

Understanding the Character of African Social Classes: Central Issues of Development, Underdevelopment and Policy

Christopher Ejembi Abah, PhD

Federal University of Health Sciences, Otukpo, Benue State, Nigeria

chrisabah2023@gmail.com

Ameh Moses Daniel, PhD

Department of Political Science, REV.FR. Moses Orshio Adasu University Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria

Danielamehh35@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper x-rays the nature and character of classes in Africa; and how class is central to understanding the challenges of development and underdevelopment of the African States. With dependency theory, the paper noted that the nature and character of the classes, which was bequeathed by the colonialists, with poor development of productive forces, labour power, objects of labour, and means of labour with corresponding poor social relations of production coupled with the negative role of Africans in both leadership and followership after independence is central to the understanding of the development and underdevelopment of states in Africa. The paper recommended, among other things, the development of states, the leadership role of states in establishing the framework of economic strategy, and collaboration between the states, state enterprises, and commercial companies as a road to development. Corruption and bad governance must be drastically reduced, if not completely eradicated, through the installation of visionary, honest, and democratic leadership. This kind of leadership is equally achievable through free, fair, and credible elections.

Keywords: *Class, Development, Underdevelopment, Dependency,*

Introduction

The world has paid a great deal of attention to the levels of development and underdevelopment in Africa. The paradoxical state of the continent's economy, given the enormous quantity of internal resources it may claim to have, both natural and human, is perplexing. The human race's enormous poverty and suffering especially in Africa are getting worse. A more contemporary and accurate description of Africa is "island of want" as opposed to the widely accepted, ideologically pervasive "dark continent" (Alex, 2002).

According to the dependency school, Africa's economic integration into the global capitalism system under which the developing capitalist nations have used specific tactics to exploit and control the region is what's behind the continent's mysterious underdevelopment. The liberal school, on the other hand, sees nothing wrong with the integration of the African economy into the global capitalism system and holds that if internal barriers are eliminated from the domestic scene in Africa, the potential for the continent's development is virtually limitless (Ogbu, 2004).

In this fictional world, it is acknowledged that post-colonial Africa is faced with a conundrum of absences: on the one hand, it is necessary to rebuild one's self-esteem after the colonizers

attempted to impose a different worldview and cultural mindset on Africans; on the other hand, Africans must grow and become an important part of the global processes and flows. The third crucial omission is the lack of a leadership tradition that can tackle the state's predicament and rescue Africa from its crippling status. The third absence, in particular, has resulted in daily attention from western broadcast media and the unavoidable conclusion that Africa is a distant location where decent people starve and bad people flee.

Nevertheless, these effects seem to give us enough justification for concluding that the fundamental problem of African states is that of leadership (Wanan 2013). We can of course mention the likes of Mobutu, Bokassa, Samuel Doe, Abacha, Mugabe, Gaddafi, Kibaki, Eyadema, Omar Bongo and so on. This conclusion is interesting to the extent that a leader has significant influence on how any state or society effectively answers the question of development and underdevelopment at any point in time.

This paper therefore investigates and answers the long and protracted question of how the composition of the nature of social classes in Africa central to understanding the challenges of development and underdevelopment.

Clarification of key Concepts

The basic requirement for debating anything according to Chafa (1994) is to first and foremost understand the actual thing being talked about. Hence, they need to define the concepts of class, development and underdevelopment.

Conceptualization of Class

Class is a group of people who live under the same economic condition. Class from a Marxist viewpoint; is a social group whose members share the same relationship to the means of production. In Marx opinion, modern society is split into two camps facing each other, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (Callinicos, 2010). It is a social division based on the living conditions - objective economic conditions of individuals in society. Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labour and consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people, one of which can appropriate the labour of another, owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy (Lenin, 1977).

