

Agricultural Development and Political Economy: A Review of the Nigerian Experience

Kareem R.O (Ph.D.)

Department of Economics and Actuarial Sciences, College of Social and Management Sciences, Crescent University, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author

Kareem R.O (Ph.D.)

Email: rskventures@yahoo.com

Abstract: It is no more a gain saying that ‘there cannot be any meaningful agricultural growth and development in any country without linking it to the roles and activities of the political rulers and leadership paddling the wheel of the economy. Governance has been described as the exercise of political power in the management of human affairs, and the material resources at federal, state and local government level. Thus, economic foundation of a country largely determines by its political structure. However, with the hugely endowed human and material resources of the Nigerian state, all these have not been harnessed to improve the material well being of her citizenry mainly due to stagnation or decline in the attention given to agricultural sector by the administration (government) in power as a result of oil boom of 1970s. It is thus pertinent to analytically examine the agricultural development and political economy of Nigeria with a view to providing recommendation(s) that will aid the policy making process of the policy makers in Nigeria and indeed the sub-Saharan Africa. This study reviews the concept of political economy, governance, forms of governance and economic policy, theoretical foundation of government policies, a number of policy measures and programmes aimed at revamping agriculture. The study therefore concluded that though, there have been a number of institutional framework that have been put in place by past and present government in Nigeria, but the problem of political instability, lack of continuity in government policies and programmes, non-implementation of programmes, improper planning, corruption, non adherence to corporate governance, lack of transparency have been the bane of agricultural development and political economy in Nigeria. The study therefore recommends that, unless there is an attitudinal change among our political leaders who champion the political and economic affairs of this country, the expected growth and development envisaged in Nigerian’s agricultural sector and the economy at large will be a mirage.

Keywords: Agricultural Development, Political Economy, Agricultural Transformation Agenda, Corruption, Gross Domestic Product.

INTRODUCTION

It is no more a gain saying that ‘there cannot be any meaningful agricultural growth and development in any country without linking it to the roles and activities of the political rulers and leadership paddling the wheel of the economy. It is also a known fact that political economy is a two co-joint words from politics and economy. It is thus, suffice to ask ourselves what Political is? and what is economy? According to the Oxford Dictionary of Current English. [1], it defined political as the ‘adjective relating to the government (the group of people who govern a state, the system by which a state or community is governed) or public affairs of a country’ while economy is the state of a country or region in terms of the production and consumption of goods and services and the supply of money. It also includes careful management of resources, financial services. Thus, political economy is the field of study that deals with the interaction of

politics and economics. Nigerian economy could refer to all such economic activities taking place in the geographical domain of Nigeria (The domestic economy) or all such economic activities of Nigerian residents wherever in the world they happen to perform that activity [2]. However, no one is oblivious of the fact that economy is the skeleton core of a nation. Hence, the study of this nature will bring to a limelight the extent of its influence on the nation’s form, present and the future.

The Nigerian economy can be structurally be classified broadly into four: Production, General Commerce, Services and others.

Production is made up of; Agriculture (cropping, livestock, forestry and fishery), manufacturing and quarrying, real estate and construction

General Commerce is composed of: Bills discounted, domestic trade, exports; and Imports, Services include public utilities, and Transport and communication. Others; are made up of credit and financial institutions, government and miscellaneous (composed of personal and professional –private sectors).

Nigeria is endowed with vast and largely untapped natural resources: including minerals, petroleum, limestone, tin, columbite, kaolin, gold and silver, coal, lead, zinc, gypsum, clay etc but still categorized among the less developed countries (LDCs) despite being governed or ruled by Nigerians as opposed to colonialism era. It is surprising to note that the situation of the pre-independence (when the colonial masters were ruling this nation) was not so precarious as compared to the post-independence era when Nigerians are governing themselves. Nigerian governments have embarked on different phases of economic development planning and rolling plans (1960-1990), yet the economy is not stable.

Around 1960s, Agriculture was the mainstay of the Nigerian economy with about 70 percent of the country's labour force employed in this sector. Moreso, the percentage contribution of this sector to the Gross Domestic Product was about 70 percent. It sad to now observe that Agricultural sector has lost its pride of place with respect to the contribution to the Gross Domestic Product [2]. Thus, the prime position occupied by agriculture was overtaken by the oil sector by the mid-1970s.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF NIGERIA

The parallel existence and mutual interaction of state and 'market' in the modern world can be termed 'political economy'. Such political economy is the reciprocal and dynamic interaction of the pursuit of wealth and the pursuit of power.

It also involves how the state and its associated political processes affect the production and distribution of wealth and in particular how political decisions and interaction influence the location of economic activities and the distribution of the costs and benefits of these activities. Currently, Nigeria operates a federal political economy (federation) implying a series of legal and administrative relationships established among units of government possessing varying degrees of real authority and jurisdictional autonomy [2].

THE CONCEPT OF GOVERNANCE

There is no doubt that various governments since independent have recognized their role as championing the economic growth and development of

the country. That necessarily meant policy articulation which ultimately influenced the allocation of powers and resources to public agencies, while influencing the private agencies. Governance, therefore, is policy making and policy execution regulated by systems of laws and guidelines which are segregated into specific operations to achieve national objectives.

