

The Strategic Features of Colonial Politico-Economic, Changes and Continuities: The Nigerian Experience.

SHAIBU, M. T

Political Science Department, Kogi State University, Anyigba, taimak2003@yahoo.com

A. O. OGOH

Political Science Department, Federal University, Dutsin-MA, Katsina State, Nigeria, aogoh@fudutsinma.edu.ng

Abstract

This paper appraised the strategic features of colonial politico-economy, bearing in mind the changes and continuities, particularly the Nigeria experience. This study derived its data from secondary sources and carried out content analysis. Marx theory was used as a framework of analysis. The study pointed out that the strategic features of the colonial politico-economy include: establishment of monetary system, transportation/communication networks infrastructures, tax system and import-export economy system. Comparatively, the study reveals major changes since Nigeria gained political independence in 1960 to include: Direct access to Nigeria economy has changed in concept from colonialism to neo-colonialism; During colonial economy, major earning comes from agriculture, but today it is from crude oil; The exploiters have changed from colonial masters to Nigerian elites; and The judiciary system has changed as we now have the supreme court as the highest court rather than privy council of the colonial era. However, the study argued that Nigeria present political economy and that of colonial era have some common features which among other are: Generosity in the remuneration of chiefs and traditional rulers for selfish gains; Exploitation of differences among ethnic groups to create division for personal interest; Disarticulation of the economy; The use of police and army to oppress oppositions; The import-export system. Therefore, the study recommended among others, that: rather than Nigeria elites/governments using traditional rulers to foster their political interest, local rulers should serve as agents of change by influencing government to develop the rural/local area so as the living standard of the rural poor can improve. That Nigeria elites/governments should come-up with strategic economy policies to ensue forward and backward linkages between raw materials produce and local industries; diversify the economy to create employment for the qualified jobless; the police and army should be allow to carry out their constitutional responsibilities rather than been use as a tool of oppression.

Keywords: Colonialism, Exploitation, Import-export, Nigeria, Political economy.

1. BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

All political phenomena appears to be the projections of underlying society's economic forces (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:225). The political structure is the superstructure to the economy structure and all the substructures of the society. This imply that the financial system, market system, raw materials, tax system and other economic components of the society are determined, controlled, explored and distributed through access to political authority. As Easton (1965) put it, politics is the "authoritative allocation of values for society". Values are desires or interests. It could be economic resources, as it were in the case of the colonialists. British colonialists obtained their control through the traditional political authority arrangements met in Nigeria. They saw the effectiveness of the traditional political structures as means to grasp the economy structure of Nigeria and smartly adopted a political system of indirect rule after the attempted direct rule system failed as a result of the stiff confrontation against the system. And more so, that they saw the indirect rule system less expensive to adopt. Adamolekun (2002:37) buttressed this succinctly thus:

"The traditional administrative system, which the British found in the emirates of Northern Nigeria was centered on a paramount rule called emir or chief. Impressed by the effectiveness of the system and its cost-saving value (in terms of money and men), the

British decided to maintain it, with the critical modification that the entire system should be subordinated to metropolitan officials. While the establishment of this indirect rule system went on smoothly in the emirate area of Northern Nigeria, it was simply imposed on the non-emirate areas. It was introduced into Western and Eastern Nigeria in 1916 and the late 1920s respectively. Although the indirect rule system significantly altered certain features of traditional governance in Yoruba land, it eventually became firmly established with limited resistance. This was due partly to the determination of the British Residents to maintain the system, and partly to the fact that some features of traditional governance in Yoruba land were similar to those of the Northern emirates. In contrast, serious difficulties were encountered in Eastern Nigeria where the traditional administrative arrangements were radically different from those of the emirates. The colonial authorities had to create chiefs who were called 'warrant chiefs'.

The "Indirect rule" is the system of the British administration in its colonies, which permitted the traditional paramount chiefs to administer the affairs of their respective domains, subject only to the guidance of the Resident as a watchful adviser not as interfering ruler (Sani, 1992:15). In this paper, however, we shall be appraising the strategic features of the colonial politico-economy, bearing in mind the changes and continuities, particularly the Nigeria experience during colonialism and post-colonialism.

2. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The manner in which the Nigeria elites/governments are operating or controlling the economy after gaining political independence from the colonial masters since 1960, appears to still reflect the same pattern of the colonial politico-economy. Many would have thought that one of the gains of independence, is freedom from the control of the colonial exploitation or internal and external colonialists. One will expect that Nigeria elites and/or leaders should have formulated policies that would have diversified the economy to boost the country's earnings and create employment opportunities for the qualified jobless as well as improve the living standard of the locals or the rural poor, but it appears that there are just few changes from what the economy was during colonial era and that of the present (prototype of the colonial politico-economy characterized by exploitative tendencies). However, to clear these doubt, this study set to examine not only the strategic features of the colonial politico-economy, what has changed in the Nigeria context having gained independence as well as dig out the features that have continue replicating in the contemporary Nigeria political economy system.

3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study is to appraised the strategic features of the colonial politico-economy, bearing in mind the changes and continuities, particularly the Nigeria experience during colonial and post-colonial era. Nevertheless, this study has four specific objectives. These include to:

- i. examine the basic strategic features of the colonial politico-economy.
- ii. find out what has changed in the Nigeria economy in comparison with colonial economy having gained political independence since 1960.
- iii. discuss the features that have continue to replicate in the contemporary Nigeria economy despite political independence.
- iv. make useful recommendations that could improve Nigeria economy.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to achieve the above purpose, the study provide answer to the following questions:

- i. What are the basic strategic features of the colonial politico-economy?
- ii. What has changed in the Nigeria economy, in comparison with colonial economy having gained political independence since 1960?

- iii. What are those features that have continue to replicate in the contemporary Nigeria economy despite political independence?

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There are two major methods of data collection sources: primary and secondary methods. However, this study used only secondary method of that collection, by extracting relevant contents from available publications. The secondary data used for discussion in this study, were majorly derived from library and internet, especially materials on politics, administration, local governance, political economy, local and urban administration in Nigeria, framework for political analysis in Africa as well as international relations, which are majorly textbook by various authors. While, some are derivative of the internet search engines - www.ask.com and www.google.com. The study adopted secondary methods due to the nature of the research questions.

6. CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

Colonialism is the policy and practice of a strong power extending its control territorially over a weaker nation or people. In this respect, colonialism is as old as society. The term took on a more specific meaning in the late nineteenth century when colonists saw it as the extension of 'civilization' from Europe to the 'inferior' peoples of 'backward' societies. It can be seen as a search for raw materials, new markets, and new fields of investment...The typical aspects of colonialism include: racial and cultural inequality between ruling and subject people, political and legal domination by the imperial power, and exploitation of the subject people. Many commentators see colonialism as a key cause of uneven development. Although, independence from former colonization has been achieved almost everywhere including Nigeria, most accept that it has been replaced by neo-colonialism...The purposes of colonialism include economic exploitation of the colony's natural resources, creation of new markets for the colonizer, and extension of the colonizer's way of life beyond its national borders (<http://www.answers.com/topic/colonialism>. 17 Apr 2009). J. A. Hobson's in his book 'Imperialism: A Study', 1902 cited by Palmer and Perkins (2007:160) described colonialism as " a natural overflow of nationality; its power of colonists to transplant the civilization they represent to the new natural and social environment in which they find themselves."

Economy is the management of domestic affairs; the regulation and government of household matters; especially as they concern expense or disbursement; orderly arrangement and management of the internal affairs of a state or of any establishment kept up by production and consumption; especially, such management as directly concerns wealth; as, political economy (<http://www.drwords.com/define/Economy>. 21 Apr 2009).

On the other hand, Colonial economy gained its root through the indirect rule system. Colonial economy hold in itself certain features or structures put in place by the British colonialists in the bid to satisfied the parochial economic interests or desires-the search for raw-materials and market for the survival of their industries abroad. Even if it was to transplant civilization as Hobson claims, the central aim of colonialists for taken over the Nigeria economy is totally to grip and take over the control of the economy for the sustainability of their own industries. This reflects in their parochial, subjection and oppression of the native people to get satisfied with their economic interests. By colonial economy we mean the colonialist activities that had shaped the economic structure of the Nigerian states during the period of colonial administration, which was not just to extend to Nigeria a mere civilization, but to create certain economic structures or system that facilitates their economic interest abroad (ibid., 2009). Thus, Colonialism holds in itself the evils that have plagued and still afflicting the Nigerian economy today. It is yet manifesting in its new form, not only in the political, social, cultural, religion configurations, but also in the economic activities of Nigeria.

7. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Karl Marxist theoretical perspective is relevant to this study. Marx said; the system of economic production determines the institutional and ideological structure of the society and whoever controls the economic system also control the political system (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:224). In Nigeria economy is at the mercy of the former colonial masters as they have always take advantage of their economic and technological strength to dictate the nature of economic institutions and political ideology that is suitable for their continually desire parochial economic interests.

Marx doctrine of surplus value also apply to Nigeria situation, Marx had said in this doctrine; that the socially useful labour that produces a commodity is considered to be the only measure of its worth. Capitalists or the elites themselves produce nothing. Instead, they live like parasites from the labour of producing class. The capitalist pays the laborer a subsistence wage and keeps the rest. According to Marx, the vast mass of the population is reduced to wage slavery in a capitalist or elitist society. The proletariat produces goods and services for which it receives little or no return. In a capitalist system, the bourgeoisies, which controls the means of production, exploits the worker and widens the gap, or surplus value, between the price paid workers for their labour and the price obtained by the bourgeoisie in the marketplace (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:224:225). This type of relationship does not only exist during the colonial economy, but it is also a practice in the contemporary Nigeria economic production relations where the labourers are under the dictations and control of the elites who owns the means of production. In other words, the labourers has no say, they compulsorily work or do what pleases and will bring surplus gain to their employers, because if they fail to agree with the employer of labours, it automatically means their family will surfer in hunger. No work, no pay to feed and survive. Thus, both colonial and post-colonial economic production relations system are largely a reflection of Marxist perspectives.

Further to the above, orthodox Marxists viewed all political phenomena...as projection of underlying economic forces. All forms of consciousness are subordinated to the economic. Religious, humanitarian, political, cultural and military-strategic motives for any kind of power relationship between a stronger group and a weaker group are explained by Marxist as rationalizations designed to designed the economic substructure (ibid, 1990: 225:226). This explains why the Nigeria elites are always struggling to gain political power using any available structure including religious, humanitarian, political, cultural or ethnicity, legal, police and military to achieve their control.

8. DISCUSSIONS

8.1 Strategic features of the colonial politico-economy.

Haven't mentioned above that the British colonialists reconfigured the Nigerian economy, we shall be unfolding some of its basic features in this part. First and foremost, colonialism was basically a system of exploitation: market, raw materials and lucrative markets overseas, British declared the Royal Niger area and gave the Royal Niger Company the Charter. The legitimate trade in commodities attracted a number of rough-hewn British merchants to the Niger River, as well as some men who had been formerly engaged in the slave trade, but who now changed their line of wares. The large companies that subsequently opened depots in the delta cities and in Lagos were as ruthlessly competitive as the delta towns themselves and frequently used force to compel potential suppliers to agree to contracts and to meet their demands. The most important of these trading companies, whose activities had far-reaching consequences for Nigeria, was the United Africa Company, founded by George Goldie in 1879. In 1886 Goldie's consortium was chartered by the British government as the Royal Niger Company and granted broad concessionary powers in "all the territory of the basin of the Niger." Needless to say, these concessions emanated from Britain, not from any authority in Nigeria (ibid., 2009).

The terms of the charter specified that trade should be free in the regional principle systematically violated as the company strengthened its monopoly to forestall French and German trade interests. The company also was supposed to respect local customs “except so far as may be necessary in the interests of humanity.” The qualifying clause was aimed at slavery and other activities categorized as “barbarous practices” by British authorities, and it foreshadowed the qualifications applied to non-interference as a guide to official policy when Britain assumed formal colonial responsibility in Nigeria (ibid., 2009).