Classes are products of history and have to do with the development of human society- in terms of the materialist forces at work and what brings about social change, not by chance but by clearly defined dialectical laws and the patterns of historical development. Classes are the dynamic of history across time and space (Hook, 1994). For example, in a feudal epoch, there are two main classes distinguished by their relationship to land (the crucial part of the means of production in an agricultural society). They are the feudal nobility who own the land, and the landless serfs who work the land. Similarly, in a capitalist era, there are two main classes: the bourgeoisie or capitalist class, which owns the means of production, and the proletariat or working class, whose members

own only their labour which they hire to the bourgeoisie in return for wages. For Marx and Engels, the capitalist mode of production has out-lived its usefulness (Engels, 1986).

The bourgeoisie class must be overthrown by the proletariat. Furthermore, a class is a group of people in a rank order of social stratification. This is to say this group occupies a position relative to other groups similarly horizontally distributed in the society. It shares significant social attributes such as education, occupation, income, status, influence and especially a consciousness of its unique standing in society. Classes, unlike castes, permit of movement up and down the social ladder by their members. Classes do not discriminate endogenously. It is what stands classes out from other groups in social stratification (Mayer 1955). From these elements, one can define a social class as a category of persons in a group where members share major attributes of social-life and who stand apart relative to other groups and who recognize themselves as they are recognized by other groups. What is attempted here agrees with Lipsets view that "Theories of social class refer to the conditions affecting the existence of strata that have developed or should develop some "consciousness of a kind", that is, some sense of existence as a group attribute of society, (1968, p.198). Other notions of class are defective in some ways, but especially that they tend to emphasis the economic properties more than anything else. For that, Barber sees Marxian theory of social stratification as too limited (1968, p.289). In similar economist fashion, Mayer (1955, p.8) would define social class as "a social hierarchy. . . based primarily upon differences in monetary wealth and income".

The point being made here is that, for any social group to be qualified as a class, its social properties must be carefully identified along those lines suggested. Lipset has reported an interesting study earned out by Bukharin, which compares the peasants, the proletariat and the lumpen-proletariat. While the peasants tested positive on all the economic variables considered, they did not on condition of union in production, and common labour. The lumpen-proletariat failed the test on economic exploitation, freedom from private property, and common labour. Only the proletariat tested positive on all variables of economic exploitation, political oppression, poverty, productivity, freedom from private property, condition of union in production, and common labour (Lipset, 1968, p.299). Of the three social categories therefore, only the proletariat passes for a class. While this analytical scheme may not satisfy every scholar, it represents a clearer explanation or a better example of how the class concept should be elucidated.

Development

The main barrier to an accepted definition of development has been the ideological bias of most scholars, who view development from a preferred position of particular ideological underpinnings. Akin, (2012) conceived development as a socio-economic transformation, which has three important implications. First, it emphasizes that development is essentially a human issue, a concern with the capacity of individuals realizes their inherent potential and effectively to cope with the changing circumstances of their lives. Rodney (1972) also posits that development in human society is a many-sided process, At the level of the individual, it implies increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material wellbeing" Development is encompassed within the idea of the ability of a society to be able to tap its natural resources in order to cater for the material and social lives of the generality of the people. This is simply a reference to the manner of production of goods and services in a society.

A scientific definition of development starts from the mode of production which tantamount the existing economic system in a society. The mode of production comprises of two components, productive forces and social relation of production. The component of productive forces focuses on the forces that propel production to higher levels like manpower or labour science and technology and industrialization or means of labour. The level of development of these three forces of production is central to the determination of the level of development in any society. For bourgeois scholars, industrialization equals development.

The second component of production in the scientific analysis of development has to do with the social relations of production. According to Vander (2003), this connotes the kind of relations people get into with each other in the course of production. In other words, the social relations of production are synonymous with the class structure of a society that usually depicts two dominant classes in the presence of many classes. This pair of classes often consists of an ownership and non-controlling class (the bourgeoisie) and a non-ownership and non-controlling class (the proletariat), with the latter group bearing the brunt of the injustices committed by the former. Due to their respective quests to preserve the status quo and implement change, these two classes are rife with animosities and strife. This aspect of development therefore entails gradual adjustments that involve the sharing of economic outputs that contribute to the improvement of the majority of people's access to fundamental requirements. This paper therefore conceives of development as the adequate utilization of resources for the advancement of the generality of mankind in society.

