

Lere Amusan (South Africa)

Between fancy and fantasy: Nigeria's journey to industrialized state status in the post-COP 19 era

Abstract

By 2020, Nigeria hopes to be one of the most industrialized countries in the comity of nations as if 'Rome wasn't built in a day.' Corruption and lack of political will are some of the issues that have affected the proper implementation of various Development Plans put in place in Nigeria since 1960. The climate change crises put the much-publicized Nigeria Vision 20-2020 (NV20-2020) under stress. Lack of government readiness, global financial problems and the concretisation of the Western inspired national strategy against global solution militates against climate smart. The western dominated technical committee on measuring, reporting and verifying (MRV) does not encourage the realization of the Vision because the committee is too technical for the country to understand their activities. Drought, flood, destabilization of the ecosystem and the destruction of biodiversity are the fallouts of climate change. The implications of these are diversion of annual budget to address immediate needs in the form of disaster risk management, mitigation and adaptation. This paper argues that long as the Nigerian government prevaricates on environmental law, the NV20-2020 will remain a pipe dream. Employing political economy approach for this analysis will shed more light on the way forward in addressing the twin issues of climate change and NV20-2020. There is a need for the polluters to pay for the environmental damages.

Keywords: Nigeria, climate change, COP19, vision 20-2020, political economy, Green Fund.

JEL Classification: Q50, Q58.

Introduction

The importance of the year 2020 in the study of climate change is scary and perhaps spells doom for the survival of humanity as predicted by Rachel Carson (1962). 2020 has been set as a target date for Nigeria to be one of the most industrialized countries in the world. Many countries and various international organizations have also set the year as a target date for various sustainable development plans. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) projected that by 2020, the Arctic region will be ice-free during summer (Borgerson, 2013). The United Nations Framework Conference on Climate Change (UNFCCC) set its envisaged 2015 COP21, which will replace the Kyoto Protocol (1997) to take effect by 2020. This agreement is expectedly to be a pro-ultra-capitalist agenda to the detriment of the developing world. The question that comes to mind is how Nigeria will abide by these mitigation strategies based on its precarious economic situation. Unfortunately, America, expectedly, did not participate in the UNFCCC as expected of a hegemon in the global system. Rather, the US focused on the Iran nuclear summit in Geneva, and also the Philippines, India and Pakistan flood received more attention during COP17 Warsaw Summit.

The United States of America (US), one of the major importers of gas and oil from Nigeria, aims at increasing its "unconventional" production of shale gas and oil through fracking by 2020. Between 2005 and 2013, America's oil production increased by

30%. Between 2013 and 2020, production of shale oil and gas is expected to add \$380-690 billion (2%-4%), to America's annual GDP, creating 1.7 million permanent jobs (*The Economist*, 2013). In 2013, oil giants in cooperation with the CIA, the Department of Defense, private intelligence team and investment bankers came up with what is known as the Lazarus Process where more than \$100 billion will be annually spent on oil prospecting from subsea. The current \$27 billion expenses on oil production will be \$52 billion by 2016 and eventually jump to \$130 billion in 2020. Abandoned oil fields were recently discovered, through hi-tech, to have housed about 75% oil deposits more. Therefore, America and the North Sea oil deposits are new sources of oil for developed countries. Contrarily, the Like-minded group of Developing Countries' (LMDC) advocated for equity and common but differentiated responsibilities through climate smart hopefully to be bankroll by the developed countries.

NV20-2020 hoped to remain a mirage as most of the technology expected to improve the economic development is from fossil fuel and agriculture. Political instability, religious fanaticism and human security fragility are the combined factors that will affect any meaningful development in the country come 2020. The massive production of oil and gas through fracking and the Lazarus Process will affect the price of conventional oil, which Nigeria depends on in achieving NV20-2020. Because of the volatility of the Middle East, the unreliable source of South America's oil and gas and recent politico-religious fundamentalism in Africa, the US is inspired to increase the production of oil and gas unconventional-

ly from the current 21% from gas and oil to 33% hopefully by 2020. This is one of America and European Union's (EU) energy development strategies despite a series of protests against fracking.