Meanwhile, the Royal Niger Company established its headquarters far inland at Lokoja, from where it pretended to assume responsibility for the administration of areas along the Niger and Benue rivers where it maintained depots. The company interfered in the territory along the Niger and the Benue, sometimes becoming embroiled in serious conflicts when its British-led native constabulary intercepted slave raids or attempted to protect trade routes. The company negotiated treaties with Sokoto, Gwandu, and Nupe that were interpreted as guaranteeing exclusive access to trade in return for the payment of annual tribute. Officials of the Sokoto Caliphate considered these treaties quite differently; from their perspective, the British were granted only extraterritorial rights that did not prevent similar arrangements with the Germans and the French and certainly did not surrender sovereignty (ibid., 2009). Under Goldie’s direction, the Royal Niger Company was instrumental in depriving France and Germany of access to the region. Consequently, he may well deserve the epithet “father of Nigeria,” which imperialists accorded him. He definitely laid the basis for British claims (ibid., 2009).

Second, another feature of the colonial economy is that which transformed and reorganized the Nigerian economy and society is that of the introduction of monetary system, the use of British currency which replaced barter system. This means that if you don’t have the new currency you can buy anything. The introduction of tax system follow as well further help to force the native into labouring in the plantation and the production of cash crops in favour of the colonialist. For you to have money to pay for your tax is to agree to be subjected to hard labour. And even the money paid was not commensurate to the labour. In fact the colonialist determined what amount to pay. This change brought by the colonial economy is still existing in a new form today’s contemporary Nigeria economy especially the production relation between owner of the means of production and labour. The bargaining system exists in theory and not in practice because the owner of a factory or industry still determines what to give as salary or wage for labour (employee) at the end of the month. This the reason why Marx said in his doctrine of surplus value, that:

“...the socially useful labour that produces a commodity is considered to be the only measure of its worth. Capitalists or the elites themselves produce nothing. Instead, they live like parasites from the labour of producing class. The capitalist pays the laborer a subsistence wage and keeps the rest. The vast mass of the population is reduced to wage slavery in a capitalist or elitist society. The proletariat produces goods and services for which it receives little or no return. In a capitalist system, the bourgeoisies, which controls the means of production, exploits the worker and widens the gap, or surplus value, between the price paid workers for their labour and the price obtained by the bourgeoisie in the marketplace (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:224:225).

Third, the infrastructural transportation and communication network configurations put in place in the name of development were born out of the British colonists exploitative interest to siphoned the Nigeria agricultural produced or raw materials useful for there industries abroad. The construction of roads, railway lines and installation of communication facilities like telegraphs was for their own selfish interest. According to Ake (2002:43-44):

“In some cases the extraction of the colony’s resources entailed some investment in infrastructure development – road, water resources, railways, electrical power, and administrative structures. Following the capitalist rationality of minimum input for maximum output, they invested only in what they had to, and where they had to. Not surprisingly the places in which colonialism fostered some development were in places from convenient collecting centres for commodities, such as Kano; places from where the commodities could be shipped abroad, such as Lagos, places where the climate was to the taste of Europeans and which could be used as administrative headquarters, such as Nairobi. These centres gradually assumed a character quite different from that of the surrounding country. Some of them had factories for processing raw materials such as palm-kernels, amenities such as top-borne, electricity, railways stations, a scattering of buses, cinemas, hotels, tarred roads, and excellent recreational facilities in the European sections... the contrast between the amenities in these centres and lack of amenities in the villages, between the commodious living of the European districts and the intolerable wretchedness of the peasant’s lifestyle, brought the meaning of colonialism home. The Kanu-Apapa railway line was built to facilitate the collection of cotton, groundnuts and cocoa for export. And the Enugu-Port Harcourt line was built to serve the oil-palm trade.”

Fourth, the introduction of import/export economy system: Before the country was colonized by Britain, during the second half of the 19th century, the various nationality groups that currently make up Nigeria were largely an agricultural people. They were food self-sufficient and produced a variety of commodities that were exported overseas. British colonial administrators amalgamated the nationality groups in 1914 into a larger economy for exploitation for the benefit of British industrial classes. Under colonial rule, Nigeria remained an agricultural country, exporting raw materials to Britain and importing from it finished goods. This was what Ake (2002:45) referred to as disarticulation and development of export commodities. He uncovered that:

“colonial capitalism was naturally interested only in the most profitable primary commodities. To obtain an adequate supply of the preferred commodities it was sometimes necessary to discourage the production of some other commodities... more often than not colonial capitalism uses persuasion or force to compel a concentration of effort on the production of particular export crops.”