Underdevelopment

Many factors have been offered to explain the apparent underdevelopment in Africa, the colonial legacy, social pluralism and its centrifugal tendencies, the corruption of leaders, poor labour discipline, and the lack of entrepreneurial skills. Poor planning, incompetent management, inappropriate policies, the stifling of market mechanisms, low levels of technical assistance, the limited inflow of foreign capital, the deterioration of commodity prices and unfavourable terms of trade, and a low level of saving and investment. These factors are not irrelevant to the problem. Alone or in combination, they could be serious impediments to development (Ake, 1999). Akin (2012) observed that the concept of underdevelopment is relative, or, more accurately, relational. It is a state of societal wellbeing that, in relation to conditions elsewhere, is far from satisfactory. The state reflects certain absolute and concrete conditions, notable among which are the loss of self-reliance and the inability to be the master of one's own fortunes. This loss of self-reliance, especially in countries described as underdeveloped, can be shown to be an inevitable concomitant of the undermining of their traditional socio-economic formation by the international capitalist system.

Rodney (1972) also opined that "it makes it easier to comprehend the concept of underdevelopment." Obviously, underdevelopment is not an absence of development because everyone has developed in one way or another and to a greater or lesser extent. Underdevelopment makes sense only as a means of comparing levels of development. It is very much tied to the fact that human social development has been uneven, and from a strictly economic point of view, some human groups have advanced further by producing more and becoming wealthier.

State: The state, according to Western liberal (bourgeois) scholars, is not a tool in the hands of the

ruling class but rather an organized group of people in a defined territory who are in charge of promoting secular common welfare, upholding law and order, and creating the conditions that could foster societal development (Maclver 1966; Laski 1967; Jackson and Roseberg, 1985; Cassese, 1986). According to Maclver, the term "state" refers to the entity whose administrative branch is the government. Association acting through laws promulgated by a government, endowed to this end with coercive power, maintains within a community territorially delineated, the universal external conditions of social order. A state has a constitution, a code of laws, a way of setting up its government, and a body of citizens.

The state was described by Laski (1967) as "a territorial society divided into government and subjects claiming within its allotted physical area a supremacy over all other institutions" in a manner similar to this. According to Jackson and Roseberg (1985), a state is a political constitution with enough organized authority and ability to rule over a certain geographic area and its inhabitants while maintaining its independence from neighboring states. Unlike Cassese (1986), who saw the state as a separate legal entity from society.

A synopsis of the western liberal scholars' arguments and submissions about the definition of the state emphasizes the concept of population government, territoriality, benevolence and impartial arbiter, coerciveness for maintenance of law and order, provision of secular common welfare and above all, the description of the state as a legal personality and its separation from society.

Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, leaders of the Marxist school of thought, claimed that "the executive of the modern state is not but a committee for managing the affairs of the entire bourgeoisie." To put it another way, a state is fundamentally a system of classes; it is not merely an arrangement where one class rules over the others, but also a tool employed by capitalists to maintain the subjection of the working class and the poor (Miliband 1969; Ake, 1985; Anifowose and Enemu, 1999). Thus, Miliband (1969, p.7) argued that: The state is not a thing..... it does not as such exist. What the state stands for is a member of particular institutions which together constitute its reality which interacts as part of what may be called the state system.

To Ake (1985), the state represents a specific modality of class domination, one in which class domination is mediated by mechanism is differentiated and dislocated from the ruling class and even the society and appears as an objective force standing alongside society. From the Marxist's analysis or perspective, it therefore means that under capitalism, the state represents the interests of the dominant capital. Miliband (1969) observed that there as on why the capitalist state represents the interest of the bourgeoisie or the dominant class is because in capitalist society, the well-being of private corporations and financial institutions are and indeed, must be perceived as the equivalent of the national interests.