1. Methodology and theoretical framework

The intention of this study is to employ political economy approach as a theoretical framework. Methodologically, historical materialism is a departing point of this paper in explaining economic underdevelopment in developing states in general with a special focus on the Nigerian situation. The integration of the country to the capitalist system not only neutralized the communal system that the country was familiar with; it also reduced the state to a producer of economic inputs for the industrialized north through series of incentives (Ake, 1983). Twenty-first century brought about the *belle époque* (truly *belle* for capital) championed by the triad of the European Union, America and Japan. The *fin de siècle* triumph of liberal globalization brought to the fore of the institutionalization of capitalism as the only development path for the periphery states (Amin, 2006). International trade arrangement of unequal development forced Nigeria to be a raw materials producer – cocoa, palm oil, ground nut – until the discovery of fossil fuel at commercial level in the Niger Delta region (Ake, 1979 & 1983). This was when oil multinationals thronged to Nigeria on the eve of the country's political independence. Economy of disarticulation institutionalized through this arrangement came with the crisis of climate change heralded the question of mitigation and adaptation that the country cannot afford.

The North-South cooperation option as a means of economic development of the developing states keeps moving the South away from meaningful economic development. The activities of the multinational corporations (MNCs) made the south believed that technology transferred from the north enhances full employment, foreign exchange and general development turned out to be a ruse. It is the intention of this paper to adhere to the 'polluter-pays' principle to avoid *limit to growth*. This shall take the argument to call MNCs in Nigeria to address the issue of climate change before any meaningful development is achievable at the global level. Based on this approach, much of the consulted literature will be secondary sources and some of the primary sources are the government policy position published by the Nigeria's Federal Ministry of Environment (FME) and the 1999 Constitution of the country.

2. NV20-2020 and climate change policy (CCP)

The aim of NV20-2020 is 'to place the country on a sustainable development path and transform into a

modern society better able to play a greater role in the comity of nations' (Nigeria Vision 20-2020, 2010). To achieve this, the documents aimed at sustainable management of the nation's natural resources as against all the previous development plans that failed to achieve expected sustainable development. NV20-2020 also aimed at structural transformation, reduce the country's overdependence on fossil fuel and improve standards of living to take a rightful position among the nations of the world. In the strategic framework for NV20-2020, pillar two aimed at optimizing the key sources of economic growth, which are agriculture and oil and gas sectors. Since the discovery of oil at commercial value in the country, agricultural sector is a mere source of employment for the rural dwellers with little contribution to GDP. The introduction of a mono-economy in the form of overreliance on fossil fuel as a means of foreign exchange leads to resource curse; more so with the discovery of the same product in almost every state in Africa. Not only that, this has reduced Nigeria's oil power in Africa. It also dwarfs its source of income because of new technology introduced to energy exploration at the global system. For a meaningful development in the country, the issue of climate change needs attention holistically as the twin concepts of climate smart and grandfathering need more attention.

The Nigeria's 1999 Constitution is the basis of environmental policy in the country and the FME is empowered to actualize this. Through Act No. 25 of 2007, the National Environmental Standard and Regulations Enforcement Agency (NESREA) was established under FME to replace the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (FEPA) Act of 1990. Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR) also has power to regulate environmental problems related to oil and gas. Ironically, for the interest of the oil multinationals, NESREA has no power to regulate environmental pollution from oil and gas. There is a concurrent power between national and state governments on the issue of environment. NESREA is empowered to enforce compliance with the provisions of international agreements, protocol, conventions and treaties on environment (FME, 2010).

The Act that established NESREA is weak in terms of enforcement. For instance, the Act provides that "A person who violates the regulations commits an offence and shall on conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding \$1,250, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year." This is an avenue for the corporate institutions to violate environmental law with impunity despite the high rate of corruption among the FME officials. Harmful Waste Act 2004, Section 2, stipulates that each of the persons respon-

sible for environmental hazard shall be deemed as an equal party to the crime and thus each person is equally liable. Such should be extended to the MNCs that contribute largely to the climate change problems in the country. The Act provides for the input of private individual to challenge any institution or individual that violates environmental law. This could have contributed to the Ogoni movement that challenged Shell Petroleum Oil Company. The agitation was met with resistance from the state leading to the hanging in 1995 of Ogoni leaders only to satisfy the interest of the oil MNCs. Observation of environmental impact assessment (EIA) by the private and public companies involved in project that affect sustainable development is marred with corruption by the EIA Agency officials (Oyesola, 2008).