The art of governance is rather complex because it influences economic, political and social aspects of a nation. Again, the tempo of development is influenced by the nation's ideology, political structure and administrative capacity. Whether these imperatives are recognized or not, effective government is achieved by means of good public policies with clear objectives, targeted programmes and readiness to anticipate and review outcomes if and when necessary.

Policy objectives are achieved only when government recognizes and provides an effective legal and institutional framework which will give the following impetuses:

- a. provision of a range of public goods and services, especially infrastructure, which will enable the economy to run smoothly;
- b. establishment of clear and consistent economic policies which, in addition to eliminating bureaucratic inefficiencies, will also build private sector confidence. The greater the level of private sector's trust and confidence;
- c. establishment of public confidence through properly adhered guidelines, accountability and probity in the public and private sectors; and
- d. provision of a framework from which the intended and unintended outcomes of economic policies are backed up by welfare, safely nets for the not-so-privileged members of the society

All governments have the responsibility to maintain stable macroeconomic policies. To achieve macroeconomic stability, it is imperative for government to formulate and implement sound fiscal and monetary policies which will ultimately guide the objectives and goals to be pursued and hopefully achieved.

It must be stressed, however, that policies are no more than instruments of governance. For them to have the intended impact, the policy formulators and implementers must be seen to be above board. A nation is as good as its leaders. As economic beings, people react to situations in a manner that first takes care of their self interest. Therefore, if for any reason the citizens of a country have reasons to doubt the personal

integrity of those in government, they are bound to flout any policy enacted by such government, no matter how good it may be. For this reason, it is imperative for those in government to understand that the foundation of any good policy (and hence good governance) is sincerity of purpose and transparency in the conduct of public affairs [3].

FORMS OF GOVERNMENT

According to Nnaemeka [4], forms of government can be classified into two categories: democratic and authoritarian. As summarized by Gulhati [5], democracies fall into the following classifications – majority party or coalition governments, parliamentary or presidential systems, and proportional representation or single constituency electoral systems. In a more compact classification, Haggard and Kaufman [6] indicated that democracies may be usefully distinguished according to whether they are “plebiscitary” or “consultative”. In plebiscitary democracies the political party is needed more for securing the vote than for the representation of interests. Consultative democracies, by contrast, provided institutionalized means for interest groups to influence, if not participate in, the policy process. Authoritarian regimes are also classified into “strong” and “weak” ones.

The two basic regimes types differ fundamentally in the way they exercise power and authority. In liberal democracies, the exercise of power and authority tends, more or less, to be moderated by the rule of law, separation of powers, free elections, institutional pluralism, and respect for fundamental human rights. Authoritarian regimes, by contrast, exercise power and authority arbitrarily. In consequence, they are apt to be politically repressive, and they typically exhibit a relentless drive to perpetuate themselves in power.

GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMIC POLICY

The exercise of power and authority in both the political and economic spheres is the essentials of governance [7]. Given the two basic regime types, it follows that the exercise of power and authority can either be democratic or authoritarian. Although, the term “governance” has no generally agreed definition, there is little disagreement as to which of its elements affect economic performance. The relevant elements are skill and capacity, accountability, transparency and the rule of law. These elements, according to Brautigam, “affect economic performance through their impact on fiscal integrity, on predictability, and on the creation of an environment conducive to productive investment”. But the definition of the term itself remains problematic. Both neutral and non-neutral definitions of governance are encountered in the literature.

Boeninger’s definition [8] is a classic example of the non –neutral type. Boeninger defines governance as the “good government of society”. Good government according to him, “guides the country along a course leading to a desired goal. Thus, development itself interpreted by him include the concepts of equity, social justice, and the effective exercise of basic human rights. Boeninger’s definition is considered non – neutral on two grounds; first, it excludes the possibility of bad government; and, second, it equated governance with democracy. A good example of a neutral definition is that proposed by World Bank. The World Bank [9] defines governance as “the exercise of political power to manage a nation’s affairs” this interpretation has been favourably appraised by [10] on the following grounds:

It encompasses the state’s institutional and structural arrangements, decision - making processes, and implementation capacity, and the relationship between government officials and the public. It implies that public authorities play an indispensable and potentially creative role in establishing the economic environment and in determining the distribution of assets and benefits. Conversely, it also implies the possibility that the government may be “captured” by self-seeking elite with the intention of plundering the nation’s wealth. Most time, societies have always establish governments that promote the public interest, only to find that public resources have been diverted to private benefit and that power is being retained by violent and arbitrary means.