Therein lay the origins of the dependence of Nigerian economy on commodity markets of the industrialized Western world for its foreign exchange. While the industrialization of the country was discouraged, rudimentary foundations for a modern Nigerian economy, however, were laid. Colonial economic policies shaped future independent Nigeria’s economy, particularly in marketing, labor supply, and investment. The process of colonial rule and formal economic exploitation ended in 1960, but left Nigeria a relatively strong but undiversified economy. Thereafter, Nigerians were poised to remedy this defect and to build a self-sustaining Nigerian economy comprising agricultural, industrial, and service sectors (<http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/economies/Africa/Nigeria-overview-ofeconomy.html> 16th April, 2009).

The strategic features of the colonial politico-economy give credence to the orthodox Marxists propositions which says...all political phenomena...are projections of underlying economic forces. All forms of consciousness are subordinated to the economic. Religious, humanitarian, political, cultural and military-strategic motives for any kind of power relationship between a stronger and a weaker community are explained by Marxist as rationalizations designed to designed the economic substructure” (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff, 1990:225-226).

8.2. Are there changes since Nigeria gained political independence in 1960.

What has only changed is that the colonial direct access to the economy is now in a new form

referred to as neo-colonialism. The accessibility conception to the economy of Nigeria by the colonial masters has taken a new dimension, from colonialism to neo-colonialism. Though, we have had our political independence, since 1960, but our economy is still at the mercy of colonial masters or foreign countries. They have developed a new way of dictating and making our economic policy an imported type. A typical example of this connection is the Structural Adjustment programme of the Ibrahim Babangida Administration of 1986. What has only changes is the product upon which the major earning comes from. During colonial rule, Nigeria dwells on agriculture (cash crops). Today, the economy is solely based on crude oil, thereby leading to a “imported” culture. Ogunlade confirmed this where he said...the negative public attitude or prejudice for agriculture and the dignity of labour during the colonial past still persist. He said further that, even the colonial policy of education for agriculture and dignity of labour in Nigeria looked better on paper than in practice, promoting agriculture to feed the nation and make it the cornerstone of the economy in contemporary remains in the realm of the rhetoric” (Asaju, K. et al. 2014). Exploiters have changed. During the colonial era it was the colonial masters that governed, but now what we have is Nigerian elites governing, yet exploitation continues because they siphoned the public money into their abroad accounts and home accounts. The judiciary system has also witnessed a fundamental change. During colonial rule, appeals from the Nigerian courts were made to the judicial committee of the Privy Council in London. Now, all appeals end in the Supreme Court of Nigeria.

8.3 The continuities of the features of colonial politico-economy in contemporary Nigeria economy arrangement

Despite the above changes, there are still some basic and strategic features of the colonial era that are continually manifesting today in Nigeria economic system. First, during the colonial economy the chiefs were generously remunerated. Sani, (1992:15) support this in his text: “in appreciation of their middlemanship function and role, the chiefs were generously remunerated, judged by the general standard of living at the time for example, in 1900, the Sultan of Sokoto, the Shehu of Borno, and the Emir of Kano were each placed on a fixed salary of what is now N12,000 that is £6,000 (pounds) per annum then. In addition, they each received a yearly establishment allowance which for the Sultan was £3,000 pounds (N6,000) and £1,500 pounds (N3,000) for each of the other two. Contrast this salary structure with the fabulous rates paid to the grade chiefs in 1991 for example, in Kogi State of Nigeria, a first class chief was placed on N42,000 per annum with other generous allowances, while a third class clan chief is paid a basic salary of N20,000 per annum. Presently, the traditional rulers are still enjoying this gesture from the government. This was also further substantiated with the amount to be deducted from the monthly salary of the royal fathers in Imo State recently as Nkwopara (2014:1) reveals:

“royal fathers rejected the Toyota Sienna vehicles presented to them by the state government. That one of the aggrieved royal fathers, said: “It was a gratuitous insult for the administration to, on its own, buy and force us to use Sienna vehicles. “it is most uncharitable for the administration to announce to the world that the governor is distributing vehicles free of charge to Imo royal fathers, when in actual fact Okorochoa would be deducting N50,000 from our monthly stipends for the next three years.” While insisting that each traditional ruler was expected to cough out a total sum of N1.8 million at the end of the three-year deductions, the monarch also opined that “the entire arrangement was deceitful and most embarrassing”

The above backdrop showcases that the traditional rulers are fixed on monthly salary and they are well paid. And the reason for offering them the vehicle loan may not be far from the fact that election is at the corner, and the governor want to “wet the ground” for the support of the chiefs which automatically could mean the support of the local people. Imam (1996:146) added that “apart from being fixed on salary, they are enjoying

other fringe benefits—government bought them cars and furnished their houses.” It is also obvious today that they still assume their middlemanship as they are periodically use by the political actors or politicians to gain the support of the local people during elections. In fact, the traditional chiefs are given huge amount of money for this assignment. These are showcases that the traditional chiefs are still performing the middleman roles and they are being paid for it, although, the salary scale has increased now than during colonial era and most of the state governors now build special office for traditional rulers/chiefs in cities where they meet with them for political reasons. One example from personal observation is what is going on in Imo State.

During colonial rule, the colonial masters exploited the differences among their colonized territories by creating division between them. Through this practice, enmities were triggered among different ethnic groups. Today, the ruling elites still manipulate those differences, although the interests, goals and objectives (such as power, wealth and privileges, that the competing elites pursue tend to be mostly self-regarding, and in fact transcend those of their ethnic groups, they have no different reconciling these with the collective ones of their ethnic groups.

The disarticulation of the agricultural economy caused by colonial policy was compounded by some of the ‘natural tendencies of subsistence agriculture towards disarticulation.’ agricultural producers are producing mainly to feed themselves, that is producing use-values, as opposed to exchange-values; there is necessarily some degree of disarticulation. In that kind of situation the market mechanism is weak, because exchange is so limited. And it is the market mechanism, which acts as an integrative force, not only among small producers but also between small producers and the wider economy. Also subsistence agriculture implies that there is highly limited functional specialization, a critical factors producing the organic unity of economy (Ake, 2002:45). This form of disarticulation still continues today in the agricultural economic system of Nigeria. Nigeria is still battling to have an economy where there will be linkages between production of raw materials and industry, which can process same. The Nigerian economy has remained essentially mono-cultural or mono-product.

The Nigeria police and army were instruments of coercion used to suppress opposition to colonial rule. Following independence, the army and police became instruments in the hands of the Nigeria ruling elites. Fundamentally, the governments use them to crush resistance as have been seen in Odi crisis in Bayelsa, the Boko Haram crisis in the North Eastern states and the entire Niger-Delta problem.

Also during the colonial rule, it was the British colonialist who determines what wage to give to labour, this still continuing as a practice in the production relation Nigeria companies or industries between the employers and the employees. The Dangote in his production relation with his workers determine what salary to pay at the end of the month in his own favour to the detriment of the employees.

The import/export system introduced during the colonial administration was basically to convey raw materials abroad for their industrial usage and to be able to sell the goods produced by their industries in Nigeria. They export raw materials at a cheaper rate and import consumer products to sell at an exploitative prices. All this activities destroyed the good economy of Nigeria that would have helped us to developed our own technology before now and deliver us from seemingly perpetual economic bondages of the European countries. Today we still have them dominating our economic. i.e. Shell, Mobile, Globalcom, MTN etc. Even our economy policies are imported today the content of SAP for example was an economic dictate from the IMF. We as well still on the side of producing raw materials for the abroad countries to process, but not as total as it were under the colonial economy. The forceful implementation of neo-liberal policies such as SAP whose condition include privatisation, trade and capital liberalisation, deregulation and removal of subsidy, devaluation of currency etc. are similar to the components of globalisation, which is a neo-liberal ideology.

This is couple with other conditions given to Nigeria by IMF, World Bank, Paris Club among other imperialist financial institutions across the world before granting loan facilities or aids to the country. Many of these conditions are unsuitable and anti- progressive to the development efforts in Nigeria (Asaju, K. et al. 2014:25).