The Act that established the DPR and NASREA requires a polluter to pay compensation to affected persons and the state for environmental damage caused by the offender. Ironically, the MNCs that operate in Nigeria are immune of this despite their contribution to environmental pollution in the name of bringing technology, sources of employment, foreign exchange and enjoy tax holiday in the country. Another source of imperialism is the power accorded to the oil and gas sector. While a search warrant can be issued to check compliance to the environmental law in other sectors, oil and gas industry are excluded from such inspection.

Though the issue of climate change with emphasis on adaptation and mitigation is included in the NV20-2020, it is confirmed by the FME that the country is not in a position to adapt national policies, strategies and plans to address climate change problems for lack of relevant technology. With regard to national emission, Nigeria claims to have contributed minimally. The issue of who should pay for the clean environment comes to the fore. At the same time, who dominates the manufacturing industry, oil and gas sectors and recently, land use (agriculture and mining) may bring the country to another level of discussion MNCs have continued to dominate the sectors from the time of colonialism till date. For the country to succeed to reduce emissions by 25% target by 2020, the state needs to invest about \$174.8 million yearly to achieve 5%. As such, mitigation strategies such as switching from fuel oil to natural gas, introduction of paraffin stove, energy saving bulbs, efficient electrical appliance at home and efficient automobiles are necessary conditions. Corruption perpetrated by relevant authorities such as the Standard Organization of Nigeria (SON) and Custom officials add to Nigeria's environmental problem.

3. The main threat to environment and its implications for the Vision 20-2020

Nigeria is blessed with various climatic regions, which, if made use of, may transform the socio-economic status of the country. The availability of mineral wealth is enough to transform the economy in a positive direction. Nigeria is "endowed with fishery resources, wildlife, timber, medicinal plants, mineral resources, water, ornamental and food crops" (Ajai, 2011). Inability to embark on climate smart may enhance total collapse of the eco-system, GDP losses, security risk, cross-border migration, scarcity of resources and increase in preventable diseases and some geopolitical reordering all of which are described as 'age of consequence' (Bales and Duke, 2008).

In trying to address herders versus crop farmers incessant clashes, the Third National Development Plan (1975-80), aimed at the creation of 22 million hectares of grazing reserves in northern Nigeria remains a pipe-dream. This can be ascribed to bad implementation of the policy. 2.84 million hectares were created in 433 locations. Out of these reserves, more than 80% have not been gazetted. Through lobbying, the northerners want to smuggle in the creation of various grazing reserves throughout the country and at every local government of the Federation through the Senate. When this was tabled in the Senate, positions of the senators towed ethnic lines. While the core northerners (north-east and north-west) want nationwide grazing reserves, the north central, south-west, south-south and south-east maintained that this would run contrary to the 1999 Constitution and the Land Use Act that vested land to the states/province as against Federal Government. The position of the Senators was not far from different socio-political groups in the country, the Arewa Consultative Forum supported the creation of nationwide grazing reserves, but the Afenifere, Ohanaeze, Ijaw National Congress and Federation of Middle Belt People differed with this position (Suleiman, 2012, p. 53).

Lack of available grazing land is aggravated by the privatization of land through Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation + Ecosystem co-benefits (REDD+) where foreigners are in control of the fertile lands for questionable food security described as 'politics of the belly and 'land grabbing' (Bayart, 1993; Galaty, 2013). Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in the agricultural sector is neither a way of resolving food insecurity nor a means of providing employment, but an attempt to produce and export to the developed states.

According to the 2010 report, \$1.78 billion is needed till 2020 to mitigate carbon release. Logging as a means of sustaining the construction industry negates balanced eco-system and preservation of the wetland. It is scientifically confirmed that deforestation is a major contributor to GHG emissions.

Incurion of the MNCs on African land is a violation of the rights of indigenous peoples (IPs) with relevant international instruments to preserve their cultural heritage and the protection of basic human rights as enshrined in the ILO Convention 169.