The World Bank’s definition is considered ‘neutral’ because it recognizes the possibility of bad government with democracy. Although, the elements of good governance such as transparency, institutional pluralism, accountability, and the rule of law are vital for the democratization of the society. Joan Nelson [11] has succinctly summarized as follows:

There is a link between elements of good governance and economic growth. There is a strong correlation between high levels of economic wealth and democratic forms of government in the long run. But there is no clear link between democratic government and economic growth in developing nations. Efforts to test that relationship empirically have been inclusive or contradictory – or both. Democracy is also obviously no guarantee of good government. There are all too many democratic governments (as well as many authoritarian ones) that are neither honest nor efficient nor growth-promoting. No consistent relationship exist between broad categories of political systems an equitable distribution of income. Obviously, a democratic regime cannot formulate good economic policy or deliver good

economic performance unless it has the political will and the technical capacity to do so. It should also be clear that a benevolent dictatorship which happens to be technically competent can deliver good economic performance. The significance of good governance lies in its capacity to enhance the potential, in both democratic and authoritarian regimes, for good economic policy and good economic performance.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF GOVERNMENT POLICIES

The actions of government are rooted in the selected theories of economic growth and development. Eight of these can be briefly highlighted following [12] as follows:

- (a) **The Classical-Neoclassical theory:** This posits that economic growth is a function of capital investments and employment of labour. Capital and labour are assumed to flow from sectors with low rates of return and marginal productivity to those with high rates of return and marginal productivity. This is the foundation of the demand for high-yielding enterprises in rural areas. Consequently, it is reasonable to measure the growth status of the rural lives by the magnitudes of rates of return to capital and labour and their marginal productivities.
- (b) **Basic resources theory:** This states that economic growth depends on the presence, the quality and magnitude of basic developed in certain regions. These resources can be developed or exploited to create utilities. Consequently, one may assesses the economic status of rural lives account of the level utilization of available resources.
- (c) **Internal combustion theory** – This attributes economic growth and development to certain factors. These include technology, specialization, economies of scales, as well the institutional, administrative and political factors. On this basis, one may examine the situation with these factors to assess the impact of development policies in rural areas using applicable socio-economic yardsticks.
- (d) **Dual-economy model:** Two sectors of the economy are demarcated namely: rural and urban. The rural sector is assumed to possess surplus resources, particularly labour, which should be released to develop the urban sector. This helps us to evaluate the resource situation of rural areas as a way of evaluating government policies.
- (e) **Export-led growth model:** This posits that policies designed to expand export market will lead to greater utilization of ideal resources, capable of enhancing incomes of producers,

employment and government revenues. This can be used a basis for evaluating certain government policies that have been used to stimulate agricultural production in rural areas.

- (f) **Urban industrial impact theory:** This describes growth as a burning candle. This candle of economic growth is located in the industrial urban centre and it illuminates the rural areas. Therefore, the intensity of this illumination is a decreasing function of distance from the urban centre. The logic of this theory is that nearness to urban centre determines the transportation cost of inputs and outputs and also the market for agricultural produce. This theory permits us to assess government policies on account of infrastructure available.
- (g) **High input pay-off model:** This assumes farmers are efficient allocators of resources and also respond to economic stimuli, but operate under immense technical economic inhibitions. Therefore, support is necessary in the forms of improved seeds and other technical inputs, as well as to output prices. It therefore provides basis favourable price policies, which lowers input prices relative for assessing agricultural research and price policies meant to enhance the productivities in rural areas.
- (h) **Diffusion model:** This attributes productivity difference among farmers to the presence of different access to inputs and adoption capabilities. Thus, the need for agricultural extension policies, therefore, arises. Effective extension would improve the profitability of the farm business. Therefore, there is basis to evaluate the impact of such policies on the economic status of rural dwellers that are mostly farmers.

PAST POLICY MEASURES OF SUCCESSIVE GOVERNMENTS ON AGRICULTURE

Before now, Nigeria has experienced about 29 years of Military Rule and about 14 years of democratically civilian government. Thus, past governments at various time periods have embarked or intervened in the formation of policies towards enhancing agricultural growth and development. This is informed as results of the political will of the people in governance or at the helms of affairs at various times. Moreso, the growing awareness of the role of agriculture in the economic development of Nigeria has prompted various governments in the country to intensity efforts aimed at transforming agriculture from its present subsistence level to a market oriented production. There had been a number of policy measures and programmes within the last two or three

decades which involved the reconstruction or reformation of the whole structure of the agricultural sector by the creation of appropriate institutions and public services designed to strengthen the economic position of the independent farmer. These measures and programmes are as discussed below:

THE NATIONAL ACCELERATED FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECT (NAFPP)

The desire to induce the masses of farmers to boost food production within the shortest possible time” led to the establishment in 1973 of the NAFPP. A programme based on the green revolution concepts and experiences of Mexico, India, Philippines and Pakistan. Its main objectives is to experiences production of six major food crops namely rice, millet, sorghum, maize, wheat and cassava. This is to be achieved by using field tested the traditional ones. The project into which have three components – research, extension, and agro-services – is divided into three phases namely the Minikit. Production Kit and Mass Production phases.

The International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Ibadan is the National Coordinator of the Project The National Cereals Research Institute (NCRI), Ibadan houses the National Rice/Maize centre which guides and coordinates the activities for the NAFPP for rice and maize while the National Root Crop Research Institute. Umudike is in the charge of cassava. Another centre at Samaru near Zaria takes charge of Sorghum, millet and wheat.