After carefully examining both the bourgeois and Marxist conceptualizations of the state, one is persuaded that, while both perspectives may have flaws, the latter better captured reality. It is beyond dispute that the capitalist class, which owns and controls the means of production, distribution, and trade, uses its economic power to rule the state. The argument of the bourgeoisie scholars that the state is neutral and objective is not water-tight because a study of all the modes of productions have always shown that the dominant class in every mode is usually the dominant political class. For instance, in the slave mode, the slave masters were in charge, while in the feudal mode, the lords were always in power. This also applies to the capitalist mode of production. This

explains the rationale behind the iron law of oligarchy which emphasizes minority rule in human organizations.

Dependency Theory

According to Dos Santos, (1979) Dependency relates to a situation which the economy of certain countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of the other to which the former is subjected. The relation of inter dependence between two or more economies, and between these and the world trade, assumes the form of dependence when some countries the dominant ones which are the capitalist nations like America can expand and can be self-sustaining while other countries the dependent ones like Nigeria can do this only as a reflection of expansion which can have either a negative or positive effect on their immediate development. The basic assumption is that there is a dialectical relationship between development and underdevelopment, in other words according to Andre Frank (1975) "Development and under development are two different sides of a universal historical process." To him what causes underdevelopment in third world is as a result of what brought about development in Europe and America.

This dependency concerns the centre, which refers to the technological advanced countries of the world and the periphery refers to the third world countries, also, when looking at this theoretical framework we talk about the centre of the centre which refers to the urban areas of the world. Centre's of the periphery refers to the urban centre of the developing countries like Nigeria; periphery of the centre refers to the rural areas of the industrialized countries while the periphery of the periphery refers to the rural areas of the developing country.

This is a relationship where the centre of the developed countries dictates the terms of their co-existence economically, socially and politically. There is an exploitative and vertical relationship between the centre of the centre and the centre of the periphery in this setup. Looking at this case the periphery is subordinate to the centre. In this, the centre is assigned the role of manufacturing industrial products while the periphery produces primary goods a material and needed resources, the periphery now depends on the centre for her economic survival and consumption of the already made products.

An Assessment of the Nature and Character of Classes in Africa: Interrogating the issues at stake

Ekekwe (2009, p.75) noted that "class boundaries are not always as clear as one would like but then reality does not always come in neat packages". He identified the sub-sets of the petty bourgeoisie, which is made up of bureaucrats and other white-collar workers, workers in service industries, teachers and other salaried workers who built and rent one or two houses. Ekekwe (2009) described this sub-set of the bourgeoisie class as "the very epitome of vacillation, disappointment, unreliability and contradictory political alliances". Fanon (1967: 152) classified the national bourgeoisie as the dominant class, i.e. the ruling class which consists of a group of people who because of the fact that they are the owners of the means of production and distribution in society also dictates the terms under which the country is governed. This dominant class, the national bourgeoisie is called the ruling class. Fanon maintained that the national bourgeoisie in Africa lacks something that is essential to bourgeoisie – capital (money). African bourgeoisie are incapable of generating bourgeois society because they are incapable of promoting productivity.

Hence, the major strength for the African bourgeoisie remains state power which guarantees their economic activity. The other constituent of the dominant class in Africa, and indeed, Nigeria, is the comprador bourgeoisie (capitalists). As Jary and Jary (2000, p.76) observed, the comprador bourgeoisies are entrepreneurs in colonial or Third World countries who accumulate capital through acting as intermediary between indigenous producers and foreign/merchants: “comprador” is a Spanish word, meaning “buyer”. Frank (1969) is reputed to have raised the concept of the “comprador bourgeoisie” in his analysis of Third World underdevelopment crisis. Frank (1969) categorized the comprador bourgeoisie as a class that promote Third World dependency, since their economic interests were in the very economic transactions which he saw as existing at the heart of the dependency relationship.

