nourishment is ethnicity. This accounts for the emergence and continued existence of internal inequalities and internal nationalism. This situation as it exists in Africa therefore is not solely economic but socio-political and economic.

Nation Building

Nation building is a process predicated on the resolve by communities of people to pursue a common purpose, goal, aspiration and destiny. It is usually with shared hope and a sense of oneness imbued with love derived from the same historical experience, origin, and cultures.

The plurality of ethnicity of present day Nigeria and the method of her creation by the British which gave no consideration to the diversity of the peoples and their ethnic nationalities, have made the foundational requirements for nation building difficult to find and harness in the country. Nation building starts with building a stable state as an entity with defined territory, sovereignty, population, and recognition by the international community. Nigeria no doubt enjoys the recognition of other independent states in the global arena but has experienced much insecurity and threat to her claim to territories and general stability. From 1967 to 1970, a few years after gaining political independence from Britain, she fought a civil war against a secessionist group which declared itself independent of Nigeria under the name Republic of Biafra. Till date, echoes of the secession remain loud in Nigeria. Aside this is the current war being fought against Boko Haram, an Islamic insurgent group which resents Western civilization, including education, since 2014. This group once seized not fewer than five local Governments in the Northern part of the country from the government of the federation. Many other disruptive activities which directly threaten the stability of the country are armed robbery, armed banditry, kidnapping and the herders-farmers clashes. These waves of insecurity are not merely distractive but question greatly the integrity of the country as a nation state.

One distinctive feature of a stable polity is the political system and the method of election and change of government. Nigeria cannot be scored high in this regard. Apart from the military inter-regnum which took the greater part of the country's political space since independence, Nigeria is yet to cultivate democratic values for building an egalitarian society and patriotism. Our elections are still far from being free and fair and leaders that emerge from such elections are hardly transparent and accountable. Democracy in its true practice is synonymous to good governance, they share common

elements, which include, right to citizens for participation in the affairs of their state, enduring institutions for decision-making and implementation, regulation of conduct and service delivery, primacy of rule of law, accountability and transparency, rights to freedom of expression and social services that make for good life. (Iyayi, 2019a, p. 97)

Related to the above is the need to build strong institutions for efficiency and effectiveness. Public services infrastructure, including electricity and health, education and, in fact, all areas are in shambles. The problems associated with the institutions range from poor funding to mismanagement. More often than not, the people provide municipal services for their use and are, in the circumstances, difficult to be mobilized for a national course. The political elites cash in on these social problems to tend to speak on behalf of their ethnic groups for respite even when they are, in the first instance, part of the problem. The hydra headedness of corruption in the system and its negative impact is of common knowledge that it requires not much space here. One of the features of its landscape is the widening gap between the rich and the poor and the consequential segmentation of the society.

Nigeria, like other African nations, has not industrialized her economy to make it competitive globally. She is still largely a commodity producer and exporter with crude oil sales as the main source of revenue. Nigeria's manufacture and technology exports are still very low, making our economy unable to absorb adverse shock whenever the price of our commodity, particularly oil falls. The country's current budget, for example, is being threatened following slump in oil price because of spread of Corona Virus. The 1981-1985 budgets were abandoned because of fall of price of oil. The plan was initially designed to have an investment capital of N82bn, to which the public sector was to contribute 50.2% and the private sector 49.8%. But almost immediately after the launching of the plan, crude oil price collapsed in the international market. The unfortunate development shattered the plan as it could no longer be implemented (Iyayi, 2019b, p. 31). Over 30 years later, we are still in that stage of item of trade being the result of our continued dependence on the developed world and the legacies bequeathed to us.

It has not been possible to obtain public confidence because of the level of injustice in the society. Just like the other institutions, the judiciary is weak and falls short of the people's expectations of its performance.

Conclusion

Several factors have challenged nation building in Africa. This work has investigated the form of relationship between the African nations with particular reference to Nigeria and the developed world which has been an unequal association in favour of the developed nations and the overall impact of such a relationship on the efforts to build Nigeria as a stable and developed nation.