Despite the fact that a substantial number of farmers have gained from the programme, it is bedeviled by inadequate finance, inadequate commitment be some states, inadequate publicity and poor infrastructural facilities.

THE NIGERIAN AGRICULTURES AND CO-OPERATIVE BANK (NACB)

The NACB was founded in April, 1973 to foster growth in the quantity and quality of credit to all aspect of agriculture production including poultry farming, fisheries, forestry and number production, horticulture, etc. It also aimed at improving storage facilities for agriculture products and the promotion of the marketing of agriculture products. The Central Bank of Nigeria has 40% of its equity shares which stood at N150 million in 1984.

The bank provides for two credit markets, direct-lending to individual farmer and organizations, and on-lending in established institutions mainly state governments and co-operative bodies against guarantees for on-lending to third parties.

After ten years of operation (1973), loans directly made to private sector investors in agriculture by the bank amounted to N122,468.031 and this is made up of 236 loans covering N26,776.654 made to individuals. 102 loans covering N94,0171, 747 made to incorporated companies and six loans covering N619, 630 made to co-operative societies for direct private investment in agriculture. By 1995, its total credit was N3,179.6 million on 68, 945 project with direct lending dominating at 62.4%.

Despite this apparent impressive performance the quantity of loan granted to small holder farmers has proved to be grossly inadequate.

THE RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITIES (RBDAS)

The development of river basins was conceived in 1963 with involvement in the Lake Chad Basin and River Niger Commissions for countries bordering the Lake and Niger River. But the concept was first tried in 1973 with the establishment of the Sokoto Rima and Chad Basin Development Authorities. Eleven others were established under Decree Nos. 25 and 31 of 1976 and 1979 respectively. These include the Sokoto Rima (for Sokoto). Hadejia-Jamare (for Kano),. The Chad (for Borno), The Upper Benue (for Gongola), the Lower Benue (for Benue and Plateau), the Cross River (for Cross River), the Anambra-Imo (for Imo and Anambra), the Niger (for Kaduna and Kwara), the Ogun-Oshun (for Oyo, Ogun and Lagos), the Benin-Owena (for Bendel and Ondo) and the Niger Delta (for Rivers)

Decree No. 87 of September 28, 1979 amended some sections of the original decree. Another amendment came in October 1981 under Amendment Act No 7.

In June 1984, the number of these basins was increased to 18 under the new name of River Basin and Rural Development Authorities).

The River Basin Development Authorities are expected to cater for the development of the land and water resources potentials of Nigeria for Agricultural purposes and general rural development. The rural development aspect will receive greater emphasis under their new names. Each RBDA covers a state, except Lagos and Abuja, which share with one other state each.

In the August, 1984, 12 of the RBDAs have assisted their participating farmers to crop 188, 194 hectares of various crops during the 1984 panting season for where 524, 859 metric tonnes of assorted crops like maize, wheat, cowpeas, rice, millet, sorghum,

groundnut and vegetables were produced. In the area of irrigation, the story is only about 82, 305 hectares or 33% is presently under irrigation.

By 1995, the later reduced number of RBDAs (from 18 to 11 in 1987) developed 51, 558 hectares of land, irrigated 12, 540 hectares, constructed 443, Kilometer of roads, catered for 136, 514 families and drilled 58 boreholes. Its funds stood at N589.3 million with 96.1% coming from the Federal Government.

Activities for the RBDAs have been hampered due to inadequate planning data, shortage of funds, shortage of spare parts and lubricants, difficulties in securing land for development especially in the south and the shortage of qualified and experienced technical, professional and managerial manpower.

OPERATION FEED THE NATION (OFN)

May 1976 witnessed the launching of the Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) Scheme by the Obasanjo regime mainly to increase food production and eventually to attain self-sufficiency the section of the population which relies on buying food to grow foods. Under the scheme encouragement and material assistance were given to the people in the form of technical advice and the supply implements, livestock and livestock feed at subsidized prices.

In order to protect farmers against a drastic fall in prices of food crop following anticipated increases in output, the government announced guarantee minimum prices per metric tonne for the 1976 agricultural season. But, it was soon found that the prices fixed were less than those obtained in the markets.

As a development strategy, the impact of the OFN was not as profound as its initiators may want us to believe. The programme only succeeded in keeping the nation aware of food shortage and mobilizing its efforts in the fight against the problem. *Everybody irrespective of trade took to farming but this did not last for long, for after a while interest started waning. Increased food importation, the land use decree, inadequate human and material resources, faulty campaign strategy and faulty administrative system led to the death of OFN*

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT GUARANTEE SCHEME (AGGS)

The need to encourage the flow of increased credit to the agricultural sector raised the necessity for an investigation to determine the bottlenecks which were experienced in attracting credit to the sector. The enquiry, a joint effort of the Central Bank of Nigeria and the Commercial Banks, focused on the current size and coverage of lending by the commercial banks to

agriculture and the measures needed to improve the situation.