9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The colonialists saw the effectiveness of the traditional political structures of the pre-colonial era as means to grasp the economy structure of Nigeria and smartly put in place various economic structures to satisfy their parochial economic interest. The features of colonial politico-economy identified in this paper are showcases of the reconfigured of the Nigeria economy by the colonial masters. This study has being able to establish the fact that some of them have changed, but the Nigeria elites has assumed the same posture of putting in place economic structure patterned towards their benefits and satisfactions rather than to the benefit of the masses. Hence, the study recommended that: (i)the Nigeria elite must do away with bad and unfavourable colonial legacies, if we must have an economy that will develop its own technology, industries, self-created job to improve the living standard of the poor masses. (ii) that rather than Nigeria elites/governments generously remunerating traditional rulers and using them to foster their political cum economic selfish interests, local rulers should serve as agents of change by influencing the government to develop the rural/local area so as to reasonably improve the standard of living of the rural poor masses. (iii) the traditional rulers/local rulers should have the interest of their subject in mind and mobilize to influence the government for the development of social amenities that will better the lives of the local populace rather than been used by the elites to exploit their subject. (iv) the elites should cease from taking advantage of ethnic differences for selfish gains as this has continue to threaten national security and unity. (v) the elite at all levels, federal, state and local, rather than using the police and army to oppress oppositions, the police should be encouraged and allowed to carry out their constitutional responsibilities of protecting live, property and territorial integrity that will ensure a conducive environment for legal economic activities to flourish. (vi) Nigeria elites should wake-up to their responsibilities by formulate strategic economic policies that will bring about forward and backward linkages between raw materials produce in the country and the local industries as this will not only bring about an economy that will not depend completely on foreign power, but that will creates employment opportunities for the qualified unemployed youths who have become terrorists in the country. (vii) that the elites should diversify the economy by investing in large scale agricultures rather than depending or tying her earnings to only crude oil. (viii) that any import-export policies that is not healthy for the locally base industries and will hinder them from flourishing should be discarded appropriately without fear of external forces. (ix) the wages that the employers are paying for labour should be commensurate to the hour and energy spent during labour to reduce exploitation and callous cash payment in the production relation.

REFERENCES

1. Ademolekun, L. (2002). *Politics and Administration in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Kenbim Press Ltd.
2. Ake, C. (2000). *A Political Economy of Africa*, Nigeria: Longman Nigeria Plc.
3. Asaju, K. et al. (2014). *The rising rate of unemployment in Nigeria: the socio-economic and political implications*.
4. *Global Business and Economics Research Journal*, 3(2): 12-32. Available online at <http://www.journal.globejournal.org>.
5. Colonialism. Retrieved from <http://www.answers.com/topic/colonialism> on 17th April, 2009.
6. Dougherty, E. J. and Pfaltzgraff L. R. (1990). *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*. Third Edition, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
7. Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for Political Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs: N. J. Prentice-Hall.
8. Economy. Retrieved from <http://www.drwords.com/define/Economy> on 21st April, 2009.

9. Encyclopedia, Overview of Nigeria Economy. Retrieved from <http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/economies/africa/nigeriaoverviewof-economy.html> on 16th April, 2009.
10. Imam, B. (1996). Local Government in Nigeria: Evolving A Third Tier of Government, Ibadan: Heinemann Education Books (Nigeria) Plc.
11. Nkwopara, C. (2014). Imo Traditional Rulers Reject Okorocho's Cars - Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/05/imo-traditional-rulers-reject-okorocho-s-cars/#sthash.bdieKCE1.dpuf> on 23rd September, 2014.
12. Palmer and Perkins, (2007). International Relations: The World Communities in Transition. 3rd Edition, India: A.I.T.B.S publishers & Distributors Delhi.
13. Sani, A. H. (1992). Local and Urban Administration in Nigeria, Nigeria: Government Printers Kwara State.

Citation: SHAIBU, M. T and A. O. OGOH (2015) The Strategic Features of Colonial Politico-Economic, Changes and Continuities: The Nigerian Experience. IJHSSE 2(3), PP: 116-125.