The most powerful class in the world capitalist political economy is the bourgeoisie or the capitalist class in terms of its composition. The middle and big bourgeoisie are distinguished by the size of their capital, while the big bourgeoisie consists of the non-monopoly and monopoly bourgeoisie, it is the monopoly bourgeoisie that holds the principal levers of political power (Zotov, 1983). The capitalist class is a class of persons possessed of wealth in money form and owning means of production which are set to work by hiring wage workers. There can therefore, be no capitalist production unless in addition to the capitalist class there is also a class of wage-workers (Oriakhi, 2014).

It should be noted that capitalist class in the global political economy has metamorphosed over the centuries since its earliest appearance as merchant capitalists, to monopoly capitalists arriving at a defining moment in the transformation of capital. This moment which Lenin (1970, p.48) described as “imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism” witnessed the merging of bank capital with industrial capital – which is the eventual creation of “finance capital” also witnessed the export of capital abroad as distinguished from the export of commodities. Capitalists, otherwise, known as international bourgeoisie are the authentic bourgeoisie, who the national bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie in Africa and Nigeria to be specific, are in conspiratorial relationship with since the colonial experience to perpetuate the exploitation of the surpluses of the people (Oriakhi, 2014, p.57&58).

Today, the class of bourgeoisie has continued to exploit the surpluses of the African People through the global financial architecture and socio-economic arrangements and institutions like the multinational companies (MNCs), Foreign Aid, Foreign Direct Investments, Debt Financing, etc. with the very conscious, active collaboration of the national bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie in Africa. The other subset of bourgeoisie in Africa is the bureaucratic bourgeoisie which is the bureaucratic elite. This bourgeoisie along with nationalist and comprador bourgeoisie collaborate with imperialism.

The Role of Classes in Understanding the Challenges of Development and Underdevelopment of Africa: The Nigerian Case

Alavi (1979) argues that the peripheral state such as the ones in Africa are the product of “the historical specificity which arises from structural changes brought about by the colonial experience and alignments of classes and by the super structures and alignments of classes and the super structures of political and administrative institutions which were established in that context and secondly from radical realignments of class forces which have been brought about in the post-

colonial situation.” Thus, the peripheral state possesses an outstanding feature i.e. of being characterized by relatively and highly over developed state apparatus/institution. And this is because the origin of the state is rooted in the metropolitan countries, which, having dominated the classes in the colonies became overdeveloped and autonomous with a strong bureaucratic military oligarchy. In other words, the apparatus of state was transplanted from the metropolitan state. Again, the super structure in the colony is therefore “overdeveloped” in relation to the structure in the colony, for its basis lies in the metropolitan structure itself, from which it is later separated at the time of independence (Alavi, 1975)

From Alavis’ (1975) analysis of the peripheral/post-colonial state in Africa, the following pertinent observations can be made. First, the classes that were formed in African societies were without a dominant and ruling class but a complex and multi-class relationship, thereby giving the military bureaucratic oligarchy a special role of mediating the competing interests of the social classes. Second, the strong influence of the metropolitan bourgeoisie still continues even after independence and as a result the subordination of local bourgeoisie automatically turns them weak. Third because the local bourgeoisie are weak, they become unable to subordinate the relatively highly/developed colonial state apparatus and again because the metropolitan power still exercises dominion over it. Fourth, the state is therefore no longer an instrument of a particular class and it becomes relatively autonomous.

Ake (1996) argues that the emergence of class division in Africa, but particularly in Nigeria was occasioned by European colonial interests which gave birth to Nigeria and by so doing established a structure of class characterization of the citizens that facilitates wealth expropriation for British vested interests. It is this structure that was inherited by the post- colonial Nigerian state and imbued with its exploitative European masters’ characteristics, this state has pursued and caused the furtherance of class division among Nigerians, in the interest of both indigenous and the western exploiter class. Ake (1996) furthers that while no one denies the existence of localized traditional classes of citizens in pre-colonial Nigerian communities, the dimension of the alliance between any of such classes with the traditional state institutions was nothing compared the contemporary order of a confederation of profligacy between the state and the dominant class which facilitates the satisfaction of the vested interest of the later.