The results was a Fund established by the Federal Government under the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Fund Act, 1977 which provided for a Fund of N100 million subscribed to by Central Bank of Nigeria (60%). The scheme came into operation on April 3, 1978 with the objective of providing guarantee in respect of loans granted for agricultural purposes by bank in accordance with the provisions of the Act and the aim of increasing the level of bank credit to the agricultural sector. The agricultural purposes in respect of which loans can be guarantee by the Fund are those connected with the establishment or management of plantations for the production of rubber, oil palm and similar crops, the cultivation of cereal crops, animal husbandry, including cattle rearing and poultry and fish farming.

Between April 1978, when the scheme came into operation and the end of that year a total of 341 agricultural loans amounting to about N11.3 million had been guaranteed by the Fund. The fund has continued to increase progressively over the years such that by the end of 1982, a total of 4, 762 projects involving the sum of N143.2 million have been guaranteed by the fund.

However, some of the observed problems in the implementation of the scheme include delays experienced by farmers in having their application processed by the banks and some issues alleged to have arisen from the land use Act

RURAL BANKING SCHEME

At the instance of the Central Bank of Nigeria, the Financial System Review Committee in 1975 recommended and the Federal Government approved a programme of geographical dispersal of bank branches particularly designed to ensure the penetration of the rural areas by banks. The rationale for this included, among others, the fact that a network of rural banks would help to mobilize rural saving some of which would be invested in the agricultural sector. The first cycle of the plan covered the period 1977-1980 and 200 bank branches which were projected to be set up have since been established. During the second phase, 1980-1983, 266 rural branches were planned to be opened. The third phase which was launched in 1985 covered 1985 to 1989 and it involved the opening of 300 rural branches. Though, the scheme was abandoned in 1990 by 1991. 200, 266, and 299 branches had been opened for each of the three phases, giving a total of 765, with only 1 outstanding.

Apart from the above, it has observed that, this programme aimed at facilitating the transformation of

the rural economy and thus restrain the population drift from the rural to the urban centres, was not being vigorously implemented. This appeared too slow and unacceptable. In addition, mere extension of the branches of existing ill-adapted banks into the rural areas falls short of a good model for 'rural bank'. They should rather provide rural financial facilities in a more dynamic manner by engaging in the mobilization of funds for investment in most of the productive activities which offer potential returns in the rural areas.

COMMODITY BOARDS

There was also a reorganization of the then existing marketing board system for export in 1977 from regional oriented boards to those with a national outlook. Thus, there came into being 7 commodity boards, viz: Cocoa, Rubber, Cotton, Groundnut, Grains (for Cereal) Root Crops (for Cassava, Yam and Cocoyam), and Palm Produce (for Palm oil and palm kernel) Commodity Boards. Their establishment was to promote both the production and marketing of their respective commodities.

In the particular case of the food crops, the boards have recorded little or no impact due to their low coverage with only a small proportion of farmers reached. In addition the minimum prices fixed by the boards are lower than those obtaining in rural markets. However, the boards 'wind up' their operations in 1986.

THE LAND USE DECREE

The Land Use Decree which was promulgated in March 1978 appears the most sensational institutional reform in Nigeria agriculture for several years. The decree was intended to reform the land tenure system which was believed to constitute formidable obstacles to the development of agriculture. The guidelines for the fourth National Development Plan explicitly stated inter alia, 'The land tenure system has long been a bottleneck in the establishment of large-scale farms by private operators. With the implementation of the recent land use decree, Private sector involvement in large-scale agricultural activities should receive a boost during the next plan period... Availability of land should no longer be a constraint to agricultural undertakings. The reform should promote better security of tenure and also encourage consolidation of holdings and large-scale operation. It should make it easier to attract foreign entrepreneurs and foreign capital into agricultural production.

The Decree thus invests the control of all land in state government' hands to be held in trust for the Federal Government. It does not disturb the rights of users of land already occupied or developed in rural areas but transfers allocative powers over undeveloped land from traditional to local government. A Land Use

Allocation Committee exists in each state to advise the governor with respect to urban lands. Land Allocation Advisory Committees exist in the rural areas to advise local government on the effective management of land.

The Decree has received mixed reaction from Nigerians. Some see it as an unnecessary interference with the basis of private property while others think that one cannot take socialist measures without the state itself becoming socialist. The Decree appears to have a more radical effect on the systems in the southern part of Nigeria than the northern part.

THE GREEN REVOLUTION PROGRAMME

With the birth of civilian administration in 1979, the question of food shortage in the country once more received a critical look as the drain in the nation's foreign reserves and its threat to the economy and existence were realized. Thus, the Green Revolution Programme was launched in 1980 by the then Shagari administration. Its objective is centered at self-reliance in food production and the diversification of Nigeria's sources of foreign exchange. To achieve this, all known constraints to increased production were to be removed.

Under the scheme, new input procurement and distribution systems came into operation. Input subsidies, and crop pricing policies were streamlined while construction of rural physical infrastructures were embarked upon via massive federal funds allocation.