How can Nigeria adapt to the negative impacts of climate change when there are no actual statistics on the degree of vulnerability? From the FME release, the issue of degree and of its impacts are discussed as it will be mostly felt in the North-East compared to the southern part of the country. This is too shallow a position as heavy rainfall in the mangrove forest is not without its shortcomings as witnessed between 2012 and 2014 when the release of excess water in Cameroon had devastating impacts on food production, housing, health and transport activities in the Middle Belt and the riparian states of Bayelsa, Rivers, Cross River, Kogi, Benue and some parts of Ondo states. Sea level rise of 0.3 m is predicted by 2020 in Nigeria. If it could rise by 1 m, the implication of this is that 75% of the Niger Delta will be lost. Several indigenous homes will find themselves in the sea. Agriculture and Water Resources Ministry is estimated to need about \$3.06 billion yearly, also the Transport Ministry also needs about \$5.33 billion for the same period to mitigate the effects of climate change. The question that awaits a solution is how can the government source for this amount when other sectors are crying for attention?

There is a need to identify the most vulnerable areas for proper planning to embark on adaptation and mitigation strategies adaptable to the Nigerian environment. For now, there is no adequate research or databank which gives a guide on the impact of climate change on the economy. There is a need for information management system and dissemination of authentic information on the effects and how to curb the impacts of climate change. A proactive response, rather than a reactive response will best serve the needs of Nigeria in the context of sustainable development in general and the attainment of the objectives of Vision 2020, in particular (Ministry of Environment, 2010).

4. The future of oil production and climate smart in Nigeria

The importance of Nigeria in the international oil market will be reduced as a result of the thawing of

glacier in the Arctic region. The importance attached to Africa will be substantially reduced when alternative and effective route along the Arctic is completed. The passage between the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean will be reduced by some thousands of kilometers. Hence, the crisis and politics of keeping Africa out of terror attack will receive little attention unlike what obtains now. On the question of mineral resources, it is estimated that the Arctic region houses 25% of the fossil fuel in the world and valuable mineral resources of commercial value. To consolidate joint exploration of the Arctic resources, the Ilulissat Declaration of 2008 was entered into by the member states (the USA, Canada, Russia, Norway and Greenland). The importance of this for Nigeria, is among others, that state energy will receive less protection from the most industrialized states in the world. The state strategic location will be substantially reduced as the Atlantic route towards the southern tip will be less patronized. The need to develop the "civilized nations of Greenland, Alaska (the USA), northern part of Canada, Russia Federation and Norway will be more prioritized as against the developing states where the dividend of the post-Cold War is always negative. This development will affect the NV20-2020.

5. Climate finance in the capitalist world

The issue of adaptation and mitigation that calls for climate financing is not without its lapses. The UN Forum on Funding of Climate Change was smuggled to be under the Bank Directive where the forces of demand and supply will determine the allocation of resources. The Bank that is involving in dirty investment and encourages developed countries to embark on grandfathering is equally and at same time, calling for climate smart. This is a source of argument among Climate Change Financing students (Bond, 2012). As much as there is a need for climate finance, the question that comes to mind is why the World Bank should be the custodian of this project? The institution is known for being pro-West and pro-dirty investment in Africa and other developing states.

REDD+ was initiated by the UNFCCC in 2005 to mitigate climate change effects. It was promoted at the COP11, Canada, with the aim of setting up special funds to help the south, mostly in the tropical region, to protect the indigenous forests by facilitating investment in carbon sequestration (Amusan, 2009; IPACC, 2011). What remains a major challenge is the financing of this project as there is a need to pay for forest conservation to the state concerned with special focus on developing states. In 2007, Nigeria and South Africa received \$100 million from the project but the question that comes to mind is who should have access to such funds? Is it

the national government, farmers, IPs who are good at preserving their flora and fauna or MNCs that are making an inroad to re-colonize the forest region of tropical areas? If the fund is meant for the government, corruption will not allow the relevant stakeholders to benefit from the facility. Before the money could be disbursed, certain criteria should be met in measured, reported and verified (MRV) forms (compliance with Annex 1, which Nigeria is not a member (FME, 2010)). Who is going to conduct this? Is it the national government, UN Forum on Forest, UNFCCC, or CBD who are the major stakeholders on climate change at the global level? Or will it be under the Bank Green Climate Fund that is not to the interest of developing states? Though records have confirmed that up to 125% increase of forest finance was recorded from ODA between 2002 and 2004-2008-2010, the same could not be said in the post-Doha COP18 as the summit did not make any mention of REDD funding for the period of 2012-2020. The problem associated with REDD is the accessibility of local people, mostly IPs to the resources of the forest and also the financing of forest management and it impacts on ecosystem of the forest/biodiversity (Recio and Bisiaux, 2013).