The British institutionalized colonial rule in order to protect her capital and to use the colonial state as the servant of imperialism. It was also to protect all those metropolitan interests which owed their existence to the continuance of imperialism (Ekundare, 1973; Toyo, 2002). The colonial state was therefore, not a product of antagonistic interests among social classes, i.e., the colonial state did not emerge because of lack of unity of interests among social classes in the society nor because the society was torn apart by irreconcilable contradictions. Indeed, the colonial state was not an instrument of any indigenous social class that developed to mediate between social classes whose interests were irreconcilable. The colonial state was basically an agent of imperialism, an instrument of economic exploitation. The colonial state in Africa was used by the metropolitan bourgeoisie to restructure the pre-capitalist economy. Like the way the liberals will define the role of the state, the colonial state maintains law and order, provided defense against attack and preserved the way of life of the colonial society, of course in a manner that made it conducive to capitalist expansion. In short, the colonial state represented the capitalist class in metropolitan Europe, with a vested interest and in maintaining their dominance inside colonial society (Brett, 1982; Schraeder, 2004).

To Ake (1975) the development of the state in Africa remains at a low level of the primitive accumulation with massive intervention of force in the labour process. Consequently, because of the low level of the development of the state, it is unable to mediate the struggle between classes and the struggle within the dominant class. Thus, the struggle to control, and the use of state power, becomes warfare. Consequently, power in Nigeria is over-valued and security lies only on getting more and more power. As a result, there is hardly any restraint on the means of acquiring power, on holding it and on using it. Hence, there is political instability because political competition becomes norm less and is carried to the extreme thereby turning political competition into warfare and the political class thus operates in a state of siege (Ihonvbere, 1989; Schraeder, 2004).

Ake (1996, p.15) submitted that in Nigeria, the dominant class-are all those who are in the power position to take what they can from the nations accumulated wealth either directly or through a form of patronage and are also in the position of decide what other will get. In Nigeria, this class includes a range of individuals who operate as cabals independently in a way it collectively engaged in covert manipulations that sustain their vested interests. Through a complex web these individuals associate to establish long term and general pathways for their families, associated and cronies for in the scheme of things in society. Using their regular connections in the corridors of state power, they create a fraternity with former and serving heads of states and government, political office holders, bureaucrats, technocrats and other with high connections to policy processes of the state. Access to the status of a dominant class is synonymous with being in control of the state apparatus that creates access to unequal distribution of public resource in this class interest. Other associated prerequisites include access to exclusive benefits of immunity against aspect of public law, prestige, unfettered contract awards, and other opportunities that guarantee wealth for members' future generations (Onimede 1988). This is therefore an existing and ever-increasing complex order of profligacy between the operators of the state apparatus and the dominant exploiter class in Nigeria which has in recent times attracted concerns among state observers in our society.

The post-colonial state of Africa is characterized by a political class that sees politics with a do or die mentality. This is because of the high premium placed on politics in Africa and the tendency to use power for accumulation. This situation generates an atmosphere of political crisis and instability which is not favorable to development. This explains why Ake (1996, p.16) opined that in postcolonial Africa, the premium on power is exceptionally high, and the institutional mechanisms for moderating political competition are lacking. As a result, political competition tends to assume the character of warfare. So absorbing is the struggle for power that everything else, including the quest for development, is marginalized”.

Igwe (2005) argues here that divisions in society along class differentials are not new in society because since antiquity various attempts have been made either to explain, rationalize or justify these divisions. These attempts have divisions have been on the basis of access of each of the groups in this division to economically determinable factors. It is therefore evident that as these divisions deepen in response to prevalent modes of socio-economic production, there have always emerged efforts by men to either reconcile the coherent differences or to deepen these differences for vested interests. As much as overtures at causing co-existence between these groups (classes) have been made by men, its sustenance had in the same vein been compromised by breaches occasioned by the in ordinate ambition for self-same by members of the dominant class.