Green Revolution National committee and state Representatives were formed with the state co-ordinating committee responsible for co-ordinating and implementing policies and programmes of various Federal Ministries concerned with the Green Revolution in the states. The programme covered all areas of agricultural production, food and export crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry.

Some measurement of positive results was recorded in increased cultivated land hectares, livestock production, forestry and fishery. But this degree of achievement was short lived due to shortage of funds, mismanagement and fraud, poor and thorough research and extension services, problems of land acquisition, inadequate data, inadequate executive capacity and lack of infrastructural facilities (see Anyanwu 1986).

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (ADPS)

As part of rural development programmes, ADPs were establishment first in pilot states and later in all the state in the country. Some of their key areas of activities are the provision of infrastructures (Including water point wash bores), farm service centres, the

supply of farm inputs such as fertilizers, root crops/tubers, agro-chemicals (pesticides and herbicides) and water pumps, and extension and training (including the establishment of special plots for extension and training (SPAT). Indeed, the ADP concepts has been used as the primary method to increase production and welfare in the small holder agricultural sector in Nigeria. Since 1974, the World Bank had assisted Nigeria with a series of ADPs which have gone through various phases. ADPs started in 1974 with the establishing of the first three enclave projects in the northern part of Nigeria (Funtua, Gusau and Gombe ADPs). The development approach focused on simple improved packages for more of the major food crops such as maize. Sorghum and millet, combined with improvement in the extension service. Some successes recorded with these early ADPs caused both the federal government and the World Bank to quickly replicate the ADP model in other states. This is from 1975 to 1980, the number of project grew from the original 3 to a total of 9 enclave projects.

The need and pressure to enlarge the programme and to cover all the states led to the first multi-state ADP (MSADP-1) comprising 7 states: Anambra, Bendel, Benue, Cross River, Imo, Ogun and Plateau. These came on stream later part of 1985 and early 1986. MSADP-II later covered Gongola, Kwara, Ondo, Lagos, and Rivers State, with the later programme incorporating support for fisheries in those maritime states. Thus, by 1988, the entire country had been covered by the ADP system with benefits spread to all LGAs in each state.

In August 1990, when the loan for the first set of state wide ADPs terminated, an Agricultural Development Fund (ADF) loan was initiated for the project. This was later split into the National Agricultural Technology Support Project (NATSP) and the National Fadama Development Project (NFDP). Both loans became effective in 1992. The NATSP provides assistance for technology adoption and dissemination in Bauchi, Kano and Sokoto States while the NFDP provides funds for Fadama Development in Nigeria by concentrating on irrigation with the use of ground water in already cultivated farms.

We noted that, basically all ADPs had the key objective of increasing food production and hence farm incomes for the majority of the rural households in the defined project regions, thus improving the standard of living and welfare of the farming population

The various components of ADPs are farm and crop development, civil work/infrastructural development, institutional support and training, and

technical assistance through long-term and short-term consultancies.

These components are achieved by the following:

- (a) Through applied research an improved extension system and a more efficient system or input procurement and distribution (especially fertilizer)
- (b) provision of feeder roads, the construction of Farmer Service Centres (FSC) for input supply in rural areas, and the establishment of project offices and staff houses.
- (c) Establishing or enhancing the capacity of the ADPs themselves to implement the development programmes through training as well as the training of local government staff.

THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LAND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (NALDA)

The NALDA was established in 1991 to execute a national agricultural land development programme to moderate the chronic problems of low utilization of abundant farm land. The main target of the programme was the development of 30,000-50,000 hectares of land in each state during the 1992-94 National Rolling Plan period. Also, it was to see to the placement of at least 7,500-12,500 farmers within the area developed such that each lives within 3Km-5Km radius of his farmland. An average of N300 million was allocated to NALDA by the Federal Government annually in 1991 and 1992, while the state and Local Governments were to allocate suitable tracts of land to the Authority in addition in token contributions towards the funding of its programme. By the end of 1995, NALDA had developed a total of 16,000 hectares of land out of which 81.1% was cultivated with various crops. However, NALDA performance had been constrained by inadequate and untimely release of fund and inadequate farm machinery/equipment.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY AND INSTITUTION SUPPORT

In 2007, agricultural production benefited from the various initiatives, including the following:

- The Presidential Initiative on Rice Production and Export, through the introduction of high yielding hectare in 2007, Government released N1.0 billion for the multiplication of NERICA and other improved rice varieties, while the National Seed Service distributed about 560 tonnes of certified rice seeds at 50.0 per cent price subsidy to the farmers through the seed companies and other private producers;
- About 5, 000 tonnes improve maize seeds and 95, 00 litres of agro-chemicals were distributed to farmers. The Presidential Initiative on Cassava Production and Export promoted private sector

investment in the cassava down stream sector, especially in Ogun, Imo, Edo, Niger and Benue states;