From Kyoto to Cancun, the instruments of the UNFCCC remained bound on the member states, but from the 2010 Cancun Summit (Mexico) of the COP16, the West realized the financial and moral implications of the Kyoto Protocol, therefore, made them embark on diplomatic horse trading that eventually led to non-binding principle. This was concretized during COP19 by Canada, Japan and Australia when they exit from the supranational Kyoto arrangement and instead called for voluntary measure. Even the COP19 host, Poland, did not agree with EU on carbon trading, but used its position as the host state to frustrate the European position on international action. America sees the Kyoto Agreement as a challenge to its sovereignty and economic development, therefore, US Senate refuses to support the move on the pretext that India and China should reduce the rate at which they pollute the environment (Rosenbaum, 2011). COP19 set up Green Climate Fund (GCF) with no enforcement on the members. Instead, the summit advocated for the participation of national governments and NGOs in the funding of climate change adaptation. The same applies to the Doha summit as those “who contributed almost 80% of global emissions have rejected the notion of ecological debt/reparation pushed by the developing states at the COP17 in Durban, South African 2011” (Sharife, 2013).

6. Why NV20-2020 may remain a mirage?

It is projected that Africa is going to outstrip Asia by 2050 in economic terms. Currently, is it believed that out of the 12 fastest growing economy in the world, 7 of them, including Nigeria, are in Africa (Devarajan and Fengler, 2013). This could have made the Nigerian government aspired for the unabated economic development of which 2020 was set as a target year to march the most industrialized states in the world. This was conceived without looking into the likely associated problems with this ambition. The issue of climate change, among others, is the most threatening factor. Some countries will benefit from the increase in the global temperature, others, including Nigeria, will face the wrath of climate variability. How then can Nigeria cope with annual flooding in the forest and arid regions? How can the government cope with desertification with its implications on military security of the country? The existence of pockets of Touaregs in Kano State may ginger cultural irredentism as it is indirectly experienced through the solidarity for the Boko Haram and Ansaruby the National Movement for the Liberation on Azawad (MNLA) in Mali. Unemployment among the youths, drought that led to the killing of animals and religious influence forced some Malian Touregsto join Ghaddafi's war in 2011 (Amusan, 2013; Francis, 2013). How can we substantiate that such will not repeat itself in Nigeria with the activities of the Boko Haram and Ansaru in the north-east and north-central part of Nigeria? These are the likely fallouts of the climate change implications for the Nigerian state. Nigeria has realized that it cannot ring a territory and expect to be safe; this has contributed to the involvement of the country's armed forces in Mali (Sharife, 2013). The unbudgeted military involvement in Mali by the Nigerian Army is an indirect way of paying dearly for the effects of GHG emissions, among which is leaving a little surplus for development.

On the need to adhere to the propositions of the western imposed REDD+, the question that comes to mind is why are the polluters and logging companies not paying for the destabilization they cause to the biodiversity in the mangrove area of Nigeria rather than waiting for the international community? This position received extensive discussion elsewhere where it is maintained that the polluters should pay because the western-inspired solution to the current logjam needs to be addressed by MNCs who have been active in environmental degradation before 1960 to ensure climate justice and equity (Amusan, 2009; Ologunorisa, 2011). The introduction of market-based mechanism has not been to

Nigeria's advantage; rather, the benefit will only be accorded to developed countries.

The promotion of plantation and agro-mechanism is to dispossess IPs of their land, perpetration of damaged biodiversity and ecosystem, abuse of human rights through the eviction of IPs, promotion of Genetically-Modified Organisms (GMOs) and Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) that are not healthy for human consumption (Doyle and McEachern, 2008; Tung, 2013) and violation of Chapter IV of Nigeria's 1999 Constitution that advocates the rights to life. The Nupe ethnic group around Patigi in Kwara State were evicted from their ancestral home in the name of development by the government of Bukola Sharaki (2003-2010) and invited Zimbabwean commercial farmers to take up their land for agricultural production that hardly impacted on the lives of the local people because the farmers' products are for export to Europe. In line with the Act that established NAS-REA, it is mandatory to assess likely impact on the eco-system that may be caused through farming in an area of 500 hectares or more. Because of the political reason, this was not conducted where the Zimbabwean farmers occupy in Kwara State. The eviction implies that the Nupe rice growers are deprived of natural food against the genetically-modified food (GMF) produced by the foreign farmers (Elliot, 2013). By extension, this is a violation of the second and third generations' human rights. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981), particularly its Article 21(1) and (2), which states that all people have the right to natural resources, wealth and property of their land (ACHPR & IWGIA, 2005, p. 20) runs parallel to the REDD objectives. Other instruments that Nigeria is legally bonded to are to protect the rights of Nigerians, the Convention of Biological Diversity (1992), the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights acceded to in 1960, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1966), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) (1979) and the Convention of the Rights of the Child (1989). Ironically, privatization of natural resources as crafted by the West excluded Nigerians from engaging in these rights.