Saul (1974) points out here that in some parts of Africa (including Nigeria) the crystallization of a fully formed (crude capitalist) class around the state apparatus constitutes a problem of development. This class have an interest that is quite distinct from and being antagonistic to the interest of the masses and indeed their societies development lacks in all spheres the distinctive “humane” characteristics of the metropolitan bourgeoisie. This is so because while the metropolitan dominant class engages itself with their states, they operate fundamentally for the multiplication of economic interest of their society and by so doing cause capital to recycle. As much as they may be maximizing their interests, their capital is kept within the borders of their nations to either attract external profits through multinational corporate business or cause domestic capital increase which creates jobs, social services etc. Whereas this is an order propelled by the alliance between the state and the capitalist (dominant class) in Europe and the Americas, the opposite pervades in Nigeria and other parts of Africa.

Conclusion

In conclusion, to fully understand the nature and character of classes in understanding the challenges of development and underdevelopment in Africa generally, and particularly in Nigeria, requires a thorough understanding of history, particularly the history of the development of global capitalism and one of its many diverse phases, colonialism. With the goal of advancing the interests of the colonial power at the expense of the vulnerable and helpless African poor, a colonial state was founded with their class composition as well.

African bourgeoisie don’t have or own the means of production like their counterparts in the developed western capitalist societies so their only means or source remains the state power which guarantee them access to wealth at the detriment of the petty- bourgeoisie. The mode of production of the colonized states was not able to ensure cohesiveness and complementarities in the colonial economy which has a spillover effect on the post-colonial state and the type of classes that emerged that was not in charged. While the state in developed countries is strong because of the high level of development of classes and the social relations of production and the productive forces, the post-colonial states in the Third World experienced low levels of development of the productive forces and are therefore unable to meet the needs of the population.

Recommendations

- i.** The development of the state should be given priority, and the government should take the lead in building the framework for economic policy. This has to do with how industrialization and its protectionism-based paradigm have improved the social relations of production as well as the productive forces.
- ii.** The aforementioned goals can be reached through working together between the government, state-owned enterprises, and private businesses. After all, Asian nations like China, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, and Japan were the first to popularize this form of public-private sector cooperation.
- iii.** It is imperative to eliminate bad governance and corruption by putting in place a visionary, trustworthy, and democratic leadership. By holding open, transparent, and reliable elections, this form of leadership can be achieved.
- iv.** The state and its leadership should establish the conditions for the employment of public

and private officials that would foster and promote ethics and accountability in governance. This can be accomplished by downplaying the standards and ideals that promote inactivity, such as laziness, money politics, thuggery, systematic begging (the God increases your syndrome), and gossip.

- v. Corruption and bad governance must be drastically reduced if not completely eradicated through the installation of a visionary, honest and democratic leadership. This kind of leadership is achievable through free, fair and credible elections.

REFERENCES

- Abimbola, J.O. and Adesote, S.A. (2011). Corruption and infrastructure development in Nigeria: The way forward mechanisms "in proceedings of the 56 Annual Congress of the Historical Society of Nigeria, October 31-November 2nd.
- Adeshina, A. (2009). Poverty as state craft: Preliminary reflections on African leadership. Holy Name University Press.
- Ake, C. (1985). "The future of state in Africa", *International Political Science Review* (6) 1: <http://www.jstor.org> 2007.
- Ake, C. (1978). *Revolutionary press in Africa*. Zed Press.
- Ake, C. (1981). *A political economy of Africa*. Longman
- Ake, C. (1996). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Spectrum Books. Ltd
- Ake, C. (1996). *Political economy of Africa*. Longman
- Akin, L. M. (2012). *The development process: A Spatial Perspective*. Hutchinson Group NZ Ltd.
- Alavi, H. and Shamin, T. (eds), (1982). *Introduction to the sociology of developing Societies*. Macmillan Press.
- Alex, T. (2002). *An introduction to African politics* (2ed). Routledge
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal development: An essay on the social formation of peripheral capitalism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Anyanwu, J.C. (1997). *The structure of Nigerian economy (1966-1997)*. Joane Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Balassa, B. (1971). *Trade policies in developing countries*. *American Economic Review* 61
- Callinicos, A. (2010). *The revolutionary ideas of Karl Marx*. Book Marks.
- Chafa K. (1994). *The Problematic of African democracy: Experiences from the political transition in Nigeria*, *African Zamani* No. 2.
- Ekekwe, E. (1986). *Class and state in Nigeria*. Longman
- Engels, J. (1986). *An introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge, England.
- Fanon, F. (1966). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Towards the African revolution*. Grove Press.
- Frank, A. G. (1978). *Dependent accumulation and underdevelopment*. Macmillan.
- Frank, A.G. (1975). *The development of underdevelopment*. Monthly Review.
- Gendzier, L. (1985). *Managing political change: social scientists and the third world* Boulder. Westview Press.
- George-Genyi, M. E. (2013). *An assessment of New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and Africa's quest for development in the 21st Century*. In the *Nigerian Journal of Political and Administrative Studies*, 1(1), 82.
- Hook, S. (1994). *From Hegel to Marx: Studies in the intellectual development of Karl Marx*. Columbia University Press.