- The Federal Government through the National Cocoa Development Programme provided seedlings, assorted herbicides, fungicides, insecticides, and other inputs for distribution to farmers at 50.0 percent price subsidy;
- The Committee on Cotton Production in Nigeria evolved clean cotton programme, through the systematic distribution of certified seeds to farmers, as well as the re-introduction of cotton grading and the direct payment of premium to cotton growers and ginner. The stakeholder made a joint take-off contribution of N400 million to implement the programme. Also the sum of N70.0 billion was facilitated as Textile Rehabilitation Fund to support the cotton, textile and garment industries. The federal Government also initiated a public-private partnership for cotton production in 24 cotton producing states of the country, to increase cotton production from 300, 00 to 1 million tonnes in 2007;
- The Federal Government approved a two-year Implementation Action Plan covering 2007 and 2008, as well as the provision of N423.1 million to kick start the Presidential Rubber. To complement the previous efforts of the Presidential initiative on Tropical Fruits, the Federal Government approved the sum of N250.0 million as its contribution for 2007 to 2008, to achieve the targets set for the production various tropical fruits;
- The Federal Government distributed N550 million Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) loans, as a component of the Animal Traction and Hand Technology Loan Scheme was extended to the end of the year. In a related development, the bill for the establishment of the National Agricultural Development Fund was passed by the National Assembly. It was expected to enhance the funding of agriculture;
- About 318.860.34 tonnes of assorted fertilizer were distributed at 25.0 per cent price subsidy to farmers for the 2007 cropping season. In addition 2,000 tonnes of different brands of organic fertilizer was delivered to the State Agricultural Development Programme (ADPs);
- The sum of N2.5 billion was released for the production/procurement of grains in the country by the Federal Government. As a result, the Federal Government met in 2005/2006 strategic food reserve target of 51,000 tonnes of grains in May 2007, with about 1,220 tonnes of processed cassava in store;
- In order to control trans-boundary pets, the Federal Government embarked on the rehabilitation of the Agro-Aviation unit in Kaduna, through he purchase

of an Agro-Aviation aircraft, and the distribution of agro-chemicals to states. About 150 flight hours were contracted out, while 15,000 litres of avicide were dispensed over the eight (8) frontline states effected by quela birds; and

- In collaboration with development partners, the poultry industry and local communities, the Federal Government drafted an integrated national avian and pandemic influenza response plan aimed at coordinating the efforts of stakeholders toward addressing the threat of avian flu.

THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR FOOD SECURITY (NPFS)

Food security exists when all people, at all times, have access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. The National programme for Food Security is an initiative of the Federal Government on Nigeria and the Food and Agriculture Organizations (FAO) for poverty reduction in line with the thrust of the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS). It forces attention on the application of innovate low-cost technologies towards improving the productivity and sustainability of agricultural systems, with the ultimate objective of contributing to better the livelihood of farmers, through a bottom-up development approach

In May 2000, the FAO signed an agreement with the Nigerian Government for a Unilateral Trust Fund Project worth US\$45.2 million in support of the National Programme for Food Security (NPFS) in Nigeria. The Federal Government of Nigeria implemented the NPSC with own its human and financial resources, while the FAO provided technical support on demand to the Government

However, The budget for the expansion of the NPFS to cover the five-year period amounts to US\$355.0 million. Funding is obtained from a variety of sources, with the Government of Nigeria bearing a large portion of the cost, supplemented by the World Bank, the African Development Bank (ADB), and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the European Union (EU) and the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa [13]. Despite all these financial commitments, Nigeria is yet to bring back the lost glory of the dominant role of Agriculture in the Gross Domestic Product of the country.

AGRICULTURAL TRANSFORMATION AGENDA

As part of the transformation agenda of the President Goodluck Jonathan administration is the plan for an agricultural programme that is expected to create

about 3.5 million jobs tagged Agricultural Transformation Action Plan (ATAP). However, the inspiration of the transformation agenda is based and draws its aspiration from the Nigeria Vision 20:2020 and the 1st National Implementation Plan (NIP), aims to deepen the effects and provide a sense of direction for the current administration over the next four years (2011-2015).

More importantly, Nigeria's Agriculture Transformation Agenda is aimed primarily at developing crops that grow easily in the six geo-political zones of the country. The idea, perhaps, is to bring back the era, prior to the discovery of oil, when agricultural commodities reigned supreme in each of the three regions of Nigeria. The North experienced the great KANO groundnut pyramids and large cotton farmlands that enabled the Textile factories to thrive in Gusau and Kaduna. The Eastern Region had the Oil Palm Plantations that gave us sufficient red oil and was generous enough to transport its seedlings to Malaysia while in Western Nigeria, the Cocoa Plantation farms encouraged, among other things the establishment of the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) in Ibadan.

Today, the agenda has targeted the North West and North East zones to grow in large quantities : Cotton, Onions, Tomatoes and Sorghum; North Central: Maize & Soya beans; South West, South East and South-South: Oil Palm & Cocoa. Nationally, Rice, Cassava, Livestock and Fisheries are considered important value chains because the entire country provide natural resources and endowment for them.