The question that comes to mind is whether the much touted Africa as the food basket of the world holds? Many farmers are now protesting against the acquisition of their lands by MNCs through traditional rulers. At the same time, dubious statistical information was recorded by the UNFAO that between 2006 and 2008, Nigeria had a 7% growth rate in food production as against the projected 6% goal predicted by the

Union (AU)-New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)'s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) (Branca et al., 2011).

7. Food security and climate change: any plan through Vision 20-2020?

The launching of Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA) by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Transformation encourages private companies to engage in farming through which small farmers will eventually lose their land to MNCs. In order to promote the principles of REDD+, genetically-modified seeds are encouraged to be sold to farmers and fertilizers without government involvement. The selling of seeds and fertilizers to farmers at subsidized rates by private companies is an attempt to eliminate natural seedlings and later come up with the market price of their products as instituted in South Africa by Monsanto. This is neo-colonialism as discussed above. Having captured South Africa, known to be the 10th largest producer of GM food, the turn is now on Nigeria through the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Adesina, 2012).

The implication of achieving Vision 20-2020 is to move closer to the tenets of globalization. This connotes the need to open up the economy to foreign investors in the field of mining and agriculture as well as water resources exploration. Unemployment is self-evident because the attracted technology will create capital-intensive as against labor intensive mode of production. These are some of the problems associated with the introduction of REDD+ as it will impact negatively on land tenure system, and a threat to rights and self-determination of the people in the name of actualizing NV20-2020. This approach of economic growth without economic development is problematic to the whole gamut of a just socio-economic development. This is being premised on who gets paid for what, rather than on looking at the issues of sustainability and equality as mentioned above (IPACC, 2011).

Conclusion

Climate change damage could wipe off all the gains of economic growth which Nigeria claims to have mustered from the sale of fossil fuel. In fact, it can impact negatively on individuals with special focus on income, health, quality of life and in some cases, one's existence (Sharife, 2013). Therefore, the NV20-2020 may remain a mirage as the effects of climate change as discussed above are not globally addressed by the polluters. The much publicised REDD+ that is expected to introduce functional adaptation and mitigation through finance from

carbon trading and carbon sequestration is being rejected by developed countries because of the financial commitment which they are not ready to pay for. Because of the low level of technology and the economy of disarticulation imposed on Nigeria, the country will find it difficult to come up with a functional climate mitigation programme in the near future. It is the conclusion of this study that MNCs and the developed states should provide for relevant friendly technology to address climate

change rather than shifting the cost on Nigeria and other developing states on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in line with the LMDC. At the domestic level, there is need for a comprehensive and coordinated approach as against a reactive position of the government on climate change. In order to ensure Vision 20-2020, a National Development Plan aimed at moving the state beyond the present level of underdevelopment is essential.