- Igwe, O. (2005). *Politics and globe dictionary*. Eagles Publication.
- Ihonvbere, J. (ed), (1989). *The political economy of crisis and underdevelopment in Africa*. Selected Works of Claude Ake. Joad Publishers.
- Krugman, P. (1992). *Toward a counter revolution in development theory*. World Bank Economic Review Supplements. Proceedings of the Annual Bank Conference on Development Economics, 15-39.
- Lenin, V.I. (1977). "Imperialism the highest stage of capitalism, Collected Works (22). Progress Publishers.
- Lewis, P. (1996). *Economic reform and political transition in Africa: The quest for a politics of development*, World Politics, 49, 92-129.
- Lipset, S.M. (1968). "Social stratification: Social class", *International encyclopedia of social sciences*, vol.15 pp.296-316.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1974). *Manifesto of the communist party Moscow*. Progress Publishers.
- Mayer, K.B (1955). *Class and society*. Random House.
- McLellan, D. (1973). *Karl Marx: His life and thought*. Harper and Row
- Mkandawire, T. (1997). *Shifting commitments and national cohesion in African countries*. (Uppsala).
- Nwanolue, B. (2005). "The prospect of NEPAD as a development strategy for Africa" In: Obi, E. et al (2005). *State and economy*. Book Point Ltd.
- Ogbu, S. (2004). *The underdevelopment of Africa: problems and prospects for development*. In the Nigeria. *journal of political and administrative studies*, 2(1).
- Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-Louverture Publications.
- Rowstow, W. W. (1960). *The states of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Sandbrook, R. (1986). *The state and economic stagnation in tropical Africa*, World Development, 14
- Saul, J. (1974). "The state of post-colonial societies" *The Socialist register*, Merlin Press.
- Soludo, C. (2006), *Can Nigeria be the China of Africa?* Published Lecture Delivered at Founders day of the University of Benin, Benin City Nigeria. Adgozo Ltd Press Division
- Sorkaa, P. (2003). *Development as ethics and accountability in governance: The way forward for Nigeria*. BSU inaugural Lecture Series No. 1. The BSU Press.
- Toyo, E. (2002). *Economics of structural adjustment: A study of the prelude to globalization*. First Academic Publishers.
- Ujo, A.A. (1999). *Understanding development administration in Nigeria*, Abuja.
- Wanan, C.T. (2013). *State craft and the challenge of development in contemporary Africa*. In the Nigerian Journal of Political and Administrative Studies. Department of Political Science, Benue State University, Makurdi, 1(1), 49.
- World Bank, (1981). *Accelerated development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Agenda for Action*. Washington, D.C: World Bank.
- World Bank, (1989). *Sub-Saharan Africa: from crisis to sustainable growth*. World Bank.
- World Bank, (1994). *Adjustment in Africa: Reforms, results and the road ahead*. World Bank.
- World Bank, (1995). *Bureaucrats in business: The economics and politics of government ownership*. World Bank.