While the Zonal value chains essentially deal with perishable food and crops likely to lose value within few months of harvest if not processed or harnessed, the ones designated national were considered more important because we imported Rice and frozen food in into the country when we could provide them locally. All of a sudden it was realised upon intensive research findings that Cassava could be used in baking bread instead of wheat, That value added products such as ethanol, starch, sweeteners etc were by-products of cassava which became a high value exported crop capable of earning the country foreign exchange. As a result, over \$200 million secured financing was granted to 18 private sector-owned large scale cassava plants with 1.3 million MT capacity with another 3.2 million MT contract orders for cassava chips from China for the production of ethanol. the Federal Government was also said to have provided 30 million bundles of cassava cuttings free of charge to farmers around the country.

One interesting feature of the emphasis on the National Rice Value chain is the fact that government is

very serious in curbing our penchant for foreign rice which was massively smuggled into the country until high tariff was placed on the commodity at the end of 2013. Prior to this action, Nigeria was the largest importer of rice in the world spending N356 billion (\$2bn) per year.

CONCLUSION

This study has been able to review the concept of political economy, governance, forms of governance and economic policy, theoretical foundation of government policies, a number of policy measures and programmes aimed at revamping agriculture, The study therefore observed that Nigeria is no doubt blessed with a lot of human and material resources, but the advent of oil boom in the 1970s had adversely led to the neglect of Agricultural sector. The study therefore concluded that though, there have been a number of institutional framework that have been put in place by past and present government in Nigeria, but the problem of political instability, lack of continuity in government policies and programmes, non-implementation of programmes, improper planning, selfishness, corruption, non adherence to corporate governance, lack of transparency have been the bane of agricultural development in Nigeria. The study therefore recommends that, unless there is an attitudinal change among our political leaders who champion the political affairs and governance of this country and the sub-Saharan Africa, the expected growth and development envisaged in agricultural sector will be a mirage.

It also astonishing to note the endemic corruption plaguing the society and the country at large most especially when appointed into a position of leadership Most people see political appointment as an opportunity to garnered and harness wealth in preparation for the unknown life (i.e future). As a results, half of the budget presented to carry out projects are not executed on the project(s) and the remaining funds are diverted to building houses and buying of expensive cars. This study therefore recommend that the citizenry (the academia and the political leaders who champion the political affairs and governance of this country in the area of policy formulation) needs to have attitudinal and psychological change on the so called 'national cake syndrome' for our country to move forward to be able to achieve agricultural growth and development for us to be rated among the top twenty economies of the world by the year 2020. Thus, if urgent attention and priority is not given to this, our aspiration of achieving agricultural growth and development will be a mirage.

On the final note, in the area of capital budget implementation which adversely affect the fiscal policy

of the economy and sustainable development, the following measures are recommended:

- Entrench a more harmonious relationship between the Executive and the Legislature to facilitate the timely release of the budget.
- Appreciate the timely rendition of budget to the legislature (end-September);
- Budget funds should be tied to project requirement and funds should not be thinly spread over many project;
- The “Due process” mechanism should be redesigned in a manner that it does not cause obstruction to project implementation;
- Government should improve on fiscal transparency by providing regular and accurate information; and
- The Government should initiate proper monitoring and evaluating unit with a view to ensuring proper agricultural project implementation that will have direct effect on the welfare of the citizenry.

REFERENCES

1. Oxford Dictionary of Current English. 3rd Edition, 1993.
2. Anyanwu JC, Oyefusi A, Oaikhenan H, Dimowo FA; The Structure of the Nigerian Economy (1960-1997).Joanee Educational Publishers Ltd. 1997; 2-32.
3. Yakubu Sheu; The Impact of Governance on Macroeconomic Management. In. Governance and the Nigerian Economy, Proceedings of the One-day Seminar held on January 19, 1994. Organized by the Nigerian Economic Society. 1994; 10-12.
4. Nnaemeka II;. Forms of Government and Economic Policy in Nigeria. Department of Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsuka. in. Governance and the Nigerian Economy , Proceedings of the One-day Seminar held on January 19, 1994. organized by the Nigerian Economic Society. 1994; 7273.
5. Gulhati R; The Making of Economic Policy in Africa. Economic Development Institute of the World Bank. 1990.
6. Haggard S, Kaufman R; The Politics of Stabilization and Structural Adjustment. In: Developing Country Debt and Economic Performance, Sacks. J.D (ed.) Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1989
7. Brautigam D; Governance and Development: A Review of Working Paper. WPS815. 1991.
8. Boeninger E; Governance and Development: Issues and Constraints, Proceedings of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics. 1991; 267-287.
9. World Bank; World Development Report, New York, 1989; 162.
10. Mills LP, Serageldin I; Governance and External Factors, Proceedings of The World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economies, Washington DC: The World Bank. 1991.
11. Joan M. Nelson; Comments on ‘Governance and Development ‘. In Proceedings of World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economics, P.292. World Bank, Washington DC, 1991.
12. Olayide OS, Ogunfowora O, Essang S, Idachaba SF; Elements of Rural Economics. Ibadan University Press, Publishing House, 1975; 299-313.
13. Central Bank of Nigeria; Annual Reports and Statement of Accounts, 2007