References

1. ACHPR (African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights) and IWGIA (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs) (2005). *Report of the African Commission's Working Group of Experts on Indigenous Populations/Communities*, Banjul and Copenhagen: ACHPR and IWGIA.
2. Adesina, A. (2012). President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's Revolutionary Strides in the Agriculture Sector within 12 Months of the Agricultural Transformation Agenda (ATA), *Tell* (weekly Magazine, Lagos), p. 12.
3. Ajai, O. (2011). Balancing of interests in environmental law in Nigeria. Faure, M. and du Plessis, W. (eds.), *The balancing of interests in environmental law in Africa*, Pretoria: Pretoria University Law Press, pp. 379-412.
4. Ake C. (1979). *Social Science as Imperialism: The Theory of Political Development*, Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
5. Ake, C. (1983). *A Political Economy of Africa*, Lagos: Longman.
6. Amin, S. (2006). *Obsolescent Capitalism: Contemporary Politics and Global Disorder*, London and New York.
7. Amusan, L. (2012). Libya's Implosion and its Impacts on Children, *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 14 (5), pp. 66-79.
8. Amusan, L. (2009). *Africa and Climate Change in the Era of Complex Interdependent Globalised International System*, Working Paper No. 2, Florida: JAPSS, October.
9. Bales, C.F. and Duke, R.D. (2008). Containing Climate Change, *Foreign Affairs*, September/October, pp. 78-89.
10. Bond, P. (2012). *Politics of Climate Change: Paralysis Above, Movement Below*, Scottsville: University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal Press.
11. Borgerson, S. (2013). The Coming Arctic Boom: As the Ice Melts, the Region Heats Up, *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, pp. 76-89.
12. Branca, G. et al. (2011). *Identifying opportunities for climate-smart agriculture investments in Africa*, Rome: FAO.
13. Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*, London: Penguin.
14. Devarajan, S. and Fengler, W. (2013). Africa's Economic Boom: Why the Pessimists and the Optimists are both Right, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June, pp. 68-81.
15. Doyle, T. and McEachern, D. (2008). *Environment and Politics*, London and New York: Routledge.
16. Elliot, J.A. (2013). *An Introduction to Sustainable Development*, London and New York: Routledge.
17. Federal Ministry of Environment (Special Climate Change Unit) National Environmental, Economic and Development Study (NEEDS) for Climate Change in Nigeria (2010). Available at: <http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/nigerineeds.pdf>, p. 4. Access on 1 November 2013.
18. Francis, D.J. (2013). The Regional Impact of the Armed Conflict and French Intervention in Mali, *Report*, Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre, April 2013.
19. Galaty, J.(2013). Land Grabbing in the Eastern African Rangelands. Catley, A. Lind, J. and Scoones, I. (eds.). *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, London and New York: Routledge and Earthscan, pp.143-153.
20. Gyorgy, A. (1992). *Ecological Economics: A Practical Programme for Global Reform*, London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
21. IPACC (Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee) (2011). *African Indigenous Peoples and REDD+: Human rights, equity and forest carbon capture in climate mitigation*, Cape Town: IPACC, November, 2011.
22. Korolec, M. (2013). Universality and Fairness of Commitments are the key to Success. Available at: <http://climate-1.iisd.org/guest-articles/universality-and-fairness-of-committments-are-the-key-to-success>. Accessed on November 17, 2013.
23. Nigeria Vision 20-2020 (2010). Available at: http://www.africaportal.org/sites/default/files/Nigeria%20vision%2020_0.pdf. Accessed on February 21, 2014.
24. Ologunorisa, T.E. (2011). In Search of Climate Justice and Equity, Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the Osun State University on January 19, 2011.
25. Oyesola, D. (2008). *Sustainable Development: Issues and Challenges for Nigeria*, Ibadan: Daily Graphics.
26. Recio, E. and Bisiaux, A. (2013). REDDy to the Put Jig saw Together, 2013. Available at: <http://climate-1.iisd.org/policy-updates/reddy-to-put-the-jigsaw-together/>. Accessed on November 17, 2013.
27. Rosenbaum, W.A. (2011). *Environmental Politics and Policy*, Washington, DC: CQ Press.
28. Sharife, K. (2013). Who Should pay for Climate Damage, *African Business*, March, pp.16-20.

29. Suleiman, T. (2012). Fighting for the Rights of Cattle, *Tell* (Lagos), November 26, pp. 46-53.
30. *The Economist* (2013). American industry and fracking: From sunset to new dawn, November 16. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/news/business/21589870-capitalists-not-just-greens-are-now-questioning-how-significant-benefits-shale-gas-and-oil>. Accessed on November 20, 2013.
31. The Ilulissat Declaration Arctic Ocean Conference. The conference held at Ilulissat, Greenland between, May 27-29, 2008. http://www.oceanlaw.org/downloads/arctic/Ilulissat_Declaration.pdf. Accessed on November 17, 2013.
32. Tung, O.J.L. (2013). GMOs, Food Security and the Right to Adequate Food: Risks and Challenges, a Paper Presented at a Conference Organised by the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (South Africa) and the Faculty of Law, North West University (Potchefstroom Campus), South Africa at Hakunamatata Conference Center, Muldersdrift, Johannesburg, October 24-25.