The requirements to create sense of nationalism out of the plural ethnic nationalities and build a desired nation are grossly lacking. Consequently, indicators of modern nation states, including stable polity, strong institutions for ensuring peaceful change of government through free and fair elections, transparency and accountability, justice and availability and access to basic facilities, like health care, education, potable water, electricity etc are to a very large extent absent. Mass poverty and widening gap between the rich and the poor provide the space for elitism which fans the embers of ethnicity and primordialism.

Recommendation

It is good that Nigeria has since corrected her initial attachment to only the West and capitalist world by extending her full relations to the countries in the East and the communists. However, what is important is to

ensure that whatever relationship she enters into with any state no matter its size and development is mutually beneficial. Globalization has pulled all states together in interdependent relationship, but still, each state needs to create internal mechanism to develop and make itself competitive economically, socially, culturally and politically in the global arena. Nigeria therefore needs to put its axe together and harness her human and material resources to do this quickly.

It is a good thing to attract investment, but it should be done with a view to developing our technology to industrialize our economy so as not to continue to be buyers of foreign goods which are either directly manufactured outside of the country or only packaged here with the attendant capital flight.

There should be mass education of the people on the activities of the elites, particularly the political elites and the need to resist their overtures and antics. One way to whittle their influence and control over the people is to improve the economy, reduce the unemployment, and close the gap between the rich and the poor to remove or lessen the vulnerability of the people to being bought with money and other promises by the elites.

References

- Agbu, O. (2011). Overview of Nigeria's foreign policy and engagements. In A. Osita and O. Ogaba (Eds.), *Nigeria in the global arena: Past, present and future*. Lagos: FOG Ventures.
- Akinterinwa, B. (2013). NIIA and CICIR within the framework of Nigeria-China strategic partnership: Collaboration as a desideratum. In A. Bola and O. Oche (Eds.), *Nigeria-China dialogue series: Issues contemporary China-Africa relations* (No. 1). Lagos: NIIA Press.
- Deutsch, K. (1953). *Nationalism and social communication*. New York: MIT Press.
- Easterly, W. (2005). Can Foreign Aid Save Africa? *Clemens Lecture Series 13*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/clemens=/13>
- Eze, O. (2010). Institutional Framework and Historical Background. In O. Eze and A. Sessy (Eds.), *Africa and Europe in the 21st century*. The Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 13/15 Kofo Abayomi Street, Victoria Island, Lagos.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN). (1979). The constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979. Government Printer.
- Ferraro, V. (2008). Dependency theory: An introduction. *The Development Economics Reader*, Giorgio Secondi (Ed.), pp. 58-64. London: Routledge.
- Ghebremeden, Y. (2010). Opinion of the Ethiopian Herald Addis Ababa. *Africa Progress Report* (APR), 11th June, Africa Progress Panel (APP).
- Hechter, M. (1975). *Internal colonialism*. London: Routledge and Kenga Paul.
- Iyayi, S. (2019a). Democracy and good governance: The nexus for sustainable development in Africa. In T. Wuam, D. O. Egbefo, M. L. Salahu, G. Jatau, and U. Y. Bako (Eds.), *Democracy in Nigeria: A reader*. Makurdi, Nigeria: Aboki Publishers.
- Iyayi, S. (2019b). *Social and economic development in Nigeria: Strategies and challenges*. Benin City: Dos-Nitas Global.
- Majuk, S. (2011). Nigeria's relations with Europe. In A. Osita and O. Ogaba (Eds.), *Nigeria in the global arena: Past, present and future*. Lagos: FOG Ventures.
- Olarewaju, S. (1987). The infrastructure of exploitation: Transport monetary changes, banking etc. In T. Falola (Ed.), *Britain and Nigeria, exploitation or development*. London: Zed Books.
- Omole, T. (2011). Nigeria and the non-aligned movement. In A. Osita and O. Ogaba (Eds.), *Nigeria in the global arena: Past, present and future*. Lagos: FOG Ventures.
- Osoba, S. (1987). The transition to neo-colonialism. In T. Falola (Ed.), *Britain and Nigeria, exploitation or development*. London: Zed Books.
- Rodney, W. (1982). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Enugu: Ikenga Publishers.
- Smith, A. (1983). *Theories of nationalism*. London: Duckworths.
- Smith, A. (1998). *Nationalism and modernism*. London: Routledge.